ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

Human Services Program

October 2010

<u>Introduction</u>

This is the last program review with combined Human Services and Early Childhood Education. In July 2010, the Early Childhood Education Program formally separated from Human Services. Lee Stein has taken on the Human Services Program Coordinator duties and Elaine Yamashita will be the Early Childhood Education Program Coordinator.

In this new 2010 UHMC Program Review format, since Human Services and Early Childhood Education have different Program Learning Outcomes, there are separate sections on assessment for each.

The system data is still combined, so the appendices will include the HSER program as a whole.

Faculty:

    Human Services: Lee Stein, Associate Professor

    Early Childhood Education: Julie Powers, Instructor
                                Elaine Yamashita, Professor, Program Coordinator

<u>**Early Childhood Education**</u>

I. Assessment of Student Learning

1. Program Learning Outcomes

   a. List program learning outcomes.

   The PLOs were developed in collaboration with Hawai'i, Honolulu, and Kaua'i Community Colleges. In April 2010, the Advisory Committee for UHMC's program approved a collaborative revision that brought the number of PLOs to seven. Those revised PLOs will be the basis for assessment as we move forward.

   Hawai'i, Honolulu, Kaua'i and UHMC are also collaborating on NAEYC (National Association for the Education of Young Children) Early Childhood Education Associate Degree Accreditation (ECEADA). A collaborative Perkins grant to facilitate this collaboration was written by Professor Linda Buck of Honolulu CC and received Fall 2010. The first part of the ECEADA process has us collectively reviewing the PLOs – so they may change yet again. The accreditation process requires the involvement of all stakeholders, which for UHMC includes our outreach sites, and since Moloka'i Education Center offers live classes, we'll be looking at ways to engage and include Moloka'i faculty and staff.

   "NAEYC standards" refers to NAEYC's Standards for Initial Licensure, Advanced, and Associate Degree programs.

   1. Plan, implement and evaluate curriculum and learning environments to ensure that they promote health, safety, positive development and learning for all children. (NAEYC Standards 1,4)

   2. Use formal and informal observation and assessment tools and methods to appropriately plan for individual children and groups of children, assess their progress, positively influence their development and learning, and communicate effectively with families and with other professionals. (NAEYC Standard 3)

   3. Communicate appropriately with children and adults from all backgrounds to build respectful, reciprocal relationships; use appropriate guidance practices with children. (NAEYC Standards 2,4)

<blockquote>

4. Participate in management of fiscal, educational, physical and human resources in classrooms and programs for young children and their families. (NAEYC Standard 2)

5. Advocate for children and their families in the classroom and the program; base decisions and actions on ethical and other professional standards; apply knowledge of development and its multiple influences; participate in ongoing, collaborative learning; demonstrate collaboration, critical thinking and reflection. (NAEYC Standard 5)

NAEYC standards:

1. Promoting Child Development and Learning

2. Building Family and Community Relationships

3. Observing, Documenting, and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families

4. Teaching and Learning

   a. Connecting with children and families

   b. Using developmentally effective practices

   c. Understanding content knowledge in early education

   d. Building meaningful curriculum

5. Becoming a Professional

b. Program map (course alignment grid)

</blockquote>

	ED 105	ED 110	ED 115	ED 131	ED 140	ED 190/191	ED 245	ED 263	ED 264	ED 275	ED 291
PLO 1	2	3	3	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	3
PLO 2	1	2	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3

PLO 3	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	3	3
PLO 4	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	2
PLO 5	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	3	3

c. Assessment plan (grid showing plan for assessment focusing on different student learning outcome(s) each year, rolling up the annual assessments during the five –year comprehensive review)

Timetable

PLO	SP 2010	F 2010	SP 2011	F 2011	SP 2012	F 2012	SP 2013
1				ED 115			ED 263
2		ED 264			ED 191		
3	ED 140					ED 245	
4			ED 190			ED 291	
5			ED 291				ED 275

    d. Which PLO is being assessed? How is it being assessed (which course is being used to assess the PLO)?

> Spring 2010 in ED 140/FAMR 140 – Guidance of Children in Groups
>
> PLO 3. Communicate appropriately with children and adults from all backgrounds to build respectful, reciprocal relationships; use appropriate guidance practices with children. (NAEYC Standards 2,4)

2. Evidence

    a. Describe the assessment tools or methods used to analyze the outcome.

    The assignment was a group project to design a parent workshop on Guidance. See the appendix, pages 5-6 for the scoring rubrics used for the assignment. The group submitted one group self-evaluation, and each individual a self-evaluation, so not all people in the group receive the same final score.

    b. Describe summative evidence (attach rubric - see below)

19 students were enrolled in the course.   According to the rubric, 6 (31%) exceeded, 6 (31%) met the requirements, 1 (5%) needed improvement, 1 (5%) had insufficient progress, and 5 (26%) did not complete the assignment/class. 12 (85%) of those who did the assignment either met or exceeded expectations. The rubric for the assignment is in the appendix, pages 5-6.

Spring 2010

140: ED Guidance for Young Children in Group Settings

Assessment of PLO # 3: Communicate appropriately with children and adults from all backgrounds to build respectful, reciprocal relationships; use appropriate guidance practices with children

Assignment	Assessment	Exceeds	Meets	Needs improvement	Insufficient progress	N/A
Assignment: Group Project— Design a Parent Workshop on Guidance with a group of fellow students	See grading rubric in appendix	6	6	1	1	5*
	Total number of students	**19**				

3. Results of student learning

   a. Discuss result of assessment evidence.

      For the majority of students who completed the assignment, assessment verifies (85%) that they met the program learning outcome.

      Regarding the students that did not complete the assignment or class: Students stopped coming to class or missed too many classes, even though the instructor

repeatedly emailed students to encourage them. Students had a combination of personal family challenges and lack of adequate preparation for college level work. Students were encouraged to take advantage of tutorials and workshops at The Learning Center (TLC).   Those who were obviously not going to succeed were strongly encouraged by the instructor to drop the course – however, because of financial aid issues, they chose not to drop.

b. What have you discovered about student learning?

The greatest challenge for students who attended class enough to benefit from the curriculum was working as respectful and reciprocal members of a team. Instructor will provide more scaffolding for teamwork.

Looking at the evidence raised a question for the program: How do we get assessment evidence from Moloka'i students when classes are taught live on Moloka'i? This is something we can work on as the ECEADA work continues.

4. Planned changes

a. Describe planned changes (pedagogy, curriculum) to improve learning.

- Providing an activity early in the semester that focuses on teamwork, provides feedback on teamwork, and asks students to reflect on their teamwork.
- Provide a system of more formal check-in with groups throughout the semester so instructor can provide individual mentoring as needed.

b. Describe how your assessment supports your current program goals and/or influence future planning.

The process of looking at the evidence aids in the continuous program improvement process. It provokes thinking on how we include Moloka'i lecturers as well as Kahului based lecturers, providing academic freedom with certain requirements.

c. Provide detailed description, including itemized costs, of additional resources required to implement change.

The current process of assessing PLOs and adjusting assignments as results are analyzed does not require more resources.

The Associate Degree accreditation process will require resources. The Perkins grant will pay for travel to collaborative meetings, professional development workshops at NAEYC conference.

Will try to engage with outreach faculty and staff through online tools such as Elluminate or Skype, and possibly arrange meetings when outreach faculty are at Kahului campus at the beginning of semesters, so that there will be minimal cost. Cost of convening advisory committee for meetings can be covered by UHFF account.

The actual accreditation visit is projected for Spring 2013. The cost of accreditation visit is $1500 plus site visit costs – estimated at $3000-$5000 (anticipated to be incurred Fall 2012).

<u>**Human Services Program**</u>

I.   Assessment of Student Learning

   1.   Program Learning Outcomes
       The program learning outcomes were developed in collaboration with the
       Human Services Program Advisory Committee in and adopted by that body
       In March 2009.
      a.   List program learning outcomes

          1. Develop interpersonal skills that build appropriate, collaborative, respectful
          relationships with fellow students in the classroom and clients and professionals
          in the practicum setting.

          2. Demonstrate the attitudes, skills and knowledge base of client-centered,
          evidence-based helping strategies with a variety of populations in diverse human
          service settings.

          3. Identify vulnerable populations and the social conditions that contribute to
          their vulnerability; consider advocacy strategies to help alleviate those conditions.

          4. Develop self-awareness of one's own values, interpersonal interaction styles,
          strengths and challenges that will impact the development of professionalism.

          5. Demonstrate knowledge of and application of the values and attitudes of codes
          of ethics commonly used in the field of specialization (e.g. NASW, CSAC, etc.)

      b.   Program map (course alignment grid)

	HSER 101	HSER 110	HSER 111	HSER 130	HSER 140	HSER 193/293v	HSER 245	HSER 248	HSER 256	HSER 268	HSER 270
PLO 1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	2
PLO 2	2	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	1	2	2
PLO 3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3
PLO 4	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2

HSER 2010 Program Review page 9

PLO 5	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	1	3

      c. Assessment plan (grid showing plan for assessment focusing on different student learning outcome(s) each year, rolling up the annual assessments during the five –year comprehensive review)

Timetable

PLO	SP 2010	F 2010	SP 2011	FL 2011	SP 2012	FL 2012	SP 2013
1			293		245		
2	248						248
3		256			110		
4			140				245
5				193/293		270	

      d. Which PLO is being assessed? How is it being assessed (which course(s) is being used to assess the PLO)?

          <u>Spring 2010 – HSER 248 – Case Management</u>

          PLO 2. Demonstrate the attitudes, skills and knowledge base of client-centered, evidence-based helping strategies with a variety of populations in diverse human service settings.

2. Evidence

      a. Describe the assessment tools or methods used to analyze the outcome.

      The course culminates with an assignment where students write a strengths-based assessment reflecting the integration of the basic attitudes, skills and knowledge for a "client" scenario. Each student chooses their "client" from

several representing diverse backgrounds experiencing various life challenges typical of those that might be presented to a beginning case manager.

b. Describe summative evidence (attach rubric - see below)

Twenty students were enrolled in the course; 17 completed the assignment and the course. Of those, based on grading guided by the rubric, 5 (30%) excelled, 11 (65%) were above average, 1 (5%) was average. All students who completed the assignment (17) either met or exceeded expectations. The rubric for the assignment is in the appendix, page 7.

Spring 2010

248 – Case Management

Assessment of PLO # 2: Demonstrate the attitudes, skills and knowledge base of client-centered, evidence-based helping strategies with a variety of populations in diverse human service settings.

Assignment	Assessment	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Needs Improvement	N/A
Assignment: Develop a Strengths-Based Assessment integrating professional case management attitudes, skills, and knowledge.	See attached grading rubric	5	11	1	0	3* see explanation in 3a below
	Total number of students	**17 completed assignment, 3 did not**				

3. Results of student learning

a. Discuss result of assessment evidence.

100% of students who completed the assignment (17), met the PLO.

*The 3 students who did not complete the assignment (or the class) stopped attending and did not withdraw in spite of the instructor initiating contact via phone and email on several occasions in an attempt to reengage them in the class if possible. These individuals had significant life challenges that interrupted their ability to complete the semester:

- 1 gave birth in February after a complicated pregnancy requiring bed rest. The infant had serious health challenges requiring hospitalization.

- 1 lost his job and appears to have left the island.

- 1 experienced severe domestic violence victimization and entered a shelter. She is working with the registrar to have the course dropped from her record. This will require the repayment of student loans.

  b. What have you discovered about student learning?
  The assignment would be improved by providing more subtle details in the client scenarios about strengths and challenges to require a deeper level of application of skill and knowledge content.

4. Planned changes

   a. Describe planned changes (pedagogy, curriculum) to improve learning.

      Case scenarios will be developed in greater detail including hints of "client" strengths and challenges to be identified and addressed in the assessment.

   b. Describe how your assessment supports your current program goals and/or influence future planning.

      Targeted assessment of assignments for specific PLO's requires an objective evaluation of the "fit" between the assignment and Learning Outcomes. This more macro perspective supports continuous improvement of the assignment to better meet the objective. The better the fit between the assignment and the case management workforce needs, the better students will be prepared for employment. These modifications become an integrated quality assurance process which benefits the program, students (current or future employees), employers, and community members seeking assistance.

c. Provide detailed description, including itemized costs, of additional resources required to implement change.

The process of evaluating assignments relative to PLO's does not incur cost or additional resources.

APPENDIX

Human Services Program Review

October 2010

Part I: Program Quantitative Indicators

Overall Program Health: Cautionary

	Demand Indicators	Academic Year		Demand Health Call
		08-09	09-10	
1	New & Replacement Positions (State)	81	111	
2	New & Replacement Positions (County Prorated)	15	14	
3	Number of Majors	158	201	
4	SSH Program Majors in Program Classes	891	961	
5	SSH Non-Majors in Program Classes	573	691	**Unhealthy**
6	SSH in All Program Classes	1,464	1,652	
7	FTE Enrollment in Program Classes	49	55	
8	Total Number of Classes Taught	38	35	

The "unhealthy" call appears to be because there is a high number of majors compared to the jobs that are available.

Efficiency Indicators		Academic Year		Efficiency Health Call
		08-09	**09-10**	
9	Average Class Size	12.4	15.5	**Cautionary**
10	Fill Rate	70%	74%	
11	FTE BOR Appointed Faculty	3	3	
12	Majors to FTE BOR Appointed Faculty	52.7	66.8	
13	Majors to Analytic FTE Faculty	44.9	62.2	
13a	Analytic FTE Faculty	3.5	3.2	
14	Overall Program Budget Allocation	Not Yet Reported	Not Yet Reported	
14a	General Funded Budget Allocation	Not Yet Reported	Not Yet Reported	
14b	Special/Federal Budget Allocation	Not Yet Reported	Not Yet Reported	
15	Cost per SSH	Not Yet Reported	Not Yet Reported	
16	Number of Low-Enrolled (<10) Classes	18	13	

"Cautionary" call may be due to the number of low-enrolled classes.

The HSER 193V/293V (WI) – Work Practicum in Community Services courses are offered simultaneously every semester with a combined enrollment cap of 10 students. This limitation is a result of the intensive instructor supervision/evaluation of the work of each student. This ongoing requirement negatively impacts the enrollment numbers each year.

The same holds true for ED 191V/291V – Early Childhood Field Experience IB and II. The cap is at 10 for the combined seminar due to the instructor observation/evaluation/feedback to the students. ED 190- Early Childhood Field Experience IA, is limited to 5 students due to the capacity of the program site (UHMC Head Start on campus).

When a HITS class is taught, or when an online course has several sections, each of the sections that are less than 10 are counted as low-enrolled – even though the class as a whole may be filled to capacity.

Effectiveness Indicators		Academic Year		Effectiveness Health Call
		08-09	09-10	
17	Successful Completion (Equivalent C or Higher)	74%	67%	
18	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	33	41	
19	Persistence (Fall to Spring)	66%	66%	
20	Unduplicated Degrees/Certificates Awarded	36	18	
20a	Degrees Awarded	14	14	
20b	Certificates of Achievement Awarded	16	8	**Cautionary**
20c	Academic Subject Certificates Awarded	0	0	
20d	Other Certificates Awarded	34	23	
21	Transfers to UH 4-yr	12	10	
21a	Transfers with credential from program	5	5	
21b	Transfers without credential from program	7	5	

Each program (HSER and ECE) continue to work on supporting students in reaching the student learning outcomes in the courses. With the advent of online courses, faculty have noticed that many students enroll in an online course thinking that it will be easier or take less time than a traditional class, when success entails much work and typically even more time. Faculty continue to work at the campus and system level on strategies to assure that online students are prepared, have enough support, and the course pedagogy maximizes the student's ability to reach the student learning outcomes.

When the data is separated for the programs, analysis will be more accurate and targeted.

Distance Education: Completely On-line Classes		Academic Year	
		08-09	09-10
22	Number of Distance Education Classes Taught	1	1
23	Enrollment Distance Education Classes	27	25
24	Fill Rate	90%	96%
25	Successful Completion (Equivalent C or Higher)	70%	36%
26	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	4	3
27	Persistence (Fall to Spring Not Limited to Distance Education)	69%	0%

Successful completion (C or higher) at 36% for 09-10 points to the previous issue of students being unprepared for a completely online course.

It's unclear why #27 – Persistence Fall to Spring Not Limited to Distance Education – is at 0%.

Perkins IV Core Indicators 2008-2009	Goal	Actual	Met
28	1P1 Technical Skills Attainment	90.00	93.33	Met
29	2P1 Completion	44.00	17.78	Not Met
30	3P1 Student Retention or Transfer	55.00	60.22	Met
31	4P1 Student Placement	50.00	92.31	Met
32	5P1 Nontraditional Participation	N\A	N\A	N\A
33	5P2 Nontraditional Completion	N\A	N\A	N\A

When the data is separated for the two programs, analysis can be more targeted and accurate. For instance, Human Services does not have "Non-traditional", while Early Childhood Education counts men as the non-traditional gender.

Final Presentation Individual Evaluation   100 points possible

NAME_____   Date_____

I was **not** an engaged member of my group. *0 points*	I was a **somewhat** engaged member of my group. *16 points*	I was an engaged member of my group. *18 points*	I took a **leadership role** with my group. *20 points*
I **did not** include others in group decisions, **and/or** If I disagreed with another member, I was **disrespectful**. *0 points*	I **tried** to include others in group decisions. If I disagreed with another member, I **did not respond**. *16 points*	I worked to include others in group decisions. If I disagreed with another member, I treated them with respect. *18 points*	I worked to include others in group decisions. If I disagreed with another member, I treated them with respect and **ensured that other group members** were respectful. *20 points*
I **did not** take appropriate responsibility for our final project. I **did not** follow through on tasks that were delegated to me. (write responsibility below) *0 points*	I took **some** responsibility for our final project. I followed through on tasks that were delegated to me, although **not to an optimal level**. (write responsibility below) *16 points*	I took appropriate responsibility for our final project. I followed through on tasks that were delegated to me. (write responsibility below) *18 points*	I took **major** responsibility for our final project. I followed through on tasks that were delegated to me and provided **excellent work**. (write responsibility below) *20 points*
I **did not** take a role in our presentation. *0 points*	I took a role in our presentation *16 points*	I took an active role in our presentation. I provided information to the audience in an appropriate and engaging manner. *18 points*	I took a **leading role** in our presentation. I provided **excellent** information to the audience in a **highly** appropriate and engaging manner. *20 points*
I was **not involved** in ensuring that we completed documents for this assignment. *0 points*	I was **somewhat** involved in ensuring that we completed documents for this assignment. *16 points*	I was actively involved in ensuring that we completed documents for this assignment. *18 points*	I was **instrumental** in ensuring that we completed documents for this assignment. *20 points*

My responsibility for our presentation was:_____

I did the following: _____

TOTAL POINTS: _____INSTRUCTOR CONCURS:_____INSTRUCTOR DISAGREES:_____INSTRUCTOR'S POINTS: ___

HSER Appendix page 5

Final Group Project -Evaluation   **100 points possible**
NAMES_____ ____ _____   Date_____

Our group was **fragmented**. A **few** members made the decisions for others. *0 points*	**Most** members of our group worked well together. We tried to include everyone in decisions, but **some members were less involved** than others. *16 points*	Our group worked well together. We included everyone in decisions and planned meeting times when everyone could participate. *18 points*	Our group was **highly collaborative**. We included everyone in decisions and planned meeting times when everyone could participate. *20 points*
We selected a topic that was **not** appropriate, **or** We covered the topic **superficially, or** Our presentation **could not be understood** by parents, **or** It was **not** developmentally appropriate. *0 points*	We selected a **somewhat** appropriate topic, **or** We **missed some important parts** of the topic, **or** Some of it might be **confusing** to parents, **or** The information we provided was in keeping was **not all** developmentally appropriate. *16 points*	We selected an appropriate topic. We covered the topic thoroughly and in a way that could be understood by parents. The information we provided was in keeping with best practices in early childhood guidance. *18 points*	We selected an **excellent** topic. We covered the topic thoroughly and in a way that **parents could easily relate to.** The information we provided was in keeping with best practices in early childhood guidance. *20 points*
We **did not turn in** an outline, bibliography, **and/or** hand-outs, **or** We **did not give** handouts to class members. *0 points*	We developed and turned in an outline, bibliography, and hand-outs, but **some pieces were missing or unclear**. We gave handouts to class members. *16 points*	We developed an outline, bibliography, and hand-outs and turned them in to the instructor. We gave handouts to class members. *18 points*	We developed an outline, bibliography, and hand-outs with **optimal detail** and turned them in to the instructor. We gave handouts to class members. *20 points*
We **did not** use a visual for our presentation, and/or we **just read our note**s to the audience. *0 points*	We used a visual for our presentation but **it was not very useful.** *16 points*	We used an interesting visual for our presentation and at least one strategy besides reading our notes to the audience. *18 points*	We used a **highly useful** and interesting visual for our presentation and **several effective** strategies besides reading our notes to the audience. *20 points*
Our presentation was **boring** or too long. *0 points*	Our presentation was **somewhat** interesting and informative but the time dragged, **or** It was **shorter** than 15 minutes. *16 points*	Our presentation was interesting and informative. It lasted 15-20 minutes and used the time well. *18 points*	**Our presentation rocked!** Our presentation lasted 15- 20 minutes and it flew by as the audience was **highly engaged**. *20 points*

TOTAL POINTS: __INSTRUCTOR CONCURS:__INSTRUCTOR DISAGREES:__INSTRUCTOR'S POINTS: __

HSER 248 – CASE MANAGEMENT
Assessment Expectations and Rubric
50 Points Possible

	Excellent 20-18 points	Above Average 17 – 16 points	Average 15 – 14 points	Below average 13 - 12	Unaccept-able 11 or below
Open-ended, Strengths Based Questions	Excellent assessment questions apply the knowledge and skills of strengths based theory and elicit vital information re: client strengths & challenges.	Questions indicate above average application of knowledge & skill of strengths based theory & elicit a majority of the required information.	Questions are adequate. Somewhat vague/over general application of knowledge & skill.	Questions poorly constructed. Little knowledge & skill evident.	Questions are inadequate due to significant omissions in application of underlying skill & theory.
Assessment Format & Clarity	Comprehensive assessment of all components. Client concerns, strengths and challenges easily identified.	Assess-ment well done with minor omissions/ vagueness All areas addressed.	Assessment is missing components and/or is vague and over-general.	Assessment has major omissions or inaccuracies and/or is generally vague and unclear	Assessment is inadequate due to inaccuracy, omissions, vagueness.
Document-ation	**10 points**	**9 – 8 points**	**7 – 6 points**	**5 points**	**4 or below points**
	Writing is clear, no grammar or spelling errors.	Less than 2 writing, grammar, spelling errors.	4 or more writing, grammar and spelling errors.	Many grammar and spelling errors cause confusion.	Significant writing, grammar and spelling errors.

50-45 Points = A   44-40 = B   39-35 = C   34-30 = D   <=F

TOTAL POINTS EARNED: