Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19   *Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.*

Unit/Program Name: __BS/BA Speech Language Pathology__   **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** __Vicki Hammen vicki.hammen@indstate.edu__

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? *Can expand on this in Part 2.*
1. 1.1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of Linguistics LO#1.1 maps to the Council for Clinical Certification [CFCC] of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association's Standard IV-B: The applicant must have demonstrated knowledge of basic human communication and swallowing processes, including the appropriate biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases. The applicant must have demonstrated the ability to integrate information pertaining to normal and abnormal human development across the life span.	1) Students completed an analysis of a language sample. 2) CD 213 Language Development	75% of the students will receive a score of 80% or above.	94.4% of the students earned a score of 80% or better. The majority of the class, 33 out of 36 students, earned a grade of 90% or above on the assignment.	In response to feedback from last year's report, learning outcomes were linked to standards required for national certification. Although a master's degree is required to obtain national certification from the CFCC, some areas of knowledge are expected to have been acquired at the undergraduate level. It does not appear that this assignment is an effective tool to determine areas of improvement as nearly all students performed well. The faculty have determined that comparing students' performance on a task in a later course in the major with a grade earned in a foundational course, such as CD 213, could better identify areas needing improvement.

2. 3.1: Students will describe normal process of language acquisition and 3.2: Students will use appropriate linguistic terminology to describe components of language. LO#3.1 maps to the Council for Clinical Certification [CFCC] of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association's Standard IV-B: The applicant must have demonstrated knowledge of basic human communication and swallowing processes, including the appropriate biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases. The applicant must have demonstrated the ability to integrate information pertaining to normal and abnormal human development across the life span.	1) The average of scores on Exam #1 & #2 2) CD 213	75% of the students will receive a score of 80% or above. **Students are required to earn a grade of 'C' in all required courses in the major. Although 75% is the lowest score that can earn a 'C' a higher criterion, 80% was chosen because early success in course in the major may facilitate retention.	72.3% of the students earned a score of 80% or above. Twenty-six students out of 37 met the criterion.	The use of averaged, overall test scores may not be sufficiently detailed to indicate content areas in which students are excelling or need more support.
3. 4.1 Students will describe the characteristics of articulation disorders. LO#4.1 maps to the Council for Clinical Certification [CFCC] of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association's Standard IV-B: Standard IV-C: The applicant must have demonstrated knowledge of communication and swallowing disorders and differences, including the appropriate etiologies, characteristics, anatomical/physiological,	1) The average of scores on Exam #1 & #2 2) CD 225 3) Exit Survey, Question #7: The Communication Disorders program's faculty attempted to related course content to clinical practice	1) 75% of the students will receive a score of 80% or above. 3) 85% of respondents will Agree or Strongly Agree	1) 87.9% of the students earned a score of 80% or above. Twenty-nine students out of 33 met the criterion. 3) We had a 37% response rate [5/13] for the exit survey. 80% or 4 out of 5 respondents chose Agree or Strongly Agree	1) As noted with LO #3.1, The use of averaged, overall test scores may not be sufficiently detailed to indicate content areas in which students are excelling or need more support. However, a new faculty member taught these courses, so it was their first efforts at assessing student outcomes within their courses.

				3) This was our first attempt to collect data from an exit survey of our undergraduate students so the questions were broad in scope. In addition, the response rate for the survey was low. The question on the survey that would be associated with this LO was not specific to this course.
acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates in the following areas: articulation; [and others]				

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.*

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table
a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities
Use Blue Reports to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you):
1) Cohort Sizes
   According to Blue Reports, our cohort sizes for Original Department over the past several years has been 23-25 students. However, that number captures only the students that declare the Speech-Language Pathology major when entering ISU as a freshman. Typically, we acquire a number of students as transfers into our major. For example, we currently have 28 students taking the first courses in our major.
2) Year-to-Year Retention
   Our retention rate in Blue Reports for 2018 FTFR by latest department and college is 97.67%. Our retention rate has increased by 5.31% from the 2017. We have steadily increased our retention rate over the past several years from a low of 77.27% for Fall 2016. The retention rate for original department and college in Blue Reports for 2018 FTFR is 86.97%, which is a 1.77% increase over 2017.
   Regardless of which metric is used, original or latest department, our retention rate is minimally 20% higher than the rate for the university as a whole.

3) 5-Year Graduation Rate
   Blue Reports does not provide a 5-year graduation rate. The reported 4-year graduation rate by original department provided in Blue Reports is 44.00% as compared to ISU's rate of 28.29%. This rate was based on a cohort size of 23. When this data was shared with the program faculty concerns about accuracy were raised since there were only 13 students in our senior classes. Since our major is

structured as a cohort model, all students in the major should be in the same set of classes. Therefore, we investigated further and by drilling down and filtering in Blue Reports we were able to determine that 10 of the 23 students included in the 2015 cohort have not been enrolled at ISU for the past two years. Some students did not return after the 2015-16 academic, or their freshman, year. When we calculated the graduation rate for the students that were matriculating through ISU since declaring the major in 2015 it was 85%, or 11 out of 13 students.

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

1) We examined the DFDr rate for one of our 'gateway' courses, CD 213 as we have experienced a fairly high drop rate for that course in the past. The DFDr rate for this course has dropped from 25% in 2016 to 8.11% in 2018. Several factors have contributed to improved student success in this course. First, the instructor has changed and several new approaches were implemented. The instructor provided study guides for all of the exams and took time to answer questions about it in class. Students receiving low score on exams were allowed to remediate the exams; nearly all students took advantage of the opportunity. There was an experiential, hands-on assignment that was presented in two phases. Students were given substantial feedback and support after the first part so they could improve their grades on the second part.

2) A couple years ago, we added 'lab' or 'study' sessions for two of our courses, CD 211: Phonetics and CD 212: Anatomy and Physiology that occur in the first year of courses in the major. Our intention was to provide extra assistance in these courses to improve student success and decrease the DFDr rate. Despite offering extra credit for attendance, it did not appear that the students in most need of the sessions actually attended.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

We have high retention and graduation rates as compared to the university as a whole; however, we can continue to work to improve our DFDr rates for key courses in the major. For on-time graduation, it is important to minimize the re-taking of courses to meet the requirement of a 'C' grade in all major courses.

We continue to have challenges with the faculty mentor program. It has been beneficial for academic advising to be provided by the professional staff in Educational Student Services, but we are finding that students are not seeking out their mentors or attending meetings mentors are holding. They appear to be asking the advisors questions that would be addressed more effectively by a mentor. In the next year we intend to survey our students about the mentoring experience. We will ask them to identify which faculty member has been assigned as their mentor, what type of information they could obtain from their mentor, as well as asking about how they would like to connect with their mentor.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)
Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. The template was sent to you with this form via email.

We began to incorporate Career Readiness activities when the 2016 FTFR cohort started in the major. At this point all students that continued in the major are on track to complete all the Career Readiness Competencies by the end of Spring 2020, or their targeted graduation semester. A tracking system was developed so when activities were completed in an academic course a student's progress towards achieving the competencies could be easily updated.

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

1) **the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness** (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)

    a. We have observed that the major attracts students that are typically high achieving and persistent so often students are achieving the expectation levels set for our outcomes. We discussed this year that it is important not to demonstrate that learning is improving over the years, but that students are retaining the information learned in courses and applying it in subsequent courses. Therefore, we want to review our assessment plan and identify comparative opportunities to assess. For example, this year over 90% of the students were able to accurately complete a language sample. We need to identify where they demonstrate that skill later on in the program, for example, in a clinical practicum course in the spring of their senior year. If they have retained knowledge and skill they should be able to perform that task independently in the later course. The retention of anatomy and physiology can be assess across two spring course taken one year apart.

    b. At this point students are achieving all career readiness competencies. However, we do not know how career readiness competencies factor into success at achieving the undergraduate degree and post-graduation career choices/options. Revising our exit survey will allow us to ask questions that will address the relationship between career readiness and post-graduation plans.

2) **findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**

    a. Develop a method to assess retention of knowledge and skills across courses in the curriculum

    b. Create a survey to determine students' knowledge of and preferred ways to interact with faculty mentors.

    c. Re-examine approaches to address underperforming students in gateway courses, CD 211 and 212.

    d. Revise exit survey to obtain more specific responses that map more directly to learning outcomes and career readiness competencies.

3) **what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**

    a. We will address Learning Outcomes #2 & 4 during the coming year. There are multiple subparts to each outcome that will allow nearly all faculty to participate in collecting and analyzing data. These two outcomes will be the focus of the exit survey

    b. In February 2020 our undergraduate program will undergo a site visit as part of the external review process. By having the visit relatively early in the semester if there are any areas that we should examine based on the report we can incorporate them into our assessment plan.

4) **how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

    a. A link to the Assessment Plan and Results on the Assessment webpage will be include when the program's webpage is converted to the new template. Hopefully, this will occur in next semester.

    b. The department has a bi-annual meeting of the Advisory Council which will provide an opportunity to share the Assessment results and obtain feedback.

Please prepare this report as a Word document. *Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college's assessment site in Blackboard.*

Dear Vicki,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: BS/BA Speech Language Pathology	Overall Rating: Mature (2.94/3.00)
Strengths	**Recommendations**
- Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measureable. - Assessment methods and courses are clearly noted. A diverse array of student performances are captured for each outcome, some by direct and some by indirect measures, giving faculty an opportunity to triangulate assumptions about performance. - Clear information about expected and actual student outcomes. - Excellent discussion of findings and how the assessment plan can be improved to give better insight into whether students are retaining and applying information throughout the program. Clear and achievable action items to address concerns. - Great opportunity to incorporate external review feedback into overall evaluation. - Clear information provided about how findings are used and shared, including information about faculty participation in the process.	Great insight into the limitations of using an exam score as the evaluation of student learning. Exams can definitely be used for evaluation of student learning outcomes. It's helpful to create an exam key that indicates which questions align with which outcomes, then take only the score from those aligned questions as indicators for corresponding outcomes.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.) Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.	No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. *(for the most part)* Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome. Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures. *(in reference to test average scores only)* Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.

	tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).			
Analysis & Results	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals. Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with little description of analysis.	No data is being collected. No results are provided.
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice. A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.	Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.	No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)
Overall Rating	□ Exemplary	□ Mature	□ Developing	□ Undeveloped