

NCA Self Study
Criterion 4 Documents

Eastern Illinois University

Year 2014

CDS undergraduate program assessment
report 2007-2008

Gail Richard

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM SUMMARY FORM AY 2007-2008

**Degree and
Program Name:**

Bachelor of Science –
Communication Disorders & Sciences

Submitted By:

Gail J. Richard, Department Chair

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CASA this year by **June 13, 2008**. Worksheets should be sent electronically to kjsanders@eiu.edu and should also be submitted to your college dean. For information about assessment or help with your assessment plans, visit the Assessment webpage at <http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/> or contact Karla Sanders in CASA at 581-6056.

PART ONE

What are the learning objectives?	How, where, and when are they assessed?	What are the expectations?	What are the results?	Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared?
1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of anatomic, physical, and physiological bases of speech, language, and hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean score on Basic Science and Audiology sections of Written Comprehensive Exam (Chair) • Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: basic science (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: basic science (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: basic science (Assess Coord) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean above 70% • Mean above 3 on 4 point scale • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale • Mean above 4 on 7 point scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic Science=78% Audiology = 72% • Mean = 3.54 (n=11) • Mean = 5.4 (n=29) • Junior = 4.9 (n=22) Senior =5.6 (n=32) 	<p>Chair and Assessment Coordinator are responsible for data. Chair shares results with faculty and issues are channeled to the appropriate department committees or discussed at the annual retreat.</p> <p>Formative data shows good progression across undergraduate years.</p>
2. Students will demonstrate knowledge of linguistic variables related to normal development of speech and hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean score on Normal Development section of Written Comprehensive Exam (Chair) • Mean on Alumni Survey re: normal develop (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: normal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean above 70% • Mean above 3 on 4 point scale • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean = 85% • Mean = 3.5 (n=11) • Mean = 5.9 (n=29) 	<p>Data comparable to previous year.</p> <p>Chair, Assessment Coordinator and Curriculum Committee Chair monitor courses and formative assessment ratings.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop (Assess Coord) Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: normal develop (Assess Coord) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean above 4 on 7 point scale 	Mean = 5.7	
3. Students will demonstrate basic knowledge of the nature, evaluation, and treatment for various communication disorders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean scores on Phonology, Child Language, and Voice sections of Written Comp Exam (Chair) Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: disorder prep (Assess Coord) Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: competence in disorder areas (Assess Coord) Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment ratings re: develop language disorders and phonology/articulation (Assess Coord) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean above 70% Mean above 3 on 4 point scale Mean above 5 on 7 point scale Mean above 4 on 7 point scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phonology=81% Child Lang = 82% Voice = 78% Mean = 3.5 (n=11) Mean = 5.0 (n=29) Language Mean: 5.1 (n=32) Phono/artic Mean: 4.8 (n=22) 	<p>Scores in Phono and Child language returned to desired levels as result of changes prompted by the observed decrease in these areas two years ago and last year.</p> <p>Chair, Assessment Coordinator, Curriculum and Clinic Committee Chairs monitor ratings and address as necessary.</p>
4. Students will demonstrate knowledge of basic principles for clinical evaluation and treatment of communication disorders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean score on Practicum section of Written Comprehensive Exam (Chair) Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: clinical prep (Assess Coord) Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: clinical comp (Assess Coord) Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: clinical eval (Assess Coord) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean above 70% Mean above 3 on 4 point scale Mean above 5 on 7 point scale Mean above 4 on 7 point scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practicum = 90% Mean = 3.5 (n=11) Mean = 5.2 (n=29) Junior = 4.8 Senior = 5.3 	<p>Practicum score improved significantly over last year (69%) with more stable positions in faculty supervisors. Other ratings similar to last year.</p> <p>Chair, Assessment Coordinator, Curriculum and Clinic Committee Chairs monitor ratings and address as necessary</p>
5. Students will demonstrate a foundation of professional development within the discipline for further education or expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage accepted into graduate programs (Chair) Number of UG student awards (Awards Chair) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90% acceptance level 3 or more student awards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% accepted 9 undergraduate awards; 8 	Acceptance rate of undergraduates continued to decline. A large senior class resulted in very competitive admission to

			undergraduate presentations	graduate schools again this year. To insure competitive undergraduates, steps were taken and are discussed in Part 3. Undergraduates demonstrated high quality performance in award recognitions. Chair and Assessment Coordinator will continue to monitor.
6. Students will demonstrate competence in basic communication skills for professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean Overall score on Oral Comprehensive Exam (Chair) • Mean rating on Alumni Survey re: written com (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on UG Exit Survey re: written and oral communication skills (Assess Coord) • Mean rating on UG Formative Assessment Ratings re: written and oral communication skills (Assess Coord) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean above 70% • Mean above 3 on 4 point scale • Mean above 5 on 7 point scale • Mean above 4 on 7 point scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall Mean=81% • Mean = 3.6 (n=11) • Written =5.6 (n=29) Oral = 6.1 • Written: Junior= 4.8 Senior=5.2 • Oral: Junior=5.0 Senior=5.9 	<p>Opportunities for student presentations and papers are integrated across the undergraduate curriculum, reflecting positively in assessment ratings.</p> <p>Chair and Assessment Coordinator will continue to monitor.</p>

(Continue objectives as needed. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.)

PART TWO

Describe what your program's assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director's comments on last year's report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

During the annual faculty retreat, an agenda item was discussed at length in regard to formative assessment with sophomore level students. The classes at this level are extremely large, which led instructors to question the reliability of their ratings. Also, at least 10% of the sophomore level students do not meet the requirements to enroll in junior and senior level classes as a CDS major. Consequently, the decision was made to consolidate faculty resources and time and discontinue formative assessment ratings at the sophomore level. This decision was paired with the plan to better inform the upper level majors (junior and senior students) of formative assessment ratings by sharing results with undergraduate students every semester (as is done with graduate students), rather than only once a year.

PART THREE

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

A large number of transfer students enrolling in the CDS major attempting to complete three years of courses in two very intense years was having negative ramifications. Students were enrolling in courses simultaneously, when prerequisite knowledge and experience were needed. Decreased levels of acceptance in graduate programs were largely attributed to transfer students who were attempting unrealistic course loads in CDS. In addition, transfer students did not have time to engage in undergraduate research experiences or the Departmental Honors program. After extensive discussion and review of data, faculty decided that transfer students would no longer be allowed to enroll simultaneously in prerequisite courses to accomplish graduation in four semesters. They would have to either extend their program or waive clinical experiences to the graduate level. While the decision was met with extreme disappointment by current transfer students, faculty felt that the data strongly suggested that it was in the students' best interest to revise the curriculum sequence to insure adequate competency in acquiring content knowledge.

Faculty also revised the departmental policy that the minimal cumulative and major grade point average levels used for admission to the program must be maintained throughout the undergraduate program (junior and senior years) for continued enrollment in upper division CDS courses. If either gpa dropped below the required minimum level, the student would need to select a new major. This is intended to prevent marginal students who are not competitive for graduate school from remaining in a major that is a minimum master's level career.