

**Department of Human Development and Family Studies (B.S.)  
Assessment Report (2018 - 2019)**

**1. Human Development and Family Studies – Undergraduate Program**

The Department of Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) has a long-standing history at Auburn University. The roots of HDFS reside in the Home Economics movement that was incorporated into the extension system of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute in 1914. In the years between 1916 and 1917, Home Economics became a unique department offering a full curriculum that grew over time to include a Department of Nursery Education with a major in Family Life and Nursery Education (1950). By 1970, the same department and major became Family and Child Development, and in the year 2000, we transformed once again to become the department of Human Development and Family Studies offering an undergraduate major with the same title.

The HDFS department is comprised of 19 tenure track faculty, 1 research assistant professor, 1 clinical associate professor, 2 full-time directors and 2 directors with teaching responsibilities, 6 instructors and 2 lecturers. In the past year, we also have had 5 graduate students serve as instructors for our undergraduate courses. We currently have 277 undergraduate majors. In our undergraduate program, we emphasize theory and research focused on healthy development across the lifespan as well as the application of knowledge to enhance the quality of life for individuals and families in the community.

Our overarching objective for the undergraduate program is to prepare students for successful accomplishment of their career goals. Our majors typically seek employment in a human service-oriented profession, or they apply for graduate school in fields such as counseling, education or Social Work. One of the ways we prepare our undergraduates to accomplish their post-graduation goals is by offering five different concentrations from which they can select based on their career interests. The five different concentrations are Early Child Development, Child Life, Middle Childhood and Adolescence, Adult Development and Family Life Education. The Child Life concentration meets the course requirements for certification through the Association of Child Life Professionals (ACLP) and students who complete the Family Life Education concentration can earn provisional certification as a Family Life Educator through the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR). Students also may select the HD FE (Human Development and Family Studies and Early Childhood Education) curriculum which involves courses in HDFS and in the College of Education. Few students each year pursue HD FE and we plan to phase out this path as we further develop our Early Child Development option. We are currently seeking accreditation from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) which will allow eligible HDFS graduates to take the early education praxis exam to become certified teachers.

A second way that we prepare our undergraduates for success in their chosen career paths is by emphasizing standards of professional practice in the classroom and in the field. We encourage students to participate in service-learning across the curriculum and we require all majors to complete a full-time, full-semester internship during their senior year.

**2. Student Learning Outcomes**

By their senior-year, HDFS undergraduate students will be able to:

1. Articulate and apply HDFS-related theory (e.g., child development, family systems) to address the needs of individuals and families in the community;
2. Write a research paper that incorporates peer-reviewed articles that are appropriate for Family Life Education programming and uses correct APA format, spelling, grammar, and sentence structure;
3. Apply principles of professional practice (i.e., dependable, ethical) in the full-time, full-semester senior internship.
4. Synthesize classroom and field learning to communicate preparation for accomplishing a specific HDFS-related professional goal, such as employment or entry into graduate school.

## Comprehensive Outcomes

The student learning outcomes for our undergraduate program were formulated Spring 2016 through a process of faculty discussion, faculty feedback and multiple revisions. The initial discussion of student learning outcomes was held during a meeting of the full faculty. A smaller committee of five faculty members was then formed to evaluate our prior student learning objectives and brainstorm possible new outcomes based on our curriculum and our aspirations for our undergraduate students. The recommendations of the committee were presented to all faculty through email for feedback and final revision. Based on feedback received from the Office of Academic Assessment on our 2016 and 2017 assessment reports, we have since made minor revisions to the wording of our student outcomes to improve clarity and make them more specific to the HDFS undergraduate major. We believe the student learning outcomes presented above are comprehensive for our undergraduate curriculum.

## Communicating Outcomes

Our student learning outcomes, the curriculum map and the results from our assessment process have been presented and discussed in at least one meeting of the full faculty each semester beginning Fall 2016 through Spring 2019. Beginning Fall 2017, we started communicating our student learning outcomes through our undergraduate syllabi. Specifically, faculty include the four learning outcomes in their syllabi and state how course learning will support student progress toward one or more of the outcomes. In addition, we communicate our student learning objectives by presenting them on the HDFS undergraduate webpage and through a display board posted outside of our main office.

### **3. Curriculum Map**

The curriculum map that follows represents the alignment between our student learning outcomes and courses completed by our majors. Because our department provides our undergraduates with the opportunity to select from among five different concentrations, the types and number of different courses they complete varies. For example, while all of our majors are required to complete HDFS 2010 – Lifespan Human Development, students in the Early Child Development concentration are required to complete HDFS 3010 – Child Development, students in the Middle Childhood and Adolescence concentration are required to complete HDFS 3030 – Adolescent Development, and students in the Child Life concentration are required to complete both HDFS 3010 and HDFS 3030. Please see *Appendix A* at the end of this report to view how the courses reflected in the Curriculum Map fit with each of our undergraduate concentrations.

Across the five concentrations, all students complete 30 credit hours toward their HDFS Major Core course requirements. They also complete between 12 and 22 hours of required professional courses, depending on their concentration. The majority of required professional courses are completed in the HDFS department. All majors, regardless of their concentration, complete HDFS 2000 (Marriage and Family) to meet a College of Human Sciences Core requirement and HDFS 2040/2043 (Analytics of the Social and Behavior Sciences) as a required supporting course. We decided to include both HDFS 2000 and HDFS 2040/2043 in our curriculum map since they are foundational in promoting accomplishment

of our student learning outcomes.

We also would like to point out that the capstone course for our undergraduate program, HDFS 4920, is a 12-credit hour, full-time, full-semester field experience that students complete their senior year. It fulfills 12 credit hours toward the HDFS Major Core. Students can complete the internship almost anywhere in the world and the academic component of the course is provided through Canvas. Because of the heavy field-work requirement (i.e., 450 hours minimum across the total number of weeks in the semester), we did not think it realistic to assess all four of our student learning outcomes during the internship experience. Therefore, our student learning outcome that involves writing a research paper is evaluated when students complete HDFS 4670 (Parent Education) that emphasizes the use of research in Family Life Education.

## HDFS Curriculum Map

	<b>SLO 1 HDFS Theory</b>	<b>SLO 2 Research Paper</b>	<b>SLO 3 Professional Practice</b>	<b>SLO 4 Synthesis of Learning</b>
<b>HDFS 2000</b> <i>Marriage &amp; Family in a Global Context</i>	1	1	1	
<b>HDFS 2010/2013</b> <i>Lifespan Human Development</i>	1	1	1	
<b>HDFS 2030</b> <i>Professional Development/Ethics</i>		1	2	1
<b>HDFS 2040/2043</b> <i>Analytics for the Social and Behavioral Sciences</i>		2	2	1
<b>HDFS 3010/3013</b> <i>Child Development in Family</i>	2	2	2	1
<b>HDFS 3030</b> <i>Adolescent and Adult Development</i>	2	2	2	2
<b>HDFS 3060</b> <i>Patterns of Family Interaction</i>	2	2	2	
<b>HDFS 4680</b> <i>Family in Cross-Cultural Perspective</i>	2	1	2	2
<b>HDFS 3080</b> <i>Interpersonal Relationships</i>	2		2	2
<b>HDFS 4670</b> <i>Parent Education</i>	2	3	2	1
<b>HDFS 4920</b> <i>Internship</i>	3		3	3

1 = Introduced, 2 = Reinforced, 3 = Mastered

### 4. Measurement

Student learning outcomes 1, 3 and 4 are assessed in HDFS 4920 our capstone course that involves completion of a full-time internship during students' senior year. Student learning outcome 2 is assessed in HDFS 4670. Since HDFS 4670 allows for enrollment of students from other departments at Auburn University, the data reported is for HDFS undergraduate majors only. The data for this assessment report also does not include our HDPE curriculum majors given that the students complete their senior-level coursework in the College of Education rather than HDFS.

Our department established our new student learning outcomes Spring 2016. All assessment measures were created and implemented beginning Fall 2016. Our first assessment results were reported in 2017. The table that follows provides an overview of our measures and our assessment strategies, as well as how our measures align with our student learning outcomes.

### HDFS Outcome-Measure Alignment

Course/Measure	Outcome Assessed	Frequency	Data Collection	Desired Result
<b>HDFS 4920</b> <i>Course assignment is an applied theory paper that is evaluated using Rubric 1</i>	1	Completed fall, spring and summer semesters	Direct Measure; Course Embedded	All students should score "Proficient" as demonstrated by an average score of 4 or greater on the criteria evaluated
<b>HDFS 4670</b> <i>Course Assignment is a research paper that is evaluated using Rubric 2</i>	2	Completed fall and spring semesters	Direct Measure; Course Embedded	All students should score "Proficient" on the criteria evaluated. An average score of 5 or greater is proficient on some criteria whereas an average score of 7 or higher is proficient on others.
<b>HDFS 4920</b> <i>A performance evaluation is completed at the end of the semester by the internship site supervisor</i>	1,3	Completed fall, spring and summer semesters	Direct Measure; Course Embedded	All students should earn an average rating of 4, i.e., "Accomplished", or greater on a 5-point scale
<b>HDFS 4920</b> <i>Course assignment is an ePortfolio that is evaluated using Rubric 3</i>	4	Completed fall, spring and summer semesters	Direct Measure; Course Embedded	All students should score "Professional" as demonstrated by an average score of 2 on the criteria evaluated

#### Rubric 1: HDFS 4920 Theory Paper Rubric

In HDFS 4920 internship course, students write a 2-3-page paper where they are asked to apply a specific HDFS-related theory to the work of their internship site. Students submit their paper on Canvas. The HDFS Internship Director is responsible for completing the rubric for each theory paper. The HDFS Internship Director in consultation with other HDFS faculty developed the Theory Paper Rubric to evaluate student's ability to accurately describe an HDFS-related theory and clearly explain how the theory can be applied to the work of their internship site. Fall 2016 the HDFS Internship Director, an HDFS faculty member and an HDFS graduate teaching assistant (GTA) applied the Theory Paper Rubric to a random sample of 12 student papers. No training on the use of the rubric was provided as the faculty and the GTA are well-versed in HDFS-Theory, and they have experience evaluating similar type of papers. Inter-rater reliability was calculated using an interclass correlation coefficient and found to be adequate

at .57.

### Theory Paper Rubric

Overview of Theory	Underdeveloped (0-1 points)	Developing (2-3 points)	Proficient (4-5 points)
Name of theory and theorist are accurate	Both the name of theory and theorist are inaccurate or both are missing	Name of theory or theorist are inaccurate or missing, but not both	Both name of theory and theorist are provided accurately
Accurate and thorough description of theory, including main assumptions	Description of theory and main assumptions are completely inaccurate or missing	Description of theory and assumptions are limited and/or somewhat inaccurate	Thorough and accurate description of theory and main assumptions
Application	Underdeveloped (0-1 points)	Developing (2-3 points)	Proficient (4-5 points)
Specific internship work task and a need met for a population served is identified	Work task and/or need met in the population is not identified	Work task and/or need met is not specific or clear	Both work task and need met is specific and clearly stated
Explanation clearly describes how the theory is applied to the internship work task to successfully meet the need of the population served	An explanation of how theory applies to a work task and/or the need met is missing or erroneous	An explanation of how theory applies to work task and/or need met is provided, but is limited or ambiguous	Explanation clearly explains how theory applies to a specific work task and meets a need in the population

### Rubric 2: HDFS 4670 Research Paper Rubric

HDFS 4670 undergraduate students write a research-based paper that serves as the foundation for developing a Family-Life Parent Education program. In preparing the paper, students are required to (1) select peer-reviewed research articles related to their program focus, (2) use the research to effectively address their topic, (3) demonstrate strong writing skills (e.g., correct spelling, grammar and sentence structure), and (4) use correct APA format. The rubric used to evaluate student performance on these criteria was developed by two faculty members who teach HDFS 4670 and one other upper-level family education-focused course. Student research papers are evaluated by the course instructor and by a Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) using the Research Paper Rubric. The GTA receives training on using the rubric through grading a sample of papers jointly with the instructor.

### Research Paper Rubric

Research Articles	Underdeveloped (1-2 points)	Developing (3-4 points)	Proficient (5-6 points)
Paper is based on scholarly research articles obtained from peer-reviewed journals; articles are relevant to the paper topic; articles are current	Research articles do not meet two or more of the stated criteria	Research articles do not meet one of the stated criteria	Research articles meet all of the stated criteria
Review of the Literature	Underdeveloped (1-3 points)	Developing (4-6 points)	Proficient (7-9 points)
Research is used to effectively address the topic (i.e., informative and enhances understanding)	The research articles used do not effectively address the topic	The research articles used are somewhat effective in addressing the topic	The research articles are used to effectively address the topic
Writing Effectiveness	Underdeveloped (1-3 points)	Developing (4-6 points)	Proficient (7-9 points)

Scholarly tone, clarity and flow, use of good grammar and spelling	Writing is not scholarly, does not flow well, and there are several errors in grammar and spelling	Writing is mostly scholarly, flows somewhat well; there are a few errors in grammar and spelling	Writing is scholarly, flows well and there are no errors in grammar and spelling
APA format	APA format is not used or is mostly used incorrectly	APA format is mostly used correctly	APA format is used correctly throughout the paper

## HDFS Site Supervisor Evaluation

All HDFS Internship site supervisors are required to complete and return to the HDFS 4920 Internship Director an evaluation of our students' performance in the field at mid-semester and at semester-end. Evaluation forms are mailed prior to the start of internship and returned to the HDFS Internship Director by fax, email or delivered in-person by the student intern. Site supervisors are not provided specific training in the use of the forms, because the same evaluation, or a similar-type version, has been used for decades by the HDFS department to evaluate student performance, students intern at many of the same sites from semester-to-semester, and most of the items on the form represent common performance evaluation markers. Data from the semester-end, or final evaluation, is used to assess Student Learning Outcome 1 and 3, although it should be noted that feedback from the mid-semester evaluation allows us to address any short-comings in students' performance in advance.

**Use this scale to rate your student intern on the evaluation criterion that follow.**

**Exemplary (5)** – represents the top 2% of all interns. The intern consistently and remarkably far exceeds the criterion.

**Accomplished (4)** – represents the top 10% of all interns. The intern exceeds the criterion most of the time.

**Proficient (3)** – represents the top 20% of all interns. The intern consistently and reliably meets the criterion.

**Developing (2)** – represents the top 50% of interns. The intern meets the criterion some of the time.

**Unsatisfactory (1)** – represents the lower 50% of interns. The intern rarely meets the criterion.

Evaluation Criterion	Exemplary Top 2%	Accomplished Top 10%	Proficient Top 20%	Developing Top 50%	Unsatisfactory Lower 50%	No Basis to Judge	Not Applicable
<b>Professionalism</b>							
Punctual in arrival to work/meetings							
Dependable in completing tasks							
Efficient in regard to time management							
Professional in self-presentation							
Eager to learn/displays intellectual curiosity							
Resourceful/displays initiative							
Adaptable/easily adjusts to work demands							
Effective at problem-solving							
Receptive to criticism/modifies behavior as requested							
Able to work independently							
<b>Interpersonal Skills</b>							
Maintains high quality relationships with staff							
Maintains high quality relationships with clients							
Communicates in an open/direct manner							
Collaborates effectively as a member of a team							

Listens effectively/ empathetically							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

### HDFS Site Supervisor Evaluation (continued)

<i>Evaluation Criterion</i>	<i>Exemplary Top 2%</i>	<i>Accomplished Top 10%</i>	<i>Proficient Top 20%</i>	<i>Developing Top 50%</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory Lower 50%</i>	<i>No Basis to Judge</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Application of Knowledge							
Integrates education with professional practice							
Applies field-related knowledge to meet work responsibilities							
Uses HDFS theory to inform practice							
<b>Diversity</b>							
Displays sensitivity to issues of diversity							
Works skillfully with people from diverse backgrounds							
<b>Ethical Practice</b>							
Demonstrates knowledge of professional ethical standards							
Meets responsibilities in an ethical manner							
Seeks consultation to address ethical situations							
<b>Technical Skills</b>							
Communicates in writing effectively							
Uses computer software/online resources effectively							
Gathers/synthesizes information effectively for program purposes							

**Please check one or two criterion that represents the STRONGEST area(s) of overall performance for the student intern.**

- ☐ Professionalism  
☐ Interpersonal Skills  
☐ Application of Knowledge  
☐ Multicultural Competence  
☐ Ethical Practice  
☐ Technical Skills

**Please CHECK AT LEAST ONE area of overall performance that the student intern can most improve upon compared to the other areas.**

- ☐ Professionalism  
☐ Interpersonal Skills  
☐ Application of Knowledge  
☐ Multicultural Competence

\_\_\_\_\_ Ethical Practice

\_\_\_\_\_ Technical Skills

### Rubric 3: HDFS 4920 ePortfolio Rubric

A several HDFS undergraduate faculty have been active participants in the Auburn University ePortfolio Project since Fall 2013. These same faculty formed a committee Spring 2014 to establish a protocol for implementing the ePortfolio across the HDFS undergraduate curriculum. In Fall 2014, the ePortfolio was integrated into HDFS 2030 as a required assignment to ensure that all HDFS majors begin their ePortfolio work early in their undergraduate career. We incorporated an ePortfolio statement into all undergraduate syllabi to encourage ePortfolio development across the curriculum and several of our faculty require ePortfolio-specific assignments in their courses. Beginning Fall 2015, all students completing the internship course (HDFS 4920) were required to submit a final ePortfolio at the end of the semester, typically just prior to graduation. The HDFS ePortfolio cohort also developed an ePortfolio Evaluation Rubric that includes four separate criteria for assessing student performance. Two of the criteria fit well with our student learning outcomes and they are used for assessing Student Learning Outcome 4. Specifically, our first criteria, *Effective Communication*, evaluates the extent to which students communicate a specific professional goal, while our second criteria, *Critical Thinking through Reflection*, evaluates the extent to which students synthesize their experience to show their preparation for accomplishing their professional goal. The HDFS 4920 Internship Director, who is a member of the department ePortfolio cohort is responsible for evaluating student ePortfolios using the rubric at the end of the internship semester.

#### HDFS ePortfolio Evaluation Rubric

<b>Professional Communication</b>					
<i>Students will demonstrate competence communicating to a professional audience outside of the academic community</i>					
<b>Novice</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Professional</b>	<b>2</b>
No statement of a professional goal is evident	<input type="checkbox"/>	Statement of professional goal is vague or unclear	<input type="checkbox"/>	Statement of professional goal is apparent and specific	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writing does not adhere to professional writing conventions. Little evidence of proofreading. Numerous errors are present.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Writing mostly adheres to professional writing conventions. Some evidence of proofreading. Few errors are present.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Writing fully adheres to professional writing conventions. Careful proofreading is evident. No errors are present.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Few, if any, features of the ePortfolio are appropriate for a professional audience	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some features of the ePortfolio are appropriate for a professional audience	<input type="checkbox"/>	All features of the ePortfolio are appropriate for a professional audience	<input type="checkbox"/>
The ePortfolio is inconsistent with conventions of ethical literacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	The ePortfolio sometimes is consistent with conventions of ethical literacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	All aspects of the ePortfolio are consistent with conventions of ethical literacy	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Critical Thinking through Reflection</b>					
<i>Students will demonstrate competence integrating learning and experience to convey preparedness for accomplishing professional goals</i>					
<b>Novice</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Professional</b>	<b>2</b>
The ePortfolio incorporates only one or two types of experiences/artifacts to support professional goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	The ePortfolio incorporates several types of experiences/artifacts to support professional goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	The ePortfolio presents a wide variety of experiences/artifacts to support professional goals	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contextualization* is not used to explain how artifacts and experiences relate to professional goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some contextualization explains how artifacts and experiences relate to professional goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	All contextualization explains how artifacts and experiences relate to professional goals	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contextualization does not convey how experience contributed to learning or professional growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some contextualization conveys how experience contributed to learning or professional growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	Most contextualization conveys how experience contributed to learning or professional growth	<input type="checkbox"/>

The ePortfolio does not use introductions and titles to explain how experiences and artifacts in proximity to each other are related	<input type="checkbox"/>	The ePortfolio sometimes uses introductions and titles to explain how artifacts and experiences in proximity to each other are related	<input type="checkbox"/>	The portfolio consistently uses introductions and titles to explain how artifacts and experiences in proximity to each other are related	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--	--------------------------	--	--------------------------

\* Contextualization is the term used by HDFS to represent Critical Thinking through Reflection. It conveys our expectation that students will provide their audience with a written context for understanding why certain artifacts (i.e., examples of experience or learning) are included in the ePortfolio and how they support the student's professional goal.

## 5. Results

**SLO 1:** Articulate and apply HDFS-related theory (e.g., child development, family systems) to address the needs of individuals and families in the community

**Assessment Method 1: HDFS 4920 Theory Paper Rubric.** The rubric was used to evaluate all theory application papers submitted in HDFS 4920 Summer 2018, Fall 2018 and Spring 2019. The results presented are based on the 69 papers submitted.

	Underdeveloped (0-1)	Developing (2-3)	Proficient (4-5)
Overview of Theory	Mean F16-SP17	Mean SM17-SP18	Mean SM18-SP19
Name of theory and theorist are accurate	4.3	4.7	4.7
Accurate and thorough description of theory	3.5	3.8	3.9
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Application of Theory			
Specific internship work task and a need met for a population served is identified	4.1	4.1	4.3
Explanation clearly describes how the theory is applied to the internship work task to successfully meet the need of the population served	3.3	3.5	3.5
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>

**Assessment Method 2: HDFS Site Supervisor Evaluation.** One item on our internship site supervisor evaluation asks about students' ability to use HDFS-related theory to inform practice and it provides us with an additional opportunity to assess SLO 1. The results presented reflect the findings based on the 74 evaluations completed across Summer 2018, Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters.

**Exemplary (5)** – represents the top 2% of all interns. The intern consistently and remarkably far exceeds the criterion.

**Accomplished (4)** – represents the top 10% of all interns. The intern exceeds the criterion most of the time.

**Proficient (3)** – represents the top 20% of all interns. The intern consistently and reliably meets the criterion.

**Developing (2)** – represents the top 50% of interns. The intern meets the criterion some of the time.

**Unsatisfactory (1)** – represents the lower 50% of interns. The intern rarely meets the criterion.

	Mean F16-SP17	Mean SM17-SP18	Mean SM18-SP19
Uses HDFS theory to inform practice	4.3	4.2	4.3

**Interpretation:** Our desired outcome for SLO 1 is for students to score "Proficient" (i.e., 4 or greater) on the Theory Paper Rubric. Overall, the outcomes for the 2018-2019 academic year are consistent with the findings of our 2017-2018 report. Students met expectations for accurately identifying an HDFS-related Theory and an applicable internship work task. They performed slightly below expectations in their ability to provide an adequate description of the theory and clearly describe how the theory applies to

the internship work task. The results of the rubric suggest that by senior year our majors may still be “Developing” in their ability to effectively communicate how theory is applied in the context of professional practice. It is uncertain, however, whether student performance is due to limitations in their understanding and/or skills, or whether students are less invested in the course assignment given their full-time professional practice in the field. Internship site supervisors provided a mean rating of 4.3 on

the 5-point HDFS Internship Site Supervisor Evaluation rating scale suggesting that they view our students as “accomplished”, or performing in the top 10% of all interns, in their ability to apply HDFS-related theory to their work at the internship site. The 2018-2019 site supervisor mean ratings were like those of our previous two assessment reports. Taken together, the findings may indicate that our students are better at, or more invested in, applying theory to daily practice than demonstrating their ability through written communication.

**SLO 2: Write a research paper that incorporates peer-reviewed articles that are appropriate for Family Life Education programming and uses correct APA format, spelling, grammar, and sentence structure**

**Assessment Method: HDFS 4670 Research Paper Rubric.** The rubric was used to evaluate all research papers (n=67) submitted by HDFS majors in HDFS 4670 Fall 2018 and Spring 2019.

**Research Paper Rubric**

	Underdeveloped	Developing	Proficient			
Research Articles	1-2	3-4	5-6	Mean F16-Sp17	Mean F17-SP18	Mean F18-SP19
Obtained from peer-reviewed journals; relevant; current				5.6	5.6	5.8
Review of the Literature	1-3	4-6	7-9			
Effectively addresses the topic (i.e., informative and enhances understanding)				7.0	7.4	7.5
Writing Effectiveness	1-3	4-6	7-9			
Scholarly tone, clarity and flow, use of good grammar and spelling				7.1	7.0	7.2
APA format				7.4	7.0	7.4

**Interpretation:** The mean scores from the Research Paper Rubric support our desired outcomes for SLO 2. On average, our students were shown to be “Proficient” in their ability to (1) select peer-reviewed research articles related to focus of their paper, (2) use research literature to effectively address their topic, (3) demonstrate strong writing skills (e.g., correct spelling, grammar and sentence structure), and (4) use correct APA format. The mean ratings for the 2018-2019 academic year were slightly higher than those of the previous two years. The HDFS faculty continually discuss and implement new strategies to improve our majors’ ability to successfully meet SLO 2. Our results suggest that the efforts of our faculty, through course instruction and SLO 2-related assignments across the undergraduate curriculum, are effective in preparing students to write a research paper that supports Family Life Education programming by their senior year.

**SLO 3: Apply principles of professional practice (i.e., dependable, ethical) in the full-time, full-semester senior internship**

**Assessment Method: HDFS Site Supervisor Evaluation.** Internship site supervisors completed a final performance evaluation for all students enrolled in HDFS 4920 (i.e., the senior internship course)

Summer 2018, Fall 2018 and Spring 2019. The results for 74 students follow.

**Exemplary (5)** – represents the top 2% of all interns. The intern consistently and remarkably far exceeds the criterion.

**Accomplished (4)** – represents the top 10% of all interns. The intern exceeds the criterion most of the time.

**Proficient (3)** – represents the top 20% of all interns. The intern consistently and reliably meets the criterion.

**Developing (2)** – represents the top 50% of interns. The intern meets the criterion some of the time.

**Unsatisfactory (1)** – represents the lower 50% of interns. The intern rarely meets the criterion.

Evaluation Criterion	Mean F16 –SP17	Mean SM17 – SP18	Mean SM18-SP19
<b>Professionalism</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Punctual in arrival to work/meetings	4.6	4.4	4.5
Dependable in completing tasks	4.6	4.6	4.5
Efficient in regard to time management	4.5	4.4	4.3
Professional in self-presentation	4.3	4.5	4.6
Eager to learn/displays intellectual curiosity	4.5	4.5	4.5
Resourceful/displays initiative	4.4	4.4	4.4
Adaptable/easily adjusts to work demands	4.6	4.6	4.5
Effective at problem-solving	4.3	4.3	4.2
Receptive to criticism/modifies behavior as requested	4.5	4.5	4.4
Able to work independently	4.6	4.6	4.4
<b>Interpersonal Skills</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Maintains high quality relationships with staff	4.6	4.6	4.5
Maintains high quality relationships with clients	4.5	4.5	4.5
Communicates in an open/direct manner	4.5	4.5	4.3
Collaborates effectively as a member of a team	4.5	4.5	4.4
Listens effectively/empathetically	4.6	4.4	4.5
<b>Application of Knowledge</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Integrates education with professional practice	4.4	4.4	4.3
Applies field-related knowledge to meet work responsibilities	4.4	4.4	4.4
Uses HDFS theory to inform practice	4.3	4.2	4.3
<b>Diversity</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Displays sensitivity to issues of diversity	4.4	4.5	4.4
Works skillfully with people from diverse backgrounds	4.4	4.5	4.5
<b>Ethical Practice</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Demonstrates knowledge of professional ethical standards	4.5	4.5	4.4
Meets responsibilities in an ethical manner	4.5	4.6	4.4
Seeks consultation to address ethical situations	4.5	4.6	4.3
<b>Technical Skills</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Communicates in writing effectively	4.5	4.5	4.4
Uses computer software/online resources effectively	4.6	4.6	4.5
Gathers/synthesizes information effectively for program purposes	4.5	4.5	4.4

Site supervisors also were asked to check one or two of the criteria that represent the strongest area(s) of overall performance for the student intern. Percentages of ratings for student strengths are provided below.

#### **F16 – SP17**

51% Professionalism  
63% Interpersonal Skills  
29% Application of Knowledge  
10% Multicultural Competence  
6% Ethical Practice  
22% Technical Skills

#### **SM17 – SP18**

59% Professionalism  
56% Interpersonal Skills  
36% Application of Knowledge  
1% Multicultural Competence  
1% Ethical Practice  
20% Technical Skills

#### **SM18 – SP19**

62% Professionalism  
62% Interpersonal Skills  
51% Application of Knowledge  
8% Multicultural Competence  
9% Ethical Practice  
23% Technical Skills

Site supervisors were asked to check one criteria of overall performance that the student intern can most improve upon. Percentages of ratings for areas of improvement are provided below.

#### **F16 – SP17**

10% Professionalism  
16% Interpersonal Skills  
31% Application of Knowledge  
26% Multicultural Competence  
2% Ethical Practice

#### **SM 17 – SP18**

14% Professionalism  
13% Interpersonal Skills  
17% Application of Knowledge  
31% Multicultural Competence  
1% Ethical Practice

#### **SM18 – SP19**

10% Professionalism  
11% Interpersonal Skills  
14% Application of Knowledge  
21% Multicultural Competence  
6% Ethical Practice

10% Technical Skills

24% Technical Skills

38% Technical Skills

**Interpretation:** The desired outcome for SLO 3 was for students to earn an average rating of 4, i.e., “Accomplished”, or greater on the 5-point rating scale used on the HDFS Site Supervisor Evaluation. The overall mean ratings for 2018-2019 ranged from 4.2 to 4.6 and they are consistent with the findings of our previous two reports. The results continue to show support for our desired outcome and suggest that students are prepared to apply principles of professional practice in their full-time, full-semester senior internship. The percentages of criterion checked by site supervisors across all three academic years suggest that our students are strongest in their demonstration of professionalism (e.g., punctual, dependable, resourceful) and interpersonal skills (e.g., communication, collaboration, and maintaining high quality relationships), and that improvement is needed in the area of multicultural competence and technical skills. Verbal and written feedback from site supervisors suggest that our students enter the internship with little exposure to people from diverse backgrounds and that improvement is needed in their ability to effectively engage people who are different from them. It is noteworthy that when identifying student strengths, a greater percentage of site supervisors checked multicultural competence in 2018-2019 than in 2017-2018 (i.e., 51% versus 36%) and fewer site supervisors indicated multicultural competence as a weakness (i.e., 21% versus 31%). Based on our previous assessment results, faculty discussions have focused on student’s ability to effectively engage multicultural competence in the field. The results of the 2018-2019 report suggest we are making progress in this area. Another noteworthy finding is that a greater percentage (38%) of site supervisors indicated that our seniors could improve in their technical skills than in either of our two previous reports. There has been an upward trend across all three reports indicating our students could improve in their technical skills. Additional information will be sought from site supervisors in the upcoming academic year to better understand the specific skills our majors can improve upon. Preliminary feedback from site supervisors suggests that students are often asked to learn new software specific to the needs of an organization, which may influence the findings.

**SLO 4:** Synthesize classroom and field learning to communicate preparation for accomplishing a specific HDFS-related professional goal, such as employment or entry into graduate school

**Assessment Method: HDFS 4920 ePortfolio Rubric.** The rubric was used to evaluate all ePortfolios submitted in HDFS 4920 Summer 2018, Fall 2018 and Spring 2019. The results presented are based on the 73 ePortfolios submitted.

	Novice = 0	Developing = 1	Professional = 2
<b>Professional Communication</b>			
Demonstrate competence communicating to a professional audience outside of the academic community			
	F16 – SP17 Mean	SM17 – SP18 Mean	SM18–SP19 Mean
Professional goal evident	1.8	1.7	1.7
Professional writing conventions	1.5	1.5	1.6
Professional audience appropriate	1.8	1.9	1.8
Ethical literacy	1.1	1.4	1.2
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>

<b>Novice = 0</b>	<b>Developing = 1</b>	<b>Professional = 2</b>
-------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

<b>Critical Thinking through Reflection</b>			
Demonstrate competence integrating learning/experience to convey preparedness for accomplishing professional goals			
	<b>F16 – SP17 Mean</b>	<b>SM17 – SP18 Mean</b>	<b>SM18–SP19Mean</b>
Variety of artifacts	1.4	1.6	1.6
Experience relates to goals	1.2	1.1	1.0
Conveys growth	1.6	1.8	1.8
Introductions/Titles	.8	1.2	1.6
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>

**Interpretation:** Consistent with the results of our previous two assessment reports, the mean scores from the HDFS 4920 ePortfolio Rubric for 2018-2019 indicate that at the end of their senior internship semester HDFS majors are still “Developing” in their ability to synthesize how their learning and experience as an undergraduate has prepared them for accomplishing a professional goal, such as employment or graduate school. It is encouraging that the gains shown in students’ inclusion of Introductions and Titles across their ePortfolio remained consistent between the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 reports. The finding indicates that faculty instruction in this area of ePortfolio development is making a positive difference. Yet, our overall assessment results indicate that the HDFS department has more work to do in improving student’s performance relative to SLO 4. Over the past two assessment periods, faculty have focused less on students’ ePortfolio work than on their ability to apply theory (SLO 1), write an effective research paper (SLO 2) and demonstrate multicultural competence (SLO 3). The results of our assessment process indicate it will be important for our faculty to direct future attention and effort to strengthen our majors’ ability to communicate how their undergraduate experience has prepared them to accomplish their professional goals, especially in the context of the ePortfolio.

## **6. Communicating Results**

The results of the 2018-2019 assessment of our HDFS undergraduate student learning outcomes have not been communicated with our faculty given data collection was completed at the end of spring semester 2019. The results will be communicated at the first full meeting of the department faculty Fall 2019. There also are plans to hold a meeting Summer 2019 specific to the undergraduate faculty where the assessment results also will be reported. As with past reports, it is expected that faculty will be invested in discussing the results and directions for improvement. As mentioned previously, faculty have been focused primarily on SLO 1, SLO 2 and SLO 3. Given our current findings, it is important that SLO 4 move to the forefront of the conversation.

In the 2018-2019 academic year, the faculty focused on the results of our 2017-2018 report and we reviewed our progress in supporting our SLO based on our previous efforts. Faculty reported progress in implementing strategies to support student performance on SLO 2 in our HDFS 2000, HDFS 2010, HDFS 2030, and HDFS 3010 and HDFS 3030 courses. In HDFS 2000 and 2010, instructors added new assignments that required students to identify peer-reviewed literature and utilize APA format. In HDFS 2030, the instructors added a guest speaker to discuss empirical research as an important foundation for Family Life Education, and the instructors of HDFS 3010 and 3030 worked toward alignment of their literature review paper assignments. Select faculty also reported strengthening their emphasis on multicultural competence relative to our SLO 3 findings.

At the end of Spring semester 2019, we conducted a Qualtrics survey of all faculty and graduate students who taught an undergraduate course in the 2018-2019 academic year. Course instructors were asked to identify the SLO supported in each course they teach and to report the strategies used to support each SLO, as applicable. We were pleased with our 100% response rate. Through the survey we learned that through their course instruction 96% of instructors support student accomplishment of SLO 1, 54% support accomplishment of SLO 2, 35% support accomplishment of SLO 3, and 64% support

accomplishment of SLO 4. These findings suggest that all of our undergraduate course instructors are actively working to support student performance on our undergraduate SLO.

Select outcomes of the 2017-2018 report also were communicated with our undergraduates. The findings for SLO 3 (i.e., principles of professional practice) based on the HDFS 4920 Site Supervisor Evaluation were communicated to our rising student interns in the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 Mandatory Internship Preparation meetings. The findings were used to remind students about the expected principles of professional practice and to stress their importance for success during the senior internship. The results based on the HDFS 4920 ePortfolio Rubric for SLO 4 (i.e., communicating preparation for accomplishing professional goals) were communicated with students at our ePortfolio 101 orientation meeting offered Fall 2018. The results for SLO 4 also were communicated with students during their

internship semester on the Canvas course website. The SLO 4-related communications were used to emphasize the importance of effectively synthesizing course and field learning to convey preparation for accomplishing professional goals, and we provided students with additional guidelines for being successful in doing so. An assignment also was added to the internship course Fall 2018 that students complete early in the semester. For the assignment, students are asked to identify and contextualize three artifacts related to their post-graduation goal for which they receive detailed feedback that they can apply to other artifacts included in their final ePortfolio.

## **7. Purposeful Reflection and Action Plan**

Since the inception of the new assessment model in 2016, the HDFS faculty have been actively discussing our student learning outcomes and strategies for the success of our undergraduates. Our overarching goal is for our students to be successful in accomplishing their post-graduation goals whether employment or entry into graduate school. We believe our current student learning outcomes will promote the success of our students regardless of the direction they pursue following graduation. We also are satisfied with the validity and reliability of our current assessment measures.

The results of our 2018-2019 report indicate that by their senior year our undergraduate majors are consistently performing as desired on SLO 2 (i.e., writing a research paper that incorporates peer-reviewed articles appropriate for Family Life Education programming) and on SLO 3 (i.e., applying principles of professional practice in their HDFS internship). On the other hand, our students are not performing to the desired standard on SLO 1 (i.e., articulating and applying HDFS-related theory). We especially would like to see our majors perform better on their ability explain how an HDFS-related theory can be applied to their field work during the internship semester. Our students also are not performing as desired on SLO 4 (i.e., synthesizing learning to communicate preparation for accomplishing professional goals). Based on these findings, the following actions will be taken beginning Fall 2019 to improve student learning and performance:

1. The results of the 2018-2019 assessment report will be presented at the first full meeting of department faculty Fall semester 2019. Emphasis will be placed on the necessity of strengthening student preparation for accomplishment of SLO 4. We also will discuss how we can better prepare our students to apply theory to the work of their internship site (SLO 1).
2. The findings of the Qualtrics survey mentioned in the previous section of this report also will be communicated with our faculty, as the results may shed some light on how we can improve student preparation relative to SLO 4 and SLO 1.

**SLO 4:** About 50% of instructors reported using strategies that support of SLO 4, but many were not specifically related to ePortfolio work. This finding suggests that faculty interpretations of SLO 4 may differ and there may be some misunderstandings about how SLO 4 is assessed. It also is likely that some instructors may be more familiar with the HDFS ePortfolio than others given that only a smaller group of HDFS faculty have focused specifically on ePortfolio development in the undergraduate program. Important action steps for Fall 2019 will be to explore faculty

interpretations of SLO 4, and to familiarize all undergraduate course instructors with the HDFS ePortfolio and the related assessment rubric.

**SLO 1:** All faculty and graduate students who reported supporting SLO 1 indicated that they provide an overview of varied HDFS-related theories in their undergraduate courses, but only about 50% require assignments that ask students to specifically apply theory. Of those instructors who require assignments that involve the application of theory, only 3 of the courses are represented on our curriculum map. A clear action step for the 2019-2020 academic year will be to form a committee of faculty who teach the courses identified on our curriculum map to identify specific strategies to improve student performance on SLO 1, particularly in their ability to apply HDFS-related theory in real-world contexts.

## Appendix A

### HDFS Major Courses by Concentration

	<b>Early Child Development</b> (11)*	<b>Child Life</b> (27)*	<b>Middle Childhood/Adolescence</b> (41)*	<b>Adult Development</b> (11)*	<b>Family Life Education</b> (2)*
HDFS 2000	X	X	X	X	X
HDFS 2010/2013	X	X	X	X	X
HDFS 2030	X	X	X	X	X
HDFS 2040/2043	X	X	X	X	X
HDFS 3010/3013	X	X	X		X
HDFS 3030		Professional Course	Professional Course	X	Professional Course
HDFS 3060	X			X	X
HDFS 4680	Professional Course			Professional Course	
HDFS 3080	X	X	X	X	X
HDFS 4670	Professional Course	Professional Course	Professional Course	Professional Course	Professional Course
HDFS 4920	X	X	X	X	X

\* The number in parentheses ( ) represents the average number of graduating seniors per year who have completed the concentration

X=Course that is required for completion of the concentration

HDFS 2000 – Required College Core

HDFS 2040/2043 – Required Supporting Course

	Major Core
	Courses

□ = Course not required for the concentration

□ = “OR”  
Student Selection

Professional Course = Required Professional Course for the concentration