

**STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM  
SUMMARY FORM AY 2020/2021**

**Degree and  
Program Name:**

Master of Science in Human Services Program Administration

**Submitted By:**

**Jill R. Bowers, Graduate Coordinator**

**PART ONE**

What are the learning objectives?	How, where, and when are they assessed?	What are the expectations?	What are the results?	Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared?
<p><b>1. Content Area Knowledge:</b> Students will demonstrate a depth of content knowledge ,including understanding of human development at various stages of the lifespan, leadership and ethics in family life education, and diversity among individuals and families. This includes the application of theories and public policy in family life education.</p>	<p>a) <b>Certification of Comprehensive Knowledge (CCK) Written Paper Capstone</b> Rubric [direct measure; course embedded]: Students completing the written capstone will be evaluated on their knowledge and understanding of public policy, ethics, theories, diversity, and research in an area of human services or program administration.</p> <p>b) <b>Thesis:</b> Students defending theses will be evaluated on their knowledge and understanding of specialized human services topics and the research methods process.</p>	<p>a) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty reviewer will rate students as competent (2 on a 3-point scale) or higher in their knowledge and understanding of human services program administration topics and theories in their written work. The 3-point scale described here and throughout the report includes: 3=highly competent 2=competent 1=not competent</p> <p>b) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty reviewer will rate students as competent (2 on a 3-point scale) or higher in their knowledge and understanding of human services program administration topics and theories.</p>	<p>a) Using the CCK rubric, 92% (N=24) of the evaluations rated students higher than the expectations. All students earned ratings of a 3 (highly competent) on a 3-point scale. Two students did not complete their CCK written paper with the plan of completion in FA21.</p> <p>b) No HSPA students completed a thesis during AY 20-21.</p>	<p>a) The CCK capstone is evaluated by the student's academic advisor, who is also the graduate coordinator. If needed (e.g., average rubric rating below a 2, unforeseen problematic circumstances), additional HSPA graduate faculty reviewers evaluate the CCK capstone.</p> <p>Results are disseminated to the graduate school and discussed in HSPA faculty meetings to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>b) Thesis committee members evaluate the student's performance. (Each thesis committee consists of 3 faculty members). Results are disseminated to the HSPA</p>

	<p>c) <b>Internship Mid-term Self-Evaluation Forms:</b> Students indicate perceived knowledge and understanding of human services content criteria and professional performance levels (e.g., professional performance in the human services field, application of human services or program administration content to their job performance).</p> <p>d) <b>Internship Final Self-Evaluation Forms:</b> Students indicate perceived knowledge and understanding of human services content criteria and professional performance levels (e.g., professional performance in the human services field, application of human services or program administration content to their job performance).</p>	<p>The 3-point scale described here and throughout the report includes:  3=highly competent  2=competent  1=not competent</p> <p>c) At least 85% of students completing midterm self evaluations will indicate competency by achieving at least a rating of 2 on a 3 point scale.  3 – Above Average  2 – Average  1 – Below Average</p> <p>d) At least 85% of students completing final self evaluations will indicate competency by achieving at least a rating of 2 on a 3 point scale.  3 – Above Average  2 – Average  1 – Below Average</p>	<p>c) 100% (N=5) of the students who completed the self-evaluation midterm evaluations indicated ratings of “highly competent” (3 on a 3-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.</p> <p>d) 100% (N=5) of the students who completed the final evaluations indicated ratings of “highly competent” (2 on a 3-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.</p>	<p>faculty during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>c) Students completing internships submit an “Internship Self-Evaluation” at the mid-term of the semester. Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>d) Students completing internships submit an “Internship Self-Evaluation” at the conclusion of the semester. Results are disseminated to the HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

	<p>e) <b>Internship Mid-term Site Supervisor Evaluation</b>  <b>Forms:</b> Site supervisors indicate students' knowledge and understanding of human services content criteria and professional performance levels (e.g., professional performance in the human services field, application of human services or program administration content to the students' job performance).</p> <p>f) <b>Internship Site Supervisor Final Student Evaluation</b>  <b>Forms:</b> Site supervisors indicate students' perceived knowledge and understanding of human services content criteria and professional performance levels (e.g., professional performance in the human services field, application of human services or program administration content to the students job performance).</p> <p>g) <b>Certification of Comprehensive Knowledge (CCK) Oral Presentation Capstone Rubric</b> [direct measure; course embedded]: Students completing the oral presentation capstone will be evaluated on their knowledge</p>	<p>e) At least 85% of students' site supervisors completing midterm evaluations will indicate student competency by achieving at least a rating of 2 on a 3 point scale.  3 – Above Average  2 – Average  1 – Below Average</p> <p>f) At least 85% of students' site supervisors completing final evaluations will indicate student competency by their achieving at least a rating of 2 on a 3 point scale.  3 – Above Average  2 – Average  1 – Below Average</p> <p>g) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty reviewer will rate students as competent (2 on a 3-point scale) or higher in their knowledge and understanding of human services program administration topics and theories in their oral presentation. The 3-point</p>	<p>e) 100% (N=5) of the site supervisors who completed the midterm evaluations indicated ratings of "highly competent" (2 on a 3-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.</p> <p>f) 100% (N=5) of the site supervisors who completed the final evaluations indicated ratings of "highly competent" (5 on a 5-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.</p> <p>g) Using the data gathered from the CCK rubric, 100% (N=22) of the evaluations submitted rated students higher than the expectations in the previous column. All students earned ratings of a 3 (highly competent) on a 3-point scale. Two additional students</p>	<p>e) Site Supervisors complete an evaluation of the student at the mid-term of the semester. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>f) Site Supervisors complete an evaluation of the student at conclusion of the semester. Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>g) The CCK capstone is evaluated by the student's academic advisor, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings</p>
--	--	--	---	--

	<p>and understanding of specialized human services program administration content and ability to apply knowledge/understanding of research, diversity, public policy, human development or family theories, and ethics in human services program administration.</p> <p><b>h) Theoretical Application Paper</b> [direct measure; course embedded]: Students enrolled in the HSL 5850 Readings/Theories of Human Development and Family Life (a required course) will be evaluated on their ability to effectively apply a theory to an issue in human development or family theories.</p>	<p>scale described here and throughout the report includes:  3=highly competent  2=competent  1=not competent</p> <p>h) At least 85% of the rubric evaluations submitted by faculty teaching the course will rate students as competent (2 on a 3-point scale) on the assignment.</p> <p>For the assignment grade, at least 85% of students will earn at least a minimum score of an 85%.</p>	<p>started the CCK but did not finish it and plan to finish it in FA22.</p> <p>h) Rubric evaluations and assignment grades were submitted for all 27 Theories students taking HSL 5850. 89% (N=24) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale).</p> <p>For the assignment grades, 89% (N=24) of students met the minimum expectations and the scores ranged from 84-100% (M=94%).</p>	<p>and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>h) Faculty teaching HSL 5850 evaluate each student's paper. Assessment data, including course assignment samples/outcomes, are disseminated to the HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made. Follow up discussion is initiated with course instructor, as well.</p>
--	---	---	--	---

<p><b>2. Critical Thinking:</b> Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills with regards to human services program administration topics.</p>	<p><b>CCK Capstone Rubric</b> [a direct measure]: a) Students completing CCK capstone written papers and oral presentations will be evaluated on their ability to think critically regarding human services program administration topics.</p> <p>b) <b>Thesis Rubric</b> [a direct measure]: Students defending theses will be evaluated on their ability to think critically regarding human services program administration topics.</p> <p>c) <b>Research Proposal Presentation Rubric and Assignment Grade</b> [direct measure; course embedded]: Students enrolled in the HSL 5900 Research Methods (a required course) will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate an understanding of research design and implementation and data analysis, in the context of current issues and</p>	<p>a) At least 85% of students completing midterm evaluations will indicate competency in critical thinking by achieving at least a rating of 2 on a 3 point scale. 3 – Above Average 2 – Average 1 – Below Average</p> <p>b) At least 85% of students completing midterm evaluations will indicate competency in critical thinking by achieving at least a rating of 2 on a 3 point scale. 3 – Above Average 2 – Average 1 – Below Average</p> <p>c) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty teaching the course will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to think critically regarding aging research.</p> <p>For the assignment grade, at least 85% of students will earn at least a minimum score of an 85%.</p>	<p>a) Faculty evaluations were rated 100% (N=22) of students who completed the CCK as highly competent (3 on a 3-point scale) in their ability to think critically regarding aging topics. Two additional students did not complete their CCK and plan to do this in FA21.</p> <p>b) No HSPA student completed a thesis during AY 20-21.</p> <p>c) Rubric evaluations and course grades were submitted for all 21 HSPA students taking 5900. 90% (n=19) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale) and the remaining 10% (n=2) of the students were rated as competent (4 on a 5-point scale). For the individual assignment grades on the research proposal, the majority (80%; n=17) of students' scores met the minimum expectations and the</p>	<p>a) The CCK capstone is evaluated by the student's academic advisor, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>b) Thesis committee members evaluate the student's performance. (Each thesis committee consists of 3 faculty members). Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>c) Faculty teaching HSL 5900 evaluate each student, who completes a research proposal presentation in the course. Assessment data, including course assignment samples/outcomes, are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes</p>

	theories in human services program administration.		assignment scores of all 21 students ranged from 80-100% (M = 89%).	or improvements need to be made. Follow up discussion is initiated with course instructor well.
<p><b>3. Communication:</b> Students will display the ability to communicate effectively and professionally information about human services in their written and oral work</p>	<p>a) <b>CCK Capstone Rubric</b> [a direct measure]: Students completing the CCK Capstone will be evaluated on their ability to communicate effectively and professionally.</p>	<p>a) c) At least 85% of students completing midterm evaluations will indicate competency by achieving at least a rating of 2 on a 3 point scale on language, verbal &amp; general delivery, and mechanics and style. 3 – Above Average 2 – Average 1 – Below Average</p>	<p>a) 100% (N=22) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (2 on a 3-point scale) in their ability to communicate effectively in their writing and oral presentations. There were two additional students who did not complete their CCK and plan to do that in FA21.</p>	<p>a) The CCK capstone is evaluated by the student's academic advisor, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p>
	<p>b) <b>Internship Supervisor's Evaluation Forms (Mid-term):</b> On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to communicate effectively and professionally in their written and oral work.</p>	<p>b) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as competent (2 on a 3-point scale) in their ability to communicate information about the human services program administration effectively orally and in writing. 3 – Above Average 2 – Average 1 – Below Average</p>	<p>b) 100% (N=5) of the mid-term evaluations rated students with at least a 2 on a 3-point scale in their ability to effectively communicate in their writing and oral presentations. The student earned a rating of 5 at the mid-term.</p>	<p>b) The internship supervisor completes the evaluation and submits the evaluation to the student and the academic adviser, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.</p>
	<p>c) <b>Internship Supervisor's Evaluation Forms (Final):</b> On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to communicate effectively and professionally in their written and oral work.</p>	<p>c) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as competent (2 on a 3-point scale) in their ability to communicate information about human services</p>	<p>c) 100% (N=5) of the final evaluations rated students with at least a 2 on a 3-point scale in their ability to effectively communicate in their writing and oral presentations. The student earned a rating of 5 at the final.</p>	<p>c) The internship supervisor completes the evaluation and submits the evaluation to the student and the academic adviser, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are</p>

	<p>d) <b>Fundraising project</b> [direct measure; course embedded]: Students enrolled in HSL 5846 Public Policy and Grant Writing (a required course) will be evaluated on their ability to complete a fundraising project, which involves communicating with a community agency and others to raise funds for that agency, creating a poster presentation, and orally presenting this poster with their group to the course and community agencies.</p>	<p>program administration effectively orally and in writing.</p> <p>d) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to communicate effectively (in writing and orally) with their poster presentation.</p> <p>For the assignment grade, at least 85% of students will earn at least a minimum score of an 85%.</p>	<p>d) Rubric evaluations and assignment grades were submitted for all HSPA students taking FCS 5846. 88% (n=21) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale). Two students were rated as competent.</p> <p>For the assignment grades, 88% (n=21) of students' scores met the minimum expectations and scores ranged from 85-100% (M=94%). Three students were rated as not competent.</p>	<p>disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>d) Faculty teaching HSL 5846 evaluate each student who writes the paper in the course. Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made. Follow up discussion is initiated with course instructor to provide feedback opportunity, as well.</p>
<p><b>4. Research:</b> Students will demonstrate an understanding of research design and implementation, data</p>	<p>a) <b>Thesis Rubric</b> [a direct measure]: Students defending theses will be evaluated on their understanding of research design and implementation,</p>	<p>a) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their understanding of research design and implementation, data analysis,</p>	<p>a) No HSPA students completed a thesis during AY 20-21.</p>	<p>a) Thesis committee members evaluate the student's performance. (Each thesis committee consists of 3 faculty members). Results are</p>

<p>analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of results in the context of current theories in human services program administration. Students will also exhibit understanding of current research in human services program administration.</p>	<p>data analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of results.</p> <p>b) <b>Research Proposal Presentation Rubric and Assignment Grade</b> [direct measure; course embedded]: Students enrolled in the HSL 5900 Research Methods (a required course) will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate an understanding of research design and implementation and data analysis, in the context of current issues and theories in human services program administration.</p>	<p>interpretation, and dissemination of results.</p> <p>b) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as at least competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their understanding of human services research.</p> <p>For the assignment grade, at least 85% of students will earn at least a minimum score of an 85%,</p>	<p>b) Rubric evaluations and course grades were submitted for all 21 HSPA students taking 5900. 90% (n=19) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale) and the remaining 10% (n=2) of the students were rated as competent (4 on a 5-point scale). For the individual assignment grades on the research proposal, the majority (80%; n=17) of students' scores met the minimum expectations and the assignment scores of all 21 students ranged from 80-100% (M = 89%).</p>	<p>disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>b) Faculty teaching HSL 5900 evaluate each student, who completes a research proposal presentation in the course. Assessment data, including course assignment samples/outcomes, are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made. Follow up discussion is initiated with course instructor, as well.</p>
<p><b>5. Ethical Behavior:</b> Students will interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with human services professionals and demonstrate understanding of ethical issues, such as confidentiality, mandated reporting, and diversity in human and family</p>	<p>a) <b>Thesis Rubric - Thesis</b> [a direct measure]: Students defending theses will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate an understanding of the challenges specific to human services and exhibit an awareness of the diversity in the field.</p>	<p>a) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (2 on a 3-point scale) in their ability to demonstrate an understanding of the challenges specific to human services program administration, including an awareness of the diversity of individual and family development.</p>	<p>a) No HSPA students completed a thesis during AY 20-21.</p>	<p>a) Thesis committee members evaluated students' performance. (Each thesis committee consists of 3 faculty). Results are disseminated to the HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p>



<p>services through their coursework in the program.</p>	<p>b) <b>Site Supervisors' Mid-Term Evaluations (Forms) of Interns</b> [a direct measure]: On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with individuals and families in the human services profession.</p> <p>c) <b>Site Supervisors' Final Evaluations (Forms) of Interns</b> [a direct measure]: On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with individuals and families in the human services profession.</p> <p>d) <b>Internship Mid-Term Self-Evaluation Form</b> [an indirect measure]: Students indicate their perceived ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with individuals in the human services profession, including a respect for diversity in the field.</p> <p>e) <b>Internship Final Self-Evaluation Form</b> [an indirect measure]: Students indicate their perceived ability to interact effectively, sensitively,</p>	<p>b) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as "Competent" (2 on a 3-point scale) in their ability in their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically in the human services profession.</p> <p>c) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as "Competent" (2 on a 3-point scale) in their ability in their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically in the human services profession.</p> <p>d) At least 85% of students completing internship will indicate a "Competent" level of confidence (2 on a 3-point scale) confidence in their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically in the human services profession, population, including a respect for diversity in the field.</p> <p>e) At least 85% of students completing internship will indicate a "Competent" level of confidence (2 on a 3-point scale) confidence in their ability to interact effectively,</p>	<p>100% (N=5) of the mid-term evaluations rated students with at least a 2 on a 3-point scale in their ability to effectively communicate in their writing and oral presentations. The student earned a rating of 5 at the mid-term.</p> <p>c) 100% (N=5) of the final evaluations rated students with at least a 2 on a 3-point scale in their ability to effectively communicate in their writing and oral presentations. The student earned a rating of 5 at the final.</p> <p>d) 100% (N=5) of the students who completed the self-evaluation midterm evaluations indicated ratings of "highly competent" (3 on a 3-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.</p> <p>e) 100% (N=5) of the students who completed the final evaluations indicated ratings of "highly competent" (2 on a 3-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.</p>	<p>b) On-site internship supervisors will evaluate each student under their supervision. Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>c) On-site internship supervisors will evaluate each student under their supervision. Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>d) Students enrolled in internships will complete an "Internship Self-Evaluation." Results are disseminated to the HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.</p> <p>e) Students completing internships will complete an "Internship Self-Evaluation."</p>
--	--	--	--	--

	and ethically with individuals in human services professions, including a respect for diversity in the field.	sensitively, and ethically with individuals in human services professions, including a respect for diversity in the field.		Results are disseminated to HSPA faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.
--	---	--	--	---

## **PART TWO**

*Describe your program's assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director's comments on last year's report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.*

Human Services Program Administration (HSPA) students have met or exceeded expectations except for the research presentation for research methods. Faculty reviewed these outcomes and the research methods presentation and determined that no changes were needed at this time based on a comparison of previous semesters and consistency with the course delivery and instruction. Further, two students did not complete their Certification of Comprehensive Knowledge though they successfully completed their independent studies; they plan to complete them and graduated in Fall 2021. We believe that this is a result of the impact of the pandemic on students' mental health (e.g., we had a few students who decided after FA20 and SP21 to take a break due to anxiety surrounding the pandemic and personal/family issues and out of the control of the program or faculty; those students' grades had suffered during these semesters). Further, The Council on Graduate Studies approved of the revised learning goals in December of 2020, which included the addition of an Ethical and Professional Responsibility Learning Goal. We already had ethics as a learning goal in HSPA, and we included data here on a few areas that we have evaluated that learning goal (e.g., internships). However, for the next academic year and assessment report, we plan to include a few more assignments and areas that which we evaluate students on the ethical and professional responsibility learning goal (e.g., this is also a major component Certification of Comprehensive Knowledge). Based on the CASA Director's feedback, we have also added students' feedback on recruitment to exit surveys. We also added a self-assessment component to the exit survey so that all students would have the opportunity to for self-assessment (vs. interns only). See the changes/additions to the exit survey below, highlighted in yellow.

### **Learning Objectives:**

The learning objectives continue to align with the goals established by CGS in the areas of depth of human services program administration content knowledge, critical thinking and problem-solving skills, effective oral and written communication skills, and evidence of advanced scholarship through research and or creative activity. The objectives also reflect the program mission, which includes a focus on leadership in human services and ethical issues, such as diversity; this was a learning objective added by CGS in December 2020.

### **How, Where, and When Assessed:**

-Measures of rubrics were retained and used to collect/analyze data from students' written work and oral presentations. Measures of student and internship site supervisor evaluations were retained and used to collect/analyze data.

-All Human Services Program Administration students are required to complete one of the following during the program: an internship, an independent study, or a thesis. The thesis assessment remains in place, although no students chose this option during AY 2020-2021. For the students enrolled during AY 2020-2021, a non-thesis plan of study was best aligned with their current and future career goals and paths. The vast majority of Human Services Program Administration graduates maintained or gained employment in human services or family and consumer sciences education. We evaluated this through the exit survey, informal conversations with students, and a survey with alumni that was conducted in Summer 2021. All students successfully completed their final independent studies or internships.

-In AY 2020-21, for measures embedded in courses, written papers in HSL 5846, 5850, and 5900 and the presentation in FCS 5900 continued to be included for more assessment breadth and diversity in types of major assignments (i.e., a research presentation, hands-on/experiential learning fundraising assignment, and a theoretical application paper). A continued strength of this current report is that the required course assignments reflect a comprehensive and holistic picture of three fundamental tenets of a graduate program's courses: research (HSL 5900 Research Methods), theory (FCS 5850 Readings/Theories of Human Development), and policy (HSL 5846 Public Policy and Grant Writing in Human Services) as these are required courses for

HSPA students and reflect information that is required in the CCK. These courses also have assignments that reflect the applied nature of the human services discipline.

### Expectations

The work for the three different assignments in HSL 5846, 5850, and 5900 were evaluated and based on students' final grades and whether or not the students completed an A or B in the course. We revised the capstone experience guidelines two years ago to reflect the new HSPA curricula, and the same scale was used to evaluate all capstone and CCK oral and written work. The oral presentation rubric for the capstone was evaluated on content, application to the discipline, nonverbal and general delivery, and technical skills on a scale of highly competent, competent, and not competent (see below). The written work was evaluated on content, application, language, APA style, and mechanics on a scale of highly competent, and non-competent (see below).

Oral Rubric for the Capstone:

Criteria	Highly competent	Competent	Not competent
Content	Exhibited highly effective use of critical thinking skills; Incorporated content knowledge to identify new solutions/ideas relevant to professional practice; Used content appropriate to situation & audience; Identified role of research in project/topic and cited appropriate information sources accurately that was academically sound;	Demonstrated some critical thinking skills; Incorporated content knowledge to identify new solutions/ideas relevant to professional practice;	Displayed poor or ineffective use of basic critical thinking skills; Failed to incorporate content knowledge in the development of solutions to professional problems;
Application to Discipline	Demonstrated original thinking; Applied scientific theory and/or knowledge to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate. Elaborated on application of public policy to topic/project that was logical and inclusive; Accurately articulated the application of two human development theories to topic/project; and Clearly and effectively described aspects of inclusion, diversity and global issues related to topic/project. Clearly and Effectively addressed professional ethical applications related to topic/project such as confidentially, safeguarding research subjects, and mandated reporting obligations.	Evidenced some application of scientific theory and/or knowledge to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate. Made moderately effective connection between support & main points; Identified aspects of public policy and human development theories; and/or Showed sensitivity to issues of diversity. Moderately, with some deficits, addressed professional ethical applications related to topic/project such as confidentially, safeguarding research subjects, and mandated reporting obligations.	Displayed little to no use of appropriate application of scientific theory and/or knowledge to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate. Provided little support for main ideas; Demonstrated limited competence regarding public policy and/or human development theories applications; and/or Content lacked sensitivity to issues of diversity. Did not articulate application of professional ethical applications related to topic/project such as confidentially, safeguarding research subjects, and mandated reporting obligations.

Language	Used professional terminology; Evidenced precise & vivid language; Defined unfamiliar terms; and varied sentence structure consistently.	Produced some varied sentence structure and word choice; Used professional terminology but in stilted, awkward usage; and/or Displayed appropriate standards of usage for situation and audience.	Displayed inadequate standards of usage; Limited variance in sentence structure; Lack of professional terminology; and/or Used slang words or other inappropriate language for situation and audience.
Verbal Delivery	Varied voice in pitch, volume, rate, & emphasis; Generated appropriate enthusiasm; Speech free of fillers (“like”, uhms, ers); Evidenced effective articulation and pronunciation.	Used some variation in pitch, volume, rate, and emphasis; Included some fillers; and/or Articulated effective pronunciation and incorporated minimal fillers.	Displayed little to no variation in pitch, volume, rate, or emphasis; Fillers detracted from the presentation; Evidenced a lack of clear articulation and pronunciation.
Non-Verbal & General Delivery	Dressed neatly, professionally and was well groomed; and Displayed consistent eye contact and confidence.	Appeared in adequate and appropriate dress and was well-groomed; and/or Displayed some evidence of confidence and appropriate eye contact.	Dressed inappropriately; Displayed professional appearance or grooming issues; Did not maintain eye contact; and/or Seemed to lack confidence.
Technological Skills	Displayed comfort, skill and confidence using the technology that supports professional and engaging presentations.	Displayed an over-reach of using technology beyond skill level; and/or Did not utilize technology that would have been expected in a professional setting.	Did not use technology; and/or Used technology in a way that seriously distracted from content.

Written Rubric for the Capstone:

Criteria	Highly competent	Competent	Not competent
Content	Exhibited highly effective use of critical thinking skills; Incorporated content knowledge to identify new solutions/ideas relevant to professional practice; Used content appropriate to situation & audience; Exemplary connections drawn between main points and support; and Cited appropriate information sources accurately.	Demonstrated critical thinking skills; Incorporated content knowledge to identify new solutions/ideas relevant to professional practice; Made connection between support and main points.	Displayed poor or ineffective use of basic critical thinking skills incorporating content knowledge in the development of solutions to professional problems; and/or Did not support main ideas.

Application to Discipline	Demonstrated original thinking; Applied scientific theory and/or knowledge to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate; Exemplary evidence of thoughtful consideration of issues of <b>diversity and application to the field of human services that reflects professional dedication to a global perspective; and Significant and appropriate evidence of concern and sensitivity to issues of professional ethics, confidentially, and mandated reporting obligations. Exemplary evidence of application to topic of public policy, research, and two human development theories.</b>	Evidenced some application of scientific theory and/or knowledge to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate; Evidence of thoughtful consideration of issues of diversity and application to the field of human services; and/or Some evidence of concern and sensitivity to issues of professional ethics, confidentially, and mandated reporting obligations. Some evidence of application to topic of public policy, research, and two human development theories.	Displayed little to no appropriate application of scientific theory and/or knowledge to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate; and/or Complete or significant lack of thoughtful consideration of issues of diversity and application to the field of human services; and/or Concerning lack of demonstrated evidence of concern and sensitivity to issues of professional ethics, confidentially, and mandated reporting obligations. No, incorrect, or very little evidence of application to topic of public policy, research, and two human development theories.
Language	Used discipline-specific professional terminology; Evidenced precise & vivid language; Defined unfamiliar terms.	Produced some varied sentence structure and word choice; Used discipline-specific professional terminology; and/or Displayed appropriate standards of usage for situation and audience.	Displayed inadequate standards of usage; Professional terminology not used effectively; Used slang words or other inappropriate language for situation and audience.
APA Style	Exemplary use of APA style in paper format, internal citations, and quotations without error or omission; Included complete and correctly formatted reference list.	Some minor errors and/or omissions in the use of APA format; Reference list was complete and has few APA errors.	Did not include internal citations, and/or APA reference list, and/or evidence of working knowledge or skill with APA style.
Specifications	Complied with any specifications for the assignment related to word count, page length, slide length, slide word density, topic outline, and documentation/attachments/appendices.	Did not completely adhere to specification instructions.	Significant deficits in compliance with specifications for written product.
Mechanics and Style (grammar, punctuation, spelling, word choice, sentence structure)	Virtually no errors in mechanics; Sophisticated and varied sentence structure and length; If a presentation, used graphics, spacing, and backgrounds in a highly effective manner; If a presentation, utilized images, videos, or other media/technology to advantage; and Precise and rich language.	Few errors in mechanics relative to length and complexity; Controlled, varied sentence structure; If a presentation, moderately effective use of graphics, spacing, background, images or other technology; and/or Effective use of language.	Errors in mechanics, sentence structure and language that interfere with communication; and/or If presentation, did not use graphics, spacing, backgrounds to benefit; and/or If presentation, did not utilize photos or other technology to supplement or used in appropriately.

## **Results**

-Most of the expectations set forth for AY 2020-2021 were achieved and exceeded the expectation criteria. Results indicated that the Human Services Program Administration curricula was well developed and implemented in the last year. We believe that those that were slightly under the 85% mark were due to uncontrollable circumstances, such as family stressors or students' struggle to balance due to pandemic related issues.

-The 33 required program hours, the face to face and online program delivery modes, and the scheduling of the majority of classes continue to benefit the program.

-All of those program/curriculum revisions strengthen our recruitment efforts (i.e., enrollment has steadily grown), retention rates (retention rates are in the upper 90<sup>th</sup> percentile), and academic performance levels (course grades, internship evaluations, and capstone experiences are being completed with high performance marks).

The current program and course configurations are highly responsive to meet the needs of our student demographic. Many students are off campus and have personal, family, or work obligations outside of their graduate program. Thus, having the online track and all courses offered online at some point each year has greatly benefited many students in the HSPA graduate degree program. The vast majority of our students are online, and this has continued to help with both recruitment and retention as many students across the state decided to go to graduate school or finish their degree during the pandemic. To successfully continue with recruitment/enrollment, retention, and academic performance levels, HSPA must continue to offer a high-quality graduate degree program with ease of accessibility, flexibility for diverse students, and cost efficiency. These key considerations assist in guiding all program efforts, including the area of assessment practices. We will also continue to offer face to face classes to continue to support the needs of local or International Students (n = 1) while adhering to the guidelines of the Office of International Students and Scholars' guidelines. Further, we did not have any issues that arose with plagiarism and or students' adhering to ethical standards in AY 2020-2021; this was an improvement from the previous academic year.

## **How Results Will Be Used**

The feedback loop will be used to continue to develop the graduate orientation and required coursework which includes ethical standards, such as guidance for citations, APA style formatting, and research methods. In addition, this was a first year that we implemented an exit survey administered; we have continued to develop the exit survey based on the feedback from the reviewers and the survey we conducted with alumni. We believe this will contribute to the results in the future. In the past year, all capstone students were assigned to the current graduate coordinator based on previous recommendations; this allowed for consistency in the certificate of comprehensive of knowledge and capstone experience; we will continue to follow this plan for HSL 5980 and HSL 5990 capstone courses.

Based on feedback from students in the exit survey, the survey we conducted with alumni in Summer 2021, and the Graduate School theme this year of "building community", we have implemented a "Building Community" workshop series for graduate students only; we will virtually meet once/month in FA21 with a different theme (i.e., mental health first aid/all day certificate training; resume development workshop; and incarceration and family advocacy panel). We believe that these events will help build community, foster connectedness among our graduate students, strengthen the student-graduate coordinator relationship, and help with retention. For the final event (family advocacy and incarceration), we will also invite prospective students and encourage students who are FCS teachers to invite their colleagues. Further, the graduate coordinator is in the process of creating virtual, professional development modules for graduate students; the modules have been created, but the process for students' participation will begin in Spring 2022.

The graduate coordinator also held an orientation the week before classes started. While only 4 students attended face to face; we also had approximately 10 students join online. We covered welcome content, as well as other topics, including self-care and communication in effort to help with personal or communication related issues the previous year. For the next academic year, we will work to facilitate a larger attendance at the graduate orientation/welcome.

In AY 2019-2021, we were limited with face to face recruitment events. However, the graduated coordinator implemented several virtual, recruitment events (n =3) in AY 2020-2021. We have also been in communication with National organizations, such as the Future Career and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA); FCCLA is an organization that HSPA has been successful at recruiting students in the past because it hosts undergraduate students, as well as FCS teachers (who may want a Masters Degree in the future).

### **PART THREE**

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

Curriculum, instructional, and learning objectives, assessment measures, expectations, results, and dissemination practices are sound at this time, formal and anecdotal student evaluation feedback has been positive. That said, in effort to improve recruitment and retention, we plan to implement the following in AY 2021-2022. Plans for each of these things are already well developed or in place:

- 1) Once/month “building community” meetings in fall and spring semesters. Topics this fall include: Mental Health First Aid (we received funding from a community foundation and a national trainer who is one of our alumni will facilitate the training for up to 16 graduate students who will be registered based on a first come/first serve basis.; eleven graduate students are registered to date); a resume development workshop, and a panel of human services professionals (i.e., theme this year is “Incarceration and Families).
- 2) Online modules for personal and professional development of graduate students. Topics include, but are not limited to: resumes, nonverbal communication, verbal communication, email etiquette, dining etiquette, and self-care.
- 3) The graduate coordinator has proposed “focus” areas (e.g., similar to the idea of “specializations”) for graduate students. This was an idea we had last year, yet the graduate coordinator proposed them to faculty in SP21 and revised based on their feedback. Faculty will review the final draft of the curriculum changes at a meeting in Fall 2021. If approved by HSPA and CGS, these focus areas would allow grad students the opportunity to be experts in a certain area of HSPA (i.e., Aging Studies, Financial Literacy, Child Welfare, Family Trauma and Trauma-Informed Practice). We believe that these focus areas will contribute to current graduate students’ success in choosing electives, as well as marketing themselves as experts in a certain area. Because human services is more of a “broad” discipline, we also believe that this will help with recruitment efforts as we can market each of these focus areas with our materials; we believe that when prospective students see concrete ideas with respect to focus areas, this will help them to make decisions about the HSPA program. It will also help graduates to better articulate what they gained from their academic training as they are on the job market.
- 4) We will continue to recruit students who are human services majors or minors to the accelerated program; the graduate coordinator has worked closely with the undergraduate advisor, as well as spoke in all undergraduate face to face classes and sent materials for all faculty to post in their online classes.
- 5) The HSPA grad coordinator worked with other graduate programs (i.e., Aging Studies and Health Communication) to create study plans for students who were interested in utilizing the Second Master’s Degree policies. We have had 2 students who completed degrees in Aging Studies and HSPA, and one of the HSPA graduates from last year is currently working on her Master’s in Health Communication. HSPA has plans to reach out to other Departments (Clinical Counseling/CSD) to assess opportunities for recruitment related to the Second master’s degree policies. These options will also contribute to recruitment successes and allow for opportunities to continue to build relationships with community partners.



- 6) In the future, HSPA will continue with existing data collection and analysis procedures. And, we will include more direct assessments of evaluation of specific assignments in required courses as recommended by an evaluation of this assessment plan. We will also continue to develop the exit survey, which has been edited by the graduate coordinator and reviewed by graduate faculty. We have included the exit survey here (see below) with the changes made based on the feedback from the last assessment plan highlighted in yellow.

Draft of exit survey that will be distributed to all students during the semester they complete their capstone:

1. What is your age?
  - a. 22 or less
  - b. 23-30
  - c. 31-40
  - d. 41 or older
  
2. Do you identify as
  - a. Female
  - b. Male
  - c. Other
  
3. Which of the following best describes the ethnic background you identify with?
  - a. African American or Black
  - b. American Indian or Alaska Native
  - c. Asian or Asian American
  - d. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
  - e. Hispanic, Latina, or Latino
  - f. Caucasian or White
  - g. Other (please specify)
  
4. Mother's education
  - a. Some high school
  - b. High school graduate
  - c. 2 year college degree (community or junior college)
  - d. 4 year college degree (bachelor's degree)
  - e. Post graduate degree (Master's, JD, PhD, MD, etc...)
  - f. Other (blank)
  
5. Father's education
  - a. Some high school
  - b. High school graduate
  - c. 2 year college degree (community or junior college)
  - d. 4 year college degree (bachelor's degree)
  - e. Post graduate degree (Master's, JD, PhD, MD, etc...)
  - f. Other (blank)

6. Where are you from (i.e., home town/country):
7. How did you originally find out about the program?
  - a. Graduated from EIU HSCL undergraduate program
  - b. Other (please explain)
8. What do you plan to do with your degree? Open ended.
9. What has been the most helpful thing to you in graduate school. Open ended.
10. How have faculty supported your needs or served as mentors? Open ended.
11. Who are your mentors? Open ended.
12. What is your favorite thing about your graduate program? Open-ended.
13. How do you think the Department or faculty could have improved your experiences to date? Open-ended.
14. What is the extent to which you agree or disagree to the following statements? (Strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree)
15. Do you have a job or plans for obtaining one following graduation? Please explain.
16. How did you original find out about the HSPA graduate program? Open-ended.
17. What are your recommendations to us for recruiting other excellent students to the HSPA program? Open-ended
18. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

**A = Strongly Disagree; B = Disagree; D = Agree; E = Strongly Agree**

My program provided an environment that increased my **critical thinking abilities** with regard to my area of professional focus.

My program provided an environment that increased my **problem solving capabilities** with regard to my area of professional focus.

My program enhanced my ability to **work independently** while developing competency in professional practice.

My program enhanced my ability to **work collaboratively** while developing competency in my area of professional focus.

During my program the quality of my **writing skills** increased.

During my program the quality of my **oral communication skills** increased.

My program prepared me to **meet my professional goals**.

During my program my knowledge of the **research process was increased**.

My program sharpened my skills in **identifying public policy issues**.

My program enabled me to articulate the relationship of **professional ethics** to professional practice.

My program increased my **awareness of diversity issues in a global context**.

I found the content in my graduate courses to be **relevant to my profession**.

Overall, the **quality of instruction** in my graduate courses was high.

Overall, **grading** in my graduate courses accurately reflected the course syllabus.

Overall, faculty in my graduate program were **accessible** to students.

Overall, faculty in my program had positive, **helpful attitudes** toward students.

I completed my **graduate program in the length of time** I anticipated.

During my program I was comfortable with the **advisement** I received.

My **technological skills** improved since I began the program.

I would **recommend** this program to another student similar to me.

Self-evaluation. Please rate your own performance and professionalism below.

Scale: Above Average, Average, Below Average

I exhibit knowledge of human services subject matter

I show effective use of verbal communication techniques

I show effective use of oral communication techniques

I display a positive attitude

I use practical judgement and common sense

I accept and implement feedback

I adapt readily to new situations

I am prepared for utilize my master's degree in the field of Human Services

I project a professional image

Accepts and follows directions

Follows through with tasks

I get along with most of my professors

I have a positive rapport with the graduate coordinator

Additional Comments:

Respectfully submitted by Jill R. Bowers, Graduate Coordinator for the MS in HSPA Graduate Program