2012-2013 Annual Program Assessment Report

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College and the assessment office by Monday, September 30, 2013. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

College: Health & Human Development

Department: Child & Adolescent Development

Program: N/A

Assessment liaison: *Rosemary Gonzalez*

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** Provide a brief overview of this year's assessment plan and process.
   The department conducted an analysis of the SLO of content knowledge. This was the first year we collected longitudinal pre-post data. We collected data from the CADV 394/494 year-long internship course. A 21-item pen and paper exam was given to the students at the beginning of a given class session. Data was collected from all internship sections (i.e., 2 per semester).

2. **Assessment Buy-In.** Describe how your chair and faculty were involved in assessment related activities. Did department meetings include discussion of student learning assessment in a manner that included the department faculty as a whole?
   The five-year assessment plans have been discussed at faculty meetings. Faculty have volunteered to take the lead on assessment projects listed on our five-year plan.

3. **Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project.** Answer items a-f for each SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, copy and paste items a-f below, BEFORE you answer them here, to provide additional reporting space.

   3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?
   SLO- Content Knowledge

   3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university's Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)

- The SLO on content knowledge is the basis upon which to later assess Critical Thinking

3c. Does this learning outcome align with University's commitment to supporting diversity through the cultivation and exchange of a wide variety of ideas and points of view? In what ways did the assessed SLO incorporate diverse perspectives related to race, ethnic/cultural identity/cultural orientations, religion, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, socio-economic status, veteran status, national origin, age, language, and employment rank?
Since all sections of the CADV 394B/494B course were assessed, it more closely reflected the diversity of the student population in CADV. In addition, the faculty in the department is ethnically diverse. Hence diversity of perspectives (e.g., at faculty meetings discussing assessment) is reflected in the assessment process.

3d. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?
A 21-item survey that included three items per 7 theories.

3e. Describe the assessment design methodology: For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.
The survey has been previously administered in CADV 250, CADV 352, & CADV 470. However, the data was cross-sectional in nature. In contrast, the data collected this year had a longitudinal, pre-post test design.

3f. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.
    Data was inputted on excel and SPSS. A total of 74 students were surveyed (pre-post data was available for 63 students. Percentages, means, and difference scores were computed. A key finding was that student scores improved over the 2012-2013 academic year. Out of 21 possible points, the average student score increased from 9.5 to 15.03. In addition, student scores significantly increased on four of the seven theories/theorists (i.e., content knowledge) that were tested. The maximum score possible for a given theory/theorists was three points. Scores on items related to (1) Erikson/Psychoanalytic theories, (2) Information Processing, (3) Bronfenbrenner, and (4) Vygotsky increased significantly from Fall 2012 to Spring 2013 (i.e., an average 1.35 increase in scores). At time two, most students had 2.55 correct items (out of 3 possible) on the theories for which there were significant gains.
    Scores on (1) Piaget, (2) Kohlberg, and (3) Behaviorism did not change significantly from Fall 2012 to Spring 2013. The average score on Piaget, Kohlberg, and Behaviorism was 1.6 correct (out of 3 possible). At time 2, scores on Piaget and Behaviorism theories had non-significant increases (i.e., a .15 non-significant increase). Scores on Kohlberg items had a negative, non-significant trend (a .13, non-significant decrease).

3g. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

Upon discussion of the results, faculty want to close the loop by (1) having individual faculty to make changes in content (e.g., on Piaget, Kohlberg, Behaviorism) and (2) they would like to want to dig deeper and understand students understanding of theory by creating another instrument that emphasizes application of theory.   In prior years, faculty suggested developing linked assignments for sequenced based courses (e.g., CADV 350 assignment is further developed in CADV 470).

4. **Assessment of Previous Changes:** Present documentation that demonstrates how the previous changes in the program resulted in improved student learning.

We had prior baseline data (Spring 2010) on this instrument. The assessment instrument was revised slightly to clarify the content of the questions. The lowest student scores were also low on Kohlberg, Piaget, and Behaviorism in Spring 2010. Overall scores on the instrument were higher (1.59 points)

5. **Changes to SLOs?** Please attach an updated course alignment matrix if any changes were made. (Refer to the Curriculum Alignment Matrix Template, http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html.)
    Not applicable.

6. Assessment Plan: Evaluate the effectiveness of your 5 year assessment plan. How well did it inform and guide your assessment work this academic year? What process is used to develop/update the 5 year assessment plan? Please attach an updated 5 year assessment plan for 2013-2018. (Refer to Five Year Planning Template, plan B or C, http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html.)

7. Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program?
         None to date.

8. **Other information, assessment or reflective activities or processes not captured above.**

Not at this time.