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: <u>MS in Speech-Language Pathology</u>   **Contact Name and Email** <u>Vicki Hammen, Prog Director; vicki.hammen@indstate.edu</u>
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

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.	b. (1) What method(s)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?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Apply theory and anatomical, neurologic, acoustic, and physiologic bases of speech, language, and hearing sciences to the diagnosis and remediation of communication disorders GSLO: **Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.**	1) Praxis II Exam in Speech-Language Pathology score as required by the CAA; Exam typically taken during CD 697 or 598 Spring 2016 2) CD 611, 616, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 625, 627, 696, 697, 520, 598	80% of students will pass the Praxis II on the first attempt	91% [20/22]of the students passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt	1)Vicki Hammen, Graduate Program Director; 2) Portions of Council on Academic Accreditation [CAA]of the American Speech –Language-Hearing Association [ASHA]report disseminated to faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting
2. Solve clinical and instructional problems by forming hypotheses and systematically analyzing and interpreting data to make informed decisions GSLO: **Students achieve mastery of the skills**	1) Program completion rates as required by the CAA; 2) CD 620, 618. 616, 622, 627, 696, 598, 697	Students must demonstrate these skills in order to complete the program. 80% of students will complete the program in six semesters given an undergraduate degree in Speech-Language Pathology or equivalent, or following completion of the 'leveling' courses.	100% of students will complete the program within the stated timeframe of six semesters.	1)Vicki Hammen, Graduate Program Director; 2) Portions of Council on Academic Accreditation [CAA]of the American Speech –Language-Hearing Association [ASHA]report disseminated to faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting

(including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.				
3. Communicate effectively with clients, caregivers, spouses, and professionals to obtain and share information GSLO: **Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.**	1) Focus group meeting with speech-language pathologists in the Vigo County School Corporation and Covered Bridge Special Educational Cooperative; Employment rates within 6 months of graduation as required by the CAA 2) CD 696, 598, 697	80% of graduates will be employed in the profession within six months of program completion	100% of graduates are employed in the field within six months of program completion; Findings from the focus group indicated students need to be in the school setting longer which means getting into the setting sooner in the semester	1)Amanda Solesky, Clinic Coordinator, Cathleen Thomas, CD 598 instructor, Vicki Hammen, Graduate Program Director and CD 697 instructor; 2) Portions of Council on Academic Accreditation [CAA]of the American Speech –Language-Hearing Association [ASHA]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.

Objective #1 Reflection: Although the Praxis II results met the criterion level, having several students fail to receive a passing score on the first attempt at the exam is not ideal. In both cases the students were not among the top students in the graduate cohort. We are reviewing our admissions criteria to ensure that selected students are capable of fully participating in the graduate program in order to improve outcomes in the future. Also, Hammen has added Praxis II type questions to exams so students become more acclimated to the type and scope of questions that will be asked on the exam. It is hoped that these experiences will better prepare students for this national exam.

Objective #2: In the current cohort, all students are projected to be ending on time. We will continue to provide the key courses in the graduate program once per semester in the order specified in the program materials. Case study projects that require clinical and academic problem solving are currently included in CD 620 and 627 as a major portion of the course grade. These activities appear to be assisting students to integrate knowledge as it relates to clinical issues; however, specific data on this have not been collected. Remediation plans have been incorporated into all courses so students that are performing below expected levels have an opportunity to improve their performance to meet expectations to ensure on-time program completion. We have noted that there are some lower incidence and culturally and linguistically diverse clinical populations that the students are not able to gain direct experience with due to the inherent variations in clinical population that occur with our on-campus clinic and in the community placements the students participate in during their school and hospital practicum courses [CD 696, 598,697]. Fortunately, this spring ASHA and the Council for Clinical Certification [CFCC] approved the use of up to 75 hours of alternative clinical experiences towards the required 400 clinical clock hours for certification. We plan on initiating use of SimuCase during Summer 2016 and the 2016-17 academic year that will allow students access to clinical problem-solving activities for low incidence and culturally and linguistically diverse populations.

Objective #3: We do not have any concerns regarding the employment rates. In order to prepare students to seek employment post-graduation they complete a 10-week, full time school practicum course in addition to a medical placement. This spring the school practicum course instructor/liaison met with a group of VCSC and Covered Bridge speech-language pathologists to discuss any concerns they had about the experience. Several concerns were noted. First the students currently take an intensive course in public school law and methods [CD 522] for the first 6 weeks of the semester then transition to the schools. The group noted that students miss out on the beginning of the semester planning

and schedule creation activities that would be important for future employment. Secondly, the speech-language pathologist serving as site supervisors are frequently pulled to proctor statewide testing in the schools. Due to concerns about performance, regardless of the skill level of the graduate clinician, principals are unwilling to let the graduate clinicians continue to provide services during this time. Therefore, the students may be unable to engage in direct clinical experiences for up to two weeks of their practicum. Finally, many schools are adopting a balanced calendar which could put a school break in the middle of the 10-week experience. Based on the input received from this focus group meeting we are changing the course delivery method for CD 522 to enable students to begin in the school setting after the first week of classes. There will be one week of intensive course instruction followed by on-line learning activities and on-campus face-to-face meetings once per month. We will initiate this new delivery method in Spring 2017.

Assessment Plan for 2016-17: The CAA requires that we obtain data on program completion, Praxis II passing rates, and employment in the field so we will continue to collect and obtain this data. We have not focused our assessment activities at the course level so at the beginning of the fall semester we will identify specific objectives for three courses in the graduate program [one taught by each of the doctoral faculty: Hammen, Stimley, Thomas] for which data will be collected during 2016-17. We will also examine the effect on experiences with the low incidence and and culturally and linguistically diverse populations. Finally, we will track the number of clock hours obtained in the CD 598 course in order to determine the impact of the course delivery method change that was implemented in Spring 2017.

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

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☐ No outcomes are identified.	☒ An Outcomes Library was provided. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. ☐ Some of the outcomes are student-centered. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered. ☐ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☐ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☐ Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains. Those assessed this year meet this criterion, but those in the library do not. ☒ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☒ 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. ☒ Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☒ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific. Some are not relevant.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. (For 2 of the 3) ☐ Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☒ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☒ Measures assess some [high impact practices](#) (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to

				demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do. ☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being collected. ☐ Some data are being analyzed. ☐ Some results are provided. ☐ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☒ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Results are provided. ☐ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process. ☒ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve. ☒ 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	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly connect to the results or are too vague to implement.	☒ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ☐ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ☐ These discussions lead to the development of specific,	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☒ 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.

	about previous results or plans.	☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	relevant plans for improvement. ☒ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	☒ 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. Faculty certainly do. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☒ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☒ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☐ **Level 1 - Developing**	☒ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   The outcomes you assessed this past year are specific and measurable (as are those on your website). However, the outcomes library developed in Taskstream lists important knowledge and skills but not learning outcomes. You should update the library and the curriculum map, which also uses these truncated outcomes, before submitting your next Student Learning Summary Report. Use the forms available at https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components. Thank you for linking your program's outcomes to those of the Graduate School.

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   I need some additional information so that I can clearly see the connection among the measures and the outcomes. It certainly makes sense that the Praxis II Exam would assess key concepts and theories. But the courses you include with each outcome are not necessarily those in which the assessments are conducted. I have trouble understanding how program completion rates would assess students' problem-solving, decision-making, and communication skills (though you certainly might elect to use program completion as an indirect measure of, for example, how well prepared they are to enter the workforce.) And while it makes sense to use a focus group to assess students' ability to communicate effectively, there is no indication that you actually assess this outcome: No results are provided, and while Part II delineates the focus group's recommendations and your plans to address them, they are not related to the communication outcome. Only the performance standards associated with the exam are clear and appropriate to the outcome being assessed.

3. **Results**
   Praxis II results are impressive, as is the placement rate.

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   Multiple faculty are involved in collecting and analyzing results, which you share widely, not just among members of the department but also on the program's website. The report also shows that a significant amount of analysis, reflection, and planning for improvement occurs on a regular basis. Previous plans have been implemented (e.g., embedding case studies, developing remediation plans, incorporating Praxis II-type questions in course exams), and there is at least some anecdotal evidence that they are making a difference. Consistently high exam pass rates and placement rates reflect the program's attention to ensuring that students are meeting established outcomes. Thank you!