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A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

Students graduating with a B.A. in Human Development from will be able to:

1. Demonstrate core knowledge in biological, psychological, and social aspects of human development;
2. Demonstrate critical thinking ability to identify similarities, differences, and connections among human development perspectives;
3. Thoughtfully reflect on the application of human development knowledge and skills to settings outside the university. Students should additionally be able to apply their knowledge and skills to new and diverse situations outside the university;
4. Access information, design and carry out individual and group research projects, and present them clearly, logically and persuasively;
5. Show ability to understand themselves reflectively and others empathetically and apply these skills to both academic and nonacademic contexts.

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

4. Access information, design and carry out individual and group research projects, and present them clearly, logically and persuasively;

C. Summary of Assessment Process

This assessment project analyzed students’ mastery of designing, conducting, and analyzing research as demonstrated in signature assignments.

Sample:
The sample included capstone papers (N = 65; n = 20) from Fall 2014 and Winter 2015 HDEV 4812: Senior Research Seminar II classes. A random systematic sample was utilized, with a random number start.

Evaluation Process:

1. In May 2015 the HDEV faculty met twice to analyze written capstone papers submitted by HDEV 4812 students.
2. The faculty modified the AAC&U’s Inquiry Analysis Value Rubric to accurately capture the content of HDEV SLO 4.
3. Papers were scored using an interval scale of 1-4. Faculty reviewers used the following ratings to assess SLO components and overall SLO attainment in paper:
   a. 1 = Unacceptable
   b. 2 = Developing
   c. 3 = Proficient
   d. 4 = Advanced
4. Faculty members independently scored one paper. Paper scores were collectively discussed and the rubric was slightly modified. The process was repeated with a second paper to ensure that the rubric was normed.
5. All faculty then scored additional papers; each paper was scored by two faculty reviewers.
6. The faculty discussed analysis results.
7. Faculty identified areas of SLO 4 strength and areas for improvement.
8. Faculty formulated strategies for SLO 4 improvement and implementation.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Assessment Results:

Scores ranged from 4 (outstanding) to 1 (unacceptable) in the analysis. The average research scores all fell between the ratings of 3 (proficient) and 2 (developing).

Mean Scores and Range for Research Indicators:

Research Question and Rationale: 2.70 (Range from 1 to 4)
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views: 2.93 (Range from 1.5 to 4)
Design Process: 2.62 (Range from .5 to 4)
Research Implementation and Analysis: 2.79 (Range from 1.5 to 4)
Limitations, Implications and Conclusions: 2.37 (Range from .565 to 4)
Holistic Paper Score: 2.77 (Range from 1 to 4)

Based upon the faculty’s assessment, the following strengths, weaknesses, and plans for improvement were made:

**Strengths:**
- Most student papers included comprehensive, well-integrated literature reviews.
- Many student papers included thoughtful, interesting research questions.

**Weaknesses:**
- Some student papers needed more explicitly laid-out methodology and research limitations sections.
- The necessary connection between literature review, methodology, and analysis needed improvement in many papers.
- Faculty determined that assessment scores at least partially reflected the two-quarter division of the senior capstone project. That is, students write research proposals in HDEV 4811 and conduct and analyze their research projects in HDEV 4812.

**Plans for closing the loop:**
- Faculty decided that mastery-level SLO4 could be better achieved through a one-term class. As we transition to the semester system, the HDEV faculty plans to transform the senior capstone project to a 15-week course.
- The HDEV faculty believes that students’ SLO4 mastery can be better achieved by asking students to streamline their research foci into realistically executable projects.
- The HDEV faculty hopes that students will develop better SLO4 mastery through additional exposure and practice throughout the curriculum. Faculty plan to revise course guidelines for classes mapped onto SLO4 by including:
  - additional methodology and research limitation components
  - enhanced discussions/analyses of the connections between research questions, theories, and methodologies.

E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CLASS FACT Project in the Future
Thank you for your hard work for the past year, and have a Great Summer!