

# University of Louisiana at Lafayette

## Detailed Assessment Report 2015-2016 Speech Pathology and Audiology BA

As of: 11/01/2016 03:22 PM CENTRAL

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked *One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*)

### Mission / Purpose

The purpose of the undergraduate degree program is to prepare students to for entry into graduate programs in speech language pathology, audiology, the speech sciences, or applied language and speech sciences.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

#### **SLO 1: Demonstration of Knowledge**

The student will demonstrate knowledge of the nature of hearing, including the anatomy and physiology of the auditory system; the concept of hearing testing; and auditory disorders affecting external ear, middle ear and inner ear.

#### **Strategic Plan Associations**

##### **University of Louisiana at Lafayette**

2.1.4 Students KPI 4: Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.

#### Related Measures

#### **M 1: Hearing Test Assignment**

In CODI 382, audiograms from the hearing testing assignment and projects requiring interpretation of audiograms depicting hearing disorders were evaluated for accuracy and knowledge of hearing testing procedures and interpretation. In CODI 386, students prepared an auditory training manual and a parent counseling module to apply their knowledge of hearing loss and rehabilitative procedures to real world situations. Projects will be rated by 2 faculty members with knowledge of hearing testing/interpretation and aural rehabilitation using a 3 point scale (minimally competent, competent, highly competent.)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

#### **Target:**

Goal for achievement of this outcome is 80% of students receiving ratings of 2 or higher.

#### **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Partially Met**

In 2015-16, 73 student projects from CODI 382 were evaluated and 69 projects from CODI 386. For CODI 382, 86% of students were rated as level 2 or above with 67% rated as Level 3. In CODI 386, only 72% of students were rated at 2 (competent) or above. Of these 56% were at the highly competent level.

#### **Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

#### **Add assessment components**

To broaden the scope of assessment of knowledge of the ear and

auditory assessment, additional evaluation components will be added to the current assessment which just focuses on interpretation of an audiogram. The expectations will also be increased on the audiogram interpretation assignment. Dr. Arehole, the instructor and departmental audiologist, will meet with the assessment coordinator to develop assessment instruments that will evaluate additional aspects of basic knowledge of hearing and hearing disorders.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Hearing Test Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstration of Knowledge

### **Focus on Parent Counseling Project**

The projects in CODI 386 were added this year to assess students on skills that both audiologists and speech language pathologists need to know about hearing and speech training in persons with hearing loss. While students met the criterion on both projects, fewer students exhibited high competence on the parent counseling aspect. More attention will be focused on this aspect in future classes as this is considered an important skill for both future audiologists and future speech-language pathologists.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Hearing Test Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstration of Knowledge

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2015

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Arehole, instructor for CODI 386

### **Holistic Assessment**

Based on the pilot data collected in CODI 302 in the Spring, 2016 semester, we will go forward with the plan to evaluate all student learner objectives associated with the BA program using a comprehensive, qualitative assessment based on student reflections in CODI 302. This course is where students are introduced to the clinical process and actually assist with the delivery of services to one client in the on-campus clinic. It is also taken after students have completed most of the courses in their major or are concurrently enrolled in these courses. Assessing at this point in their degree program allows us to look at whether or not they are integrating information from the basic classes and beginning to apply the information to actual individuals with communication disorders. In the fall semester (2016), a rubric will be devised and used to evaluate the pilot data and specific targets for each SLO will be created. At the end of the spring semester (2017) data from both semesters will be combined and a random sample will be drawn for evaluation against the rubric by a three member committee drawn from both the academic and clinical faculty. The action plans currently in place to increase knowledge of parent counseling and rehabilitation of individuals with hearing loss will continue, however the projects will not be used to evaluate the learner objectives. They will, however, remain

a part of the class (CODI 386).

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Hearing Test Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:**  
Demonstration of Knowledge

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2017

## **SLO 2: Nature of Speech**

The student will demonstrate knowledge of the nature of speech, including the anatomy and physiology of the vocal tract; and the process of speech production and ways to record it.

### **Strategic Plan Associations**

#### **University of Louisiana at Lafayette**

2.1.4 Students KPI 4: Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.

### **Related Measures**

#### **M 2: Speech Production & Transcription Projects**

Projects from CODI 220 (Phonetics) were used to assess student competencies. Project 1 requires students to describe the sequence of movements of the parts of the vocal tract involved when a speaker says the phrase "phonetic transcription" Project 2 requires students to complete a broad phonetic transcription of the first three minutes of the 2013 State of the Union Address. Randomly selected projects/assignments from fall/spring semesters will be rated by 2 faculty members using a 3 point scale (minimally competent, competent, highly competent).

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

#### **Target:**

Goal for achievement of this outcome is 80% of students receiving ratings of 2 or higher on these projects.

#### **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Not reported this cycle. These classes were taught by graduate students or adjunct professors.

#### **Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

##### **Create new Evaluation Rubric and/or Assessment**

Students have traditionally been successful in meeting the competency set, but several years later once they are in the graduate program, ability to recall and apply knowledge of the nature of speech production to actual clinical cases is lacking. The faculty will develop ideas for a more comprehensive assessment project and/or a more descriptive scoring rubric that will more accurately define the skills undergraduate students should have in place.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014

**Implementation Status:** Terminated

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Speech Production & Transcription Projects |

**Outcome/Objective:** Nature of Speech**SLO 3: Organization of Speech in Language**

The student will demonstrate knowledge of the way speech is organized in language; and disorders of both speech articulation and phonological organization.

**Strategic Plan Associations****University of Louisiana at Lafayette**

2.1.4 Students KPI 4: Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.

**Related Measures****M 3: Culminating Projects in CODI 323**

In CODI 323 (both fall and spring semesters), culminating projects will be evaluated for completeness and accuracy of analysis of phonetic inventory and phonological patterns as well as ability to prioritize the error patterns in treatment. Projects will be rated by 2 faculty members using a 4 point rating scale (4- exceeds basic competence, 3 - meets basic competence, 2- minimal competence, 1 - inadequate)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**

Goal for achievement of this outcome is 85% of students in spring semester class will be rated at Level 3 or above with at least 10% at Level 4.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**

This objective was met with 85% of students rated at Level 3 and above and 65% of students at Level 4.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):****Holistic Assessment**

Based on the pilot data collected in CODI 302 in the Spring, 2016 semester, we will go forward with the plan to evaluate all student learner objectives associated with the BA program using a comprehensive, qualitative assessment based on student reflections in CODI 302. This course is where students are introduced to the clinical process and actually assist with the delivery of services to one client in the on-campus clinic. It is also taken after students have completed most of the courses in their major or are concurrently enrolled in these courses. Assessing at this point in their degree program allows us to look at whether or not they are integrating information from the basic classes and beginning to apply the information to actual individuals with communication disorders. In the fall semester (2016), a rubric will be devised and used to evaluate the pilot data and specific targets for each SLO will be created. At the end of the spring semester (2017) data from both semesters will be combined and a random sample will be drawn for evaluation against the rubric by a three member committee drawn from both the academic and clinical faculty. Projects in CODI 323 will be continued as they do appear to be accomplishing the goal of helping the students develop skills that they will need as clinicians. We will just not use them to evaluate this specific learner objective

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Culminating Projects in CODI 323 |

**Outcome/Objective:** Organization of Speech in Language

**SLO 4: Nature of Language**

The student will demonstrate knowledge of the nature of language, including the nature of language disorders; and the basics of language assessment and intervention.

**Connected Document**

[Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

**University of Louisiana at Lafayette**

2.1.4 Students KPI 4: Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Clinical Observations in CODI 384**

Students perform supervised observations of therapy sessions with clients with language disorders as part of CODI 384. Observation summaries from the final observation of the semester will be evaluated by 2 faculty members and rated using a 3 point scale (minimally competent, competent, highly competent).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Documents**

[Assessment Summary Form 09-10](#)

[Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Target:**

Students receiving a rating of 2 or higher will be judged as demonstrating appropriate mastery of this objective. The departmental goal is that 80% of students will meet this criterion.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This objective was not evaluated this cycle though a pilot project was conducted in another class with the hope that it will be a better predictor of student success in meeting this learning objective.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Modify Assessment**

While the students were successful in meeting the target for this assessment, questions were raised by the faculty involved in assessment of this SLO of how well this activity actually measures the desired outcome which is knowledge of the nature of language disorders and the basics of language assessment and intervention. Possible changes could include restructuring the written feedback associated with the observation activity to better target the actual student learner outcome being assessed or moving the assessment to CODI 302 which is taken later in the undergraduate curriculum and designing a different assessment procedure.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Clinical Observations in CODI 384 |

**Outcome/Objective:** Nature of Language

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2016

### **SLO 5: Human Development**

The student will demonstrate knowledge of normal human development, including psychological, biological, and cultural development; and the development of speech and language.

#### **Strategic Plan Associations**

##### **University of Louisiana at Lafayette**

2.1.4 Students KPI 4: Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.

#### Related Measures

### **M 5: Observations and Language Samples**

Assignments from CODI 275 which include 3 separate observations of normally developing children and the analysis of a language sample will be rated by 2 faculty members on a 3 point scale with scores of 2 or above reflecting appropriate mastery of this goal.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

#### **Target:**

Goal for achievement of this outcome is 80% of students receiving a rating of 2 or above on the specified assignments.

#### **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Not evaluated in this cycle.

#### **Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

##### **Change in Student Products**

This year the assessment for this learner objective was associated with a different class. Previously, CODI 310 Analysis of Social Action was used, but since the topic of the learner objective was normal development of speech and language, it was decided that we would assess students in CODI 275 where this is the topic of the course. This is a lower level class but our rationale was that we needed to know if students were meeting this learner objective before they reached CODI 310 which required synthesis and application of the knowledge obtained in CODI 275. At this point, it seems as if these assignments are a better indicator that students are obtaining the knowledge of normal development than those used in CODI 310. We will continue this action plan for another year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

##### **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Observations and Language Samples |

**Outcome/Objective:** Human Development

##### **Develop Rubric**

This objective will not be evaluated next cycle which will give an opportunity for the faculty to develop a customized rubric for assessment of the specific knowledge and skills students should be exhibiting on

these assignments. The assignments are broad and comprehensive but the current 3 point rubric looks at the student's products holistically and does not help identify possible areas of weakness in the curriculum. Using a more specific rubric with subcategories for rating should provide data that can be used to adjust course content if necessary.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Observations and Language Samples |

**Outcome/Objective:** Human Development

### **Continue to push for more specific rubric**

The students sampled are able to complete the portfolio assignments with the majority reaching at least average competency but it is not clear that this really reflects their overall knowledge of human development - specifically speech and language development. The assessment team does believe that this assignment can give us that information if we use the data appropriately and sample the students at the appropriate time during the 4 years at the BA level. We will continue to try to establish a scoring rubric that looks not at whether or not the student follows the directions and completes the project but on whether they are displaying their global knowledge of human development. In order to know if the undergraduate curriculum is sufficient, this assessment should perhaps be linked to a class that occurs later in the curriculum.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Observations and Language Samples |

**Outcome/Objective:** Human Development

## **Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

---

### **How were assessment results shared and evaluated within the unit?**

Reports for all 3 degree in the department were compiled and printed and distributed to faculty members at the first faculty meeting of the 2016-17 semester. The assessment coordinator discussed the two learner objectives that were evaluated this year, the results for each and the action plans that had been implemented during the year. Faculty had the opportunity to ask questions and make comments on the findings. Volunteers were solicited from faculty teaching in the undergraduate degree program to devise action plans in response to deficits identified. This year only 2 of the 5 student learner objectives were evaluated with one partially met and the other met. The report from an ad hoc committee tasked with developing a more comprehensive method of evaluating student progress toward all learner objectives made a report and faculty input was used to modify the product.

### **Identify which action plans [created in prior cycle(s)] were implemented in this current cycle. For each of these implemented plans, were there any measurable or perceivable effects? How, if at all, did the findings appear to be affected by the implemented action plan?**

Two action plans put into place following the 2013-14 assessment cycle were implemented during this cycle. For SLO 1, nature of hearing disorders, the action plan to put more focus

on parent counseling during lectures and assignments did not seem to have the effect we had hoped. There was actually a decline in the percentage of students who met the overall criterion as well as the intermediate criterion of percentage of students at the highest level of competency. While the actual percentages remain high (72% of students rated as exhibiting competency and over half at the highest level), we had more students who fell in the lowest level. Other factors might have impacted this result other than the content presented in the course. There was a substantial increase in the size of the class, from 44 students to 69 students. The instructor for the class felt that this had a huge impact on her ability to relate to all students both during and outside the classroom. She typically teaches another class each semester with equally high enrollment. The second action plan implemented seemed to have a more positive effect. This action plan focused on SLO 3, which involves student knowledge of how speech sounds are organized into language - i.e. the fundamental processes of phonological organization and articulation or production of the sounds in a meaningful way. While students had typically been quite successful meeting the criterion for this objective, clinical supervisors did not see students being able to apply this knowledge directly to management of disordered children and adults as the students moved into the graduate program. The plan was to refocus the content of the class, the assessment instruments and the rubric used to judge success to better reflect application of knowledge clinically rather than theoretically. Using this new focus and rubric, 100% of students evaluated in the spring semester showed at least minimal competency. This was seen as progress in the right direction.

**What has the unit learned from the current assessment cycle? What is working well, and what is working less well in achieving desired outcomes?**

Overall, we feel that our undergraduate program is preparing students well for moving into graduate programs. Student GPAs are typically high and over the years they seem to meet the benchmarks that we have set. In addition, the students from our undergraduate program who are accepted in our master's program are eventually successful at the graduate level. In graduate programs, students continue to expand on the basic knowledge they obtained at the undergraduate level, but now they must also show that they can apply that knowledge to actual hands on work with adults and children with communicative disorders. At the graduate level we assess both knowledge, through grades in academic courses, and skills, through grades in clinical practicum courses. At the undergraduate level, students receive very little experience in clinical settings. This leap is a difficult one for some students and overall undergraduate GPA does not always identify the students who will not be as successful as therapists or conversely the students who will shine in the clinical realm though their GPAs were more modest. With that in mind, we thought that perhaps refocusing how we assess undergraduate knowledge would let us better identify what aspects of basic knowledge in our undergraduate students is not transferring well to clinical skills. We came to the conclusion that perhaps wasn't working as well as we hoped was HOW we were assessing student outcomes. We had associated each student learner outcome to the primary course or courses where this knowledge was obtained and assessed within the course. This meant that some objectives/outcomes were assessed at the sophomore level, some at the junior level and very few when students reached the senior level when they were hopefully synthesizing and combining knowledge for application. This year an ad hoc committee created a pilot project that focused on one course that is typically taught in the 4th year (though some students may take in second semester 3rd year) and created probe questions that targeted each of the student learner objectives for the program. In this class (CODI 302), students act as assistants to graduate students who are the primary therapists, so they are immersed in the therapeutic process. At the end of the semester, each student was asked to reflect on how specific information about hearing, speech production, language development etc helped them understand the client, their disorder and the actual therapy being applied. We hope that this information will allow us to look at the undergraduate curriculum in a more holistic way and perhaps redesign classes to strengthen areas that are not as strong as we hoped. We



are using the qualitative data taken in Spring, 2016 and developing an appropriate rubric to measure how well students are applying knowledge. Data will continue to be collected in both the Fall and Spring semesters and reported in the 2016-17 assessment cycle.