

# 2017-2018 Assessment Cycle COLA\_Speech Pathology and Audiology MS

## Mission (due 12/4/17)

### University Mission

The University of Louisiana at Lafayette offers an exceptional education informed by diverse worldviews grounded in tradition, heritage, and culture. We develop leaders and innovators who advance knowledge, cultivate aesthetic sensibility, and improve the human condition.

### University Values

We strive to create a community of leaders and innovators in an environment that fosters a desire to advance and disseminate knowledge. We support the mission of the university by actualizing our core values of equity, integrity, intellectual curiosity, creativity, tradition, transparency, respect, collaboration, pluralism, and sustainability.

### University Vision

We strive to be included in the top 25% of our peer institutions by 2020, improving our national and international status and recognition.

### College / VP and Program / Department Mission

#### Mission of College or VP-area

*Provide the mission for the College or VP-area in the space provided. If none is available, write "None Available in 2017-2018."*

The College of Liberal Arts is dedicated to the advancement of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The College teaches students to think critically, applying scientific principles and intellectual schema to understand human behavior and society in a diverse world, to express ideas and ideals in a variety of forms, and to understand themselves and others as members of regional and global communities. The intellectual and creative foundations of this enterprise are written and oral communication, analytical and reasoning skills, and the ability to solve problems creatively. Each departmental curriculum presents perspectives from the past, provides an understanding of the present and directs attention to the challenges of the future. As active researchers, faculty in the College work to advance the frontiers of knowledge and our understanding of humanity and the world we live in, and to use that knowledge and understanding to improve the human condition.

#### Mission of Program / Department

*Provide the program / department mission in the space provided. The mission statement should concisely define the purpose, functions, and key constituents. If none is available, write "None Available in 2017-2018."*

The Department of Communicative Disorders is dedicated to understanding how communication works and how it breaks down in order to design and implement better ways to prevent communicative disorders as well as design and teach better intervention procedures. Our ultimate mission is to enable individuals with communication disorders to lead richer, full, more productive lives.

#### Attachment (optional)

*Upload any documents which support the program / department assessment process.*

## Assessment Plan (due 12/4/17)

### Assessment Plan (Goals / Objectives, Assessment Measures and Criteria for Success)

#### Assessment List

|                     |   |  |  |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Goal/Objective      | The student will demonstrate knowledge of the nature of speech, Language and hearing and of communication and swallowing disorders sufficient for entry level positions as a speech-language pathology clinical fellow.(Imported) |  |  |
| Legends             | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);  |  |  |
| Standards/Outcomes  | <b>Identifier</b>   |  | <b>Description</b>   |
|                     | Student SI.Student SI<br>1.KPI 4  |  | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices. |
| Assessment Measures | <b>Assessment Measure</b>   | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Attachments</b>   |
|                     | Direct - Licensure Exam   | All students take the National Exam in Speech Language Pathology (PRAXIS Specialty Exam)within 9 months of graduation. The program goal is that 95% of our students will attain the official passing score of 162 with 50% or greater scoring in the average performance range (170 - 184) and 10% in the high performance range (>184). |  |

|                     |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Goal/Objective      | The student will demonstrate knowledge of principles and methods of prevention, assessment and intervention for individuals with communication and swallowing disorders.(Imported) |  |  |
| Legends             | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);   |  |  |
| Standards/Outcomes  | <b>Identifier</b>  |  | <b>Description</b>   |
|                     | Student SI.Student SI<br>1.KPI 4   |  | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices. |
| Assessment Measures | <b>Assessment Measure</b>  | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Attachments</b>   |
|                     | Direct - Licensure Exam  | Student scores on three sub-tests of the PRAXIS exam will be used to measure student progress. The sub-tests used include foundations and professional practice; screening, assessment, evaluation and diagnosis; and planning, implementation and evaluation of treatment. The goal is for the average % correct on all 3 sub-tests to exceed 70%. In |  |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | addition, our students' scores should be within 3 % points of national averages on all sub-tests. |  |
|--|--|---|--|

| Goal/Objective                               | The student will demonstrate a minimum level of clinical competence in the areas of evaluation, intervention and interaction with clinic/patient populations with various types and severity of communication and/or related disorders, differences and disabilities.(Imported)   |                    |  |                    |             |  |  |  |                    |
|--|---|--------------------|--|--------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--------------------|
| Legends                                      | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);  |                    |  |                    |             |  |  |  |                    |
| Standards/Outcomes                           | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Identifier</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Student SI.Student SI<br/>1.KPI 4</b></td> <td>Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  |                    |  | Identifier         | Description | <b>Student SI.Student SI<br/>1.KPI 4</b> | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices. |  |                    |
| Identifier                                   | Description   |                    |  |                    |             |  |  |  |                    |
| <b>Student SI.Student SI<br/>1.KPI 4</b>     | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.  |                    |  |                    |             |  |  |  |                    |
| Assessment Measures                          | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Assessment Measure</th> <th>Criterion</th> <th>Attachments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Direct - Observation of clinical performance</td> <td>Each student is evaluated on the above clinical competencies by the supervisors each semester of clinical practicum using the CODI Student Clinician Knowledge and Skills Acquisition rating form. The goal is that 100% of students graduating from the program will attain an average rating of 4.0 across evaluation, treatment and professional practice. This represents the semi-independent level</td> <td>OffCampus_Eval.xls</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |                    |  | Assessment Measure | Criterion   | Attachments                              | Direct - Observation of clinical performance                         | Each student is evaluated on the above clinical competencies by the supervisors each semester of clinical practicum using the CODI Student Clinician Knowledge and Skills Acquisition rating form. The goal is that 100% of students graduating from the program will attain an average rating of 4.0 across evaluation, treatment and professional practice. This represents the semi-independent level | OffCampus_Eval.xls |
| Assessment Measure                           | Criterion   | Attachments        |  |                    |             |  |  |  |                    |
| Direct - Observation of clinical performance | Each student is evaluated on the above clinical competencies by the supervisors each semester of clinical practicum using the CODI Student Clinician Knowledge and Skills Acquisition rating form. The goal is that 100% of students graduating from the program will attain an average rating of 4.0 across evaluation, treatment and professional practice. This represents the semi-independent level  | OffCampus_Eval.xls |  |                    |             |  |  |  |                    |

| Goal/Objective                            | The student will demonstrate knowledge of the processes used in research and the integration of research principles into evidenced-based practice.(Imported)  |  |  |            |             |  |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|--|------------|-------------|--|--|---|---|
| Legends                                   | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);  |  |  |            |             |  |  |   |   |
| Standards/Outcomes                        | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Identifier</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Student SI.Student SI<br/>1.KPI 4</b></td> <td>Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Student SI.Student SI<br/>3.KPI 10</b></td> <td>Promote a comprehensive chain of research mentoring for graduate students via student-faculty interactions, peer activities, and apprenticeships.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |  |  | Identifier | Description | <b>Student SI.Student SI<br/>1.KPI 4</b> | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices. | <b>Student SI.Student SI<br/>3.KPI 10</b> | Promote a comprehensive chain of research mentoring for graduate students via student-faculty interactions, peer activities, and apprenticeships. |
| Identifier                                | Description   |  |  |            |             |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Student SI.Student SI<br/>1.KPI 4</b>  | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.  |  |  |            |             |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Student SI.Student SI<br/>3.KPI 10</b> | Promote a comprehensive chain of research mentoring for graduate students via student-faculty interactions, peer activities, and apprenticeships.   |  |  |            |             |  |  |   |   |
| Assessment Measures                       |   |  |  |            |             |  |  |   |   |

| Assessment Measure | Criterion  | Attachments                     |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Direct - Project   | Clinical action research projects developed in CODI 550 will be evaluated by at least 2 faculty members using a rubric designed to evaluate action research (see attached). Faculty members will rate projects independently during a poster competition held during the CODI graduate conference each spring. The goal is that 100% of our students will be rated at Level 2 (Novice) or higher with 50% of our students rated at Level 3 (proficient). | CODI_Action_Research_Rubric.doc |

| Goal/Objective                   | The student will demonstrate knowledge of ethical conduct, ASHA Code of Ethics and contemporary professional issues.(Imported)  |                         |                    |             |                                  |  |   |                         |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| Legends                          | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);  |                         |                    |             |                                  |  |   |                         |
| Standards/Outcomes               | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="375 1073 748 1115">Identifier</th> <th data-bbox="748 1073 1511 1115">Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1115 748 1188">Student SI.Student SI<br/>1.KPI 4</td> <td data-bbox="748 1115 1511 1188">Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |                         | Identifier         | Description | Student SI.Student SI<br>1.KPI 4 | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices. |   |                         |
| Identifier                       | Description   |                         |                    |             |                                  |  |   |                         |
| Student SI.Student SI<br>1.KPI 4 | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.  |                         |                    |             |                                  |  |   |                         |
| Assessment Measures              | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="375 1331 591 1404">Assessment Measure</th> <th data-bbox="591 1331 1175 1404">Criterion</th> <th data-bbox="1175 1331 1511 1404">Attachments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1404 591 1814">Direct - Capstone Assignment</td> <td data-bbox="591 1404 1175 1814">Written summaries of the ethics topic discussed in Capstone Seminar will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using a 4 point writing rubric with emphasis on knowledge aspects of their writing. Approximately 1/2 of summaries will be chosen randomly for evaluation. Scores will be compared and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 100% of students will earn a rating of 3 (Effective) or above on the appropriateness, accuracy, extensiveness and perspective aspects of the writing rubric with 40% being rated as 4 (outstanding).</td> <td data-bbox="1175 1404 1511 1814">CODI_Writing_Rubric.doc</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |                         | Assessment Measure | Criterion   | Attachments                      | Direct - Capstone Assignment   | Written summaries of the ethics topic discussed in Capstone Seminar will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using a 4 point writing rubric with emphasis on knowledge aspects of their writing. Approximately 1/2 of summaries will be chosen randomly for evaluation. Scores will be compared and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 100% of students will earn a rating of 3 (Effective) or above on the appropriateness, accuracy, extensiveness and perspective aspects of the writing rubric with 40% being rated as 4 (outstanding). | CODI_Writing_Rubric.doc |
| Assessment Measure               | Criterion   | Attachments             |                    |             |                                  |  |   |                         |
| Direct - Capstone Assignment     | Written summaries of the ethics topic discussed in Capstone Seminar will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using a 4 point writing rubric with emphasis on knowledge aspects of their writing. Approximately 1/2 of summaries will be chosen randomly for evaluation. Scores will be compared and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 100% of students will earn a rating of 3 (Effective) or above on the appropriateness, accuracy, extensiveness and perspective aspects of the writing rubric with 40% being rated as 4 (outstanding).   | CODI_Writing_Rubric.doc |                    |             |                                  |  |   |                         |

|                     |  |  |                         |
|---------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| Goal/Objective      | The student will demonstrate skill in written communication sufficient for entry into professional practice.(Imported) |  |                         |
| Legends             | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);   |  |                         |
| Standards/Outcomes  |  |  |                         |
| Assessment Measures |  |  |                         |
|                     | <b>Assessment Measure</b>  | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Attachments</b>      |
|                     | Direct - Written Assignment  | First drafts of clinical reports from second year students will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using the 4 point writing rubric and focusing on perspective, structure and coherence. Scores will be compared across raters and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 80% of students will earn a rating of 3 (effective) or above on the structural components of the writing rubric with 20% rated at the level of 4 (outstanding) | CODI_Writing_Rubric.doc |

### Program / Department Assessment Narrative

The primary purpose of assessment is to use data to inform decisions and improve programs (student learning) and departments (operations); this is an on-going process of defining goals and expectations, collecting results, analyzing data, comparing current and past results and initiatives, and making decisions based on these reflections. In the space below, describe the program's or department's overall plan for improving student learning and/or operations (the "assessment plan"). Consider the following:

- 1) What strategies exist to assess the outcomes?
- 2) What does the program/department expect to achieve with the goals and objectives identified above?
- 3) How might prior or current initiatives (improvements) influence the anticipated outcomes this year?
- 4) What is the plan for using data to improve student learning and/or operations?
- 5) How will data be shared within the Program/Department (and, where appropriate, the College/VP-area)?

### Assessment Process

Our assessment plan this cycle for the Master's program has two related goals. First we want to make sure that our students continue to graduate with a comparable set of knowledge to students graduating from Master's programs across the country but more importantly across the state as these are the individuals that our students compete for jobs. Secondly, we want to make sure that our students are not only employable but sought out by employers because of their ability to think critically about how to approach therapy with every individual they treat rather than to apply cookie-cutter therapy to every child or adult on their caseload. We expect that if we achieve all of the goals identified above, we will be developing well-rounded professionals. Based on results of the prior cycle, we identified professional writing as a potential weakness and will institute a couple of strategies this cycle to address this goal. One is to try to infuse specific guidance and direction on professional writing in the first year so that when we evaluate student products in the second year, we can expect to find stronger samples. We also identified a drop in our students scores when compared to both state and national averages on the national certification exam. Other programs have experienced good results with specific classes addressing a review of the information covered on the exam as well as practice with the specific format of the exam. Because our pass rate on the exam is still very good, we don't plan to require a class, but we will infuse some of this information into either the clinical practicum course as a series of staffings or as part of the Capstone seminar which

students take in place of a comprehensive exam or thesis.

## Results & Improvements (due 9/15/18)

### Results and Improvement Narratives

**Assessment List Findings for the Assessment Measure level for The student will demonstrate knowledge of the nature of speech, Language and hearing and of communication and swallowing disorders sufficient for entry level positions as a speech-language pathology clinical fellow.(Imported)**

|                     |   |  |  |                                       |  |
|---------------------|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Goal/Objective      | The student will demonstrate knowledge of the nature of speech, Language and hearing and of communication and swallowing disorders sufficient for entry level positions as a speech-language pathology clinical fellow.(Imported) |  |  |                                       |  |
| Legends             | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);  |  |  |                                       |  |
| Standards/Outcomes  | <b>Identifier</b>   |  | <b>Description</b>   |                                       |  |
|                     | <b>Student SI.Student SI 1.KPI 4</b>  |  | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.   |                                       |  |
| Assessment Measures | <b>Assessment Measure</b>   |  | <b>Criterion</b>   |                                       |  |
|                     | Direct - Licensure Exam   |  | All students take the National Exam in Speech Language Pathology (PRAXIS Specialty Exam)within 9 months of graduation. The program goal is that 95% of our students will attain the official passing score of 162 with 50% or greater scoring in the average performance range (170 - 184) and 10% in the high performance range (>184). |                                       |  |
| Assessment Findings | <b>Assessment Measure</b>   | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b>   | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b> | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>  |
|                     | Direct - Licensure Exam   | Has the criterion All students take the National Exam in Speech Language Pathology (PRAXIS Specialty Exam)within 9 months of graduation. The program goal is that 95% of our students will | The primary goal is passing the national certification exam and the program met this goal with 95% of students who took the exam in the 2017-18 exam cycle attaining the passing score. Additionally, 57%  |                                       | - Assessment Process: Targets / Criteria for Success changed: There is very little room for improvement in this objective which shows that our program is doing well preparing students for certification and licensing. For |

|  |  |   |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
|  |  | attain the official passing score of 162 with 50% or greater scoring in the average performance range (170 - 184) and 10% in the high performance range (>184).<br>been met yet?<br>Met | of students scored in the national average performance range and 9% exceeded scores of 184. One student scored 188 which is only 2 points less the the maximum scaled score of 200. |  | the next cycle, we will raise expectations to 60% scoring within the national average performance range. |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|

**Assessment List Findings for the Assessment Measure level for The student will demonstrate knowledge of principles and methods of prevention, assessment and intervention for individuals with communication and swallowing disorders.(Imported)**

|                     |  |  |  |                                       |   |
|---------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| Goal/Objective      | The student will demonstrate knowledge of principles and methods of prevention, assessment and intervention for individuals with communication and swallowing disorders.(Imported) |  |  |                                       |   |
| Legends             | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);   |  |  |                                       |   |
| Standards/Outcomes  | <b>Identifier</b>  |  | <b>Description</b>   |                                       |   |
|                     | <b>Student SI.Student SI 1.KPI 4</b>   |  | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.   |                                       |   |
| Assessment Measures | <b>Assessment Measure</b>  |  | <b>Criterion</b>   |                                       |   |
|                     | Direct - Licensure Exam  |  | Student scores on three sub-tests of the PRAXIS exam will be used to measure student progress. The sub-tests used include foundations and professional practice; screening, assessment, evaluation and diagnosis; and planning, implementation and evaluation of treatment. The goal is for the average % correct on all 3 sub-tests to exceed 70%. In addition, our students' scores should be within 3 % points of national averages on all sub-tests. |                                       |   |
| Assessment Findings | <b>Assessment Measure</b>  | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b>   | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b> | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>   |
|                     | Direct - Licensure Exam  | Has the criterion Student scores on three sub-tests of the PRAXIS exam | Student scores on all three subtests exceeded 70%  |                                       | - Curricular Change : While the criterion was met for this objection, |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | will be used to measure student progress. The sub-tests used include foundations and professional practice; screening, assessment, evaluation and diagnosis; and planning, implementation and evaluation of treatment. The goal is for the average % correct on all 3 sub-tests to exceed 70%. In addition, our students' scores should be within 3 % points of national averages on all sub-tests. been met yet?<br>Met | with scores of 73.5% on foundations and professional practice, 73 % on assessment and 75% on treatment falling within 3% points of national averages. Our students outpaced the national average on the treatment subtest, were comparable on foundations and below on assessment. |  | we noted that our students were below the national average on the assessment subtest. Coupled with a slight dip in competency ratings evaluated for SLO3, we feel that additional focus on the assessment process is warranted. Through implementation of a new professional seminar, increased focus will be placed on assessment and opportunities for conducting assessments will be increased in the clinic. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

**Assessment List Findings for the Assessment Measure level for The student will demonstrate a minimum level of clinical competence in the areas of evaluation, intervention and interaction with clinic/patient populations with various types and severity of communication and/or related disorders, differences and disabilities.(Imported)**

|                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Goal/Objective      | The student will demonstrate a minimum level of clinical competence in the areas of evaluation, intervention and interaction with clinic/patient populations with various types and severity of communication and/or related disorders, differences and disabilities.(Imported) |   |
| Legends             | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);  |   |
| Standards/Outcomes  | <b>Identifier</b>   | <b>Description</b>  |
|                     | <b>Student SI.Student SI 1.KPI 4</b>  | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.  |
| Assessment Measures | <b>Assessment Measure</b>   | <b>Criterion</b>  |
|                     | Direct - Observation of   | Each student is evaluated on the above clinical competencies by the supervisors each semester of clinical practicum using the CODI Student Clinician Knowledge and Skills Acquisition rating form. The goal is that |



|  |   |  |                |                                       |  |
|--|---|--|----------------|---------------------------------------|--|
|  | clinical performance  | 100% of students graduating from the program will attain an average rating of 4.0 across evaluation, treatment and professional practice. This represents the semi-independent level                                     |                |                                       |  |
| Assessment Findings                          |   |  |                |                                       |  |
|  | <b>Assessment Measure</b>   | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Summary</b> | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b> | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>  |
| Direct - Observation of clinical performance | Has the criterion Each student is evaluated on the above clinical competencies by the supervisors each semester of clinical practicum using the CODI Student Clinician Knowledge and Skills Acquisition rating form. The goal is that 100% of students graduating from the program will attain an average rating of 4.0 across evaluation, treatment and professional practice. This represents the semi-independent level been met yet?<br>Met | All graduating students achieved a rating of semi-independent on all aspects of the the scale. They achieved an average rating of 4.33 on evaluation skills, 4.66 on treatment skills and 4.69 on professional practice. |                |                                       | - Curricular Change : Graduating students consistently achieve proficiency ratings of semi-independence in the areas of evaluation, intervention and interaction with clients. However, clinical evaluation competency has been consistently rated lower than treatment and professional practice for several assessment cycles and is an area that the faculty feel needs strengthening. In order to further develop competency in evaluation proficiency, specific assessment modules will be developed and included as components in a new clinical professional seminar that will be implemented this academic year. |

**Assessment List Findings for the Assessment Measure level for The student will demonstrate knowledge of the processes used in research and the integration of research principles into evidenced-based practice.(Imported)**

| Goal/Objective                       | The student will demonstrate knowledge of the processes used in research and the integration of research principles into evidenced-based practice.(Imported)   |   |         |                                |                        |             |         |                                |                                     |  |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|---------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Legends                              | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);   |   |         |                                |                        |             |         |                                |                                     |  |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |
| Standards/Outcomes                   | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="375 552 654 594">Identifier</th> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="654 552 1531 594">Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 594 654 699">Student<br/>SI.Student SI<br/>1.KPI 4</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="654 594 1531 699">Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 699 654 804">Student<br/>SI.Student SI<br/>3.KPI 10</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="654 699 1531 804">Promote a comprehensive chain of research mentoring for graduate students via student-faculty interactions, peer activities, and apprenticeships.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |   |         |                                | Identifier             | Description |         |                                | Student<br>SI.Student SI<br>1.KPI 4 | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.   |  |   | Student<br>SI.Student SI<br>3.KPI 10 | Promote a comprehensive chain of research mentoring for graduate students via student-faculty interactions, peer activities, and apprenticeships. |  |  |
|                                      | Identifier   | Description   |         |                                |                        |             |         |                                |                                     |  |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |
|                                      | Student<br>SI.Student SI<br>1.KPI 4  | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.                                    |         |                                |                        |             |         |                                |                                     |  |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |
| Student<br>SI.Student SI<br>3.KPI 10 | Promote a comprehensive chain of research mentoring for graduate students via student-faculty interactions, peer activities, and apprenticeships.  |   |         |                                |                        |             |         |                                |                                     |  |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |
| Assessment Measures                  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="375 940 597 1014">Assessment Measure</th> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="597 940 1531 1014">Criterion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1014 597 1203">Direct - Project</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="597 1014 1531 1203">Clinical action research projects developed in CODI 550 will be evaluated by at least 2 faculty members using a rubric designed to evaluate action research (see attached). Faculty members will rate projects independently during a poster competition held during the CODI graduate conference each spring. The goal is that 100% of our students will be rated at Level 2 (Novice) or higher with 50% of our students rated at Level 3 (proficient).</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |   |         |                                | Assessment Measure     | Criterion   |         |                                | Direct - Project                    | Clinical action research projects developed in CODI 550 will be evaluated by at least 2 faculty members using a rubric designed to evaluate action research (see attached). Faculty members will rate projects independently during a poster competition held during the CODI graduate conference each spring. The goal is that 100% of our students will be rated at Level 2 (Novice) or higher with 50% of our students rated at Level 3 (proficient). |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |
|                                      | Assessment Measure   | Criterion   |         |                                |                        |             |         |                                |                                     |  |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |
| Direct - Project                     | Clinical action research projects developed in CODI 550 will be evaluated by at least 2 faculty members using a rubric designed to evaluate action research (see attached). Faculty members will rate projects independently during a poster competition held during the CODI graduate conference each spring. The goal is that 100% of our students will be rated at Level 2 (Novice) or higher with 50% of our students rated at Level 3 (proficient).   |   |         |                                |                        |             |         |                                |                                     |  |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |
| Assessment Findings                  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="375 1350 581 1444">Assessment Measure</th> <th data-bbox="581 1350 914 1444">Criterion</th> <th data-bbox="914 1350 1101 1444">Summary</th> <th data-bbox="1101 1350 1312 1444">Attachments of the Assessments</th> <th data-bbox="1312 1350 1531 1444">Improvement Narratives</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1444 581 1971">Direct - Project</td> <td data-bbox="581 1444 914 1971">Has the criterion Clinical action research projects developed in CODI 550 will be evaluated by at least 2 faculty members using a rubric designed to evaluate action research (see attached). Faculty members will rate projects independently during a poster competition held during the CODI graduate conference each spring. The goal is that 100% of our students will be rated at Level 2 (Novice) or higher with 50% of our</td> <td data-bbox="914 1444 1101 1971">This student learner objective was not evaluated this cycle. It will be evaluated in the 2018-19 cycle.</td> <td data-bbox="1101 1444 1312 1971"></td> <td data-bbox="1312 1444 1531 1971"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   |         |                                | Assessment Measure     | Criterion   | Summary | Attachments of the Assessments | Improvement Narratives              | Direct - Project   | Has the criterion Clinical action research projects developed in CODI 550 will be evaluated by at least 2 faculty members using a rubric designed to evaluate action research (see attached). Faculty members will rate projects independently during a poster competition held during the CODI graduate conference each spring. The goal is that 100% of our students will be rated at Level 2 (Novice) or higher with 50% of our | This student learner objective was not evaluated this cycle. It will be evaluated in the 2018-19 cycle. |                                      |   |  |  |
|                                      | Assessment Measure   | Criterion   | Summary | Attachments of the Assessments | Improvement Narratives |             |         |                                |                                     |  |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |
| Direct - Project                     | Has the criterion Clinical action research projects developed in CODI 550 will be evaluated by at least 2 faculty members using a rubric designed to evaluate action research (see attached). Faculty members will rate projects independently during a poster competition held during the CODI graduate conference each spring. The goal is that 100% of our students will be rated at Level 2 (Novice) or higher with 50% of our   | This student learner objective was not evaluated this cycle. It will be evaluated in the 2018-19 cycle. |         |                                |                        |             |         |                                |                                     |  |  |   |                                      |   |  |  |

|  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  |  | students rated at Level 3 (proficient). been met yet? |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|

**Assessment List Findings for the Assessment Measure level for The student will demonstrate knowledge of ethical conduct, ASHA Code of Ethics and contemporary professional issues.(Imported)**

|                     |  |  |   |  |                                       |  |
|---------------------|--|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Goal/Objective      | The student will demonstrate knowledge of ethical conduct, ASHA Code of Ethics and contemporary professional issues.(Imported) |  |   |  |                                       |  |
| Legends             | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);   |  |   |  |                                       |  |
| Standards/Outcomes  | <b>Identifier</b>  |  | <b>Description</b>  |  |                                       |  |
|                     | <b>Student SI.Student SI 1.KPI 4</b>   |  | Improve student success through engagement in high impact practices.  |  |                                       |  |
| Assessment Measures | <b>Assessment Measure</b>  |  | <b>Criterion</b>  |  |                                       |  |
|                     | Direct - Capstone Assignment   |  | Written summaries of the ethics topic discussed in Capstone Seminar will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using a 4 point writing rubric with emphasis on knowledge aspects of their writing. Approximately 1/2 of summaries will be chosen randomly for evaluation. Scores will be compared and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 100% of students will earn a rating of 3 (Effective) or above on the appropriateness, accuracy, extensiveness and perspective aspects of the writing rubric with 40% being rated as 4 (outstanding). |  |                                       |  |
| Assessment Findings | <b>Assessment Measure</b>  |  | <b>Criterion</b>  | <b>Summary</b>   | <b>Attachments of the Assessments</b> | <b>Improvement Narratives</b>  |
|                     | Direct - Capstone Assignment   |  | Has the criterion<br>Written summaries of the ethics topic discussed in Capstone Seminar will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using a 4 point writing rubric with emphasis on knowledge aspects of their writing. Approximately 1/2 of summaries will be  | Student ethics summaries were rated with the majority falling at the effective level but only 94% scored at the effective level or above and only 27% were rated as outstanding. |                                       | - Pedagogical Change : More robust training centered on ethics will be provided through the new professional seminar with introduction to ethics in the first year of clinic and advanced training modules for the |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>chosen randomly for evaluation. Scores will be compared and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 100% of students will earn a rating of 3 (Effective) or above on the appropriateness, accuracy, extensiveness and perspective aspects of the writing rubric with 40% being rated as 4 (outstanding).<br/>                 been met yet?<br/>                 Not met</p> |  |  | <p>second year clinicians.<br/>                 - Assessment Process:<br/>                 Measures changed: A committee of faculty will reevaluate the way that we are assessing student competence in the area of ethics. Ethics papers from Capstone Seminar will continue to be evaluated but we will design a more appropriate evaluation instrument.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

**Assessment List Findings for the Assessment Measure level for The student will demonstrate skill in written communication sufficient for entry into professional practice.(Imported)**

| Goal/Objective              | The student will demonstrate skill in written communication sufficient for entry into professional practice.(Imported)  |           |         |                                |                        |                    |           |                             |  |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------|---------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|--|
| Legends                     | SLO - Student Learning Outcome/Objective (academic units);  |           |         |                                |                        |                    |           |                             |  |
| Standards/Outcomes          |   |           |         |                                |                        |                    |           |                             |  |
| Assessment Measures         | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="375 1440 602 1514">Assessment Measure</th> <th data-bbox="602 1440 1531 1514">Criterion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="375 1514 602 1734">Direct - Written Assignment</td> <td data-bbox="602 1514 1531 1734">First drafts of clinical reports from second year students will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using the 4 point writing rubric and focusing on perspective, structure and coherence. Scores will be compared across raters and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 80% of students will earn a rating of 3 (effective) or above on the structural components of the writing rubric with 20% rated at the level of 4 (outstanding)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |           |         |                                |                        | Assessment Measure | Criterion | Direct - Written Assignment | First drafts of clinical reports from second year students will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using the 4 point writing rubric and focusing on perspective, structure and coherence. Scores will be compared across raters and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 80% of students will earn a rating of 3 (effective) or above on the structural components of the writing rubric with 20% rated at the level of 4 (outstanding) |
| Assessment Measure          | Criterion   |           |         |                                |                        |                    |           |                             |  |
| Direct - Written Assignment | First drafts of clinical reports from second year students will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using the 4 point writing rubric and focusing on perspective, structure and coherence. Scores will be compared across raters and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 80% of students will earn a rating of 3 (effective) or above on the structural components of the writing rubric with 20% rated at the level of 4 (outstanding)  |           |         |                                |                        |                    |           |                             |  |
| Assessment Findings         | Assessment Measure  | Criterion | Summary | Attachments of the Assessments | Improvement Narratives |                    |           |                             |  |

|  |                                    |   |  |  |  |
|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Direct - Written Assignment</p> | <p>Has the criterion First drafts of clinical reports from second year students will be evaluated by 2 faculty members using the 4 point writing rubric and focusing on perspective, structure and coherence. Scores will be compared across raters and agreement reached on any discrepancies. The goal is that 80% of students will earn a rating of 3 (effective) or above on the structural components of the writing rubric with 20% rated at the level of 4 (outstanding) been met yet?</p> | <p>This objective was not assessment this cycle. It will be assessed in the 2018-19 cycle.</p> |  |  |
|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|

**Reflection (Due 9/15/18)**

**Reflection**

The primary purpose of assessment is to use data to inform decisions and improve programs and operations; this is an on-going process of defining goals and expectations, collecting results, analyzing data, comparing current and past results and initiatives, and making decisions based on these reflections. Recalling this purpose, respond to the questions below.

**1) How were assessment results shared in the program / department?**

*Please select all that apply. If "other", please use the text box to elaborate.*

- Distributed via email
- Presented formally at staff / department / committee meetings (selected)
- Discussed informally
- Other (explain in text box below)

**2) How frequently were assessment results shared?**

- Frequently (>4 times per cycle)
- Periodically (2-4 times per cycle)

Once per cycle (selected)  
Results were not shared this cycle

**3) With whom were assessment results shared?**

*Please select all that apply.*

Department Head (selected)

Dean / Asst. or Assoc. Dean

Departmental assessment committee (selected)

Other faculty / staff (selected)

**4) Consider the impact of prior applied changes. Specifically, compare current results to previous results to evaluate the impact of a previously reported change. Demonstrate how the use of results improved student learning and/or operations.**

Based upon prior evaluation cycles and the changes implemented, we were able to meet 3 of the 4 SLOs evaluate. In the SLO focused on ethics were able to identify areas for advanced instruction. We also identified an opportunity to revisit the assessment of the instrument used to evaluate ethics.

**5) Over the past three assessment cycles, what has been the overall impact of "closing the loop"? Provide examples of improvements in student learning, program quality, or department operations that are directly linked to assessment data and follow-up analysis.**

The cumulative efforts towards closing the loop have resulted in the design and implementation of a professional seminar to tailor clinical instruction to the needs of the students. It allows the program flexibility to individualize instruction for specific cohorts of students. The assessments and resulting modifications have moved us closer towards meeting the aspects of our strategic plan for integrating classroom instruction into clinical practices.

**Attachments (optional)**

*Upload any documents which support the program / department assessment process.*