**Annual Assessment Report to the College 2011-12**

**College: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_HHD\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Department: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_FCS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Program: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Note: Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the assessment office and to the Associate Dean of your College by September 28, 2012. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

**Liaison: \_\_\_\_Angie Giordano\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s) (optional)**

|  |
| --- |
| 1a. **Assessment Process Overview:** Provide a brief overview of the assessment plan and process this year. For the 2011-2012 academic year, our assessment activities focused on analyzing student data that was collected the previous year pertaining to our PLO #1. An assessment committee was formed consisting of five full time faculty who represented all the areas within our department (Apparel Design and Merchandising, Consumer Affairs, Family Studies, Interior Design, Nutrition/Dietetics and Food Science). The committee met to discuss the initial evaluation plan, including a pilot test to evaluate the same subset of student data as a way to establish inter-rater reliability. We also then met several other times throughout the assessment efforts to address ongoing evaluation issues, including an interesting discussion in which we all revisited the wording and meaning of our department’s PLO #1 from our unique disciplinary perspectives. Data analysis was completed (see below for further details). |

**2. Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project:** Answer questions according to the individual SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, report in the next chart below.

|  |
| --- |
| **2a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?**For this academic year, our assessment activities focused on the following department PLO:PLO #1:  Demonstrate knowledge of human ecological theory and the integrative nature of the family and consumer sciences profession. |
| **2b. Does this learning outcome align with one of the following University Fundamental Learning Competencies? (check any which apply)****Critical Thinking\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Oral Communication\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Written Communication\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Quantitative Literacy\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Information Literacy\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Other (which?)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **2c. What direct and indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?** In order to assess our department’s PLO #1 among our incoming students enrolled in their gateway course (FCS 170) and then assess the same PLO again among our graduating students in their capstone internship courses (FCS 491/494), a signature assignment that included two essay questions was created by the assessment liaison. The full faculty subsequently provided feedback on these questions and how to best ask students about their knowledge of our department’s PLO #1. The final essay questions used in Moodle on this signature assignment were:1. In your own words, explain the meaning of the human ecological theory.
2. In your own words, explain how the separate areas in our department (Apparel Design and Merchandising, Consumer Affairs, Family Studies, Interior Design, Nutrition/Dietetics and Food Science) meaningfully fit together in the same field of Family and Consumer Sciences.
 |
| **2d. 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.  For the 2010-2011 academic year, a system to collect and store student data was developed using the university-wide online system of Moodle to assess our department’s PLOs and to specifically determine whether our FCS students were gaining knowledge of our student learning outcomes after having completed our program. Our department focused on PLO #1 last year to collect assessment data from incoming and graduating students in our program through a Moodle online system. This data was stored last year to be analyzed later by the faculty (this analysis took place this 2011-2012 academic year). During the fall semester of 2010, the assessment liaison created and oversaw an FCS Assessment course in Moodle to collect the data. FCS 170 was selected as the gateway course and our FCS 491/494 internship experience class was used as the capstone course in which to assess early, and then graduating, students in our program.  During the fall semester, students in all sections across these two courses responded to the two essay questions on the signature assignment above, via the Moodle FCS Assessment class, as a way to assess PLO #1 and store the data. Students in the FCS 170 gateway course responded to the essay questions early in the semester, and the FCS 491/494 capstone course students responded to the essays at the end of the fall semester in attempt to accurately capture the two incoming and exiting populations. This process was repeated for the 2011 spring semester students. The total number of student responses for FCS 170 and FCS 491/494 in the fall and spring semesters are as follows:Fall FCS 170 (4 sections of the course): n = 71Fall FCS 491/494 (6 sections of the course): n = 85Spring FCS 170 (3 sections of the course): n = 41Spring FCS 491/494 (3 sections of the course): n = 91 This year, we established an assessment committee consisting of five full time faculty who represented the five different areas in the department to analyze this data. The committee met several times to discuss and agree upon an appropriate plan of analysis and then to address any issues that arose during the data analysis efforts.  |
| **2e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO:** Provide a summary of how the evidence was analyzed and highlight important findings from collected evidence.  At the end of the 2010-2011 academic year, the assessment liaison created a grading rubric to use in the student data analysis. The rubric was presented to the faculty and their feedback was elicited, resulting in the following rubric: **Rubric for Assessing FCS Student Learning Outcome #1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stated Category or Performance** | **Unacceptable****1** | **Developing****2** | **Competent****3** | **Outstanding****4** | **Score** |
| Human Ecological Theory accurately discussed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Complexity of the Human Ecological Theory discussion |  |  |  |  |  |
| All 5 Department areas mentioned |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion of how the 5 areas fit under the FCS field |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall grammar & punctuation |  |  |  |  |  |

  This academic year, using this grading rubric, all members of the assessment committee performed a pilot evaluation of the same 15 students’ questions. Specifically, each committee member scored all 15 students’ responses individually and then the committee met as a group to review our scoring approaches and results in order to ensure inter-rater reliability.  I would like to mention that this meeting, in particular, proved to be quite insightful for the committee. As the five members teach in the different disciplines across the department, our discussion of the meaning of this SLO #1 and how it fits within our course curricula, as well as how each of the faculty interpreted the meaning and significance of the PLO, was very interesting. Once the committee felt comfortable proceeding forward with the student analysis in a unified manner, we evaluated 50 FCS 170 students’ responses and 45 FCS 491/494 students’ responses. The evaluation was based on the scale of 1 (unacceptable), 2 (developing), 3 (competent), and 4 (outstanding) for each of the five categories of their responses. Therefore, the students’ verbatim responses were quantified and scores were obtained for their learning outcomes, with a higher score indicating a better learning outcome.  A total score was obtained for each respondent by adding up individual scores for each of the five response categories. A t-test revealed that the students in FCS 491/494 scored statistically significantly higher than those in FCS 170 (t = -5.95; p < .000). Among the students in FCS 170, the mean score was 10.8 (s.d. = 3.6), which indicates that, on average, the students were still developing their understanding of the Human Ecological Theory and how it fits within the field of FCS. Among the students in FCS 491/494, the mean score was 15.1 (s.d. = 3.3), indicating that those students were competent in understanding the theory and the integrated disciplines within our FCS department.  With respect to each of the five response categories, a t-test was also performed to compare the mean score between the scores obtained from the FCS 170 students and the FCS 491/494 students. The results showed that the FCS 491/494 students obtained a statistically significantly higher score on every category than did the FCS 170 students (all p < .001):* *Human Ecological Theory accurately Discussed:* the FCS 170 students received an average score of 2.1 (s.d. = .9) (Developing), whereas the FCS 491/494 students received an average score of 2.8 (s.d. = 1.0) (Competent).
* *Complexity of the Human Ecological Theory Discussed:* the FCS 170 students received an average score of 1.9 (s.d. = .9) (Developing), whereas the FCS 491/494 students received an average score of 2.9 (s.d. = 1.0) (Competent).
* *All Five Department Areas Mentioned:* the FCS 170 students received an average score of 2.2 (s.d. = 1.3) (Developing), whereas the FCS 491/494 students received an average score of 3.0 (s.d. = 1.2) (Competent).
* *Discussion of How the Five Areas Fit Under the FCS Field:* the FCS 170 students received an average score of 1.9 (s.d. = .8) (Developing), whereas the FCS 491/494 students received an average score of 2.9 (s.d. = .9) (Competent).
* *Overall Grammar and Punctuation:* the FCS 170 students received an average score of 2.6 (s.d. = .9) (Developing to Competent), whereas the FCS 491/494 students received an average score of 3.4 (s.d. = .7) (Competent).

The following table summarizes the comparison of the mean scores obtained from the students in the two classes:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Responses** | **FCS 170** | **FCS 491/494** | **Comparison** |
| Overall | 10.8 (s.d.=3.6) | 15.1 (s.d.=3.3) | t = -5.95; p < .000 |
| Human Ecological Theory accurately Discussed | 2.1 (s.d. = .9) | 2.8 (s.d. = 1.0) | t =-3.68; p < .000 |
| Complexity of the Human Ecological Theory Discussed | 1.9 (s.d. = .9) | 2.9 (s.d. = 1.0) | t = -4.82; p< .000 |
| All Five Department Areas Mentioned | 2.2 (s.d. = 1.3) | 3.0 (s.d. = 1.2) | t = -3.29; p <.001 |
| Discussion of How the Five Areas Fit Under the FCS Field | 1.9 (s.d. = .8) | 2.9 (s.d. = .9) | t =-5.27; p <.000 |
| Overall Grammar and Punctuation | 2.6 (s.d. = .9) | 3.4 (s.d. = .7) | t =-5.02; p <.000 |
|  |  |  |  |

 |
| **2f. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO:** Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year?Type of change:changes to course content/topics covered\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_course sequence\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_addition/deletion of courses in program\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ describe other academic programmatic changes\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_student support services\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_revisions to program SLOs\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_assessment instruments\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_describe other assessment plan changes\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Have any previous changes led to documented improvements in student learning? (describe)  Although our department did not specifically use results from this PLO #1 for any of the above categories, I do want to report that I have noticed the more frequent use of assessment activities and general assessment knowledge and language among the faculty in our department. In particular, many of our faculty have become aware of and more comfortable with the need to use assessment information/data when developing and proposing new curricula, as well as when providing compelling justifications for new faculty hires.  |

Some programs assess multiple SLOs each year. If your program assessed an additional SLO, report the process for that individual SLO below. If you need additional SLO charts, please cut & paste the empty chart as many times as needed. If you did NOT assess another SLO, skip this section.

1. **How do your assessment activities connect with your program’s strategic plan and/or 5-yr assessment plan?**

|  |
| --- |
|   For the past several years, our department has been evaluating a single PLO each year. By having our faculty address individual PLOs each year, we continue to engage our full department faculty, across all five areas, to collectively revisit the core question of our FCS Department: what basic student learning outcomes do we deem the most important and essential for our graduates from the department to understand/apply?  Although our assessment committee engaged in some interesting discussion regarding the meaning and significance of our particular PLO #1 this year, no modifications were made. In addition, the development of an online Moodle Assessment system that was used to collect student data and allow for the storage and simple access by multiple faculty to evaluate SLO #1 seemed to be an effective system and could also be implemented in the future to assess the other department SLOs.  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program? Please provide citation or discuss.**

|  |
| --- |
| None as of yet. |