|  |
| --- |
| **IMPACT REPORT 2021-2022** |
| **SECTION A: WHAT IS THE MISSION OF THE PROGRAM OR CERTIFICATE?** |
| The mission of the human services program is to equip students with transferable knowledge, skills, and abilities that will enable them to meet the human needs of their clients while maintaining a commitment to improving the overall quality of life for human service populations. This mission is closely aligned with that of Old Dominion University: advancement of knowledge, pursuit of truth, and responsible citizenship. |
| **SECTION B: LIST ALL THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO)** |
| 1. (SLO 1) History (standard 11): Students will be able to evaluate the historical development of the human services field.
2. (SLO 2) Interpersonal Communication (standard 17): Students will be able to develop genuine and empathic relationships with others. Specifically, we are looking for students to a) clarify expectations, b) dealing effectively with conflict, c) establish rapport with clients, and d) develop and sustain behaviors that are congruent with the values and ethics of the profession.
3. (SLO 3) Self-Development (standard 20): Students will be able to develop awareness of their own values, personalities, reaction patterns, interpersonal styles, and limitations as part of producing effective interactions with clients.
4. (SLO 4) Field Experience (standard 21): Students will be able to integrate knowledge, theory, skills, and professional behaviors in a human services field experience.

**Specific Benchmarks:** 1. 80% of students will be rated “Meeting Expectations” or higher by their internship site supervisors on the specific SLO.
2. 70% of students will rate themselves as “Very Good” or “Excellent” on the specific SLO through their evaluation of the program.
3. Students will receive an average score of 88.5% (B+) or higher on SLO-specific assignment(s).
 |
| **SECTION C: CURRICULUM MAP** |
| **DIRECTIONS:**  List **all** student learning outcomes (SLO) from Section B across the top row of your curriculum below (add columns as needed)1. List the program’s **required courses** and requirements along the left row,
2. Add an **X** if a course grades student work on their progress toward achieving the outcome (this should include all sections and instructors)
3. Add an **A** to the areas where data from all students is collected and reviewed
4. Add an **[I]** if the outcome is introduced in that course, an **[R]** if the outcome is reinforced, or an **[M]** if the outcome should be mastered
5. **In a few words,** describe the data that is collected

Need Resources? Click Here: [Curriculum Mapping/Curriculum Matrix | Assessment and Curriculum Support Center](https://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment/resources/how-to/curriculum-mapping-curriculum-matrix/)Need Help? Email us at assess@odu.edu | kcarlisl@odu.edu

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SLO 1 – History** | **SLO 2 – Interpersonal Communication** | **SLO 3 – Self-Development** | **SLO4 - Field Experience** |
| **HMSV 341** | X, ASite supervisor final evaluation [M]: 92% of students were rated as Meeting Expectations or Meeting All Expectations on this SLO, with a mean score of 4.7 out of 5 for all students. **Benchmark Met.** NOTE: A higher percentage of campus/face-to-face students met this benchmark as compared to online students (94.7% vs 80%) even though there were only marginal differences in their mean scores (4.5, n=38 vs 4.3, n=65). AStudent evaluation of program [M]: 85.6% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this SLO, with a mean score of 4.4 out of 5 for all students (n=104). **Benchmark Met.**NOTE: There were no differences in the percentage of campus/face-to-face students (93.8%) and online students (93.8%) achieving the benchmark for this SLO and no differences in the mean scores for the two groups (*M*=4.7, *n*=64 vs *M*=4.7, *n*=83). X, A, Exam 1 grade [I]: An average score/grade of 89.9% was recorded. **Benchmark Met.** |  |  |  |
| **HMSV 339** |  | X, ASite supervisor final evaluation [M]: 94% of students were rated as Meeting Expectations or Meeting All Expectations on this SLO, with a mean score of 4.8 out of 5 for all students. **Benchmark Met.**NOTE: There were no substantial differences in the percentage of campus/face-to-face students (95.4%) and online students (94.1%) in achieving the benchmark for this SLO. Both groups [campus/face-to-face students (65); online students (*n*=84) had the same mean (4.8) on this measure.AStudent evaluation of program [M]: 84.6% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this SLO, with a mean score of 4.5 out of 5 for all students (n=104). **Benchmark Met.**NOTE: A lower percentage of campus students achieved this benchmark as compared to online students (81.6% vs 86.2%) even though campus/face-to-face students (*M*=4.6; n=38) recorded a slightly higher mean than online students (*M*=4,4; *n*=65). X, AGratitude discussion board [I] = An average score of 89.8% was recorded (*n*=235). **Benchmark Met.**X, AFinal grades [R]: An average grade of 86.8% was recorded (n=391). **Benchmark Not Met**. |  |  |
| **HMSV 346** |  |  | X, Asite supervisor final evaluation [M]: 95.4% of students were rated as Meeting Expectations or Meeting All Expectations on this SLO, with a mean score of 4.7 out of 5 for all students (*n=*151). **Benchmark Met.**NOTE: There were no substantial differences in the percentage of campus/face-to-face students (96.9%) and online students (95.2%) in achieving the benchmark for this SLO. Both groups also had similar means [campus/face-to-face students (*M*=4.7, *n*=65); online students (*M*=4.8, *n*=84) on this measure.AStudent evaluation of program [M]: 91.4% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this SLO, with a mean score of 4.5 out of 5 for all students (*n*=104). **Benchmark Met.**NOTE: There were no substantial differences in the percentage of campus/face-to-face students (92.1%) and online students (90.8%) in achieving the benchmark for this SLO. Both groups also had similar means [campus/face-to-face students (*M*=4.6, *n*=38); online students (*M*=4.5, *n*=65) on this measure.X, AIntegrated writing assignment paper and video [R]: An average grade of 87.6% was recorded (*n*=194). **Benchmark Not Met.** |  |
| **HMSV 468** |  |  |  | X, ASite supervisor final evaluation [M]: 90.7% of students were rated as Meeting Expectations or Meeting All Expectations on 50 evaluation items relevant to this SLO. The overall score for all students (*n=*151) was 233/250 (equivalent to 4.66 out of 5). **Benchmark Met.**NOTE: There were no substantial differences in the percentage of campus/face-to-face students (90.8%) and online students (92.9%) in achieving the benchmark for this SLO. Both groups also had similar means [campus/face-to-face students (*M*=4.7, *n*=65); online students (*M*=4.8, *n*=84) on this measure. The overall score for the two groups was only slightly different 234/250 for campus students vs 238/250 for online students. AStudent evaluation of program [M]: 84.5% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this SLO, with a mean score of 4.4 out of 5 for all students (*n*=103). **Benchmark Met.**NOTE: A higher percentage of campus/face-to-face students met this benchmark as compared to online students (89.2% vs 80%). Campus/face-to-face students also had a slightly higher mean than online students on this measure (campus/face-to-face students (*M*=4.55, *n*=37; online students (*M*=4.29, *n*=65).X, ACase Presentation grades [R] [M]: An average grade of 93.1% was recorded (*n*=79). **Benchmark Met.** |

 |
| **SECTION D: NEW PROGRAM OR CERTIFICATE?** |
| * **Is this a new program that was launched within the last year? \_No\_** (please write yes/no)
	+ If yes, please complete the curriculum map above and plan for learning improvement to be documented in the next cycle.
	+ If no, please continue to complete Sections E and F and consider future learning improvement pursuits.
 |
| **SECTION E: BACKGROUND INFORMATION** |
| **LEARNING IMPROVEMENT PURSUIT #1** | **LEARNING IMPROVEMENT PURSUIT #2** | **LEARNING IMPROVEMENT PURSUIT #3** |
| **1. What is one student learning action started, stopped, or refined last Academic Year?**(e.g., changes in instruction, assignments, curriculum, program requirements, etc. ) | **1. What is a second student learning action started, stopped, or refined last Academic Year?**(e.g., changes in instruction, assignments, curriculum, program requirements, etc. ) | **1. What is a third student learning action started, stopped, or refined last Academic Year?**(e.g., changes in instruction, assignments, curriculum, program requirements, etc. ) |
| The HMSV program is evaluated on 12 outcomes of which only 4 outcomes are evaluated every 3 years. SLO2 was last evaluated in the previous reporting period (2020-2021). As a result of that evaluation, the program improved study guides for the HMSV 339 Interpersonal Relations course while adding a new course assignment which also served as a new/additional measure of SLO2.  | In 2020-2021, the program modified the Personal Reflection Paper assignment – which was the third measure for SLO3 - to the Integrated writing paper and video assignment. This new(er) assignment requires a more detailed self-assessment of students’ experiences and socialization around various dimensions of diversity. | During the 2021-2022 academic year, HMSV 468 Internship in Human Services course instructors reviewed skills and interventions, and the program offered a grant for students taking addictions courses and Internship.  |
| **2. What was the information/data collected in the past that prompted this action?** *(info from test/rubric results/faculty meetings - likely gathered the term/year prior to the change)* | **2. What was the information/data collected in the past that prompted this action?** *(info from test/rubric results/faculty meetings - likely gathered the term/year prior to the change)* | **2. What was the information/data collected in the past that prompted this action?** *(info from test/rubric results/faculty meetings - likely gathered the term/year prior to the change)* |
| The 2020-2021 WEAVE report showed that benchmarks were exceeded on two measures for SLO2, but not met on the third measure which required students to achieve an average grade of B+ in the HMSV 339 Interpersonal Relations course. An average grade of B was recorded/reported for this assignment in 2020-2021. | SLO3 was last evaluated in 2018-2019, when all three benchmarks were met with the only implicit recommendation being that future evaluations tease out the ways in which students are developing self-awareness. The action discussed above (modified measure) was based on the desire to better evaluate this SLO.  | SLO4 was last evaluated in 2018-2019 when all three benchmarks were met. However, that report mentioned that future evaluations may also report on the final grade in the Internship Course.. HMSV 468 course assignments were evaluated in 2020-2021 but as part of other outcomes/SLOs, which were met. The actions taken in 2021-2022 aimed to further enhance students’ field experience. |
| **3. List the student learning outcomes from Section B above that were intended to benefit from this action?**  | **3. List the student learning outcomes from Section B above that were intended to benefit from this action?**  | **3. List the student learning outcomes from Section B above that were intended to benefit from this action?**  |
| This action was informed by the program's commitment to ensure students enjoy greater success in their ability to develop genuine and empathic relationships with others (SLO2). Specifically, the program expects students to a) clarify expectations, b) dealing effectively with conflict, c) establish rapport with clients, and d) develop and sustain behaviors that are congruent with the values and ethics of the profession. | This action was informed by the program's commitment to ensure that students develop high awareness of their own values, personalities, reaction patterns, interpersonal styles, and limitations as part of producing effective interactions with clients (SLO3). | This action was informed by the program's commitment to ensure that students are able to better integrate knowledge, theory, skills, and professional behaviors in a human services field experience. |
| **SECTION F: DISCUSS THE IMPACT** |
| **4. Are the data collected and ready for discussion on how student learning has been impacted as a result of this action?** | **4. Are the data collected and ready for discussion on how student learning has been impacted as a result of this action?** | **4. Are the data collected and ready for discussion on how student learning has been impacted as a result of this action?** |
| **If YES**, please proceed to # 5a.**If NO**, please click here to indicate your timeline, then return to this form and check for any other improvement pursuits | **If YES**, please proceed to # 5a.**If NO**, please click here to indicate your timeline, then return to this form and check for any other improvement pursuits  | **If YES**, please proceed to # 5a.**If NO**, please click here to indicate your timeline, then return to this form and check for any other improvement pursuits |
| **5a. What are the expectations for student performance as a result of the action?** *[e.g. describe faculty expectations on students’ academic performance (course/rubric/text)]* | **5a. What are the expectations for student performance as a result of the action?** *[e.g. describe faculty expectations on students’ academic performance (course/rubric/text)]* | **5a. What are the expectations for student performance as a result of the action?** *[e.g. describe faculty expectations on students’ academic performance (course/rubric/text)]* |
| Overall course grades reflect both students’ knowledge and behaviors related to interpersonal interactions. An enhanced study guide would further enhance those attributes, and the new measure would primarily capture student behavior or skills relevant to this SLO. Faculty expect that these changes will result in and demonstrate greater success in students’ ability to develop genuine and empathic relationships with others (SLO2). These gains will be reflected on all measures especially through high average scores for the Gratitude discussion board assignment and higher average final course grades.  | Faculty expect that these changes will result in students’ developing high awareness of their own values, personalities, reaction patterns, interpersonal styles, and limitations as part of producing effective interactions with clients. These gains will be reflected on all measures especially through high average scores for the Integrated writing paper and video assignment. | Faculty expect that these changes will result in greater success in students’ ability to integrate knowledge, theory, skills, and professional behaviors in a human services field experience. These gains will be reflected in higher scores/ratings on all three measures. |
| **5b. How did the action influence students’ ability to meet the expectations?** *(e.g describe the impact of the changed instruction/examination on how students’ met 5a).*  | **5b. How did the action influence students’ ability to meet the expectations?** *(e.g describe the impact of the changed instruction/examination on how students’ met 5a).* | **5b. How did the action influence students’ ability to meet the expectations?** *(e.g describe the impact of the changed instruction/examination on how students’ met 5a).* |
| An average score/grade of 84.2% was recorded for this course in 2020-2021, whereas a slightly higher average grade of 86.8% (n=391) was recorded in 2021-2022. On the other hand, the benchmark {requiring an average score of B+ (88.5%) or higher} was not met – albeit marginally - for the second consecutive year. However, the benchmark for the fourth and new measure (Gratitude discussion board) for this SLO was met. It is pertinent to note that 42 cases with a score of zero were excluded from the analysis of this measure. The other two benchmarks were surpassed substantially. Remarkably, students’ rated themselves much lower on this SLO than their site supervisors, which may be the best measure for this and other SLOs. The overall performance on all four measures for this SLO suggests that the program is doing a commendable job on this front. Some recommendations are below.Given the inclusion of a new measure, identification of the above concern relevant to this new measure, and the marginal improvement on the measure of concern identified in the previous evaluation, it is unclear if the study guides helped enhance the overall performance of students in the course. One area of concern is that a substantial percentage of students (about 16%) may not have attempted the Gratitude discussion board assignment. The program needs to review and take steps to address this and other concerns identified in this report. One solution is requiring students to complete assignments that are critical to their growth and development, and to achieving course and program objectives. Data collection and analysis methods may also need to be reviewed and changed if needed for all measures. For example, the percentage of campus students who met the benchmark for measure 2 was lower than online students by about 5% points. It may be helpful to collect and analyze data for assignments and/or grades based on students’ campus or online status. Additionally response options for closed questions/items in the various surveys are vague, overlapping, and unbalanced, i.e., they include positive/favorable responses. Distinct, balanced, and consistent response options need to be offered for future evaluations. The differences in the benchmarks for measures 1 and 2 also needs to be reduced by about 5 percentage points.  | An average score/grade of 90.8% was recorded for the Personal Reflection Paper in 2018-2019, whereas an average score/grade of 87.6% was recorded for the Integrated writing paper and video assignment in the current assessment period. Yet, the benchmark {requiring an average score of B+ (88.5%) or higher} was very marginally missed. It is pertinent to note that 22 cases (10% of data collected) with a score of zero were excluded from the analysis of this measure. The other two benchmarks were surpassed substantially. Similar to SLO2, students rated themselves lower on SLO3 than their site supervisors, which may be the best measure for this and other SLOs. The overall performance on all three measures for this SLO suggests that the program is doing a commendable job on this front. Some recommendations are below.Given the identification of the above concerns with Integrated writing paper and video assignment, the program needs to review and take steps to address this concern. One option is requiring students to complete assignments that are critical to their growth and development, and to achieving course and program objectives. It may also help to review assignment guidelines, student burden and/or redundancy (ask for paper or video only rather than both), etc. Given that Integrated writing paper and video assignment is a relatively new assignment/measure, it may help to add a fourth – albeit temporary - measure relevant to this SLO, such as overall course grade.  | A different benchmark was used for the first measure in 2018-2019, so results cannot be compared with 2021-2022. 91% of students in 2018-2019 rated their internship experience as very good or excellent as compared to 84.2% in 2021-2022. This decrease in performance may be attributed to the fact that only 80% of online students achieved this benchmark in the current assessment period. An average score/grade of 92.34% was recorded for the Case Presentation assignment/measure in 2018-2019, as compared to 93.1% in 2021-2022. Yet, all three SLO4 benchmarks were surpassed substantially suggesting that the program is doing a commendable job on this front. Some recommendations are below.The impact of actions taken in 2021-2022 (and mentioned previously) on SLO4 is unclear as the performance on two of the three measures is mixed. It may be worthwhile to continue implementing these actions, while ensuring consistency in implementing actions and strategies across all course sections may also be helpful. Adding another temporary measure (final course grade as mentioned in the 2018-2019 assessment report) may also be helpful. It may be helpful to collect and analyze data for assignments and/or grades based on students’ campus or online status. |
|
|  |
| **WHEN FINISHED, FIND YOUR PROGRAM/CERTIFICATE IN THIS LIST (CLICK HERE)****THEN CHANGE THE STATUS FROM “IN-PROGRESS” TO” COMPLETE”** |

|  |
| --- |
| **IMPACT REPORT 2021-2022** |
| **SECTION A: WHAT IS THE MISSION OF THE PROGRAM OR CERTIFICATE?** |
| The mission of the human services program is The mission of the human services program is to equip students with transferable knowledge, skills, and abilities that will enable them to meet the human needs of their clients while maintaining a commitment to improving the overall quality of life for human service populations. This mission is closely aligned with that of Old Dominion University: advancement of knowledge, pursuit of truth, and responsible citizenship. |
| **SECTION B: LIST ALL THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO)** |
| 1. (SLO 1) Student will be able to apply their knowledge of drug types to examine addiction cases.
2. (SLO 2) Students will be able to assess evidence based practices specific to addiction prevention and treatment cases.
3. (SLO 3) Students will be able to examine how substance abuse impacts populations.
4. (SLO 4) Students will be able to employ foundational addiction counseling skills.
5. (SLO 5) Students will be able to use ethical decision making skills within human services practice.

**Specific Benchmarks:** 80% of students will rate their satisfaction on the specific SLO as very good or excellent through their evaluation of the program.80% of students will obtain a grade of 92% or better on SLO-specific assignments. |
| **SECTION C: CURRICULUM MAP** |
| **DIRECTIONS:**  List **all** student learning outcomes (SLO) from Section B across the top row of your curriculum below (add columns as needed)1. List the program’s **required courses** and requirements along the left row,
2. Add an X if a course grades student work on their progress toward achieving the outcome (this should include all sections and instructors)
3. Add an A to the areas where data from all students is collected and reviewed
4. Add an **[I]** if the outcome is introduced in that course, an **[R]** if the outcome is reinforced, or an **[M]** if the outcome should be mastered
5. **In a few words,** describe the data that is collected

Need Resources? Click Here: [Curriculum Mapping/Curriculum Matrix | Assessment and Curriculum Support Center](https://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment/resources/how-to/curriculum-mapping-curriculum-matrix/)Need Help? Email us at assess@odu.edu | kcarlisl@odu.edu

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SLO 1 – Drugs** | **SLO 2 – EBP** | **SLO 3 – Impacts** | **SLO4 - Skills** | **SLO5-Ethics** |
| **HMSV 447** | AStudent evaluation of program **[M]:** 70.7% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this measure, with a mean score of 4.05 out of 5 for all students (*n*=75). **Not Met.**NOTE: A higher percentage of campus/face-to-face students met this benchmark as compared to online students (76% vs 67.4%) even though there were only marginal differences in their mean scores (4.2, n=25 vs 3.98, n=49). X, ARelapse Prevention Plan **[M]:** An average score/grade of 92.8% (*n*=144) was recorded on this measure, but only 68.1% of students received a score of 92 percentage points or greater. **Not Met.** |  |  |  |  |
| **HMSV 452** | X, ACase Vignettes **[I]:** An average score/grade of 95.5% (*n*=100) was recorded for this measure with 81% of students receiving a score of 92 percentage points or greater. **Met.** | AStudent evaluation of program **[M]:** 78.4% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this measure, with a mean score of 4.08 out of 5 for all students (*n*=74). **Not Met.**NOTE: There were marginal differences in the percentage of campus/face-to-face students meeting this benchmark as compared to online students (79.2% vs 77.6%) and there were only marginal differences in their mean scores (4.21, n=24 vs 4.02, n=49). X, AResearch Report **[M]:** An average score/grade of 88.2% (*n*=75) was recorded for this SLO with 49.3% of students receiving a score of 92 percentage points or greater. **Not Met.**X, ATreatment Plan **[M]:** An average score/grade of 92% (*n*=76) was recorded for this SLO with 51.3% of students receiving a score of 92 percentage points or greater. **Not Met.** |  | AStudent evaluation of program **[M]:** 67.1% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this measure, with a mean score of 4.01 out of 5 for all students (*n*=73). **Not Met.**X, ATreatment Plan **[M]:** An average score/grade of 92% (*n*=76) was recorded for this SLO with 51.3% of students receiving a score of 92 percentage points or greater. **Not Met.** |  |
| **HMSV 449** |  |  | AStudent evaluation of program **[M]:** 79% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this measure, with a mean score of 4.21 out of 5 for all students (*n*=76). **Not Met.**X, APrevention and Intervention Plan **[M]:** An average score/grade of 95.7% (*n*=278) was recorded for this SLO with 83.5% of students receiving a score of 92 percentage points or greater. **Met.** |  | AStudent evaluation of program **[M]:** 77.3% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this measure, with a mean score of 4.16 out of 5 for all students (*n*=75). **Not Met.**X, AEthical Assessment **[M]:** An average score/grade of 95.1% (*n*=209) was recorded for this measure with 77% of students receiving a score of 92 percentage points or greater. **Not Met.** |

 |
| **SECTION D: NEW PROGRAM OR CERTIFICATE?** |
| * **Is this a new program that was launched within the last year? \_No\_** (please write yes/no)
	+ If yes, please complete the curriculum map above and plan for learning improvement to be documented in the next cycle.
	+ If no, please continue to complete Sections E and F and consider future learning improvement pursuits.
 |
| **SECTION E: BACKGROUND INFORMATION** |
| **LEARNING IMPROVEMENT PURSUIT #1** | **LEARNING IMPROVEMENT PURSUIT #2** | **LEARNING IMPROVEMENT PURSUIT #3** |
| **1. What is one student learning action started, stopped, or refined last Academic Year?**(e.g., changes in instruction, assignments, curriculum, program requirements, etc. ) | **1. What is a second student learning action started, stopped, or refined last Academic Year?**(e.g., changes in instruction, assignments, curriculum, program requirements, etc. ) | **1. What is a third student learning action started, stopped, or refined last Academic Year?**(e.g., changes in instruction, assignments, curriculum, program requirements, etc. ) |
| The program decided to give students (additional/new) practical experience in applying knowledge of the types of drugs (SLO1). Through the Addictions Training Grant, students were offered extra training in addictions work, telehealth, and trauma-informed care. Assistance in internship placement with sites that provide addiction services and/or behavioral health services was also offered. It was also decided that the students’ evaluation of the program in 2021-2022 would seek qualitative input from students on how to better meet this SLO-related need. | The program decided to find and utilize new resources to help students understand the meaning of evidence-based and how to use evidence-based practice for prevention and treatment of addictions (SLO2). Through the Addictions Training Grant, students were offered extra training in addictions work, telehealth, and trauma-informed care. Assistance in internship placement with sites that provide addiction services and/or behavioral health services was also offered. It was also decided that the students’ evaluation of the program in 2021-2022 would seek qualitative input from students on how to better meet this SLO-related need. | The program decided to give students more opportunities to practice their addictions counseling skills (SLO4). Through the Addictions Training Grant, students were offered extra training in addictions work, telehealth, and trauma-informed care. Assistance in internship placement with sites that provide addiction services and/or behavioral health services was also offered. It was also decided that the students’ evaluation of the program in 2021-2022 would seek qualitative input from students on how to better meet this SLO-related need. |
| **2. What was the information/data collected in the past that prompted this action?** *(info from test/rubric results/faculty meetings - likely gathered the term/year prior to the change)* | **2. What was the information/data collected in the past that prompted this action?** *(info from test/rubric results/faculty meetings - likely gathered the term/year prior to the change)* | **2. What was the information/data collected in the past that prompted this action?** *(info from test/rubric results/faculty meetings - likely gathered the term/year prior to the change)* |
| Benchmarks for all three measures for this SLO in 2020-2021 were met. Note: The third measure consisted of two assignments, the Relapse Prevention Plan and Case Vignettes. One measure (Site Supervisors’ Final Evaluation) was dropped for the current assessment year. The 2020-2021 WEAVE report indicated slightly lower achievement on the Students’ Evaluation of Program measure as compared to the two other measures, which necessitated the actions listed under Learning Improvement Pursuit #2. | Benchmarks for all three measures for this SLO in 2020-2021 were met, but one measure (Site Supervisors’ Final Evaluation) was dropped from the current assessment year while the Research Report assignment was added as an additional assignment to the third, direct measure. The 2020-2021 WEAVE report indicated slightly lower achievement for this SLO on the Students’ Evaluation of Program measure as compared to two other measures, which necessitated the actions listed under Learning Improvement Pursuit #2. | Benchmarks for all three measures for this SLO in 2020-2021 were met, but one measure (Site Supervisors’ Final Evaluation) was dropped from the current assessment year. The 2020-2021 WEAVE report indicated slightly lower achievement for online students on the Students’ Evaluation of Program measure for this SLO as compared to campus students, which necessitated the actions listed under Learning Improvement Pursuit #2. |
| **3. List the student learning outcomes from Section B above that were intended to benefit from this action?**  | **3. List the student learning outcomes from Section B above that were intended to benefit from this action?**  | **3. List the student learning outcomes from Section B above that were intended to benefit from this action?**  |
| The above actions were informed by the program's commitment to ensure students report more success in their ability to apply their knowledge of drug types to examine addiction cases (SLO1). | This action was informed by the program's commitment to ensure students report more success in their ability to assess evidence based practices specific to addiction prevention and treatment cases (SLO2). | This action was informed by the program's commitment to ensure students report more success in their ability to employ foundational addiction counseling skills. (SLO4). |
| **SECTION F: DISCUSS THE IMPACT** |
| **4. Are the data collected and ready for discussion on how student learning has been impacted as a result of this action?** | **4. Are the data collected and ready for discussion on how student learning has been impacted as a result of this action?** | **4. Are the data collected and ready for discussion on how student learning has been impacted as a result of this action?** |
| **If YES**, please proceed to # 5a.**If NO**, please click here to indicate your timeline, then return to this form and check for any other improvement pursuits | **If YES**, please proceed to # 5a.**If NO**, please click here to indicate your timeline, then return to this form and check for any other improvement pursuits  | **If YES**, please proceed to # 5a.**If NO**, please click here to indicate your timeline, then return to this form and check for any other improvement pursuits |
| **5a. What are the expectations for student performance as a result of the action?** *[e.g. describe faculty expectations on students’ academic performance (course/rubric/text)]* | **5a. What are the expectations for student performance as a result of the action?** *[e.g. describe faculty expectations on students’ academic performance (course/rubric/text)]* | **5a. What are the expectations for student performance as a result of the action?** *[e.g. describe faculty expectations on students’ academic performance (course/rubric/text)]* |
| Following the above actions, faculty expect that students will report more success in their ability to apply their knowledge of drug types to examine addiction cases (SLO1). | Following the action, faculty expect that students will report more success in their ability to assess evidence based practices specific to addiction prevention and treatment cases (SLO2). | Following the action, faculty expect that students will report more success in their ability to employ foundational addiction counseling skills (SLO4). |
| **5b. How did the action influence students’ ability to meet the expectations?** *(e.g describe the impact of the changed instruction/examination on how students’ met 5a).*  | **5b. How did the action influence students’ ability to meet the expectations?** *(e.g describe the impact of the changed instruction/examination on how students’ met 5a).* | **5b. How did the action influence students’ ability to meet the expectations?** *(e.g describe the impact of the changed instruction/examination on how students’ met 5a).* |
| The benchmark for measure 1 (Student Evaluation of Program) was not met as only 70.7% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent, with a mean score of 4.05 out of 5 for all students. Benchmark for only one (Case Vignettes) of the other two assignment-related measure was met, whereas benchmark for this measure was met for both assignments in 2020-2021. These results are somewhat misleading. The performance on measure 1 in 2021-2022 is indeed lower than the previous assessment period when 75.47% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this measure, with a mean score of 4.17 out of 5 for all students. On the other hand, there is negligible difference in average scores for the two assignments of measure 2 over the two assessment periods (Relapse Prevention Plan: 2020-2021=93.7%; 2021-2022=93.1%)(Case Vignettes: 2020-2021=94.7%; 2021-2022=94.5%). The 2021-2022 results appear unflattering because the benchmark for both measures have been increased. The benchmark for measure 1 was increased from 70% to 80% whereas the benchmark for measure 2 was changed from “On average, students will score a B+ (88.5%) or higher” in 2020-2021 to “80% of students will obtain a grade of 92% or better” in 2021-2022. **If the previous benchmarks had been retained, then both measures would have been met in 2021-2022.**  At a minimum, the program has mostly maintained its standards on this SLO in 2021-2022. However, the decreased performance on measure 1 (Student Evaluation of Program) suggest that it is likely that corrective actions/steps taken by the program in 2021-2022 may not have resulted in enhanced performance. These actions/steps must be discussed further and continue to be implemented if deemed helpful. However, there are other suggestions from students (shared in their evaluation of the program for 2021-2022) that may need to be reviewed by faculty and implemented to improve this SLO. Students generally requested more opportunities to practice skills, additional classes, more class interaction, more feedback, more focus on treatment plans, more information such as through articles, videos, etc., and help with finding suitable internship sites. It is pertinent to note that a higher percentage of campus/face-to-face students met the benchmark for the Student Evaluation of Program measure as compared to online students (76% vs 67.4%) even though there were only marginal differences in their mean scores (4.2, n=25 vs 3.98, n=49). This indicates that some of the above suggestions (ex: additional classes) may need to be implemented especially for online students. It may be helpful to collect and analyze data for assignments and/or grades based on students’ campus or online status. Given the consistent low (mean) scores reported by students for the certificate in general as compared to the overall HMSV program, it may also be helpful to revert back to the original benchmarks which continue to be used to evaluate the HMSV program.  | The benchmark for the Student Evaluation of Program measure was not met as only 78.4% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this measure, with a mean score of 4.08 out of 5 for all students. Additionally, the benchmark for the two assignments for the second measure were also not met. These results are somewhat misleading because results for measure 1 in 2021-2022 (78.4%, M=4.08) are similar to those in 2020-2021 (79.3%, M=4.13) and the average score for the Treatment Plan assignment is nearly the same (2020-2021=91.6%, 2021-2022=92%). However, like with SLO1, the 2021-2022 results appear unflattering because the benchmark for both measures have been increased. The benchmark for measure 1 was increased from 70% to 80% whereas the benchmark for measure 2 was changed from “On average, students will score a B+ (88.5%) or higher” in 2020-2021 to “80% of students will obtain a grade of 92% or better” in 2021-2022. **If the previous benchmarks had been retained, then the first measure would have been met and the second measure would have been partially met in 2021-2022 with the second assignment (Research Report) for the second measure being missed by just 0.3% point.** At a minimum, the program has maintained its standards on this SLO in 2021-2022. However, the lack of enhanced performance on both measures indicates that corrective actions taken by the program have not yet resulted in enhanced performance. These actions/steps must be discussed further and continue to be implemented if deemed helpful. Yet, there are other suggestions from students (shared in their evaluation of the program for 2021-2022) that need to be reviewed by faculty and implemented if necessary. Students requested more opportunities to practice skills, additional classes, more class interaction, more feedback, more focus on treatment plans, more information such as through articles, videos, etc., and help with finding suitable internship sites. It is pertinent to note that campus/face-to-face students (*n*=24) had a marginally higher mean score of 4.21 on measure 1 as compared to 4.02 for online students (*n*=49), thereby indicating that some of the above suggestions (ex: more focus on [evidence based] treatment plans, more information such as through articles, videos, etc.,) may need to be implemented especially for online students. It may be helpful to collect and analyze data for assignments/grades based on students’ campus or online status. Given the consistent low (mean) scores reported by students for the certificate in general as compared to the overall HMSV program, it may also be helpful to revert back to the original benchmarks which continue to be used to evaluate the HMSV program. | The benchmarks for measure 1 (Student Evaluation of Program) and measure 2 (HMSV 452 Treatment Plan assignment) were not met. The performance on measure 1 in 2021-2022 is indeed lower than the previous assessment period when 78.3% of students rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this measure, with a mean score of 4.21 out of 5 for all students. On the other hand, the average score for the Treatment Plan assignment is nearly the same (2020-2021=91.6%, 2021-2022=92%). The 2021-2022 results appear particularly unflattering because the benchmark for both measures have been increased. The benchmark for measure 1 was increased from 70% to 80% whereas the benchmark for measure 2 was changed from “On average, students will score a B+ (88.5%) or higher” in 2020-2021 to “80% of students will obtain a grade of 92% or better” in 2021-2022. **If the previous benchmarks had been retained, then the second measure would have been met in 2021-2022.** At a minimum, the program has maintained its performance on the second measure for this SLO in 2021-2022. However, the decreased performance on measure 1 (Student Evaluation of Program) suggest that that corrective actions/steps taken by the program in 2021-2022 have not been successful. These actions/steps must be discussed further and continue to be implemented if deemed helpful. However, there are other suggestions from students (shared in their evaluation of the program for 2021-2022) that may need to be reviewed by faculty and implemented to improve this SLO. Students generally requested more opportunities to practice skills, additional classes, more class interaction, more feedback, more focus on treatment plans, more information such as through articles, videos, etc., and help with finding suitable internship sites. It is pertinent to note that online students had a lower mean score (3.98) than campus students (4.08) even though the same percentage of students (66.7%) in the two groups rated themselves as Very Good or Excellent on this measure. This indicates that some of the above suggestions (ex: additional classes) may need to be implemented especially for online students. It may be helpful to collect and analyze data for assignments and/or grades based on students’ campus or online status. Given the consistent low (mean) scores reported by students for the certificate in general as compared to the overall HMSV program, it may also be helpful to revert back to the original benchmarks which continue to be used to evaluate the HMSV program. |
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