

## Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): MA in Communication Sciences and Disorders

Department: Communication Sciences and Disorders

College/School: Doisy College of Health Sciences

Date: 08/21/2018

Primary Assessment Contact: Dr. Elizabeth Blessing

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

PLO #1: Demonstrate compassionate ethical behavior during clinical practice.  
PLO #3: Demonstrate effective interactions with others during academic discourse.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

PLO #1: IRB educational module (completion); completion of an electronic literature review  
PLO #3: group presentation; observations of class discussions

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?  
**NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.**

All academic faculty provided input to the graduate program director who then worked with the department chair to further analyze the data (see rubrics in the appendix)

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

**NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.**

PLO #1: In course CSDI 5050 100% of students demonstrated a ranking of “introduce” or above using the corresponding assessment rubric. In course CSDI 5050 90% of students demonstrated the ranking of “reinforce” or above using the corresponding assessment rubric. In course CSDI 5010 at least 85% of students demonstrated a ranking of “mastery” on Clinical Practicum Evaluations. Students met the program target of 85%.  
PLO #3: In course CSDI 5530 89% of students demonstrated a ranking of “reinforce” or above using corresponding assessment rubric on group presentation and in group discussions. In course CSDI 5800 100% of students demonstrated “mastery” using corresponding assessment rubric during in-class problem-solving discussions and case studies. Both of these results met the target of 85% at reinforce and mastery, respectively.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

The PLOs were heavily weighted toward the clinical side of knowledge and skills; there will be more balance of learning targets that are addressed in academic course work as well as clinical practicum; for example to address PLO #1 in both clinical and academic settings, students can engage in case study work and still

make clinical decisions that are based on evidence based practice (EBP).

#3 – a shift in the day of the Professional Issues (CSDI 5800) course was needed to allow for greater student participation as well as more consistency for instruction.

The Professional issues course (CSDI 5800) was changed from spring to fall to allow for a more structured syllabus with themes for each class; this facilitated richer, deeper class discussion around each theme.

6. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

Since 2017-18 was the first academic year to implement this type of assessment plan, we did not have a previous assessment plan in this format.

***IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.***

## MA-CSD Program Assessment Rubrics<sup>1</sup>

**\*\*IMPORTANT NOTES:** The ratings, identified by the column headings below, are of increasing complexity moving across the table (from left to right). Students who are able to function at the “**reinforce**” level must also be able to perform at the “**introduce**” level. Likewise, in order for students to propose solutions (the “**master**” rating), they must be able to perform at both the “**introduce**” and “**reinforce**” levels.

<b>MA-CSD</b>			
<b>Program Learning Outcome (PLO #1): Demonstrate compassionate ethical behavior during clinical practice.</b>			
<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Introduce**</b>	<b>Reinforce**</b>	<b>Master**</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unable to identify examples of compassionate ethical behaviors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies examples of compassionate ethical behaviors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains compassionate ethical behaviors observed in the clinical setting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrates instructional knowledge of ethics by interpreting ethical behaviors in clinical practice.</li> </ul>

<b>Program Learning Outcome (PLO #3): Demonstrate effective interactions with others during academic discourse</b>			
<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Introduce**</b>	<b>Reinforce**</b>	<b>Master**</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unable identify characteristics of effective interactions with others during academic discourse.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies characteristics of effective interactions with others during academic discourse.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in effective interactions with others during academic discourse.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develops methods for fostering effective interactions with others when communication breakdowns occur.</li> </ul>