

## EWU Programmatic SLO Assessment

AY 2014-15 and “Closing the Loop” for AY 2013-14

### Introduction:

Assessment of student learning is an important and integrated part of faculty and programs. As part of ongoing program assessment at Eastern Washington University, each department is asked to report on assessment results for *each* program and *each* certificate for *at least one* Student Learning Outcome (SLO) this year. To comply with accreditation standards, the programs must also demonstrate efforts to “close the loop” in improving student learning and/or the learning environment. Thus, this template has been revised into two parts.

### Resources:

Check this site for sample reports (created with the previous year’s template) by EWU programs and other assessment resources: <http://access.ewu.edu/undergraduate-studies/faculty-support/student-learning-assessment/program-slo-assessment.xml>

Additional resources and support are available to:

- 1) Determine whether students can do, know or value program goals upon graduation and to what extent;
- 2) Determine students’ progress through the program, while locating potential bottlenecks, curricular redundancies, and more; and
- 3) Embed assessments in sequenced and meaningful ways that save time.

Contact Dr. Helen Bergland for assistance with assessment in support of student learning and pedagogical approaches: [hbergland@ewu.edu](mailto:hbergland@ewu.edu) or 359.4305.

Use this template to report on your program assessment. **Reports are due to your Dean and to Dr. Helen Bergland ([hbergland@ewu.edu](mailto:hbergland@ewu.edu)), Office of Academic Planning, by Nov. 2, 2015.**

Degree/Certificate: BA

Major/Option: COMD

Submitted by: Lesli Cleveland

Date:

### Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2014-15

**Part I – for the 2014-15 academic year:** Because Deans have been asked to create College-Level Synthesis Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

1. **Undergraduate Student Learning Outcome: Describe the anatomical, physiological and psychological properties involved in normal communication processes of hearing, speech, language and swallowing.**

We focused on normal process of hearing to measure this SLO.

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

\_\_\_\_\_ SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;

\_\_\_\_\_ SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;

\_\_x\_\_ SLO is met without change required

3. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

During COMD 372 Audiometry, two activities (two hearing screenings and one sound level assignment) were implemented to assess the students' knowledge of the normal process of hearing. Specifically, 32 juniors and post-bac students had to demonstrate knowledge of the physics of sound and the measurement of its dimensions and apply basic principles of acoustics to human hearing and speech by 1) conducting hearing screenings using an audiometer and discussing prevention procedures with the subjects and 2) calculating the signal to noise ratio in a classroom setting. They were graded by the instructor or teaching assistant using a rubric (attached).

The students had to recruit subjects for the hearing screening project. Everyone was received a hearing screening screened in one of the clinic rooms on campus.

4. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.

- a. Findings: **The students conducted two supervised hearing screenings: one school-age child and one adult. The students had to demonstrate knowledge and skills learned in the classroom. The average earned score for the school-age child hearing screening 41.75/42 points (letter grade A) with scores ranging from 39-42. The average earned score for the adult hearing screening 47.38/48 points (letter grade A) with scores ranging from 43-48.**

**The signal to noise ratio calculation was conducted in a classroom setting. All students earned the 20 points for this project (letter grade A).**

- b. Analysis of findings: **Based on the grades earned for these projects, the students demonstrated knowledge of normal hearing process and the skills to carry out these activities which address this particular SLO.**

5. **What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?**

- a) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

**These projects demonstrate active learning and a real-world experience for the students. We have no plans to change these learning activities or the way they are assessed.**

- b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.

6. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

**NEW:** PART II – CLOSING THE LOOP – COMD UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM  
FOLLOW-UP FROM THE 2013-14 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

In response to the university's accrediting body, the [Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities](#), this section has been added. This should be viewed as a follow up to the previous year's findings. In other words, begin with findings from 2013-14, and then describe actions taken during 2014-15 to improve student learning along, provide a brief summary of findings, and describe possible next steps.

**PLEASE NOTE:** The College-Level Synthesis report includes a section asking Deans to summarize which programs/certificates have demonstrated "closing-the-loop" assessments and findings based on the previous year's assessment report.

***Working definition for closing the loop:** Using assessment results to improve student learning as well as pedagogical practices. This is an essential step in the continuous cycle of assessing student learning. It is the collaborative process through which programs use evidence of student learning to gauge the efficacy of collective educational practices, and to identify and implement strategies for improving student learning." Adapted 8.21.13 from <http://www.hamline.edu/learning-outcomes/closing-loop.html>.*

7. **Student Learning Outcome(s)** assessed for 2013-14  
**Undergraduate Student Learning Outcome: Illustrate insight into the communication disorders profession by participating in service learning opportunities**
  
8. **Strategies implemented** during 2014-15 to improve student learning, based on findings of the 2013-14 assessment activities.  
**To increase the students' insight into the profession of speech-language pathology, the instructor focused more on the connection between language and literacy and the roles and responsibilities of an SLP working with young school-age children on written and spoken language. Reflection questions in the students' SL journals were revised and geared toward making the clinical connection. The students gain knowledge regarding literacy skills and how to create and implement literacy activities. This is demonstrated through the actual implementation of the literacy centers and student assessment (i.e., tests) over the course. However, they also need to make the connection between what they are doing and learning with the field of speech-language pathology. Molly Ayers assisted the course professor with a slight revision of the SL journal reflection questions to better address this connection. However, a pre-post survey regarding SL and the knowledge of the profession of communication disorders was not completed during this course.**

9. **Summary of results** (may include comparative data or narrative; description of changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.): Describe the effect of the changes towards improving student learning and/or the learning environment.

**Based on the Spring 2015 journal entries, students were able to make the connection between the SL literacy experience and what a school-based SLP does; however, this is still a work in progress for this class. Another activity involving the students identifying commonalities between the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts (2010) and the Roles and Responsibilities of Speech-Language Pathologists with Respect to Reading and Writing (ASHA, 2001) will also be instituted in this class.**

10. What **further changes to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.** are projected based on closing-the-loop data, findings and analysis?

**There is another SL course in our department - COMD 451. A pre-post survey regarding SL and the knowledge of the profession of communication disorders is conducted in this course. Next year we will incorporate data from that SL experience to determine the connection between SL activities and student knowledge/insight regarding the field of speech-language pathology.**

**Degree/Certificate: MS**

**Major/Option: COMD**

**Submitted by: Lesli Cleveland**

**Date:**

### **Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2014-15**

**Part I – for the 2014-15 academic year:** Because Deans have been asked to create College-Level Synthesis Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

- 1. Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Write and speak clearly and effectively.**
- 2. Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

\_\_\_\_\_ SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;  
\_\_\_\_\_ SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;  
\_\_x\_\_ SLO is met without change required

- 3. Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

**COMD graduate students complete a research proposal during the spring term of their first year. The proposal consists of a written 3-5 page paper and PowerPoint presentation that describes the problem, rationale for study, literature review and proposed methodology. The PowerPoint is presented to the two COMD faculty members on the students' research committees. The students' written and communication skills demonstrated during the PowerPoint presentation were evaluated with a rubric (attached).**

- 4. Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.
  - a. Findings:** At the time of this report, 18 out of 25 students were evaluated with the rubric during their research proposals. The average score was 22.75/28 points, which is the equivalent to a letter grade B-. The scores ranged from 14 – 27.5.

- b. Analysis of findings: **While a B- grade is acceptable, it is not where we want our students to be. However, this is the beginning of the research process and the first time for most that they have had to craft a research proposal. While faculty mentors the students, this is a student project. These grades reflect the student work at this stage of the project. COMD is a clinical program and the focus of the program is on that clinical training.**
5. **What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?**
- c) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).  
**Students need more practice writing a research paper and crafting a research proposal. Students take COMD 520 Research Methods followed by a three course research series (COMD 620, 621, 622) to complete their research projects. The three course series was created for faculty to mentor a small group of students through this process. To mentor and facilitate the research, all students and faculty follow a general syllabus; however, faculty may take different approaches during their course series with their students. Utilizing the Writers' Center may help the students with the written components.**
- d) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.  
**The chair has contacted the Writers' Center regarding potential workshops for all COMD graduate students. They will be conducting a workshop in fall 2015 covering poster design and public speaking for all students presenting their research at the Inland Northwest Research Symposium. It is suggested the Writers' Center could also conduct a workshop in the beginning of their spring semester of their first year that could cover research proposals.**
6. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.
- The COMD faculty will also evaluate the research proposal rubric to determine if it should be revised in any way.**

**NEW:** PART II – CLOSING THE LOOP – COMD GRADUATE PROGRAM  
FOLLOW-UP FROM THE 2013-14 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

7. **Student Learning Outcome(s)** assessed for 2013-14  
**Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Demonstrate application of research in the discipline of communication disorders.**
  
8. **Strategies implemented** during 2014-15 to improve student learning, based on findings of the 2013-14 assessment activities.  
**The graduate students' participation in the Inland Northwest Research Symposium is a real-world demonstration of student learning. COMD and other faculty use a quantitative rubric to assess student learning for this SLO. However, we are in the process of revising the wording of the actual SLO to better clearly identify the expectations of student learning.**
  
9. **Summary of results** (may include comparative data or narrative; description of changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.): Describe the effect of the changes towards improving student learning and/or the learning environment.  
**COMD will revise the SLO as follows: Students will develop a research proposal and completed research project reflecting evidenced-based practice as measured by a quantitative assessment rubric.**
  
10. What **further changes to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.** are projected based on closing-the-loop data, findings and analysis?

**We have also implemented a rubric for the research proposal, which was discussed earlier in this report.**

## Definitions:

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.
2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** This checklist informs the reader whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.
3. **Strategies and methods used to gather student performance data,** including assessment instruments used, and a description of how and when the assessments were conducted. Examples of strategies/methods: embedded test questions in a course or courses, portfolios, in-class activities, standardized test scores, case studies, analysis of written projects, etc. Additional information could describe the use of rubrics, etc. as part of the assessment process.
4. **Observations gathered from data:** This section includes findings and analyses based on the above strategies and methods, and provides data to substantiate the distinction made in #2. For that reason this section has been divided into parts (a) and (b) to provide space for both the findings and the analysis of findings.
5. **Program changes based on the assessment results:** This section is where the program lists plans to improve student learning, based on assessment findings, and provides a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year. Programs often find assessment is part of an ongoing process of continual improvement.
6. **Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed.** Evaluation of the assessment plan and process itself: what worked in the assessment planning and process, what did not, and why.

*Some elements of this document have been drawn or adapted from the University of Massachusetts' assessment handbook, "Program-Based Review and Assessment: Tools and Techniques for Program Improvement" (2001). Retrieved from [http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/publications/online\\_handbooks/program\\_based.pdf](http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/publications/online_handbooks/program_based.pdf)*