

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18 *Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.*

Unit/Program Name: Communication Disorders—MS Speech-Language Pathology **Contact Name(s) and Email(s):** Vicki Hammen, Program 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. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?</p>
<p>1. [G4] Apply theory and anatomical, neurologic, acoustic, and physiologic bases of speech, language, and hearing sciences to the diagnosis and remediation of communication disorders</p> <p>[G2, G5] Competently administer, interpret and report the results of evaluative instruments and procedures</p> <p>[G4, G5] Plan, implement, revise, and terminate treatment programs using available data</p> <p>[G4, G5] Solve clinical and instructional problems by forming hypotheses and</p>	<p>(1) All of these outcomes were assessed with a survey of the faculty/instructors/staff that supervise graduate clinicians. Supervisors rated sets of students on a 100mm visual analog scale within a Qualtrics survey. The supervisors were also able to provide additional comments following their ratings.</p> <p>(2) CD 696: Clinical Practicum in Speech-Language-Hearing</p>	<p>The group of students that were undergraduates in the Speech-Language Pathology major at Indiana State University would be rated higher on a set of four fundamental clinical skills than students with the same major from other institutions. The impetus for the expectation was that ISU is one of only a very few institutions that provide direct clinical experiences as undergraduates.</p>	<p>The average ratings for the ISU undergraduates ranged from 63.50 to 68.75. There was a large range in ratings for one item, “Develops setting appropriate intervention plans” as indicated by a standard deviation of 23.80.</p> <p>Average ratings for the non-ISU undergraduates ranged from 49.63 to 54.75 with large standard deviations for every item rated [e.g., 21.33 to 25.38].</p>	<p>Several years ago we began an extended orientation program to the clinical practicum course. The data suggests that further improvements in that orientation program are needed to reduce the difference between students we admit to our program from undergraduate experiences that do not include clinical practica.</p>

systematically analyzing and interpreting data to make informed decisions				
<p>2. [G4] Apply theory and anatomical, neurologic, acoustic, and physiologic bases of speech, language, and hearing sciences to the diagnosis and remediation of communication disorders</p> <p>[G5] Read, interpret, and integrate research findings into educational and clinical applications</p> <p>[G2, G5] Competently administer, interpret and report the results of evaluative instruments and procedures</p> <p>[G1] Discuss issues related to professional practice and ethics</p>	<p>(1) Pass rate on the Praxis II Subject Area exam in Speech-Language Pathology.</p> <p>(2) Students usually take the exam while in their final, external practica which are courses CD 598: School Practicum or CD 697: Hospital Practicum.</p>	<p>100% pass rate on the first attempt with a score more than 5% above the minimum passing score when averaged across the cohort.</p>	<p>All students passed on the first attempt, achieving the 100% pass rate.</p> <p>The cohort averaged scores that were 9% above the minimum with a range from 3% to 34%.</p>	<p>Feedback from the previous report indicated we should be presenting the data relative to pass rates on the national exam. By assessing the extent to which our students exceed the minimum we are able demonstrate that students are achieving our learning outcomes.</p>
<p>3. [G4] Apply theory and anatomical, neurologic, acoustic, and physiologic bases of speech, language, and hearing sciences to the diagnosis and remediation of communication disorders</p> <p>[G5] Read, interpret, and integrate research findings into educational and clinical applications</p> <p>[G2, G5] Competently administer, interpret and report the results of evaluative instruments and procedures</p> <p>[G1] Discuss issues related to professional practice and ethics</p>	<p>(1) The Praxis II Subject Area test in Speech-Language Pathology breaks down the student's overall score into three content domains: Foundations and Professional Practice; Screening, Assessment, Evaluation, Diagnosis; and, Planning, Implementation and Evaluation of Treatment.</p> <p>(2) Students usually take the exam while in their final, external practica which are courses CD 598: School Practicum or CD 697: Hospital Practicum.</p>	<p>70% of the cohort passing the exam will earn at least 75% of the possible points for that content domain.</p>	<p>Foundations and Professional Practice: 55% of the cohort earned 75% of the available points. Criteria Not Met</p> <p>Screening, Assessment, Evaluation, Diagnosis: 75% of the cohort earned 75% of the available points. Criteria Met</p> <p>Planning, Implementation and Evaluation of Treatment: 70% earned 75% or more of the points. Criteria Met</p>	<p>The data demonstrated that students completing our academic and clinical training are acquiring superior knowledge and skills in two of the three content domains.</p> <p>Since the program does not 'teach to the test and that Foundations content is related to anatomy, physiology, acoustics that is taken primarily at the undergraduate level we learned that we may need to integrate more of this content into courses within the graduate program.</p>

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.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must 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 must 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.
- 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: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

- 1) Based on the data analyzed our students are know how to evaluate, diagnose, and implement intervention for persons with communication disorders throughout the lifespan. Students that did not have clinical practicum during their undergraduate program need additional orientation, education, and support to successfully provide clinical services as a beginning graduate student. We need to augment the Foundations knowledge students are expected to obtain at the undergraduate level through integrating content and assessments into applicable graduate courses and inform students of areas that they may wish to review in more depth as they prepare to take the national Praxis II exam.
- 2) In the coming year we plan to collect data from course assignments or exam to evaluate outcomes. This data collection will enable our two new faculty members to become involved in the assessment process. In addition, course-based assessment will allow us to evaluate the extent to which student transfer knowledge from class to the clinic.
- 3) Public posting of student achievement data [e.g., Praxis II pass rate] is required by our accrediting organization. However, we can share the information about the extent to which students exceed the minimum pass rate on that section of our website. In addition we will provide a program update at the bi-annual meeting of the CDCSEP advisory board.

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
<p>1. Increase the number of applicants to the MS in Speech-Language Pathology program</p>	<p>Updated the Communication Disorders and Sciences Centralized Application Service [CSDCAS] ISU page to provide current information to prospective students. [Hammen]</p> <p>Provide an alternative to an on-campus 'open house.' [Hammen, and Media Services]</p>	<p>CSDCAS data on applications.</p>	<p>The number of applications in the CSDCAS system increased from 140 in 2017 to 198 in 2018.</p> <p>Recorded a video interview with the program director and a virtual tour of the Grosjean Clinic and University Hall</p>	<p>We will continue to monitor this goal. It is too early to evaluate the potential yield from the addition of virtual tours to the website.</p>
<p>2. Improve the quality of the incoming cohort to the graduate program.</p>	<p>All applicants meeting the minimum GPA requirement as stated online and in the catalog [3.0] are reviewed. [Hammen, Luttrell, Solesky, Stimley]</p> <p>Improve the video interview so it is not simply a reading of the responses to application questions. [Hammen, Luttrell, Solesky, Stimley]</p> <p>Change the 'personal statement' document into a series of supplemental questions. [Hammen]</p>	<p>Within CSDCAS review completion can be checked by the program director. Number of viable applicants.</p> <p>Faculty feedback following the 2018 cycle</p>	<p>In the past the cut off for review was a 3.2 due to the high workload associated with graduate admissions. This cycle all applicants meeting the minimum GPA requirement as stated online and in the catalog [3.0] were reviewed by a team of two faculty members that included one tenure track professor and one instructor. If there was a discrepancy in scoring an application it was assigned to the other team of reviewers. The new review process resulted in</p>	<p>For both years we had a yield of about 85 candidates following faculty review of applications. Since we typically need to send out 50-60 offers to fill our 20 student cohort this process is sufficient.</p> <p>In a couple more years we will analyze the supplemental questions to try to identify a 'profile' of a successful graduate student in our program.</p>

			<p>The video 'interview' portion of ISU's CSDCAS application was reduced in length from 3 minutes to 1 and suggestions from faculty were added to the instructions in order to obtain videos that can assist faculty in evaluating applicants. [Hammen, Luttrell, Solesky, Stimley]</p> <p>At the recommendation of CSDCAS content that formerly would have been submitted as a 'personal statement' document should be converted into supplemental questions. This will allow the program to run analyses of the content and compare it to performance in the program. Once a sufficient number of applicants and graduate students have processed, this will allow the program to search for key words in the applicant's responses based on identified characteristics of previous students.</p>	
3. Assist students in obtaining employment following degree completion.	<p>Allow outside speakers from therapy companies to educate students about their clinical fellowship experience. [Hammen, and outside speakers]</p> <p>Improve student's resumes and interviewing skills [Career Center, Hammen]</p>	Employment rate within six months of graduation	<p>Speaker from EBS and the Career Center provided talks to the graduate students.</p> <p>Graduates have a 100% employment rate within 6 months of degree completion.</p>	Our external accreditors require reporting of employment rates within one year of graduation. However, our program exceeds that standard. We will continue to examine employment rate as it is required for accreditation.

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

- 1) Our success in providing students with the knowledge and skills to enter the profession of speech-language pathology as evidenced by our Student Achievement Data has resulted in a large number of applicants for our program. The students that accept our offer of admission are retained, persist, and complete their degree program within the stated six semesters. Our program graduates students that are well equipped to be employed in their profession. In the future we will begin tracking when students receive job offers as anecdotally it appeared that for the last cohort more than 80% had accepted a position prior to degree completion.

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 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are 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 Deans 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: CD – MS Speech Language Pathology	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Mature (2.75/3.00)	
Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): Mature (2.25/3.00)	
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Great work clearly aligning your learning outcomes with the Graduate Student Learning Outcomes. This shows a clear connection between the achievements of students in your program and the goals of CGPS for students.• Clear, straightforward representation of findings. Congrats to your faculty and students for such excellent performance!• Your use and sharing of results is truly exemplary. Clear evidence of considering past findings and related curricular/pedagogical adjustments is given, as are informed responses to the findings from this cycle.• The goal for the next assessment cycle to include course-based assessment to evaluated knowledge transfer from course to clinic is excellent and may help you pinpoint new opportunities to deepen student learning. Plus, any opportunities to get more faculty involved in assessment helps share the load and creates more opportunities for direct assessment.• Clearly stated goals, relevant and actionable strategies, and clearly assigned responsibilities.• Good discussion of how changes are being implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Using tools to comprehensively evaluate all outcomes can be done effectively, but it may be helpful for analysis and use of results to be more specific about which sections of each tool align to which outcomes (i.e. focusing on a section of the Praxis II, or coding the questions on the supervisor survey to the related outcomes).• Comparing ISU students to non-ISU students is reasonable given the rationale provided. It may help to also define what faculty consider the baseline standard of achievement and the ideal standard separate from peer comparison.• Looks good overall – preparing for the format in which you hope to collect data from this review cycle will be helpful.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent partnerships with others to achieve goals (Career Center, Media Services, outside speakers). | |
|--|--|

Assessment Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success Scoring Rubric is attached on the last page for reference only. Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

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

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

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)

Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary