

## EWU Programmatic SLO Assessment

AY 2015-16 and “Closing the Loop” for AY 2014-15

### 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: [hberglan@ewu.edu](mailto:hberglan@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 ([hberglan@ewu.edu](mailto:hberglan@ewu.edu)), Office of Academic Planning, by September 15, 2016.**

**Degree/Certificate: BA**

**Major/Option: CMSD**

**Submitted by: Lesli Cleveland**

**Date: 9.1.2016**

### **Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2015-2016**

**Part I – for the 2015-16 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: Recall and relate the causes, characteristics and consequences of the disorders of hearing, speech, language and swallowing**

**We focused on acquired neurologic communication disorders, which potentially result in disorders of hearing, speech, language or swallowing or some combination.**

- 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;  
\_\_x\_\_ SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;  
\_\_\_\_\_ 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 451 Neurogenic Communication Disorders, one integrative learning assignment was used throughout the semester requiring integration of past course information (neuroanatomy, COMD 422) with neurological damage (cause) in order to relate that damage to predicted and experienced consequences regarding communication (speech, language, hearing) and/or swallowing. Students choose a memoir specific to neurological disorders (e.g., “A stroke of luck”) and had progressive assignments throughout the semester building on knowledge from past courses and integrating that knowledge with newly presented information in this senior year spring semester course (see attached for assignments). This culminated in individual oral presentations given in small groups (see attached for rubric). Twenty-two COMD seniors completed this project.**

4. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.
- a. Findings: **The students completed five written memoir assignments to demonstrate application of past knowledge from major courses and integration with current course information as applicable to their chosen memoir. The average earned score across the written assignments was 90% (3.7, A-) with percentages ranging from 54-100%. The average earned score for the oral presentation was 94% (A-) with scores ranging from 70-100%.**
  - b. Analysis of findings: **Based on the grades earned for this project, the students, overall, demonstrated the ability to recall and connect past and new learning regarding neurogenic communication disorders (causes, consequences of brain damage relating to speech, language, hearing and/or swallowing) which address this particular SLO. One student performed much lower than others and it is determined to be due to his language proficiency (an International student with English as his second language). Additionally, one student (averaged 54% on writing assignments) did not submit two of the five assignments. She later shared a history of learning disability that impacted her efficiency of writing and being able to turn assignments in in a timely fashion. This same student earned near maximum points when assignments were turned in and earned 19/20 on her oral presentation. Neither of these students had accommodations.**

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).

**Advising: when an International student is in the major, work with Office of Global Initiatives to determine appropriate supports for success in the classroom specific to writing and public speaking. Also, when indicating accommodation information of the syllabus, encourage students to meet with Disability Support Services to discuss potential accommodation.**

**The sequence of the course fits well in senior year, spring semester for the integrative nature of this assignment. The seniors are also in the major Capstone course this same semester; placing this assignment in Capstone would allow for broader application of this type of integrative knowledge in other areas of our field (speech sound disorders, child language, congenital hearing impairment etc.). However, I would argue that acquired brain injuries, by their very nature, require students to bring to bear past knowledge in all pertinent**

areas listed in this SLO (speech, language, hearing, swallowing) dependent on the part of the nervous system damaged. Although each student was focused on the individual's experience as related in a memoir, students learned from each other both in the course (students would comment on memoir as it applied to course lecture content) and in the small group individual presentations.

- b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year. **J Pimentel will meet with Capstone instructor fall 2016 in preparation for assignments to be made for the spring semester (2017) courses to determine if this memoir assignment can be used across courses to meet this SLO.**

- 6. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself. **In collaboration with the Office of Global Initiatives develop a different assessment rubric to be used with International students to better illustrate their knowledge and skills.**

#### **NEW:** PART II – CLOSING THE LOOP

##### FOLLOW-UP FROM THE 2014-15 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 2014-15, 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>.

1. **Student Learning Outcome(s)** assessed for 2014-15  
**Undergraduate Student Learning Outcome: Describe the anatomical, physiological and psychological properties involved in normal communication processes of hearing, speech, language and swallowing.**
  
2. **Strategies implemented** during 2015-16 to improve student learning, based on findings of the 2013-14 assessment activities.  
**We did not change these activities based on findings that suggested positive learning results from the 2014-2015 report and results from the same projects during the most recent academic year. This project involves active hands-on learning and the community. It is a productive experience for the students and meets this particular SLO in the area of hearing.**
  
3. **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.
  - a. **2014-2015 Results: 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).

2015-2016 Results: Grade range for school-age child hearing screening was 38-42 points = letter grade range A-/A (42 points possible). The grade range for the adult screenings was 46-48 points = A (48 points possible). Students' grades ranged from 17-20 points = letter grade range B to A (20 possible) for the signal to noise ratio calculation.

Two years of data for these projects related to hearing impairments and disorders have produced similar positive results.

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

**Degree/Certificate: MS**

**Major/Option: CMSD**

**Submitted by: Lesli Cleveland**

**Date: 9.1.2016**

## **Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2015-16**

**Part I – for the 2015-16 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 in the presentation of applied research projects.**

Data for the 2014-2015 SLO Assessment came from our students' research proposals. The average score was a B-. The focus of our program is on clinical training and while a B- is acceptable for the research proposals, that score was lower than expected. So we decided to further assess this SLO and evaluate the same students' final research projects after their participation in our research course series (CMSD 620, 621, 622) and the implementation of a one hour "research workshop" provided by the Writer's Center.

- 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;

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

\_\_\_\_\_ 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.

CMSD graduate students complete a research project to graduate from our program. They participate in a research course series (CMSD 620, 621, 622). The first course involves the creation of the literature review and method section that is presented to the students' department committees during their research proposal. Obtaining IRB approval, data collection and analysis usually occur during the second course in the series. The course series culminates with the presentation of the students' research projects at the Inland Northwest Research Symposium during the spring semester of their final year. Committee members utilize rubrics for both the proposal and presentation to score the students. We tweak the rubrics each year. The rubrics for both the research proposal and poster are attached.

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

- a. **Findings: Of our second year graduates, 24/25 students presented at the Symposium. The average score for the students was  $46.45/50 = 92\% = A-$ .**
- b. **Analysis of findings: After participating in the research course series and completing their projects, attending the “research workshop” and presenting their projects, the group as a whole improved by a letter grade from their research proposals to their final research projects (from a B- to an A-).**

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).

**The improvement in their grades from the beginning to the end of the research course series suggests the participation by faculty and students in the research series supports students academic success in a positive and productive way. We are always exploring ways to improve the process and student success with research, data collection, analysis and presentation. Kelly Evans, Spokane EWU librarian, approached our department regarding an experimental one-credit library research course that she would like to offer to the students in our college. This one-credit library course, offered alongside CMSD 620, has the potential to enhance student success during the literature review search and ultimate creation of the students’ research proposals.**

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

**We are not changing the SLO or the expectations of the research course series or graduate research requirement. We (faculty and students) are going to hopefully participate in this experimental course with Kelly Evans through the library (in spring 2017) and potentially be able to evaluate the effect on the research proposal scores.**

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

**We are always interested in better rubrics to score the research projects. I am hoping Kelly Evans may be a resource to help us fine-tune the rubrics. I will also reach out to the Faculty Commons for aid with the rubrics.**

**NEW: PART II – CLOSING THE LOOP**  
**FOLLOW-UP FROM THE 2014-15 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 2014-15, 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>.

1. **Student Learning Outcome(s)** assessed for 2014-15  
**Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Write and speak clearly and effectively.**
2. **Strategies implemented** during 2015-16 to improve student learning, based on findings of the 2014-2015 assessment activities.

**At the time of the 2014-2015 report 18/25 students had completed their research proposals and earning an average grade of a B- (22.75/28 points) on their proposals. To assist them in successful research endeavors, we arranged for the Writer's Center to provide a “research project workshop” for our graduate students. The workshop focused on poster design and public speaking. At the time of the workshop, our students were in the process of gathering data, analyzing data and working on their research posters.**

**Results from 2015-2016: At the time of this report 12/24 students have completed their research proposals earning an average grade of a B- (22.75/28 points). Coincidentally, the results from the current group of students' proposals were exactly the same as the last group of graduate students.**

3. **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.

As a result of the lower than expected research proposal scores during the 2014-2015 SLO Assessment year, all 25 research students participated in the Writer's Center workshop in addition to their participation in the research course series. While the workshop was helpful, most students reported they "were beyond that stage/knowledge" in their research. Our students have, for the most part, reported positive, helpful individual sessions focused on their individual posters with the Writer's Center. While the workshop was good, it wasn't as rich of an experience that we had all hoped it would be. Perhaps the large group format affected the students' perceptions of the workshop. The same student group that earned the average score of B- on their proposals and attended the workshop and completed our research course series then presented their research at the Inland Northwest Research Symposium in spring 2016. Their final research scores improved. Results: 24/25 students presented their research at the Symposium with an average score of  $46.45/50 = 92\%$  (A-). These students began the research process with an average score of B- on the research proposals. They ended the process with an average score of A- on the research projects (the continued evaluation of the same SLO in the current report for 2015-2016).

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

In addition to the students' participation in the research course series, this year our department is planning on conducting our own "research project workshop" to the entire group of graduate students this year. We are always exploring ways to improve the process for the students and student success with research, data collection, analysis and presentation. As mentioned earlier, we are also in discussions with Kelly Evans, Spokane EWU librarian, regarding an experimental one-credit library research course to enhance the research process for the students with a specific focus on the literature search and available resources during the creation of their research proposals. If the library course is approved, the students would take this one-credit course as they are preparing their research proposals. We will also work with the Faculty Commons on any improvements/revisions to the rubrics.

#### 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)*