

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): **B.S. in Speech Language and Hearing Sciences** Department: **Speech Language and Hearing Sciences**

Degree or Certificate Level: **B.S.**

College/School: **Doisy College of Health Sciences**

Date (Month/Year): **09/28/2023**

Assessment Contact: **Saneta Thurmon**

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? **AY 2022-2023**

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? **AY 2021-2022**

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization or subject to state/licensure requirements? **American Speech Language and Hearing Association**

If yes, please share how this affects the program's assessment process (e.g., number of learning outcomes assessed, mandated exams or other assessment methods, schedule or timing of assessment, etc.):

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please provide the complete list of the program's learning outcome statements and **bold** the SLOs assessed in this cycle.)

PLO #2) Identify how students' actions can impact their professional decisions with ethical consequences.

PLO #4) Apply the principles of evidence-based practice to identify acceptable treatment methodologies.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail, identify the course(s) in which they were collected, and if they are from program majors/graduates and/or other students. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

PLO #2 was determined through student learning in the freshman or sophomore level SLHS 1000 by completing exams and quizzes throughout the term. Some quizzes and exam questions address students' knowledge and application of basic ethical principles in the profession.

PLO #2 was determined through student learning outcomes in the junior level course SLHS 4150 by completing projects involving common disorders seen within the field and a current trend project focusing on new and upcoming trends within the field. The artifacts are test #2 and test #3. The entire tests cover different speech-language disorders, and their treatment

PLO #2 was determined through student learning in the senior level course SLHS 4300 when students completed a case study project while adhering to the ASHA code of ethics for the scope of practice for SLPs. Case studies were comprised of individuals with varying disabilities, and students had to submit research articles supporting their approach. These research articles combined with student's clinical expertise and considerations of each individual client's needs meets all three components of evidence-based practice as outlined by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. See Rubric.

PLO #4 was determined through student learning in the sophomore level course SLHS 2000 by artifacts from exams corresponding with questions related to treatment. As well as transcribing disordered speech and choosing treatment targets during a case study.

PLO #4 was determined through student learning outcomes in the junior level course SLHS 4200 by completing case studies. Students are assigned or choose a pathology that causes damage to the auditory system and use current evidence to discuss

mechanisms of damage to the auditory system as well as manifestation of auditory symptoms, clinical evaluation results, treatment recommendations, and treatment outcomes. considering the best use of evidence-based practice for professionals

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

All PLOs: All undergraduate teaching faculty provided input toward learning outcomes by reviewing trends and patterns in their collected data. The undergraduate program director and graduate program director further analyzed the assessment data.

PLO #2

SLHS1000 - item analysis on exam #1 and quiz #1

SLHS4150- item analysis on exams and answer keys are used to determine if criterion was met. Rubrics are used to determine if criterion is met on class projects such as current trends project and facts sheet project.

SLHS4300 - Students were evaluated using corresponding assessment rubric for ethics case study project considering ASHA code of ethics for Speech-Language Pathologist and Audiologist.

PLO# 4

SLHS 2000 - Students were evaluated corresponding test questions on vowel and consonant sound productions and transcription of sounds in words and sentences from both citation form speech and disordered speech by an answer key; students were also evaluated, by rubric, on the speech mechanism as well as understanding of phonological disorders.

SLHS 4200 - Students were evaluated using corresponding assessment rubric for their case study.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? 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)?

PLO #2

SLHS 1000 - item analysis on exam #1 and quiz #1 was met at 90% or higher.

SLHS 4150 - This semester 96% of students successfully developed a quiz and a final exam with a KEY attached that addressed at least 2 questions, respectively, on professional ethics. This is considered "reinforcement level".

SLHS 4300 - Students completed a case study project while adhering to the ASHA code of Ethics for the scope of practice for SLPs with 100% accuracy. Students used cases from the ASHA website <http://www.asha.org/Practice/ethics/Ethics-Inquiries/>

PLO #4

SLHS 2000 Students achieved mastery of 85% or higher on exam.

SLHS 4200 – 95 % of students achieved a ranking of "mastery" or better using rubric.

Achievement has shown that a face-to-face teaching model is more beneficial to students in terms of learning and understanding class material. These classes are only offered on SLU's STL North Campus in McGannon Hall. This allows students to go from one class to another without having to worry about being late, and all materials and professors are in the same building. This allows students access to materials in the SLHS on campus clinic in McGannon Hall and professors' offices in McGannon Hall.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you? Address both a) learning gaps and possible curricular or pedagogical remedies, and b) strengths of curriculum and pedagogy.

Additionally, SLHS courses are sequenced in nature. 1000 level courses are taken by freshman, 2000 by sophomores, 3000 by juniors, and 4000 by seniors. This allows the SLHS program to measure student's experience throughout the major throughout mean-making experiences. Artifact collection varies from instructor graded assignments, rubrics, hands-on

clinical lab experience, thus giving us a wide scope of how SLHS students grow from introductory to mastery level throughout the major. SLHS program results from this past academic year show us that we set appropriate targets in terms of the actual learning outcome as well as the performance level. Assessment is always a collaborative effort, involving all faculty, and the data shows high quality of learning is being maintained across all courses.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss the results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

All faculty members reported their data for both PLOs in May 2023 via a Google Form. This information was then reviewed as a group in August 2023 during the faculty retreat. Course Content and teaching techniques were discussed among faculty. Faculty shared new teaching techniques and the value of hands on clinical learning at the Junior and Senior level courses. The program director shared data from Senior Exit Interviews and Surveys. Below are themes that were found and discussed with faculty. 100% of seniors who applied to graduate schools in Speech-Language Pathology were admitted this spring.

Seniors' Feedback Regarding Program Strengths:

- Students reported small class sizes were beneficial to building rapport with peers and great for hands on learning in more clinical based learning classes
- Students LOVE pre-Select option, many didn't even apply to other programs for graduate school
- A sense of community supported students feeling of anxiety or stress, giving them a kind of "safety net". They also reported this making the program feel less competitive and more engaging.
- Many students remarked they noticed the professors cared for them and their success, making them feel the program genuinely cares about teaching and helping.
- Many students reported that they Loved all the new electives senior year!

Seniors' Suggestions for Program Improvement:

- Stability in electives and graduation credits (old core v new core)
- A course that combined Hearing and Speech Science content would be better for learning
- Highlighting of knowledge that will carry over in future courses.
- More in-person observation opportunities.
- Opportunities to meet and speak to grad-students more often.
- Program opportunities promoted through social media more (Instagram)
- Wished we had 5 year program like OT

Student Qualitative Responses in Senior Survey

1. "...The emphasis on community and group projects was really noteworthy for me. I felt like the professors were always available and willing to help and teach as well..."
2. "...I think the professors truly care about our success, in the classroom and in our lives. They are accommodating and realistic while pushing us to achieve our fullest potential. This program has helped me build my confidence in myself and has shown me what it means to be a clinician for others..."
3. "...I have loved the community we've built within the Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences department. In classes, our professors encourage community building, teamwork, instead of complete individualism and a competitive environment. A supportive environment was very beneficial for my learning experience..."
4. "...The course Hearing Science is very hard and most of SLHS students don't want to be Audiologists anyways, this course could maybe be removed as a required class. Only students who want to be Audiologists should have to take it. Speech Science covers enough of hearing science material for students to be successful in SLP..."

In summary, our Seniors valued:

- Community, friendships, and hands-on learning experiences.
- Professors and advisors genuinely care for success and well-being.
- Strong organization in classwork and advising methods.
- Communication among faculty, and a sense of alignment in helping them get in grad school.

- Flexibility in course hours, electives, and credit hours. Room for Minors

B. How specifically have you decided to use these 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
- Artifacts of student learning
- 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 these findings.

In a senior exit survey for the past 3 years, our students expressed that they wanted more exposure to specific areas of our field at the undergraduate level. To address this, we have combined two courses into one, creating a new course (Speech & Hearing Sciences). Combining Speech Science and Hearing Science together to create Speech & Hearing Science allows the students to learn the content at the same time to better understand the course material. This also allows all undergrads to choose a SLHS elective for their senior year. Electives total up to 38 credits standard track and 41 scholar's tracks, which is important to find areas of interest within this field. Students have more of a choice in their interests and choose from one of the following electives courses to meet the graduation requirements for the major related electives from these SLHS courses: SLHS 1000, SLHS 1420, SLHS 4600, SLHS 4650, or SLHS 4900.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

N/A

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 previous assessment data?

One thing that has changed in the program has been within the course SLHS 4150 from previous assessment findings. In this course a project has been added to include more learning about changing trends in the profession such as the use of many different types of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) devices. This project allows students to pick any current trend within the field of speech language pathology and to give a presentation on what the trend is, the idea behind the trend, how it works in the field, and their own thoughts and opinions about the trend. This project is a great way for students to understand how dynamic and ever-changing the field is. There is always something to learn or keep up with and it is important to be versatile. With this project students get an idea of what this looks like and can get ahead start in learning the new trends that they will one day be using in their practice as a clinician. Students completed these projects in their Junior year and in their senior year in the course SLHS 4300 this project is reinforced in the case study projects below where students take their learning a step further

Another change that has happened in recent years is another new diagnostic and case study project in the SLHS course 4300. This diagnostic and case study project consists of many different parts. The students are assigned an assessment, typical with speech and language disorders. Students are assigned to go to the SLHS on campus clinic and physically go through their assessment learning about it in detail. The students are given a case study which includes specific details of a patient, their age, and their speech or language problems. Students expected to explain how they would give this assessment to this patient and the results of their patient's assessment. This project gives the students an advantage of knowing an assessment in detail before starting graduate school, where they would typically begin to learn these assessments. Students discuss how the assessments are reliable and valid and discuss new trends in the use of using assessments with patients who may use AAC devices. Then the next week a special guest speaker who is specialized in the area of AAC lectures in the course 4300 and brings devices to the course for hands on learning. Students are assessed on this learning via a quiz developed by the guest speaker and professor.

B. How has the change/have these changes identified in 7A been assessed?

These changes have been assessed through rubrics making sure all criteria were met.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

Students achieved and met all criteria from projects and quizzes

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

Because students have been successful in the sequence of courses and have requested an accelerated option for SLHS majors like Occupational Therapy Students within DCHS a new accelerated track is proposed to move forward with growing the major. The SLHS Scholars track has existed in the department for 3 years, since fall 2020. A proposal will be introducing an accelerated Scholars track to UACC which would allow students to graduate with their B.S. and M.S. in speech-language pathology in 5 years as compared to 6 years starting in Fall 2024. There are no new courses needed for this track, but rather a re-sequencing of existing SLHS classes. This track will continue to be a direct admission available to potential freshmen applying to Saint Louis University. The Scholars track will only be offered at an accelerated freshman admit program. The SLHS Standard Track will remain the same, which is a 4 year B.S. and 2 year M.S. Program. Students in the SLHS Standard Track do have the option for Pre-Select Admission into the SLU SLHS M.S. program which occurs Junior year spring and will remain the same.

This proposal is for the Scholars track courses to be re-aligned to make it an accelerated track. This is supported by the desire from SLHS students voicing a need for this accelerated track and the fact that current SLHS Scholar and Standard track students graduate early in every cohort. The accelerated track will align the courses so that more students will have the option to graduate early and also recruit new students to SLU looking for this option. This accelerated track will be unique among the 3 other SLP programs in the STL area. Maryville, Fontbonne and SIUE all have strong SLP programs but have started to expand their programs via online learning, none have an accelerated 5 year option.

Additionally, this **accelerated** track allows the department and college to attract students who are looking to complete their degree a year early. There are 4 graduate SLP programs in the Saint Louis area, therefore this track would make SLU's program unique and stand out from the other programs. This accelerated scholar track will be a key recruitment tool for Doisy College. Furthermore, this track will attract students like the PT and OT accelerated programs which draw gifted students to the University looking to graduate early.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted/appended into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document. Thank you.

PLO #2 Evaluation Rubrics EXAMPLE

Oral Presentation Rubric: Current Trends Project

Teacher Name: Dr. Brammer

Student Names: [REDACTED] **50/50 WOW! Excellent**

CATEGORY				
Preparedness	Students are completely prepared and have obviously rehearsed with 4 guiding questions/discussion points ready for the larger group. 15 points	Students seem fairly prepared but might have needed a couple more rehearsals. Presented at least 3 guiding questions or discussion points for the larger group. 10 points	The students are somewhat prepared, but it is clear that rehearsal was lacking. Presented only 1-2 guiding questions or discussion points for the larger group. 5 points	Students do not seem at all prepared to present. No guiding questions or discussion points prepared for the larger group. 0 points
Content-Oral	Evidenced strong knowledge of content with little if any reliance on notes during oral presentation. 10 points	Evidenced knowledge of content with some reliance on notes during oral presentation. 5 points	Substantial reliance on notes during oral presentation. 3 points	Was unable to present orally without looking at notes throughout the entire oral presentation. 0 points
Content-Written	5-6 page paper synthesized and analyzed information about the trend plus its significance to the field 20 points	5-6 page paper synthesized OR analyzed information about the trend plus its significance to the field. Information was more general than specific. 10 points	5-6 page paper synthesized OR analyzed information about the trend but did not explain significance to the field. Information was more general than specific. 5 points	Paper was lacking specific information in terms of overall depth and breadth of knowledge about the assigned topic. Did not meet the length guidelines. 0 points
Written Report	0-2 errors in mechanics, typing, punctuation, grammar present in the paper. 5 points	3-4 errors in mechanics, typing, punctuation, grammar present in the paper. 4 points	5-6 errors in mechanics, typing, punctuation, grammar present in the paper. 2 points	7+ errors in mechanics, typing, punctuation, grammar present in the paper. 0 points

PLO #2 Ethics Project Rubric - 20 points
Clinical Methods SLHS 4300

Name: _____

	2 points		3 points	4 points	5 points	Score/No
Code of Ethics portion	Missing most (=75%) or mostly incorrect selection of sections; poor explanations for each section.		Missing many (50%) relevant sections; fair explanations for each section.	Included most relevant sections; thorough explanation for sections provided.	Provided all relevant sections pertaining to assigned scenario; thorough explanations for choosing each section.	
Avoidance of Violation Paragraph	Most (=75%) steps/decisions were irrelevant or missing.		Many (50%) steps/decisions were irrelevant or missing.	Mostly complete overview of steps/decisions – a couple missing/irrelevant steps.	Complete and relevant overview of steps/decisions to take.	
Documentation #1	Most (=75%) pieces of pertinent information (“...”) are missing or mostly irrelevant information is provided; documentation explanation is incomplete and/or inappropriate.		Many (50%) pieces of pertinent information (“...”) are missing or irrelevant information is provided; documentation explanation not optimal.	Mostly complete and relevant summary of pertinent information (“...”); documentation explanation present but not optimal.	Complete and relevant summary of all pertinent information (initial behavior/attitude of client, discussion of issue with client and their reaction, plan for future); thorough documentation explanation.	
Documentation #2	Most (=75%) pieces of pertinent information (“...”) are missing or mostly irrelevant information is provided; documentation explanation is incomplete and/or inappropriate.		Many (50%) pieces of pertinent information (“...”) are missing or irrelevant information is provided; documentation explanation not optimal.	Mostly complete and relevant summary of pertinent information (“...”); documentation explanation present but not optimal.	Complete and relevant summary of all pertinent information (initial behavior/attitude of client, discussion of issue with client and their reaction, plan for future); thorough documentation explanation.	
						Total:

**PLO #2 Mock Exam Project Rubric
SLHS 4150**

Name _____

	Exemplary	Emerging	Needs Improvement
Content	Exam is comprehensive in nature, including a variety of questions from <u>each</u> topic discussed. 50 points	Exam only included questions about a <u>few</u> of the topics covered in class. 25 points	Exam only included questions about 1-2 topics in class. 0 points
Knowledge level	Exam included a variety of questions that included questions involving higher level thinking. (e.g., compare/contrast; etc.) 25 points	Exam had more than 10 T/F or 10 MC questions OR some short answer questions were more “direct recall” types of questions. 15 points	Exam had more than 10 T/F or 10 MC questions AND some/all short answer questions were more “direct recall” types of questions. 0 points

PLO #4 Evaluation Rubric

Case Study Rubric

	Absent 0-20%	Low Emerging 20-70%	High Emerging 70-90-%	Exemplary 90-100%
Literature Review (30%) Depth of content/research evidence and support.	Provides inaccurate or inappropriate information related to the pathology. Evidence cited is poor quality. NO journals cited, text and web citations only	Provides minimal or inaccurate information related to the pathology. Most evidence is not current or of poor quality. 1-2 relevant Journal articles cited and discussed.	Provides enough information to accurately describe the pathology and mechanism of action. Consistently provides appropriate, current, and moderate to high levels of evidence. 3-4 relevant journal articles cited and discussed.	Provides more than adequate information and goes above and beyond expectations. Offers more or new information about the pathology and mechanism of action. Consistently provide appropriate, current, and high quality evidence. 5 or more relevant journal articles cited and discussed
Literature Review (20%) Organization/style/clarity	Lit review is haphazardly organized and illogical. Reader cannot follow line of reasoning. Student fails to provide examples or pertinent definitions or explanations.	Lit review is unclear, does not follow a logical progression, and has many confusing points. Reader can follow only with significant effort. Insufficient examples, definitions, or explanations.	Lit Review is reasonably clear and follows a logical progression with 1-2 minimally confusing points. Reader can follow with minimal effort	Lit Review is very clear and follows a logical progression. Reader can follow without effort.
Patient File (50%)	Provides inaccurate, inappropriate, or fails to include patient results	Provides minimal or mostly inaccurate patient results	Consistently provides adequate, accurate patient results, with few inaccuracies.	Consistently provides adequate, accurate patient results, with very minimal to no inaccuracies.