College of Letters and Science
2002 Annual Survey and Report of Departmental Assessment Practices

Please return to Dean Certain by May 24, 2002
c/o Associate Academic Planner Elaine Klein
307-E South Hall, 1055 Bascom Mall, Madison WI 53706

Department Name: Communicative Disorders

I. Assessment Plan

Q1. The department has an assessment plan for the undergraduate program. 
   Yes [x] No [ ]

Q2. The department has an assessment plan for the graduate program. 
   Yes [x] No [ ]

Q3. The assessment plan/s is/are linked to articulated outcome goals for your majors. 
   Yes [x] No [ ]
   Not clear, probably yes [ ]

Please identify the types of tools in the assessment plan(s); if possible, indicate the academic years in which they have been or are intended to be employed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools used to directly assess student learning:</th>
<th>Undergraduate Program</th>
<th>Graduate Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Exams</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Exams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Courses</td>
<td>Possibly CD 390</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded Testing</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Portfolios</td>
<td>Eventually yes</td>
<td>Eventually yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses, Dissertations</td>
<td>Not routine</td>
<td>Routine for non-clinical degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluations</td>
<td>Exclusively absent, no</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre &amp; Post Testing</td>
<td>Not routine</td>
<td>Not routine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools used to indirectly assess student learning:</th>
<th>Undergraduate Program</th>
<th>Graduate Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Infrequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Interviews</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Surveys</td>
<td>UGI specifically, no</td>
<td>Infrequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Surveys</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not to my knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviews</td>
<td>Combined various tools: ASHA accreditation; College review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Of the tools used to directly assess student learning, which provide the most useful information?

In my opinion, local examinations

Q6. Of the tools used to directly assess student learning, which provide the least useful information?

At this time (because I've never seen one), I wonder about the value of the project portfolio that will be required of UGI.

Q7. Of the tools used to indirectly assess student learning, which provide the most useful information?

Relatively little information is obtained. Externally reviewed by the college & by ASHA

Q8. Of the tools used to indirectly assess student learning, which provide the least useful information?

See the preceding response

Q9. Please elaborate on any of the responses given above (please attach additional pages as needed).

See the attached page.
II. Assessment Processes

Q10. Responsibility for assessment has been assumed by ______ an individual ______ a committee of the whole

If responsibility is delegated to an individual, this person is:

the chair / tenured faculty / untenured faculty / academic staff / short term staff / other:_______

If responsibility is delegated to a committee, this group is:

Specially constituted to address assessment of student learning ______ Y ______ N
Part of the Curriculum Committee ______ Y ______ N
Part of the Executive Committee ______ Y ______ N
Part of the Undergraduate/Graduate Education Committee ______ Y ______ N
Other: The entire department participates in assessment of all types and at all levels

Q11. The department has requested funds from the University Assessment Council (UAC) to help the department assess student learning. ______ Y ______ N

If "yes", did the UAC award the department funds? ______ Y ______ N

Were those funds useful? ______ Y ______ N

Q12. The department has sought professional assistance to conduct assessment. ______ Y ______ N

If "yes", from whom has the department sought professional assistance? (For example, the LEAD Center, the Office of Quality Improvement, the UW Survey Center, etc.)

To my knowledge, no.

III. Additional Information

1. Please attach a brief description of any changes in curriculum, advising, or procedures that were the result of your assessment findings so we may include this information in our annual report to the Provost. If your department has received funds from the University Assessment Council, you may attach the assessment report submitted to the UAC in compliance with its funding support requirements.

2. In the interest of streamlining our requests for assessment information, please identify an assessment contact person: the Department Chair

3. Do you have any suggestions for workshops or learning opportunities in the area of student outcomes assessment?

Thank you for taking time to complete this report.

Please return this report by May 25, 2002.
2002 Annual Assessment Survey
An addendum (in response to Part I, question #9, and Part III, question #1)

re/ National Exams:
Graduates of accredited Master’s degree programs cannot obtain certification from the American Speech and Hearing Association (as future Speech-Language Pathologists [SLPs] and/or audiologists) unless they obtain a criterion score on the Professional Assessment for Beginning Teachers examination (often referred to as the PRAXIS exam), administered by ETS. It is common in our field (Communicative Disorders) to refer to the PRAXIS test as a “national examination.”

re/ Capstone Courses:
In our Undergraduate Program, we require a course of all School of Education (SoE) majors – CD390 (“Practicum in Communicative Disorders”). This course is both summative and overtly clinical in nature, requiring integration and application of much of the basic information acquired in all other required undergraduate courses. Unfortunately, space is limited in CD390, and relatively few Letters & Science (L&S) majors are allowed to take it. Hence, the course is not a degree requirement for L&S students, but is a degree requirement for SoE students.

re/ Student Portfolios:
It is our understanding that within the next two calendar years, both the State of Wisconsin (Division of Licensing Requirements) and the American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA, which accredits our combined clinically-oriented undergraduate and graduate degree programs) will require portfolios from students as conditions of licensure and clinical certification. The data and work samples to be included in the student portfolios will span both undergraduate and graduate courses. For obvious reasons, the development of portfolios is being spear-headed by the School of Education. None of us has ever seen such products before. Hence, it is impossible to say how valuable portfolios might be as an assessment tool.

re/ External Reviews:
Accreditation of our (combined undergraduate and Master’s-level) degree programs by ASHA is necessary if we are to remain a viable clinical training center for SLPs and audiologists. The accreditation period normally lasts seven years, and the granting of accreditation is preceded by an external review conducted by independent examiners appointed by ASHA. Our current accreditation expires in August, 2004, and we are beginning to prepare now for our next review. Part of that preparation involves a thorough internal review and revision of the Master’s degree curriculum. In part, this internal curriculum review has been motivated by staffing changes, and a desire to re-organize the way information for and about the discipline is provided. Normally, the ASHA accreditation review itself does not stimulate program changes. It is in the Department’s interest to maintain a high level of awareness regarding accreditation standards, and to address these as they become known to us, in advance of an accreditation review.

An external Departmental review is also conducted by the UW-Madison College of Letters & Science each 10 years. Our last review, completed in 1996 or 1997, motivated several additional extra-departmental requirements for the undergraduate major (e.g., the inclusion of newly required discipline-relevant courses in linguistics, ethnic studies, and natural/physical sciences). These changes were motivated by a criticism that the undergraduate degree program was somewhat “insular.”