## Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
**Department:** Speech, Language, Hearing  
**Academic Year:** 2014-15  
**Program:** Speech-Language Pathology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Direct Measure (DM)</th>
<th>DM Results</th>
<th>Indirect Measure (IM)</th>
<th>IM Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>For each of the three test content categories (Foundations and Professional Practice; Screening, Assessment, Evaluation, and Diagnosis; and Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation of Treatment) of the National Examination in Speech-Language Pathology (NESP)* 80% of the graduating cohort will score at the 25th percentile or higher compared with the benchmark set by all test takers nationally for that test administration year.</td>
<td>Comparison of quartile scores achieved on each of the three test content categories of the NESP by the MASLP graduating cohort with the published national quartile scores of all test takers for that test administration year.</td>
<td>On each of the three test content categories, 83% of the 2015 graduating cohort scored at the 25th percentile or higher compared with the benchmark set by all test takers nationally for the 2014-2015 test administration year.</td>
<td>Percentage of the MASLP graduating cohort who passed the NESP before graduation.</td>
<td>The pass rate on the 2014-2015 NESP by the 2015 graduating cohort was 100% (19/19).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impression**

The mean percentage+ of correct responses obtained by the 2015 graduating cohort was 75% in the area of Foundations and Professional Practice; 81% in the area of Screening, Assessment, Evaluation, and Diagnosis; and 76% in the area of Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation of Treatment, suggesting above average integration of content knowledge and skill in principles of professional practice, clinical assessment, and intervention. 

Students completing the MA SLP program are well prepared in the content and skill areas assessed by the NESP at the time of graduation.

**Proposed Action Item:** Tool

NA

**Proposed Action Item: Program Content**

Map individual MASLP courses by primary content/skill and secondary content/skill to specific NESP outcome areas in each of the three test content categories using a curriculum crosswalk.

**Action Items Implemented**

Collect the Pennsylvania Statewide Evaluation Form for Student Professional Knowledge and Practice (PDE430 form) on 2015 graduating cohort completing a school-based clinical practicum (for Objective 2).

**Objective to be Assessed Again/Next**

Data on Objective 1 (direct and indirect measures) will be tracked each year. Objective 2 data are being collected and will be analyzed to report in AY2015-2016.

*Notes:*

The NESP exam taken by the 2015 graduating cohort was modified in 2014-15. Direct comparison between this cohort and previous cohorts who took the exam cannot be made.

**Range of Percentage Correct Obtained in NESP Content Categories:** 61-89% Foundations and Professional Practice; 67-94% Screening, Assessment, Evaluation, and Diagnosis; and 56-97% Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation of Treatment
**Program: Speech and Hearing Science**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Direct Measure (DM)</th>
<th>DM Results</th>
<th>Indirect Measure (IM)</th>
<th>IM Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>At program completion, at least 80% of SHS students will demonstrate knowledge of theoretical foundations of speech, language, and hearing sciences that support normal communication development and use.</td>
<td>Earned score of 37.5/50 (75%) or better on SHS Communication Science Foundations (CSF) Assessment*</td>
<td>Overall Results+ No graduating seniors obtained a score of 75% or better; Class average was 49%; 15% of graduating seniors scored between 60-74%; 72% of graduating seniors scored between 30-60%</td>
<td>Median Likert scale rating of 4 (on five-point scale) on SHS Communication Science Foundations Learning Outcomes (CSFLO) Exit Survey</td>
<td>46 of 50 (92%) learning outcome statements had median Likert scale rating of 4 or 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impression**
Graduating seniors retain less than 50% of the declarative (explicit) content presented in their core classes, with the exception of Communication Development Across the Lifespan, as measured by this instrument.
Graduating seniors agree/strongly agree that they grasp the concepts/skills targeted as learning outcomes in their Communication Science Foundation courses.
With the excitement of completing their degree program and its requisite time and financial investment, students may over-estimate their abilities when faced with statements of what they can do versus activities in which they have to demonstrate that knowledge/skill.

**Limitations**
Multiple-choice tests normally assess content knowledge. Information that is memorized but not practiced or elaborated upon is less likely to be retained.

**Proposed Action Item: Tool**
Revamp assessment instrument to include authentic assessment that simulates student’s ability to apply critical thinking and knowledge and to perform tasks that approximate those found in the clinical setting. Assessment instrument for AY2015-16 Objective 2 will trial authentic assessment format.

**Proposed Action Item: Program Content and Course Assessment Practices**
1. Student assignments in foundation classes should emphasize practice with new/import information.
2. In-class and out-of-class activities should emphasize elaborative rehearsal (e.g., thinking of related examples of the content, mentally tying the information together, creating mental image of the information) and personal experiences. We want the tone of learning to be one of a constant process of reconciling old thinking with new data/information.
3. Course content should be presented in multiple sensory modalities to encourage expansion/elaboration of information in memory stores, and purposeful connections and association with prior knowledge should be pointed out to students.
4. Retention of new learning can be improved through distributed practice across multiple sessions. Students will recall information better when it is paired with personal experience.
5. Assessment instruments in foundation classes should incorporate skill practice with critical reading, writing, and problem-solving, capitalizing on divergent, evaluative, integrative, and inferential thinking processes, instead of lower level convergent and memory processes.
6. Modify the way we have conducted tutoring. Continue to use GAs, but limit the number of courses they are tutoring, have them attend the class meetings, and possibly add a weekly recitation for some of the undergraduate courses.

**Action Items Implemented**
We are implementing the new tutoring method in 2015-16, with a goal of improved retention of core knowledge, as evidenced by improved performance on the comprehensive exams.

**Objective to be Assessed Again/Next**
Objective 1 will be re-assessed in AY 2017-2018 with a different direct measure assessment instrument.
Objective 2 will be assessed in AY 2015-2016. Direct and indirect assessment instruments will be developed in Fall 2015 and administered in Spring 2016.

*Notes: Demographics: 39 seniors (no post-bac students) graduating in May/December 2015; Test Characteristics: 50 Multiple Choice Questions (7-10 questions per course content area; Administration: Anonymous group in in last week of classes, average time to complete assessment was 25 minutes

+ Percentage of Questions Missed by Course: 58% Psychology of Communication; 37% Communication Development Across the Lifespan; 59% Anatomy & Physiology; 56% Acoustic Phonetics; 50% Speech & Hearing Science; 49% Advanced Language Analysis