


California State University, Sacramento
Humanities & Religious Studies
6000 J Street • Mendocino Hall 2011 • Sacramento, CA 95819-6083
T (916) 278-6444 • F (916) 278-7213 • www.csus.edu/hum

revised

April 19, 2019

Memorandum

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Jeffrey Brodd, Chair 
Academic Program Review Oversight Committee

SUBJECT: Program Review of the Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education: Child Development

The Academic Program Review Oversight Committee has reviewed the Academic Program Review report of the Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education: Child Development prepared by Review Team chair Tom Krabacher and agrees that it is ready for final approval. The Committee thanks and commends all of those involved in the review for their collegial and effective approach to the process.

The Review is ready for action by the Faculty Senate.

cc: Sheri Hembree, Chair, Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education
Sasha Sidorkin, Dean, College of Education
Kitty Kelly, Chair, Curriculum Policies Committee
Amy Wallace, Associate Vice President, Academic Excellence
Steve Perez, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Interim)

Academic Program Review Report

Child Development Program

Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education

California State University, Sacramento

Review Team

Thomas Krabacher (Chair)
Department of Geography

External Consultant

Dr. Robin Love
Professor, Child Development
San José State University

Spring 2018

INTRODUCTION

The Child Development program review took place during 2017-2018 program review cycle according to the following schedule:

- *December 2017:* Self-study proposal submitted
- *February 2018:* Completed Self-study submitted
- *Spring 2018:* Review and external consultant visit conducted

Additional interviews took place in early summer, 2018.

The Self-Study was organized into three sections in accordance with program review guidelines laid down in the university's 2016 *California State University Sacramento, Academic Program Review Manual*, which is organized around the following three components:

- A general overview of the program, including degrees offered, curriculum, students, faculty, staff, and facilities, etc.
- A review of the program's assessment process.
- A Focused Inquiry that examines "issues of particular interest/concern to the department itself, in the context of what is currently important to the college and university."

For its Focused Inquiry the Child Development Program elected to examine two broad topics: (1) the effectiveness and alignment of its BA and MA programs, focusing on program identity (both within the CSU and nationally) and the alignment of programmatic requirements with those found at other institutions, especially the California community colleges; and (2) retention and graduation rates (including both student enrollment and time to degree) for its programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. All of this was laid out very clearly in the Department's self-study. This report is, by and large, organized around the framework found in the self-study.

Commendation 1: The Child Development Program is commended for its preparation of a very detailed and thoughtful Self-Study, which proved to be an invaluable resource throughout the course of the program review.

It is important to point out that this program review is taking place under atypical circumstances in as much as that it is the first such review that the Child Development Program has undergone since 2003. The reasons for the lengthy interval since the last review are not relevant here. It is important to point out, however, that during the fifteen-year period since the last review the nature of the Child Development Program at Sacramento State has undergone dramatic changes. In 2003 the Program was a newly-established Department of Child Development (formed out of an earlier Teacher Education Department) in the College of Education. As a result of a reorganization of the College of Education in 2010-2012, Child Development currently is no longer a department but a program within the much larger Branch (or Department) of

Undergraduate Studies in Education, while also offering an MA degree through the College's Graduate and Professional Studies Branch. A consequence of this is that, due both to the length of time involved and the administrative reorganization that has taken place in the interval, recommendations from the earlier program review, though included here in Appendix I for historical purposes, proved largely irrelevant to the present review. The present review took place effectively *de novo*.

It is also important to note that the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Enhancement (OIREE) factbook that served as the basis for much of what is contained in the Self-Study and Program Review Report – the *Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education Factbook 2017* – aggregates data for both the Child Development and American Sign Language/Deaf Studies Programs. This made it difficult at times to address the Child Development Program specifically. It would be extremely useful if OIREE could find a way to separate out data for the two programs in the future.

Recommendation 1: The Provost/Office of Academic Affairs should work with the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Enhancement to ensure that disaggregated program-specific data be available for future program reviews.

Individuals Consulted:

The review team met with a large number of individuals during the review process, all of whom were unfailingly helpful. We thank them for their time and cooperation:

Dr. Sheri Hembree, Chair, Undergraduate Studies in Education

Dr. Kristen Alexander, Faculty and BA Program coordinator, Child Development

Dr. Patrick Pieng, Faculty and Graduate Program Coordinator, Child Development

Dr. Amber Gonzalez, Faculty Fellow, Student Success Center, College of Education

Dean Alexander Sidorkin, College of Education

Associate Dean Karen Davis, College of Education

Associate Dean Pia Wong, College of Education

Dr. Robin Love (External Consultant), Professor of Child Development, San José State University

Tenure-line Faculty, Child Development Program (Undergraduate Studies in Education):
Separate meetings with members of the following faculty groups:

- Senior (tenured) faculty

- Tenure/Tenure Track junior faculty

Follow-up meetings with some faculty on an individual basis also took place.

Part-Time Faculty (lecturers), Child Development Program (Undergraduate Studies in Education)

Undergraduate Studies in Education office staff

Dr. Amy Liu, Director, Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA)

Kristen/Anderegg, Advisor/Manager, Liberal Studies Program

Sean Ryan, Co-Coordinator Summer New Student Orientation

Undergraduate students in Child Development Program 138

Graduate students in Child Development Program 247

Documents Consulted:

The following documents were consulted during the review process:

Child Development Program Documents:

- Self-Study Proposal (Fall, 2017)
- Child Development Program Self-Study (Fall, 2017)
https://www.csus.edu/acaf/programreview/Self_Study_Report/17-18_Reports/CHDV%20Self-Study%202017-2018_Final.docx
- Child Development Factsheet
<https://www.csus.edu/coe/academics/undergraduate/programs/assets/factsheet-ugrad-chdv-20150112-web.pdf>
- Master of Arts in Child Development Handbook 2015-2016
<https://www.csus.edu/coe/academics/graduate/handbooks/assets/handbook-chdv-ma-2015-2016.pdf>
- Assessment Plan, Child Development Program (2017)
<https://www.csus.edu/programassessment/assessment-plans/Education/ChDv%20Ugrad%20Assessment%20Plan.03%2014%2017.pdf>
- Child Development Program Annual Assessment Reports (2014-15, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017) and Feedback
- <https://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2014-15reports/educ%20undergrad.html><https://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2014-15reports/educ%20undergrad.html>
- <https://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2015-16reports/educ%20undergrad.html>

- <https://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2016-17reports/educ%20undergrad.html>
- Undergraduate Studies in Education 2017-2018 CSUS catalog listing
<http://catalog.csus.edu/archives/2017-2018/colleges/education/undergraduate-studies-education/#undergraduatetext>
- Undergraduate Studies, College of Education website
<https://www.csus.edu/coe/academics/undergraduate/programs/overview-chdv.html>
- Faculty curriculum vitae/résumés

Office of Institutional Research, *Undergraduate Studies in Education Fact Book, Fall 2017*
<https://www.csus.edu/oir/datacenter/departmentfactbooks/UndergraduateStudies17.pdf>

Office of Institutional Research, *University Fact Book, Fall 2016*
<https://www.csus.edu/oir/datacenter/universityfactbook16.pdf>

California State University Sacramento, *Academic Program Review Manual, 2016*
<https://www.csus.edu/acaf/programreview/ProgramReviewManual2016.pdf>

[https://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2015-Office of Academic Program Assessment. 2013-2014 Annual Program Review Template](https://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual-assessment/2015-Office%20of%20Academic%20Program%20Assessment.2013-2014%20Annual%20Program%20Review%20Template)
[http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual assessment/Guidelines.%20Template%20and%20Example%20pdfs/13-14%20template%204-18.pdf](http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/annual%20assessment/Guidelines.%20Template%20and%20Example%20pdfs/13-14%20template%204-18.pdf)

In addition to the above, the program review benefitted from separate written comments from individual faculty and students, all of which were greatly appreciated and informed the review team's final report.

Although no written external consultant's report was submitted, her comments during her on campus visit, particularly at her exit interview, also provided a useful perspective on the program.

SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations to the Program:

1. The Child Development Program its preparation of a very detailed and thoughtful Self-Study, proved to be an invaluable resource to the review team over the course of the program review.
2. The Child Development Program for its large, well put-together BA program with multiple concentrations that offer students a wide range of options.

3. The Child Development Program is commended for offering a well-designed and flexible MA program capable of serving a wide range of students.
4. The Child Development Program is commended for its knowledgeable and dedicated faculty who command a wide range of interests and expertise and offer a large and diverse curriculum.
5. The Child Development Program, Dean and Associate Deans are to be commended for the interest and support they show for the junior faculty members, especially in their initial years on the faculty.
6. Child Development adjunct lecturers are to be commended for their dedication to the Child Development Program and for the excellent, essential, and often innovative teaching support they provide.
7. Chair Hembree and the Department staff are to be commended for their dedicated support to the very large and often demanding Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education and, through it, to the Child Development Program.
8. Child Development Program for its development of a comprehensive assessment plan linking program learning outcomes to the University's baccalaureate learning goals.
9. Child Development Program for carrying out a well-designed focused inquiry that lays the groundwork for the future strategic planning over the future direction of the Program.

Commendations to the College:

5. The Child Development Program, Dean and Associate Deans are to be commended for the interest and support they show for the junior faculty members, especially in their initial years on the faculty.

Recommendations to the Program:

2. The Child Development Program investigate the possibility of introducing a pro-seminar for first year graduate students to better prepare them for the independent work they will undertake in their second and third years.

3. That Child Development should undertake to find ways of increasing faculty willingness and available to serve as sponsors for graduate students working on their culminating projects.
4. The Child Development and the Dean of Education should jointly develop a hiring plan to increase tenure density in the Program. If possible, two faculty hires over the next two years should be the goal.
5. The Child Development Program should strengthen its orientation advising to provide incoming majors with a better understanding of the options open to them by way of different BA concentrations.
6. The Child Development Program should develop a plan to familiarize all faculty with the information necessary to allow them to provide effective advisement to students regarding the BA degree, its concentrations, and its requirements.
7. The Child Development Program should investigate the desirability of instituting a mandatory advising requirement for undergraduate majors.
8. The Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education (and, therefore, Child Development) should be authorized to hire a second full-time lead (ASC II) as part of its office staff, to replace the split position that currently exists.
9. The Child Development and the College of Education should work jointly to acquire facilities and other resources necessary to establish a Child Development Observation Laboratory on the Sacramento State campus.
10. The Child Development Program should work with the Office of Academic Program Assessment to develop an assessment plan that focuses more directly links the outcomes of specific assessment measures to the program-level learning outcomes.
11. The Child Development Program is urged to conduct a retreat of its faculty run by an outside facilitator for the purpose of deciding what it wants to be (identity), how this will relate to the missions of the College and University, and what it will mean for the students. The Dean is urged to provide the necessary resources to support the retreat, should additional resources be needed.

12. It is recommended that the Child Development Program and the College Dean, working in conjunction with the Provost, undertake a joint discussion over the desirability of returning the status of Child Development to that of a department offering both the BA and MA degrees.

Recommendations to the College:

4. The Child Development and the Dean of Education should jointly develop a hiring plan to increase tenure density in the Program. If possible, two faculty hires over the next two years should be the goal.
8. The Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education (and, therefore, Child Development) should be authorized to hire a second full-time lead (ASC II) as part of its office staff, to replace the split position that currently exists.
9. The Child Development and the College of Education should work jointly to acquire facilities and other resources necessary to establish a Child Development Observation Laboratory on the Sacramento State campus.
11. The Child Development Program is urged to conduct a retreat of its faculty run by an outside facilitator for the purpose of deciding what it wants to be (identity), how this will relate to the missions of the College and University, and what it will mean for the students. The Dean is urged to provide the necessary resources to support the retreat, should additional resources be needed.
12. It is recommended that the Child Development Program and the College Dean, working in conjunction with the Provost, undertake a joint discussion over the desirability of returning the status of Child Development to that of a department offering both the BA and MA degrees.

Recommendations to the Provost/Office of Academic Affairs:

1. The Provost/Office of Academic Affairs should work with the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Enhancement to ensure that disaggregated program-specific data be available for future program reviews.
4. That Child Development and the Dean of Education should jointly develop a hiring plan, in conjunction with Academic Affairs, to increase tenure density in the Program. If possible, two faculty hires over the next two years should be the goal.

12. It is recommended that the Child Development Program and the College Dean, working in conjunction with the Provost, undertake a joint discussion over the desirability of returning the status of Child Development to that of a department offering both the BA and MA degrees.

Recommendation to the Faculty Senate:

The Review Team recommends that the degree programs in the Child Development Program be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

PART I: PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Child Development Program is one of two programs, along with American Sign Language/Deaf Studies, in the College of Education offering the BA degree. Originally part of the Teacher Education Department, Child Development acquired its own department status in 2001-2002. The last program review took place at this time. When, in 2012, the College was restructured around student groupings rather than disciplines, Child Development status was changed to that of a program residing in the broader department (or Branch) of Undergraduate Studies in Education. The program currently offers the BA degree in Child Development along with the MA degree and two undergraduate minors.

BA Degree in Child Development

The Child Development undergraduate baccalaureate degree (BA) is organized around five concentrations:

- Bachelor of Arts: Child Development, Elementary Pre-Credential
- Bachelor of Arts: Child Development, Social and Community Settings
- Bachelor of Arts: Child Development, Early Development, Care and Education (EDCE)
- Bachelor of Arts: Child Development, Individualized Concentration
- Bachelor of Arts: Child Development, Integrated Elementary Pre-Credential

The first four concentrations offer a 120-unit degree and follow the normal University General Education (GE) pattern. Concentration course requirements include, in addition to the GE and other University graduation requirements, 49-50 units in (primarily) a common curriculum of upper-division Child Development course work, and 14-15 elective units specific to the concentration. The fifth concentration, Integrated Elementary Pre-Credential, combines 111-114 units of GE and major course work in the subject matter areas covered by the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET).

In addition to the Integrated Program, the concentrations are designed to provide students with maximum flexibility to accommodate different academic interests and career goals. Elementary Pre-Credential prepares students to enter a multiple subject credential program for elementary and

middle school teachers; Social and Community Settings prepares students for work in health-related, counseling, and research fields; and EDCE prepares students for work with infants, young children, and their families. Taken together, these concentrations provide students with three career paths and multiple ways of getting there:

- Career in social and community settings;
- Careers in early childhood education and development;
- Elementary school teaching (two tracks)
 - Pre-credential option
 - The individual pathway, which folds in GE and waives the CSET.

The Individualized concentration, serves students who wish to design their own programs, incorporating more flexibility in their electives.

Child Development also offers, in conjunction with the College of Continuing Education a cohort-based hybrid video-streamed version of the EDCE concentration, which is unique in California. Because this program is run through CCE it is scheduled to undergo a separate review in 2018-2019, and no data were available for the Self-Study; as a result only brief mention of the option was available for this review. One student who completed the program, however, was interviewed by the Program Review Team; he praised it, particularly for its clear organizational structure.

In addition to the above, a Special Education concentration consisting of the Child Development Program BA plus additional credentialing has been approved and its implementation is being fast-tracked. It is designed to be completed in 4 ½ years.

The Child Development Program is well-aligned with its feeder community colleges in the Los Rios Community College District and with Sierra Community College. Regular communication between program faculty and the community colleges helps maintain currency in the alignments.

Enrollments in the BA program are robust and have increased steadily since the College was restructured in 2012. Data show Child Development majors represent approximately 90 percent of undergraduate enrollment in the Undergraduate Studies Department – and hence the College – throughout this period, with American Sign Language/Deaf Studies accounting for 10 percent.

Table 1. BA Program Enrollment 2012-2016

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Number of Majors	709	757	836	971	1,149
% Dept. Total	90.4	89.1	89.3	88.9	88.9

Source: 2017 Factbook for Undergraduate Studies in Education, Table 5.

More recent data show that enrollment continued to grow to 1,605 majors in Fall, 2017. This greatly exceeds what one would have expected, based on the trend over the previous years.

Enrollments within the major show that students were spread more or less evenly among the concentrations over the five-year period for which data is available.

Table 2. Enrollment by BA Concentration 2012-2016

Concentration	% total
<i>Child Development</i>	27
<i>Early Development, Care & Education (EDCE)</i>	20
<i>Integrated elementary Pre-Credential</i>	31
<i>Social and Community Settings</i>	22

Source: 2017 Factbook for Undergraduate Studies in Education, Tables 5 and 13.

Trends for the number of BA degrees conferred by the program parallel those for enrollment, showing a steady increase over the most recent five years for which data is available, with Child Development representing about 90 percent of undergraduate degrees in both the Department and College.

The external consultant observed in her exit interview that, the BA program is large but well put-together. The concentration options provide flexibility for students, and the curriculum's strong field work component is a major asset. The on-campus program review concurs with this assessment.

Commendation 2: The Child Development Program is commended for its comprehensive and well-organized baccalaureate degree (BA) that provides students with a wide range of options.

Minor

The Child Development Program offers two minors, one in Child Development and the other in Child Development-Counseling. The Child Development minor consists of 20 units plus 3 units of electives and serves students in other majors such as Psychology, Business, or Biology who might wish to incorporate a childhood focus in their major. The Child Development-Counseling minor is a 19-unit program for students in Child Development or related majors with an interest in counseling, many of whom intend to pursue graduate work in counseling. Spring 2018 enrollment data show there are 55 students seeking a Child Development minor and 193 working toward the minor in Child Development Counseling.

Students

Student profile data provided by the Office of Institutional Research is aggregated at the Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education level and therefore does not provide specific details for the Child Development Program. However, given that Child Development majors represent approximately 90 percent of the Department's undergraduate majors, it is reasonable to assume that the numbers are largely reflective of the Child Development Program itself.

Table 3. Student Profile, by Percent, 2012 to 1016

<i>Category</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>University*</i>
Ethnicity:		
<i>White/Caucasian</i>	33.6	27.2
<i>Latinx</i>	28.5	30.5
<i>Asian</i>	17.6	20.9
<i>African-American</i>	7.0	5.7
<i>Multiracial</i>	7.2	6.3
<i>Other/Foreign/Unreported</i>	6.1	9.5
All Minority (total)	55.4	56.4
Gender		
<i>Female</i>	92.2	55.9
<i>Male</i>	7.8	44.1

Source: *Dept. of Undergraduate Studies 2017 Factbook*, Table 2

* Calculated from *University 2017 Factbook*, Table 9.

For the 2012-2016 period, 36 percent of new majors were first-time freshmen and 64 percent were transfers. Retention and graduation data for this period indicate that the Program closely parallels the University averages in these categories and somewhat exceeds it in the area of four-year graduation rates. Average time to degree is 4.6 – 5.0 years for native freshmen and 2.4 to 2.7 for transfers.

Table 4. Five-Year Average Retention and Graduation Rates (percent)

	<i>Program</i>	<i>University</i>
<i>Retention: Freshmen</i>	80.4	81.5
<i>Retention: Transfer</i>	88.4	86.4
<i>Graduation Rates: 4-yr</i>	13.4	8.0
<i>Graduation Rates: 6-yr*</i>	81.1	9.8

Source: *Calculated from Dept. of Undergraduate Studies 2017 Factbook*, Tables 14 and 15

* For transfer students this includes 4 years after transfer.

Students have expressed some frustration with their experience in the BA program, but many of these are the kind of concerns one hears from undergraduate students generally such as dissatisfaction with class scheduling, particularly the way required courses were occasionally scheduled in conflict with one another. Class availability was another concern; the high student demand for some classes, such as CHDV 138, made them difficult to get into. The field experience was felt by many to be particularly hard to schedule, particularly for those that work or have family commitments. Overall, it was generally agreed that the biggest area for improvement was a need for more classes and better scheduling.

Advising was a second area that students felt could benefit from improvement. This is addressed in the Advising section of the report below.

On the whole majors expressed satisfaction with their undergraduate program. They liked the major, especially the flexibility it offers by way of multiple concentrations and its ability to accommodate multiple student interests, not just teaching. They also greatly liked their faculty, whom they found to be knowledgeable and approachable.

MA in Child Development

The program offers the Master of Arts graduate degree in Child Development. When Child Development had independent department status from 2001 until 2012, the MA program was housed in the same unit as was the undergraduate BA. After the College of Education was restructured in 2012 to organize programs according to student groups rather than disciplines, however, the Child Development MA was relocated to the Graduate and Professional Studies in Education Branch/Department while the BA and minor were part of Undergraduate Studies in Education. This has proved awkward on various levels and at the time of the program review efforts were underway to reunite both the BA and MA programs within the Department of Undergraduate Studies.

The MA program is a 30-unit graduate degree organized around a single track; this was changed from an earlier two-track option as a result of reductions in faculty and a lack of student demand. The program consists of 30 units course work – nine required courses and three units of electives – and a culminating experience in the form of either a thesis or a project. A third option, MA by exam, existed at one point but was dropped several years ago. The thesis is expected to be based on original research, while projects tend to have a more applied focus. The program admits 20-22 students a year and usually takes two to three years to complete. The MA program is primarily career-oriented, serving students interested in pre-school teaching, pre-school program directors, consulting, service on education boards, among other professions.

At the time of the program review there were 66 students enrolled, a number currently sufficient to sustain the program. The majority of the students come out of the Sacramento State undergraduate program although a significant percentage are from other CSU campuses. Additionally, there are usually a few from out of state. The majority of students have undergraduate degrees in Child Development, with Psychology in second place. Most students currently work and many are returning students so therefore the entire program is offered after hours.

Commendation 3: The Child Development Program is commended for offering a well-designed and flexible MA program capable of serving a wide range of students.

Conversations with graduate students revealed that their satisfaction with the program as it is currently structured is mixed. During their first year, when the program is well-structured, satisfaction and morale are generally high. When they move into their second or third year, however, where the emphasis is on independent work they often find themselves adrift and in need of guidance. A common complaint is that, as first year-students, they're not given enough information about the culminating experience early enough to be able to finish in the hypothetical

two-year time frame. There was a general sense that some sort of early orientation to the program is needed.

Recommendation 2: The Child Development Program investigate the possibility of introducing a pro-seminar for first year graduate students to better prepare them for the independent work they will undertake in their second and third years.

The most serious source of graduate student frustration, however, was the difficulty they encountered in trying to find a faculty sponsor for their thesis or project. They found choices restricted and many faculty already committed or otherwise unavailable. This situation has been acknowledged by program administrators who point to the fact that (1) there is currently no workload credit for taking or graduate students and (2) not all Child Development faculty teach in the graduate program.

Recommendation 3: That Child Development should undertake to find ways of increasing faculty willingness and available to serve as sponsors for graduate students working on their culminating projects.

Other issues raised included the availability of classes; many courses listed in the catalog, such as CHDV 248 rarely seem to be offered. The lack of an opportunity for practical experience was also mentioned. Several students missed the opportunity to take a practicum as an elective, something that was apparently possible in the past.

Faculty

In her exit interview the external consultant observed that the Child Development faculty are the program's greatest strength. The faculty are well-liked by their students who praise them for their knowledge, commitment, and approachability. The Program Review Team concurs with this assessment, finding them to be knowledgeable, dedicated, and enthusiastic about their students and their discipline. Until recently the Child Development faculty consisted of thirteen tenure-line faculty; Karen Davis O'Hara, however, has now taken a full-time administrative position as a College Associate Dean, reducing the number of tenure-track faculty to twelve. Of these, Shree Hembree has full-time release from teaching to serve as department chair of Undergraduate Studies in Education and two faculty have entered the FERP program and only teach half-time. This in effect leaves the Child Development with ten tenure/tenure-track faculty (six Full, three Assistant) and two half-time FERP faculty to serve the program.

They are supported by 26 non-tenure line lecturers.

Commendation 4: The Child Development Program is commended for its knowledgeable and dedicated faculty who command a wide range of interests and expertise and offer a large and diverse curriculum.

The tenure-line faculty is young. This in large part is the result of retirements and other separations during the hiring freeze of the past decade. Demographically it currently consists of seven Full Professors and six Assistant Professors, with one of the latter scheduled to go up for promotion to Associate Professor in 2018-2019. In terms of diversity the tenure-line faculty is predominantly female, with only one male faculty member. Six faculty count as culturally or ethnically diverse.

In practical terms, only ten tenure-line faculty are available for teaching since two of the senior faculty now occupy administrative positions and two full professors are now retired and will have entered the FERP program beginning in 2018-2019; in addition, one Full Professor has six units reassigned time as a faculty fellow. Also, incoming junior faculty receive a reduced teaching load during their initial years. The current breakdown of work assignments for the 13 tenure-line faculty is as follows:

- 2 on administrative reassignment
- 10 teaching faculty
 - 2 Full Professors – FERP
 - 2 Full Professors – active
 - 1 Full Professor – 6 WTU reassignment as a faculty fellow
 - 6 Assistant Professors (probationary)

As a result, teaching in the major is carried out disproportionately by lecturers. Tenure density in the program currently stands at approximately 25 percent, well below the University average and CSU system-wide goals.

Overall morale is good among probationary faculty. Unlike junior faculty in many other departments they have expressed little or no anxiety over tenure expectations. They believe the policy is clearly defined and find it easy to reach out to senior faculty for advice if needed. To this end, the Dean and Associate Deans make a point of meeting on a regular basis with new faculty during their first two years.

Commendation 5: The Child Development Program, Dean and Associate Deans are to be commended for the interest and support they show for the junior faculty members, especially in their initial years on the faculty.

With increasing emphasis placed on research and scholarship most junior faculty are on a reduced teaching load. A consequence of this is that they don't always have the opportunity to get to know their students well, which can make it difficult for students to get a letter of recommendation. Less time in the classroom has meant it also takes longer for junior faculty to become familiar with the options in the undergraduate program, which can cause challenges when it comes to advising.

Adjunct lecturers constitute the majority of the teaching faculty in the Child Development Program. Scheduling a meeting with them for purposes of the program review was difficult given the wide variation their on-campus availability. The Program Review Team and external consultant managed to meet with three of them, however. All had been teaching for more than a decade, two of them for more than 20 years. They have taught both lower-division and specialized upper-division courses in the major. One currently serves as the program's fieldwork coordinator. At times they have been teaching innovators, with one teaching the program's first online course in 2007 and several currently teach hybrids.

Commendation 6: Child Development adjunct lecturers are to be commended for their dedication to the Child Development Program and for the excellent, essential, and often innovative teaching support they provide.

Assuming the three interviewed are representative of the lecturer faculty as a whole, it is clear that they love their jobs, the range of teaching opportunities available to them, their colleagues, and their students. At the same time they bemoaned the current lack of interaction with tenure-line faculty and staff; this was contrasted with the holiday parties and beginning of year get-togethers of the past. They acknowledge that this is likely due at least in part to the rapid program growth and frequent staff turnovers in recent years. Chair Hembree has tried to address this by recently introducing brown bag lunches to help bring people together.

At the moment, along with more staff, Child Development's greatest need is for additional tenure-line faculty. This is driven by strong program growth in recent years, as illustrated by changes over the past decade.

Table 5. Child Development Program Tenure-Line Faculty and Majors 2007 and 2017

	<i>Tenure-Line Faculty</i>	<i>Majors</i>
2007	12	600
2017	9	1600

* Minus faculty in administrative or bought-out coordinator positions.

Curriculum courses are now overwhelmingly taught by adjunct faculty. As the external consultant noted, there is a serious need to get more tenure-line faculty into upper-division courses.

In addition, curricular gaps resulting either from both separations and emerging trends in the discipline have created a need for additional faculty hires. The program has currently identified an urgent need for faculty hires in the following areas: human development & learning, curriculum, language development, and early childhood. Additional faculty conversant with public advocacy, community settings, and disabilities should also be considered; a tenure-line faculty fieldwork coordinator is also desired.

The Program Review Team recognizes that the hiring needs of Child Development must be balanced against those of professional programs which may have mandated hiring requirements by credentialing bodies. Nonetheless, the recruitment of Child Development faculty should be a priority for both the Program and the College. The number of hires and in what areas need to be negotiated between the Program and the Dean, but ideally, the recruitment of a minimum of two new faculty in the next two hiring cycles should be the goal.

Recommendation 4: That Child Development and the Dean of Education should jointly develop a hiring plan, in conjunction with Academic Affairs, to increase tenure density in the Program. If possible, two faculty hires over the next two years should be the goal.

Advising

Numerous students, particularly in the undergraduate major, have expressed frustration with their program orientation and subsequent advising.

Undergraduate advising is currently in a state of transition. In the past students were not required to see an advisor and faculty provided individualized advising to majors. Now, however, advising takes place in the College's Student Success Center. The goal of the Center is to provide one-stop advising five days a week for the entire College and, at the time of the review, it had recently received increased support from the Dean. It is staffed by a tenure-line faculty member, two to three faculty fellows, and three staff. Students if they wish can then seek additional advising from individual faculty. It is unclear, however, to what degree students actually take advantage of the services the Center offers. When students in CHDV 138, a class usually taken by students in their senior year, were asked how many made use of the Student Success Center and how often, a large majority of those present admitted to having never heard of it. It is unclear to what degree this meant students had not used the Center or whether they didn't recognize it under that name. Given that the Center had been in existence for little more than a year at the time of the interview this may not be unusual. It nonetheless suggests, however, that more effort needs to be made to raise student awareness of its services. The Program Review Team would be remiss if it did not highlight at this point that, from those students who made use of the Center, Professor Amber Gonzalez received universal praise for the assistance she provides.

Frustration over advising seems to be greatest in the case of new majors, both transfer and first-year freshmen. For students this is especially the case with the incoming student orientation experience required of all incoming Sacramento State students prior to their first semester on campus. Students with whom the review team has spoken noted that the large cohorts during orientation make it difficult to get detailed answers to individual questions and that there is often little opportunity for a general discussion of the major and its various options. Students are fuzzy about the different concentrations and there seems to be an assumption that students are interested solely in the teaching options and they therefore are steered in that direction. Incoming students often need an initial general orientation to the program but, to their frustration, orientation seems to focus almost solely on what courses to take.

The Co-Coordinator for Summer New Student Orientation also stated that newly-arrived Child Development majors reported often being confused over what concentration to pursue and courses to take. He reported that this has been a problem for the past few years.

Recommendation 5: The Child Development Program should strengthen its orientation advising to provide incoming majors with a better understanding of the options open to them by way of different BA concentrations.

A second problem for students is that frequently, when they speak with faculty for individual advising, the faculty don't always seem well-versed in the programs. As a result, students often get contradictory advice from different faculty. This may be an unintended consequence of shifting advising responsibilities to the Student Success Center; as the chair of Undergraduate Studies noted, doing so has taken away the opportunity for faculty, especially junior faculty, to become familiar with the program through regular advising. Junior faculty themselves have acknowledged they are often fuzzy about the concentrations and feel they need training about advising activities.

Recommendation 6: The Child Development Program should develop a plan to familiarize all faculty with the information necessary to allow them to provide effective advisement to students regarding the BA degree, its concentrations, and its requirements.

One possible way of addressing these issues would be through the implementation of mandatory advising, an idea suggested by several faculty and students. The Program Review Team recognizes, however, that for a 1,600 student major such as Child Development, the implementation of such a requirement would likely present major practical difficulties.

Recommendation 7: The Child Development Program should investigate the desirability of instituting a mandatory advising requirement for undergraduate majors.

Resources and Staff

Technically, the Child Development Program consists only of faculty; the chair (Sheri Hembree) and all allocated staff positions are assigned to the Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education (UGSE). The Department, along with other Departments/Branches of the College, is housed in a single large office suite on the fourth floor of Eureka Hall. The Dean's Office is on the second floor.

Faculty and staff are currently spread among Eureka, Brighton, Alpine, and Benicia Halls. In most cases tenure-line faculty share a two-person office, while lecturer faculty, especially those with a light schedule, can find themselves in offices holding up to five or six individuals. Classes are for the most part in Brighton or Eureka Halls or other nearby buildings, although as the number of class offerings has increased, classes have increasingly been scheduled in more distant locations.

The current staff consists of one lead, an Administrative Staff Coordinator (ASC II) that serves the entire Department, and an Administrative Staff Assistant (ASA I) who handles desk and receptionist duties. The ASA I position is shared with the College. In addition, an ASC I based in Graduate and Professional Studies will assist when needed. There has been significant staff turnover in recent years and at the time of the program review two staff positions – for an ASC II and an ASA II – remained vacant.

Commendation 7: Chair Hembree and the Department staff are to be commended for their dedicated support to the very large and often demanding Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education and, through it, to the Child Development Program.

The external consultant in her exit interview observed that the Department (and hence the Child Development Program) is significantly understaffed for an academic unit of its size. The USGE chair, Dr. Sheri Hembree, pointed out that USGE currently has the same staff support as Graduate and Professional Studies, which carries an FTES of only one-third the size.

The growing demand for Child Development courses due both to the growth in the number of majors and the program's growing service role (CHDV 30 is now required by Psychology and Pre-Nursing) has placed an increased workload on the chair and staff. As a consequence, Dr. Hembree notes, the current staff, especially the Department's single lead (ASC II) is overworked and has time for little more than addressing immediate issues and "putting out fires."

Recommendation 8: The Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education (and, therefore, Child Development) should be authorized to hire a second full-time lead (ASC II) as part of its office staff, to replace the split position that currently exists.

In terms of physical space, in addition to the Department office suite and faculty offices, Child Development in the past has had an interview room for meeting with children and parents. In recent years, however, this space has been used primarily for storage purposes.

There is widespread consensus among Child Development faculty that its greatest resource need is for a Child Development Observation Lab. This was brought up by several faculty including the chair; the external consultant highlighted this as well. An observation lab, as was repeatedly observed, is a mark of having a good program.

The Child Development Program has a good working relationship with ASI Children's Center on campus, but the opportunities this presents are limited, since the Center deals only with young children and lacks the observation facilities (e.g. via one-way mirror) necessary for research and teaching purposes. As the Self-Study notes, many Child Development programs in the CSU and elsewhere have a lab school and/or center used by students for observation, assessment, and learning and for faculty research. The absence of such a facilities at Sacramento State has been noted by outside observers. The Program Review Team and the external consultant (based on

comments made in her exit interview) urge the Program and College to work jointly to establish a Child Development Observation Lab on campus.

Recommendation 9: The Child Development and the College of Education should work jointly to acquire facilities and other resources necessary to establish a Child Development Observation Laboratory on the Sacramento State campus.

PART II: PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Section II of the Self-Study, “Summary of Previous Learning Outcomes and Assessment,” reviews the results of Child Development Program evaluation measures since the last program review in 2001-2002. These include responses to recommendations from the earlier review, an analysis of the results of the 2017 Alumni Survey, and a summary of course specific assessments from the years 2012-13 through 2016-17.

Child Development’s response to recommendations in the 2001-2002 program review are at this point largely of historical interest. As the Self Study notes, the BA and MA programs have gone through substantial changes since that time in terms of both program structure and their status in the College of Education. The recommendations, however, provide an excellent starting point for anyone wishing to understand the program’s development over the past seventeen years. (See Appendix I)

According to the Self-Study 234 alumni completed the 2017 survey, although the breakdown of results only show 202 responses (191 BA, 11 MA). Results indicate the majority of alums were satisfied with their experience in the program; 89.2 percent of BA respondents reported being either *satisfied* or *somewhat satisfied* with their undergraduate program and 90 percent of MA alumni reported being *very satisfied* with their experience. In addition 72.8 percent of both undergraduate and graduate alumni reported they were satisfied with the career preparation they received from their major. Based on these results the Program concludes that they are meeting their objectives and goals.

The summary of course specific assessments for the preceding five years (2012-13 to 2016-17) provides a lengthy and detailed narrative of the annual assessment process for both the BA and MA programs; primary focus of the process has been the linkages between the Child Development Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) and campus Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLG). A detailed description is provided, showing PLO links to fourteen BLGs in the case of the Child Development BA and – even though it is a graduate program – links to 14 BLGs in the case of the MA. A lengthy summary of the assignments, surveys, and measures is also provided.

The rubrics against which student performance were measured as well as tables showing the breakdowns for individual PLOs and BLGs were to have been provided in two appendices that were to be attached to the document (presumably the Self-Study?). Frustratingly, the appendices

were nowhere to be found and an examination of specific results by the Program Review Team was not possible.

The Review Team, at the time of the review, did not have access to the appendices showing the breakdown for individual PLOs and BLGs, however, summary table included in the Self-Study (Table 5) shows overall assessment results. Students in the BA program were found to have met expectations for seven PLOs, exceeded expectations in the case of one other, and partially met expectations in the case of one more. For the six PLOs in the case of the MA program, between 65 and 100 percent of students generally met expectations for five of them, while the results were widely variable for the sixth.

Commendation 8: Child Development Program for its development of a comprehensive assessment plan linking program learning outcomes to the University's baccalaureate learning goals.

With the assistance of Dr. Amy Liu, Director of the Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA), the Program Review Team examined the four annual assessment reports submitted between 2012 and 2016, as well as the OAPA feedback for each. The reports and feedback indicated that Child Development's assessment process has a number of strengths; in particular, the PLOs closely align with the mission of both the program and the University, the local rubrics used in assessment align directly with the key assignments and PLOs, and the data analysis is thoughtful and thorough.

According to Dr. Liu, the major weakness of Child Development's annual assessment reports has been their tendency to focus on individual courses without explaining how those courses are connected to learning outcomes. While this is not true in all cases, it is nonetheless a weakness given that the purpose of program assessment is to focus on the program as a whole. The program has recently completed its assessment plan for 2018-2024, and Child Development is encouraged revisit it to ensure that it focuses more directly on the assessment of the program as a whole during this cycle.

Recommendation 10: The Child Development Program should work with the Office of Academic Program Assessment to develop an assessment plan for its baccalaureate program that focuses more directly links the outcomes of specific assessment measures to the program-level learning outcomes.

PART III: FOCUSED INQUIRY

Child Development elected to use the focused inquiry to examine (a) program effectiveness and alignment by investigating its program identity, purpose, and curriculum, and (b) undergraduate and graduate student retention and graduation patterns through the review of student enrollment, retention, graduation rates, and time-to-degree.

In effect, what the inquiry has done is to provide a detailed inventory of program characteristics in regard to definition, program structure, and the degree to which Child Development at Sacramento State aligns with those at other institutions and the field generally. It similarly reviews, but in greater detail, much of the student data on enrollment, retention, and graduation rates that were discussed in Part I (Program Overview) of the Self-Study. Based on a comparison with Child Development programs at selected institutions both within and outside the CSU, the campus program aligns closely with both Child Development programs elsewhere with national patterns.

The focused enquiry then ends with a series of recommended steps the program should take for future improvement. Several of these parallel recommendations made to the program and College in this report.

The reader can't help but notice the brevity of this section of the Program Review Report dealing with the focused inquiry. This is for two reasons. First, much of what is covered in the focused inquiry has already been addressed in the first part of the report dealing with the program overview; much of the information in the overview comes from the focused inquiry. Second, some of the key issues touched on in the focused inquiry, particularly issues of program identity, merit a more detailed consideration and this will be found in Part IV of the report below.

The Child Development Program is to be complimented for the clarity of its focused inquiry. In terms of meeting the stated purpose of the focused inquiry – *to address issues of particular interest/concern to the academic unit, in the context of what is currently important to the College and University* – this is one of the best examples this author has ever seen.

Commendation 9: Child Development Program for carrying out a well-designed focused inquiry that lays the groundwork for the future strategic planning over the future direction of the Program.

PART IV. PROGRAM IDENTITY AND STATUS

This section addresses two subjects that emerged during the review process that are major issues for faculty the Child Development Program, but were not easily addressed elsewhere in the report. They are program identity and program status.

While the need for additional faculty lines is the most immediate priority for Child Development faculty, the questions of program identity and of its status within the College emerged as major themes throughout the program review as faculty returned to them again and again. They have proved a source of uncertainty about the role of Child Development in the College and University at-large, and have negatively affected faculty morale. Both of these questions should be addressed if the program is to move forward.

Program Identity

The Child Development Program has undergone significant change in recent years. The size of the major has increased dramatically and most of the faculty are relatively new. The faculty are different from what they were when the program was established fifteen years ago and the current curriculum doesn't reflect those differences.

Prior to the establishment of Child Development as an independent department in 2002 it had been a program within Teacher Education where the focus was primarily on teacher preparation. As the Self-Study notes, however, since that time the Program has become more broadly situated in the Child Development field and, in addition to teacher prep, its interests have expanded to parallel what has happened in the discipline nationally. The faculty, especially the younger faculty, reflect this and maintain strong links with work done in other fields such as psychology and sociology. There is concern expressed by a number of faculty that, with the emphasis on teacher preparation at Sac State, campus recognition of the broader nature of Child Development as an academic discipline is being lost. Concerns included:

- the seeming failure by administrators and other faculty on campus to recognize that Child Development isn't exclusively focused on early childhood, but encompasses the study of human development from infancy and early childhood through adolescence and young adulthood;
- a sense that within the College, Child Development is perceived as simply as a feeder program to the College's graduate and credential offerings;
- that without a strong campus identity there will be encroachment by other programs that fail to recognize the scope of what the Child Development discipline entails; the proposed name change by Family & Consumer Sciences to Human Development & Family Science was cited as an example of this.

These concerns lead to the fear that disciplinary interests are being sidelined as the program is increasingly pushed in to meet the institution's teacher preparation needs.

Concerns over program identity have been compounded among faculty by uncertainty over what the Dean's vision of the role of Child Development in the College should be. One probationary faculty member reported that the Dean had recently told them they don't have the luxury of defining their own identity. Accurate or not, the perception is there. Given this, it is important that the program open a dialogue with Dean Sidorkin to clarify his view of the nature and role of the Child Development Program within the College of Education.

The program has begun to address the question of identity; the detailed information and thoughtful reflection found in the Self-Study's focused inquiry provides a good starting point for this. In addition, the new program leadership makes this a particularly good time to do so, and the Dean has indicated he's receptive to forward looking ideas in this regard.

Both College administrators and a number of Program faculty have stated that the next step at this point should be for Child Development to hold faculty retreat – preferably run by an outside facilitator – to help the Program address questions of identity and future direction. The program review strongly supports this proposal

Recommendation 11: The Child Development Program is urged to conduct a retreat of its faculty run by an outside facilitator for the purpose of deciding what it wants to be (identity), how this will relate to the missions of the College and University, and what it will mean for the students. The Dean is urged to provide the necessary resources to support the retreat, should additional resources be needed.

The results of the retreat would then provide a basis for the Program to undertake a conversation about the status and role of Child Development within the College of Education.

Program Status

When the Child Development Program was established in 2002 it held independent department status. As part of the 2012 reorganization of the College, its status changed to that of a one of three programs in the newly-formed Department of Undergraduate Studies in Education. As such it retained the authority to offer the BA degree and undergraduate minors, but the MA program was relocated to the Department of Graduate and Professional Studies. This created the awkward situation where the MA program was housed in one department while the degree was conferred by the faculty in another.

There currently exists a widespread consensus among both Program faculty and leadership that Child Development should be made an independent department analogous to what it was prior to 2012. The argument for doing so rests on several grounds. Philosophically, Child Development sees itself as an academic program surrounded by professional programs and, as such, it makes sense that both BA and MA be housed in the same unit. As noted above, it is awkward that the MA degree be housed in department but administered by faculty from another.

Additionally, such unification – or reunification – would reinforce Child Development’s sense of identity and be good for morale.

Experience from prior to 2012 suggests that housing all Child Development degrees in the same unit results in greater internal continuity. The current USGE Department chair notes that there would be administrative advantages, as well. Under the present structure USGE is simply too big, with over 2000 FTES, and both advising and staff are spread too thin. Were the reorganization to take place, the logical new structure would be two new departments, one containing Child Development and offering the BA, MA, and minors; one housing Undergraduate Education and American Sign Language/Deaf Studies.

In her exit interview, the external consultant also argued that Child Development needs its own department because it differs in important ways from other segments of the teacher preparation curriculum.

The Program Review Team agrees that the Child Development be converted to an independent department within the College of Education and urges the current Program, College and the Provost to undertake discussions over how this might be brought about.

Recommendation 12: It is recommended that the Child Development Program and the College Dean, working in conjunction with the Provost, undertake a joint discussion over the desirability of returning the status of Child Development to that of a department offering both the BA and MA degrees.

PART V. CONCLUSION

This review finds the Child Development Program to be a vibrant and growing asset to the College of Education and the California State University. It offers well-designed degree programs at both the undergraduate (BA) and graduate (MA) levels that are appreciated and valued by students, both past and present. Its faculty are dedicated, enthusiastic, well-respected and knowledgeable in their discipline. Based on the above, the Review Team makes the following recommendation to the Faculty Senate:

Recommendation to the Faculty Senate: The Review Team recommends that the degree programs in the Child Development Program be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment
February 27, 2003

Commendations

1. The Review Team commends the faculty for its collaboration in making a smooth transition from a program within Teacher Education to a stand-alone department.
2. The Review Team commends the administrative support staff, who have demonstrated flexibility and independence in creating a new office for faculty and students in the Department.
3. The Review Team commends the Department for their assiduous and successful work toward balancing diversity among the faculty.
4. The Review Team commends the Department for including students in faculty research efforts and for placing students in meaningful community projects that are related to their professional interests.

Recommendations to the College of Education

1. The Review Team recommends continued support for the course revisions necessary for compliance with the new California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Subject Matter Standards.
2. The Review Team recommends the immediate development of a blended program as a third option in the Department's curricular offerings or as a replacement for Major B.
3. The Review Team recommends that the Department work with the College to secure furniture and office equipment comparable to that found in other departments within the College.
4. The Review Team recommends that the Department and the College work together to ensure that space needs are met.

Recommendations to the Department

1. The Review Team recommends the implementation of the department assessment plan, which should be coordinated with assessment efforts currently underway in the College of Education for compliance with NCATE and CTC standards.
2. The Review Team recommends collaboration with area community colleges to articulate prerequisite courses in an effort to reduce time to degree for Major B students.

Recommendations to the Faculty Senate

The Review Team recommends that the Faculty Senate approve this program for six years or until the next program review.