### PART ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning objectives?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed?</th>
<th>What are the expectations?</th>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of anatomic, physical, and physiological bases of speech, language, and hearing. | • Mean score on Basic Science and Audiology sections of Written Comp Exam (Chair)  
• Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: basic science (Assess Coord)  
• Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: basic science (Assess Coord) | • Mean above 70%  
• Mean above 5 on 7 point scale  
• Mean above 4 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan | • Basic Science=66%  
Audiology = 71%  
• Mean of 5.5 (n=24)  
• Soph = 4.5 (n=144)  
Junior = 5.4 (n=54) | Chair shares results with all faculty. Audiology remained above passing for second year. Basic science concerns will be channeled to Curriculum Committee Chair to assess coursework in the area. |
| 2. Students will demonstrate knowledge of linguistic variables related to normal development of speech and hearing. | • Mean score on Normal Development section of Written Comp Exam (Chair)  
• Mean rating on UG Exit Survey 5 re: normal development (Assess Coord)  
• Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: normal development (Assess Coord) | • Mean above 70%  
• Mean above 5 on 7 point scale  
• Mean above 4 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan | • Normal Dev=84%  
• Mean of 5.5 (n=24)  
• Soph = 4.2 (n=96)  
Junior = 5.6 (n=24) | Chair, Assessment Coordinator and Curriculum committee Chair will continue to monitor courses and evaluate Student Formative Assessment ratings from normal development courses. |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3. Students will demonstrate basic knowledge of the nature, evaluation, and treatment for various communication disorders.** | • Mean scores on Phonology, Child Language, and Voice disorder sections of Written Comp Exam (Chair)  
• Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: competence in disorder areas (Assess Coord)  
• Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: develop language disorders (Assess Coord)  
• Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: articulation/phonology disorders (Assess Coord) | • Mean above 70%  
• Mean above 4 on 7 point scale  
• Mean above 4 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan | • Phono=85%  
Child Lang =76%  
Voice = 76%  
• Mean of 5.1 (n=24)  
• Soph =4.9 (n =53)  
Junior=5.6 (n = 50)  
Senior=5.6 (n=17)  
• Junior=4.9 (n=28)  
Senior=5.6 (n=17) | Chair shares results with all faculty. Assessment Coordinator and Curriculum Committee Chair will monitor ratings and evaluate Student Formative Assessment Ratings in pertinent courses. |
| **4. Students will demonstrate knowledge of basic principles for clinical evaluation and treatment on communication disorders.** | • Mean score on Practicum section of Written Comp Exam (Chair)  
• Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: clinical competence (Assess Coord)  
• Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: clinical evaluation (Assess Coord) | • Mean above 70%  
• Mean above 4 on 7 point scale  
• Mean above 4 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan | • Practicum = 88%  
• Mean of 5.0 (n=24)  
• Junior=5.1 (n=106)  
Senior=5.4 (n=37) | Chair shares results with all faculty. Assessment Coordinator and Clinic Committee Chair will monitor ratings and evaluate Student Formative Assessment Ratings in pertinent courses. Practicum ratings continue to improve, reinforcing the commitment of UG clinic and course credit units invested in the experience. |
| **5. Students will demonstrate a foundation of professional development within the discipline for further education or expansion into content applications.** | • % of UG accepted into graduate programs (Chair)  
• Number of undergraduate student awards (Awards Committee Chair) | • 90% minimum acceptance into graduate programs  
• 3 undergraduate student awards | • 100% of 04-05 UG accepted in graduate school  
• 5 UG research awards; 5 UG scholarships; 5 UG presentations | UG students were very successful in demonstrating a strong professional preparation. Chair and Assessment Coordinator will continue to monitor. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Students will demonstrate competence in basic communication skills for professional development</th>
<th>• Mean score on Oral Comp Exam (Chair)</th>
<th>• Mean above 70%</th>
<th>• Overall Mean on Oral Comp=84%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: written and oral communication skills (Assess Coord)</td>
<td>• Mean above 5 on 7 point scale</td>
<td>• Written = 5.33 Oral = 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: written communication skills (Assess Coord)</td>
<td>• Mean above 4 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan</td>
<td>• Soph=4.8 (n=45)Junior=4.7 (n=55)Senior=5.4 (n=39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: oral communication skills (Assess Coord)</td>
<td>• Mean above 4 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan</td>
<td>• Soph=4.9 (n=45)Junior=5.3 (n=85)Senior=5.9 (n=17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum changes in UG courses incorporate increased opportunities for student presentations and written papers. Faculty will evaluate this in Student Formative Assessment ratings across all courses. Chair and Assessment Coordinator will monitor.

**PART TWO**

Describe what your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

In response to the CASA Director’s comments last year, the CDS Department discussed the following:

- **Work on developing a procedure to more objectively evaluate the effectiveness of undergraduate clinical practicum experiences.**
  Response: A section for written comments was added to the Undergraduate Student Exit Survey, specifically asking about their undergraduate preparation and clinical practicum experiences. Narrative comments were extremely positive, citing that the undergraduate clinical experiences were the most beneficial part of the program and helped students utilize their academic knowledge in a meaningful way. The goal for this year will be to try and more objectively evaluate that component as part of the UG Exit Survey.

- **Student Formative Assessment Ratings will be calculated from all undergraduate courses for the first time this summer. Those ratings will be used to evaluate courses to determine if the content is meeting knowledge and skill statements targeted within each course. Several actions will occur as a result. First, students who do not meet minimum rating levels will be required to formulate a Remediation Plan to address weak areas identified on Formative Assessment Ratings. Second, the Curriculum Committee will review course ratings, summative results (comprehensive exams) and UG Exit Survey ratings and comments to determine if content objectives are being adequately met. Third, ratings will be used to determine if levels of course offerings (sophomore, junior, senior) are productive for student learning.**
PART THREE

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

Assessment results have been used to modify several aspects of the CDS program. In addition, continual monitoring and discussion is ongoing in standing departmental committees. Some specific examples are provided in the following section.

- The low scores in Basic Science on the Written Comprehensive Exam are a concern. The Curriculum Committee is investigating the use of various computer software programs to strengthen the laboratory component of the basic science courses. The software could be available to students for independent review and learning to reinforce classroom instruction. A Presidential Graduate Assistantship has been awarded to the department for the purpose of developing this technology laboratory component during 2005-2006.

- Assessment data suggests that moving the Audiology course from the junior sequence to the senior year course sequence has been a positive change. Students are more prepared for the technical information at that level and are learning the material better, as reflected in scores.

- The implementation of Student Formative Assessment Ratings has now been integrated into assessment data points for the undergraduate program. First year data is already very positive, showing an upward trend in ratings as students matriculate through the program. This suggests that the formative assessment goals integrated throughout the academic curriculum are strengthening knowledge in content areas with increased exposure to content over the three years of courses in the major at the undergraduate level.