

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17 Due to your dean by the college deadline; due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by Sept. 1

Degree Program Name: MS in 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?</p> <p>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>Student Learning Outcome 1: 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>GSLO: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>1) Exam #2 Score in the Voice Disorders course which integrates anatomic, acoustic, neurologic, and physiologic bases of voice disorders with diagnostic methods</p> <p>2) CD 620</p>	<p>80% of students will receive a score of 80% or higher on this exam</p>	<p>Seventy-six percent [16/21] of students obtained a score of 80% or greater.</p>	<p>1) Vicki Hammen, Course instructor; 2) Data collected was discussed at a faculty meeting</p>
<p>Student Learning Outcome 3: Competently administer, interpret and report the results of evaluative instruments and procedures</p> <p>GSLO: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>1) Cumulative average for the Evaluation section of the Final Performance Evaluation</p> <p>2) CD 696, Clinical Practicum, CD 598 School Practicum, and CD 697, Hospital Practicum</p>	<p>80% of students will receive a rating of 4.0 or better.</p>	<p>Sixty-two percent of the cohort [13/21] received a rating of 4.0 or better. Ratings ranged from 3.64 to a 4.58.</p>	<p>1) Amanda Solesky, Clinic coordinator and overall instructor for CD 696; Vicki Hammen, Program Director 2) Data was discussed at a faculty meeting</p>
<p>Student Learning Outcome 6:</p>	<p>1) Rating on the final cumulative</p>	<p>80% of the cohort will receive a</p>	<p>Seventy-one percent of the</p>	<p>1) Amanda Solesky, Clinic</p>

<p>Communicate effectively with clients, caregivers, spouses, and professionals to obtain and share information</p> <p>GSLO: Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p>	<p>evaluation for Standard V-B, 3a [Communicates effectively, recognizing the needs, values, preferred mode of communication, and cultural/linguistic background of the patient, family, caregiver, and relevant others]</p> <p>2) CD 696, 598, 697</p>	<p>rating of 4.0 or above</p>	<p>cohort [15/21] received a rating of 4.0 or better. Ratings ranged from 3.71 to a 4.61</p>	<p>Coordinator and overall CD 696 course instructor, Cathleen Thomas, CD 598 instructor, Vicki Hammen, Graduate Program Director and CD 697 instructor;</p> <p>2) Results 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: While close, the target was not met. Exam #1 focuses solely on the anatomical, neurologic, acoustic, and physiologic bases of normal voice production. Students that do not meet criterion levels for the content on this exam must rewrite responses. Since disorders are introduced after the first exam the students may be rewriting while needing that content to integrate with the disorders. Including some disorders in the 'normal aspects' of the course [before the first exam] might assist students in making the necessary connections between these areas of content. The instructor intends to use more flipped classroom activities that could encourage more integration the next time the course is taught [Spring 2018].

Objective #2 Reflection: We realized that one issue with this measure is that there are fewer opportunities for students to demonstrate knowledge of evaluation procedures than for on-going data analysis during therapy sessions. Student clinicians complete some evaluations at the beginning of the semester only so the number of data points for that overall evaluation are low. We are going to have supervisors that have the students for an evaluation only complete the Calipso evaluation to increase the number of opportunities. It might also be beneficial to look at the evaluation rating from CD 697: Hospital practicum because there are many opportunities to complete evaluations in that setting.

Objective #3 Reflection: Providing students with the opportunity to complete 'mock' interviews with staff/faculty would allow us to identify specific needs relative to communicating effectively. We also noted that our student learning outcome for this component of the graduate program does not include language related to cultural sensitivity and/or diversity. In the upcoming year we will revisit our outcomes and include language that will convey the importance of being able to communicate with diverse populations. All students have access to SimuCase that includes simulation cases from culturally/linguistically diverse backgrounds. Requiring all students to complete at least one simulation could be beneficial.

2) *Based on the feedback received from last year's assessment, this assessment cycle we looked at more specific data derived from evaluations conducted during coursework/practicum rather than looking at the more global data [Praxis passing rates, Program completion rate, Employment rates]. This will allow us to identify areas that need improvement or areas of strength. In reviewing the data on effective communication we need to incorporate more focused practice in communicating with parents. We started a 'mock evaluation reporting session' with the cohort that began last fall so we should be able to have pre-post data available this next cycle. We have committed to using simulations to provide our students with a greater variety of clients and to provide focused practice in areas needing growth. We should be able to assign students that are identified early on in their graduate program as needing improvement in evaluation, for example, cases with in SimuCase to complete. We would be able to examine any change in rating for this section of their evaluation following completion of the simulation.*

3)

Assessment Plan for 2017-18: Rather than looking at the cumulative rating, during this next assessment cycle we want to look at the change in rating from their first practicum experience to one of their last, full-time clinical placements. We this data we will be able to review the change/improvement in performance, or the value-added, of our graduate education program. We will use CD 598 evaluations from their field supervisors as compared to supervisors from their first CD 696, Clinical Practicum course since the client populations would be similar. We instituted a supervision component in the graduate program. Second-year graduate students 'supervise' beginning undergraduate clinicians with the assistance and guidance of their clinical supervisor. New national accreditation standards that went into effect August 1st require programs to provide knowledge and skills in supervision. We will work on developing assessment method for this new requirement in the upcoming cycle.

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

Degree Program: MS in Speech Pathology Date: 10.25.2017

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is

				<p>addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><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. <i>Not reported.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation</p>

				<p>is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</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 and 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</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 and meaningful.</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 and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to</p>

		standards expected of them.		achieve/achieve less well. <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. <i>Not reported this time.</i>
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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. <i>Faculty do.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <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.
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

Comments:

The alignment between the two outcomes and their assessment measures is much clearer in this year’s report, and while students did not meet the goals set for them, you identify a number of proactive approaches that should help improve their performance. I did not mean to discourage you from reporting cumulative results like national exam pass rates, by the way, since they are important indicators of student success; but I appreciate your looking more specifically at what such results tell you about what students know and can do. As I recall, you indicated that you planned to review admissions criteria and add Praxis-II-type questions to course exams this year. Were these initiatives implemented? Finally, please note that I still hope to receive an updated outcomes library for the program.

As I noted in my comments on the undergraduate program report, we are gearing up for the Higher Learning Commission (which will visit ISU in 2020 or 2021 as part of the accreditation reaffirmation process). It thus is particularly important for us to be able to provide evidence that we are systematically assessing our curricular and co-curricular programs; using the information we derive from that process to develop actionable plans for improvement in student learning; and documenting the improvements that result. Again, I would just ask you to continue doing so in your 2018 Student Learning Summary Report.

Thank you for completing your 2016-17 Student Learning Report!