

2017-18 Assessment Report
Department of Child and Family Science
BS in Child and Family Science
Assessment Coordinator: Kathleen Dyer

1. What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?

Direct Measure: Knowledge (Qualifying Exam)

The first learning goal for the Child and Family Science programs is knowledge. The second outcome in this area is (1b) is knowledge of milestones of development at various ages, the third (1c) is research methods, and the fourth (1d) is the influence of law and society on children and families. These knowledge outcomes were assessed using our departmental qualifying exam.

Indirect Measure: Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions (Senior Survey)

We used a senior survey to indirectly assess all of our learning outcomes including those classified under the goal of knowledge (1), the goal of skills (2), and the goal of dispositions (3). The instrument was designed to perfectly match our department's learning outcomes.

Indirect Measure: Knowledge and Skills (Student Survey)

We used an anonymous student survey that students completed in virtually every CFS class for one semester, that provides indirect assessment of learning outcomes including (1) knowledge, and (2e) skills related to professionalism.

Direct Measure: Writing Competence (Memo Assignment)

Under the goal that students will effectively apply cognitive, technical, and interpersonal skills, we include a learning outcome (2d) that states "Write clearly and concisely according to the professional standards of our discipline."

2. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?

Direct Measure: Knowledge (Qualifying Exam)

Knowledge was assessed in Child and Family Science students using a Qualifying Exam, that is required of graduating seniors who did not take the exam when they came into the major, and new students who are requesting to move from the pre-major into the major. In the 2017-18 academic year, 74 pre-major students took the Qualifying Exam, and 180 current majors took the exam.

This Qualifying Exam has been described in great detail in previous year's assessment reports. It is not attached because the content of the exam needs to be guarded closely to protect its

usefulness. In brief, it measures foundational knowledge from our three pre-major classes: CFS 39 (Introduction to Child Development), CFS 31 (Families in America), and CFS 153 (Research Methods). Many of our students take the two lower-division classes at community colleges, where we are powerless to enact quality control. Since students flounder in upper-division classes when they have not yet mastered the basic principles of the developmental and social sciences, this exam is designed to test their retention of very basic foundational knowledge from those three classes.

The benchmarks for success include: 90% of current majors pass, and 66% of pre-majors pass the exam. (We are trying to reduce the size of our program by about one third, so if one-third of pre-majors fail, that will achieve our target program size because pre-majors who fail the exam are not allowed to move out of the pre-major.)

Indirect Measure: Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions (Senior Survey)

Indirect Assessment was conducted using a survey of graduating seniors. It was administered near the end of the semester in each of our three culminating experience classes for Child Development and Family Science (CFS 139, 145b, and 193). There are three sections of the survey: 1) Demographic information about the student, 2) Evaluation of the degree program (this is the section analyzed for outcomes assessment purposes), and 3) the student's employment and graduate school plans for the future.

The complete senior survey is attached. The benchmark for success is that at least 80% of graduating students agree or strongly agree with items evaluating the program.

Indirect Measure: Knowledge and Skills (Student Survey)

We used an anonymous student survey that students completed at the end of the semester in virtually every CFS class during the spring 2018 semester. In addition, we compiled the self-report data along with the grade distributions of all CFS classes. The complete student survey is attached.

Benchmarks for Success:

- Statistically significant reduction in percent A's as compared to the 2011 baseline
- No statistically significant difference in percent A's between full-time and part-time faculty
- 80% of students in our classes report:
 - Spending at least 4-5 hours/week on the focal class
 - Missing class no more than "a time or two"
 - Completing the assigned reading almost all the time
 - Learning a moderate amount or a lot
 - Agree or strongly agree that their grade is an accurate reflection of work and learning

Direct Measures: Writing Competency (Memo Assignment)

We used a global rating scale that we created and used for assessment in spring 2013. It is designed to parallel a letter-grading scale.

5: This is an essay with *nearly perfect* writing. There are very few, if any, writing errors, and content is easily understandable, well-organized, thorough and insightful. It either has NO writing errors, or so few and so minor that they're easy to miss. Letter grade of A.

4: This is an essay with a *few simple writing mistakes* that are likely typos rather than reflecting a lack of knowledge about writing. Content is easily understandable, well-organized, thorough and insightful. Letter grade of B.

3: This is an essay with either multiple simple writing mistakes, or a few serious writing mistakes. Serious errors are those that seem to reflect a lack of ledge about writing, or mistakes that confuse the meaning. Content is understandable, well-organized, and thorough. It is not as insightful as essays that earn 4 or 5 points. Letter grade of C.

2: This is an essay with multiple simple writing mistakes and some more serious writing errors as well. Content might also lack some clarity, organization, thoroughness, and insight. Letter grade of D.

1: This is an essay with many writing mistakes that can be a combination of simple and serious. It is also lacking in clarity, organization, thoroughness, and insight. Letter grade of F.

0 : Does not meet the minimum level of expectation for quality in a course, and will not be scored.

We applied this rating scale to an assignment in our CFS 130-Professional Writing class. The prompt was to write a workplace memo based on a list of possible scenarios. The resulting memos were generally one page in length. The memo assignment is attached.

Our benchmark is that 85% of students in our Professional Writing class write at the level of a passing grade, up from the 75% we observed in 2013.

3. What did you discover from the data?

CFS Qualifying Exam

During 2017-18, the CFS Qualifying Exam was taken 343 times by 254 unique students. The average total score was 64%, with a range from 30% to 88% (standard deviation=11.3).

Pass Rate

The overall pass rate was 56% of the 343 attempts. Of the 254 students, some of whom took the exam multiple times, the eventual pass rate was 76%.

	Pre-Majors (n=74 unique students)	Current Majors (n=180 unique students)	Total (n=254 unique students)
First Attempt	n=71 pass rate=20% avg=58%	n=174 pass rate=73% avg=66%	n=245 pass rate=58% avg=63%
Second Attempt	n=35 pass rate=29% avg=63%	n=45 pass rate=80% avg=65%	n=80 pass rate=57% avg=64%
Third Attempt	n=13 pass rate=15% avg=60%	n=5 pass rate=80% avg=62%	n=18 pass rate=33% avg=60%
Cumulative Pass Rate	36%	92%	76%

We still have more current majors taking the exam than pre-majors. We expect the balance to shift in the next year as students on older catalog years graduate and move on. The current majors have a higher pass rate than pre-majors. This appears to be largely because their hurdle is lower (60% required rather than 70%), but also because they perform significantly better on the first attempt.

Both groups have a pass rate on the second attempt that is higher than the pass rate on the first attempt. This suggests that a lot of students who fail the first time around simply went in cold, and after putting in a little effort, they are able to bring their scores up.

Appropriate Passing Grade

The low pass rate (even cumulatively over the year) of the pre-majors is concerning. On the one hand, we need to block some students from a Child and Family Science major, as we are seriously impacted, and this exam will effectively do that. On the other hand, we do not need to reduce our numbers by two-thirds, which will happen if this pattern continues. Our target is to reduce our number of majors by about one-third instead. Therefore, the standard for a passing grade may be too high, especially when one considers that the highest score each year hovers right around 90%, which suggests that a 10-point curve might be appropriate.

Among the 74 pre-majors who took the Qualifying Exam in 2017-18, the pass rate was only 36%. If we had used 65% as a passing score, instead of 70%, the pass rate would have been 45%. If we had used 60% as a passing score, the pass rate would have been 66%. Therefore, using a higher passing grade may help us achieve the appropriate level of reduction in the number of majors.

The AY 2017-18 saw 11 pre-major students fail the exam for the third and final time, and be notified that they cannot declare CFS as their major. The procedure is that Admissions and Records changes their major to “Undeclared” and they start meeting with an advisor in Joyal who works specifically with undeclared.

Subscores

Students generally get the strongest scores on the Child Development section of the exam, with somewhat lower scores in Research, and the lowest scores in Family Science.

	Pre-Majors			Current Majors			Total		
	CD	FS	Res	CD	FS	Res	CD	FS	Res
First Attempt	61%	53%	57%	71%	60%	63%	68%	58%	61%
Second Attempt	60%	64%	68%	65%	63%	64%	63%	63%	66%
Third Attempt	58%	51%	61%	63%	47%	57%	60%	50%	60%
Total	61%	56%	61%	70%	60%	63%	67%	59%	62%

Research scores tend to increase dramatically, however, on the second attempt. The real weak area is Family Science.

Class Grade Compared to Exam Score

Student GPA is significantly correlated with the total exam score ($r=.319, p<.0001$), and with the Child Development ($r=.318, p<.0001$) and Research ($r=.312; p<.0001$) subscores. But it is not related at all to the Family Science subscore ($r=.101, p=.063$).

Scores on all three subsections of the qualifying exam are unrelated to how much time has elapsed since they took the relevant class. But their performance in the class is related: The Child Development subscore is mildly correlated with the grade in CFS 39 ($r=.121, p=.027$). The Research subscore is strongly correlated with the grade in CFS 153 ($r=.324; p<.0001$). In contrast, the Family Science subscore is not correlated with the grade in CFS 31 ($r=.006; p=.923$).

Fresno State versus Community College Classes

Students do a little better on the Child Development subsection if they took CFS 39 at Fresno State rather than somewhere else ($F=4.283, p=.039$). They also do better on the Family Science subsection if they took CFS 31 at Fresno State rather than somewhere else ($F=7.007, p=.009$).

Where student took the relevant class:	Child Development Section	Family Science Section
Fresno State	68% (n=177)	63% (n=108)

All Others	65% (n=165)	58% (n=150)
Fresno City College	67% (n=61)	58% (n=37)
Clovis Community College	62% (n=13)	55% (n=13)
Reedley College	68% (n=52)	58% (n=49)
College of the Sequoias	62% (n=20)	59% (n=19)
Other	59% (n=29)	56% (n=28)

However, there are differences based on which community college they went to. On the Child Development section of the exam, students perform best if they took the class at Fresno State, Reedley College, or Fresno City College. But scores are significantly worse for students who took the course at Clovis Community College, College of the Sequoias, or another community college.

(“Other” community colleges include schools like Hartnell, Bakersfield, Merced, West Hills....each of which only sends a few students, so I can’t calculate a reliable score for each individual school in this category.)

On the Family Science section of the exam, students perform best if they took the class at Fresno State, but their scores are intermediate if they went to College of the Sequoias, Reedley College, or Fresno City College. Score are worst if they took the class at Clovis Community College or another community college.

These disparities reflect our initial impetus for creating a Qualifying Exam in the first place. We had students in upper-division classes who had clearly not mastered material from foundational classes. In many cases, it seemed they weren’t even vaguely aware of the material that we consider essential and foundational. We exerted energy on CFS 39 and 31 here at Fresno State, cracking down on the grade inflation that we found in those classes. But given that half of our students take these foundational classes at community colleges, over which we have no control, we wanted to create a check on the system, to verify that students had learned and retained foundational knowledge before getting into our upper-division coursework.

Qualifying Exam Conclusion:

We achieved one benchmark in this area, but not the other.

- We had hoped for a 90% cumulative pass rate for our current majors because they are simply too far into the major for them to find another major at this point. We achieved 92%. The current majors who fail twice start to meet with the department chair, who helps them construct a study plan. Those who fail a third time either graduate with a special major (provided that they have met all other graduation requirements) or meet regularly with the chair to review the course content that they have failed and take

weekly exams over the content as they proceed through the course. Passing grades on those weekly exams are then accepted as a passing grade for the Qualifying Exam.

- We had hoped for a 66% cumulative pass rate for our pre-major students because we want to reduce our number of majors by about a third, and this is our primary mechanism for eliminating the weakest students. Unfortunately, however, the cumulative pass rate for pre-majors was only 36% last year. Many of those students, however, have only take the exam twice, and so still have one more attempt before they will be changed to Undeclared and forced to find another major.

Senior Survey

112 students completed the senior survey in capstone classes for graduating seniors (CFS 139, 145B, and 193) during AY 2017-2018.

- 92 Child Development
- 20 Family Science

Self-Report of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

The department has identified three primary goals of our program. They are to prepare graduates who:

1. Are knowledgeable about foundational theory and research regarding child and family science.
2. Have the cognitive and interpersonal skills required to serve as effective and evidence-based professionals in child and family science.
3. Are emotionally mature, self-aware, and personally balanced enough to work with, and advocate for, diverse populations.

We have further identified specific learning outcomes associated with each of these goals. Just this year, we started to ask students to rate themselves on each of our learning outcomes when they enter the program as a pre-major. When they are finishing up their final capstone class (which is generally the semester that they graduate) we ask them to do the same as part of the senior survey. Because it is the first year, we do not yet have data on the same people from pre-major to capstone class, so here we present graduating seniors' self-perception of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and compare that to the 81 pre-majors who replied to the same questions in October 2017.

KNOWLEDGE

	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Seniors (PreMajors)	Agree or Strongly Agree Seniors (Premajors)
THEORY: I know the most widely used theories of child development and family relationships.	3% (12%)	91% (19%)
DEVELOPMENT: I know the major milestones of development and typical behaviors from conception through adulthood.	2% (7%)	85% (19%)

RELATIONSHIPS: I know the common patterns in intimate relationships, parent-child relationships, and other family relationships.	4% (6%)	83% (21%)
CONTEXT: I can explain the influence of culture and society, as well as economic, political and legal contexts, on children and families.	4% (7%)	73% (19%)

Graduating seniors self-report impressive knowledge. The weakest area (where we did not meet our benchmark) has to do with social and cultural context, but they feel very confident about the other areas of knowledge.

SKILLS

	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Seniors (PreMajors)	Agree or Strongly Agree Seniors (PreMajors)
CRITICAL THINKING: I can distinguish between scientific knowledge and pseudoscience pertaining to children and families.	3% (12%)	75% (14%)
CRITICAL THINKING: I can critique the quality of scientific studies on development or family relationships.	5% (13%)	71% (11%)
INFORMATION LITERACY: When I discover a need for knowledge about children or families that I don't have, I know where to look for reliable professional information.	5% (8%)	86% (23%)
QUANTITATIVE REASONING: I am able to interpret the results of scientific studies when they are depicted in tables and graphs.	6% (11%)	64% (13%)
WRITING 1: I can write clearly and concisely, following all standard writing conventions that are the professional standard in child and family science.	2% (12%)	78% (13%)
WRITING 2: I know when to cite sources in my professional writing, and I can do so according to the APA style.	2% (11%)	91% (26%)
PROFESSIONALISM: I am aware of the range of professional jobs related to children and families, and how to pursue and retain such employment.	9% (13%)	65% (24%)

Graduating seniors are not quite as confident about their skills. They are confident, meeting our benchmark, about writing (both professional writing conventions, and citing sources in APA style) and about information literacy. But fewer students feel

confident with regard to critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and awareness of the job market. **We did not meet our benchmark in these very important areas.**

DISPOSITIONS

	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Seniors (PreMajors)	Agree or Strongly Agree Seniors (PreMajors)
CULTURAL COMPETENCE: I am culturally competent to work with a diverse population with regard to race, culture, gender, religion, sexual orientation and family structure.	3% (2%)	96% (51%)
PERSONAL REFLECTION: I am aware of how my personal experiences, beliefs, and values shape my professional work with children and families.	2% (1%)	97% (48%)
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT 1: I believe that part of my role as a professional in child and family science is to advocate on behalf of children and families.	4% (0%)	91% (55%)
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT 2: I stay informed about political and economic issues pertaining to children and families in my community.	10% (5%)	64% (21%)

Graduating seniors report very high levels of confidence regarding professional dispositions that we prioritize. **The only weak area, where we did not meet our benchmark, is their civic engagement with regard to staying informed about politics.**

Experiences in the Degree Program

We also asked graduating seniors to report about the experiences they had in the program. These are processes that we believe promote the development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions described above. We consider these to be best practices for us, the faculty, and this is their report on how well we provided them with these experiences.

KNOWLEDGE

	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Agree or Strongly Agree
KNOWLEDGE: I learned new things about child development and family relationships in my CFS classes. It wasn't just common sense.	3%	94%
KNOWLEDGE: Instructors in my CFS classes were knowledgeable in the discipline.	3%	96%
KNOWLEDGE: I had to read the assigned reading to do well in most of my CFS classes.	4%	81%

Graduating seniors generally report experiences that promote the development of disciplinary knowledge. We met our benchmark on all of these items. They were confronted with information that jolted them out of a reliance on “common sense” and they found their instructors to be knowledgeable. The weakest area is required reading; 19% of students couldn’t quite agree with the statement that they had to do the assigned reading to do well.

SKILLS

	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Agree or Strongly Agree
CRITICAL THINKING: I was required to read original research, and instructed how to do so, in some of my CFS classes.	5%	88%
CRITICAL THINKING: I changed some of my beliefs because of what I learned in my CFS classes.	7%	70%
INFORMATION LITERACY: I was required to locate professional sources of information in addition to the required reading, and instructed how to do so, in some of my CFS classes.	3%	88%
WRITING: I was required to submit professional writing, and instructed how to do so, in some of my CFS classes.	2%	93%
PROFESSIONALISM: I was required to demonstrate professionalism in interactions with my instructors in my CFS classes.	3%	90%
PROFESSIONALISM: I received adequate academic advising to help me navigate my educational path while in this major.	16%	59%
PROFESSIONALISM: I received adequate guidance to help me choose a career path in my discipline.	18%	50%

With regard to skills, we are doing some things well: requiring students to find and read original research, to write professionally, and to demonstrate professional behavior. But graduating seniors are less likely to report that they were challenged to think critically about their beliefs, and they continue to report that we did not provide adequate advising with regard to academic plans and career plans. We did not meet our benchmark in these areas, and we are alarmingly distant from our goals with respect to academic advising and career guidance.

DISPOSITIONS

	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Agree or Strongly Agree

CULTURAL COMPETENCE: I have deepened my appreciation for multiple kinds of diversity as a result of some of my CFS classes.	4%	90%
PERSONAL REFLECTION: My CFS classes gave me opportunities for self-reflection about my personal experiences, beliefs, and values.	3%	93%
PERSONAL REFLECTION: I have used what I've learned in CFS classes to help me manage my personal and family relationships.	4%	91%
PERSONAL REFLECTION: The faculty in my program were responsive to my needs and interests.	6%	76%
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT: I was required to explore the impact of economics and politics on children and families in some of my CFS classes.	9%	67%

Graduating seniors also have mixed reports about the development of professional dispositions. They are confident about abilities to develop appreciation for cultural diversity, to engage in personal reflection, and to use their classes to help their personal lives. But they are less confident that the faculty were responsive to them personally, and they were least likely to report exploring economics and politics in their coursework. **We fell below benchmark in these two areas.**

Senior Survey Conclusions

We report here the first use of a newly revised senior survey. It is an improvement over the previous survey in that it directly reflects the stated goals and learning objectives of our program. The primary advantage of a self-report measure like this is that it reflects the internal and subjective perspective of our students, but this is also its primary limitation. This tells us how students think and feel about their knowledge and their experiences, but we do not know to what degree these subjective perceptions reflect the objective reality of their knowledge and the practices of their instructors.

With that said, we can make some concluding observations about the perspective of our graduating seniors.

- Overall, students are finishing the program believing that they have most of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that we hope for them. They are quite confident. Overall, they report that we have provided them with most of the experiences in the major that we believe promote their learning and success. From the subjective self-assessments of our graduating seniors, our program appears to be quite successful.
- There are three areas, however, of relative weakness.
 1. **Social Context:** Knowledge of social context, including cultural, legal, and political contexts of development and family relationships is a relatively weak area of knowledge. They report that they were not required to explore the impact of economics and politics in their coursework, and they acknowledge that they do not stay current with news that relates to children and families.

2. **Critical Thinking and Quantitative Reasoning:** Students are also less likely to report adequate skill reading, interpreting, and critiquing evidence from scientific studies. Many say that they never changed their mind about anything as a result of their studies.
3. **Academic Advising and Career Guidance:** This has been a long-standing weakness in our program. We have made several attempts to address these unmet needs, and still they are not getting what they need.

Student Survey

Grade Distributions

The Department of Child and Family Science offered 37 sections of classes in Spring 2018. On average, 33% of students in CFS classes earned an A grade, with an average DFW rate of 8%, and an average GPA of 2.96. Class size was not correlated with percent As or with DFW rate. **Instructor rank was not correlated with percent As**, but tenured and tenure-track (T/TT) faculty did have significantly higher DFW rates than did part-time faculty (4% for part-time faculty, 12% for T/TT faculty; $F=7.197$, $p=0.011$).

Student Survey

Of the 37 course sections taught, students in 30 sections were surveyed anonymously at the same time that they completed their course evaluations at the end of the semester. (The instructor declined to participate in one class, instructors seem to have forgotten to participate in 4 classes, and in two classes only a very few surveys, less than 10%, were completed returned, so those were thrown out.) Average response rate in the remaining 30 courses was 76% (ranging from 28% to 100%).

The results of the survey suggest that students like CFS classes, that they attend class regularly, and that they feel they are being treated fairly.

- Most students in CFS classes report being interested in the content of those classes (36% are moderately interested, 52% are very interested).
- Only 2% of students report that they missed class “fairly often”, and only 15% say that they missed class “every once in a while”. **The vast majority say that they have missed never (25%) or “a time or two” (58%). This is a benchmark that we achieved.**
- **Most believe that they have learned in the classes (34% said that they learned a moderate amount, 60% reported learning a lot). This is also a benchmark that we achieved.**
- **Most report that their grade in the class is an accurate reflection of their effort and learning (50% agree, 30% strongly agree). Another benchmark successfully achieved.**
- Students seem to know what grade to expect. On average, 33% of students reported that they expected an A grade, and 33% actually received an A grade. On average, 10% of students expect a D, F, or W, and 8% actually earned one of these grades.

But results also suggest that most students are not doing an adequate amount of work outside of class.

- We generally expect 2-3 hours of study time outside of class for every one hour spent in class. By that standard, for a 3-unit class, students should be studying 6-9 hours per week outside of class.
 - Only 9% of our students self-report 6 or more hours per week studying for the focal class. Another 26% report spending 4-5 hours per week. **We had hoped that 80% would spend 4-5 hours or more, but we did not meet that benchmark.**
 - Fully 11% of students report spending, “on average, zero to one hour per week” on the class.
 - Most students (53%) report spending 2-3 hours per week studying for the class.
- **Only 30% of students report doing “all or almost all” of the assigned reading when it was due. Another 21% said that they read “more than half the time”. This falls well short of our benchmark that 80% would complete all or almost all of the reading.**
 - 7% of students say that they did “none” of the assigned reading.

The actual percent As was positively correlated with students’ average expected grade ($r=.750, p<.0001$), but NOT correlated with their average study time, amount of the reading completed on time, number of absences, self-reported learning, or even their perception of whether the course was difficult.

The actual DFW rate was positively correlated with student rating of the class as difficult ($r=.473, p=.008$), but not with anything else that the students reported about the class. It seems noteworthy that effort (study time, and amount of reading completed) is not related to the student’s self-reported interest in the content of the class, or how much they reported learning in the class.

2018 Compared to 2011

The methods employed in 2018 replicated an analysis from 2011 when we reviewed grade distributions and surveyed students. Most strikingly, our grade distributions have shifted dramatically. **Fewer students in CFS classes are earning A’s, which was a benchmark.** Interestingly, nothing else has changed with respect to what students report about our classes. They are just as interested and report learning just as much; they read and study and miss class with the same frequency in 2018 as in 2011, but their self-reported GPAs have gone down a bit.

	Spring 2011	Spring 2018	ANOVA
CFS Courses Offered	29	37	
Percent As	56%	33%	F=14.142, p<.0001
DFW Rate	5%	8%	
Class GPA	3.25	2.96	F=4.421, p=.04
T/TT Instructor	28%	46%	

Average Class Size	36	38	
CFS Classes Surveyed	19	28	
Response Rate	81%	74%	
Student GPA (1-4)	3.90	2.71	F=81.278, p<.0001
Study Time (1-5)	2.26 2=2-3hrs/wk 3=4-5hrs/wk	2.39	
Interest (1-4)	3.52 3=Moderately 4=Very	3.35	
Absences (1-4)	1.88 2=time or two	1.94	
Reading (1-5)	3.39 3=half the time 4=more than half the time	3.51	
Difficulty (1-5)	2.61 2=little easier than most 3=about the same as most	2.94	
Learned (1-4)	3.55 3=moderate amount 4=learned a lot	3.55	
Fair Grade (1-4)	3.22 3=agree 4=strongly agree	3.09	

Part-Time Faculty versus Tenure-Track Faculty

Back in 2011, there were several statistically significant differences between part-time faculty and tenure-track faculty. Specifically, classes taught by part-time faculty had a higher percentage of A grades (58% versus 50%). Students in classes taught by part-time faculty reported lower GPAs, spending less time studying, being less likely to complete the reading on time, and were more likely to say that the class was “easier than most.”

By 2018, those differences have disappeared. Part-time and tenure-track faculty had both reduced their percent A's (to 33 and 35%, respectively) and there were no statistically significant differences between the two on other outcomes.

Memo Assignment

Background

Previous to 2017, our department did not offer a W class specifically for our majors. We had anecdotal evidence that our students were not getting adequate instruction in writing and were demonstrating a pronounced lack of professional writing skills in our upper-division classes. Bolstering that conclusion was an analysis conducted by faculty member Kathie Reid in 2013. She collected writing samples, near the beginning of the semester, from students in three upper-division core classes (CFS 134, 140, and 146). She scored each writing sample using a global grading rubric of her own design. Within her convenience sample of 94 students, 25 (27%) did not earn what would be considered a passing grade (A, B, or C). About half of the students who did not earn a passing grade on the writing sample had already completed the campus upper division writing requirement (UDWR).

When we considered these results, along with our subjective assessment that our students were not adequately instructed in writing, we responded by creating a W class for our majors. The course is CFS 130W – Professional Writing. It was offered for the first time in Spring 2017, and is currently required of all CFS majors. We crafted the current assessment activity to serve as a post-test to measure any improvement since 2013.

Method:

During the spring semester of 2018, the instructors of our three sections of CFS 130W collected a one-page written assignment from all of their students. They copied the papers before grading them for the purpose of the course, and submitted them to the department chair.

At a department faculty meeting, we scored several papers together, using the grading rubric previously used, in order to calibrate our use of the scoring system. Once we had established patterns that were comparable to each other, we each took a portion of the memos and scored them independently. The final scores were then submitted to the assessment coordinator, who recorded them, and also connected scores to a few other pieces of information about each of the students.

Results

Overall, there appears to be no change in writing quality. In the 64 writing samples that we scored in 2018, 25% earned a score that was below passing. (It was 27% in 2013.) A more detailed analysis revealed that 11% of students scored an A, 36% scored a B, and 28% scored a C. The remaining students were mostly D grades (19%) with just a few F grades (6%).

In an attempt to explore the validity of the grading rubric that we used, we compared writing scores to other indicators of academic achievement. Scores on the memo assignment were, in fact, correlated with students' eventual grades in the course ($r=.29$, $p=.02$) and, for those students who have already taken our department qualifying exam, correlated with that exam score ($r=.32$, $p=.04$).

This is a fairly dramatic failure to meet our benchmark on the issue of writing competence.

4. What changes did you make as a result of the data? Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.

As usual, all full-time department faculty (and some part-time faculty as well) worked together to create an assessment plan, to create the measurement tools and maintain their quality over time, to collect data from the relevant classes, and to discuss the results after they had been compiled by the assessment coordinator.

Qualifying Exam

The Qualifying Exam (in its current and preceding forms) has been providing useful information about our students and our curriculum for several years. We have used it to make decisions about course sequencing in our curriculum, about courses that should be added to our required curriculum, and about course sequence as managed through prerequisites. Many of these changes were described in our 2017-18 Assessment Report, and so will not be repeated here. We continue to be troubled by our students' poor performance regarding retention of basic and foundational information from pre-major coursework. The most important changes we have made to our program as a result of Qualifying Exam information have to do with our pre-major and other sequencing requirements that we have recently put in place.

As most of our students either transfer in to Fresno State after spending time at community college or change their major into our department after spending time in other departments, and the pre-major did not appear in the catalog until 2016 and some new prerequisites started to appear in the 2018 catalog, we are only slowly transitioning into this new system. We still cannot see the effects of the pre-major, as it does not yet apply to most of our students. As of Fall 2018, we have 166 students in the pre-major with 266 in one of the options of our major. So we anticipate this upcoming year will be the first that we will see the drop in numbers that we have been working toward, and we hope to also see an improvement in the academic performance of the students who have been screened by this new method. So for now, we do not intend to make more changes to our curriculum. We will instead look for evidence of improvements based on the very dramatic changes that we have made over the past few years.

However, there are a few other issues that we intend to address as a result of our review of Qualifying Exam data. For one thing, we have decided to lower our requirement for passing for the pre-major students from 70% to 65%. Very few students have ever scored higher than 90% on the exam, and no one has ever scored higher than 95%, so we feel certain that a curve of 5 percentage points is reasonable. While we desire to maintain high standards, we are afraid of reducing our number of majors past the point of sustainability, so this is a small concession to that.

More importantly, we need to re-examine the articulation agreements in place for CFS 31. If some community colleges (and we will start with Clovis Community College and College of the Sequoias) have articulated the wrong class with CFS 31, as we suspect, that needs to be

corrected immediately. In addition, the Assessment Coordinator has begun conversations with department chairs at our feeder community colleges to inform them about how our Qualifying Exam works, and where we have suggestions to help them better prepare their students. Those meetings will take place during the 2018-29 academic year.

Senior Survey

We have also utilized a Senior Survey for multiple years, and have used that information to inform changes to our curriculum in recent years. Therefore, we have long been aware that academic and career counseling are weak areas. We have added a new course (CFS 100) specifically to help with career guidance. We have also shifted advising to professional staff advisors who are available during all business hours and who are required to provide regular prompts for advising.

Given these changes, both in place for about two years now, it is fairly astounding that students STILL do not feel that they get what they need in this regard. At the moment, we are at a loss as to how to do better. Our guess is that graduating seniors are simply full of anxiety about their futures. They are in a discipline that does not provide a clearly marked path into a specific career; it has more options than majors with clearly delineated paths, but also more ambiguity as a result. We suspect that they are reporting anxiety that is endemic to our discipline and their status on the precipice between university training and job-seeking. At the moment, we plan no further intervention, but we will discuss this with the Jordan College advisor assigned to work with our students for her ideas, and return to this issue in our discussions.

Some new information was gleaned from the senior surveys this year. We revised our senior survey to match our stated program objectives, and we therefore, for the first time, we heard from graduating seniors about some of our objectives that had been heretofore ignored. Specifically, we learned that students do not feel adequately prepared in the areas of social context, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning. We anticipate that we will spend a good deal of time talking about these three areas during the upcoming year.

Critical thinking and quantitative reasoning are both shifting into focus as we assume full responsibility for teaching our research methods class (CFS 153) as part of our pre-major. Until this year, the Psychology Department had taught the course as a service to our department, but that arrangement has ended as of Fall 2018. At this point, three of our faculty have taught sections of the course, and we have closely consulted with one another about our approach to the class, sometimes coordinating assignments and activities. We have also (starting just this semester) arranged to have Supplemental Instruction for this course. The focus of our direct assessment during AY 2018-19, so we are actively discussing that dimension of our program for the first time.

The finding regarding social/cultural/political context had not previously been identified as an area of concern. We suspect that we can explain this unfortunate gap in the curriculum as a result of inadequate attention to our Diversity course (CFS 134). It has, for several years now, been taught by part-time instructors without any particular expertise in the content. This came after many years during which it was a coveted and well-tended course, as a product of our

impaction that forced some highly qualified tenured and tenure-track faculty to teach multiple sections of other courses, and pulled them away from this course. As our program shrinks a little, some of those pressures are being reduced. In Fall 2018, we have a tenure-track faculty member whose area of expertise is culture and identity teaching both sections of CFS 134. We will continue to talk about how to better prepare students with regard to political and economic context, and we intend to share those discussions with our part-time faculty who teach many of the courses where this is most relevant.

Student Survey and Grade Distributions

With regard to our much improve grade distributions, we celebrate a great success. No longer do students tell us they are moving into our major because they hear it is easy. No longer do we graduate students who we fear are not actually competent to do the very important jobs caring for children and families that they will be called upon to do. We feel we have achieved a far more balanced program: one that is rigorous and personal.

Our concern is with how many students neglect their reading and homework in some of our classes. We have discussed teaching strategies that essentially force students to read in advance in order to earn their grade including daily reading quizzes and a flipped classroom model where classroom activities assume that students come prepared. We will not mandate these strategies (as faculty have academic freedom to teach as they see fit), but we have been offering support to one another and to our part-time faculty as they explore options like this.

Writing Competence

The lack of progress on writing competence is disheartening. We have offered our own professional writing class for three semesters now, and we had expected to see some progress. However, using the writing rubric developed by our colleague several years ago proved quite difficult. We are not entirely convinced that it is a valid and reliable measure, especially when used on a totally different writing prompt than the one against which we compared it. We suspect that we need a more specific measure rather than a global one in order to get actionable data that will help us improve our course.

5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-2018 AY? List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.

The SOAP for our degree program lists two regular activities (Qualifying Exam, and Senior Survey) as well as one occasional activity (Quantitative Reasoning) for the 2018-19 academic year. We intend to abide by this schedule.

6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan? Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”

- 1. Restructure the degrees such that BS is called “Child and Family Science” and has two options: 1) Child Development, and 2) Family Science, and such that the BA is called “Fashion Merchandising”.**
 - These changes have been accomplished and went into effect in Fall 2018.

- 2. Design a mechanism for faculty to work on independent research with students.**
 - We have proposed a new course (CFS 178-Research Lab) to serve the function that Independent Study courses have been serving. Faculty will sign up for a 1-unit or 2-unit course, and meet with small groups of invited students. The students will get course credit, and the faculty member will get a standard number of WTUs. (In the past, it has been wildly variable, based on how many students actually join the lab.) We are still working on whether, and how to revise our program requirements to reflect this new course structure.

- 3. Hire tenure-track faculty in the area of early childhood education.**
 - A position was approved, and a search is currently underway for this position.

- 4. Change the CFS curriculum by a) requiring a pre-major, b) managing enrollment in CFS classes, c) reducing electives, thereby requiring a more cohesive and stronger CFS core, d) include an introductory class to the discipline for career guidance, and e) require a sequence of courses such that expertise can build as students move through the curriculum.**
 - We have completed all of these curricular changes. Some of the new prerequisites to allow better sequencing are currently at the level of the University curriculum committee, but we expect that they will be approved and go into effect within the next year.

- 5. Prioritize the balance of support of research agendas of our tenured/tenure-track faculty with provision of required courses for students.**
 - This is an item on which there has been little to no progress. Currently, the Dean has allowed us to hire part-time instructors to compensate for release time provided by grants. We have also been allowed to add sections of courses to accommodate the increased need during the transition between the old and new curricula. The support of the Dean’s Office has been generous. But the need to teach required courses is pressing, and our faculty have been equally generous in the way they have accepted their teaching assignments, and worked collaboratively with one another, so as to provide our curriculum. I would probably have to say that balance has not been achieved....that curricular needs still override support for the research agendas of our faculty. Sore points include the lack of release time available for coordinating a

graduate program and for working to mentor, support, and monitor our large number of part-time faculty.

6. Arrive at an agreement regarding the future of the Fashion Merchandising program.

- The Fashion Merchandising program moved into the Craig School of Business in January 2018. So this goal is fully accomplished.

CFS Senior Survey

AY 2017-18

This survey is being administered by the Department of Child, Family, and Consumer Sciences at California State University, Fresno for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of our Child and Family Science program, including both Child Development and Family Science. Your cooperation in completing the survey will help to improve the educational program for future students.

Please write your name and student ID on the Scantron card.

Information About You

1. What is your major?
 - a. Child Development
 - b. Child Development – Pre-Credential
 - c. Family Science
 2. Which capstone class are you taking this semester?
 - a. CFS 139
 - b. CFS 145b
 - c. CFS 193
 3. What is your current GPA, approximately?
 - a. Less than 2.0
 - b. 2.0 – 2.5
 - c. 2.6 – 3.0
 - d. 3.0 – 3.5
 - e. 3.6 – 4.0
 4. What is your gender?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
- Please identify your race/ethnicity, marking “no” or “yes” for each category.
5. White/European American a. no b. yes
 6. Black/ African American a. no b. yes
 7. Latino/Hispanic a. no b. yes
 8. Asian: Hmong a. no b. yes
 9. Asian: Other a. no b. yes
 10. Native American a. no b. yes
 11. Other a. no b. yes

Reflecting on your Knowledge and Skills

Please self-asses your knowledge and skills in the following areas:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strong Agree
12. I know the most widely used theories of child development and family relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
13. I know the major milestones of development and typical behaviors from conception through adulthood.	a	b	c	d	e
14. I know the common patterns in intimate relationships, parent-child relationships, and other family relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
15. I can explain the influence of culture and society, as well as economic, political and legal contexts, on children and families.	a	b	c	d	e
16. I can distinguish between scientific knowledge and pseudoscience pertaining to children and families.	a	b	c	d	e
17. I can critique the quality of scientific studies on development or family relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
18. I am able to interpret the results of scientific studies when they are depicted in tables and graphs.	a	b	c	d	e
19. When I discover a need for knowledge about children or families that I don't have, I know where to look for reliable professional information.	a	b	c	d	e
20. I can write clearly and concisely, following all standard writing conventions that are the professional standard in child and family science.	a	b	c	d	e
21. I know when to cite sources in my professional writing, and I can do so according to the APA style.	a	b	c	d	e
22. I am aware of the range of professional jobs related to children and families, and how to pursue and retain such employment.	a	b	c	d	e
23. I am culturally competent to work with a diverse population with regard to race, culture, gender, religion, sexual orientation and family structure.	a	b	c	d	e
24. I am aware of how my personal experiences, beliefs, and values shape my professional work with children and families.	a	b	c	d	e
25. I believe that part of my role as a professional in child and family science is to advocate on behalf of children and families.	a	b	c	d	e
26. I stay informed about political and economic issues pertaining to children and families in my community.	a	b	c	d	e

Reflecting on Your Degree Program

Now we would like to know your thoughts about your **CFS classes** during your time at Fresno State.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strong Agree
27. I learned new things about child development and family relationships in my CFS classes. It wasn't just common sense.	a	b	c	d	e
28. Instructors in my CFS classes were knowledgeable in the discipline.	a	b	c	d	e
29. I had to read the assigned reading to do well in most of my CFS classes.	a	b	c	d	e
30. I changed some of my beliefs because of what I learned in my CFS classes.	a	b	c	d	e
31. I was required to submit professional writing, and instructed how to do so, in some of my CFS classes.	a	b	c	d	e
32. I was required to locate professional sources of information in addition to the required reading, and instructed how to do so, in some of my CFS classes.	a	b	c	d	e
33. I was required to read original research, and instructed how to do so, in some of my CFS classes.	a	b	c	d	e
34. I was required to demonstrate professionalism in interactions with my instructors in my CFS classes.	a	b	c	d	e
35. My CFS classes gave me opportunities for self-reflection about my personal experiences, beliefs, and values.	a	b	c	d	e
36. I have used what I've learned in CFS classes to help me manage my personal and family relationships.	a	b	c	d	e
37. I have deepened my appreciation for multiple kinds of diversity as a result of some of my CFS classes.	a	b	c	d	e
38. I was required to explore the impact of economics and politics on children and families in some of my CFS classes.	a	b	c	d	e
39. I received adequate academic advising to help me navigate my educational path while in this major.	a	b	c	d	e
40. I received adequate guidance to help me choose a career path in my discipline.	a	b	c	d	e
41. The faculty in my program were responsive to my needs and interests.	a	b	c	d	e

Your Plans After Graduation

42. What is your INTENTION with regard to your eventual work?

- a. I would like to find a job directly related to my college major.
- b. I plan to work, but not in a field related to my college major.
- c. I am not seeking employment because I plan to be at home caring for my family.
- d. I just don't know yet.

What career would you like to pursue?

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 43. child care provider | a. no b. yes |
| 44. child care administrator | a. no b. yes |
| 45. elementary school teacher | a. no b. yes |
| 46. special education classroom work | a. no b. yes |
| 47. high school teacher | a. no b. yes |
| 48. college professor | a. no b. yes |
| 49. school psychologist | a. no b. yes |
| 50. after-school program administrator | a. no b. yes |
| 51. athletic coach | a. no b. yes |
| 52. therapist/counselor | a. no b. yes |
| 53. applied behavior analysis | a. no b. yes |
| 54. family life educator (including parent educator) | a. no b. yes |
| 55. social worker | a. no b. yes |
| 56. probation/corrections officer with delinquent youth | a. no b. yes |
| 57. child life specialist | a. no b. yes |
| 58. non-profit agency administrator | a. no b. yes |

59. Do you have plans to go to graduate school?

- a. No, it's not in my plans
- b. Not at this time, but I haven't ruled it out for the future.
- c. Yes, I'd like to get a graduate degree, but I don't have any firm plans yet.
- d. Yes, I'm actively exploring options for graduate school.
- e. Yes, I've been accepted into a graduate program and will start within the next year.

60. If you are considering graduate school, how far do you intend to go with your education?

- a. No plans for graduate school
- b. Teaching credential
- c. Master's degree
- d. Doctoral degree

Student Report Survey in CFS Classes

Please answer these questions on the red scantron card.

1. What is your gender?
 - a) male
 - b) female
2. What is your major?
 - a) Child Development
 - b) Family Science
 - c) Liberal Studies
 - d) Something else
3. What year are you?
 - a) Freshman
 - b) Sophomore
 - c) Junior
 - d) Senior
4. What is your overall GPA?
 - a) 2.0 or below
 - b) 2.1 – 3.0
 - c) 3.1 – 3.5
 - d) 3.6 – 4.0
5. What grade do you anticipate receiving in this class?
 - a) F
 - b) D
 - c) C
 - d) B
 - e) A
6. Please estimate the number of hours per week that you spend, on average, studying and/or doing homework for this class.
 - a) 0 – 1 hour
 - b) 2 -3 hours
 - c) 4 – 5 hours
 - d) 6 – 7 hours
 - e) 8 or more hours
7. How interested are you in the subject matter of this course?
 - a) Not at all interested
 - b) A little interested
 - c) Moderately interested
 - d) Very interested
8. How often have you missed this class?
 - a) Never so far
 - b) Just a time or two
 - c) Every once in a while
 - d) Fairly often
9. How much of the assigned reading for this class did you complete when it was assigned?
 - a) none of it
 - b) less than half the time
 - c) about half the time
 - d) more than half the time
 - e) all or almost all of it
10. Compared to your other classes, this class is:
 - a) a lot easier than most
 - b) a little easier than most
 - c) about the same as most
 - d) a little harder than most
 - e) a lot harder than most
11. How much have you learned in this class?
 - a) nothing
 - b) not much, but something
 - c) a moderate amount
 - d) learned a lot
12. My grade in this class is an accurate reflection of how much work I put into it and how much I learned.
 - a) strongly disagree
 - b) disagree
 - c) agree
 - d) strongly agree

CFS 130W Memo Assignment

Instructions and Scenarios

Directions: Be creative in your interpretation of your role in being tasked with writing a memo to address the scenario you have been assigned. Use the handout posted on Blackboard as a guide to assist you in constructing your memo. Bring a hard copy of your first draft of your memo to class for peer review on Wednesday, May 2. Final Draft **Due Monday, May 7.**

Scenario 1: You work at a small, non-profit company that is in need of additional funding. You have been tasked with writing a memo to the board of directors advising them of the need to reach out to potential donors for additional funding. Again, be creative and include several additional details of your own design to build upon this scenario.

Scenario 1: You work at a small, non-profit company that is in need of additional funding. You have been tasked with writing a memo to the board of directors advising them of the need to reach out to potential donors for additional funding. Again, be creative and include several additional details of your own design to build upon this scenario.

Scenario 2: You work at a child care center which has several locations throughout the Central Valley. It is flu season, and you have been tasked with writing a memo to advise all child care staff on policies and procedures for handling sick children. Again, be creative and include several additional details of your own design to build upon this scenario.

Scenario 3: You are an employee at the local school district office. The school district will be migrating their e-mail system from Office 365 to Google within the next few months. Write a memo advising district employees on the coming change. Again, be creative and include several additional details of your own design to build upon this scenario.

Scenario 4: You are human resources employee with PG&E (gas and electric company) who has been asked to write a memo to all company employees. The purpose of the memo is to encourage employees to participate in an upcoming workplace satisfaction survey. Again, be creative and include several additional details of your own design to build upon this scenario.

Scenario 5: You work at an after-school tutoring program that employs a lot of young people who work as tutors for elementary-age children. You are writing a memo to tutors to remind them of dress and grooming expectations (due to some recent infractions). Again, be creative and include several additional details of your own design to build upon this scenario.