

2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down. If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

BS Speech Pathology & Audiology

OR

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) **did you assess?** [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, Competency, and Perspectives
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. Global Learning and Perspectives
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☒ 18. Overall Disciplinary Knowledge
- ☐ 19. Professionalism
- ☒ 20. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a. Human Cultures and the Physical World

b.

c.

Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

Our undergraduate program has developed seven specific program learning goals (PLGs) with associated program learning outcomes (PLOs) aligned to the knowledge and skills acquisition outcomes required by our accrediting body, the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) (See assessment plan on file). The Primary Learning Outcomes for the undergraduate program naturally align with the Primary Learning Outcomes for the graduate program, 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. All students admitted to our graduate program have completed the exact coursework equivalent of our undergraduate BS degree, regardless of the program in which the undergraduate degree was earned. This hierarchical process is closely aligned to our ASHA accreditation expectations. This learning of key concepts aligns with WSCUC Core Competencies and the Sacramento States Baccalaureate Learning Goals, particularly in the areas of competence in the discipline, critical thinking, knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, personal and social responsibility, integrative learning, and inquiry and analysis.

This year, we assessed our Program Assessment Plan's PLG/PLO 3 (Overall Competencies in the Major; ASHA Knowledge Standard IV-A; Human Cultures and the Physical World; Quantitative Reasoning/Information Literacy) and we also assessed our PLG/PLO 4 (Overall Competencies in the Major; ASHA Knowledge Standard IV-B).

PLG/PLO 3: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the biological sciences, physical sciences, statistics, and the social/behavioral sciences

PLG/PLO 4: Students will begin to demonstrate knowledge of basic human communication and swallowing processes, including the appropriate biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases. The applicant must have demonstrated the ability to integrate information pertaining to normal and abnormal human development across the lifespan.

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
- ☐ 4. N/A
- ☐ 5. Other, specify:

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 Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to Q1.5)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip 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", see <http://degreeprofile.org>) 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?

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

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** 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 Disciplinary Knowledge

If your PLO is **not listed**, please enter it here:

Q2.1.1.

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

See Q1.2 RE: PLG/PLO 3

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 **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

1. Learning Outcomes Assessment

Tool Description: Each year, we distribute a 23-item multiple-choice learning assessment to each student in our program. The measure is made up of a focused set of questions in general areas of the curriculum, including specific targets related to the use and interpretation of normative data and basic to higher level distinctions between speech and language. Each question has only one correct answer. The assessment is useful in tracking candidates' mastery of basic knowledge in our major and as they progress through the program, as 48% of the questions have been designed to do this. It also provides information regarding the development of critical thinking, as 52% of the questions have been designed as "case study" questions that require a higher level of analysis and problem-solving in the style of our national *Praxis* exam. It should be noted that 39% of the questions have been designed to track candidates knowledge of the biological sciences, physical sciences, statistics, and social sciences (ASHA Standard IV-A).

Standard of Performance: 73% of senior students will answer 60% of the IV-A (Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, Statistics, and the Social/Behavioral Sciences) related questions correctly.

The questions align to our seven specific PLG areas (and the associated PLOs) in the following manner:

| Question | PLGs Assessed | ASHA Knowledge/Skill Outcome Area Assessed | Critical Thinking (CT) |
|----------|---------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | Basic Knowledge (BK) |
| 1 | 6,7 | IVF, IVG, V | CT |
| 2 | 4,1,7 | IVB, IV(C4), IVG | BK |
| 3 | 3,1,7 | IVA, IV(C3), IV(C4), IVG | BK |
| 4 | 1,7 | IV(C4), IVG | BK |
| 5 | 4,1,5,7 | IVB, IV(C4), IVD, IVG | BK |
| 6 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C4), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 7 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C4), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 8 | 3,1,7 | IVA, IV(C3), IVG | BK |
| 9 | 3,1,7 | IVA, IV(C3), IVG | BK |
| 10 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C4), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 11 | 4,5,6,7 | IVB, IVD, IVF, IVG | BK |
| 12 | 4,1,5,7 | IVB, IV(C1), IVD, IVG | BK |
| 13 | 3,4,1,5,7 | IVA, IVB, IV(C7), IVD, IVG | BK |
| 14 | 3,4,2,5,7 | IVA, IVB, VB(C7), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 15 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C8), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 16 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C8), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 17 | 2,1 | VB(C5), IVG | CT |
| 18 | 3,1,7 | IVA, IV(C5), IVG | BK |
| 19 | 3,4,2,5,7 | IVA, IVB, VB(C6), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 20 | 1,5,7 | IV(C2), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 21 | 3,4,2,5,7 | IVA, IVB, VB(C3), IVD, IVG | CT |

| | | | |
|----|-----------|----------------------------|----|
| 22 | 3,4,2,5,7 | IVA, IVB, VB(C4), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 23 | 4,1,5,7 | IVB, IV(C9), IVD, IVG | BK |

2. Completion of Pre-Major Requirements

Tool Description: Upon admission to the undergraduate course sequences, all students must provide proof of successful completion of pre-major requirements (*Human Development Lifespan; Introduction to Psychology; Introduction to Statistics; Introduction to Sign Language*).

Standard of Performance: 100% of the students will have successfully completed this coursework before beginning our undergraduate program sequence.

3. Performance in Coursework

Tool Description: All undergraduate students complete the same sequence of hierarchical courses. There is only one elective course (CSAD 146). Completion of these courses reflect knowledge of the Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, Statistics, and the Social/Behavioral Sciences.

Standard of Performance: 90% of the students will complete the program with a 2.5 GPA or higher in major coursework

4. Performance on Praxis exam

Tool Description: The *Praxis II* exam in Speech-Language Pathology is required, in addition to the earned Master's Degree and a required professional experience, in order to apply for the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) Certificate of Clinical Competence, the California License in Speech-Language Pathology, and the Clear California Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential with or without the Special Class Authorization. This summative assessment measures candidate's level of preparation for independent practice as a speech-language pathologist in all primary employment settings and is aligned to ASHA's student learning outcomes. 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).

All of our graduate students have completed our undergraduate curriculum or its content equivalent (if their undergraduate degree was completed at another university). Foundational knowledge and skills required for graduate work and, ultimately, practice in the field of speech-language pathology begin in the undergraduate program. The *Praxis* results, therefore, are one measure of the appropriateness of our undergraduate curriculum in preparing students for professional practice.

Successful completion of this exam reflects knowledge in the Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, Statistics, and the Social/Behavioral Sciences.

Standard of Performance: 90% of the students will score 162 or higher on the *Praxis*

| Q2.4. PLO | Q2.5. Stdnd | Q2.6. Rubric | Please indicate where you have published the PLO , the standard of performance, and the rubric that was used to measure the PLO: |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. In the student handbook/advising handbook |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. In the university catalogue |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Other, specify: <input type="text" value="All students are familiar with the 2014 ASHA Standards for Clinical Co..."/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO |

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?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No (skip to Q6)
☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
☐ 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

Q3.1.1.

How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

Q3.2.

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No (skip to Q6)
☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
☐ 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

Q3.2.1.

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:

Direct:

- Learning Outcomes Assessment
- Successful completion of Pre-Major Requirements
- GPA in Major
- National *Praxis* Exam

Indirect:

- Student Exit Survey Feedback
- Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback

The Learning Outcomes Assessment is distributed in selected course sections. Through this process, it is completed by each student in our program annually. Each question has one "correct" answer. Data is compiled and analyzed by the Department Chair and Faculty using the alignment table previously provided.

Passage of pre-major requirements are enforced by the registrar at the time of enrollment into our course sequence classes. Department exceptions for enrollment are only permitted if proof of pre-major requirement course enrollment and completion prior to the beginning of the course sequence is provided by the student.

The chair consults with the office of the Registrar and monitors students' progress to degree monthly through the graduation application process.

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

Undergraduate students complete an Undergraduate Experience Exit Survey in a selected class. Graduate students complete a Brief Clinical Experience Survey in one of their methods class. There are sets of evaluative questions on each survey. All of the questions target evaluation of the quality of our program and/or the student experience.

Minutes are taken at biannual advisory committee meetings.

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to Q3.7)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q3.7)

Q3.3.1.

Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used?

[Check all that apply]

- ☐ 1. Capstone project (e.g. 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 assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- ☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
- ☐ 6. E-Portfolios
- ☐ 7. Other Portfolios
- ☒ 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.

Please **provide** the direct measure (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, THEN **explain** how it assesses the PLO:

Please see attached Learning Outcomes Assessment Key and description above.



2017learning_outcome_assesment_questionnaire key & designation.docx
31.17 KB



No file attached

Q3.4.

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- ☐ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☒ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

- ☒ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify: (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

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

Q3.4.3.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

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

Q3.4.4.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

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

☐ 4. N/A

Q3.5.

How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

All full time faculty
participate in the
development and refinement
of the Learning Outcomes

Q3.5.1.

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

All full time faculty participate ...

Q3.5.2.

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

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

Q3.6.

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

All students complete the Learning Outcomes Assessment. We reviewed all of these.

Didactic coursework scores and overall GPA are on file for each student.

National *Praxis* exam scores are provided to the department by ETS at student request.

Q3.6.1.

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

We reviewed all Learning Outcome Assessments completed by students attending school on the day(s) of administration. We reviewed the major GPA of all graduating students. *Praxis* scores for those students electing to take the exam were also reviewed.

Q3.6.2.

How many students were in the class or program?

359 (218 junior-level students and 141 senior-level students)

Q3.6.3.

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

108 junior-level student and
114 Senior-level student
Learning Outcome
Assessments were reviewed

Q3.6.4.

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

Q3.7.1.


Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]


- ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)
☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
☒ 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
☒ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
☐ 7. Other, specify:

Q3.7.1.1.

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

- Student Exit Survey Feedback
- Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q3.7.2.

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

All senior undergraduate students complete an Undergraduate Experience Exit Survey in a selected class section.

Q3.7.3.

If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

All fourth-semester senior students not absent from class on the day the survey was distributed completed the Undergraduate Experience Exit Survey. All data collected was analyzed.

While no formal survey is provided to the Community Advisory Board, minutes are taken at each meeting and are reviewed by the faculty at faculty meetings and retreats in order to inform program design.

Q3.7.4.

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

114 of 141 senior level
undergraduate students
completed the
Undergraduate Experience

Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.

Which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

- ☒ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify:

Q3.8.2.

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.

If other measures were used, please specify:

The *Praxis II* exam in Speech-Language Pathology is required, in addition to the earned Master's Degree and a required professional experience, in order to apply for the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) Certificate of Clinical Competence, the California License in Speech-Language Pathology, and the Clear California Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential with or without the Special Class Authorization. This summative assessment measures candidate's level of preparation for independent practice as a speech-language pathologist in all primary employment settings and is aligned to ASHA's student learning outcomes. 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). All of our graduate students have completed our undergraduate curriculum or its content equivalent (if their undergraduate degree was completed at another university). Foundational knowledge and skills required for graduate work and, ultimately, practice in the field of speech-language pathology begin in the undergraduate program. The *Praxis* results, therefore, are one measure of the appropriateness of our undergraduate curriculum in preparing students for professional practice.



No file attached



No file attached

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in Q2.1:

Q4 BS SPEECH PATHOLOGY AUDIOLOGY

Direct Measure 1: Learning Outcomes Assessment

In 2016-17, the data indicates that, by the fourth semester, 73% or more students are answering 44% of the **IVA** questions correctly. The standard of performance for the measure was met for only 3/9 questions (33%) in the junior year and for only 4/9 questions (44%) in the senior year. The results, however, do demonstrate a general trend of acquisition of knowledge in this area as students progress through the program, as 6 of 9 questions (67%) show a steady increase in percent of students answering correctly from the junior to senior year. For example, while only 51% of junior students answered question 3 correctly, 78% of senior students answered it correctly. Questions 8, 13, 14, and 18 require further examination both in terms of their general trend of decrease across semesters and/or because of their low rate of passage.

| 2016-17 | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Cohorts | % of students answering IVA questions correctly | | | | | | | | |
| | 3 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 22 |
| Junior | 51% | 81% | 45% | 6% | 17% | 63% | 51% | 76% | 84% |
| Senior | 78% | 77% | 52% | 11% | 39% | 49% | 64% | 87% | 75% |

Direct Measure 2: Successful Completion of Pre-Major Requirements

The new catalog, which was published in 2016-17, lists successful completion of pre-major required courses as pre-requisites for enrollment in our coursework. This was enforced at the time of registration in the CSAD coursework. Additionally, all students must complete a physical and biological science as part of their GE coursework at Sacramento State. In 2016-17, no students applying for graduation reached program completion without successful completion of a biological and a physical science and without successful completion of pre-major requirements. In the past, this was not always the case.

Direct Measure 3: GPA in Major

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

Direct Measure 4: 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 2016-17, 26 students took the *Praxis* exam. 25 students (96%) passed the exam on the first attempt. One student passed it on the third attempt. The mean passing score was 178. The high passing score was 191. The low passing score was 164.

Indirect Measure 1: Undergraduate Experience Exit Survey

This year, 114 senior-level students completed our Undergraduate Experience Exit Survey. The Results follow: 43.9% of students surveyed indicated that they plan to attend to graduate programs Communication Sciences and Disorders (36%) or Audiology (7.9%); 12.3% indicated that they plan to attend graduate programs in other fields; .9% indicated that they plan to pursue a PhD in Communication Sciences and Disorders; 28.1% indicated that they plan to pursue training and licensure as a Speech-Language Pathology Assistant (SLPA); 14% indicated that they planned to apply for entry level administrative jobs in health, education, or related environments; 18.5% indicated that they planned to do other things, such as take a year off or to enroll in additional coursework to improve GPA.

While 22.8% indicated that they had applied to our Master's Degree program in Communication Sciences and Disorders, 19.3% indicated that they had applied for other Master's Degree programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders, 3.5% had applied to AuD programs, 1.8% had applied to Master's Degree programs in other fields, and .9% had applied to a PhD program in another field. At the time of the Survey (early May 2017), 56.5% of these students had received an admissions offer to the programs to which they had applied.

Indirect Measure 2: Biannual Advisory Committee Meetings

A review of feedback from our advisory committee, which meets biannually, indicates that we are preparing out students well for independent clinical practice. The feedback did highlight a need to provide students with education and clinical experience in parent training models and early intervention, and to ensure that clear expectations and rules are established regarding sick days for students on internships (a professional behavior).



No file attached



No file attached

Q4.2.

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

Q42 BS SPEECH PATHOLOGY AUDIOLOGY

A triangulation of the data collected through both direct and indirect measures indicates that our students are, in many areas, exceeding our overall program standards for this PLG/PLO (See below). The analysis does, however, provide an opportunity for discussions across our curriculum with regard to specific topics that may require curricular emphasis.

Direct Measure 1: Learning Outcomes Assessment (Standard of Performance Partially Met)

The standard of performance, which is 73% of senior students answering 60% of the IV-A questions correctly, was met for only 3/9 questions (33%) in the junior year and for only 4/9 questions (44%) in the senior year. Questions 8 (Basic Knowledge/Voice and Respiration), 13 (Basic Knowledge/Cognitive aspects of communication), 14 (Critical Thinking/Cognitive Aspects of Communication), and 18 (Basic Knowledge/Hearing and its Impact on Speech and Language-physical properties of sound) require specific analysis to determine if the questions need further development (which affects the validity of this measure) or if curricular modifications or enhancements are appropriate.

Direct Measure 2: Completion of Pre-Major Requirements (Standard of Performance Met)

In 2016-17, 100% of our students began the program having successfully completed the pre-major requirements or with proof of enrollment in them at the time of registration. The standard of performance was for 100% of students to have successfully completed this coursework. Additionally, 100% of students applying for graduation reached program completion with successful completion of a biological and a physical science through their GE coursework at Sacramento State and with successful completion of pre-major requirements.

Direct Measure 3: GPA in Major (Standard of Performance Exceeded)

In recent cycles, 100% our graduating seniors have met or exceeded the 2.5 minimum GPA required by the Speech Pathology and Audiology Department for graduation. Our goal is for 90% of students to achieve this goal. The department chair will continue to monitor GPA in consultation with the degree evaluation office through the graduation application process and will offer student advising and suggestions for tutoring when needed.

Direct Measure 4: Praxis Exam (Standard of Performance Exceeded)

96% of students taking the *Praxis* exam in 2016-17 passed it on the first attempt. One student passed it on the third attempt. The mean passing score was 178. The high passing score was 191. The low passing score was 164. This exceeds our program's predetermined standard of performance. Our goal is for 90% of students to pass the exam with a score of 162 or higher. The 2016-17 *Praxis* results indicate that our program has been doing an adequate job of preparing most students for independent practice, but that we need to continue 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 employment settings. Students will be encouraged to take the *Praxis* at the end of the program, after they have had a variety of clinic experiences, including two internships, because the *Praxis* is designed to test both students' knowledge of our field's core content AND their ability to problem solve when given case studies related to practical application. We will continue to test both basic knowledge and critical thinking in our major annually through our Learning Outcomes Assessment in order to ensure development in both areas across the curriculum and throughout the program. Dr. Roseberry-McKibbin has addressed faculty on the creation of academic experiences that prepare students for the critical thinking required to pass the newest version of the *Praxis* exam. We also plan to continue our biannual discussion regarding our

comprehensive examination structure in an attempt to ensure the case-study format that provides additional preparation for students preparing to take the *Praxis*.



Indirect Measure 1: Undergraduate Experience Exit Survey (Feedback Exceeds Expectations)

This year, 114 senior-level students completed our Undergraduate Experience Exit Survey. The Results follow: 43.9% of students surveyed indicated that they plan to attend to graduate programs Communication Sciences and Disorders (36%) or Audiology (7.9%); 12.3% indicated that they plan to attend graduate programs in other fields; .9% indicated that they plan to pursue a PhD in Communication Sciences and Disorders; 28.1% indicated that they plan to pursue training and licensure as a Speech-Language Pathology Assistant (SLPA); 14% indicated that they planned to apply for entry level administrative jobs in health, education, or related environments; 18.5% indicated that they planned to do other things, such as take a year off or to enroll in additional coursework to improve GPA. While 22.8% indicated that they had applied to our Master's Degree program in Communication Sciences and Disorders, 19.3% indicated that they had applied for other Master's Degree programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders, 3.5% had applied to AuD programs, 1.8% had applied to Master's Degree programs in other fields, and .9% had applied to a PhD program in another field. At the time of the Survey (early May 2017), 56.5% of these students had received an admissions offer to the programs to which they had applied.

The overwhelming majority of our students are indicating that they feel that they have the knowledge and skills necessary to apply their coursework to careers and higher education in our field and related fields.

Indirect Measure 2: Biannual Advisory Committee Meetings (Feedback Meets Expectations)

Feedback from our Community Advisory Committee indicates that we are preparing our students well for independent clinical practice, but that an increased focus increased awareness in areas related to adult learning models and working with adults in the area of coaching models for early intervention would be helpful. Professional behaviors, including absence reporting and making up missed time were also concerns. We have implemented curriculum discussions in our faculty meetings focusing on particular areas in our undergraduate curriculum, such as CSAD 112, 125, and 146, where these topics can be addressed. Through these discussions our faculty determine ways we can cover these foundational concepts before students apply to graduate programs. We have hired two new full time tenure track faculty members to begin in fall 2017. Their expertise and teaching ability will provide additional benefit to student learning and critical thinking in these areas. We will attend to continued outcomes in this area and expect to see higher levels of performance in these areas in future graduating cohorts.

 No file attached No file attached**Q4.3.**

For the 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/standard has been specified
- ☐ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.

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

Q4.5.

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

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

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

Q5.1.

As a result of the assessment effort and based on 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 (skip to **Q5.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

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.

Learning Outcome Assessment Questions 8 (Basic knowledge/Voice and Respiration), 13 (Basic knowledge/Cognitive aspects of communication), 14 (Critical thinking/Cognitive Aspects of Communication), and 18 (Hearing and its Impact on Speech and Language-physical properties of sound) require specific analysis to determine if the questions need further development (which affects the validity of this measure) or if curricular modifications or enhancements are appropriate. In fact, the faculty will review the overall results from the Learning Outcomes Assessment, paying particular attention to these questions, at our fall faculty retreat. We will assess the impact of any changes as part of our ongoing cycle of review and revision to this annual measure.

Passage of pre-major requirements (*Human Development Lifespan; Introduction to Psychology; Introduction to Statistics; Introduction to Sign Language*) will continue to be enforced by the registrar at the time of enrollment into our course sequence classes. Department exceptions for enrollment will only be permitted if proof of pre-major requirement course enrollment and completion prior to the beginning of the course sequence is provided by the student.

The department chair will continue to monitor GPA in consultation with the office of the registrar/degree evaluation office through the graduation application process and will make tutoring referrals when a need is perceived. The Curriculum Committee will also continue to monitor course passage rates and faculty will offer student advising and suggestions for campus tutoring. Faculty will be provided with specific criteria for department-specific tutoring. NSSLHA student mentoring will also continue.

The 2016-17 *Praxis* results indicate 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. The chair will continue to monitor *Praxis* scores and share results with the faculty 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 employment settings. Students will be encouraged to take the *Praxis* at the end of the program, after they have had a variety of clinic experiences, including two internships, because the *Praxis* is designed to test both students' basic knowledge of our field's core content AND their ability to problem solve when given case studies related to practical application. We will continue to test both basic knowledge and critical thinking in our major annually through our Learning Outcomes Assessment in order to ensure development in both areas across the curriculum and throughout the program. Dr. Roseberry-McKibbin, a member of our Curriculum Committee, will continue to address faculty on the creation of academic experiences that prepare students for the knowledge and skills required to pass the newest version of the *Praxis* exam. We also plan to continue our biannual discussion regarding our comprehensive examination structure in an attempt to ensure the case-study format provides additional preparation for students preparing to take the *Praxis*.

We will continue curriculum discussions in our faculty meetings focusing on particular areas in our graduate undercurriculum, such as CSAD 112, CSAD 125, and CSAD 146, where adult learning models and working with adults in the area of coaching models for early intervention, along with professional behaviors in the field, can be addressed. We have hired two new full time tenure-track faculty members to begin in fall 2017. Their expertise and teaching ability will provide additional benefit to student learning and critical thinking in these areas. We will attend to continued outcomes in this area, and to other areas identified by our Advisory Committee or by students in the Student Exit Survey in the future.

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

Q5.2.

Since your last assessment report, **how have the assessment data from then been used** so far?

| | 1. Very Much | 2. Quite a Bit | 3. Some | 4. Not at All | 5. N/A |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Improving specific courses | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. Modifying curriculum | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Improving advising and mentoring | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. Revising learning outcomes/goals | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. Developing/updating assessment plan | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 7. Annual assessment reports | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. Program review | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. Prospective student and family information | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. Alumni communication | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12. Program accreditation | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13. External accountability reporting requirement | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 15. Strategic planning | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 16. Institutional benchmarking | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 17. Academic policy development or modifications | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 18. Institutional improvement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 19. Resource allocation and budgeting | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 20. New faculty hiring | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 21. Professional development for faculty and staff | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 22. Recruitment of new students | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 23. Other, specify: | <input type="text"/> | | | | |

Q5.2.1.

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

Learning Outcomes Assessment Questions 3 (Basic knowledge/voice & Resonance & Language), 13 (Basic knowledge/Cognitive aspects of communication), and 23 (Basic knowledge/AAC) were analyzed to determine if the questions needed further development to improve the validity of this measure or if curricular modifications or enhancements were appropriate. The same was done for questions 14 (Critical Thinking/Cognitive aspects of communication), 15 (Critical Thinking/Social Aspects of Communication), and 20 (Critical Thinking/Fluency). In fact, the faculty reviewed the overall results from the Learning Outcomes Assessment, paying particular attention to these questions, at our fall 2016 faculty retreat. While new questions were not added, the current questions were refined to improve their validity. We assess the impact of all changes as part of our ongoing cycle of review and revision to this annual measure. 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 PLG/PLO. The assessment is adjusted annually as needed in order to assess areas of perceived need that may also require pedagogical emphasis.

The department chair continued to monitor GPA in consultation with the office of the registrar/degree evaluation office through the graduation application process and made tutoring referrals when a need was perceived. The Curriculum Committee also continued to monitor course passage rates and offered student mentoring through NSSLHA. Faculty also made suggestions for tutoring when needed. Tutoring was regularly offered to student through campus programs (the Peer and Academic Resource Center, Smarthinking, and the campus writing center). Department specific tutoring was sponsored by the College of Health and Human Services Educational Equity and Student Retention Committee with specific referral criteria provided to faculty.

We continued 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 employment settings. Dr. Roseberry-McKibbin, a member of our Curriculum Committee, continued to address faculty on the creation of academic experiences that prepare students for the critical thinking required to pass the newest version of the *Praxis* exam. We also adjusted curriculum, culminating experience, and Learning Outcomes Assessment expectations to support students' preparation for the new version of the exam following our biannual discussions on the topic at our faculty retreats.

Articulation across the curriculum, with the Curriculum Committee's guidance, continued with particular attention paid to the topic of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). A service learning opportunity was provided experience for our students in this area. The students worked in a group with a client with ASD. Students were required to determine communication strategies to facilitate communication for the child with ASD. Observations in the field were provided to ensure that students have a better understanding of treatment ideas and goals and improve critical thinking across cohorts as information is shared in clinical methods courses. We will assess the impact of these changes through our related questions on the Learning Outcomes Assessment and through ongoing feedback from our Community Advisory Committee.

Q5.3.

To what extent did you apply **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

| | 1. Very Much | 2. Quite a bit | 3. Some | 4. Not at All | 5. N/A |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Program Learning Outcomes | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. Standards of Performance | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Measures | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. Rubrics | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. Alignment | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. Data Collection | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. Data Analysis and Presentation | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. Use of Assessment Data | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. Other, please specify: <input type="text"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q5.3.1.

Please share with us an example of how you applied **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

The feedback from last year's assessment report and our program review report helped us begin to better align our annual assessment to our PLGs/PLOs. We also clearly identified BLGs and WSCUC goal areas that are associated with these PLGs/PLOs for the undergraduate program. We were advised to consider *Praxis* results as a direct assessment method rather than an indirect method at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, so we have done so in this year's report. We have also created a curriculum map that explicitly aligns our accrediting body's knowledge and skills outcomes, which are directly aligned to our PLGs/PLOs, to our coursework. You will find it attached to this report. As recommended, we are measuring different PLGs/PLOs on a rotating basis, as outlined in our assessment plan

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6.

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

Q6 BS SPEECH PATHOLOGY AUDIOLOGY

Our program measured two PLGs and associated PLOs this year. Below are abbreviated results from the second PLG/PLO measured.

Question 1: PLG/PLO 4 (Overall Competencies in the Major: ASHA Knowledge Standard IV-B)

Students will begin to demonstrate knowledge of basic human communication and swallowing processes, including the appropriate biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases. The applicant must have demonstrated the ability to integrate information pertaining to normal and abnormal human development across the lifespan.

Question 2/3/4 Standard of Performance/Data, Findings, and Conclusions

A triangulation of the data collected through both direct and indirect measures indicates that our students are, in many areas, exceeding our overall program standards for this PLG/PLO (See below). One Direct Measure, our Learning Outcomes Assessment, does provide an opportunity for discussions across our curriculum with regard to specific topics that may require curricular emphasis.

Direct Methods

1. Learning Outcomes Assessment: 73% of senior students will answer 60% of the IV-B related questions correctly (Standard of Performance partially met)

In 2016-17, the data indicates that, by the fourth semester, 73% or more students are answering 3 of 15 of the **IV-B** questions correctly. (Knowledge of basic human communication and swallowing processes, including the appropriate biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases and the ability to integrate information pertaining to normal and abnormal human development across the lifespan) The standard of performance for the measure was met for 4/15 questions (27%) in the junior year and for only 3/15 (20%) questions in the senior year. Our goal is for 73% of students to answer 60% of the IV-B related questions by the senior year. The results do demonstrate, however, a general trend of acquisition of skills in this area as students progress through the program, as 9 of 15 questions (60%) show a steady increase in percent answered correctly from the junior to senior year. For example, while only 22% of junior students answered question 16 (Critical Thinking/Social Aspects of Communication) correctly, 48% of senior students answered it correctly. Questions 2 (Basic Knowledge/Receptive and Expressive Language), 10 (Critical Thinking/Receptive and Expressive Language), 12 (Basic Knowledge/Articulation), 13 (Basic Knowledge/Cognitive Aspects of Communication), 15 (Critical Thinking/Social Aspects of Communication), and 22 (Critical Thinking/Receptive and Expressive Language) require further examination both in terms of their general trend of decrease across semesters and because of their low rate of passage.

| 2016-2017 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Cohorts | % of students answering IV-B related questions correctly | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 19 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| Junior | 75 | 61 | 13 | 55 | 32 | 53 | 80 | 6 | 17 | 17 | 22 | 51 | 76 | 84 | 24 |
| Senior | 67 | 60 | 35 | 66 | 25 | 56 | 77 | 11 | 39 | 15 | 48 | 64 | 87 | 75 | 34 |

2. Performance in Coursework: 90% of the students will complete the program with a 2.5 GPA or higher in major coursework (Standard of Performance exceeded)

In recent cycles, 100% our graduating seniors have met or exceeded the 2.5 minimum GPA required by the Speech Pathology and Audiology Department for graduation. Our goal is for 90% of students to achieve this goal. The department chair will continue to monitor GPA in consultation with the degree evaluation office through the graduation application process and will make tutoring referrals when a need is perceived. The Curriculum Committee will also continue to monitor course passage rates and faculty will offer student advising and suggestions for campus tutoring. Faculty will be provided with specific criteria for department-specific tutoring. NSSLHA student mentoring will also continue.

3. National Praxis Exam: 90% of students will score 162 or higher (Standard of Performance exceeded)

96% of students taking the *Praxis* exam in 2016-17 passed it on the first attempt. One student passed it on the third attempt. The mean passing score was 178. The high passing score was 191. The low passing score was 164. This exceeds our program's predetermined standard of performance. Our goal is for 90% of students to pass the exam with a score of 162 or higher. The 2016-17 *Praxis* results indicate that our program has been doing an adequate job of preparing most students for independent practice, but that we need to continue 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 employment settings. Students will be encouraged to take the *Praxis* at the end of the program, after they have had a variety of clinic experiences, including two internships, because the *Praxis* is designed to test both students' basic knowledge of our field's core content AND their ability to problem solve when given case studies related to practical application. We will continue to test both basic knowledge and critical thinking in our major annually through our Learning Outcomes Assessment in order to ensure development in both areas across the curriculum and throughout the program. Dr. Roseberry-McKibbin has addressed faculty on the creation of academic experiences that prepare students for the critical thinking required to pass the newest version of the *Praxis* exam. We also plan to continue our biannual discussion regarding our comprehensive examination structure in an attempt to ensure the case-study format provides additional preparation for students preparing to take the *Praxis*.

Indirect Methods

1. Positive Alumni, Employer, and Student Survey Feedback (Feedback exceeds expectations)

This year, 114 senior-level students completed our Undergraduate Experience Exit Survey. The Results follow: 43.9% of students surveyed indicated that they plan to attend to graduate programs Communication Sciences and Disorders (36%) or Audiology (7.9%); 12.3% indicated that they plan to attend graduate programs in other fields; .9% indicated that they plan to pursue a PhD in Communication Sciences and Disorders; 28.1% indicated that they plan to pursue training and licensure as a Speech-Language Pathology Assistant (SLPA); 14% indicated that they planned to apply for entry level administrative jobs in health, education, or related environments; 18.5% indicated that they planned to do other things, such as take a year off or to enroll in additional coursework to improve GPA. While 22.8% indicated that they had applied to our Master's Degree program in Communication Sciences and Disorders, 19.3% indicated that they had applied for other Master's Degree programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders, 3.5% had applied to AuD programs, 1.8% had applied to Master's Degree programs in other fields, and .9% had applied to a PhD program in another field. At the time of the Survey (early May 2017), 56.5% of these students had received an admissions offer to the programs to which they had applied.

The overwhelming majority of our students are indicating that they feel that they have the knowledge and skills necessary to apply their coursework to careers and higher education in our field and related fields, including areas related to ASHA Knowledge Standard IV-B.

2. Positive Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback (Feedback exceeds expectations)

Feedback from our Community Advisory Committee indicates that we are preparing our students well for independent clinical practice, but that an increased focus increased awareness in areas related to adult learning models and working with adults in the area of coaching models for early intervention would be helpful. Professional behaviors, including absence reporting and making up missed time were also concerns. We have implemented curriculum discussions in our faculty meetings focusing on particular areas in our undergraduate curriculum, such as CSAD 112, 125, and 146. Through these discussions our faculty determine ways we can cover these foundational concepts before students apply to graduate programs. We have hired two new full time tenure track faculty members to begin in fall 2017. Their expertise and teaching ability will provide additional benefit to student learning and critical thinking in these areas. We will attend to continued outcomes in this area and expect to see higher levels of critical thinking in this area in future graduating cohorts.

-


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

Learning Outcomes Assessment Questions 2, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 22 require specific analysis to determine if the questions need further development (which affects the validity of this measure) or if curricular modifications or enhancements are appropriate. In fact, the faculty will review the overall results from the Learning Outcomes Assessment, paying particular attention to these questions, at our fall faculty retreat. We will assess the impact of any changes as part of our ongoing cycle of review and revision to this annual measure.

The department chair and will continue to monitor GPA in consultation with the office of the registrar/degree evaluation office through the graduation application process and will make tutoring referrals when a need is perceived. The Curriculum Committee will also continue to monitor course passage rates and faculty will offer student advising and suggestions for campus tutoring. Faculty will be provided with specific criteria for department-specific tutoring. NSSLHA student mentoring will also continue.

The 2016-17 *Praxis* results indicate 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. The chair will continue to monitor *Praxis* scores and share results with the faculty 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 employment settings. Students will be encouraged to take the *Praxis* at the end of the program, after they have had a variety of clinic experiences, including two internships, because the *Praxis* is designed to test both students' knowledge of our field's core content AND their ability to problem solve when given case studies related to practical application. We will continue to test both basic knowledge in our major and critical thinking in our major annually through our Learning Outcomes Assessment in order to ensure development in both areas across the curriculum and throughout the program. Dr. Roseberry-McKibbin, a member of our Curriculum Committee, will continue to address faculty on the creation of academic experiences that prepare students for the knowledge and skills required to pass the newest version of the *Praxis* exam. We also plan to continue our biannual discussion regarding our comprehensive examination structure in an attempt to ensure the case-study format provides additional preparation for students preparing to take the *Praxis*.

We will continue curriculum discussions in our faculty meetings focusing on particular areas in our graduate curriculum, such as CSAD 112, CSAD 125, and CSAD 146, where adult learning models and working with adults in the area of coaching models for early intervention, along with professional behaviors in the field, can be addressed. We have hired two new full time tenure-track faculty members to begin in fall 2017. Their expertise and teaching ability will provide additional benefit to student learning and critical thinking in these areas. We will attend to continued outcomes in this area, and to other areas identified by our Advisory Committee or by students in the Student Exit Survey in the future.

 No file attached

 No file attached
Q7.

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [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, Competency, and Perspectives
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. Global Learning and Perspectives
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☒ 18. Overall Disciplinary Knowledge
- ☐ 19. Professionalism
- ☒ 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a. b. c. **Q8.** Please attach any additional files here:
CALIPSO KASA 2017.docx
 50.7 KB

 No file attached

 No file attached

 No file attached
Q8.1.

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

Learning Outcomes Assessment Key

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) Knowledge and Skills Assessment (KASA) Curriculum Map

Program Information (**Required**)

Program:

129
pages.
File too
large to
include
in whole
form.

(If you typed your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q10)

Q9.

Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name appears above]

BS Speech Pathology & Audiology

Q10.

Report Author(s):

Robert Pieretti, PhD CCC-SLP

Q10.1.

Department Chair/Program Director:

Robert Pieretti, PhD CCC-SLP

Q10.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

Robert Pieretti, PhD CCC-SLP

Q11.

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Speech Pathology & Audio.

Q12.

College:

College of Health & Human Services

Q13.

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

Undergraduate 359
Second Bachelor's 29
Graduate: 84

Q14.

Program Type:

- ☒ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
☐ 2. Credential
☐ 3. Master's Degree
☐ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
☐ 5. Other, specify:

Q15. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

2

Q15.1. List all the names:

Communication Sciences and Disorders;

Second Bachelor of Science in Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSAD2B)(Formerly SBSSPA)

Q15.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

0

Q16. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

Q16.1. List all the names:

Communication Sciences and Disorders

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

0

Q17. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

1

Q17.1. List all the names:

Speech-Language Pathology Services with or without Special Class Authorization

Q18. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q18.1. List all the names:

| When was your assessment plan... | 1. Before 2011-12 | 2. 2012-13 | 3. 2013-14 | 4. 2014-15 | 5. 2015-16 | 6. 2016-17 | 7. No Plan | 8. Don't know |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Q19. developed? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Q19.1. last updated? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q19.2. (REQUIRED)

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:



Departmental Assessment Plan BS and SBSSPA.docx
32.83 KB

Q20.

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q20.1.

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:



CALIPSO KASA 2017.docx
50.7 KB

Q21.

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q22.

Does your program have a capstone class?

- ☐ 1. Yes, indicate:
☒ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q22.1.

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☒ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

ver. 5.15/17

Departmental Assessment Plan Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders

**BACHELOR OF SCIENCE: COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND
DISORDERS**

**SECOND BACHELOR OF SCIENCE: COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND
DISORDERS**

Note: Degree titles will change from “Speech Pathology and Audiology” to “Communication Sciences and Disorders” for cohorts entering the program in Fall 2016

Posted: **Spring 2016 (Revised 2017)**

ASSESSMENT PLAN

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE: COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND DISORDERS

SECOND BACHELOR OF SCIENCE: COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND DISORDERS

Mission Statement: Our mission is to train competent professionals in speech-language pathology and audiology with an appropriate scientific background, clinical skill, and an appreciation for the need to continue learning beyond formal academic training.

Strategic goals:

- Encourage innovative teaching, research opportunities, and scholarly activities
- Enhance community partnerships
- Provide quality academic and clinical training
- Support Student Success

I. Program Learning Outcomes

Our program is held to strict accreditation standards and required annual reporting as set forth by the Council on Academic Accreditation (CAA) of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). The accreditation standards are directly related to the knowledge and skills outcomes required of students applying for their national certification through ASHA. These knowledge and skills begin to develop at the undergraduate level. The undergraduate program sets the theoretical foundation (knowledge) and fosters the development of critical thinking (skills) for student knowledge and skill development at the graduate level.

The ASHA accreditation standards, which resonate with most, if not all, of the Sacramento State Program Learning Outcome areas, can be found at: <http://caa.asha.org/wp-content/uploads/Accreditation-Standards-for-Graduate-Programs.pdf>

The 2014 ASHA certification standards can be found at: <http://www.asha.org/Certification/2014-Speech-Language-Pathology-Certification-Standards/>

The Second Bachelor of Science Program requires the same program sequence as the Bachelor of Science program. It is offered through the College of Continuing Education (CCE). Students enrolled in the program possess a Bachelor's Degree in another field.

Upon completion of the bachelor's program, students in Communication Sciences and Disorders will demonstrate knowledge in advanced theories and methodology in our field. Upon completion of the program, they will also have begun to develop the critical thinking necessary to be a graduate student clinician. The following learning goals and outcomes, which are measured regularly, are aligned with the missions of the university and the department and our accrediting body, ASHA.

| | Undergraduate Program Learning Goals (PLGs) | Program Learning Outcome (PLOs) | Method of Data Collection |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | <p>Overall Competencies in the Major (BLG)</p> <p>ASHA Knowledge Standard IVC</p> | <p>To <u>begin</u> to demonstrate knowledge in the areas set forth by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) (2014).</p> <p>Students will <u>begin</u> to demonstrate knowledge of communication and swallowing disorders and differences, including the appropriate etiologies, characteristics, anatomical/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates in order to demonstrate knowledge across the nine major areas delineated by ASHA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) | <p>Direct Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Outcomes Assessment: 73% of senior students will answer 6 of the basic knowledge questions correctly. Note: 73% equates to a grade of C for the Cohort (6 questions equate to 60% of the basic knowledge acquired across the undergraduate and graduate programs) • 90% of the students will complete the program with a 2.5 GPA or higher in major coursework • National <i>Praxis</i> Exam: 90% of students will score 162 or higher <p>Indirect Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Alumni, Employer, and Student Survey Feedback • Positive Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>7) Cognitive aspects of communication (attention, memory, sequencing, problem-solving, executive functioning)</p> <p>8) Social aspects of communication (including challenging behavior, ineffective social skills, and lack of communication opportunities)</p> <p>9) Augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) modalities</p> | |
| 2 | <p>Critical Thinking (WSCUC)</p> <p>ASHA Skills Standard V-B</p> | <p>To <u>begin</u> to demonstrate <u>skills</u> in the areas set forth by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) (2014).</p> <p>Students will <u>begin</u> to demonstrate <u>potential</u> for clinical competence in the areas of Writing, Assessment (Evaluation), Treatment (Intervention), and Professional Behavior (Interaction and Personal Qualities) and <u>potential</u> for required clinical and internship experiences in order to demonstrate skills across the nine major areas delineated by ASHA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <p>Direct Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Outcomes Assessment: 73% of senior students will answer 7 of the <u>critical thinking</u> questions correctly • 90% of the students will complete the program with a 2.5 GPA or higher in major coursework • National <i>Praxis</i> Exam: 90% of students will score 162 or higher <p>Indirect Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Alumni, Employer, and Student Survey Feedback • Positive Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | <p>5) Hearing, including the impact on speech and language</p> <p>6) Swallowing (oral, pharyngeal, esophageal, and related functions, including oral function for feeding, orofacial myology)</p> <p>7) Cognitive aspects of communication (attention, memory, sequencing, problem-solving, executive functioning)</p> <p>8) Social aspects of communication (including challenging behavior, ineffective social skills, and lack of communication opportunities)</p> <p>9) Augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) modalities</p> | |
| 3 | <p>Overall Competencies in the Major (BLG)</p> <p>ASHA Knowledge Standard IV-A</p> <p>Human Cultures and the Physical World (BLG)</p> <p>Quantitative Reasoning and Information Literacy (WSCUC)</p> | <p>Students will demonstrate knowledge of the biological sciences, physical sciences, statistics, and the social/behavioral sciences</p> | <p>Direct Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Outcomes Assessment: 73% of senior students will answer 60% of the <u>IV-A</u> related questions correctly • Pre-major requirements: Upon admission to the program 100% of students will have successfully completed the following pre-major coursework: <i>Human Development Lifespan; Introduction to Psychology; Introduction to Statistics; Introduction to Sign Language</i> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% of the students will complete the program with a 2.5 GPA or higher in major coursework • National <i>Praxis</i> Exam: 90% of students will score 162 or higher <p>Indirect Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Alumni, Employer, and Student Survey Feedback • Positive Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback |
| 4 | <p>Overall Competencies in the Major (BLG)</p> <p>ASHA Knowledge Standard IV-B</p> | <p>Students will <u>begin</u> to demonstrate knowledge of basic human communication and swallowing processes, including the appropriate biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases. The applicant must have demonstrated the ability to integrate information pertaining to normal and abnormal human development across the lifespan.</p> | <p>Direct Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Outcomes Assessment: 73% of senior students will answer 60% of the IV-B related questions correctly • 90% of the students will complete the program with a 2.5 GPA or higher in major coursework • National <i>Praxis</i> Exam: 90% of students will score 162 or higher <p>Indirect Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Alumni, Employer, and |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Student Survey Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback |
| 5 | <p>Overall Competencies in the Major (BLG)/Intercultural knowledge and Competency</p> <p>ASHA Knowledge Standard IV-D</p> <p>Personal and Social Responsibility (BLG)</p> | <p>Students will <u>begin</u> to demonstrate, for each of the nine areas specified in Standard IVC, current 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.</p> | <p>Direct Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Outcomes Assessment: 73% of senior students will answer 60% of the IV-D related questions correctly • 90% of the students will complete the program with a 2.5 GPA or higher in major coursework • 90% of students will successfully complete the CSAD 143 Multilingual Language Disorders course with a grade of C or better • National <i>Praxis</i> Exam: 90% of students will score 162 or higher <p>Indirect Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Alumni, Employer, and Student Survey Feedback • Positive Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Inquiry and Analysis</p> <p>ASHA Knowledge Standard IV-F</p> <p>Integrative Learning and Inquiry and Analysis (BLG)</p> <p>Quantitative Reasoning and Information Literacy (WSCUC)</p> | <p>Students will <u>begin</u> to demonstrate knowledge of processes used in research and of the integration of research principles into evidence-based clinical practice</p> | <p>Direct Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Outcomes Assessment: 73% of senior students will answer 60% of the IV-F related questions correctly • 90% of the students will complete the program with a 2.5 GPA or higher in major coursework • 90% of students will successfully complete the CSAD 148 Research Methods Course with a Grade of C or better • National <i>Praxis</i> Exam: 90% of students will score 162 or higher <p>Indirect Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Alumni, Employer, and Student Survey Feedback • Positive Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback |
| 7 | <p>Overall Competencies in the Major (BLG)</p> <p>ASHA Knowledge Standard IV-G</p> | <p>Students will <u>begin</u> to demonstrate knowledge of contemporary professional issues</p> | <p>Direct Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Outcomes Assessment: 73% of senior students will answer 60% of the IV-G related |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>questions correctly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% of the students will complete the program with a 2.5 GPA or higher in major coursework • National <i>Praxis</i> Exam: 90% of students will score 162 or higher <p>Indirect Methods/Standards of Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Alumni, Employer, and Student Survey Feedback • Positive Biannual Advisory Committee Meeting Feedback |
|--|--|--|---|

II. OUTCOME MEASURES OF COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND DISORDERS STUDENTS

This outline identifies the tools and timelines for assessing our students, and how this information is used in the review and revision process. Our assessment process includes analyzing data provided from several sources, including our students' learning outcomes assessment, our students' performance in our coursework, our students' successful completion of pre-major requirements, our students' performance on the national *Praxis* exam, alumni, employer and student surveys, and feedback from our Community Advisory Committee.

Student Learning Outcome Assessment:

Tool Description: Each year, we distribute a 23-item multiple-choice learning assessment to each student in our program. The measure is made up of a focused set of questions in general areas of the curriculum, including specific targets related to the use and interpretation of normative data and basic to higher level distinctions between speech and language. Each question has only one correct answer. The assessment is useful in tracking candidates' mastery of basic knowledge in our major and as they progress through the program. It also provides information regarding the development of critical thinking, as 52% of the questions have been designed as "case study" questions that require a higher level of analysis and problem-solving in the style of our national *Praxis* exam.

The questions align to the seven specific PLO areas and to the ASHA Knowledge and Skills Certification Standards in the following manner:

| Question | PLOs Assessed | ASHA Knowledge/Skill Outcome Area Assessed | Critical Thinking (CT) Basic Knowledge (BK) |
|----------|---------------|--|--|
| 1 | 6,7 | IVF, IVG, V | CT |
| 2 | 4,1,7 | IVB, IV(C4), IVG | BK |
| 3 | 3,1,7 | IVA, IV(C3), IV(C4), IVG | BK |
| 4 | 1,7 | IV(C4), IVG | BK |
| 5 | 4,1,5,7 | IVB, IV(C4), IVD, IVG | BK |
| 6 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C4), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 7 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C4), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 8 | 3,1,7 | IVA, IV(C3), IVG | BK |
| 9 | 3,1,7 | IVA, IV(C3), IVG | BK |
| 10 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C4), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 11 | 4,5,6,7 | IVB, IVD, IVF, IVG | BK |
| 12 | 4,1,5,7 | IVB, IV(C1), IVD, IVG | BK |
| 13 | 3,4,1,5,7 | IVA, IVB, IV(C7), IVD, IVG | BK |
| 14 | 3,4,2,5,7 | IVA, IVB, VB(C7), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 15 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C8), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 16 | 4,2,5,7 | IVB, VB(C8), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 17 | 2,1 | VB(C5), IVG | CT |
| 18 | 3,1,7 | IVA, IV(C5), IVG | BK |
| 19 | 3,4,2,5,7 | IVA, IVB, VB(C6), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 20 | 1,5,7 | IV(C2), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 21 | 3,4,2,5,7 | IVA, IVB, VB(C3), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 22 | 3,4,2,5,7 | IVA, IVB, VB(C4), IVD, IVG | CT |
| 23 | 4,1,5,7 | IVB, IV(C9), IVD, IVG | BK |

Timeline: The assessment is distributed to each student enrolled in the program at the end of each academic year. The resulting data is analyzed each year in June and reviewed at the faculty retreat in August.

Use of Data in Review and Revision: 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 elements that are directly related to our PLOs. The overall analysis allows us to determine whether or not our students are meeting the predetermined standards of performance. The assessment is adjusted annually as needed in order to assess areas of perceived need that require pedagogical emphasis and the need for curriculum modification and development.

Performance in Coursework/GPA in Major

Tool Description: All undergraduate students complete the same sequence of hierarchical courses. Each course is tied to one or more of the 9 specific ASHA knowledge and skill areas and other specific ASHA certification standards. There is only one elective course (CSAD 146). A 2.5 GPA in this major coursework is required to graduate from our program.

Timeline: The Chair monitors GPA with the Registrar's Office as part of the graduation application process. The Curriculum Committee also annually reviews passage rates by course each semester. The Committee shares the results with faculty at both our fall and spring retreat.

Use of Data in Review and Revision: The Curriculum Committee evaluates whether or not our students are meeting the pre-determined standard of performance. Recommendations are considered by the department faculty for any proposed curricular changes consistent with the department's policies and procedures.

Completion of Pre-Major Requirements

Tool Description: Upon admission to the undergraduate course sequences, all students must provide proof of successful completion of Pre-Major Requirements (Human Development Lifespan; Introduction to Psychology; Introduction to Statistics; Introduction to Sign Language).

Timeline: Upon admission to the undergraduate course sequence.

Use of Data in Review and Revision: The Curriculum Committee evaluates whether or not our students are meeting the pre-determined standard of performance. Recommendations are considered by the department faculty for any proposed curricular changes consistent with the department's policies and procedures.

Graduates' performance on the National Speech Language Pathology *Praxis* Examination:

Tool Description: The *Praxis II* exam in Speech-Language Pathology is required, in addition to the earned Master's Degree and a required professional experience, in order to apply for the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) Certificate of Clinical Competence, the California License in Speech-Language Pathology, and the Clear California Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential with or without the Special Class Authorization. This summative assessment measures candidate's level of preparation for independent practice as a speech-language pathologist in all primary employment settings and is aligned to ASHA's student learning outcomes, particularly to the knowledge and skills in the 9 areas outlined in PLO1 and PLO2. A pass rate at the national average is threshold for curricular assessment. 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).

All of our graduate students have completed our undergraduate curriculum or its content equivalent (if their undergraduate degree was completed at another university). Foundational knowledge and skills required for graduate work and, ultimately, practice in the field of speech-language pathology begin in the undergraduate program. The *Praxis* results, therefore, are an indirect measure of the appropriateness of our undergraduate curriculum in preparing students for professional practice.

Timeline: The Chair receives regular reports from the national *Praxis* organization. The Chair shares the results with faculty at both our fall and spring retreat and with the Community Advisory Committee.

Use of Data in Review and Revision: The Curriculum Committee, which includes a faculty member with extensive knowledge of the *Praxis* examination, evaluates whether or not our students are meeting

the pre-determined standard of performance. Recommendations are considered by the department faculty for any proposed curricular changes consistent with the department's policies and procedures.

Alumni, Employer and Student surveys:

Tool Description: We distribute surveys to alumni, employers and students. The alumni and employer surveys are distributed electronically. Undergraduate students complete an Undergraduate Experience Exit Survey in a selected class. Graduate students complete a Brief Clinical Experience Survey in one of their methods class. There are sets of evaluative questions on each survey. All of the questions target evaluation of the quality of our program and/or the student experience

Timeline: The alumni and employer surveys are distributed every three years. The student surveys are distributed at the end of every academic year.

Use of Data in Review and Revision: The surveys are reviewed at the fall faculty retreat. If/when common themes emerge, the Curriculum Committee examines whether or not there are indications for needed curricular change. The Curriculum Committee submits any recommendations to the faculty for any proposed curricular changes consistent with the department's policies and procedures. Any evaluation of proposed curricular changes also takes into account the feedback and evaluation from multiple sources including our department advisory board.

Biannual Advisory Committee Meetings

Tool Description:

Our Community Advisory Committee 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 is provided to this group, 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 in the areas outlined in PLO1 and PLO2.

Timeline: Our Community Advisory Committee meets biannually (fall and spring).

Use of Data in Review and Revision: The chair of the Community Advisory Committee presents highlights from the meeting minutes to the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee evaluates the content to identify curricular implications, and presents the findings to the faculty. Recommendations are considered by the department faculty for any proposed curricular changes consistent with the department's policies and procedures. Proposed curricular changes take into account feedback from multiple sources, including our Community Advisory Committee.

III. Curriculum Map and Lines of Evidence

Curriculum Map and Lines of Evidence
I=Introduced, D=Developed, M=Mastered

| | PLO 1 | PLO 2 | PLO 3 | PLO 4 | PLO 5 | PLO 6 | PLO 7 | Lines of Evidence |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Human Development | | | IDM | | | | | Proof of Completion |
| Intro to Psych | | | IDM | | | | | Proof of Completion |
| Intro to Stats | | | IDM | | | I | | Proof of Completion |
| ASL I | IDM | IDM | | | | | | Proof of Completion |
| One Physical Science | | | IDM | | | | | Proof of Completion |
| One Biological Science | | | IDM | | | | | Proof of Completion |
| CSAD 110 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 111 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 112 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 145 | I | I | | I | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 125 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 126 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 130 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 123 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 142 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----|---|--|----|---|---|-----|---|
| CSAD 147 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 146 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 133 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 127 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 143 | IDM | I | | ID | I | I | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |
| CSAD 148 | IDM | I | | | | D | IDM | Assignments, Projects, Presentations, Quizzes and Exams |

IV. Assessment Timeline

While we measure many of the PLOs annually, the Curriculum Committee will focus on one or two program learning outcomes each year. The Curriculum Committee will evaluate the data collected and compare it to the predetermined standards of performance. The Committee will also identify curricular implications and present the findings to the faculty. Recommendations are considered by the department faculty for any proposed curricular changes consistent with the department's policies and procedures. Proposed curricular changes take into account feedback from multiple sources including, our department advisory board. The Curriculum Committee will assess the impact of the new changes on the student learning outcomes, student services, and student success and assess each learning outcome at least once every six years. The following is our detailed timeline.

| | PLO 1 | PLO 2 | PLO 3 | PLO 4 | PLO 5 | PLO 6 | PLO 7 |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 2015-16 | X | X | | | | | |
| 2016-17 | | | X | X | | | |
| 2017-18 | | | | | X | X | |
| 2018-19 | | | | | | | X |
| 2019-20 | X | X | | | | | |
| 2020-21 | | | X | X | | | |