SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Doisy College of Health Sciences Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Comm Sciences & Disorders   Department: CSD

Degree or Certificate Level: MA   College/School: **Doisy College of Health Sciences**

Date (Month/Year): September 2020   Primary Assessment Contact: Mitzi Brammer/Travis Threats

In what year/cycle was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2019-2020

In what year/cycle was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2019

1. Student Learning Outcomes
Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

The Program Learning Outcomes assessed for the academic year 2019-2020 were #'s 1 and 3.

PLO 1 Identify how students' actions can impact their professional decisions with ethical consequences.

PLO 3 Students will incorporate critical thinking to solve complex problems related to management of communication disorders.

2. Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts
Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

PLO #1: CSDI 5800 – instructor-designed rubric to evaluate content of research paper/case study on "client abandonment", CSDI 5012 – observational rubric used by individual clinical instructors, CSDI 5910 – observational rubric used by clinical preceptor

PLO #3: CSDI 5450 – at least 80% on quizzes 3, 4, and 5, CSDI 5720 – at least 80% on midterm and final exam, CSDI 5700 – at least 82% on lab assignment, CSDI 5012 – observational rubric during clinical practicum with areas marked as meets or exceeds in clinical areas

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process
What process was used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

Each course instructor utilized self-designed rubrics to measure the COURSE requirements that aligned with the PLO. Some instructors used specific tests and students had to have a certain level of performance on the exam(s). Rubric/assessment data from courses were entered on a spreadsheet by the CSD administrative assistant. The curriculum committee made up of the graduate program director, one academic professor and one clinical professor analyzed the data to determine if they met criteria for introduce, reinforce or mastery on the assessment rubric.

4. Data/Results
What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? 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)?

All graduate didactic coursework was taught in-seat on campus during the fall 2019 semester. It began in-seat in spring 2020, and beginning March, 2020, all graduate course work moved to virtual (asynchronous). Clinical practicum moved

to simulated case work rather than working with actual patients.

PLO 1: Identify how students' actions can impact their professional decisions with ethical consequences.

Assessment tools: CSDI 5800 – professor will use an instructor-designed rubric to evaluate content of research paper/case study on "client abandonment" – 100% of the class performed within expectation or exceeds expectation on this project in terms of content of the paper; CSDI 5012 – observational rubric used by individual clinical instructors – 100% of students met ASHA clinical standards addressed in terms of professionalism Standards IV and V; CSDI 5910 – observational rubric used by clinical preceptor; target is to meet or exceed clinical expectations on the rubric-100% of students met ASHA clinical standards addressed in terms of professionalism Standards IV and V [meet or exceed denoted on rubric].

The goal for this PLO was met.

PLO 3: Students will incorporate critical thinking to solve complex problems related to management of communication disorders.

Assessment tools: CSDI 5450 – at least 80% on quizzes 3, 4, and 5 – 90% of the class performed at least 80% on quizzes; CSDI 5720 – at least 80% on midterm and final exam – 100% of the class performed at 80% or higher on the midterm and final exam; CSDI 5700 – at least 82% on lab assignment – 95% of the class achieved an 82% or higher on the lab assignment; those who did not were allowed to resubmit using a different case and attained greater than 82%; CSDI 5012 – observational rubric during clinical practicum with areas marked as meets or exceeds in clinical areas; 100% of students were marked at "meets" (no exceeds) on the observational rubric.

The goal for this PLO was met.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions
What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

These courses are not requisite courses for either PLO. That is, one course does not build on another as in our BS-CSD program. ALL graduate courses (didactic and clinical) have a level of application to them which complicates interpretation of data. Switching to asynchronous instruction did not impact student performance to a measurable degree given that both PLOs evaluated were met. Each instructor utilizes different teaching methods and from the data, it can be interpreted that students are able to comprehend and learn material in a variety of ways. Moving to online instruction necessitated more communication between instructors and students. We can conclude that the increase in communication assisted students toward progressing and meeting expectations in coursework.

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?

Results were discussed and shared with faculty within the department during a fall faculty meeting.
Data will be analyzed in the spring of 2021 as a dedicated assessment review meeting (PLOs 2 and 4). Possible changes and/or additions will be discussed at that time.

B. How specifically have you decided to use 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 • Student artifacts collected • 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 the findings.

Results on all program activities are continuously monitored for improvement. Consideration for changes have been noted in this report and will be considered along with any ideas/concerns from other faculty not on the curriculum/program committee.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

A change is curriculum has been completed, which may alter our assessment cycle. These will not be in effect until academic year 2021-2022.

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?

Changes are being considered for additional or more specific evaluations questions in the clinical rotation evaluations.

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

Covid restrictions changed our methodologies to some point, so comparison is limited between this year and previous years.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

The target was met with all PLO's. As with assessments, this may be due to class size (36 second year cohort and 31 first year cohort), or may point to looking at different outcomes.

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

Outcomes will be continually reviewed, along with different outcomes required by the specific accrediting body of the MRI program. Currently, the program enjoys a 98% employment rate and a 100% credentialing (Praxis) pass rate. To remain in competitive, review will be ongoing.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

All assignment instructions and rubrics are attached to the Assessment plan.