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1. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Child & Adolescent Development (ChAD) became a department in the mid 1990s when it split from being a program within Teacher Education. In the years following the department has grown steadily and substantially, and now includes:
- Minor, Child and Adolescent Development
- Minor, Atypical Child Studies
- BA, Child and Adolescent Development
- BA, Child and Adolescent Development, Preparation for Teaching
- MA, Child and Adolescent Development

The ChAD office is located in Sweeney Hall room 201; our website is http://www.sjsu.edu/chad/

1a. Program mission and goals

In alignment with both the university and the College of Education (COE) mission statements, the mission of the Department of Child & Adolescent Development “is to develop educated people who are intelligent, well-informed, responsible lifelong learners, and who take an active interest in the world around them.” We strive to achieve that mission in our curricular activities by supporting students to recognize the value of formal and informal education and the danger of ignorance; to see learning as a lifelong process; to have both breadth and depth of factual knowledge; to have an understanding of human development; to have an understanding of the fundamentals of mathematics and a broad view of what science is, what it has achieved, and what it might continue to achieve; to have an historical perspective on their own time and an understanding of other civilizations and cultures from these and former times; and to be politically literate. Our students are problem solvers who are regularly required to apply critical thinking skills. They can make sense out of complexity, make decisions, and facilitate change. Our students have technological and informational competence. They can read with comprehension and express themselves clearly both in speech and in writing. Finally, they are compassionate, ethical, responsible, inquisitive, flexible, patient, and self-confident. They understand and respect the diversity of the human experience, and are committed to equity and excellence.

1b. Curricular Content of Degrees, Minors, Certificates, and Credentials

- Minor, ChAD: examines human development with an emphasis on infancy through adolescence;
- Minor, Atypical Child Studies: foundation in both normative and atypical early childhood development;
- BA ChAD: General preparation in child & adolescent development;
- BA ChAD, Preparation for Teaching: General preparation in child & adolescent development and subject matter preparation for elementary school teaching; and
- MA ChAD: Advanced preparation in child & adolescent development with an emphasis on student professional and/or academic purposes.

1c. Service Courses

The ChAD schedule routinely offers a wide range of general education (GE) courses. We have four core GE courses (ChAD 60, 67, 70, 75) and three SJSU Studies (upper division GE) courses (ChAD 100W, 102, 106). Our service to the university is substantial. In fall 2013, for example, we offered 30 sections of these GE courses with a total actual enrollment of 1239.5 students. As is clear in Data
Exhibit 4, students from virtually every major at SJSU enroll in our courses. These enrollments are almost all in our service courses. There are several SJSU majors that require courses we offer (e.g., nursing, five subject matter preparation majors).

2. SUMMARY OF PROGRESS, CHANGES, AND PROPOSED ACTIONS

2a. Progress on action plan of previous program review

Most of the suggestions made in the external reviewer’s 2008 summary were identical to those that the department had included in its program review document. In brief, the more substantive recommendations included:

1. Continue a pattern of collaborative relations to assimilate and mentor junior faculty as well as the high numbers of lecturer faculty currently on staff.
   The faculty continues to enjoy a reputation in the college and throughout the university as a group that produces high-quality work and effective service and that works productively together. (See faculty vita in Appendix E) New faculty are assigned to share an office with a more veteran faculty member who assists our new faculty with department, student, and university issues. The three new tenure-track faculty who were hired since our previous review and new lecturers have all received both structured and as-requested support from the ChAD chair and tenure-track faculty.

2. Revise the Plan B academic track to include a focused set of subspecialty options or concentrations which address a range of career interests in the field.
   Perhaps the most significant change we have implemented in the program has been the development of a second pathway to the Plan B baccalaureate degree. Based on our analyses of the data we have been collecting in our senior seminar exit survey, it was clear that the focus of the new pathway should address the potential for careers in community institutions serving children and families. It has taken several years for us to work out the details of that new program. By the end of spring 2013, four new courses for that program had been designed and had completed all curricular review processes. In addition, the requirements for the existing Plan B major were revised. The change-of-major materials were submitted to Undergraduate Studies for review in summer 2013. In spring 2014 we will begin advising new students about the new degree option to be offered officially in fall 2014. We will also examine how well these new changes address the range of students’ career interests with our senior exit survey.

3. Consider creating more coherent options or tracks with the M.A. electives for the purposes of career planning and explore ways to increase faculty involvement in the oversight and mentorship of graduate students.
   To address this goal, we reviewed all of the elective options from which our MA students select three courses (nine units of a 30-unit degree). As part of this process we reviewed all of the courses offered throughout the university that we had not previously included; we eliminated some of the less-relevant options and added other more relevant courses; and we grouped the options into potential career categories (e.g., health, social policy, administration) so that students could more readily see how their choice might map on to their career goals (see http://www.sjsu.edu/chad/Programs/graduate/maelectives/index.html). We have also changed the advising structure for our MA students; these students are now assigned to an individual
faculty member who serves as their advisor. To further assist MA students, they are now required to select their electives in consultation with their advisor.

4. Use data collected in the assessment program to implement and improve the plan itself and use the data to inform program development and improvement.

The ChAD faculty consistently reviews department data, consider options for addressing findings, and implement and review the impact of changes in the program. This pattern is clearly documented in our faculty meeting minutes. Most semesters we administer an online exit survey to all students enrolled in the senior seminar, and attain a high response rate. At the fall and spring department retreats, we discuss these survey findings as well as any SLO assessments completed the previous semester. Based on the data reviewed and other student input and faculty discussions, we have made numerous improvements in our program. Below are just a few examples of our activities, in no particular order:

- In ChAD 170, we found that students were not skilled at addressing scholarly resources. Two faculty members revised the course assignments, and the situation improved.
- Faculty noted a need for consistency in assessing MA culminating experience projects. Consequently, a common rubric was developed and reviewed by all faculty to assist in the project evaluations. Other changes that have improved our MA program relate to advising. We now provide an orientation for our MA students in the first few weeks of class and faculty advisors receive a common advising document- to provide constructive guidance in academic advising. See Appendix B.
- In response to our accumulating SLO and survey data, we conducted a significant review of our curriculum. From spring 2011 through fall 2012, the faculty collectively and systemically reviewed and revised: 1) all SLOs; 2) the signature assignments used to assess SLOs; 3) structure and content of all syllabi; and 4) the content of each required BA and MA course.
- We standardized the scales and rating labels used in rubrics to assess all SLO signature assignments so that comparisons could be more consistent within and across courses.
- In spring 2013, we joined with Bernd Becker of the University library to create and implement an information literacy survey as a way to collect data on an additional form of student learning. Students in our junior level writing course (ChAD 100W) and in our senior seminar (ChAD 195) have been asked to respond to the survey. We plan to review these data in spring 2015 when the initial group of ChAD 100W students enter ChAD 195. We are interested in using these data to examine the impact of the information literacy activities infused throughout the curriculum.
- In AY 2008 and again in AY 2011/12, we revised the senior exit survey to better align with our student learning outcome objectives.
- In response both to student interest in ‘hands-on’ assignments and to a growing body of research on the value of service learning components of courses, we increased the number of ChAD courses that now include service learning.

2b. Significant changes to the program and context, if any

There are two significant changes in our program since the previous review. Section 2.2 above describes a major curricular development in the department. Section 2.3 provides additional changes as we strive to better serve our MA students. The other change is the significant increase in
the sheer number of students served by the department. This trend is easily observed in required Data Exhibit 1, which shows the number of course sections we offer; and in Data Exhibit 4, which shows the total course enrollment from fall 2009 (headcount of 1552) to fall 2013 (headcount of 2426), an increase of almost 1000 students enrolled in the courses we offer.

3. **ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING**

3a. **Program Learning Objectives (PLO)**

ChAD refers to the PLOs as student learning objectives (SLOs). These SLOs are the same for both the BA and the MA programs. They are:

1. Demonstrate basic knowledge of child and adolescent development in four major domains (cognitive, emotional, social, and physical) and understand the interrelationships among these domains;
2. Understand the role of context in the growth and development of children and adolescents and their socialization by family, community, society, and culture;
3. Apply research, theory, and problem-solving skills to questions about social policy, education, intervention, and practical situations pertaining to children and adolescents;
4. Examine and evaluate information about children and adolescents from a variety of sources;
5. Demonstrate inquisitiveness about the development of children and adolescents by articulating reasoned questions and methods for seeking answers to those questions;
6. Demonstrate communication and interpersonal skills for facilitating the development of children and adolescents and meeting the challenges of working with other professionals; and
7. Understand ethical and advocacy responsibilities in working with and on behalf of children and adolescents.

Approximately every four years, the ChAD faculty methodically reviews the entire ChAD curriculum. The faculty, as a group, discusses each syllabus in detail, and as necessary, makes changes to content, to signature assignments, etc. This process takes about three semesters. In preparation for this review, the faculty examines the ChAD SLOs and considers whether they continue to reflect our goals for students, and make revisions where necessary. In AY 2010/11, we revised our SLOs. The list above is substantively the same as those we used at the time of the previous program review except that we have reorganized the content, ending up with seven, not eight SLOs. Along with this work, new or revised signature assessments were created and there were changes in which courses we use to assess several of the SLOs. This work is clearly documented in the department minutes archived and stored in SH 201.

In terms of the WASC PLO rubric, the faculty regards our work with our own SLOs as effective. We are confident that we capture sufficient meaningful information to understand whether and how students achieve the ChAD learning goals. Likewise, we believe that we are successful in identifying gaps in student learning and in implementing changes that narrow or eliminate those gaps. In our assessment of our SLOs using the WASC PLO rubric, we conclude:

- Comprehensive list: Highly developed
- Assessable outcomes: Highly developed
- Alignment: Developed
- Assessment planning: Highly developed
- The student experience: Developed
3b. Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ChAD SLOs</th>
<th>University PLOs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Matrix of PLOs to Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required CHAD Core Courses by University PLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChAD Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159/160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162/164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3d. Assessment Data

The department has a substantial documented history of regularly examining all aspects of our curriculum and other elements of our work with students. We collectively conduct a detailed review of the content and activities of all our courses at about four-year intervals; we routinely discuss exit survey findings and SLO assessment materials at faculty meetings, and at our biennial retreats, we typically review advising materials and procedures.

About every four years, the faculty as a group review and agree upon the content and assignments of each ChAD course. We most recently completed this work in the spring of 2012. A tenure-track faculty member serves as the coordinator for each course offered by ChAD. Based on the faculty review and agreement on the course content, the coordinator is required to ensure that all faculty who teach the course use a common syllabus and text/readings, assignments, assessments, and rubrics associated with major assignments.
Although we have assessed each SLO at least once since our last program review, we have only recently set up a new plan for scheduling the assessment of each SLO using the agreed-upon signature assignments. The table below shows our data collection plan by semester. Data will be discussed by the faculty during the semester following the assessment, with any changes implemented as soon as possible. The new calendar provides instructors with a three-semester window between assessments to implement any changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ChAD SLOs</th>
<th>101</th>
<th>159/160</th>
<th>162/164</th>
<th>163/173</th>
<th>169</th>
<th>195</th>
<th>Exit survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F even</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sp even</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F odd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F even</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department SLO assessment planning includes curriculum review, data collection employing signature assignments analyzed using rubrics, faculty discussion of the data, and revision as appropriate followed by review of changes. Below is a brief description of the signature assignments and changes made as a result of the collection and discussion of the assessment data. Rubrics for grading the signature assignments are presented in Appendix B:

**SLO 1, ChAD 163, 173:** Students write a 10-page research-based term paper on some aspect of infant/toddler (173) or adolescent (163) development or the effects on development of certain experiences during this period. Students search for and use eight empirical articles from peer-reviewed journals in their paper. For this paper, students need to show how their topic is affected by or affects four domains of development (physical, cognitive, social, and emotional).

Other than the course content review and associated curricular changes completed in 2012, we have not identified any changes based on the SLO assessment. The coordinators have conducted informal data collection around various aspects of these two courses. One coordinator, for example, examined the impact of using the mini-mediascapes available in the COE. The outcome of that work was that she will use the mediascape activity again, which allows students to follow-up on an individual assignment with group discussion and shared PowerPoint presentation.

**SLO 2, ChAD 162/164:** In the 162/164 SLO signature assignments, students are asked to investigate the role of parenting styles on cultural practices and children’s developmental outcomes. With this assignment, students review connections between their socialization experiences with parents and the community, society and cultural context. Using research to substantiate their ideas, students
discuss the universality of these parenting styles and discuss the impact of variation in styles on children's development.

**SLO 3, ChAD 195:** For ChAD 195, we have two signature assessments, one for SLO #3 (Policy Paper) and one for SLO #7 (Advocacy exam question). The policy paper is an opportunity for our capstone students to investigate a social problem from a variety of perspectives (e.g., research, policy, and advocacy). Within this paper they use research to evaluate a policy related to children, youth and/or families and explore how theory and research can be used to determine best practice, program, and policy development.

Over the last 5 years we created and refined the 'common' rubrics for all sections of ChAD 195. The instructors have periodically reviewed these rubrics to ensure that they are still compatible with the assignments. We have also assessed the impact of these assignments on students.

**SLO 4, ChAD 170:** Signature assignment for SLO 4 is an examination and evaluation of information about children and adolescents from a variety of sources. The assignment requires students to investigate a question of interest regarding the various influences on a specific cognitive ability. Students are required to search for scholarly sources and different non-scholarly sources on the topic, identify and evaluate the claims and evidence of those sources, and to write a review using their evaluations to make tentative conclusions, suggest practical implications as well as factors left unexplored in their sources. Students are evaluated on their ability to introduce the topic, describe the claims and evidence of their sources, critically evaluate their sources, compare the quality of information from the various sources, and develop conclusions about the topic.

**SLO 5, ChAD 169:** The signature assignment in this class is a group project that allows students to explore a question that has developmental implications for children’s motivation to learn. Groups plan their question, gather scholarly research on the topic, and select a practical setting in which they can observe that issue in action. The assignment involves a short group paper, a longer individual paper from each group member, and a culminating group presentation to the class regarding their findings.

**SLO 6, ChAD 159, 160:** The signature assignment in this class is the evaluation of each of the students’ participation in their practicum settings. Students work in the on-campus lab preschool (ChAD 160) or K-8 public school classrooms (ChAD 159) for a minimum of 5 hours per week throughout one semester. Their role is to assist the teacher in preparing materials and working with the children. The preschool instructors or classroom cooperating teachers complete both a midterm and a final evaluation of the student’s work in the practicum setting. We are currently attempting to convert these evaluations to an electronic form.

**SLO 7, ChAD 195:** The advocacy exam question assessing SLO 7 requires students to describe how they would advocate on behalf of children regarding a variety of social problems (e.g., poverty, health, education). Within the question, students are asked to delineate their understanding of 'advocacy' and describe the process of advocating for children, youth, and families as well as challenges associated with this process. In general advocacy is a strong component of 195 that is
discussed in nearly every class session. For SLO #7, students appear to understand their role in the advocacy process and tend to excel on the exam question.

**Exit survey:** As mentioned previously, we survey students in our senior seminar, and we regularly review the survey findings and consider making appropriate changes or improvements. The last time the survey underwent a careful revision was spring 2012. The program exit survey is conducted in the senior seminar in an online format every spring and some fall semesters. The exit survey is presented in Appendix D.

3e. Assessment Results and Interpretation

In the department minutes there are numerous entries documenting how the faculty actively use the SLO and exit survey findings to identify areas for program improvement and then implement those changes. One very clear example of that process concerns the quality of student writing. Because every one of our upper division degree requirements includes significant writing assignments, the assessment of writing is an issue that spans our entire curriculum. Thus, a key element of one of our SLOs is that students will develop the ability to communicate clearly in writing. In the review of a combination of our SLO data, faculty observations, and to some extent data from the exit survey, we identified a critical gap in student achievement. We found that students were having difficulty in writing junior and senior level term papers, including at the point of enrollment in the senior seminar. In addition we found that many students were waiting until their last semester before graduation to take the junior level writing course, ChAD 100W. In response to the review of multiple sources of data, the department made several changes:

1) In all advisement sessions and at the department transfer orientation sessions, attendance at which is a requirement for matriculation at SJSU, we put a great deal of emphasis on the importance of passing the writing skills test (WST) and then taking the junior level writing course, ChAD 100W, as early in their careers at SJSU as possible.

2) We made some content revisions to ChAD 100W, such as an increased emphasis on key elements of the APA formatting and writing style guide.

3) We added a pre-requisite to the senior seminar. All students are now required to have completed ChAD 100W before they can enroll in the senior seminar, a policy for which we make no exceptions.

As a result of implementing these changes, the senior seminar instructors have seen significant improvements in the content and quality of students’ writing. Informally, instructors in other upper division courses have reported improvements in student writing as well.

The ChAD faculty have made many other improvements to our curriculum over the period since our most recent review. These curricular changes have all resulted from reviews almost identical to the process we followed in improving students’ ability to write. In brief, some are:

- all sections of all courses now have an online component (e.g., Canvas on-line learning management system) to facilitate out-of-class communication, access to instructor notes and materials to augment lecture/discussions, and to reduce paper usage;
- adjustments were made to the curriculum in ChAD 168 to enhance the career-related information previously offered;
- an infancy/toddler course was added as a result of faculty discussions that knowledge in this area was not sufficient for certain career paths for our students;
• in ChAD 169, we have added an assignment involving a library information literacy component in collaboration with our library liaison;
• expansion of our service learning courses to include ChAD 150 and ChAD 151;
• classroom use of COE Apple iPad carts by several instructors (e.g., Fusaro, Jabagchourian, Love, Mathur);
• based on review of student data, we developed a third path through the major (see 2.a.2 above);
• successful application for an intramural student success grant to enhance high impact practices throughout the ChAD curriculum, particularly in the new course offerings;
• increase in the courses requiring free and/or online readings rather than purchased text or materials (ChAD 106, most sections of ChAD 195)

A major goal of our exit survey is to query students about their assessment of the extent to which they believe they have achieved each of the ChAD SLOs. The faculty reviews this information the semester following administration of the survey. Across the years, we generally find that s 90 – 98% of students report they strongly agree or agree that they are leaving with program with:
• a basic knowledge of child/adolescent growth & development in four major domains;
• an understanding of the role of context in the development of children and their socialization by family, community & society;
• the ability to connect theories of child/adolescent growth and development to social policy, education, and intervention;
• the ability to apply theoretical knowledge and problem solving skills in practical situations with children/adolescents and their families;
• the ability to examine and evaluate information about children and families from different sources;
• the ability to formulate good questions and seek answers;
• the skills needed to read with comprehension and write clearly;
• communication and interpersonal skills for facilitating the development of children and meeting the challenges of working with other professionals; and
• an understanding of ethical and advocacy responsibilities in working with children and families.

3f. Placement of Grads
As discussed previously, we administer an exit survey to students in our senior seminar, data we regularly review and find extremely helpful to us in considering changes/improvements that could be made in the program. The voluntary program exit survey is conducted online all spring semesters and some fall semesters in the senior seminar (see the exit survey in Appendix D). A number of items in this survey address the soon-to-be graduates’ views on the relationship of their ChAD coursework to their lives. Across many semesters we find that more than 90% of these students strongly agree or agree that “most of my ChAD courses provided me with knowledge I use in my daily life.” Similarly, more than 90% of respondents indicate that their career goal is “very related” to child development.”

The university does not supply support or resources to track and survey our alumni or their employers. Faculty, however, do keep in touch with some of their students. From these contacts we know that many of our graduates are successfully employed in a range of responsible positions. Some recent specific examples from fall 2013 include:
• Director and Asst. Director of BING Preschool at Stanford University
• Project Coordinator of the Accelerated Reading Program
• Volunteer Coordinator at Children’s Discovery Museum
• Volunteer Coordinator at Community Health Awareness Council
• Site Coordinator at Reading Partners
• Executive Director at Santa Maria Urban Ministry
• Youth and Family Coordinator at the YMCA
• Preschool Director at Mandala Children’s House
• Teacher at San Jose Family Shelter
• Director at Hope Services
• Counselor at ACE Charter Schools

4. PROGRAM METRICS AND REQUIRED DATA
The Required Data Elements discussed in this section are attached in Appendix A of this report.

4a. Enrollment, retention, graduation rates, and graduates
The information presented in the required data exhibits document the success of the students, staff, and faculty in the areas of enrollment, retention, graduation rates, and the number of graduates. In Appendix A, refer to Exhibits 5, 8, 9, and 10.

In Exhibit 5 notice the steadily increasing numbers of SJSU applicants who select ChAD as their major: 460 in fall 2009; 693 in fall 2013. The admission rates of those applicants, likewise, trends upward: 58% in fall 09; 77% in fall 2013.

Exhibit 8 shows that the number of majors we are graduating has nearly doubled in five years: 137 in AY 08/09; 201 in AY 12/13. The fact that the number of graduates is increasing so sharply is clear evidence that the department has successfully 1) managed enrollments to expand access to required courses as the number of majors has increased and 2) provided advisement services that ensure student success. The result is that our students are earning their degrees in a timely manner.

The department is particularly proud of our student retention and graduation rates. The retention data found in Exhibit 9 show that the department first year freshmen rates for fall semesters across all categories and types of students are high. In the latest fall semester for which we have data, 2012, for example, the rates range from 84.6% - 100%. The University overall average for that same period was 87%. The 2012 College of Education (COE) rate was 89.2%, most of which were ChAD majors. Likewise, our first year data for new transfers was 88.6% - 90.3% while the university overall average for that same group was 86.2% and the COE rate was 88.8%, almost entirely ChAD majors. We regard these retention data as clear evidence of the work of an engaged faculty and staff and an advising program that is both efficient and responsive to students’ needs.

We are equally pleased with our graduation rates, as presented in Exhibit 10. Our first-time freshmen six-year graduation rates fluctuate quite a bit suggesting that something other than department-controlled variables are operating 2030-2007(33.3% – 83.3%). Notice that we serve relatively few first-time freshmen. The University overall all retention averages fluctuate hardly at all over the period 2003 – 2007 (46.2% - 48%). The COE rates during this period were 42.1% - 82.3%.
Most of our enrollment comprises transfer students. Our first-time transfer student graduation rates in each category are high, and with few exceptions, have been increasing each year. Looking at the three-year graduation rates for new undergraduate transfers in the 2010 cohort, we find that ChAD graduates 67.9% - 77.8% of our students. The university overall average for that same cohort is 53.7% and the COE rate is 71.1%. This pattern of above-average graduation rates in ChAD has been consistent across years.

Like most other SJSU departments, many of our students are self-supporting; they work significant numbers of hours. In addition to working, many of our students are older and have children. As a result of these factors, many students are often unable to complete 15, 12, or even 9 units per semester. We believe that a far better measure of a successful department graduation rate is whether students who joined the program eventually graduated, not whether they graduated in six years.

4b. Headcount in sections
With the exception of the junior level writing course (ChAD 100W) and the senior seminar with section enrollments of 25, virtually all undergraduate ChAD courses have an enrollment cap of 30 students. Data Exhibit 2 shows our average headcount per section has been steadily increasing: 29.3 in fall 2009; 33.7 in fall 13. The University average headcount per section was 25.1 fall 2009; 26.8 fall 2013. The COE average headcount per section was 18.8 fall 2009; 20.7 fall 2013. We consistently serve considerably more students per course section than is the case for our colleagues either within the COE or across the university.

In response to a university administration initiative, we reorganized one course to accommodate large enrollments. In the fall of 2013 at the request of our dean, we converted nine sections of ChAD 60 (Introduction to Child Development; GE Area E) to three large sections of 120 students each. We were able to efficiently preserve the service learning and other course requirement in these three sections. At this time, the department is not in a position to open more large sections because we do not have the capacity to manage more of these courses, which require significant planning and support.

The enrollment cap in most of our MA courses is the total number of students enrolled in the program. Our MA is a ‘boutique’ program deliberately designed to have about 20 active students at any one time taking two ChAD courses per semester on target to graduate in two years.

The ChAD chair maintains a comprehensive detailed record drawn from PeopleSoft data showing the actual enrollment in courses, number of sections, and FTE/course based on the amount of instructional time assigned to our faculty that we know staffed the courses. As an example see Appendix C which presents the data for fall 2013. Based on these data, our fall 2013: SFR = 31.6, FTES =504.4; FTEF = 15.98. These values are noticeably inconsistent with the data for fall 2013 shown in the university-generated data presented in Exhibits 3.a, 3.b, and 3.c. We would welcome the opportunity to compare our data with that reported by the university.

4c. FTES, Induced Load Matrix
As described in a number of areas above (e.g., 2.b and 4.b), the clear trend in the ChAD program FTES is an unrelenting increase in enrollments in our program both in terms of the number of majors we serve and the numbers of students enrolled in our service course offerings.

The total number of ChAD majors is a fast-moving target for our department. In spring 2013 there were 617 students who had declared ChAD as their major. Despite having graduated a large number of students in spring 13 and some in the summer of that year, by fall 2013 we served 726 majors. In addition to the students accepted into the major by the university each semester, in the last few semesters we have been seeing increasingly large numbers of students walking into the department office to change their majors to ChAD. During one two-week period (5/28/13 – 6/7/13) in spring 2013, 24 students requested and were approved for a change of major to ChAD. During the fall 2013 semester, there were 57 such changes of major.

As noted in 1.c above, the enrollment in ChAD service courses is substantial. In fall 2013, for example, we offered 30 sections of these GE courses with a total actual enrollment of 1239.5 students (refer to Appendix C), some of whom are our own majors, particularly in the courses required for the major (ChAD 60, 67 or 70, 100W). The enrollment in service courses is approximately 50% of our total enrollment. See Data Exhibit 4 for a list of majors enrolled in our classes fall semesters 2009 – 2013.

At this time, we do not have the capacity to track the number of students in our courses who are ChAD minors, who are graduating, or who are new students.

4d. FTEF, SFR, Percentage T/TT Faculty
As described in 4.b above, our most recent (fall 2013) FTEF and SFR numbers, based on data collected by the department, are SFR = 31.6; FETF = 15.98. These values are noticeably inconsistent with the data for fall 2013 shown in the university-generated data presented in Data Exhibit 3.a and 3.c. Whether examining department records or university-generated statistics, the ChAD trend is for increasing SFRs and FTEFs. These trends are clearly seen when examining the data in university exhibits; our SFR is trending up (22.7 for fall 2009; 25.8 for fall 2013) as is our FTEF to handle sharply increased course offerings (13.7 in fall 2009; 18.8 in fall 2013).

A very large percentage of our courses is taught by part time faculty. In fall 2013, our most recent semester, only 32.5% of our sections were taught by tenure-track faculty. There are three primary reasons we have such a high percentage of part time faculty:

1) we have experienced significant growth in the number of ChAD majors and in the demand for our service courses;

2) our faculty members have a well-established history of service to the college and university. Because of that, they are called upon to take leadership roles on campus. In the years since our most recent review, one full professor was recruited to serve as the associate dean for our college. Another full professor was recruited almost more than three years ago to serve as the interim director of the Center for Faculty Development, a position she continues to hold. Most semesters, our tenure-track faculty have release time awarded by the university to conduct research, complete
university tasks, or to chair university committees. In fall 2013, for example, two faculty each held .2 release-time assignments; in fall 2012, four each held .2 such assignments; and

3) the enrollment in our major and the demand for our GE courses has increased dramatically during a period when we have lost faculty (including one who began her Faculty Early Retirement Program, or FERP, participation three years ago); despite the increases of students in our courses and major and loss of tenure-track faculty, we have only been able to hire three tenure track faculty in recent years.

5. PROGRAM RESOURCES

5a. Faculty
Currently, ChAD has nine tenure/tenure-track faculty members, of which one is on long-term ‘loan’ as the interim director of the Center for Faculty Development. Three faculty are assistant professors, three are associate professors, and three are full professors. One faculty member is in her third year of the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP), and her position will terminate in two years. The entire tenure-track faculty hold doctoral degrees relevant to the discipline. (See faculty vita in Appendix E) In fall 2013, we were assisted by 22 lecturers. Of those, 11 hold Ph.D.’s in a discipline relevant to ChAD and all the others are either ABDs or hold appropriate masters degrees. The lecturers taught an average of fifty percent time (range=.2 – 1.0). A persistent challenge for the department is finding a sufficient number of qualified lecturers to meet our FTES needs.

5b. Support staff
The faculty is supported by one full-time administrative assistant and various part-time student helpers primarily funded by Work Study funds. One administrative assistant is insufficient to meet the demands of a department with a growth trajectory like ours. While Work Study support has been generous, the natural turnover as students graduate; time invested in training for and learning office routines; and the limits on the types of assistance the students can perform does not substitute for an additional regularly-employed office staff member. Our need for additional support staff is urgent.

5c. Facilities
The department ‘controls’ one classroom rich in instructional enhancements (e.g., smart board, LCD projectors, rolling chairs and tables, huddle boards) and uses many other similar classrooms in the building. The ChAD faculty and students have embraced the use of technology in the classroom and have benefitted from the aggressive plan our Dean is implementing to ‘modernize’ all classrooms under the control of the COE. We have recently been assigned more faculty offices to house the large number of lecturers who teach with us. Access to classrooms that are controlled by the university and are appropriate for our large-enrollment sections is an on-going problem.

The department operates a child development lab preschool. The program for toddlers is housed in Sweeney Hall room 117-O and the preschool facility is in Central Classroom Building 118. Our two lab instructors maintain their faculty offices in these two facilities. The income from fees paid by parents is sufficient to enhance and improve these spaces as appropriate. We are currently in conversation with a play area consultant who will assist us in the design and upgrade of our preschool outdoor area.
6. OTHER STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND CHALLENGES

- High Impact Practices in Curriculum
  The department has consistently had a commitment to enhancing high impact practices in our curriculum. We have a significant number of students (fall 2013 = 563) enrolled in courses that require service learning. In the spring of 2013, the ChAD faculty successfully applied for a student success grant designed to infuse additional HIPs across the curriculum, particularly in the new pathway to the degree. Currently five course coordinators are engaged in that work on behalf of the entire department. We anticipate that this work will lead primarily to the infusion of HIPs in all three of our practica and all of the courses developed for the new pathway through the major.

- External funding
  In the summer of 2013, the department launched a special sessions BA program. The program is specifically designed to assist working early childhood educators to complete all their upper division coursework for the BA in ChAD. This group takes classes year ‘round, one or two classes at a time in ten or twelve-week ‘semesters’ that are scheduled off campus on late afternoons to accommodate work schedules. Funding has been secured by the department to fully support these students’ fees and textbook expenses, all of which are paid by a third party.

7. DEPARTMENT ACTION PLAN

Our highest priority for the immediate future is hiring additional faculty and an additional permanent clerical person to support our department administrative assistant. Our dean is well aware of the importance of both of these priorities. The resources to move on this agenda are almost entirely dependent on the university administration.

As a consequence of preparing our program review document, it has become clear that we need to have a formal schedule and a specific work plan for conducting further assessments of our SLOs. As shown in 3.d above, we have created that structure and believe that we will have little difficulty in adhering to the schedule.

For some time, we have been discussing possible approaches to assessing our SLOs multiple times across different courses (currently each SLO is formally assessed once in the curriculum). We recognize that aspects of all seven SLOs are part of the student experience in each of our required courses, and we know that review of more data points provides a stronger foundation for making changes to the curriculum. While we will continue to try to find ways to expand the complexity of our assessment, we know we will be limited in what is possible to achieve in making large changes due to the many competing demands made on faculty time. Currently, in addition to teaching, research, and service, tenure/tenure-track faculty coordinate two-five courses some of which have as many as nine sections.

Except for the substantial effort involved in rolling out our new pathway in the major (see 2a.2 above) beginning in fall 2014, a process that will take several years to fully implement, we do not anticipate making any additional significant curricular changes over the next five years. We will, as has been our
practice for more than a decade, regularly make adjustments to courses based on our review of our assessment data and based on the intensive faculty reviews that we conduct approximately every four years in all of our courses.

8. APPENDICES

A. Required Data Elements
   From www.iea.sjsu.edu/Courses/default.cfm#Prefix, select your program
   Exhibit 1 Number of Course Sections
   Exhibit 2 Average Headcount per Section
   Exhibit 3 Student to Faculty Ratio
   Exhibit 4 Induced Course Load Matrix

   From www.iea.sjsu.edu/Assessment/ProgRev/default.cfm, select your program
   Exhibit 5 Applied, Admitted, Enrolled
   Exhibit 6 Enrollment by Class Level with FTES
   Exhibit 7 Enrollment by Major and Concentration
   Exhibit 8 Degrees Awarded

   From www.iea.sjsu.edu/RetnGrad/default.cfm#Prefix, select your program
   Exhibit 9 First Year Retention Rates
   Exhibit 10 Graduation Rates

   Also calculate T/TT instructional faculty percentage. From www.iea.sjsu.edu/Faculty/default.cfm#Dept, select your department. Under “Instructional Faculty – FTEF”, select “by Tenure Status”. Add together “Tenured” and “Probationary” numbers, and divide sum by “Total”. >

B. Assessment rubrics
C. ChAD enrollment/staffing data fall 2013
D. ChAD exit survey
E. ChAD faculty vita