

## Gerontology Program 2012-2013 Annual Assessment Report

1. As a result of last year's assessment effort, have you implemented **any changes for your assessment including learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment tools (methods, rubrics, curriculum map, or key assignment etc.), and/or the university baccalaureate learning goals?**
  - a. If so, what are those changes? How did you implement those changes?

**PLOs:**

The 2010 Gerontology Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) remained the same for the 2012-2013 year (numbers in parentheses show alignment to Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals).

**Assessment Plan & Tools:**

The Gerontology Assessment Plan Map was revised to reflect the current plan for PLO review (Appendix A). Outcomes were assessed using AACU Value Rubrics. During the 2012-2013 AY the faculty continued to measure PLO #6 – AACU *Communication* Rubric - using the same "key course assignments" used the previous year to measure and compare learning at both the course and Program levels. This allowed faculty to see the impact of any recommended changes and compare data from multiple courses (four of the Major Courses - GERO 100, 101, 102, 122, commonly taken during the first year in the Major, and the Capstone course GERO 195B taken the final semester).

This past year (F12-S13) the *Integrative Learning Rubric* was implemented in the Program Assessment Plan. The Culminating Community Project presentation was used as the "key assessment" in this new assessment. Integrative Learning criteria were identified in the assignment grading rubric and used to assess course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and all six (6) PLOs in the Capstone Internship course (GERO 195B/now GERO131). This was possible because the Internship Capstone course objectives were purposefully made to be the same as the PLOs.

During Fall 12 - Spring 13 "key assignment" Rubrics were reviewed, and affirmed or augmented by faculty and completed at the end of each course. Each Summary Sheet (Appendix B) documented data, identified "Areas for Change," and "Assignment Modifications". Course data were then compared with the overall Program measurement from the Internship Capstone course by the Program Director. Updates were discussed with faculty and are described in Question Number 7 of this document.

- b. How do you know if these changes have achieved the desired results?  
Course assignment rubrics and evaluations along with the AACU Communication Rubric (Appendix B) criteria continue to be completed and analyzed by faculty each time the course is offered (once/AY). The AACU Integrative Learning Rubric was added as a metric Fall 2012 (Appendix C) and included in this current assessment cycle. It is used in the Internship Capstone course (GERO 195B) and measures completion of the Program Learning Outcomes #1-#6.

Progress toward meeting the Performance Standard (80% of students earn > 78% on assignment and reach **Milestone 3** or higher) will determine the validity of the changes. Collection and comparison of data over semesters will assess reliability and guide future analysis. Results and potential changes are discussed with other faculty members and the Program Director each semester.

- c. If no, why not?  
NA

2. As a result of last year's assessment effort, have you implemented **any other changes at the department, the college or the university, including advising, co-curriculum, budgeting and planning?**
  - a. If so, what are those changes? How did you implement those changes?
    1. Advising – Instituted “highly recommended” academic advising for all majors once/semester beginning Fall 2012 to assist students’ understanding of required courses and progression to graduation sequences along with any other needed academic or personal advising. This included a form for students to complete that had at least two “Plans” to achieve their intended graduation date. FSMP Ambassador responsibilities were broadened to include providing strategies for navigating the university, answering common questions regarding courses, and discussing strategies to assure course completion and graduation.
    2. Co-curriculum – The Director discussed ways to assure enough seats for the growing numbers of Gerontology Majors (now 145 students – increased from 69 students in January 2012) with Chairs of Programs and Departments providing Major Interdisciplinary Core courses.
    3. Budget/Planning – Plan to increase the number of Core Major course sections (GERO 101, 102, 103, 121, & 122) from one/year to one/semester to accommodate realistic student progression to graduation.
  - b. How do you know if these changes have achieved the desired results?
    1. Advising – Student participation in the advising sessions, informal verbal feedback, and senior survey comments along with students progressing in major courses with fewer students missing registration in key courses will be indicators of success with these additions. Continued Program student retention and graduation rates may also be used as indicators. Advising was done by the Program Director as there are no other full-faculty to assist her. It was very time-consuming however it was worthwhile and successful. Only a small number of students did not come for advising at least once/year and most came both semesters. Using FSMP Ambassadors also assisted students with advising questions - clarifying Program information, and maintaining current information in SacCT. These practices will continue for the 2013-2014 AY. Although it is very time consuming, the verbal feedback from students was that “they found it was very helpful! “
    2. Co-curriculum – All Chairs contacted provided space for students in Fall 2013 courses either through creation of another section or by providing dedicated seats for Gerontology Majors. Ongoing strategies for this concern will be addressed early in the Fall 2013 semester.
    3. Budget/Planning – The Program Director is currently in discussions with the Dean to make purposeful plans for increasing the number of Core Major course from one/year to one/semester to accommodate realistic student progression to graduation.
  - c. If no, why not?  
NA
3. What **PROGRAM** (not course) learning outcome(s) have you assessed this academic year?

PLO #6 (communication) continued to be assessed as in previous years and all Gerontology PLOs #1-6 were assessed for the first time (Fall 2012) in the Capstone course (Appendix A).

4. What method(s)/measure(s) have you used to collect the data?

AACU's Value Rubrics for Written & Presentation Communication (PLO #6) and Integrative Learning (PLOs #1-6) were used to gather data from student assignments, presentations, and an assignment from the final Capstone Portfolio. Course evaluation data were also included in the discussions.

5. What are the criteria and/or standards of performance for the program learning outcome?

Beginning Spring 2013 the **Standard of Performance** = 80% of students earn > 78% on the assignment and reach **Milestone 3** or higher in the AACU Rubric.

6. What data have you collected? What are the results and findings, including the percentage of students who meet each standard?

Course and Program data comparisons for this year were made among the theory and practice (internship) courses on PLO #6 (communication) and PLO #1-6 (Integrative Learning). Included in the final comparisons were course evaluation data and the changes implemented for the last two years.

Analysis showed that the changes (noted in previous Assessment Reports) were successful. This AY, the overall number of students (80-90%) reaching the desired Performance Standard levels - Milestone 3 (meets expectation) and Capstone 4 (exceeds expectation), and the overall total % earned for the assignment *increased* to beyond the desired performance standard (>78%) in all courses except the one GE course. In the Major courses, 100% of the students earned at least an average of 78 % on their assignment and 80% of the students reached Milestone 3 or higher on individual criteria. Students in the GE course passed their assignment at 78% or better however they had lower scores/% on the individual measure criteria. (Individual course Summary Sheets are on file in the Program Office).

a. In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations?

PLO #6 – Written & Oral Communication measure- Analysis of individual course AACU *Communication* criteria showed that students in the GE course (F12 & S13) met the standard of performance (85%-95%) in the areas of purpose & development & subject mastery; audience engagement; clarity of summary.

Gerontology Majors in the courses measured met the standards of performance (80-100%) in all criteria in all courses except one (GERO 102 - S13), where the range was from 34%-96%. As in the GE course, the criteria related to purpose & development & subject mastery; audience engagement; clarity of summary, demonstrated success (80%-93%).

PLO#1-6 – *Integrative Learning*– this metric measured all Program Outcomes (appendix A) using the Capstone Community Project and Presentation. Students met expectation on almost all the criteria of the *Integrative Learning* metric both Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. Improvement was seen in scores from Fall 12 (66-99%) to Spring 13 (80-100%). Areas of strength were in connecting knowledge to experiences; connections to discipline; integrated communication; reflection & self-assessment.

b. In what areas do students need improvement?

PLO #6 - Analysis of individual AACU *Communication* criteria showed that while students in the GE course met the score standard of 78% or higher, they had more difficulty with paper organization, syntax/mechanics, and correctly citing sources than the Gerontology Majors in later courses. There was also a small variance between criterion scores between semesters of the GE

course. This will be followed up as assessment goes forward; to determine if it is a “class effect” or other strategies need to be implemented.

Gerontology Majors in the courses measured were at the 80% or higher mark on all the criteria, therefore meeting the standard of performance, in all but one Major course (GERO 102 -S13). Since some of these students were in other courses that were assessed this may just be an artifact of this semester. It will be assessed the next time the course is offered.

PLO#1-6 – *Integrative Learning* measure – this metric measured all course and Program Outcomes using the Capstone Community Project and Presentation assignment. Data revealed that students’ weakest area in Fall 2012 was their ability to clearly demonstrate how they could transfer learned knowledge to the practice setting in their Community Project (66%). This score increased to 80% on this criterion in Spring 2013.

7. As a result of this year’s assessment effort, do you anticipate or propose any changes for your program (e.g. structures, content, or learning outcomes)?
  - a. If so, what changes do you anticipate? How do you plan to implement those changes?

**Structure:** Map Gerontology Core Competencies to Course Objectives (GERO 100, 101, 102, 103, 121, 122, 130, 131) & PLOs by the end of spring 2014.

**Content & Assignments:** Major Core Course Changes (GERO 100, 101, 102, 103, 121, 122, 130, 131) the next time they are offered, based on PLOs:

**1. Demonstrate understanding of fundamental interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge, theories, skills, values, and current trends as a basis for competent gerontological practice. (1, 2, 5)**

*Based on course assignment rubrics and evaluations, and the Capstone course AACU Integrative Learning data, changes included:* course readings/textbooks were changed/augmented to even more clearly reflect current trends in elder health and illness, family concerns, and societal changes; incorporated even more exposure to a variety of interdisciplinary theories/skills *throughout* class content and in assignments and during internship planned/monitored experiences; modified assignments again to keep pace with changing evidence-based (EB) research such as increasing content on changing elder health/illness, quality of life issues, family and life span theory, housing opportunities, and transportation needs/concerns. *AACU Critical Thinking Rubric will be incorporated Fall 2013 into Major Core courses so it can be compared with Capstone data.*

**2. Demonstrate critical thinking when analyzing diverse and complex aging issues and outcomes for elders, families, and society from an interdisciplinary perspective that is grounded in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. (1, 2, 3, 5)**

*Based on course assignment rubrics and evaluations, and the Capstone course AACU Integrative Learning data, changes included:* modified assignments to consistently include more critical thinking/problem solving components; added more case studies; included additional small group work; continued to require strong focus on EB application in all assignments, Service Learning, journals, Reflective Journal entries, and Internship practice. *AACU Critical Thinking Rubric will be incorporated Fall 2013 into Major Core courses so it can be compared with Capstone data.*

**3. Synthesize and apply learned interdisciplinary theories and research in applied settings. (1, 2, 3, 5)**

*Based on course assignment rubrics and evaluations, and the Capstone course AACU Integrative Learning data, changes included: This PLO has not been assessed in a purposeful manner except this past semester in the (two) Internship and Internship Capstone courses. Data from this first assessment suggests that while all students met the overall **performance standard** of >78% on the presentation, a small number (2/10 students) did not reach the anticipated **performance standard of 80%** of students reaching **Milestone 3** or higher. These students fell short of this standard in the specified PLO#3 areas. Specific changes to address this are being considered this summer prior to any adjustments to the assignment or grading rubric. AACU Critical Thinking Rubric will be incorporated Fall 2013 into Major Core courses so it can be compared with Capstone data.*

**4. Demonstrate social and cultural awareness, sensitivity, respect, and support of multiple perspectives when interacting with others along with exhibiting personal and social responsibility, and ethical and professional behavior in all settings. (2, 3, 4, 5)**

Included specific course objectives to assure components of this LO were addressed. *Based on course assignment rubrics and evaluation, and the Capstone course AACU Integrative Learning data, changes included: added class objectives in courses to more clearly address and to connect these personal and professional components; included expectations in case study assignments; added even more variety in practice sites to increase exposure for Seminar discussants; included topics/perceptions in assignment grading rubrics. AACU Critical Thinking Rubric will be incorporated Fall 2013 into Major Core courses so it can be compared with Capstone data.*

**5. Exhibit personal and social responsibility, and ethical and professional behavior in all settings. (4, 5)**

*Based on course assignment rubrics and evaluations, and the Capstone course AACU Integrative Learning data, changes included: continue to expect (include in class objectives) these behaviors in classroom discussions, Service Learning (SL) and Internship Reflective Journals and interactions; increase focus on this PLO in Seminar discussions as they relate to self, profession, agency, elders; continue to include in Internship and add to SL Mid and Final Self, Faculty, and Supervisor Evaluations. AACU Critical Thinking Rubric will be incorporated Fall 2013 into Major Core courses so it can be compared with Capstone data.*

**6. Exhibit effective use of basic communication (written, oral and interpersonal) skills and information technology needed in a global information society. (3 & 4)**

*Based on course assignment rubrics and evaluations, and using the AACU Communication Value Rubric (two years) and the Capstone course AACU Integrative Learning (one semester) data, changes included: specific assignment rubrics continued to be formulated, tested, modified, and used for all Major core course written and presentation assignments. This has helped students to understand the assignment components as well as give direction for grading within the course, and has facilitated more consistent Program data gathering, analysis, and changes related to communication. The measuring tools demonstrated that the weakest areas are formal writing abilities and professional presentation skills. Comparison among course and Program data show that previous recommendations such as consistently using assignment rubrics, increasing follow-up on referrals to the writing center, and incorporating a "tutoring" component to the Program Ambassador (FSMP) Program as assisted students in both these areas.*

- b. How do you know if these changes will achieve the desired results?
  - 1. Analysis/comparison of data from course grading Rubrics, Graduating Senior Surveys, and AACU Value Rubrics assessed during the next Assessment cycle.

- 8. Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year? How?

PLOs #1-5 using the AACU Critical thinking Value Rubric along with course assignment rubrics and evaluations.