1. What are your current degree-level learning outcomes?

Current degree-level learning outcomes for majors in the MA Speech-Language Pathology program include their ability to demonstrate:

- **Foundational Knowledge**: Describe foundational speech-language pathology content, theory, and evidence
- **Application & Use**: Apply foundational knowledge to clinical situations
- **Analytical Processes**: Track and interpret data to determine whether an approach is effective for a given client or clients
- **Communication**: Effectively communicate disciplinary knowledge to a variety of groups (e.g., clients; other professionals inside and outside the discipline).

These learning outcomes have not been modified over the last year.

2. What evidence of student learning was collected in the past year?

Evidence of student learning was collected during Fall 2014, Spring 2015, and Summer 2015 semesters. Measures of student performance on the learning outcomes were derived from artifacts that took the form of course assignments, course projects, exams, papers, presentations, journals, and rubrics. The student prepares an electronic portfolio over the course of their Master’s program to reflect on their growth and learning in the 4 targeted learner outcomes. Artifacts selected by the student are described and reflected upon each semester as they are entered into the student’s portfolio. The summative (final) exam includes a presentation by the student of selected artifacts and questions from faculty committee members.

Learning outcomes were evaluated using: (1) summative exam data (based on presentation of portfolio material), (2) a student exit survey, (3) national test results (i.e., praxis), and (4) employment upon graduation.

Which learning outcomes does the evidence address?

The evidence addresses all four learning outcomes: Foundational knowledge, Application and Use, Analytical Processes, and Communication.
3. What have you learned from the evidence you collected?

(1) Summative Examination Data- The four learner outcomes were evaluated as part of each student’s summative examination. A total of 23 summative examinations were conducted with 22 of 23 (96%) passing the exam on the first attempt. The one student who did not pass on the first attempt, did pass on the second attempt. The final outcome data are summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Outcome</th>
<th>Low/Unacceptable</th>
<th>Mid/Acceptable</th>
<th>Top/Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>1/24 (4.2%)</td>
<td>14/24 (58.3%)</td>
<td>9/24 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application &amp; Use</td>
<td>0/24 (0%)</td>
<td>17/24 (70.8%)</td>
<td>7/24 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Processes</td>
<td>0/23 (0%)</td>
<td>15/23 (65.2%)</td>
<td>8/23 (34.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0/23 (0%)</td>
<td>14/23 (60.9%)</td>
<td>9/23 (39.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
<td>(69.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 26% of the students scored “Outstanding” in all four areas. Overall, the students most often scored in the Acceptable category across the 4 learner outcomes. The strongest category response demonstrated by the students as a group was in the Communication learner outcome. These results are very similar to our results from last year.

(2) Student Exit Survey Results- Students were asked to evaluate their own learner outcome level and to comment on the strengths and areas for improvement for the program anonymously. In the Spring, 2015 semester, 14 graduating students provided responses. Students were asked:

How well did you achieve each of the following departmental learning goals?

5-Extremely Well   4-Very Well   3-Adequately   2-Not Very Well   1-Not At All

1. Graduates will be able to describe foundational speech-language pathology content, theory, and evidence.
2. Graduates will be able to apply foundational knowledge to clinical situations
3. Graduates will be able to track and interpret data to determine whether an approach is effective for a given client or clients
4. Graduates will be able to effectively communicate disciplinary knowledge to a variety of groups (e.g., clients; other professionals inside and outside the discipline)
Following are a summary of the students’ responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Outcome</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
<th>Extremely Well</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Not Very Well</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application &amp; Use</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Processes</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale for average is 1-5.
5-Extremely Well; 4-Very Well; 3-Adequately; 2-Not Very Well; 1-Not At All

The students’ rated their achievement as primarily “extremely well” in all four learner outcomes. This is an increase over last year’s survey results where most students rated their achievement as “very well.” This year, students’ rated themselves most highly in achieving application and use of the knowledge and skills attained during their MA program.

Students also were asked the following open-ended questions:

What aspects of your education in this program helped you with your learning, and why were they helpful?

What might the program do differently that would help you learn more effectively, and why would these actions help?

With respect to the first open-ended question, a common theme was the diversity of courses and clinical experiences which provided opportunities to learn in different formats and gain multiple, different experiences in the same broad topic area. These comments are similar to last year.

Regarding the second open-ended question, students commented on (1) the need for diagnostic experience early in their studies; (2) an interest in opportunities to observe experienced clinicians in a particular setting before students are expected to work in that setting; (3) the amount of documentation required in clinic; (4) challenges of the intercampus program (e.g., different course evaluation formats, double campus fees,
different clinic models); (5) greater incorporation of clinical methods into didactic courses.

(3) National test results (i.e., praxis). 100% of the students taking the Praxis National Examination for Speech-Language Pathology in 2014-2015 received a passing score (18/18 of the scores reported to KU). The 3-year average is a 98% pass rate.

(4) Employment upon graduation. 96% of the graduates in 2014-2015 were employed upon graduation (n=24 reporting). The 3-year average is a 92% employment rate.

In summary, we learned that faculty rated students as acceptable most of the time in their attainment of the learner outcomes during their summative examinations. Approximately 26% demonstrated superior performance. The students evaluated their own achievement at high levels of competency across learner outcomes. Evidence from our National Praxis exam and employment indicate that our graduates are highly competent in their knowledge and skills and highly sought after in the job market. Based on student feedback, our Programs’ strengths lie in the diverse opportunities that are provided to the students. Several suggestions were provided by the students to improve the program, with the general theme being better communication/alignment across campuses, more diagnostic experiences, and specific suggestions for additional ways to support learning (e.g., incorporate clinical methods in didactic courses, reduce documentation burden or make clear why documentation is needed in a particular format).

5. What recommendations have been generated from discussions of assessment results among the faculty?

As a result of the discussion of the learner outcome data, it was decided to (1) continue our expanded orientation program; (2) examine diagnostic opportunities; (3) re-design courses to create additional learning opportunities.

6. What changes did you make as a result of these assessments in the past year?

Expanded orientation program: In August 2014, we initiated a week-long orientation program (rather than a 1-day orientation program) to provide a more in-depth introduction to our program and requirements. In addition, the orientation takes place on both campuses so that students immediately become familiar with how things work on each campus. The week-long orientation also provided opportunities for students to better prepare for clinical experiences. We continued this orientation for August 2015 with minor adjustments in the format. This year we will be collecting data from the August 2014 orientation cohort. This will help us determine the effectiveness of our revised orientation.

Examine diagnostic opportunities: This year we will examine the data in our clinical contact hour database to determine how many diagnostic contact hours students are accruing while in our program, when these hours are accrued, and the hours accrued in different areas of clinical practice. We will examine these data as part of our next report to determine whether adjustments are needed.
Course re-design: From last year’s report, we had determined that there may be practical benefits (e.g., decreasing drive time between campuses) to re-designing our graduate courses to incorporate online learning tools. Several of our faculty piloted online learning tools in Spring 2015 (e.g., teaching via Blackboard collaborate). This year’s report further emphasizes that student’s desire greater hands-on activities during class (e.g., introduction of clinical methods and cases). Although our faculty were interested in course re-design, most of us had limited experience with emerging formats and tools for courses. Therefore, we have focused on support for course re-design during the current calendar year. During Spring 2015, we created a planning committee consisting of 4 of our faculty, Doug Ward (Center for Teaching Excellence), Julie Loats (Center for Online and Distance Learning), and Ann Lindbloom (Educational Technology/Blackboard Support). With their input, we also surveyed the faculty to determine their interest in different topics. Through this process we developed the format for a full-day summer workshop which consisted of (1) Overview of the potential benefits of course redesign; (2) Examples of re-designed courses from related programs (e.g., social work, education); (3) Examples of re-designed courses within our own program; (4) Tour of media facilities; (5) Breakout sessions that included an individual meeting with an instructional designer as well as a variety of specific tools available at our institution. Immediate faculty feedback surveys showed that 100% of attendees found the information useful to their work and rated the workshop as excellent. A follow-up survey further showed that the majority of faculty attendees were making changes to their courses based on what they learned at the workshop. 77% of attendees were interested in attending additional monthly follow-up activities. 100% of attendees were interested in attending a follow-up workshop in January focused on sharing course changes. We are currently implementing the follow-up monthly workshops, which will be conducted in an interactive format where attendees can (1) bring examples of tools that they are using for guidance on improving their implementation of the tool; (2) bring activities they would like to do for guidance on the best tool to use and how to implement that tool. In addition, we are making plans for our January 2016 workshop, where we will document the changes that faculty made during the Fall semester and reflect on successes and challenges. Overall, this has been a successful approach in facilitating re-examination of our teaching methods for our speech-language pathology program.