

Academic Assessment: AY 2012-2013
B.A. Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences
School of Communication Disorders and Deafness
College of Education
Kean University

Mission:

The mission of the School of Communication Disorders and Deafness is to provide undergraduate students with a strong academic and theoretical foundation in the area of speech-language-hearing sciences as well as opportunities to integrate and meaningfully apply this foundational learning. Because the entry level degree in the field of speech-language pathology is a master's degree and in audiology it is a doctoral degree, the undergraduate program is designed to prepare these students with the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to successfully complete a graduate program in either of these professional areas.

The Bachelor of Arts program in Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences (SLHS #26201) in the School of Communication Disorders and Deafness has established student learning objectives that are aligned with this mission, the stated goals of the College of Education, those of the General Education program and of Kean University as a whole (see Attachment A). Our ultimate goal is to develop a student body reflective of the University's mission to serve socially, culturally and linguistically diverse traditional and non-traditional students.

Assessment Process:

Each core curriculum course has objective assessment tools (e.g., exams, take home written assignments, research writing and reflective writing products, oral presentations) to assess student learning as the course progresses as well as to provide a culminating objective measure of individual student outcomes. Because each course is crafted to address a unique set of knowledge, skills, and dispositions, each naturally falls primarily within 1-2 areas of the program's student learning outcome objectives in addition to those outlined in the outcome goals for the College of Education, the General Education curriculum, and Kean University. The distribution of courses across each of the student learning objectives and the curriculum maps are presented in the tables in Attachment B.

Two sets of direct measures were identified in the Fall of 2012 as appropriate for objective assessment of the learning objectives of the program. The first was performance on oral and written projects to determine changes in student performance as they progressed through the program. These additional data sets were also collected for comparison to performance in Capstone (CDD 4275 Pre-Professional Speech Language Pathology/Audiology: Preparing for a Career (Capstone)). The oral presentation and written products were assessed utilizing rubrics consistent with those used for General Education written and oral projects (see Attachment C).

The second direct measure utilized was pre-and post-test measures of student knowledge, skill, and disposition in the 6 program SLOs, allowing a comparison of mastery as they enter the program in CDD 2251 (Introduction to Speech-Language and Hearing Disorders) to student performance on the same task in CDD 4275 (Capstone). Composite data for both direct measures were subsequently analyzed to determine areas of program strength and weakness.

An indirect measure of student learning outcome was also examined, the Graduating Student Survey. This 23 question survey presented in an online format through Qualtrics provided students an anonymous forum to express perceptions/opinions of their academic experiences at Kean including their overall impression of the University and individual academic program experiences as well as their perceived achievement of the program's six specific learning outcomes.

Summary of Findings:

Academic Assessment Report AY 2012-2013

The Academic Assessment Report provides a detailed outline of the methods and results of data assessment across the program's six student learning outcomes at the close of the second cycle of program assessment.

In summary, the undergraduate faculty came to the following conclusions:

(1) The direct measures of student learning, as recorded on the rubrics, appear to indicate that overall student achievement is at acceptable levels upon completion of the program. However, it was noted on several occasions that the designated metrics of student learning outcome do not appear, overall, as sensitive to the specific objective as was originally envisioned. While generally positive and satisfactory, careful consideration of the results obtained on the direct measure has identified areas that can be strengthened and also changes that should be made to the measure to increase validity in the future.

(2) The second direct measure, implemented for the first time in AY2012-2013, was the pre- and post-test measures of student performance at the beginning and end of the program. The data obtained demonstrate an overall improvement in knowledge, skill, and disposition for all 6 program SLOs when comparing students beginning the program (enrolled in CDD 2251 Introduction to Speech-Language-Hearing Disorders) and those completing the program in CDD 4275 Capstone. However, it was noted that not all questions clearly differentiated students entering the program from those completing the program. The specific items in the measure are being reconsidered for use in AY 2013-2014.

(3) Indirect measures currently appear to indicate that student learning outcomes for all six areas were achieved. Specifically, 97% (33 of 34) graduating students perceive having learned the six targeted student learning outcomes. The inclusion of specific questions on the graduating student completer survey that specifically asked students to consider their perceived understanding and mastery of the 6 program SLOs appeared to provide more clear and distinct outcomes for analysis.

(4) In considering the assessment results obtained in AY2011-2012, the SLHS undergraduate curriculum committee noted CDD 4274, Computers and Technology in SLHS, as lead the faculty to conclude that that the course was ineffective in addressing SLO5. This course was removed from the required program course list. Results of the graduating student survey obtained in AY 2012-2013 was consistent with the results obtained the previous year, indicating that, while this is an area that continues to need to be monitored, eliminating the course did not affect perceived student learning outcomes.

(5) Creation and implementation of a new course this year, CDD 4101 Deafness and Society, was chosen to replace CDD 4274 to augment and solidify senior-level consideration of SLO6, which was determined as being an area that needed improvement in the last academic assessment cycle. The introduction of this course to the curriculum appears to have strengthened student-perceived learning outcomes for this SLO.

Capstone Courses and GE SLO Outcomes

The assessment findings by General Education lead to an examination of "Revisions" from the Writing rubric and "Overall Impact" from the Speaker Evaluation form. The GE Assessment Data Analysis and Recording Sheet for Programs provide a detailed outline of the methods and results of this assessment.

In summary, the undergraduate faculty came to the following conclusions:

(1). Examination of the objective and subjective data related to revision of written work suggests that students improved their ability to revise work successfully. As compared to the last assessment cycle, these skills appear to have improved overall. This area continues to require monitoring and the implementation of further explicit teaching. In addition, the curriculum committee will consider how to reinforce this skill across the curriculum.

(2) Although improved, students to score lower in "Overall Impact" on the oral presentation/speaker evaluation rubric and continue to demonstrate an inability to present without detailed speaker note and/or reading all of the text from Power Point slides, which affected their ability to answer questions readily and confidently as well as to develop a rapport with the audience as well as their ability to maintain an appropriate rate and fluency of speaking.

Preliminary Plan for AY 2013-2014:

Moving forward into AY 2013-2014, several actions are being considered for ongoing performance assessment:

(1) CDD 4101 Deafness and Society has been added to the required courses for the BA in Speech-Language-Hearing Science. This course needs to be integrated into the assessment plan and included on the Curriculum Map. Additionally, its assignments will be used as additional measure of SLO6. Change in the direct and indirect measures of SLO 6 will be carefully monitored to see if positive change happens.

(2) Continue to improve and explicitly teach assess writing skills across the curriculum. Specifically, increased standardization of rating of student works, unify the types of works that are being assessed in different courses (eg, research paper versus reaction paper) needs to be considered. Writing emphasis courses other than Capstone will continue to be included in the assessment process.

(3) Courses that require oral presentations, in addition to Capstone, will continue to utilize the Oral Presentation rubric to allow for more data collection and analyses across the curriculum. In addition, these other lower level program courses as well as Capstone, will continue to provide explicit teaching regarding constructing Power Point presentations as supplemental material as well as how to speak without reading from

detailed speaker notes. Again, standardization of rubric use and types of assignments being assessed will be addressed in AY 2013-2014.

(4) The questions contained in the pre- and post-test measures of student learning at the beginning and completion of the program will be reconsidered and revised in an attempt to assess the six program SLOs which should facilitate more clear differentiation of the two groups.

(5) Questions will be reexamined contained in the Graduating Student Completer Survey to provide a comprehensive indirect measure of all of the program's SLOs. This revised survey will be implemented in May 2014.

GE Assessment Data Analysis and Recording Sheet for Programs

AY 2012-2013

Review of GE Data

Program: BA Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences

Date: May 17, 2013

Course	GE SLO/ Related Program SLO	Data reviewed (Direct or indirect measurement of GE SLO used)	Summary of findings/Implications for improving teaching and learning	Action taken for Summer I / II Fall 2013
CDD 4275	GES1/ SLO3	Direct: Capstone written project Students complete a comprehensive written project on a current clinical issue in speech-language hearing sciences requiring the integration of information across all curriculum SLOs with current published research. The criterion "Revision", which subsequent submissions of the same writing assignment improve with revision, was used. Measures of central tendency for the sample of 34 student submissions across two course sections with two instructors were calculated and considered.	Mean score: 4.3 Examination of the data and subjective assessment by the two course instructors suggest that students improved in ability to revise written work; this outcome has exceeded the AY 2011-2012 mean of 3.8. An area in the writing rubric that was the weakest skill was Genre/Audience, with a mean of 3.7. This was due to inconsistent use of professional writing style and vocabulary use as well as inconsistent implementation of APA conventions.	Writing emphasis courses other than Capstone will continue to include writing assignments which require revision. The writing rubric will continue to be used in the writing emphasis courses to directly monitor student writing to allow for further data analysis following AY 2013-2014. The curriculum committee will assess the need to include APA requirements in more classes and perhaps a standard instructional framework for students as well as to enhance their writing skills overall. These skills will be carefully monitored in AY 2013-2014.
CDD	GES2/	Direct: Capstone oral	Mean: 4.1	Courses that include oral presentations, in

4275	SLO3	<p>presentation</p> <p>Students complete an oral presentation requiring the integration of the speech-language-hearing sciences curriculum SLOs with current published research.</p> <p>A rubric for Capstone courses across Kean University was used to assess all graduating student works across a variety of areas using a 5-point Likert scale (see attachment).</p> <p>The criterion "Overall Impact", which assesses speaker credibility, appropriate use of time and the overall success of the presentation, was used.</p> <p>Measures of central tendency for the sample of 34 student presentations across two course sections with two instructors were calculated and considered.</p>	<p>Examination of the data and subjective assessment by the two course instructors suggests that student scores improved from last year when a 4.0 was achieved. Skills that continue to be addressed are the ability to speak without notes or reading all of the text from Power Point slides, which affected their ability to answer questions readily and confidently as well as to develop a rapport with the audience.</p>	<p>addition to Capstone, will continue to utilize the Oral Presentation rubric to allow for more data collection and analyses. In addition, these other lower level program courses as well as Capstone, will provide more explicit teaching regarding constructing Power Point presentations as supplemental material as well as how to speak without relying heavily on detailed notes.</p>
------	------	--	--	---

Attachment A
Program Student Learning Objectives
BA Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences

The following is a summary of the student learning objectives for the Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences program and how they align with those of the University and General Education .

Undergraduate students majoring in Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences will demonstrate:

SLO1: a knowledge base, both theoretical and practical, in the normal processes that underlie expressive and receptive human communication and its development across the lifespan.

*- KU SLO 2, 4

** GE SLO K2, K3, K4, S1, S2, S5, V5

SLO2: an understanding of communicative disorders across the lifespan: their etiology, symptomatology, assessment and management models.

*- KU SLO 1,2,3,4

** GE SLO K1, K2, K4, S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, V4, V5

SLO3: the ability to discuss research and other professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative and philosophical) relevant to speech-language pathology and audiology.

*- KU SLO 1,2,3,4

** GE SLO K1, K2, K3, S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, V1, V2, V3, V4, V5

SLO4: an ability to translate content materials into appropriately tailored evaluation and treatment procedures.

*- KU SLO 1,2,3,4

** GE SLO K1, K2, K3, K4, S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, V1, V2, V4, V5

SLO5: knowledge of and the ability to use technological tools and resources standard to the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology in laboratory and clinical settings.

*- KU SLO 2, 4

** GE SLO K2, K3, S1, S2, S5, V5

SLO6: an awareness of individual differences (e.g., cultural and linguistic diversity) as it affects the development of human communication and the practice of speech-language pathology and audiology.

*- KU SLO 1, 2, 3

** GE SLO K2, K4, S1, S2, S4, S5, V1, V2, V4

*** KU Student Learning Outcomes: Kean University graduates should be able to:**

1. Think critically, creatively and globally;
2. Adapt to changing social, economic, and technological environments;
3. Serve as active and contributing members of their communities; and
4. Advance their knowledge in the traditional disciplines (GE) and enhance their skills in professional areas (Professional programs)

****General Education Student Learning Outcomes**

Student Learning Outcomes – Knowledge

Students will demonstrate proficiency in knowledge and content by:

- 1) applying the scientific method to understand natural concepts and processes (GEK1)
- 2) evaluating major theories and concepts in social sciences (GEK2)
- 3) relating literature to historical context (GEK3)
- 4) evaluating major theories and concepts in the fine arts (GEK4)

Student Learning Outcomes – Skills

Students will demonstrate the skills and technology necessary to:

- 1) write to communicate and clarify learning (GES1)
- 2) communicate effectively through speech (GES2)
- 3) solve problems using quantitative reasoning (GES3)
- 4) think critically about concepts in multiple disciplines (GES4)
- 5) demonstrate information literacy (GES5)

Student Learning Outcomes – Values

Students will exhibit a set of values that demonstrates:

- 1) personal responsibility (GEV1)
- 2) ethical and social responsibility (GEV2)
- 3) social and civic engagement (GEV3)
- 4) respect for diverse cultures and perspectives (GEV4)
- 5) life-long learning (GEV5)

Attachment B
Curriculum Maps
Course to Program/Discipline Level Student Learning Outcomes
Communication Disorders & Deafness
Undergraduate Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences

The undergraduate program in Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences prepares students to achieve the expected student learning outcomes identified by the program or discipline. The following table demonstrates how learning activities in specific courses map to these learning outcomes.

Key: I-Introduced R-Reinforced M-Mastery A-Assessment evidence

Core Courses	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4	SLO5	SLO6
CDD 1101 American Sign Language I		IR	IR			IR
CDD 2251 Intro to Speech-Language-Hearing Sci	I	I	I	I	I	I
CDD 2254 Phonetics	IRA	I			I	IA
CDD 2255 Language Development	IRA	I			I	I
CDD 2260 Anatomy & Physiology of the Ear/Speech	IRA	I			I	
CDD 3258 Disorders of Speech Production & Voice	R	IRA	IR	I	IR	IR
CDD 3259 Basic Audiology	IR	I		IRA	IR	
CDD 3260 Disorders of Language & Communication	R	IRA	IR	I	R	IR
CDD 3261 Speech Science	IRA				IR	R
CDD 3262 Aural Rehabilitation	IR	IRA	R	IRA	IR	R
CDD 3267 Hearing Science	IRA				IRA	
CDD 3269 Neuroscience	IRA	R	R		I	
CDD 3270 Developmental Phonology	IRA	IR	R	IR	R	RA
CDD 4269 Pre-Professional/Clinical Issues	R	R	RA	RA	R	R
CDD 4274 Computer Technology for SLHS					IRA	
CDD 4275 Capstone SLHS	RMA	RMA	RMA	RMA	RMA	RMA

The following table demonstrates how learning activities in specific courses map to the University's student learning outcomes.

Core Courses	KU1	KU2	KU3	KU4
CDD 1101 American Sign Language I	X		X	X
CDD 2251 Intro to Speech-Language-Hearing Sci	X		X	X
CDD 2254 Phonetics	X	X		X
CDD 2255 Language Development	X	X		X
CDD 2260 Anatomy & Physiology of the Ear/Speech				X
CDD 3258 Disorders of Speech Production & Voice	X	X		X
CDD 3259 Basic Audiology	X	X		X
CDD 3260 Disorders of Language & Communication	X	X		X
CDD 3261 Speech Science		X		X
CDD 3262 Aural Rehabilitation	X	X		X
CDD 3267 Hearing Science		X		X
CDD 3269 Neuroscience		X		X
CDD 3270 Developmental Phonology	X	X		X
CDD 4269 Pre-Professional/Clinical Issues	X	X	X	X
CDD 4274 Computer Technology for SLHS		X		X
CDD 4275 Capstone SLHS	X	X	X	X

The following table demonstrates how learning activities in specific courses map to the General Education student learning outcomes.

Core Courses	GE K				GE S					GE V				
	GEK1	GEK2	GEK3	GEK4	GES1	GES2	GES3	GES4	GES5	GEV1	GEV2	GEV3	GEV4	GEV5
CDD 1101 American Sign Language I		X				X		X		X	X	X	X	X
CDD 2251 Intro to Speech-Language-Hearing Sci	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
CDD 2254 Phonetics	X							X		X	X			X
CDD 2255 Language Development	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X		X	X
CDD 2260 Anat & Physiology of the Ear/Speech	X							X		X				X
CDD 3258 Disorders of Spch Production & Voice		X			X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
CDD 3259 Basic Audiology	X						X	X		X	X			X
CDD 3260 Disorders of Lang & Comm		X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
CDD 3261 Speech Science	X						X	X		X				X
CDD 3262 Aural Rehabilitation		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
CDD 3267 Hearing Science	X						X	X		X				X
CDD 3269 Neuroscience	X							X		X				X
CDD 3270 Developmental Phonology	X	X				X		X		X	X			X
CDD 4269 Pre-Professional/Clinical Issues	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X
CDD 4274 Computer Technology for SLHS								X		X				
CDD 4275 Capstone SLHS	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X

Academic Assessment Report Outcomes - AY 2012 2013

College, School/Department, Name of Program: College of Education
School of Communication Disorders and Deafness; BA Program in Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences

Program SLOs:

Undergraduate students majoring in Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences will demonstrate:

SLO1: a knowledge base, both theoretical and practical, in the normal processes that underlie expressive and receptive human communication and its development across the lifespan .KU SLO 2, 4; GE SLO K2, K3, K4, S1, S2, S5, V5

SLO2: an understanding of communicative disorders across the lifespan: their etiology, symptomatology, assessment and management models.
KU SLO 1,2,3,4; GE SLO K1, K2, K4, S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, V4, V5

SLO3: the ability to discuss research and other professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative and philosophical) relevant to speech-language pathology and audiology. KU SLO 1,2,3,4; GE SLO K1, K2, K3, S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, V1, V2, V3, V4, V5

SLO4: an ability to translate content materials into appropriately tailored evaluation and treatment procedures.
KU SLO 1,2,3,4; GE SLO K1, K2, K3, K4, S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, V1, V2, V4, V5

SLO5: knowledge of and the ability to use technological tools and resources standard to the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology in laboratory and clinical settings. KU SLO 2, 4; GE SLO K2, K3, S1, S2, S5, V5

SLO6: an awareness of individual differences (e.g., cultural and linguistic diversity) as it affects the development of human communication and the practice of speech-language pathology and audiology. KU SLO 1, 2, 3; GE SLO K2, K4, S1, S2, S4, S5, V1, V2, V4

Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (Add rows for additional SLOs)	As detailed as possible: projected enrollments, section #s, etc.		Results of Assessment (Specific to Data Collected: or follow up from FA12-SP13)	Action Taken: Closing the loop for improving teaching and learning
	Assessment Measure(s) (Add rows if necessary)	Assessment Criteria (Describe how data is collected--rubric, survey, etc.)		
SLO #1: a knowledge base, both theoretical and practical, in the normal processes that underlie expressive and receptive human communication and its development across the lifespan.	Direct: written project Students will complete a written project requiring the integration of information related with the development of human communication and related composite skills	A rubric will be used to assess all student works in CDD 3258, 3270, 4269, and 4275 using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment C). The criterion "Communication Development", which requires clear	CDD 2251: The mean score for a written assignment for SLO1 was 3.6/5 (n=25) CDD 3258: The mean score achieved across 3 sections (n=61) found a mean rating of 4.2/5 for SLO1 in a writing assignment.	The results obtained are unexpected; it appears that students in Introduction to Speech-Language-Hearing Disorders (2251) did equally well as the students in Capstone (CDD 4275) on a written assignment in demonstrating a theoretical and practical knowledge of normal communication across the lifespan with intermediate classes exceeding the results of 2251 and 4275.

		<p>description of requisite and specific skills related to human communication development, will be used. Measures of central tendency for the sample of approximately 50 student submissions in each course will be individually calculated and considered.</p>	<p>CDD 3270: The mean score across 1 section (n=22) was 3.8/5</p> <p>CDD 4269: The mean score across 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.5/5</p> <p>CDD 4275: data obtained from 13/34 students yielded a mean score of 3.5/5</p>	<p>Several possible reasons for this discrepancy are theorized:</p> <p>(1) the ratings given by different instructors may not have all been equivalent, with perhaps rating student performance on what was expected for in that class/at that level as opposed to comparing performance at all levels to graduating seniors;</p> <p>(2) it was noted that the assignments that were used for gathering data varied greatly, even across different sections of the same course (e.g., an interview/opinion paper versus a research paper); and</p> <p>(3) not all instructors used the prescribed rubric for assessment purposes but instead used and submitted their own unique grading rubric for as their metric or a previous version of the rubric from AY 2011-2012.</p> <p>This measure should continue to be monitored in the next academic year.</p> <p>Changes to be made in AY 2013-14:</p> <p>(1) instructors will be provided more specific instruction and specific criteria for comparing of students across the program to the performance of graduating seniors/first year MA students;</p> <p>(2) the curriculum committee will standardize assignments to be used for</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			gathering data to allow for a more consistent task to allow comparisons of performance across sections and the program; and (3) meet with all instructors to discuss the use of the prescribed rubric for program assessment purposes while using their own unique rubric for grading.
Direct: oral presentation Students complete an oral presentation requiring the integration of the speech-language-hearing sciences curriculum SLO1	A rubric will be used to assess student presentations in CDD 3260, 4269, and 4275 using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment D). The criterion "Communication Development" will be used. Measures of central tendency for the sample of approximately 50 student presentations in each course sections of 25 students each will be calculated and considered.	CDD 3260: data obtained in 1 section (n=22) was 3.8/5 CDD 4269: The mean score for 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.5/5 CDD 4275: data obtained from 13/34 students enrolled in one of two sections of Capstone demonstrated a mean score of 4.3/5	The results appear to demonstrate increased abilities to understand and describe normal communication development across the lifespan. Students enrolled in Capstone (CDD 4275) performed better on an oral presentation assignment than students in classes taken earlier in the curriculum. These data are consistent with those obtained in the written assignment. This measure should continue to be monitored. Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) following up with instructors to insure rubrics are being filled out consistently; and (2) insure consistent use of the prescribed rubric for program assessment.
Direct: Pre-Test and Post-Test data will be collected. A 30 question assessment will be developed by the curriculum committee which will include 5	The assessment will be distributed to students in Intro (CDD 2251) in the Fall and Spring semesters (2 sections, each with about 25 students). The same	Four questions were presented to assess mastery of SLO1. Percent of correct responses for all students in each course across sections was calculated. CDD 2251: n=36	Obtained group data obtained from Capstone students demonstrate 50% of the questions were more consistently answered correctly than students in Intro. This result is unexpected, and could be the result of the questions contained in the test presented or it could be random

	questions specifically tapping the skills addressed in SLO1.	measure will be used to gather data from the two sections of Capstone (CDD 4275) each with about 25 students taught in the Spring 2013 semester. The results obtained from Intro and Capstone will be compared to objectively assess performance differences.	1-1: 10% correct 1-2: 44% correct 1-3: 83% correct 1-4: 13% correct CDD 4275: n=13 (13/34) 1-1: 21% correct 1-2: 37% correct 1-3: 32% correct 1-4: 42% correct	chance as it was a multiple-choice task. This direct measure should continue to be used to assess change from the early phase of the program to completing the curriculum. Change to be made in AY 2013-14: reconsider the questions used to assess knowledge of normal communication across the lifespan
	Indirect: Program Completer Survey	Approximately 50 students will complete the online survey presented through Qualtrics in May of 2013; Question 23 item 1 will ask students to rate their perceived learning outcome for SLO1 on a 5-point Likert scale	33/34 completed the survey. 19 (56%) agreed strongly and 13 (39%) agreed that they feel they achieved knowledge about the processes that underlie normal communication across the lifespan; and 1 respondent (3%) neither agreed nor disagreed.	No action required; continue to monitor.
SLO #2: an understanding of communicative disorders across the lifespan: their etiology, symptomatology, assessment and management models.	Direct: written project Students will complete a written project requiring the integration of information related with the development of human communication and related composite skills.	A rubric will be used to assess written works in CDD 3258, 3270, 4269, 4275 using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment C). The criterion "Communication Disorders" will be used.	CDD 2251: The mean score for SLO2 was 3.6/5 (n=25) for a written assignment CDD 3258: The mean score achieved across 3 sections (n=61) found a mean rating of 4.4/5 for SLO2.	The results obtained are similar to those found for SLO1. Here it appears that students in CDD 2251 did not perform as well as the students in Capstone on a written assignment intended to assess understanding of communicative disorders. Again, intermediate classes, although exceeding the results of 2251, did not demonstrate a robust change

		<p>Measures of central tendency for the sample of approximately 50 student submissions in each course across 2 sections will be calculated and considered.</p>	<p>CDD 3270: Twenty-two students enrolled in one section obtained a means score of 3.8</p> <p>CDD 4269: The mean score for 1 of 2 sections (n=12 out of 34 enrolled this year) was 3.75/5</p> <p>CDD 4275: 13/34 students had a mean score of 4.4/5 on tasks related to SLO2.</p>	<p>when compared to measurements form the cohort enrolled in 4275.</p> <p>Possible reasons for these results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) the ratings were given by different instructors, so not all scores of 4, for example, are equivalent, reporting could have been based on expectations for that class/at that level as opposed to comparing performance in all courses to graduating seniors; (2) assignments used for gathering data varied greatly, even across different sections of the same course (e.g., an interview/opinion paper versus a research paper); and (3) not all instructors used the prescribed rubric for assessment data reporting consistently. <p>This direct measure should continue to be used in the next academic year.</p> <p>Changes to be made in AY 2013-14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) instructors will be re-oriented to and more specific instruction will be provided outlining the criteria for assessing performance across the program to the that of graduating seniors/first year MA students; (2) unify the assignments to be used for gathering data to allow for a more consistent task to assess performance within each course and across the curriculum; and
--	--	--	---	--

			(3) follow up with all instructors to insure the use the prescribed rubric for program assessment.
Direct: oral presentation Students complete an oral presentation requiring the integration of the curriculum in SLO2.	A rubric will be used to assess all student presentations in CDD 4269, 3260 and 4275 using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment D). The criterion "Communication Disorders" will be used. Measures of central tendency for the sample of approximately 50 student presentations across two course sections for each course will be calculated and considered.	CDD 3260: The mean score of 22 students enrolled in one section was 3.8/5 CDD 4269: The mean score for 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.5/5 CDD 4275: data obtained from 13/34 students enrolled in one of two sections of Capstone demonstrated a mean score of 4.4/5	Results appear to show increased abilities to understand and describe disorders of communication across the lifespan. Students enrolled in Capstone (CDD 4275) performed better on an oral presentation assignment than in classes taken earlier in the program. These data are consistent with those obtained in the written assignments in CDD 4269 and 4275. This measure should continue to be monitored. Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) following up with instructors to insure rubrics are being filled out completely and consistently; and (2) support consistent use of the prescribed rubric for program assessment.
Direct: Pre-Test and Post-Test data will be collected. A 30 question assessment will be developed by the curriculum committee which will include 5 questions specifically tapping the skills addressed in SLO2.	The assessment will be distributed to students in Intro (CDD 2251) in the Fall and Spring semesters (2 sections, each with about 25 students). The same measure will be used to gather data in Spring 2013 from the two sections of Capstone	Four questions were presented to assess mastery of SLO2. Group data of the percent of correct responses for all students in each course across sections was calculated. CDD 2251: n=36 2-1: 86% correct 2-2: 42% correct 2-3: 42% correct	Group data indicate 75% of the questions were more consistently answered correctly by Capstone students than students in Intro. One question was roughly equivalent between the groups. This could be the result of a question that does not adequately test the desired skill; or, it could be random chance as it was a multiple-choice task. This direct measure should continue to be

		each with about 25 students. The results obtained from Intro and Capstone will be compared to objectively assess performance differences.	<p>2-4: 11% correct CDD 4275: n=13 (13/34)</p> <p>2-1: 84% correct 2-2: 79% correct 2-3: 47% correct 2-4: 53% correct</p>	<p>used to assess change from the early to late in the curriculum.</p> <p>Change to be made in AY 2013-14: reconsider the questions 2-1 and 2-3 used to assess its effectiveness in measuring knowledge of disorders of communication.</p>
	Indirect: Program Completer Survey	Approximately 50 students will complete the online survey in May of 2013 presented through Qualtrics; Question 23 item 2 will ask students to rate their perceived learning outcome for SLO2 on a 5-point Likert scale	<p>33/34 graduating students completed the survey and answered item 2 in Question 23 asking if they feel they understand the etiology, assessment, and management models of disordered communication across the lifespan.</p> <p>18 (55%) agreed strongly, 14 (42%) agreed, and 1 respondent (3%) neither agreed nor disagreed.</p>	No action required; continue to monitor.
SLO #3: the ability to discuss research and other professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative and philosophical) relevant to speech-language pathology and audiology	Direct: written project Students will complete a written project requiring the integration of the curriculum included in SLO3.	The criteria "Research" and "Professional Issues" as well as "Revision", which subsequent submissions of the same writing assignment improve with revision, will be used to assess student written work in CDD 3258, 4269, and 4275 utilizing the rubric in	<p>CDD 2251: The mean score for performance related to SLO3 in one section was 3.3/5 (n=25)</p> <p>CDD 3258: The mean score achieved across 3 sections (n=61) was 3.7/5 for SLO3</p> <p>CDD 3270: data collected from 22 students in one section demonstrated a mean performance of</p>	The results obtained appear to support a progression of improved performance for students as they progress through the program. Intermediate class data indicate a positive change from 2251 to 4275; however, these differences are not as robust as would be expected. Possible reasons for this small change: (1) instructors may not have compared performance to that of graduating seniors; (2) assignments used for gathering data varied greatly in terms of the task

		<p>Attachment C. Measures of central tendency for the sample of approximately 50 student submissions across two sections of each course will be calculated and considered.</p>	<p>3.8/5 CDD 4269: The mean score across 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.8/5 CDD 4275: data obtained from one section (13/34 students enrolled in Capstone) yielded a mean performance of 4.2/5</p>	<p>required, even across different sections of the same course; and (3) not all instructors used the prescribed rubric for assessment purposes.</p> <p>This direct measure should continue to be used in the next academic year.</p> <p>Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) provide specific instruction outlining the criteria for comparing of students across the program to the performance of graduating seniors/first year MA students; (2) standardization of assignments used for gathering assessment within all sections of each course and through the program; and (3) insure the use the prescribed rubric for the specified assignments for program assessment.</p>
<p>Direct: oral presentation Students complete an oral presentation requiring the integration of the speech-language-hearing sciences curriculum in SLO3</p>		<p>A rubric will be used to assess all student works in CDD 3260, 4269, and 4275 using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment D). The criteria "Supporting Material" and "Professional Issues" will be used. Measures of central tendency for the sample of</p>	<p>CDD 3260: For one section (n=22) the mean score was 3.8/5 CDD 4269: The mean score for 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.5/5 CDD 4275: data obtained from 13/34 students enrolled in one of two sections of Capstone demonstrated a mean score of 4.1/5</p>	<p>Results appear to show increased abilities to understand and describe professional issues and research in speech-language pathology and audiology. Students enrolled in Capstone (CDD 4275) performed better on an oral presentation assignment than in classes taken earlier. These data are consistent with those obtained in the written assignments.</p> <p>This measure should continue to be monitored.</p>

		approximately 50 student presentations in two sections of each course will be calculated and considered.		Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) insure rubrics are being filled out consistently; and (2) consistent use of the prescribed rubric for program assessment.
Direct: Pre-Test and Post-Test data will be collected. A 30 question assessment will be developed by the curriculum committee which will include 5 questions specifically tapping the skills addressed in SLO3.	The assessment will be distributed to students in Intro (CDD 2251) in the Fall and Spring semesters (2 sections, each with about 25 students). The same measure will be used to gather data from the two sections of Capstone in the Spring 2013 semester each with about 25 students. The results obtained from Intro and Capstone will be compared to objectively assess performance differences.	Four questions were presented to assess understanding of professional issues and research. Group data of the percent of correct responses for all students in each course across sections was calculated. CDD 2251: n=36 3-1: 55% correct 3-2: 11% correct 3-3: 42% correct 3-4: 64% correct CDD 4275: n=13 (13/34) 3-1: 74% correct 3-2: 53% correct 3-3: 37% correct 3-4: 89% correct	Group data indicate 75% of the questions were more consistently answered correctly by Capstone students than students in Intro. One question was roughly equivalent between the groups. This could be the result of a question that does not adequately differentiate competency of the content of SLO3; or, it could be random chance as it was a multiple-choice task. This direct measure should continue to be used to assess change from the early to late in the curriculum. Change to be made in AY 2013-14: examine question 3-3 to assess its effectiveness in measuring knowledge of research and other professional issues relevant to speech-language pathology and audiology.	
Indirect: Program Completer Survey	Fifty students will complete the online survey presented through Qualtrics in May of 2013; Question 23 item 3 will ask students to rate their	Of the 33/34 students graduating, 58% (19) strongly agreed that they possess an introductory ability to understand and discuss research and clinical issues in speech-language	No action required; continue to monitor.	

		perceived learning outcome for SLO3 on a 5-point Likert scale	and audiology. 39% (13) agreed and one respondent did not agree or disagree with the statement.	
SLO #4: an ability to translate content materials into appropriately tailored evaluation and treatment procedures.	Direct: written project Students complete a written project in speech-language hearing sciences requiring the integration of information included in SLO4	A rubric will be used to assess all student works using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment C). The criterion "Evaluation & Treatment Methods" will be used. Measures of central tendency for the sample of approximately 50 anticipated student submissions across two course sections of CDD4269 and 4275 will be calculated and considered.	CDD 2251: The mean score reported for 1 section's performance on SLO4 was 3.0/5 (n=25) CDD 3258: No data for SLO4 was reported CDD 3270: Data obtained from 22 students yielded a mean of 3.8/5 CDD 4269: The mean score across 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.75/5 CDD 4275: data obtained from 13/34 students yielded a mean score of 4.4/5	The results appear to support positive change in student performance when comparing those entering the program and those in their final semester of their senior year in Capstone in regard to their ability to apply content to evaluation and treatment procedures. This outcome will continue to be monitored. However, the same concerns discussed in SLOs 1-3 could have affected the outcomes, including: (1) instructors possibly rating student performance on what was expected for in that class/at that level as opposed to comparing performance to graduating seniors or first year graduate students; (2) assignments used for gathering data varied greatly even within a single course; and (3) not all instructors used the prescribed rubric consistently for assessment. Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) instructors will be provided with more specific instructions outlining the criteria for comparing of students across the curriculum; (2) unification of assignments used for gathering data within each course and

			across the curriculum; and (3) follow up with all instructors to insure the use the prescribed rubric for program assessment.
Direct: oral presentation Students complete an oral presentation about a current clinical issue requiring the integration of the speech-language-hearing sciences curriculum included in SLO4	A rubric will be used to assess all student works using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment D). The criterion "Evaluation and Treatment" will be used. Measures of central tendency for the anticipated sample of 50 student presentations across two course sections of CDD 3260, 4275, and 4275 will be considered.	CDD 3260: mean score for SLO 4 for 1 section (n=22) was 3.8 CDD 4269: The mean score for 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.5/5 CDD 4275: data collected from 13/34 students enrolled in two sections revealed a mean score of 4.4/5	The data indicate increased abilities to applying learned content to treatment and assessment materials. Students enrolled in Capstone (CDD 4275) performed better on an oral presentation assignment than in courses earlier in the curriculum. These data are consistent with those obtained in the written assignments in CDD 4269 and 4275. This measure should continue to be monitored. Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) rubrics are to be filled out completely and consistently; and (2) consistent use of the prescribed rubric for program assessment.
Direct: Pre-Test and Post-Test data will be collected. A 30 question assessment will be developed by the curriculum committee which will include 5 questions specifically tapping the skills addressed in SLO4.	The assessment will be distributed to students in Intro (CDD 2251) in the Fall and Spring semesters (2 sections, each with about 25 students). The same measure will be used to gather data from the two sections of Capstone CDD 4275 in Spring 2013 each with	Four questions were presented to assess ability to translate content to assessment and treatment procedures. Group data of the percent of correct responses for all students in each course across sections was calculated. CDD 2251: n=36 4-1: 27% correct 4-2: 19% correct	Obtained group data indicate 50% of the questions were more consistently answered correctly by Capstone students than students in Intro. Two questions were roughly equivalent between the groups. This could be the result of a question that does not adequately differentiate competency of the content of SLO4; or, it could be random chance as it was a multiple-choice task. This direct measure should continue to be

		about 25 students. The results obtained from Intro and Capstone will be compared to objectively assess performance differences.	4-3: 36% correct 4-4: 58% correct CDD 4275: n=13 (13/34) 4-1: 21% correct 4-2: 58% correct 4-3: 11% correct 4-4: 68% correct	used to assess change from the early to late in the curriculum. Change to be made in AY 2013-14: examine questions 4-1, 4-3 and 4-4 to determine if it effectively measures the skills in SLO4.
	Indirect: Program Completer Survey	Fifty students are expected to complete the online survey presented through Qualtrics in May 2013; Question 23 will ask students to rate their perceived learning outcome for program SLOs on a 5-point Likert scale	33 students (97% of those graduating) completed the Qualtrics survey. 67% (22 students) strongly agreed and 33% (11 respondents) agreed that they have an appreciation for the process of translating content into evaluation and treatment procedures.	No action required; continue to monitor.
SLO #5: knowledge of and the ability to use technological tools and resources standard to the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology in laboratory and clinical settings.	Direct: written project Students complete written projects requiring the integration of SLO5 curriculum	A rubric will be used to assess all student work using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment C). The criterion "Technology & Resources" will be used to calculate measures of central tendency for the sample of approximately 50 anticipated student submissions in each of the following courses: CDD4269, 4275.	CDD 2251: The mean score for SLO5 was 0 (n=25) CDD 3258: No data for SLO 5 was collected in any of 3 sections. CDD 3270: For 22 students, the mean score was 3.8/5 CDD 4269: The mean score across 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.8/5 CDD 4275: data obtained from 13/34 students yielded a mean score of 4.2/5	The results appear to suggest that students improved knowledge in the use of technology in speech-language pathology and audiology in written assignments as they progress through the program when examining data from 2251, 4269, and 4275. As stated in SLO4 there are concerns about the method for data collection: (1) the understanding and use of the 5-point scale may not have been equivalent across instructors and it is suspected that student performance was judged based upon what was expected for in that class/at that level as opposed to comparing performance of graduating

			<p>seniors; (2) assignments used for data collection were not consistent, even across different sections of the same course; and (3) not all instructors used the prescribed rubric in the same way.</p> <p>Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) providing specific criteria for rating student work to insure comparisons are being considered against the expected performance of graduating seniors/first year MA students; (2) prescribed assignments to be used for gathering data to allow for a more consistent assessment of performance; and (3) insure the use the prescribed rubric for the specified assignments for program assessment.</p> <p>Results for this measure should be continued into the coming year.</p>
Direct: oral presentation Students complete an oral presentation integrating SLO5 curriculum content	A rubric will be used to assess student works using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment D). The criteria "Technology and Resources" as well as the quality of the PowerPoint presentation to be measured in	<p>CDD 3260: For the 22 students enrolled in one section of this course, the mean score calculated was 3.8/5</p> <p>CDD 4269: The mean score for 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.7/5</p> <p>CDD 4275: data obtained from 13/34 students</p>	<p>Students enrolled in Capstone (CDD 4275) performed better on an oral presentation assignment when discussing technology and electronic resources than classes taken earlier in the sequence. These data are consistent with those obtained in the written assignments in CDD 4269 and 4275.</p> <p>This measure should continue to be monitored.</p>

		"Supplemental Materials" will be used. Measures of central tendency for the sample of 50 expected student presentations across two course sections of CDD 3260, 4269, and 4275 will be considered.	enrolled in one of two sections of Capstone demonstrated a mean score of 4.2/5	Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) facilitate the complete data set is being provided in rubrics consistently; and (2) consistent use of the prescribed rubric for program assessment.
Direct: Pre-Test and Post-Test data will be collected. A 30 question assessment will be developed by the curriculum committee which will include 5 questions specifically tapping the skills addressed in SLO5.	The assessment will be distributed to students in Intro (CDD 2251) in the Fall and Spring semesters (2 sections, each with about 25 students). The same measure will be used to gather data from the two sections of Capstone CDD 4275 taught in the Spring 2013 semester each with about 25 students. The results obtained from Intro and Capstone will be compared to objectively assess performance differences.	Four questions were presented to assess mastery of SLO5. Group data of the percent of correct responses for all students in each course across sections was calculated. CDD 2251: n=36 5-1: 55% correct 5-2: 19% correct 5-3: 8% correct 5-4: 55% correct CDD 4275: n=13 (13/34) 5-1: 42% correct 5-2: 74% correct 5-3: 5% correct 5-4: 89% correct	The group data indicate 50% of the questions did not differentiate Intro students from Capstone students. Two questions were roughly equivalent between the groups. This could be the result of a question that does not adequately differentiate competency of the content of SLO5; or, it could be random chance as it was a multiple-choice task. This direct measure should continue to be used to assess change from the early to late in the curriculum. Change to be made in AY 2013-14: examine questions 5-1, and 5-3 to determine if it effectively measures the skills in SLO5.	

	Indirect: Program Completer Survey	<p>Fifty students are expected to complete the online survey presented through Qualtrics in May 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question 6 item 9 asks students to indicate on a Likert scale their agreement with the statement that improvements were made in computer skills. • Question 23 item 4 asks students to rate their perceived learning outcome for SLO5 on a 5-point Likert scale 	<p>Thirty-three (97%) of the graduating students answered these questions.</p> <p>8 students (24%) strongly agreed with the statement, 13 students (39%) agreed, and 11 (30%) neither agreed nor disagreed. One respondent (3%) disagreed that improvements were made in computer skills.</p> <p>When asked if they had exposure to and use of technology in laboratory and clinical settings, 36% (12) strongly agreed, and another 39% (13) agreed. Four students (12%) indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed and another 4 (12%) disagreed.</p>	<p>While it appears that overall computer skills are being perceived as increased/improved, 36% do not feel that they gained any skills in computer use. This could possibly be due to more and more students arriving to our program with already advanced skills that they had previously acquired. A question will be added to the Pre and Posttest used at the beginning and end of the program to determine baseline and final perception of computer skills. This data will determine if more computer experience as part of the curriculum is needed or not. One quarter (24%) of respondents feel that they did not have sufficient exposure to technology across the curriculum.</p> <p>Action to be taken in AY2-13-2014: The curriculum committee will meet to discuss how more specific, required activities/lessons to technology in targeted required classes to achieve increased use and exposure during the program</p>
<p>SLO #6: an awareness of individual differences (e.g., cultural and linguistic diversity) as it affects the development of human communication and the</p>	<p>Direct: written project Students complete a written project requiring the integration of information included in the curriculum of SLO6</p>	<p>A rubric will be used to assess student works using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment C). The criterion "Diversity & Individual Differences" will be used. Measures of</p>	<p>CDD 2251: Data was not collected for this SLO CDD 3258: No data reported for this SLO CDD 3270: For n=22 students, the calculated mean score was 3.8/5 CDD 4269: The mean score</p>	<p>The results appear to indicate that students in Capstone (CDD 4275) performed better on a written assignment demonstrating an awareness of individual differences as it affects communication and clinical practice. However, there is no baseline to compare performance to.</p>

<p>practice of speech-language pathology and audiology</p>		<p>central tendency will be considered for the anticipated 50 student submissions across two sections of CDD 3270, 4269 and 4275.</p>	<p>for 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.6/5 CDD 4275: data obtained from 13/34 students yielded a mean score of 4/5</p>	<p>Concerns regarding this data set include: (1) obtained ratings given by different instructors may not have all been equivalent; and (2) not all instructors filled out the rubric data for this SLO consistently .</p> <p>Assessment data should continue to be gathered to monitor this SLO in the coming year.</p> <p>Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) following up with instructors to insure rubrics are being filled out consistently; and (2) providing criteria filling out rubrics and ranking student performance..</p>
	<p>Direct: oral presentation Students complete an oral presentation requiring the integration of the SLO6 curriculum</p>	<p>A rubric will be used to assess student works using a 5-point Likert scale (see Attachment D). The criterion "Diversity/Individual Differences" will be considered for the anticipated 50 students who will be enrolled across two sections of CDD 4269 and 4275.</p>	<p>CDD 3260: for the 22 students who took this course, the calculated mean score was 3.8/5 CDD 4269: The mean score for 1 section (n=12 out of 34 enrolled in all sections) was 3.5/5 CDD 4275: data obtained from 13/34 students enrolled in one of two sections of Capstone demonstrated a mean score of 4/5</p>	<p>The results appear to indicate that students in Capstone (CDD 4275) performed better on an oral presentation assignment demonstrating an awareness of how individual differences affect communication, assessment and treatment considerations. These data are consistent with those obtained in the written assignments. This measure should continue to be monitored.</p> <p>Changes to be made in AY 2013-14: (1) following up with instructors to insure rubrics are being filled out consistently; (2) providing criteria filling out rubrics and ranking student performance; and</p>

			(3) foster consistent use of the prescribed rubric for program assessment.
Direct: Pre-Test and Post-Test data will be collected. A 30 question assessment will be developed by the curriculum committee which will include 5 questions specifically tapping the skills addressed in SLO6.	The assessment will be distributed to students in Intro (CDD 2251) in the Fall and Spring semesters (2 sections, each with about 25 students). The same measure will be used to gather data from the two Spring 2013 sections of Capstone each with about 25 students. The results obtained from Intro and Capstone will be compared to objectively assess performance differences.	Four questions were presented to assess mastery of SLO6. Group data of the percent of correct responses for all students in each course across sections was calculated. CDD 2251: n=36 6-1: 19% correct 6-2: 30% correct 6-3: 38% correct 6-4: 66% correct CDD 4275: n=13 (13/34) 6-1: 47% correct 6-2: 84% correct 6-3: 74% correct 6-4: 84% correct	Preliminary group data indicate the questions differentiated Capstone students from Intro students. This direct measure should continue to be used to assess change from the early to late in the curriculum. Change to be made in AY 2013-14: reconsider the question 6-4 used to assess SLO6.
Indirect: Program Completer Survey	Fifty students are expected to complete the online survey presented through Qualtrics in May 2013; Question 23 item 5 will ask students to rate their perceived learning outcome for SLO6 on a 5-point Likert scale	Of the 33/34 graduating students, 100% reported agreeing (36%; 12/33) or strongly agreeing (64%; 21/33) that they have knowledge of and sensitivity to cultural diversity and its impact on communication skills and the practices of speech-language pathology and audiology.	No action required; continue to monitor.

Attachment C

Rubric Used in Capstone to Gather Assessment Data
Based Upon Written Student Work AY2012-2013

Student Name: _____ Total Score Writing: _____
 Kean ID: _____ Total Score Content: _____
 Course and Section: _____ Instructor's Name: _____

Criteria	5	4	3	2	1	0	Total
<i>Writing Mechanics</i>							
Genre/Audience							
Focus							
Development							
Organization							
Grammar/Mechanics							
Revision							
<i>Content/Knowledge, Skills, Disposition</i>							
Communication Development SLO1							
Communication Disorders SLO2							
Research SLO3							
Professional Issues SLO3							
Evaluation & Treatment Methods SLO4							
Technology & Resources SLO5							
Diversity/Individual Differences SLO6							

Comments (use back if needed):

CAPSTONE RUBRIC FOR WRITTEN PRESENTATION

	5	4	3	2	1	0
<i>Writing Mechanics</i>						
Genre/ Audience	Uses conventions, APA, professional language & terminology in skillful way	Uses conventions, APA, professional language & terminology in somewhat skillful way	Uses conventions APA, professional language & terminology in formulaic way	Does not follow conventions, APA, professional language & terminology consistently	Fails to follow most or any conventions APA, professional language & terminology	Not applicable
Focus	Explicit, nuanced, complex stance	Explicit and nuanced, but not complex, stance	Stance defined in general terms	Vague stance	No clear stance	Not applicable
Development	All ideas developed with specific, relevant information.	Most ideas developed with specific, relevant information. Reader raises few questions	Ideas not developed consistently. Supported with vague generalization or inappropriate examples	Most ideas not developed or supported with inappropriate examples.	Ideas stated, not developed	Not applicable
Organization	Structure imparts feeling of wholeness and skill	Structure imparts a feeling of wholeness but not skill	Structure breaks down in some places, though solid overall	Structure feels rough or unclear	Structure clear or confusing	Not applicable
Grammar/ Mechanics	Few or no errors exist; those present have no effect on reading	Errors obvious but not distracting	Errors begin to interfere with reading	Several distracting errors or multiple patterns of error	Numerous errors make understanding text difficult or impossible	Not applicable
Revision	Almost all revisions make draft stronger	Most revisions make draft stronger	Some revisions strengthen, but some weaken draft	Few revisions, with little effect on quality	Very few revisions; may make final worse	No evidence of revision
<i>Content/Knowledge, Skills, Disposition</i>						
Communication Development	Shows clear, comprehensive and well defined practical & theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of	Shows practical & theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of human communication	Discusses practical & theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of human communication in a formulaic	Does not demonstrate theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of human communication consistently	Fails to show theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of human communication or has gross errors or	Not applicable

	human communication		way		omissions	
Communication Disorders	Shows clear, comprehensive understanding of communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management	Shows some understanding of communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management	Discusses communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management in a formulaic way	Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management consistently	Fails to show understanding of communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management or has gross errors or omissions	Not applicable
Research	Sources cited adequately & appropriately using good professional quality sources	Most sources cited adequately & appropriately &/or using some professional quality sources	Some sources cited adequately & appropriately &/or using few professional quality sources	Most sources not cited &/or using mostly sources of questionable quality	Sources not adequately cited &/or are of questionable quality	Not applicable
Professional Issues	Shows clear, comprehensive understanding of current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology	Shows some understanding of current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology	Discusses current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology in a formulaic way	Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology consistently	Fails to show understanding of current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology or has gross errors or omissions	Not applicable
Evaluation and Treatment Methods	Shows clear, comprehensive understanding of translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures	Shows some understanding of translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures	Discusses translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures in a formulaic way	Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures consistently	Fails to show understanding of translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures or has gross errors or omissions	Not applicable

Technology and Resources	Shows clear, comprehensive understanding of technology as it relates to the field as well as an ability to use these resources in research and clinical settings	Shows some understanding of technology as it relates to the field as well as an ability to use these resources in research and clinical settings	Discusses or uses technology as it relates to the field in research and clinical settings in a formulaic way	Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of technology as it relates to the field as well as an ability to use these resources in research and clinical settings consistently	Fails to show understanding of technology as it relates to the field as well as an ability to use these resources in research and clinical settings or has gross errors or omissions	Not applicable
Diversity & Individual Differences	Shows clear, comprehensive understanding of individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic) as it affects communication development and clinical practice	Shows some understanding of individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic) as it affects communication development and clinical practice	Discusses individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic) as it affects communication development and clinical practice in a formulaic way	Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic) as it affects communication development and clinical practice consistently	Fails to show understanding of individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic) as it affects communication development and clinical practice or has gross errors or omissions	Not applicable

Descriptors for Capstone Written Product Rubric

This document contains an expanded explanation of the criteria making up the baseline and portfolio evaluation rubrics for College Composition as well as the criteria that encompass the programs six student learning objectives. Each criterion is briefly defined and linked to common terms used for it in composition textbooks. Characteristics of each level in a criterion are also included.

Writing Mechanics:

Genre/Audience: The writing demonstrates an understanding of the conventions of the genres they are writing as well as for academic writing in general.

Terms related to this criterion: conventions, community of readers, discourse community, genre, style, tone

- Score of 5: the writer follows all or almost all of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. In addition, the writer demonstrates a skillful ability to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader's expectations.
- Score of 4: the writer follows most, if not all, of the conventions for the genre and academic writing in general. There is evidence of effort made to manipulate those conventions in ways that make their work stand out while still fulfilling the reader's expectations. However, those efforts are not as skillful as a level-five essay.
- Score of 3: the writer follows most of the conventions. However, they do so in a formulaic way that shows little attempt to engage the audience.
- Score of 2: the writer follows most of the conventions but does not do so consistently. They may also not follow some conventions, but the reader gets the sense the writer understands the conventions.
- Score of 1: the writer fails to follow most or any of the genre conventions and of academic writing in general.

Focus: The writing presents a unified, clear stance with respect to the characteristics of the assignment. In a given essay, each paragraph relates to that stance.

Terms related to this criterion: main idea, purpose, stance, thesis statement

- Score of 5: explicit, nuanced stance. The reader feels like the writer has constructed a complex, well thought-out point.
- Score of 4: stance is explicit and/or nuanced, but not to the degree of a five. The reader may feel like some minor points are missing or that the stance could be more complex.
- Score of 3: stance somewhat clear, but may be defined in general terms (i.e. "subject A and B are alike in some ways and different in others" or "I agree/disagree with X" without giving reasons for their stance)
- Score of 2: vague stance or purpose. It may only apply to part of the piece.
- Score of 1: no clear stance or purpose.

Development: The main ideas in the writing are supported with specific, relevant information.

Terms related to this criterion: details, evidence, examples, facts, observations, statistics, and testimony

- Score of 5: all ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay's focus. The reader feels like she or he has learned a lot from reading the piece.
- Score of 4: all major and most minor ideas are developed with specific, relevant information that clarifies, extends, and illustrates the essay's focus. However, the reader occasionally raises questions or wishes for more information.
- Score of 3: ideas are not developed consistently, causing the reader to want more information about some points. Ideas, in places, are clear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Some examples may not be appropriate.
- Score of 2: most ideas are not developed or are supported with inappropriate examples. The support is made up almost entirely unclear or made up of vague or commonplace generalizations. Overall, the piece seems to have been written quickly and without the writer thinking through the ideas he or she wanted to convey.
- Score of 1: ideas are stated without any development at all.

Organization: The writing uses an overall and paragraph structures appropriate to the assignment(s).

Terms related to this criterion: coherence, cohesion, mode, patterns of development, structure, transitions

- Score of 5: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall pieces that imparts a feeling of wholeness and skill.

- Score of 4: the writer uses a logical order for both paragraphs and the overall piece that is effective but that may not be artful. Some slight breakdowns exist, but they are almost unnoticeable and seem more like isolated gaffes than patterns of error.
- Score of 3: the structure of the essay breaks down in some places, but holds together overall. At the paragraph level, some sentences are out of place. Some transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied among the paragraphs ideas.
- Score of 2: the structure of the essay feels rough and unclear. At the paragraph level, multiple sentences are out of place. Most of the transitions between sentences are abrupt or inappropriate for the kind of relationships implied by the paragraph's ideas. The pieces seem to have been planned quickly and not revised.
- Score of 1: the writer uses an unclear or confusing overall organization. The paragraphs lack coherence; sentences are disorganized, with little or no effective use of transitions.

Grammar/Mechanics: the essay follows the conventions of Edited Academic English. This includes conventions for citing sources, regardless of the system used. An essay does not have to be perfect to receive a score of 5 in these criteria. Instead, consider whether the errors would either distract an average reader or make them doubt the writer's credibility.

Terms related to this criterion: diction/word choice, documentation, punctuation, sentence boundaries, sentence structure, and spelling

- Score of 5: errors do not detract from the essay's central focus and from the smooth delivery of the writer's ideas. Few or no errors exist, and those that appear are minor or reflect obscure rules.
- Score of 4: errors are obvious but not to the point of distracting an average reader.
- Score of 3: grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors begin to interfere with understanding the text's meaning. Patterns of status-marking error may exist (ex. sentence boundaries, verb endings).
- Score of 2: several distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text's meaning difficult. Multiple patterns of error exist.
- Score of 1: numerous distracting grammatical, mechanical, spelling, and documentation errors make understanding the text's meaning difficult or impossible.

Revision: the writer made changes between drafts to the essay's focus, organization, development, and/or style that lead to a more successful final essay. These changes can take place at any level of the text (overall, paragraph, or sentence). Invention and planning work used to create a rough draft counts as evidence of revision.

Terms related to this criterion: addition, deletion, substitution, and rearrangement. (Note: The last two are not done as often, even when they are needed.)

- Score of 5: almost all of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used all four forms of revision as appropriate.
- Score of 4: Most, but not all, of the revisions make the final draft stronger than the original. The writer used most of the forms of revision, but may have needed to use others. (ex. the added and deleted material, but should have also rearranged it).
- Score of 3: the draft includes some revisions that make the final draft stronger, but others are needed. The writer mostly used addition and deletion, even if substitution and rearrangement was also needed. Some of the revisions may distract from the draft's quality.
- Score of 2: The draft includes few revisions, most of which have no influence on the final draft's quality. The writer may have used only one form of revision even though others are needed.
- Score of 1: The draft includes very few revisions; most either have no influence on the final draft's quality or make it worse. It seems like the writer just retyped the original draft.
- Score of 0: No evidence of revision. The writer turned in only one draft and no invention/planning work.

Content/Knowledge, Skill, Disposition:

Communication Development: the writer shows clear, comprehensive, and well defined practical and theoretical knowledge of the typical processes and skills (e.g., cognition, age, motor skills, audition, anatomy and physiology) that underlie the development of human communication across the lifespan (SLO1).

Terms related to this criterion: cognition, motor, oral motor, auditory processing, neurological processes, anatomy, physiology, embryology, articulation, phonology, language, expressive, receptive, speech, discrimination, chronological age, mental age, mean length of utterance, developmental sequence, gesture, sign

- Score of 5: The author demonstrates a clear, comprehensive and well defined practical and theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of human communication across the lifespan.
- Score of 4: Shows practical & theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of human communication which is not of the depth or comprehensive demonstration that would be a score of 5.
- Score of 3: Discusses practical & theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of human communication in a formulaic way with little integration or deeper understanding of the concepts being discussed.
- Score of 2: Does not demonstrate theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of human communication consistently. The writer may have gaps in information or some minor errors in the information presented.
- Score of 1: Fails to show theoretical knowledge of skills that underlie the development of human communication or have gross errors/ omissions of key information.

Communication Disorders: the writer demonstrates an understanding of communicative disorders across the lifespan: their etiology, symptomatology, assessment, and management models (SLO2).

Terms related to this criterion: delay, disorder, deviance, difference, typical development

- Score of 5: The author shows clear, comprehensive understanding of communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management
- Score of 4: Shows some understanding of communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management but not to the level that would earn a score of 5
- Score of 3: Discusses communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management in a formulaic way without evidence of integration or deeper understanding
- Score of 2: Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management consistently
- Score of 1: Fails to show understanding of communicative disorders including etiology, symptomology, assessment, management or has gross errors or omissions

Research: the writing uses adequate and appropriate sources throughout. These references demonstrate knowledge of the body of professional research and an ability to understand it sufficiently to support views, points, and ideas (SLO3).

Terms related to this criterion: sources, citation, peer-reviewed, professional, levels of evidence, research, professional issues, and service delivery

- Score of 5: The author cited the work of others appropriately and adequately; works cited were of good professional quality and from a variety of sources/publication types; provided sufficient, detailed examples from the literature/sources to support his/her analysis
- Score of 4: Most sources cited adequately & appropriately &/or using mostly professional quality sources; provided many detailed examples from the literature/sources to support the analysis
- Score of 3: Some sources cited adequately & appropriately &/or using few professional quality sources; works cited were for the most part good quality but the score of the literature review appeared limited; provided some outside sources to support the points made in the narrative
- Score of 2: Most sources not cited &/or using mostly sources of questionable quality; provided minimal outside sources to support the points made in the narrative
- Score of 1: citations were not used or used inappropriately; the author frequently did not provide sources for information; sources used by the author were of questionable quality and the literature review was insufficient. The author did not provide any outside sources to support the points in the narrative

Professional Issues: the writing demonstrates the student's ability to meaningfully discuss clinical, scientific, administrative, and philosophical issues relevant to the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology (SLO3).

Terms related to this criterion: ethics, service delivery, research levels of evidence, research, professional issues, current issues, advocacy,

- Score of 5: The author shows clear, comprehensive understanding of current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology
- Score of 4: Shows some understanding of current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology but not to the level to achieve a score of 5
- Score of 3: Discusses current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology in a formulaic way with little evidence of original ideas or integration of ideas and concepts
- Score of 2: Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology consistently
- Score of 1: Fails to show understanding of current professional issues (clinical, scientific, administrative, philosophical) relevant to speech pathology and audiology or has gross errors or omissions of vital information or demonstrates misunderstanding of essential concepts

Evaluation and Treatment Methods: the writing demonstrates the student's ability to meaningfully discuss the translation of content material into appropriately tailored evaluation or treatment procedures (SLO4).

Terms related to this criterion: service delivery, research, levels of evidence, evaluation, testing, diagnosis, therapy, intervention, goals, treatment, intervention, outcomes, evidence-based practice

- Score of 5: Shows clear, comprehensive understanding of translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures relevant to speech pathology and audiology
- Score of 4: Shows some understanding of translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures but not to the level to achieve a score of 5
- Score of 3: Discusses translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures in a formulaic way with little evidence of original ideas or integration of ideas and concepts
- Score of 2: Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures consistently
- Score of 1: Fails to show understanding of translating content materials into appropriate evaluation and treatment procedures or has gross errors or omissions

Technology and Resources: the writing shows clear, comprehensive understanding of technology as it relates to the field as well as an ability to use these resources in research and clinical settings (SLO5).

Terms related to this criterion: technology, digital, software, hardware, electronic, database, internet, telepractice, high tech, augmentative alternative communication, amplification

- Score of 5: Shows clear, comprehensive understanding of technology as it relates to the field as well as an ability to use these resources in research and clinical settings
- Score of 4: Shows some understanding of technology as it relates to the field as well as an ability to use these resources in research and clinical settings but not to the level to achieve a score of 5
- Score of 3: Discusses or uses technology as it relates to the field in research and clinical settings in a formulaic way with little evidence of original ideas or integration of ideas and concepts
- Score of 2: Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of technology as it relates to the field as well as an ability to use these resources in research and clinical settings consistently
- Score of 1: Fails to show understanding of technology as it relates to the field as well as an ability to use these resources in research and clinical settings or has gross errors or omissions or clear misunderstanding of key concepts/ideas

Diversity & Individual Differences: the writer demonstrates an awareness of individual differences (e.g., cultural and linguistic diversity) as it affects the development of human communication and the practice of speech-language pathology and audiology (SLO6).

Terms related to this criterion: multi-lingual, multi-cultural, Deaf/deaf, gender, religious beliefs, dialect, accent modification, ethics, evidence-based practice, diversity, individualism, variability, difference

- Score of 5: shows clear, comprehensive understanding of individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic, gender) as it affects communication development, clinical practice, and research
- Score of 4: Shows some understanding of individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic) as it affects communication development and clinical practice but not to the level to achieve a score of 5

- Score of 3: Discusses individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic) as it affects communication development and clinical practice in a formulaic way with little evidence of original ideas or integration of ideas and concepts
- Score of 2: Does not demonstrate comprehensive understanding of individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic) as it affects communication development and clinical practice consistently
- Score of 1: Fails to show understanding of individual differences (e.g., cultural, linguistic) as it affects communication development and clinical practice or has gross errors or omissions or clear misunderstand of key concepts/ideas

Attachment D

Rubric Used in Capstone to Gather Assessment Data Based Upon Oral Student Work AY2012-2013

Oral Presentation/Speaker Evaluation Rubric

Rating Key: 1 = unacceptable
 2 = fair
 3 = acceptable
 4 = good/above average
 5 = excellent

Rating	Item	+ = Positive/Effective 0 = Needs Work		Comments
Content				
	Analysis of Topic	Clear Purpose	Clear Central Idea	
		Relevant topic	Multi-sided argumentation	
	Supporting Material/Research (SLO3)	Credible Sources	Sufficient Sources	
		Cited Sources	Appropriate Sources	
		Varied Sources		
	Organization	Introduction	Transitions	
		Main Points Clear	Conclusions	
	Style	Defined Terms	Grammar	
		Vivid Terms	Avoids Clichés, Jargon	
	Communication Development (SLO1)			
	Communication Disorders (SLO2)			
	Professional Issues (SLO3)			
	Evaluation and Treatment (SLO4)			
	Technology and Resources (SLO5)			
	Diversity/Individual Differences (SLO6)			
Delivery				
	Engagement	Audience Awareness	Poise	
		Eye Contact	Manages anxiety	
	Body Movement	Posture	Facial Expression	
		Gestures		
	Vocal Quality	Volume	Extemporaneous	
		Tone	Articulation	
		Variety	Vocal Control	
	Fluency	Freedom from Notes	Effective use of Pauses	
		Avoids Vocal Filters	Effective Rate	
		Effective Pace		
Preparation				
	Outline	Structure	Bibliography/References	
		Annotation		
	PowerPoint(SLO5)/ Supplemental Materials			
Impact				
	Overall Impact	Speaker is Credible	Speech is Memorable	
		Appropriate Use of Time	Speech Accomplishes Purpose	
	Final Grade			