

2014-15 Annual Assessment Report Speech Pathology and Audiology BS

FOR GRADUATE AND CREDENTIAL PROGRAMS: THIS TEMPLATE REFERS TO SAC STATE BACCALAUREATE LEARNING GOALS. PLEASE IGNORE THESE REFERENCES IN YOUR REPORT.

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) did you assess in 2014-2015? [Check all that apply]

- 1. Critical thinking
- 2. Information literacy
- 3. Written communication
- 4. Oral communication
- 5. Quantitative literacy
- 6. Inquiry and analysis
- 7. Creative thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team work
- 10. Problem solving
- 11. Civic knowledge and engagement
- 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
- 13. Ethical reasoning
- 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
- 15. Global learning
- 16. Integrative and applied learning
- 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
- 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above:
 - a.
 - b.
 - c.

Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (Go to **Q1.5**)
- 3. Don't know (Go to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q1.5. Did your program use the [Degree Qualification Profile](#) (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No, but I know what the DQP is
- 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is.
- 4. Don't know

Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable? Yes.

Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:

Our primary learning outcome for the undergraduate program aligns with the first primary learning outcome for the graduate program (See Appendix I), because knowledge in key areas in our field begins with instruction in approximately the junior year of the undergraduate program and continues into the graduate program as students move from remembering and understanding key concepts to critical thinking as they analyze and evaluate their impact on the client cases they are assigned in the graduate program. This hierarchical process is closely aligned to our ASHA accreditation expectations. This learning of key concepts begins in the undergraduate program and aligns with Sacramento States Baccalaureate Learning Goals, particularly in the areas of competence in the disciplines, intellectual and practical skills, and integrative learning.

PLO:

1. To demonstrate knowledge in the areas set forth by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) (2014)

These include:

- A. Knowledge of basic human communication and swallowing processes, including

Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

- 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
- 3. No rubrics for PLOs
- N/A, other (please specify):

the appropriate biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases.

B. The ability to integrate information pertaining to normal and abnormal human development across the lifespan.

C. Knowledge of communication and swallowing disorders and differences, including the appropriate etiologies, characteristics, anatomical/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates in the following nine areas:

- 1) Articulation
- 2) Fluency
- 3) Voice and Resonance, including respiration and phonation
- 4) Receptive and Expressive language (phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, prelinguistic communication and paralinguistic communication) in speaking, listening, reading, and writing
- 5) Hearing, including the impact on speech and language
- 6) Swallowing (oral, pharyngeal, esophageal, and related functions, including oral function for feeding, orofacial myology)
- 7) Cognitive aspects of communication (attention, memory, sequencing, problem-solving, executive functioning)
- 8) Social aspects of communication (including challenging behavior, ineffective social skills, and lack of communication opportunities)
- 9) Augmentative and alternative communication modalities

D. Knowledge of the principles and methods of prevention, assessment, and intervention for people with communication and swallowing disorders, including consideration of anatomical/physiological, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates of the disorders.

E. Knowledge of standards of ethical conduct, processes used in research and of the integration of research principles into evidence-based clinical practice, contemporary professional issues, and entry level certifications relevant to professional practice.

IN QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 5, REPORT IN DETAIL ON ONE PLO THAT YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the selected PLO

Q 2.1. Specify one PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1):

Overall Competencies in the major/discipline

Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know
 4. N/A

Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix:
[Word limit: 300]

Graduation Requirement:

All students are in possession of the 2014 ASHA Standards for knowledge outcomes, which are published on the ASHA website and on every course syllabus with a direct link to how the stated course learning outcomes address specific standards. Additionally, because a major GPA of 2.5 is required to graduate from our undergraduate program, all department course syllabi are required to include a Learning Outcomes Competency chart in which each learning outcome for the course is explicitly connected to assessment measures for the course (exams, projects, etc.). Students are instructed to track their learning outcomes/progress towards meeting ASHA knowledge outcomes as they are measured by the specified learning assessments. Remediation strategies are initiated by faculty if students fall below 73-76% or a grade of "C" on any of the specified course-level assessment measures. The statement on each course syllabus is listed below:

Course Learning Outcomes Competencies:

Mastery of each student learning outcome listed below is indicated by a grade of C (73-76%) or better on each component of the corresponding measures listed in the table. Students are required to track their progress towards meeting each learning

outcome and must make an appointment with the instructor for any grade equal to or less than a C. The instructor will suggest strategies to help you establish competence and knowledge in these areas.

Course Learning Outcome	Components Indicating Competence	Grades Received
1	Exam 1 (X%)	
2	Exam 1 (X%)	
3	Exam 1 (X%)	
4	Exam 1 (X%), Exam 2 (X%)	
5	Exam 2 (X%)	
6	Exam 3 (X%)	
7	Exam 2 (X%)	
8	Exam 1 (X%)	
9	Exam 2 (X%)	
10	Exam 3 (X%)	
11-12	Project (X%)	
13	Exam 2 (X%)	

Students should track their progress towards meeting each learning outcome by listing their grades on the table below over the course of the semester.

Our standard of performance is that all of our seniors will meet the 2.5 minimum GPA required by the Speech Pathology and Audiology Department for graduation.

As a student passes each academic course, the associated knowledge is recorded as being met on their Knowledge and Skills form, maintained electronically by the department.

Learning Outcomes Assessment:

Each undergraduate student completes a faculty-devised Student Learning Outcomes Assessment aligned to the knowledge areas outlined by ASHA at the end of each academic year. The faculty meets to discuss the results from this assessment and the need for modification of the tool itself. This also allows the faculty to have substantive articulations across the curriculum and cohort groups, adjusting course content as appropriate and facilitating student competence in highlighted areas.

The items include a focused set of questions in general areas of the curriculum. The assessment is useful in tracking students' mastery of core content across ASHA's 9 areas in our curriculum.

This year's assessment is attached **(See Appendix II)**. The questions align to the specific PLO areas in the following manner:

Learning Outcomes Assessment Question	PLO/ASHA Knowledge/Skill Standard Area Assessed	Standards of Performance/ Expectations
1	E	
2	A, B, C4, D	
3	C3, D	
4	A, C4	
5	B, C4	
6	B, C4	
7	B, C4	
8	A, C3	
9	A, C3	
10	B, C4	
11	E	
12	A, B, C1	
13	A, B, C7, D	
14	A, B, C7, D	
15	A, B, C8, D	
16	A, B, C8, D	
Overall Score		We report our overall results into quartiles. 50% of Juniors should score in the top 2 quartiles. 80% of Seniors should score in the two 2 quartiles. No seniors

		should score in the fourth quartile.	
Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Critical thinking		
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Information literacy		
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Written communication		
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Oral communication		
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Quantitative literacy		
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Inquiry and analysis		
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Creative thinking		
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Reading		
<input type="checkbox"/>	9. Team work		
<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Problem solving		
<input type="checkbox"/>	11. Civic knowledge and engagement		
<input type="checkbox"/>	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency		
<input type="checkbox"/>	13. Ethical reasoning		
<input type="checkbox"/>	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning		
<input type="checkbox"/>	15. Global learning		
<input type="checkbox"/>	16. Integrative and applied learning		
<input type="checkbox"/>	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline		
<input type="checkbox"/>	19. Other:		
Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and the rubric that measures the PLO:			
	Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
	(1) PLO	(2) Standards of Performance	(3) Rubrics
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO			
2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	X	X	X
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook			
4. In the university catalogue		X	
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters			
6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources or activities	X	X	X
7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university	X	X	X
8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents			
9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents			
10. Other, specify:			
Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO			
Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for the selected PLO in 2014-2015?		Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for this PLO in 2014-2015?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No (Skip to Q6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No (Skip to Q6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know (Skip to Q6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know (Skip to Q6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. N/A (Skip to Q6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. N/A (Skip to Q6)

Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? (5)

- Graduation Requirement
- Learning Outcomes Assessment
- Alumni Survey
- National Praxis Exam
- Biannual Advisory Committee Meetings

Q3.2A Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected (see Attachment II)? **[Word limit: 300]**

The department chair corresponds with the Registrar's office regarding students who do not meet the 2.5 GPA graduation requirement. As a student passes each academic course, the associated knowledge is recorded as being met on their Knowledge and Skills form, maintained electronically by the department.

Each student completes a faculty-devised Student 16-item Learning Outcomes Assessment at the end of each academic year. The assessment is provided in selected courses so that it is administered to all students across the undergraduate and graduate curriculum.

The Alumni Survey is administered via survey monkey each summer to all graduates of the program for whom we have contact information.

Student results for the National Praxis Exam are sent to our department by ETS.

Minutes are taken at biannual advisory committee meetings.

Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios)

Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?

1. Yes
 2. No (Go to **Q3.7**)
 3. Don't know (Go to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? **[Check all that apply]**

1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
 3. Key assignments from elective classes
 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
 6. E-Portfolios
 7. Other portfolios
 8. Other measure. Specify: Clinical Competency Forms

Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data.

Each undergraduate student completes the faculty-devised Student Learning Outcomes Assessment at the end of each academic year. The faculty meets to discuss the results from this assessment and the need for modification of the tool itself. This also allows the faculty to have substantive articulations across the curriculum and cohort groups, adjusting course content as appropriate and facilitating student competence in highlighted areas.

This year, we distributed the 16-item multiple choice student learning assessment across all student levels of our program at the end of the year. The items included a focused set of questions in specific areas of the curriculum directly aligned to the ASHA knowledge areas stated in our PLO. The assessment is useful in tracking students' mastery of core content across these 9 areas in our curriculum and their ability to think critically as they progress through the program.

In the style of our national Praxis exam, the questions require both demonstration of basic knowledge and some critical thinking when presented with case studies. The questions included specific targets that had been suggested by our department advisory committee related to the use and interpretation of normative data and basic to higher level

<p>distinctions between speech and language. The assessment is useful in tracking students' mastery of core content in our curriculum and the ability to think critically as they progress through the program.</p> <p>204 undergraduate students completed the assessment in 2014-15. Students not assessed were not present on the days/times the evaluations were presented.</p> <p>This year's assessment is attached. (See Appendix II)</p>		
<p>Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select only one]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to Q3.5)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5. The VALUE rubric(s)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 7. Used other means. Specify:</p>		
<p>Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>	<p>Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>	<p>Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>
<p>Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO?</p> <p>All full-time faculty participate in the development of the assessment tool and submit questions in their area of expertise.</p>		<p>Q3.5.1. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)? N/A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p>
<p>Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? N/A</p>		<p>Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review?</p> <p>An attempt is made to assess all students.</p>
<p>Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program?</p> <p>339 Undergraduate Students were enrolled in the program in Spring 2015.</p>	<p>Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate?</p> <p>204 students took the survey</p>	<p>Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p>
<p>Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)</p>		
<p>Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q3.8)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p>		<p>Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. College/Department/program student surveys</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews</p>
<p>Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?</p> <p>Surveys were sent to all graduates of the undergraduate</p>		

<p>program for whom we and/or the alumni association have current contact information.</p> <p>Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample. Surveys were sent to all graduates of the undergraduate program for whom we and/or the alumni association have current contact information.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>7. Other, specify:</td> </tr> </table> <p>Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?</p> <p>A campus alumni survey was distributed to all graduates of our program for whom we have contact information in summer 2015. Responses from 59 alumni were received at the time of summer data analysis. We expect responses to continue to come in through early fall 2015. Thirty-nine questions were presented in Likert Scale format. Questions targeted evaluation of the student experience in the Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology in specific areas: Quality of faculty instruction, intellectual challenge of the major, overall experience in the major, level of preparation you received from the major in relation to post-program career success, preparation in intercultural knowledge and <u>competence related to the field</u>.</p> <p>Our Community Advisory Board, which meets biannually, maintains a system of three cohorts (public schools, hospitals, and private practices) of professionals in the community, each with a designated liaison. These cohorts are charged with conducting a caucus prior to the meetings so that an equally-distributed agenda can be created that defines the needs of the group and brings current issues from the field to the direct attention of our faculty. The mission of the committee is to collaboratively discuss current trends in the fields and to discuss the department's academic and clinical programs so that the department can integrate input from the committee into plans for the ongoing improvement and updating of these programs. While no formal survey was provided to this group in 2014-15, minutes are taken at each meeting and are reviewed by the faculty at faculty meetings and retreats in order to inform program design. Particular attention is paid to the Committee's impression of our graduates and their preparation for clinical practice in the field.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Other, specify:
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews						
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Other, specify:						
<p>Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)</p>							
<p>Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p>	<p>Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (See Praxis description in Q.3.8.3 below) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4. Other, specify: GPA (2.5 and above)</p>						
<p>Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.9) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.9)</p>	<p>Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:</p> <p>The <i>Praxis II</i> exam in Speech-Language Pathology is required as a requirement for the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) Certificate of Clinical Competence, the California License in Speech-Language Pathology, and the California Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential with or without the Special Class Authorization. This summative assessment measures knowledge important for independent practice as a speech-language pathologist in all primary employment settings, including schools and is also aligned to the 9 areas outlined in our PLO. It is most often taken by students at the completion of their Masters' Degree/Credential Program, but it does provide us with information related to student's success with our PLO, particularly for those who completed not only their</p>						

graduate, but undergraduate program at Sacramento State. The majority of our graduate students fall into this category.

Q3D: Alignment and Quality

Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q3.9.1. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Question 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions

Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment III) [Word limit: 600 for selected PLO]

Direct Measure: Graduation Requirement

Results are unknown at this time as the registrar's office is still processing degrees. However, in recent cycles, all of our seniors have met the 2.5 minimum GPA required by the Speech Pathology and Audiology Department for graduation.

Direct Measure: Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

Undergraduate Program 2014-2015					
	Distribution of Results				
	Top 25%	2 nd 25%	3 rd 25%	Bottom 25%	Mean Score
Junior Class (109)	11%	66%	22%	1%	(8.8)
Senior Class (93)	13%	67%	20%	0%	(9.3)

The data from the Learning Outcomes Assessment indicates that all undergraduate students are acquiring proficiency surrounding key concepts related to our field, as there is a general trend of knowledge acquisition as students progress through the undergraduate program and into the graduate program (mean score junior year 8.8/13.9 mean score 4th semester graduate cohort). This corresponds to the design of our program and its alignment to ASHA knowledge and skill acquisition over the undergraduate and graduate program in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance as students move from acquisition of theoretical knowledge to increasing degrees of practical application and critical thinking.

For the 2014-15 undergraduate classes, 77% of juniors scored in the top 2 quartiles (ahead of our 50% junior criteria) and 80% of seniors scored in the top two quartiles. No seniors scored in the fourth quartile (on par with our senior criteria).

Indirect Measure: Alumni Survey

Analysis of the response from undergraduate alumni was not complete at the time of this reporting. Additional responses are expected through early Fall 2015. Initial graduate program responses indicated the following:

Overall, the results indicated that program completers felt satisfied to very satisfied in most areas. Of particular note, 73% felt very satisfied with the level of clinical preparation provided by our coursework in various graduate-level clinics. Completers felt less satisfied with clinical facilities, the availability of computer stations and clinical prep areas, and opportunities for interprofessional education.

Completers felt particularly well prepared in the following areas:

- Child Language Disorders (91%)
- Speech Sound Disorders (91%)
- Assessment (73%)

Considering the large role it plays in our field, program completers did not feel as well prepared as we would like them to in the area of adult language disorders:

- Adult Language Disorders (18%)

Completers felt least prepared for clinical in the following areas:

- Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) (64%)
- Aural Rehab/Audiology (73%)

Other Measure: Praxis Exam

As of September 2014, *Praxis* Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) test scores are reported on a 100–200 score scale in one-point increments. The required score for ASHA and the state boards of examiners (including the California Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Licensing Board and the CTC) on the new scale is 162 (equivalent to the required score of 600 or greater on the former 250–990 scale).

In 2013-14, 22 students took and passed the Praxis exam on their first attempt. The mean score was 702.21. In 2014-15, 24 students took the new exam. 21 students passed the exam on the first attempt. The mean score was 174.27. One student passed it on the third attempt. Two students need to retake the exam.

This indicates that our program has been doing an adequate job of preparing most students for independent practice in California Public Schools, but that we need to attend to the new version of the exam to ensure that our students are prepared for success.

Biannual Advisory Committee Meetings

A review of feedback from our advisory committee, which meets biannually, indicates that we are preparing our students well for independent clinical practice. The feedback did highlight a need for increased focus on clinical practice in the areas of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), assessment and therapy for individuals with acquired language deficits or disorders, and the ability to analyze normative data.

Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

In recent cycles, all of our seniors have met the 2.5 minimum GPA required by the Speech Pathology and Audiology Department for graduation, which indicates we have been doing an adequate job preparing students for the minimum undergraduate degree requirements.

The results of our learning outcomes assessment indicate that the majority of our candidates are mastering core content that is directly related to our PLO as they progress through the program as evidenced by a trend of improvement in scores between the junior and senior years. The junior and senior cohorts in 2014-15 have also met or exceeded our expected standard of performance, indicating that we are doing a better than adequate job of preparing our students for core competence in the field. Despite this, upon initial item analysis of our overall 2014-15 results, it was apparent that earlier curricular emphasis is warranted in the areas of neuroanatomy and acquired communication deficits and disorders, the critical distinctions between speech and language, the ability to work with normative data, and autism spectrum disorders.

The results of our alumni survey cannot be fully analyzed until fall 2015. Early analysis does indicate that students feel particularly well-prepared in the areas of child language disorders, speech sound disorders, and assessment. Several recent changes address areas where completers felt less prepared for independent clinical practice as indicated by the alumni survey. Since the fall of 2013, Dr. Hagge has begun to develop an adult language disorders strand, beginning with newly designed formal undergraduate instruction in neuroanatomy and adult acquired language deficits and disorders coupled with volunteer and academic opportunities in community-based programs under her Neuro Service Alliance applied communication sciences lab. These opportunities continue in the graduate program where required clinical experience and specific methodology coursework are paired with academic coursework in neurogenic language disorders, motor speech disorders, and AAC and assistive technologies. In response to completer's perception of being less prepared for clinical practice in aural rehabilitation and audiology, our undergraduate program has developed specific advising for students with interests in these areas. We have also hired an additional audiologist, Dr. Robert Ivory of U.C. Davis Medical Center, as a part-time faculty member. He joins one emeriti audiologist and another part-time audiologist on our faculty and provides an additional level of training and exposure to the field of audiology for students preparing for a career in either speech-language pathology or audiology. We have begun to track the progress of our audiology emphasis undergraduate students and are pleased to report that they are being accepted into AuD programs on a regular basis. We currently have approximately 17 students pursuing the emphasis. One student in Spring 2015 applied to 5 schools across the U.S. and was accepted into all 5. Another applied to 5 schools in 2014 and was accepted to 3 of them.

Most candidates are performing very well on the summative Praxis exam, demonstrating strong performance in their overall preparation for knowledge and skills acquired cumulatively in our program. It is clear that we need to attend to the new version of the exam to ensure that our students are prepared for success. We will continue to monitor praxis scores to ensure that all of our students are graduating from our program possessing knowledge that is considered by national and state agencies to be essential for independent practice as a speech-language pathologist in all primary employment settings, including schools. We will make specific adjustments at the graduate level to address this, but we also plan to discuss adjusting the Learning Outcomes Assessment and our course curriculum to promote case-study type assessment questions that align to the exam and promote critical thinking at the undergraduate level.

Feedback from our Community Advisory Committee indicates that we are preparing our students well for independent clinical practice, but that an increased focus on clinical practice in the areas of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), assessment and therapy for individuals with acquired language deficits or disorders, and the ability to analyze normative data would be helpful. Dr. Hagge's coursework/clinical strand will directly address assessment and therapy for individuals with acquired language deficits or disorders beginning in the junior year of the undergraduate program. We have also implemented curriculum discussions in our faculty meetings focusing on particular areas in our curriculum. Through these discussions our faculty determine ways we can cover important concepts like the distinctions between speech and language, the use and interpretation of normative testing data, and clinical indicators in adults. We have hired a new full time tenure track faculty member, Dr. Heather Thompson. Beginning in the fall of 2015, she will be the lead teacher for our undergraduate SPHP 142 ASD class. Dr. Thompson's expertise and teaching ability will benefit student learning and critical thinking in this area. She will attend to continued outcomes in this area.

Q4.3. For **selected** PLO, the student performance:

- 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- 4. **Did not meet** expectation/standard
- 5. No expectation or standard has been specified
- 6. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2014-2015** and based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (Go to **Q6**)
- 3. Don't know (Go to **Q6**)

Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes. **[Word limit: 300 words]**

We will continue to monitor the minimum GPA requirement for graduating seniors.

We will continue to survey our Alumni annually with a continued emphasis on disaggregating the responses of undergraduate program students over a five year period.

The student learning outcomes assessment will continue to be implemented each year across classes to assess student learning and the need for curriculum modification. We plan to add new questions in key areas as a result of the analysis of data for this report because it is clear that we are not assessing the following PLO ASHA areas: A (culture), C2, C5, C6, C9. Questions will be added in these areas. We also plan to add new questions in key areas as a result of the assessment data in this report: AAC, audiology, and aural rehabilitation. The learning assessment results are reviewed each year at our fall faculty retreat when an item analysis is conducted. This item analysis allows us to see our students' mastery of each element of the PLO. The assessment is adjusted annually as needed in order to assess areas of perceived need that require pedagogical emphasis.

We will continue our emphasis on undergraduate audiology mentoring and tracking, the development of our adult language disorders strand, and our increased focus on AAC and IPE. We

	<p>expect that future generations of completers will indicate improved levels of satisfaction in these areas. We will continue to survey our Alumni annually with a continued emphasis on disaggregating the responses of undergraduate program students over a five year period and we plan to add and modify our Learning Outcomes Assessment to measure learning in this area. Articulation across the curriculum will continue related to the topics of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), assessment and therapy for individuals with acquired language deficits or disorders, and the ability to analyze normative data. We will assess these concepts annually through our Learning Outcomes Assessment, designing questions that promote critical thinking. Continued discussion around these topics at our biannual Community Advisory Committee meeting will provide an additional measure of our graduate's knowledge in these areas.</p> <p>We will continue to monitor Praxis scores to ensure that our students are graduating from our program possessing knowledge that is considered by national and state agencies to be essential for contemporary independent practice as a speech-language pathologist in all primary employment settings. We will adjust undergraduate curriculum and assessment requirements to support students' preparation for the new version of the exam following a robust discussion on the topic at our faculty retreat in fall 2015.</p>
--	---

Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (2013 - 2014) been used so far? [Check all that apply]

	(1) Very Much	(2) Quite a Bit	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A
1. Improving specific courses	x				
2. Modifying curriculum	x				
3. Improving advising and mentoring		x			
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals				x	
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations		x			
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	x				
7. Annual assessment reports	x				
8. Program review		x			
9. Prospective student and family information		x			
10. Alumni communication	x				
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)		x			
12. Program accreditation		x			
13. External accountability reporting requirement	x				
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					x
15. Strategic planning					x
16. Institutional benchmarking					x
17. Academic policy development or modification	x				
18. Institutional Improvement					x
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					x
20. New faculty hiring		x			
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	x				
22. Recruitment of new students					x
23. Other Specify:					

Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.

The feedback from last year's assessment report helped us begin to better align our annual assessment to our long-standing PLOs.

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. **[Word limit: 300]**

Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1. Critical thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Information literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Written communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Oral communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Creative thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Team work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Problem solving |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Global learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: |
| | a. |
| | b. |
| | c. |

The faculty plan an item analysis discussion related to the Learning Outcomes Assessment that will divide the measure in to a overall competencies in the major/discipline section and a critical thinking question with case study questions aligned to the new version of the praxis exam.

Q8. Have you attached any appendices? If yes, please list them all here:

Appendix I: Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives
 Appendix II: Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program Information

<p>P1. Program/Concentration Name(s): Speech Pathology and Audiology</p> <p>P1.1. Report Authors: Robert Pieretti, Ph.D., CCC-SLP</p>	<p>P2. Program Director: Robert A. Pieretti, Ph.D., CCC-SLP</p> <p>P2.1. Department Chair: Robert A. Pieretti, Ph.D., CCC-SLP</p>										
<p>P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: Speech Pathology and Audiology</p>	<p>P4. College: College of Health and Human Services</p>										
<p>P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (<i>See Department Fact Book 2014 by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment:</i>)</p> <p>Undergraduate: 339 Graduate: 81</p>	<p>P6. Program Type: [Select only one]</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td><td>1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>2. Credential</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>3. Master's degree</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d)</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>5. Other. Please specify:</td></tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Master's degree	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d)	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Other. Please specify:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major										
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential										
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Master's degree										
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d)										
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Other. Please specify:										
<p>Undergraduate Degree Program(s):</p> <p>P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 1</p> <p>P7.1. List all the name(s): Speech Pathology and Audiology</p> <p>P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? None</p>	<p>Master Degree Program(s):</p> <p>P8. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 1</p> <p>P8.1. List all the name(s): Speech-Language Pathology</p> <p>P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? None</p>										
<p>Credential Program(s):</p> <p>P9. Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 1</p> <p>P9.1. List all the names: Speech-Language Pathology Services with or without Special Class Authorization</p>	<p>Doctorate Program(s)</p> <p>P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: None</p> <p>P10.1. List all the name(s):</p>										

When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed				X						
P12. Last updated									X	
								1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?								X		
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?								X		
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?									X	
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?									X	

