***STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM***

***SUMMARY FORM AY 2015-2017***

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 15, 2017**. Worksheets should be sent electronically to kjsanders@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.
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Angela B. Anthony, Department Chair

**Please use size 10 font or larger.**

**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? |
| 1.Students will demonstrate knowledge of anatomic, physical, and physiological bases of speech, language, and hearing | Mean score on Basic Science & Audiology sections of Written Comprehensive Exam. Chair administers multiple-choice exam in January each year.Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: basic science. Assessment Coordinator and Chair coordinate electronic collection annually.Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: basic science. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically from seniors prior to graduation annually.Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: basic science and neurology. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically at conclusion of each semester and averages annually. | Mean score above 70%Mean above 3 on 4 point scale Mean above 5 on 7 point scale Mean above 4 on 7 point scale  | Basic Science = 82%Audiology = 77%Basic Science Mean = 3.64/4(n = 39)Basic Science Mean = 5.97/7( n= 33)Anatomy/PhysiologyJuniors = 5.53 (n=54)Seniors = 5.51 (n=48)NeurologyJuniors = 5.34 (n=54)Seniors= 5.24 (n=48) | Chair and Assessment Coordinator are responsible for data collection and compilation. Data is shared with all faculty and issues are discussed. Any follow-up actions are channeled to the appropriate departmental committee. |
| 2. Students will demonstrate knowledge of linguistic variables related to normal development of speech and hearing. | Mean score on Normal Development section of Written Comprehensive Exam. Chair administers multiple-choice exam in January each year.Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: normal development. Assessment Coordinator and Chair coordinate electronic collection annually in March. Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: normal development. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically from seniors prior to May graduation annually.Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: normal development. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically at conclusion of each semester and averages annually. | Mean score above 70%Mean above 3 on 4 point scaleMean above 5 on 7 point scaleMean above 4 on 7 point scale | Normal Development =89%Normal Dev Mean = 3.49/4(n = 39)Normal Dev Mean = 6.25/7(n = 32)Normal Development Language MeanJuniors = 4.43 (n= 54)Seniors = 4.83 (n= 48)Phonology/Artic MeanJuniors = 4.86 (n=54)Seniors = 4.58 (n=48) | Chair and Assessment Coordinator are responsible for data collection and compilation. Data is shared with all faculty and issues are discussed. Any follow-up actions are channeled to the appropriate departmental committee. Curriculum Committee Chair also monitors course content and formative assessment rating averages.  |
| 3. Students will demonstrate basic knowledge of the nature, evaluation, and treatment for various communication disorders | Mean scores on Phonology, Developmental Language, and Voice sections of Written Comprehensive Exam. Chair administers multiple-choice exam in January each year.Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: disorder preparation. Assessment Coordinator and Chair coordinate electronic collection annually in March. Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: competence in disorder areas. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically from seniors prior to May graduation annually.Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: developmental language disorders and phonology/articulation. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically at conclusion of each semester and averages annually. | Mean score above 70%Mean above 3 on 4 point scaleMean above 5 on 7 point scaleMean above 4 on 7 point scale | Phonology = 84% Developmental Lang =78% Voice = 85%Disorders Mean = 3.61/4 (n = 39)Disorders Mean = 5.56/7(n = 32)Language MeanJuniors = 4.43 (n= 54)Seniors = 4.83 (n= 48)Phonology/Artic MeanJuniors = 4.86 (n=54)Seniors = 4.58 (n=48) | Chair and Assessment Coordinator are responsible for data collection and compilation. Data is shared with all faculty and issues are discussed. Any follow-up actions are channeled to the appropriate departmental committee. Curriculum Committee Chair also monitors course content and formative assessment rating averages; Clinic Committee Chair monitors formative assessment rating averages.  |
| 4. Students will demonstrate knowledge of basic principles for clinical evaluation and treatment of communication disorders. | Mean score on Practicum section of Written Comprehensive Exam. Chair administers multiple-choice exam in January each year.Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: clinical preparation. Assessment Coordinator and Chair coordinate electronic collection annually in March. Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: clinical competency. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically from seniors prior to May graduation annually.Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: clinical evaluation. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically at conclusion of each semester and averages annually. | Mean score above 70%Mean above 3 on 4 point scaleMean above 5 on 7 point scaleMean above 4 on 7 point scale | Practicum = 86%Clinical Prep Mean =3.54/4 (n = 39)Clinical Comp Mean = 5.79/7 (n = 33)Evaluation Principles MeanJuniors = 5.05 (n=54)Seniors = 5.45 (n = 48) | Chair and Assessment Coordinator are responsible for data collection and compilation. Data is shared with all faculty and issues are discussed. Any follow-up actions are channeled to the appropriate departmental committee. Clinic Committee Chair also monitors formative assessment rating averages. |
| 5. Students will demonstrate a foundation of professional development within the discipline for further education or expansion, including critical thinking and global citizenship (**undergraduate learning goals)** | Percentage of students accepted into graduate programs. Chair monitors annually by surveying seniors prior to May graduation.Number of undergraduate student awards. Awards Committee Chair compiles and shares with Chair annually.Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: critical thinking and socio-cultural knowledge. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically from seniors prior to May graduation annually. | 85% acceptance rate3 or more student awardsMean above 5 on 7 point scale | 85% accepted in graduate programs in CDS or related disciplines2 Undergraduate Research Awards, 6 scholarships, 7 ISHA presentations, 2 ASHA presentations, Commencement Speaker chosen from CDS in 2016 and 2017Critical Think Mean = 6.36/7 (n = 33)Socio-Culture Mean = 5.42/7 (n = 33) | Chair calculates acceptance rate into graduate study. Results are shared with faculty.Awards Committee Chair and Department Chair monitor and compile student awards. Results are shared with faculty and published annually in the Alumni Newsletter.  |
| 6. Students will demonstrate competence in basic communication skills for professional development, including speaking and writing **(undergraduate learning goals)** | Mean overall score on Oral Comprehensive Exam. Faculty hear oral case summary presentations in January each year.Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: written communication and oral interaction. Assessment Coordinator and Chair coordinate electronic collection annually in March. Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: written and oral communication skills. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically from seniors prior to May graduation annually.Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: written and oral communication skills. Assessment Coordinator collects electronically at conclusion of each semester and averages annually. | Mean score above 70%Mean above 3 on 4 point scaleMean above 5 on 7 point scaleMean above 4 on 7 point scale | Oral Comp Mean = 83%Written Comm Mean = no data available Oral Interaction Mean = 3.68/4(n = 39)Written Comm Mean = 6.0/7Verbal Comm Mean = 6.12/7(n = 33)Written CommunicationJuniors = 4.84 (n=54)Seniors =5.22 (n= 48)Oral CommunicationJuniors = 4.96 (n =54)Seniors = 5.41 (n =48) | Chair and Assessment Coordinator are responsible for data collection and compilation. Data is shared with all faculty and issues are discussed. Any follow-up actions are channeled to the appropriate departmental committee.  |

**PART TWO**

Describe 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.

Writing rubrics, which were originally implemented in 2011, continue to be used across all levels of undergraduate coursework. At sophomore level, the rubric emphasizes mechanics of writing (e.g., spelling, punctuation, sentence structure), at the junior level, the rubric emphasizes content and formatting (e.g., transitions, clarity, APA), and at the senior level, the rubric emphasizes critical thinking (e.g., support for ideas, synthesis, substantiate conclusions).Assignments graded with the writing rubric are also returned with opportunities for students to revise and resubmit, and serve as papers that can be submitted for the EWP.

The CDS senior capstone class continues to provide an excellent summative course for addressing the undergraduate learning goals. Students engage in case-based discussion that requires critical thinking with a synthesis of content across the entire undergraduate curriculum. Case-based applied projects provide opportunities to address professional written skills. One written project includes utilizing feedback for a revised submission that can be used for the EWP. The final is a verbal case summary that is scored using the university speaking rubric. Global citizenship is addressed through sensitivity to cultural differences in cases, collaboration with other professional disciplines, and the impact of disorders on the wider cultural environment. Students have responded positively to the course and it provides the CDS Department with an assessment point for all of the undergraduate learning goals.

Students continue to successfully complete the Departmental Honors program, with presentations given both on campus and at state and national conferences. One student project in 2016-17 led to a publication with her advisor that is currently accepted and in final revision stages.

One notable improvement since the last report is the rate of acceptance of undergraduate students into graduate programs. At the time of the previous report, only 61% were accepted into CDS or related graduate programs. During this assessment period, the target 85% acceptance rate was achieved. This is a notable accomplishment, as recent data shows that nationwide, the acceptance rate is approximately 50%.

Also during this time period, alumni and exit surveys were converted to a new web-based system that allows for more efficient summarization and analysis of the data. In the process of conversion, it was discovered that some questions in the old system were not transferred to the new system. This will be corrected for future surveys.

**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?

The use of formative assessment ratings to guide student advising decisions has continued. The departmental learning objectives that constitute the formative assessment ratings are independent of the course grade. Faculty spend a great deal of time evaluating every student each semester on multiple assessment points. Trends in the assessment data over time suggest that students with multiple Remediation Plans from more than one departmental class are generally not successful in completing the major or being admitted to graduate school unless those deficits are addressed. Completion of Remediation Plans is not required of students, it is optional; but the data is very convincing. Faculty can emphasize how important it is for students with Remediation Plans to take advantage of extra faculty mentoring to resolve weak areas if they want to succeed or remain in the discipline. Though this is a valuable process, it is extremely time consuming; therefore, discussions have begun about how the process can be made more efficient, without losing the quality of the assessment data we obtain.

In response to trends in data showing that transfer students who came to EIU and completed the CDS major in two years often struggled more than students who completed the typical 3 year sequence of CDS courses, a 2.5 year sequence of courses was developed for transfer students. During recruitment and advising of transfer students, the option of beginning at EIU in the spring semester to take the 2000 level courses was encouraged. Spring courses were scheduled on two days rather than over four days, to allow students who are within driving distance to Charleston to come to campus just two days per week. This was intended to allow students to also take courses at their community college or to work on the other days. This option allows students to then spread out the junior and senior sequence courses over the subsequent 2 years. The department has been successful in getting some students to enroll in this course sequence, and some have still taken courses at their community college in the spring or summer to complete their associate’s degree. Future data will be analyzed to determine if students in this sequence show a better rate of success.

Additionally, undergraduate advising assignments have been reorganized to allow for more intentional advising. Instead of assigning students at all levels to each faculty advisor, students have been grouped into cohorts by graduation date. This means that when faculty are advising students in a particular semester, all of the students they are advising are at the same level in the program, and should be focused on the same requirements, coursework, etc. This has allowed faculty advisors to use their time more efficiently, and several advisors have worked to develop a handbook that highlights necessary requirements and procedures at each level, and have share those with new advisors as they begin to advise a new group of students.

Given the data that only 50% of students are successful in entering graduate school in the profession, the Curriculum Committee has spent a significant amount of time in the past two years examining how we might provide our students with the greatest chances for success in getting admitted to their desired program, but also provide them with coursework that offers alternatives for entering graduate programs in other fields or opportunities for employment with the undergraduate degree. One task was to expand our list of suggested minors for students, which has been developed and is shared during the annual advisement night. In addition, CDS is exploring the option of developing a certificate and/or minor in teaching English as a second language. Collaboration is occurring with the Education department, as this is an option that also has potential to benefit their program and students.