Human Services Department's AV 2021-2022 Assessment Report; HUS PLO #1: Assessment

This view always presents the most current state of the plan item.
Plan Item was last modified on 11/29/22, 1:02 PM
Your individual permission settings determine what fields and content are visible to you.

Template:

PLO Assessment Report

Type of Assessment Report:

PLO Assessment Report (traditional full report}

Upload of Assessment Report:

We want to take this space to explain that as a department, we have decided to do a full assessment process annually. We have done so, and will continue to do so. This means that we do the assessment for all seven (7) of our PLOs annually. The faculty in the department believes that these 7 PLOs are interconnected, and that's one of the reasons we have resisted reporting on each one separately. However, per the SLOAC's recommendation, starting this year, we will report here one PLO per year, and we will go into more depth on the specified PLO. This year, we will report on our first PLO: Assessment. The reader will at times notice that we use "the PLOs" in totality, rather than on each specific PLO. Thank you.

Attached Files

IIHUS_2021-2022_Assessment_report_worksheet_for_PLO1_Assessment_only.docx

Name of the Assessment Project:

Human Services Department's AY 2021-2022 Assessment Report; HUS PLO #1: Assessment

PLO description:

PLO#1: Assessment: Display ability to assess, plan, implement and evaluate human services as they apply to target populations of individuals, groups and organizations.

Explanation on PL0#1: In Human Services, being able to do an assessment on a client is one of the first, most basic skill one needs to have to be a professional helper. This assessment process is operationalized as doing an intake with a client, being able to gather and summarize the information including background and current situation of the client to understand their issue(s). From this information, the future professional helper (the student) collaborates with the client to come up with a treatment plan, implement, and evaluate the treatment process. A "client" here is defined as an Individual, family, group, or organization that needs help. Skills measured are interviewing skills, oral and written communication, planning, implementing, note-taking, consultation, and other human services practice skills (theories, modalities, etc.).

Start:

7/1/2022

End:

6/30/2023

Description of the Assessment

As mentioned above, following SLOAC's recommendation, instead of the usual full assessment report where we present the results of all seven (7) of our PLOs, this year, we are reporting on only one PLO {#1) named "Assessment." The assessment report for the "Assessment" PLO is attached above. Our assessment process is ongoing, data collected in both the fall and spring semesters of the academic year, and comprised of three separate assessment instruments. These summative and formative assessment measures are designed to triangulate and provide reliability and validity of the results. The AY 2021-2022 results show that student achieved our benchmarks (basic, Intermediate, advanced) in all three instruments for the "Assessment'' PLO, More detailed descriptions are included herein. The department discussed implications of these results as well as ongoing effort to continuously improve student achievements.

Relevant Courses In Which The Assessment Was Done:

There are three (3) separate formative and summative assessment instruments for the assessment report on PLO#1 (Assessment). These were collected in the following eight {8) courses and the exit survey:

   1, The Field Instructor's Evaluation of student {Summative) in HUS 380; HUS 390; HUS 480; and HUS 484.

2. The Signature Assignment (Summative) for each of the courses in HUS 381 (The Five Journals); HUS 391 (The Community Mapping Project); HUS 481 (The Professional Portfolio); and HUS 485 (The Professional Portfolio).
3. The Exit Survey (Formative): Collected two weeks after the student graduated.

Assessment Method :

Exam, Rubric, Performance, Paper, Presentation, Other

If Other List Here:

Direct internship practice rated by field internship supervisor (FI); student self-rating (Exit Survey).

Evidence:

Please see the attached assessment report which lists the three measures on the "Assessment" PLO, the N for each, and the results at basic, intermediate, and advanced competency levels for AY 2021-2022. To answer this question, we are repeating some information here:

There are three separate formative and summative assessment instruments for the assessment report. These were collected in the following eight (8) courses and the exit survey:

1. The Field Instructor's Evaluation of student (Summative) in HUS 380; HUS 390; HUS 480; and HUS 484. This is where the direct fieldwork supervisor of the student (in internship) rates the student on his/her ability to carry out the work at the appropriate level on HUS' seven PLOs. We view this as an Important source of an external evaluator of the students' achievement on our PLOs,
2. The Signature Assignment (Summative) for each of the courses in HUS 381 (The Five Journals); HUS 391 (The Community Mapping Project); HUS 481 (The Professional Portfolio); and HUS 485 (The Professional Portfolio). This direct instrument is an evaluation of the student's work by his/her class instructor.
3. The Exit Survey (Formative): Collected two weeks after the student graduated. This is a formative assessment by the student themselves on their level of achievement on HUS' seven PLOs at exit.

Attached Files
There are no attachments.

Assessment Process:

Assessment Process:

Summatlve Assessments:

For this section, it's important that the reader understands the three levels of "basic" "intermediate" and "advanced" as we conceptualize it. They are operationalized as follows:

Basic skills=Learning the concepts and skills in HUS related to the "Assessment" PLO by shadowing, listening, observing, an start doing some of the work under supervision. These "basic skills" are measured in HUS 380, HUS 381 (both of these are the first field internship and field seminar), and Exit Survey.

Intermediate skIlls=Implementing human services skills related to the "Assessment" PLO under supervision. These "intermediate skills" are measured in HUS 390; HUS 391 (both of these are the second field internship and seminar); and Exit Survey.
Advanced skills=Implementing human services skills related to the "Assessment" PLO independently with regular supervision. These "advanced skills" are measured in HUS 480/481 or HUS 484/485 (these are the third field internship and seminar); and Exit Survey,

We will now present the assessment process for each instrument. As mentioned, there are three separate instruments and each measures all seven (7) PLOs of the Human Services department. Here we are reporting only one PLO each year ("Assessment" for this year), per the recommendation from USLOAC. The instruments are complimentary to each other and provide interrater reliability for the assessment process. They are:

1. The Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student in field placement (HUS 380; HUS 390; HUS 480/484). This field instructor is an external field supervisor that directly supervise students In the field internship,
2. The Signature Assignments for HUS 381; HUS 391; HUS 481/485. This person is the department instructor of this course on campus.
3. The Exit Survey. In this instrument, the graduating student rates him/herself on the specific PLO being measured.

For the **Field Instructor's Evaluation of student** in field placement, a student registers for the relevant course (HUS 380, HUS 390, or HUS 480/484, and they go in sequence, depending on the current status of the student), which will place him/her in an actual field internship. Each student spends 120 hours for each internship, which totals to 360 hours of internship before a student graduates. Students are required to collaborate wlth their fieldwork supervisors to design a learning contract for the duration of the internship (1 semester each) that focuses on learning an achieving the 7 PLOs on a basic (HUS 380), intermediate (HUS 390), and advanced (HUS 480/484) level. Students meet with their fieldwork supervisor weekly for 1 hour for supervision, and at the end, the field supervisor {who is under contract with the university and the department) will complete an evaluation on the student's work. For the PLO "Assessment, the student is rated on a 1-4 point scale, as follows:

1=Area of future growth

2=Demonstrate emerging skill

3=Demonstrate emerging skill consistently

4=Demonstrate advanced accomplishment

Two weeks before the student completes his/her internship, the form is filled out by the field supervisor and discussed/shared with the student (for feedback) and then both signs the form. This form is then turned into the department and collected by the Dept. Assessment Committee. Once collected, the information is entered into SPSS, and data is analyzed using descriptive statistics. For HUS 380, a 2 and above meets/exceed the "basic" benchmark, for HUS 390 and 480/484, a 3 and above meets/exceed the benchmarks of "intermediate" and "advanced."

The Signature Assignments {Summative; HUS 381; HUS 391; HUS 481/485). In each of these courses, there are several assignments but among them, there is a "signature assignment" which is the most comprehensive assignment in the course, We utilize this signature assignment for the assessment of the PLO (Assessment). We will discuss each separately:

-HUS 381's Signature Assignment: The Five Journals (rubric used)

In this course, the "Signature Assignment" is the five journals students write about their learning in the field internship and in the co-requisite field seminar. The topics are designed to get the students to reflect, describe, and self-assessment of their learning on the "Assessment" PLO and they are graded on a 1-5 point scale for this PLO, with the following indicators:

1=Needs significant Improvement
2=Needs some improvement
3=Average
4=Very good with minor improvement needed
5=Excellent/No improvement needed

Since this course (HUS 381) is the "basic level" of the three internship/seminars, all those who got 2 and above are analyzed as achieving the benchmark. The instructor(s) for this course turn the data over to the Dept. Assessment Committee at the end of each semester. Once collected, data is entered into SPSS, and analyzed using descriptive statistics.

-HUS 391's Signature Assignment: The Community Mapping Project (rubric used)

In this class, students branch out and learn about the communities in which they will work as human services professionals. Therefore, they are assigned into small groups, choose a community relevant to their interest and do research, survey, interview stakeholders, write a research paper, and present their findings to the class. This paper/presentation is the signature assignment, and it is graded using the rubric where the HUS "Assessment" PLO is embedded. The instructors for this course then grade the assignment and turn this data over to the Dept. Assessment Committee. Once collected, data is entered, and analyzed in SPSS using descriptive statistics. Again, scores range from 1-5 {similar to HUS 381 above) but since this is the "Intermediate" level, only those scored 3 and and above are analyzed as having achieved the benchmark.

-HUS 481/485 The Professional Portfolio (rubric used)

In this senior seminar, the signature assignment is the Professional Portfolio where students are required to put together a professional portfolio which is composed of several components of their education, including their professional resume, letter of intent, summaries of their internships, their self-perception of their skill level on the 7 competencies, their reflections of the Human Services field, and a professional development plan. The 7 PLOs are embedded (including the "Assessment" PLO) in all of these components and students achievement are scored from 1-5 (siml!ar to HUS 381, and 391 above) and those achieving 3 and above are deemed as meeting the benchmark. Again, the instructor(s) of this course turn the data over to the Dept. Assessment Committee at the end of the semester. Once collected, the data is entered into SPSS and analyzed.

Formative Assessment:
-The Student Exit Survey (2 weeks after graduation)
Approximately two weeks after graduation, all graduates of the HUS major are contacted with a survey gizmo survey regarding their educational experience in the department. In this survey, among many other items, we ask students to rate themselves on the 7 PLOs at the basic, intermediate, and advanced level. The correspond percentages are then reported as seen on the results document attached with this report. The Dept. Assessment Committee is responsible for the deployment of this exit survey. This year, we are reporting on the "Assessment" PLO only.

Diversity, equity, and inclusion: As discussed, data from all students are captured and measured, so we think diversity, equity, and inclusion are embedded into the three instruments. For the Exit Survey, however, students self-selects and those more motivated tend to complete it. We try to address this issue by sending email reminders to students and think we capture diversity in those subsequent emails.

Student Awareness of PLOs:

Students are first introduced to the HUS' seven PLOs in the orientation of the semester they are admitted to the program {Summer orientation for fall, Fall, Spring). These PLOs are then discussed at length in the HUS 300 Introduction to Human Services, and then in every course thereafter as these PLOs are listed on each course syllabus in the major. The goal of each of the major course is to train students to master these seven PLOs from beginning, to intermediate, to advanced levels at graduation. Hence, there are many assignments (discussed above) that contain these PLOs. Students are also required to do journaling assignments that reflect on their learning in the PLO as they move along to provide self-awareness on these PLOs. In sum, we know that students are well aware of the seven PLOs in the department throughout the process.

The HUS' Dept. Seven (7) PLOs are listed here: Planning

https://www.csudh.edu/human-development/human-services/

Results of Student Learning:

PLO #1: Assessment: Display ability to assess, plan, implement and evaluate human services as they apply to target populations of individuals, group and organization.

Basic: Program Goal of 90%

-Instrument #1 The Field Supervisor's Evaluation of Student (N=19}; 100% of students achieved this level.

-Instrument #2 The Signature Assignment 0ournals) (N=46); 93.5% of students achieved this level.

-Instrument #3 The Exit Survey (N=13); 100% of student achieved this level.

Intermediate: Program Goal of 60%

-Instrument #1 The Field Supervisor's Evaluation of Student (N=13); 92.3% of students achieved this level.

-Instrument #2 The Signature Assignment (Community Mapping) (N=68); 97.1% of students achieved this level.

 Instrument #3 The Exit Survey (N=13); 84.6% of student achieved this level.

Advanced: Program Goal of 40%

Instrument #1 The Field Supervisor's Evaluation of Student (N=116); 87.4% of students achieved this level.

Instrument #2 The Signature Assignment (Professional Portfolio) (N=127); 94.5% of students achieved this level.

Instrument #3 The Exit Survey (N=13); 69.2% of student achieved this level.

Overall, the department achieved its standards for success at all three levels.

Check if Your Program Achieved its Standards for Success,:

true

Achieved BASIC Criterion for Success?:

true

Achieved INTERMEDIATE Criterion for Success?:

true

Achieved ADVANCED Criterion for Success?:

true

Explain Standards of Success:

Our standards of success are listed here:

For basic, it's 90%; for intermediate, it's 60%; for advanced, it's 40% of all students would achieve these levels. In the past, we have set the basic program goal of 100% and although we have generally achieved them, but in last year's assessment report, we contemplated changing this "absolute" standard (of 100%) and received feedback from USLOAC that we didn't need to set it at 100%, so we have discussed this issue in the department, and have now decided to set it at 90%. This allows for some flexibility regarding student dropout, not being able to complete courses, or those not fit for the major. We appreciate USLOAC's input on this.

For the intermediate and advanced goals, we have kept them the same at the benchmark stated above.

Discussion of Results for Program Improvement:

As in past years, we have achieved departmental benchmarks on all three levels in multiple instruments. The results tell us that we are continue to serve our students well in preparing them to be entry level human services professionals. However, the Committee discussed a few issues that were of concern that needed our continued attention:

During the 2021-2022 academic year, the University was still partly closed with many classes being held online, and it continued to affect our ability to place students in field placements. In addition, many of our students suspended their schooling, therefore, it affected the number of students in internships, Hence, the reader will notice see the low numbers In student field internships

(particularly in the "basic" and "intermediate" levels} and therefore, reflected the low Ns. Overall, however, the numbers in the results are similar to the past but we want to continue to monitor this issue and take note to see if there are differences in trends regarding low/high Ns.

Another issue we had was the sudden illness of one of our core faculty and therefore, we did not have the data for her classes and this affected the N for this year's report. We discussed ways to prevent this in the future so that the data is secured and not dependent on anyone in case of similar emergencies in the future.

Lastly, the reader will notice that the N for the exit survey (N=13) is particularly low. We had about 85 graduates this academic year, and despite our best efforts, we only got 13 responses and we recognize that this is very !ow return rate. In years past, we have had around 40% return rate, which is still low but better than 15% as we had this year. Discussions ranged from giving a random reward for completion to collecting data during the last week of school Instead of waiting until after graduation. We will probably be doing some of these to improve the response rate.

Type of Change Needed (Based on Data):

Assessment Plan (Refine SLO statements; Change methods and/or measures; Change where (e.g. courses} the data are collected; Collect additional data; Improve data reporting and dissemination mechanisms)

Participants in Discussing/ Reviewing Results:

We have a formal Assessment Committee in the department comprising of Phu Phan (dept. chair), Hannah Nguyen, and Annalyn Valdez-Dadia (tenure-track asst. professors), America Islas (Fieldwork Coordinator), and Heidi Allison-Rhoades (part-time adjunct faculty member). In years past, we have intermittent attendance from our student representative, but this year we did not due to COVID-19. Since ours,is a small department, this committee comprises most of the members of the department. We have several adjunct faculty members teaching for us, and all of those who teaches the relevant courses (listed above) are involved in the assessment process, including, Alma Melena (adjunct faculty), Sharon Vaughn (adjunct faculty), Rocio Garcia, and over 120 field supervisors who are supervising students in the field are also regularly engaged in evaluating the student intern's work, which is captured in the "Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student" instrument. It should be noted that everyone involved in this evaluation process has been trained in this process, and is in regular communication with the Assessment Committee.

Past Proposed Changes:

We have discussed in past assessment reports regarding the need to review our curriculum in an effort to stay up-to-date and we have started doing so in 2021-2022 as we had our 6 year program review. We did have a very successful 6 year review and together with the feedback from the External Reviewer, the Provost, and the Dean, we are looking forward to diversify the delivery of the curriculum (example: class mode offerings, etc.) and increasing the department capacity in field coordination. These changes are slow and on-going, but they have started. These will also impact the assessment report as changes do happen. For example, the Assessment Committee will look at if there are differences on the PLO achievement between online, hybrid, and in-person classes.

Status of Past Proposed Changes:

Per the discussion mentioned in past proposed changes above, the department has increased online/hybrid modality in course offering from zero (0) to 20% within the past 6 years. The department curriculum committee is continuing to discuss more courses to be proposed to be online, but these efforts are constrained by current departmental resources. In addition, we are requesting additional resources to significantly increase capacity in our field department. As discussed above, these changes are ongoing.

Proposed Completion and Effective Dates:

on-going.

Alternate Report Documents:

Providing Department:

Human Services

Responsible Roles:

Progress:

Report Completed

Expected Date of Submission:

11/30/2022

Additional Documentation :

Attached Files
There are no attachments.

Explanation of progress:

Related Items