Dear Dr. O’Hanlon,

I am pleased to inform you that during its meeting on February 16, 2012 the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (CAA) voted to re-accredit the graduate education program in speech-language pathology at California State University, Sacramento for a period of 8 years beginning December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2019.

The issues related to standards compliance provided in the attached Accreditation Action Report must be addressed in the program’s next CAA report. The CAA expects that the program will demonstrate full compliance with the standards cited by the time of the next CAA report. If there is not sufficient evidence of full compliance by that date, the program’s accreditation may be in jeopardy, in keeping with the US Department of Education’s criteria for CAA’s recognition:

(b) if the institution or program does not bring itself into compliance within the specified period, the agency must take immediate adverse action unless the agency, for good cause, extends the period for achieving compliance.

The program’s first annual report will be submitted using an on-line format via the Higher Education System on February 1, 2013. Four months prior to the due date of the program’s next CAA report, the program director will be sent an email notification indicating the timeline for completing this report.

The CAA considers timely submission of all accreditation reports and fees a critical condition for continued accredited status. Thus, a program will be placed on Administrative Probation when it has not met its reporting and/or financial expectations to the CAA. Administrative Probation is an action taken by the CAA as a result of failure, by established deadlines, to complete and file
any accreditation report, including all special requests for information or pay annual accreditation fees.

Public Notice of Accreditation Status:
The CAA requires programs to disclose accurate information about their accreditation status, to include the specific degree program awarded candidacy or accreditation, along with the full name, address, and phone number of the accrediting agency:

**Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology**
American Speech-Language Hearing Association
2200 Research Boulevard #310
Rockville, MD 20850
800-498-2071

Refer to Chapter II.c of the CAA Accreditation Manual for the appropriate language to use in publicizing your program’s accreditation status, which may be found on the CAA Web site at:
http://www.asha.org/academic/accreditation/accredmanual/section2c.htm#process9

Notification of Changes:
When the CAA awards an accreditation status, it does so based on the expectation that the program will continue to comply with all accreditation standards over the term of accreditation. On occasion, changes occur prior to the next regularly scheduled CAA report and require immediate notification to the CAA. These include:
1. Changes in institutional accreditation status
2. Program director changes
3. Administrative structure changes
4. Program closure

Should any of these changes occur prior to your next CAA report, please refer to the detailed information about the CAA’s policies and procedures, which are available under the Public Notification section of the CAA Accreditation Manual and may be found on the CAA web site at:
http://www.asha.org/academic/accreditation/accredmanual/section2c.htm.

Congratulations to you, the faculty, and staff in the program, as well as the administration, on this national distinction.

Sincerely,

Dan C. Halling, PhD, Chair
Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology

cc: Dr. Alexander Gonzalez, President
    Susan Flesher, Associate Director, Accreditation Services
    CAA Members
The Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology took the following accreditation action at its February 16, 2012 meeting regarding the following program:

Name of Program: California State University, Sacramento

File #: 119

Professional Area:  
- Audiology [ ]  
- Speech-Language Pathology [x]  

Residential Program [x]  
Distance Education [ ]  
Satellite Campus [ ]  
Contractual Arrangement [ ]  

Degree Designator: M.S.


Action Taken: Re-Accredit

Effective Date: February 16, 2012

New Accreditation Cycle: December 1, 2011 – November 30, 2019

Next Review: Annual Report due February 1, 2013

Notices: The program is advised to adhere to the following notices that are appended to this report.

- COMPLIANCE EXPECTATIONS
- PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF ACCREDITATION STATUS
In its comprehensive review, the CAA found the program to be in compliance with all accreditation standards except those noted below.

**AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE**
The program was determined not to be in compliance with the following standards for accreditation. Non-compliance means that the program does not have in place the essential elements necessary to meet the standard. The program should report its progress made toward addressing these concerns in the Prior Concerns section of the next Annual Report or according to the time line specified below. The CAA will indicate in its review of that report whether the program has adequately addressed these areas.

- There are no areas of non-compliance.

**AREAS OF PARTIAL COMPLIANCE**
The program is in partial compliance with the following standards. Partial compliance means that the program has in place some, but not all, of the essential elements necessary to meet all aspects of the standard. The program should report its progress made toward addressing these concerns in the Prior Concerns section of the next Annual Report or according to the time line specified below. The CAA will indicate in its review of that report whether the program has adequately addressed these areas.

- There are no areas of partial-compliance.

**AREAS FOR FOLLOW-UP (clarification/verification)**
The program should provide an update in the next Annual Report on the issues related to the following standards. The CAA did not determine the program to be out of compliance with these standards at this time, but will require additional information in the next Annual Report in order to monitor the program’s continued compliance in the stated areas.

**Standard: 5.1**

**Evidence/Rationale:**
Most tracking of knowledge and skills outcomes is based primarily on class grades and earning a grade of “B” or better indicates successful completion of all knowledge and skills outcomes in classes. The program indicated that it has taken steps to rectify this situation and has implemented a process whereby it more closely tracks specific knowledge and skills acquisition in a more formative way over the course of the semester in classes.

**Steps to be Taken:**
In the next Annual Report please provide an update on the program’s continued progress in implementing the revised process for tracking students’ acquisition of knowledge and skills.
As a recognized accrediting agency, the CAA has evaluated the program regarding its performance with respect to student achievement and provides the following report, as required by the US Secretary of Education [34 CFR 602.17(f)(2)].

PERFORMANCE WITH RESPECT TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Comments/Observations:

The CAA assessed the program’s performance with respect to student achievement and found the program to meet or exceed the established CAA expectations (as described in accreditation standard 5.0-Assessment) in the following checked areas. Details regarding any of these areas not found to be in compliance are described earlier in this report.

- Program Completion Rates
- Employment Rates
- Praxis Examination Rates

COMPLIANCE EXPECTATIONS

CAA’s recognition by the United States Department of Education (ED) requires that, if an accrediting agency’s review of a program under any standard indicates that the program is not in compliance with that standard, the agency must require the program to take appropriate action to bring itself into compliance with the agency’s standards within a time period that must not exceed two years. [34 CFR 602.20(a)(2)(iii)] If, after review of a reaccreditation application or an Annual Report, the program remains out of compliance with any standard and sufficient progress toward compliance has not been demonstrated, CAA may act to place the program on probation in accordance with the policy and procedures outlined in the Accreditation Manual on the CAA Web site. If the program does not bring itself into compliance within the specified period, the accrediting agency must take immediate adverse action. If the program continues to remain out of compliance with any standard at the end of the specified period, CAA will withdraw accreditation, unless the CAA judges the program to be making a good faith effort to come into compliance with the standards criteria. In such case the CAA may, for good cause, extend the period for achieving compliance and may determine to continue the accreditation cycle and to monitor the program’s progress. CAA defines a “good faith effort” as 1) an appropriate plan for achieving compliance within a reasonable time frame, 2) a detailed timeline for completion of the plan, 3) evidence that the plan has been implemented according to the established timeline, and 4) reasonable assurance that the program can and will achieve compliance as stated in the plan.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF THIS DECISION AND ACCREDITATION STATUS BY THE PROGRAM AND INSTITUTION

The US Department of Education recognition requires all recognized accrediting agencies to provide for the public correction of incorrect or misleading information an accredited or preaccredited institution or program releases about accreditation or preaccreditation status, contents of reports of on-site reviews, and accrediting or preaccrediting actions with respect to the institution or program. [34 CFR 602.23(d) and 602.23(e)] The institution and program must make accurate public disclosure of the accreditation or preaccreditation status awarded to the program. If the institution or program chooses to disclose any
additional information within the scope of the ED rule, such disclosure also must be accurate. Any public disclosure of information within the scope of the rule must include the CAA’s name, address, and telephone number as described in the Accreditation Manual located on the CAA Web site. If an institution or program misrepresents or distorts any action by the CAA with respect to any aspect of the accreditation process, its accreditation status, the contents of the site visit report, or final CAA accreditation actions or decisions, the CAA will notify the chief executive officer of the institution and the program director, informing them that corrective action must be taken. If corrective action is not taken, the CAA will release a public statement that provides correct information and may invoke other sanctions as may be appropriate. If the Accreditation unit discovers that an institution or program has released incorrect or misleading information within the scope of the ED rule, then it, acting on behalf of CAA, will make public correction, and it reserves the right to disclose this Accreditation Action Report in its entirety for that purpose.