

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

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? 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>1. Students will describe the characteristics of articulation disorders.</p>	<p>Grades on Exam I and Exam II in CD 225-001 and CD 225-002</p>	<p>75% score on the exams will be achieved by at least 70% of the students based on the average of the Exam I and Exam II grades</p>	<p>CD 225-001: 12/20 (60%) students achieved 75% or higher on the average of the 2 exams. The class average of the 2 exams was 78%. CD 225-002: 17/21 (80%) students achieved 75% or higher on the average of the 2 exams. The class average of the 2 exams was 81%.</p>	<p>1) Amanda Solesky, course instructor 2) Report disseminated to faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting</p>
<p>2. The student will identify and describe appropriate assessments and interventions for persons with communication disorders, including modifications necessary due to developmental, physical, linguistic, and cultural considerations.</p>	<p>Rating on American Speech-Language-Hearing Association [ASHA] Content Standards 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 5.1, 5.5 in CD 400</p>	<p>75% of students will be rated as "Meets" on the above standards</p>	<p>100% (16/16) of students were rated as 'Meets' on all of the above standards in the fall 2015. These students were completing their second clinical practicum.</p>	<p>1) Amanda Solesky clinic coordinator, and overall instructor for CD 400 2) Report disseminated to faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting</p>
<p>3. Students will demonstrate knowledge of physical sciences</p>	<p>Grades on Exam I in CD 224.</p>	<p>75% score on the exams will be achieved by at least 70% of the students</p>	<p>83% [25/29] students achieved a score of 75% or greater on the exam</p>	<p>1) Vicki Hammen, Course instructor 2) Report disseminated to faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting</p>

* 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)

Objective #1 Reflection: Looking at the overall class average the objective was achieved. However individually the objective was not achieved for section 001 as only 60% of students achieved 75% or higher. In both course sections the class average was lower on the second exam. CD 225-001 (81% exam I, 75% exam II) and CD 225-002 (82% exam I, 80% exam II). Exam I included some review of concepts from CD 211 phonology and Exam II is more new information and assessment. In future classes this information can be used to make changes to spend more time on development and assessment techniques.

Objective #2 Reflection:

We compared the data from CD 399 spring of 2015, which is the course the students take to complete their first clinical experience. The data showed that 5 students did not meet all of the above standards during their first clinical practicum. All but student 5 went on to meet these standards in fall 2015.

Student 1 = 4.6, 5.1 (Interpretation of eval info; Development of goals)

Student 2 = 5.1 (Development of goals)

Student 3 = 4.6, 5.1 (Interpretation of eval info; Development of goals)

Student 4 = 4.6, 5.5 (Interpretation of eval info; Modifies plan)

*Student 5 = 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 5.5 (Admin of tests; Interpretation of eval info; Report Writing; Modifies plan). *This student graduated at end of spring 2015 and did not take an additional clinical practicum.*

Showing that not all students meet standards in their first clinical practicum gives evidence that additional clinical experience is valuable in student's clinical growth. The undergraduate clinical program is undergoing modification. Beginning fall 2016 the undergrad clinical practicum will begin with each undergrad student paired with a graduate clinician for one client experience. The undergrads will also attend a new course CD 398 which will allow further education, practice, and experience with clinical assessment and treatment. Students will enter into CD 400 with greater knowledge to meet the ASHA standards and program objectives.

Objective #3 Reflection: Beginning in Spring 2015 CD 224: Speech and Hearing Sciences was shifted from Spring of the 'sophomore' year in the major to the third or 'junior' year. When comparing the data from Spring 2013 to Spring 2016 there was a 16% increase in the percentage of students that achieved a grade of 75% or better on Exam #1. Since this course is very challenging as it involves principles of physics and acoustics it was thought that if it were placed later in the major when students have had more exposure to disorders of communication and were more mature students they would be better equipped to face the challenges of this course. The data from both 2015 and not in 2016 support the benefits of moving the course.

2)

The change in the clinical sequence for undergraduates was explained in section #1. This will be implemented in Fall 2016. No changes to CD 224 or 225 are indicated by the data.

3)

During the current year we did not have an indirect measure for any of our objectives. Since the intent of changing the clinical sequence is to provide more guided initial experiences so that the students have more confidence in their skills when entering CD 400 we will have the students complete a survey at the end of CD 400 to obtain their insights into how CD 398 impacted their experience in CD 400. In the coming year we will be obtaining data for the following objectives:

Student Learning Outcomes	Courses/Educational Strategies (indicate if the outcome is introduced [I], practiced [P], or reinforced [R])	Assessment Method(s)	Source(s) of Assessment	Time of Data Collection	Person(s) Responsible
1.1 Students will demonstrate knowledge of linguistics	CD 213 [I], LING 210 [I] or CD 303 [I]; CD 213 [I]	MLU quiz grade	CD 213	Fall 2016	Course instructor: Luttrell
4.2 Students will describe the characteristics of language disorders.	CD 226 [I]	Exam #2 score	CD 226	Fall 2016	Course instructor: Luttrell
3.3 Students will complete a speech and/or language assessment.	CD 213 [I], CD 225 [I], CD 226 [I], CD 311 [R], CD 400 [P]	Phase I report grade	CD 400	Spring 2017	Clinical supervisors and Course instructor: Solesky
7.2 Students will apply appropriate legal and ethical practices.	CD 400 [P]	Content standard 6.4 rating	CD 400	Beginning Spring 2017 then every three years	Clinical supervisors and Course instructor: Solesky

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

Degree Program: BS in Speech-Language Pathology Date: 7.14.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> An Outcomes Library was provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered. Many are. <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 listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and 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 associated learning outcomes.

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <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. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what

				<p>students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve.</p> <p><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.</p>
<p>4. Engagement & Improvement</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly connect to the results or are too vague to implement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the</p>

		about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. Faculty do.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.
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
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. Learning Outcomes

You assessed three outcomes this past academic year. All are student-centered, and two are specific and measurable. The third (“Students will demonstrate knowledge of physical sciences”) is quite broad. Can it be refocused on the principles of physics or acoustics in particular? You also could clarify how students will demonstrate that knowledge. Will they, for example, explain the principles of acoustics as they affect individuals with communication disorders? (You get the idea.) Several of the outcomes in the outcomes library also call on students to “demonstrate knowledge” and should be revisited as well. Last, the program’s curriculum map is incomplete: It does not reference three outcomes at all, and it suggests that several others are introduced but never practiced or reinforced. Please complete the map before your next Student Learning Summary Report is due. You’ll find an Excel template at <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>.

2. Measures & Performance Goals

I would like to see more information that demonstrates the relationship of the measures to the outcomes. What exactly do the exams and ASHA rating measure? Are the exam questions coded so that you know which outcome they address, and so that you and your students can tell at a glance which concepts or skills they need to work on? I assume that as is the case in Illinois (where I’m from), licensure occurs at the graduate level, and thus there are no state pass rates to report? Providing me with access to the rubrics/keys also would help me verify the connection between the outcomes and measures. The performance goals look fine, particularly in context with the actual results. And thanks for identifying an appropriate indirect measure.

3. Results

Thank you for providing details about the results. When results by section are combined, students achieved all standards (though they just barely met outcome 1). This is another good reason to code exam questions—i.e., so that you know exactly what needs more emphasis in the course.

4. Engagement & Improvement

Two faculty members were responsible for collecting and analyzing this year’s results, which were shared with the faculty as a whole. Do you involve students or external stakeholders in conversations about student learning? In Part Two of the report, you provide details that demonstrate the analysis and reflection that occurs, the improvements in learning that have resulted from your efforts, and your plans for future improvements. Question: Will placing more emphasis on development and assessment techniques help ameliorate the weaknesses in students’ achievement of the first outcome? (I’m not seeing the connection.)

I look forward to learning more about your assessment program from next year’s report!