

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—BA/BS 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>PROGRAM OUTCOME #7: The student will apply legal and ethical practice guidelines for speech-language pathology clinical practice</p> <p>*7.1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of laws governing the practice of speech-language pathology</p>	<p>Code of Ethics Quiz was administered in CD 400: Clinical Practicum following unit over the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association's Code of Ethics and Practicing Laws</p>	<p>A score of 75% or better will be achieved by at least 70% of the students</p>	<p>85% of the class (23/27 students) scored 80% or higher indicating the target was achieved.</p> <p>The class average was 13.2 of 15 points or a grade of 88% indicating the target was achieved.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Although the target was met, the instructor plans to use the data to provide more detailed information and samples for the topic.</p>
<p>2. PROGRAM OUTCOME #5: The student will communicate effectively in both oral and written formats</p> <p>*5.2 Students will write an analysis of a clinical session.</p>	<p>CD: 226 Language Disorders</p> <p>Students had to watch a clinical session in the Rowe Center for Communicative Disorders and then write up answers to given questions.</p>	<p>A average score of 80% across four observations reports will be achieved by at least 70% of the students.</p>	<p>95% of students (18/19) earned an average score of 80% or higher on the four observations</p>	<p>Although the scores are very similar, the comparison shows that the students overall improved on their analysis from observation 1 to observation 4 (3 percentage points); therefore, The target</p>

	<p>Each observation was worth 10 points.</p>		<p>On observation 1 the students averaged a score of 87%</p> <p>On observation 2 the students averaged a score of 88%</p> <p>On observation 3 the students averaged a score of 87%</p> <p>On observation 4 the students averaged a score of 90%</p>	<p>was achieved for Objective 5.2.</p> <p>The instructor set up the due dates for the observation assignments so that the students received feedback on the prior observation before the next one was due. This procedure appeared to have helped the students make adjustments in their interpretation of the session target, goal, rationale, and clinician feedback procedures. Most students used this feedback to correct their written analysis in subsequent observations. The recommendation is that this procedure continue to be used.</p> <p>An additional recommendation is to provide samples of adequate written observations and to go over each question and acceptable answers with more detail in class.</p>
<p>3. PROGRAM OUTCOME # 6 Identify and describe appropriate assessments and interventions for persons with communication disorders including any modifications necessary due to developmental, physical, linguistic, and cultural considerations</p>	<p>CD 398: Introduction to Clinical Methods and Procedures and CD 400: Clinical Practicum in Speech, Language, and Hearing</p> <p>Students completed a 10-item survey that had them rate their confidence in their ability to perform activities</p>	<p>It was expected that students would rate their confidence as higher across all items when completing the survey at the beginning of CD 400.</p>	<p>Twenty-seven students completed the survey in both courses. On the initial survey in CD 397 the students' ratings across all items averaged 3.38. When completed at the beginning of CD 400 the average rating was 4.24, meeting the expectation for this outcome.</p>	<p>Several years ago we revised the clinical component of our undergraduate program to add an introduction to clinical practice course to build students' skills prior to providing in clinical services. The intent was to develop knowledge, skills, and confidence so the students</p>

	associated with assessing and developing intervention plans for persons with communication disorders on a 5-point scale [1=poor to 5=Excellent] The survey was first administered at the beginning of CD 398 in Fall 2017 and then at the beginning of CD 400 in Spring 2018.		The greatest increase in their confidence rating [+1.37] for the item that addressed their ability to design a treatment plan for a target. The smallest change was for the item asking about managing client behavior. There was essentially no difference in their rating on the question related to timeliness for completing assignments and attending meetings.	could be more independent in CD 400. This survey indicates CD 398 has had a positive impact on student's confidence.
--	---	--	--	--

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

- Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- 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.
- 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."
- 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?

- The students in the undergraduate program met the criteria set for all objectives targeted this cycle. The outcomes and courses in which assessments occurred were selected to examine 'later' learning in our undergraduate program. CD 226 is taken in fall of the 'junior' year in the major [if students either enter into the major as a freshman or transfer before the start of their sophomore year]. CD 398 and 400 are taken in the last or 'senior' year of the major. We learned that students that remain committed to the major following their sophomore year demonstrate high levels of performance and develop confidence in their clinical skills. Examining the data from last year for the Code of Ethics quiz suggested modifications to questions was needed. This year's data showed the changes made by the instructor improved student performance. The data show that students are learning clinical skills that have increased their confidence entering into their clinical practicum course.
- During the upcoming year, the CD undergraduate program must complete a self-study as part of an external program review. The work for the self study will contribute to the focus of our assessment plan. We have two, new faculty members that are teaching a number of

courses in our undergraduate program. We will need to re-examine our overall assessment plan to revise assignments to reflect the types of learning activities they are including in their courses. We will be collecting data from their courses during the Spring 2018 semester.

- 3) The CDCSEP program has an advisory board that typically meets twice per year. Programs provide updates about their areas which includes assessment data. One of our new faculty has agreed to work on updating the undergraduate program portion of the website. We plan to add a section that presents some of our assessment data in a way that could be used as a recruitment tool.

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. Improve our one-year retention by current program by 2%.</p>	<p>The advisor to the student organization encourages the officers and other senior members to reach out to incoming freshman that have declared the major. [Luttrell]</p> <p>The program director meets with undergraduate students in the major when they have concerns about the program and will address the concerns following college procedures. [Hammen]</p> <p>Recognize students' academic achievement at the annual banquet of student organization. [Luttrell, Hammen]</p>	<p>Blue reports data</p>	<p>Based on blue reports data, our 1 year retention was 88% this past year, up from 78%.</p> <p>A number of students were considering dropping courses and changing majors due to difficulties with a particular faculty member. The program director met with the group of students during a different course in the major to assure them that we wanted them in the major and to provide support for their academic efforts. The DFDr for that course was lower [15.2%] than the previous year [25%]</p> <p>We were able to recognize about 50% of the majors at the</p>	<p>We will continue to monitor retention rates. We plan to monitor our retention rates annually. The departure of a faculty member that students found very difficult and unapproachable could have a positive impact on our retention rates.</p> <p>Students and their family members appear to appreciate the tangible recognition of student achievement when their certificates are presented annually.</p>

			annual banquet. Students unable to attend the banquet were able to pick up their certificate from the student services assistant.	
2. Maintain 4-year graduation/completion rate for current program at the 2016-17 rate, 72%.	<p>Provided academic support for challenging courses [CD 211, 212, 224] by having a GA run study weekly sessions.</p> <p>Mentors for students that are being advised by Educational Student Services were assigned to full-time faculty/instructors [Luttrell, Solesky, Stimley]</p>	Comparison of DFDr rates from 2016-17 to 2017-2018.	<p>CD 212 had the highest DFDr rates in 2016-17 at 32.4%. Data from 2017-18 showed the DFDr for CD 212 to be 29.4%, or a 3% decline. While a decrease is positive, the addition of the GA-led study sessions did not have as great an impact as we had hoped. The next highest DFDr rate in 2016-17 was in CD 213 at 25%. This decreased to 15% in 2017-18.</p> <p>Our 4-year graduation/completion rate during 2017-18 was 70.97% which is down from</p> <p>One challenge we had with implementation appeared to be related to our former student services assistant. Mentors were not assigned in a timely manner so some may not have known about the assistance their mentors can provide.</p>	<p>We will continue this goal. Determining other factors that could be contributing the DFDr rates in CD 212 and 213 will be part of the plan for</p> <p>We want to track students attendance at meetings with their mentors.</p>
3. Introduce Career Ready [CR} activities into entry level CD courses.	We provided binders to the students in the 'sophomore' level courses to create a CR portfolio. Assignments related to CR activities were integrated into the following courses: CD 119 [Hammen]; CD 211 [Luttrell]; CD 225 [Solesky]	Assignment completion data from courses.	<p>All students completed the CR assignments in their respective courses.</p> <p>One challenge encountered was that the binders were purchased as part of a CR grant awarded to Solesky, Luttrell, Hammen. The</p>	We will continue this goal.

			program faculty discussed alternative methods of tracking completion of CR activities.	
--	--	--	--	--

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) The BS/BA Speech-Language Pathology major appears to attract students that are committed to continuing in the major, persisting through challenging courses and progressing to graduation within four years. Our 70.97% four-year graduation rate by current department is among the highest at the institution, however, there is room for improvement. With the transfer of advising responsibilities to Educational Student Services our faculty contact with our majors has diminished. We feel improving/increasing this contact will be important for retention, persistence, degree completion, and post-graduation success.

We continue to have key courses that have high DFDr rates. One potential contribution to the DFDr for one course, CD 213, was a less than effective instructor that left the institution following the fall semester. It will be important to continue to track DFDr rates for courses that are early pre-requisites for future courses in the major.

We are pleased with the implementation of the first set of career ready course-based activities. The creation of a binder/portfolio was initially thought to be a good method to keep all materials. However, the faculty discussed some issues related to portfolio development, such as the cost to the student to purchase and maintain the binders. We also did not have a centralized process to track completion of the portfolio. As most of the Career Ready [CR] activities are submitted electronically we have determined that the creation of an Excel tracking sheet for each undergraduate student that is housed in the program area's L-drive or on One Drive would allow any faculty to access the file to record CR activity completion. The students will be encouraged to keep an electronic portfolio.

- 2) Since the major is structured as a 'lock step' type of program, identifying causes of the DFDr rates for key courses in the major will positively impact student success by not requiring students to defer taking subsequent courses and potentially delaying graduation.

Increasing faculty contact with students will greatly assist in retention, persistence, and completion rates. We also intend to survey our students in CD 400: Clinical Practicum near the end of the semester to obtain information about their post-graduation plans.

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 BA/BS Speech-Language Pathology	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Mature (2.25/3.00)	
Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): Mature (2.75/3.00)	
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear description of program outcomes and the specific learning outcomes measured. Excellent additional information provided about where in the curriculum sequence these assessments are conducted and why.• Good incorporation of direct measures for outcome 7 and 5, and especially interesting and helpful granularity in the breakout of the 4 different evaluations done for outcome 5.• Clear, straightforward representation of findings. Congrats to your faculty and students for such excellent performance!• Excellent reflection on past findings and curricular/pedagogical changes, and great thoughts on current findings and next steps.• Clear goals paired with actionable strategies and clear assignments of responsibility.• Good use of a variety of sources of information to inform goals and strategies (student and family feedback, DFDr rates, retention data, etc.)• Good discussion of strategies, results, and plans for follow-up.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adding notation of accreditor and/or professional standards that align with the learning outcomes measured could help faculty in demonstrating connections between student learning outcome achievement in their courses with advancement toward standards.• The survey described to assess student confidence doesn't seem to match up exactly with the stated outcome to identify and describe appropriate interventions. This could be considered an indirect measure potentially, but clarification would help tighten the link between outcome and measure here. The findings were clearly useful and relevant, but maybe for other outcomes.• The goal to track student attendance at meetings with mentors may be very useful – consider detailing how this might be possible.

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