

Doisy College of Health Sciences

2021-2022 Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Speech, Language & Hearing Sciences	Department: SLHS
Degree or Certificate Level: M.S.	College/School: Doisy College of Health Sciences
Date (Month/Year): 9/2022	Assessment Contact: Mitzi Brammer
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2021-2022	
In what year was the program’s assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2019-2020	
Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization? Yes, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) https://www.asha.org/certification/course-content-areas-for-slpstandards/	

Note to DCHS Programs:
Please use this format to title each report file- 2021-2022, program title abbreviation, Prog-Lvl Assess AnnualRpt
 [example: 2021-2022,HSCI_ProgLvlAssessAnnualRpt]

Upload completed reports to the T-drive here: [each program has a separate folder]
 Allied Health | Common | 1.2-2021-2022 DCHS ProgLvlAssessRpts

Thank you!

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

PLO #2 Students will demonstrate evidence-based practice (EBP), including critical appraisal of research
 PLO #4 Students will demonstrate cultural and linguistic competence

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail and identify the course(s) in which they were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Research for the Clinician: PICO project
 AAC: Assessment Plan, Device Recommendation & Embedded Instruction Plan Project
 Clinical Practicum: Clinical performance as measured by supervisor observation and eValue® ratings
 Clinical Practicum: Clinical performance as measured by supervisor observation and eValue® ratings
 Multilingual Communication Disorders: Praxis Practice Exam
 Social Communication Disorders: Social Communication Language Assessment Report

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

The instructors for Research for the Clinician, AAC, and Social Communication Disorders utilized a self-developed rubric respectively for their course culminating projects. Practicum experiences were a numerical scale using the eValue system to denote mastery or not. Students also received qualitative feedback from their Clinical Instructors (Cis).

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

100% of students scored 85% or higher on the PICO project (course was taught face-to-face only)
100% of students scored 85% or higher on the Assessment Plan, Device Recommendation & Embedded Instruction Plan Project for AAC
80% of students are scoring in “developing” on the eValue rubrics for practicum (first year cohort); 90% of the students are scoring in “meets expectancy” on the eValue rubrics for external practicum (2nd year cohort)
75% of the students who took the Praxis practice exam achieved a “passing” score (this is not uncommon as students have not had time to fully prepare for the actual exam, taken in spring year 2)
90% of students scored 90% or higher on the Social Communication Disorders Language Assessment Report Project

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

All of the courses were taught in class. Students have noted that they feel that have stronger instructor support when courses are taught in person. Students need to dedicate amounts of time after each of their semesters to begin studying for the Praxis rather than waiting until the very end and using “mass practice” over several days. The rubrics have been designed to accurately measure the results the instructors are looking for.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The faculty discussed these results during a faculty meeting using open ended questions, reviewing this report, and harvesting additional faculty feedback. The reflective question was also asked if we would do anything differently the next time the course is taught.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you’ve initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

Artifacts of student learning will be adopted because the accrediting body of ASHA now says that every SLHS Master's program MUST have a way to summatively measure student outcomes which is NOT the Praxis exam. Rubrics have been helpful tools for instructors to use to guide students so that they know what an "A" project looks like versus a "C" level project. This is the first year for Dr. Roepke to teach our graduate students and they have responded excellently to her teaching techniques.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

NA

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

We developed our own rubrics rather than the previous ones that delineated introductory vs. mastery. By the time students are in the master's program, there really are no introductory courses. Teacher-designed rubrics have been a better way to measure student learning. Students have expressed in end of course evaluations that they felt rubrics were a fair and informative way to assess their work and knowledge of the material presented.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

Through feedback from the instructors who have taught using the previous rubrics and the rubrics they designed themselves.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

They want to continue to design their own rubrics.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

It still needs to be evaluated each year because depending on the course material, a rubric may not be the best way to measure student progress.

IMPORTANT: *

Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. *Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.*

For DCHS Programs:

If you choose to copy/paste items from the list above* and those below^, clearly label them within the

Word document. Example: PLO1 Rubrics

Submit a description of each artifact and whenever possible, an example of a student-completed artifact with the student's name removed.

Submit the actual analyzed data (not the raw data) for each PLO being assessed.

If the items below are submitted as separate documents[^], label them following these examples:

2021-2022,HSCI_ArtifactDescription4PLO1

2021-2022,HSCI_CurrentAssessRubrics4PLO1

2021-2022,HSCI_AnalyzedData4PLO1

2021-2022, HSCI_Revised ProgLvlAssessPlan

Use the same labelling format for other separate documents germane to the PLO under assessment.