Annual Departmental Assessment Report

Department or Program: <u>Family and Human Services (FHS) Program, Department of Counseling Psychology and Human Services</u>

Academic Year of Report: <u>2017-2018</u>

Department Contact Person for Assessment: <u>Jessica M. Cronce, PhD, FHS Program Director</u>

Section 1: Learning Objectives Assessed for this Report

The FHS curriculum encompasses a set of ten specific student learning objectives (LO). The objectives are organized into five categories:

Core Skills:
   LO1. Graduates will have knowledge of theories of interaction of human systems including: individual, interpersonal, group, family, organizational, community and societal.
   LO2. Graduates will understand human services ethics and their application in practice.
   LO3. Graduates will develop awareness of their own values, personalities, reaction patterns, interpersonal styles and limitations.

Core Knowledge:
   LO4. Graduates will understand the scope of conditions that promote or inhibit human functioning.
   LO5. Graduates will understand the historical development of human services.

Professional Skills:
   LO6. Graduates will have knowledge and skills in information management.
   LO7. Graduates will develop their interpersonal skills.
   LO8. Graduates will have knowledge and skills in direct service delivery and appropriate interventions.

Administrative and Management Skills:
   LO9. Graduates will have knowledge and skills in the administrative aspects of the service delivery system.

Professional Products:
   LO10. Graduates will have knowledge and skills in systematic analysis of service needs; planning appropriate strategies, services and implementation; and evaluation of outcomes.

For the **2017-2018 academic year**, we opted to focus on assessment of learning objectives under the category of ***Administrative and Management Skills* (LO 9)** for the purpose of this report.

Section 2: Assessment Activities

A total of six classes (one with two sections) were included as part of this year's assessment. All courses utilized direct measures of assessment (i.e., student performance on assignments) to gauge students' achievement of learning objectives (see **Table 1** for a description of assignments by course, as well as benchmarks for achievement of competency on LO 9).

	Table 1. Assessment Methods by Course Assignment (Score Needed to Establish Competency/Total Possible Points)
	LO9: Graduates will have knowledge and skills in the administrative aspects of the service delivery system.
FHS 327: Organizational Issues in Human Services	2 exams (25 / 30) Federal Budget Project (16 / 20)
FHS 406: Field Studies	Completion of required hours and paper work (graded P [1] / NP [0])
FHS 494: Senior Professional Practices and Issues I	Supervisor Interview Project (21 / 30) Agency Materials Project (19 / 25) 2 questions on 1 exam (graded P [1] / NP [0]) Leadership Survey Project (14 / 20)
FHS 495: Senior Professional Practices and Issues II	2 exams (35 / 40) Grant Proposal Project (65 / 70)
FHS 496: Senior Project Proposal	Rationale and References Paper (14 / 20) Project Description Paper (7 / 10) Budget and Management Plan (14 / 20) Final Senior Project Proposal (53 / 75)
FHS 497: Senior Project	Final Senior Project Portfolio (49 / 70) Final Senior Project Presentation (21 / 30)

Data from each course were organized by assignment and sent to the Program Director in Excel format. The Program Director imported and combined data across courses into SPSS for analysis. Sixteen variables were created denoting the difference between each student's raw score and the benchmark. These variables were used to examine the distribution of scores by assignment relative to competency benchmarks (see **Appendix A** for relevant histograms) and to calculate the overall percentage of students meeting the benchmark by assignment (see **Table 2**). FHS 406, which is a *pass/no-pass* (P/NP) field-based practical experience class, was excluded from formal statistical analyses, as there are only three possible scores used in the rubric—*below expectations (0), meets expectations (1), exceeds expectations (2)*—and nearly all students received a score of 1.

	Table 2. Assessment Results
	LO9: Graduates will have knowledge and skills in the administrative aspects of the service delivery system.
Overall	**% exceeding benchmark (# / total)**
FHS 327: Organizational Issues in Human Services	Exam 1 **75.6%** (68/90) Exam 2 **76.7%** (69/90) Federal Budget Project **95.6%** (86/90)
FHS 406: Field Studies	Completion of hours/paperwork **100%** (105/105)
FHS 494: Senior Professional Practices and Issues I	Supervisor Interview Project **98%** (100/102) Agency Materials Project **95.1%** (97/102) Exam Question 9 **96.1%** (98/102) Exam Question 10 **95.1%** (97/102) Leadership Survey Project **97.1%** (99/102)
FHS 495: Senior Professional Practices and Issues II	Exam 1 **53.8%** 49/91) Exam 2 **78%** (71/91) Grant Proposal Project **85.7%** (78/91)
FHS 496: Senior Project Proposal	Rationale and References Paper **93.9%** (108/115) Project Description Paper **97.4%** (112/115) Budget and Management Plan **97.4%** (112/115) Final Senior Project Proposal **99.1%** (114/115)
FHS 497: Senior Project	Final Senior Project Portfolio **100%** (24/24) Final Senior Project Presentation **100%** (24/24)

Overall conclusions drawn from these results include: **(a)** the majority of students are achieving competency on program learning objectives, suggesting use of effective instructional practices and appropriate assessment methods; and **(b)** some rubrics used to assess performance and grading practices may require recalibration to allow for greater variability of scores. Without exception, score distributions relative to the benchmark were moderately to significantly negatively skewed, and some rubrics (e.g., FHS 494 Exam Questions 9 and 10) created a ceiling effect, whereby competency was demonstrated by receiving the top possible score. Although not evident in the data presented, other conclusions include: **(c)** courses did not systematically conduct qualitative assessments, which would have allowed them to be summarized for the purpose of this report; and **(d)** other indirect measures of student performance (e.g., meetings with academic advisors; individual meetings with their university supervisors for extra support; participation in Plan of Action meetings) are also not systematically tracked, and if tracked could contextualize results. For example, such data could help us answer research questions including "Are students who access program supports more or less likely to achieve benchmarks?"

Exam 1 in FHS 495 stood out has having a somewhat lower relative rate of achieving LO 9 (53.8%). This may be due to the high bar set by the instructor (i.e., needing to achieve 87.5%, a B+, on the exam to "meet" the benchmark), which is not typical—it is more common for instructors in FHS to use the equivalent of a "C" or "C-" as their benchmark. That being said, this same instructor set an even higher benchmark (92.9%) for another assignment (Grant Proposal Project) and more students demonstrated

competency on that assignment relative to Exam 1. Overall, there does appear to be an "instructor effect," as the individual who taught FHS 495 also taught FHS 327, and these were the only classes where the percentage of students demonstrating competency was below 90%. This may suggest a need for calibration across classes, as neither of these courses should be more or less difficult than the other courses assessed.

Findings from this assessment and a copy of this report were shared with FHS faculty via email on January 3, 2019 and will be discussed during a regularly scheduled meeting of the Counseling Psychology and Human Services Undergraduate Council.

Section 3: Actions Taken Based on Assessment Analysis

Faculty will discuss how to organize and systematically conduct indirect assessments, such that they may be included in future reports. The presence of instructor effects also requires that we discuss grading practices and rubrics to ensure parity across courses of equivalent difficulty. The outcome of this discussion is likely to be a policy regarding how benchmarks are set for all FHS classes.

Section 4: Other Efforts to Improve the Student Educational Experience

FHS has actively engaged in several continuous improvement efforts this academic year directly related to the learning goal above. Principal among these efforts has been a proposal to revise the FHS curriculum, including a reduction of required courses and credits, expansion of options for meeting professional studies requirements outside of FHS, and course-level changes affecting FHS 495. These changes, if approved by the UO Senate in Spring 2019, will build on changes that were approved in Spring 2017. Collectively, these changes were made to increase flexibility for students to pursue depth and breadth of training in areas most relevant to a given student's career goal within human services and increase accessibility and equity. It is believed that these changes will ultimately allow the program to facilitate stronger alignment of program course content with the expertise of tenure track faculty members and better balance a focus on practice with a focus on research.

Section 5: Plans for Next Year

During the next academic year, FHS will focus its assessment of students' performance in relation to **Professional Products** (i.e., LO 10: *Graduates will have knowledge and skills in systematic analysis of service needs; planning appropriate strategies, services and implementation; and evaluation of outcomes.*). At this point in time, it is planned to assess LO 10 in six classes across the 2018-2019 academic year: FHS 330, FHS 420, FHS 482, FHS 483, FHS 492, and FHS 493.

Appendix A: Distribution of Scores by Learning Objective by Class
by Assignment Relative to Competency Benchmark

Note: In all histograms, "0" means the student received the benchmark score on that assignment. Scores greater than 0 indicate that the student's score exceeded the benchmark, and scores less than 0 indicate that the student's score was below the benchmark.

Learning Objective 9

@327_Exam_1_Difference

Mean = .54
Std. Dev. = 2.911
N = 90

@327_Exam_2_Difference

Mean = 2.26
Std. Dev. = 3.208
N = 90

@327_Exam_2_Difference

@327_Final_project_Difference

Mean = 2.49
Std. Dev. = 2.462
N = 90

@327_Final_project_Difference

@494_Sup_Inform_Interview_Difference

Mean = 6.19
Std. Dev. = 4.18
N = 102

@494_Sup_Inform_Interview_Difference

@494_Agency_materials_Difference

Mean = 4.64
Std. Dev. = 3.05
N = 102

@494_Agency_materials_Difference

@494_Q9_Difference

Mean = -.04
Std. Dev. = .195
N = 102

@494_Q9_Difference

@494_Q10_Difference

Mean = -.05
Std. Dev. = .217
N = 102

@494_Q10_Difference

@494_Leadership_survey_Difference

Mean = 5.08
Std. Dev. = 3.483
N = 102

@494_Leadership_survey_Difference

@495_Exam_1_Difference

Mean = -.81
Std. Dev. = 5.157
N = 91

@495_Exam_1_Difference

@495_Exam_2_Difference

Mean = 1.78
Std. Dev. = 3.571
N = 91

@495_Exam_2_Difference

@495_Grant_Proposal_Difference

Mean = 2.25
Std. Dev. = 4.194
N = 91

@495_Grant_Proposal_Difference

@496_Rationale_and_References_Difference

Mean = 3.08
Std. Dev. = 3.262
N = 115

@496_Rationale_and_References_Difference

@496_Project_Description_Difference

Mean = 1.98
Std. Dev. = 1.618
N = 115

@496_Project_Description_Difference

@496_Management_Plan_and_Budget_Difference

Mean = 4.93
Std. Dev. = 2.794
N = 115

@496_Management_Plan_and_Budget_Difference

@496_Final_Proposal_Difference

Mean = 15.80
Std. Dev. = 7.432
N = 115

@496_Final_Proposal_Difference

@497_Final_Senior_Project_Difference

Mean = 16.38
Std. Dev. = 3.255
N = 24

@497_Final_Senior_Project_Difference

@497_Final_Senior_Proj_Presentation_Difference

Mean = 7.75
Std. Dev. = .848
N = 24

@497_Final_Senior_Proj_Presentation_Difference