

**STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
SUMMARY FORM AY 2004-2005**

**Degree and
Program Name:**

Master of Science
Communication Disorders & Sciences

Submitted By:

Gail J. Richard

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CASA this year by **June 1**. Worksheets should be sent electronically to cskjs@eiu.edu and should also be submitted to your college dean. For information about assessment or help with your assessment plans, visit the Assessment webpage at <http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/> or contact Karla Sanders in CASA at 581-6056.

PART ONE

What are the learning objectives?	How, where, and when are they assessed?	What are the expectations?	What are the results?	Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared?
<p>1. Students will demonstrate advanced knowledge of the nature, evaluation, and treatment for various communication disorders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean score on Adult Language, Fluency, and Dysphagia sections of Written Comp Exam (Chair) • Pass rate on national accreditation exam (Chair) • Pass rate on ISBE certification exam (Chair) • Mean rating on Grad Exit Survey re: nature, evaluation, and treatment of communication disorders (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on Alumni Survey re:competence in disorder areas (Assess Coord) • Mean Rating Grad Formative Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean above 70% • 90% pass rate • 95% pass rate • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale • Mean above 3 on 4 point scale • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Lang=66% Fluency = 82% Dysphagia = 82% • 83% pass • 75% pass • Mean of 6.0 (n=24) • Disorder Prep= 3.5 (n=12) • Clinic Dis =5.99 	<p>Chair shares results with all faculty. Dysphagia was above the pass rate for the first time. Adult Language concerns will be channeled to the Curriculum Committee to assess coursework in the area.</p> <p>Low pass rates on national and state exams have been discussed extensively. ISBE implemented a new exam this year and required students to take it prior to student teaching, which is a significant disadvantage to students. The CDS Professional Regulations course, which covers this content, was also moved to summer, resulting that student take the test prior</p>

	Ratings re: clinical disorders	below requires Remediation Plan		to receiving the content knowledge. This is an ongoing discussion in the department.
2. Students will understand principles and apply methods of clinical treatment for evaluation and intervention of various communication disorders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean score on Practicum section of Written Comp Exam (Chair) • Mean rating on Grad Exit Survey re: clinical treatment (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: clinical treatment (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on Grad Formative Assessment Ratings re: clinical assessment • Mean Rating on Medical Internship Formative Assessment Ratings re: clinical assessment • Mean Rating on Educational Internship Formative Assessment Ratings re: clinical assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean above 70% • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale • Mean above 3 on 4 point scale • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practicum=88% • Mean of 6.2 (n=24) • Clinical Applic=3.7 (n = 12) • Clin Assess=6.15 • Clin Assess=6.5 (n=19) • Clin Assess=6.65 (n=22) 	<p>Graduates, alumni, and employers consistently cite strength in clinical training at EIU.</p> <p>Clinic Director, Graduate Coordinator, Chair, and Committee Chairs regularly discuss curriculum issues for modifications to improve effectiveness.</p>
3. Students will demonstrate a foundation within the discipline for future professional development activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean scores on Professional Regulations section of Written Comp Exam (Chair) • Mean rating on Grad Exit Survey re: independent learning strategies and professional ethics (Assess Coord) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean above 70% • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof Regs = 81% • Indep Learn=6; Prof ethics=5.8 (n=24) 	<p>Results are shared with all faculty by the chair. Issues are channeled to the standing department committees to address, as appropriate.</p> <p>Graduates continue to perform extremely well in employment settings and are very competitive in</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: independent learning (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on Grad Formative Assessment Ratings re: professional / ethical development • Mean Rating on Medical Internship Formative Assessment Ratings re: prof/ethics • Mean Rating on Educational Internship Formative Assessment Ratings re: prof/ ethics • % employment (Chair) • Number of professional presentations by graduate students (Awards Com Chair) • Number of graduate scholarships and research awards (Awards Com Chair) • Number of graduate theses completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean above 3 on 4 point scale • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan • 95% or above • 5 or more graduate presentations • 5 or more graduate student awards • 3 or more graduate theses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indep Learn = 3.7 (n= 12) • Prof/ethic = 5.8 • Prof/ethic = 6.95 (n= 19) • Prof/ethic =6.9 (n=23) • 100 % employed • 13 professional presentations • 7 graduate scholarships; 6 research awards • 5 graduate theses completed 	<p>the job market. Ratings from supervisors in Educational and Medical Internship rate students very high on professionalism and ethical conduct.</p> <p>Professional awards and accepted presentations at national and state conferences continue to increase in number each year.</p>
<p>4. Students will develop and demonstrate professional verbal communication and interpersonal skills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean overall score on Oral Comprehensive Exam (Chair) • Mean rating on Grad Exit Survey re: written, verbal and critical thinking skills (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: written, verbal, and critical thinking skills (Assess Coord) • Mean Rating on Grad Formative Assessment Ratings re: written, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean above 70% • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale • Mean above 3 on 4 point scale • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall mean= 84% • Written = 6.0; Verbal = 6.1; Critic Think = 5.8 (n=24) • Written = 3.6 Verbal = 4.0 Critic Think =3.75 (n= 12) • Written =6.04 Verbal = 6.11 Critical Think=5.8 	<p>Format for the Oral Comprehensive Exam for graduate students was completely revamped to a Case Study format and implemented this year with positive comments from both faculty and students.</p> <p>Medical and Education Internship Site Supervisors were asked to complete Formative Assessment Ratings on their students this year;</p>

	verbal, and critical thinking preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean Rating on Medical Internship Formative Assessment Ratings re: • Mean Rating on Educational Internship Formative Assessment Ratings re: 	Remediation Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale; 3 or below requires Remediation Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written = 6.7 Verbal = 6.7 Critical Think=6.6 (n= 19) • Written = 6.82 Verbal = 6.8 Critical Think=6.8 (n=22) 	those ratings have been very strong from future employment settings Graduate Coordinator, Chair, and Clinic Director will continue to monitor assessment data to determine program effectiveness and need for modifications.
--	--	---	--	---

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 to the graduate program last year, the CDS Department discussed the following:

- The Medical and Educational Internship experiences need to be evaluated in a similar format so impressions can be incorporated into the Student Formative Assessment Ratings. The Clinic Committee worked with the CDS Internship Coordinators and CDS Assessment Coordinator to revise the evaluation forms to allow off-campus supervisors to rate the students' knowledge and skills on the same rating scale as is used internally in the department throughout their academic coursework. This will allow comparison of internal on-campus clinical competence to off-campus external clinical competence. This will provide valuable data in the department's feedback loop by insuring perceptions of training competence as evaluated by professionals outside the department immediately following completion of their off campus training, prior to seeking professional employment.
- Student Formative Assessment Ratings were calculated each semester for all graduate students for the first time this year. The ratings were used to identify students who demonstrated deficits in knowledge or skills in specific areas of the discipline. Students identified were required to generate a Remediation Plan to independently resolve those deficits. One graduate student was flagged at the end of the fall semester using this process; two students were identified at the end of spring semester for Remediation Plans. The process of the Remediation Plan was monitored and evaluated during its first implementation, which resulted in several modifications to streamline the process for both students and faculty to more satisfactorily accomplish the intent of the Remediation Plan.
- The Oral Comprehensive Exam for graduate students was revised and piloted with a small group of students last year. Faculty and student feedback was used to revise the format and implement a case-study structure for all students this year. The results were very positive for both faculty and students, with everyone feeling that the experience was more beneficial and realistic in evaluating a student's cumulative knowledge for a summative assessment experience.

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 decrease in pass rate on the national and state professional exams is a significant concern. Both have been discussed extensively at the department's all day retreat and monthly faculty meetings. Discussion has been initiated with ISBE to determine if the timing of the teacher certification exam can be changed to allow students to experience that setting prior to being tested on their knowledge of that setting. Movement of the Professional Regulations course to summer also appears to have negatively impacted test performance; the students are receiving the content knowledge in the summer after being required to take the test during the previous spring.
- Curriculum changes implemented in the past year are being evaluated to determine weak areas on the national certification exam. This issue will continue to be discussed in the coming year to determine possible resolutions.
- The clinical delivery model was consistent in the EIU Clinic, consisting primarily of individual treatment sessions. In response to credit units constraints in the summer program and alternative service delivery options encouraged in various employment settings, the Clinic Committee generated options to revise summer clinical practicum to a group service module once a week for two hours. That new treatment model is being implemented this summer. Clients, faculty, and graduate students will be asked to provide feedback regarding the revised structure.
- The limited number of responses to Alumni and Employer Surveys continues to be a concern. The CDS Department is in the second year of on-line submission and will continue to evaluate response numbers. The Department Assessment Coordinator and Chair have also discussed modifying the timing of the request for completion of the survey to earlier in the spring semester. The implementation of Student Formative Assessment Ratings in the Medical and Educational Internships will be used to supplement these ratings for the graduate program.