

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17 Due to your dean by the college deadline; due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by Sept. 1

Degree Program Name: BA/BS Speech Language Pathology **Contact Name and Email:** Vicki Hammen, Prog Director, vicki.hammen@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the normal aspects of speech production.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2.1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of phonetics. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Transcription portion of final exam 2) CD 211 	<p>A score of 75% or better will be achieved by at least 70% of the students.</p>	<p>Outcome 2.1 was not achieved. It was found that 68% of the class (24 out of 35 students) earned a score of 75% or better on the final exam phonetic transcription</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Lee Ann Luttrell, course instructor 2) Report disseminated to faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting
<p>Student Learning Outcome 7: The student will apply legal and ethical practice guidelines for speech-language pathology clinical practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 7.1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of laws governing the practice of speech-language pathology 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Performance on the Code of Ethics Quiz following unit over ASHA Code of Ethics and Practicing Laws 2) CD 400 	<p>A score of 75% or better will be achieved by at least 70% of the students</p>	<p>96% of the class (26/27 students) scored 87% or higher indicating the target was achieved.</p> <p>The class average was 13.6 of 15 points or a grade of 91% indicating the target was achieved.</p> <p>Breakdown of results: 10 of the students scored 15/15; 10 students scored</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Amanda Solesky clinic coordinator, and overall instructor for CD 400 2) Report disseminated to faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting

			14/15; 6 students scored 13/15; 1 student scored 10/15	
<p>Student Learning Outcome 1: The student will demonstrate foundational knowledge required for the evaluation and treatment of communication disorders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2: Students will demonstrate knowledge of biological sciences 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Performance on basic knowledge questions about biologic terminology on the first exam of CD 212 covering basic elements of anatomy 2) CD 212 	<p>A score of 70% will be achieved by at least 70% of the students</p>	<p>Thirty-seven students who were all communication disorders majors completed this assessment. Analysis reveals that 70.2% of the class (26 out of 37 students) earned 70% or higher on this assessment. The data provided indicates that criteria level associated with the outcome was met.</p> <p>The average grade on this assessment was 77% and scores ranged from 20% to 100%. Eleven students out of 37 did not meet the criteria level of 70% accuracy and 10 out of the 37 obtained scores of 90% or above.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Mark Stimley, Course instructor 2) Report disseminated to faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

1)

SLO #2 Objective 2.1 Reflection: The results were close to being achieved; however the results indicate a possible need for more instruction dedicated to transcription exercises. The instructor introduced an optional phonetics lab for students to improve and hone their phonetic transcription skills. Students could meet once a week with either the instructor or a GA and extra credit points were given for attendance of 10, thirty minute sessions throughout the semester. It is felt the student outcomes and transcription proficiency could improve if the phonetics lab was mandatory for CD 211. Indirect assessment indicated that not all students participated in the optional lab.

The results indicate that the target would have been met if two more students had transcribed word skills at 75% accuracy. Sixty percent of the class achieved 89% or better on the transcribing skill on the final exam. A contributing factor to not meeting the target criteria may be that the final transcription task was cumulative and included all phonetic symbols learned over the course of the semester. The course is structured so that the students are introduced to a certain group of phonetic symbols based on their production components (place, manner, voicing or vowels). As the course progresses the transcription exercises and tests/quizzes cover only a specific set of phonetic symbols, then the final exam is cumulative to include knowledge of all phonetic symbols and how they are transcribed. The instructor plans to cover the all the phonetics symbols earlier in the course so there is more time for transcription practice utilizing all phonetic symbols. Additionally, it would be a good idea to implement the current optional lab time to a mandatory phonetics lab. We are in the process of submitting this request through Curriculog.

SLO #7 Objective 7.1 Reflection: Although the target was met the instructor plans to use the results to provide more detailed information and samples for the topic. A review was provided to the students prior to the quiz and the students knew they would take a quiz on the topic. After the last assessment the quiz was revised to correct a misleading question. Scores improved indicating this action helped the class.

Objective #3 Reflection: Although 70% of the students met the criteria target on this assessment, next year, the instructor plans to attempt to increase the proportion of students who pass this early in the semester assessment by administering at least one quiz over the material before the formal assessment instrumental is administered. Contextual background and follow-up observation reveals that all of the students who did not meet criteria on this assessment that occurred three weeks into the semester had continued difficulty with material in this class to the point that none of them passed the class with a grade of D+ or higher. Well over half of the students who did not meet this assessment's criteria decided to pursue a different major by the end of the semester. All students who had difficulty with this assessment also had had significant difficulty with at least one other sophomore level class in the major.

2)

The optional 'study sessions' need to be mandatory and included as part of the course requirements for CD 211 and 212. As noted above we have initiated the Curriculog process for adding these lab sections to the courses.

3)

We had intended to survey the students at the end of CD 400 to determine if the new CD 398 experience positively impacted their performance in the practicum. However, we determined that waiting nearly 4 months after CD 398 with the intervening clinical practicum and supervision provided in CD400 would make it difficult to evaluate the contribution of CD 398. So in this next cycle we will survey the students after the first 3 weeks of their clinical practicum in CD 400. Rather than assessing a new objective, the assessment in CD 212 should be conducted and analyzed the next time this class is offered (Spring 2018) to determine if the addition of at least one quiz covering the material improved the proportion of students who pass the assessment.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BS Speech Language Pathology Date: 10.25.2017

	Level 0 - Undeveloped	Level 1 - Developing	Level 2 - Mature	Level 3 - Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the

				<p>associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <i>Is 70% too low?</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific</p>

				evidence of what students know/can do. <input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to

	about previous results or plans.	connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 - Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 - Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 - Exemplary

Comments:

Thank you for completing your 2016-17 Student Learning Report!

The rubric appended to the report identifies the particular criteria via which I assessed it. So I will only note here that I still hope to see a new curriculum map for the program (the one I have is dated 2012 and is incomplete). And I was particularly impressed with the in-depth analysis you provided in regard to objective #3, since knowing the ramifications of students not meeting the benchmark is crucial to improving their performance but also to retaining them in the major. In last year's report, I believe you indicated that you were modifying the clinical program. Is it too soon for there to be evidence of the impact?

Because we are gearing up for the Higher Learning Commission (which will visit ISU in 2020 or 2021 as part of the accreditation reaffirmation process), it is particularly important for us to be able to provide evidence that we are systematically assessing our curricular and co-curricular programs; using the information we derive from that process to develop actionable plans for improvement in student

learning; and documenting the improvements that result. You already are doing so—just keep doing it in your 2018 Student Learning Summary Report!

Finally, you should be aware that by fall 2018, all undergraduate programs are expected to include career readiness outcomes or activities. In your next Student Learning Summary Report, be sure to reference your efforts to help prepare students for their careers.