**2012-2013 CLASS FACT Assessment Year End Report, June, 2013**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Name(s)** | **FACT Faculty Fellow** | **Department Chair** |
| **HDEV / WOST** | **Patricia Drew** | **Patricia Guthrie** |

[NOTE: Items A, B, C, and D are identical to your Page 2 on your Annual Report for CAPR. Please simply cut and paste from there. Item E is unique to the CLASS FACT Project.]

**A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

|  |
| --- |
| Students who graduate with a BA in Human Development will be able to:  1. Demonstrate core knowledge in biological, psychological, and social aspects of human development; 2. Demonstrate critical thinking ability to identify similarities, differences, and connections among human development perspectives; 3. Thoughtfully reflect on the application of human development knowledge and skills to settings outside the university. Students should additionally be able to apply their knowledge and skills to new and diverse situations outside the university; 4. Access information, design and carry out individual and group research projects, and present them clearly, logically and persuasively; 5 Show ability to understand themselves reflectively and others empathetically and apply these skills to both academic and nonacademic contexts. |

**B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

|  |
| --- |
| Demonstrate critical thinking ability to identify similarities, differences, and connections among human development perspectives. |

**C. Summary of Assessment Process**

|  |
| --- |
| The assessment project analyzed students’ mastery of critical thinking skills as demonstrated in senior capstone papers.  Sample:  The sample included papers (N = 55; n = 27) from Fall 2012 and Winter 2013 HDEV 4812: Senior Capstone II classes. A random systematic sampling strategy was utilized, with a random number start.  Evaluation Process: 1. In May 2013, the HDEV faculty met to analyze written work submitted for Capstone Projects by HDEV 4812 students.  2. The faculty created a rubric for assessment, using the AACU Critical Thinking Values Rubric as a starting point for rubric development. (See Appendix I for CSUEB HDEV Critical Thinking Values Rubric) and Appendix II for the AACU Critical Thinking Values Rubric.) 3. Papers were scored using an interval scale of 1 – 4. Faculty reviewers used the following ratings to assess papers: 1 = Outstanding 2 = Proficient 3 = Developing 4 = Unacceptable 4. All faculty members independently scored 3 papers. Paper scores were then collectively discussed to ensure that the rubric was normed.  5. Each faculty member scored an additional 6 papers. 6. The faculty discussed the results of our analysis. 7. The faculty identified areas of critical thinking strength and areas of improvement. 8. The faculty formulated strategies for SLO improvement and implementation. |

**D. Summary of Assessment Results**

|  |
| --- |
| 2012-13 Assessment Results:  Scores ranged from 4 (outstanding) to 1 (unacceptable) within each of the six critical thinking indicator areas. The average critical thinking scores all fell between the ratings of 3 (proficient) and 2 (developing).   Mean Scores for Critical Thinking Indicators: Explanation of Issues: 2.87 Evidence: 2.54 Influence of Context and Assumptions: 2.27 Student’s Position: 2.16 Conclusions and Related Outcomes: 2.02 Overall Paper Score: 2.27 Based upon the faculty’s assessment, the following strengths, weaknesses, and plans for improvement were made:   Strengths: 1. Students had developed interesting research questions based upon academic literature.  2. Students were able to draw upon credible scholarly sources. 3. Many papers included strong analyses of sources..  Weaknesses: 1. Some papers featured a thoughtful review of literature, but lacked understanding of how to articulate findings in terms of literature.  2. Students rarely questioned existing categories or questioned theoretical assumptions. 3. Some papers demonstrated a lack of understanding of a broader theoretical context.  Plans for closing the loop: 1. Provide instructors with HDEV Critical Thinking Rubric as part of the course guidelines.  2. Create and provide students with a critical thinking timeframe. This may help to lengthen course time devoted to analysis of findings in terms of academic literature.  3. Provide students with examples of proficient and outstanding papers.  4. Discuss application of research findings to theoretical frameworks in 3201, 3202, 3203 and other junior core classes 5. Strongly recommend that students need to have completed WST before registering for 4811 and 4812 classes 6. Consider having one faculty stay with 4811 and 4812 for consecutive terms.  2013-14 Assessment Plans:  In the 2013-14 academic year, the Department of Human Development and Women’s Studies intends to: 1. Continue our 2012-13 assessment work by implementing our plans for closing the loop.  2. Conducting an assessment of HDEV SLO 3: “Students who graduate with a BA in Human Development will be able to .... [t]houghtfully reflect on the application of human development knowledge and skills to settings outside the university. Students should additionally be able to apply their knowledge and skills to new and diverse situations outside the university.”  This assessment will incorporate direct evidence, including: 1) students’ work in HDEV 3203, and, 2) written reviews of students’ service learning placement supervisors. |

**E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CLASS FACT Project in the Future**

|  |
| --- |
| Starting in Fall Term will be helpful --- as would having Julie Marty-Pearson give an overview of assessment and WASC needs/wants. |

Thank you for your hard work for the past year, and have a Great Summer!