



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Ensuring Educator Excellence

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report**
(For Institutions in the Yellow, Blue, and Violet Cohort Due Summer/Fall 2012)
Academic Years 2010-11 and 2011-12

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Institution | California State University, Fresno | |
| Date report is submitted | August 1, 2012 | |
| Program documented in this report | Deaf Education | |
| Name of Program | Deaf Education | |
| Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other) | Traditional | |
| Credential awarded | Education Specialist: Deaf and hard of hearing | |
| Is this program offered at more than one site? No | | |
| If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered | | |
| Program Contact | Don Freed | |
| Title | Department Chair | |
| Phone # | (559) 278-2029 | |
| E-Mail | donfr@csufresno.edu | |
| If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below: | | |
| Name | Nan Barker | |
| Title | Deaf Education faculty | |
| Phone # | (559) 278-6940 | |
| E-mail | nanb@csufresno.edu | |

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information California State University, Fresno (2012-2013) Advanced Programs – Deaf Education

California State University, Fresno, also known as Fresno State, is one of the 23 campuses of the California State University system, primarily serving the San Joaquin valley. Fresno State has approximately 21,000 culturally rich and diverse students in bachelor's degree, master's degree and two doctoral programs, which are divided into eight colleges and 82 departments. The Department of Communicative Disorders and Deaf Studies (CDDS), housed in the College of Health and Human Services, offers undergraduate degrees in audiology, speech language pathology, deaf education, and interpreting, in addition to graduate degrees in speech pathology and deaf education. Deaf Studies encompass deaf education, American Sign Language (ASL), Deaf culture and interpreting courses. CDDS faculty work closely with the Kremen School of Education and Human Development faculty and staff to coordinate credential requirements for the Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing credential as well as the Speech-Language Pathology Services credential.

The deaf education program began in the fall of 1969 and, by 1972, had a program director and two additional full time tenure track faculty. Currently in Deaf Studies, deaf education and interpreting combined, there are 3 full time faculty, one open tenure track position and 9 part time faculty members. There are approximately 56 undergraduate, 7 graduate and 20 Level II credential students in deaf education programs; and 64 undergraduate students in the interpreting program.

For most students, the deaf education program requires an average of four years of full time study. Ideally, this begins when the student is a junior and concludes after two years of graduate study. These four years prepare the candidates for the California Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Preliminary teaching credential and Council on Education of the Deaf (CED) certification. Depending on the student's individual program of study, Master's Degree requirements typically require one additional semester to complete.

Deaf Education credential students take 46 undergraduate units in the CDDS department, 22 units of teacher preparation coursework from the Kremen School of Education, and 35 units of CDDS graduate coursework for a total of 103 units. With one additional semester of coursework and a culminating experience, students can satisfy the requirements for a Master's Degree in Deaf Education. Students who choose to complete the Phase III of the Multiple Subject credential program are eligible for a Multiple Subject Preliminary credential.

Program Specific Candidate Information

Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported

| Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option | 2010-11 | | 2011-2012 | |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | Number of Candidates | Number of Completers/ Graduates | Number of Candidates | Number of Completers/ Graduates |
| | <u>16</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>12</u> | <u>6</u> |

Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity (Biennial Report, Program Assessment or Site Visit). Please include approximate date changes were initiated. (Brevity/bulleted format are highly encouraged).

The new program document was submitted February 2012 to the Commission. The program is awaiting comments on the document.

The Communicative Disorders and Deaf Studies search committee is advertising for candidates to apply for the open tenure track position.

The university curriculum and budget committees have approved the conversion of seven graduate level Deaf Education courses from a face to face format to an 80/20 hybrid online format. Upon WASC approval, the program changes will become effective in Fall 2013.

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

Assessments of Candidates and Completers

Candidates for the DHH credential are assessed at various points in the program. In order to apply for the graduate program, candidates must have passed all undergraduate coursework in deaf education. CDDS 164 School Subjects for the Deaf, an undergraduate course, has a practicum component where students work one on one with a DHH student, under the supervision of university faculty. Candidates must demonstrate preliminary skills in writing lesson plans and interacting with DHH students. In the 2011-2012 academic school year, all 11 students who took CDDS 164 successfully completed the course. In the academic school year 2010-2011, all 13 students successfully completed the course and 8 students applied for the Deaf Education graduate program or the Multiple Subject credential program.

CDDS 164 Students

| | Continuing in BA degree program | Applied and admitted to deaf education grad program and continuing in DE program | Pursuing Multiple Subject Credential only | BA degree only. Not pursuing credential or advanced degree at this time |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Fall 2011 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Fall 2010 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

Graduate School Applications

Student applying for the graduate credential program in Deaf Education must have a 3.0 GPA in the last 60 units and a 3.0 GPA in all CDDS coursework, provide three letters of recommendation, submit a letter of intent, and GRE scores to the Communicative Disorders and Deaf Studies Department. All complete applications are evaluated and reviewed by the CDDS Department Graduate Committee and recommendations for acceptance must be approved by the faculty.

For admission for Fall 2011 in the CDDS graduate programs, there were 8 complete applications to the deaf education graduate degree program. One student was denied admission based on GPA. One students was accepted as a post bac student to complete necessary prerequisite coursework. One student accepted for the deaf education graduate program chose to postpone her deaf education graduate work while she completed credential courses. Three students were

accepted, began to take Multiple Subject credential classes, then left the university for personal reasons. Two students accepted are taking graduate level Deaf Education courses.

For admission for Fall 2010 application period, 8 students applied and were accepted into the deaf education graduate program. One student transferred from the DHH Credential program to a Mild/Moderate credential program. Seven students accepted continued in the DHH program.

Graduate School Coursework

Student progress throughout the graduate program is measured by student writing samples in CDDS 200 Graduate Studies and Research, cumulative projects in CDDS 263 Seminar in Language for DHH Children and Youth, practicum evaluations in CDDS 262 Seminar in Speech for DHH Children and Youth, and a comprehensive Theme Unit with differentiated instruction in CDDS 264 Seminar in School Subjects for DHH Children and Youth. Candidates have one 30 hour practicum in a DHH classroom in the first year of graduate school where they receive feedback from Master teachers in the field. All current graduate students have satisfied the expectations for courses they have completed. Students admitted for Fall 2010 have not completed any graduate coursework yet.

CDDS 200 Graduate Studies and Research

The CDDS department designed Graduate Level Writing Skill assessment includes an in-class spontaneous essay and a research proposal. Organization of written work, spelling, grammar, and use of American Psychological Association guidelines are evaluated. Students who do not pass the in-class essay are given a second opportunity to write a second spontaneous essay on a new topic during the semester. Students who do not receive a grade of B or better on the research proposal are allowed to make changes and resubmit the proposal.

| Writing Proficiency | Fall 2010 |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| | First attempt |
| Student #1 | pass |
| Student #2 | pass |
| Student #3 | pass |
| Student #4 | pass |
| Student #5 | pass |
| Student #6 | pass |

CDDS 262 Seminar in Speech for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children and Youth

Practicum performance is evaluation the following areas: teaching effectiveness (including perceptiveness and flexibility),ability to communicate with client, quality of lesson plans, quality of clinical materials, implementation of professor’s suggestions and punctuality (of lesson plans and practicum attendance) All students demonstrated acceptable teaching skills in speech practicum.

| Speech Practicum Evaluation | Fall 2010 |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Student #1 | 98/100 |
| Student #2 | 99/100 |
| Student #3 | 99/100 |

| | |
|------------|---------|
| Student #4 | 100/100 |
| Student #5 | 98/100 |
| Student #6 | 96/100 |

CDDS 263 Seminar in Language for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children and Youth

In the Cummin's Model/Bloom's Taxonomy - Differentiated Instruction Assignment, students draw, label, and explain the Cummin's Model, incorporating Bloom's Taxonomy. Students focus on one content standard and create appropriate activities for each of the quadrants. Activities must be context embedded/context reduced, cognitively undemanding/cognitively demanding as appropriate based on specific quadrant of the model. Activities must also show appropriate level thinking skills, based on Bloom's.

Students present his/her assignment to peers and they will work together as a group to refine the activities.

Scores are based on assignment prior to students working with classmates and making revisions. Students that receive a grade lower than a B- have the option of meeting with the instructor to go over concepts, and then re-doing the assignment for a possible additional 10 points.

| Cummins Model Project | Fall 2010 |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| Student #1 | 92% |
| Student #2 | 91% |
| Student #3 | 96% |
| Student #4 | 89% |
| Student #5 | 90% |
| Student #6 | 96% |

CDDS 264 Seminar in School Subjects for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children and Youth

For the Theme Unit project, students design and write a thematic unit based on a California Curriculum Framework that incorporates: differentiation, active learning strategies, adaptations for DHH students, assessment including rubrics. Units are based on the Differentiation in Practice unit frameworks from the Tomlinson & Eidsen text:

Tomlinson, C. & C. Eidson (2003). Differentiation in Practice: A Resource Guide for Differentiating Curriculum (Grades K-5). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development ISBN 0871207605. Students present this project to the whole class at the end of the semester and are evaluated using weighted rubric for a possible total of 100 pts.

| Theme Unit | Fall 2010 |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Student #1 | 91/100 |
| Student #2 | 93/100 |
| Student #3 | 90/100 |
| Student #4 | 94/100 |
| Student #5 | 86/100 |
| Student #6 | 89/100 |

Final Student Teaching Evaluations

Final student teaching evaluations for Education Specialist: DHH candidates are completed by their Master teachers midway through the final student teaching placement and again at the end of the placement. Candidates are evaluated in multiple aspects of teaching and professional attitudes. Evaluations were collected and evaluated after the first 8 week placement, CDDS 258. Results indicate students were adequately prepared to begin their student teaching experience with basic competence and demonstrated improvement during the 8 week placement. Ratings are based on a four point scale with one being does not meet standard, two is basic, three is proficient, and four is exemplary.

Student Teaching Evaluations SUMMARY

Spring 2011

| | Student #1 | Student #2 | Student #3 | Student #4 | Student #5 | Student #6 | AVE. ALL |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|

Communication

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 3.0 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.1 |
| Final | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.3 | ** | 4.0 | 2.8 | 3.6 |

Planning

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 3.0 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| Final | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.6 | ** | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.7 |

Assessment

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Final | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.9 | ** | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.7 |

Environment

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 2.8 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 3.0 |
| Final | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.3 | ** | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.6 |

Teaching

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 2.8 | 3.6 | 3.0 | | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.8 |
| Final | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.2 | ** | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.6 |

Professionalism

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|-----|
| Mid | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 3.3 |
| Final | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.8 | ** | 4.0 | 2.5 | 3.6 |

** Student was hired prior to completing eight week placement.

**Student Teaching
Evaluations
SUMMARY**

Spring 2012

| | Student #1 | Student #2 | Student #3 | Student #4 | Student #5 | Student #6 | Ave ALL Students |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|

Communication

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 3.1 |
| Final | 3.7 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.7 |

Planning

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Final | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.9 |

Assessment

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 3.8 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 3.1 |
| Final | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.7 |

Environment

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 2.1 | 3.2 |
| Final | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 3.8 |

Teaching

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 2.1 | 3.2 |
| Final | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.9 |

Professionalism

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mid | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 3.5 |
| Final | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.0 |

All student teachers showed an increase in overall assessment in each area of the evaluation and were adequately prepared for their final externship placement for the last eight weeks of the semester.

Comprehensive Exams

Six graduate students took deaf education comprehensive exams January 2012. Students demonstrated content knowledge specific to deaf and hard of hearing students with written exams, receptive and expressive sign language video, and oral exams as needed. One student did not pass at least four sections of the written portion of the Comprehensive Exams and will retake the exam Jan 2013 after completing student teaching.

| Deaf Ed Comprehensive Exams January 2012 Written questions | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------|
| | Area I | Area II | Area III | Area IV | Area V | Area VI | Action taken | Result |
| | <i>Sign Language</i> | <i>Speech</i> | <i>Aural Rehab</i> | <i>School Subjects</i> | <i>Language</i> | <i>Assessment</i> | | |
| Student #1 | marginal pass | pass | marginal pass | pass | marginal pass | pass | Orals all areas | passed |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------|
| Student #2 | pass | pass | pass | pass | marginal pass | pass | Orals Area V | passed |
| Student #3 | marginal pass | marginal pass | marginal pass | pass | marginal pass | marginal pass | Re-write entire exam 2013 | |
| Student #4 | pass | pass | pass | pass | pass | pass | | passed |
| Student #5 | marginal pass | pass | pass | pass | pass | pass | Orals Area I | passed |
| Student #6 | marginal pass | pass | pass | marginal pass | marginal pass | pass | Orals all areas | passed |

Exit Interviews

All credential candidates at Fresno State participate in the Kremen School of Education and Human Development NCATE Unit – Program Evaluation upon Exit survey. Student responses are included in the University NCATE report.

Student Outcomes Assessment Plan (SOAP)

The Deaf Education program is part of the Communicative Disorders and Deaf Studies Department (CDDS). Student outcomes are measured for all CDDS students each academic by a variety of measures. For the 2010-2011 academic year student teaching/clinic evaluations, the graduate writing requirement, and comprehensive exam results were reviewed and the results follow.

Department of Communicative Disorders and Deaf Studies

Summary of Outcome Assessment Program Results: 2010-2011

The Communicative Disorders and Deaf Studies (CDDS) Department has a SOAP plan that includes multiple graduate and undergraduate measures that are scheduled on a 5-year cycle where each measure is administered 1 to 3 times over the five year period (see schedule on p. 28 of our SOAP). There are a total of eight graduate measures (4 direct and 4 indirect), and four undergraduate measures (2 direct and 2 indirect). The graduate outcome measures specified for the 2010-2011 academic year in the Student Outcome Assessment Plan included: (1)

Clinic/Student Teaching Evaluations, (2) **Pass Rate for the Graduate Writing Requirement**, and (3) **Comprehensive Exams**. The direct undergraduate outcome measure specified for this period was the **Final Practicum Evaluations for CDDS 164**. The indirect measure specified for this period was the **Undergraduate Exit Questionnaire**.

Undergraduate Program

Two new undergraduate measures were implemented this year, including 1 direct measures and 1 indirect measure. We piloted our undergraduate exit questionnaire on line, in hopes of converting our graduate questionnaires to an on-line format if it was a success.

INSTRUMENT: Final Practicum Evaluations for CDDS 164. (direct)

The Final Practicum Evaluations for this class was selected because it represents a Senior-level class and culminating experiences within the Deaf Education Programs (the SLP class was assessed last year and the Interpreting class will be assessed next year). A detailed description of this culminating experience, as well as the grading rubric used to evaluate it is available in the

SOAP. This measure was first implemented (piloted) in the Fall 2010 semester. Evaluations were completed by multiple instructors/supervisors.

LEARNING OUTCOMES THAT WERE ASSESSED

The students will demonstrate understanding and application of basic knowledge within their selected discipline.

The students will write a professional report within their discipline.

The students will establish appropriate and measurable goals for potential clients or students.

The students will demonstrate the ability to assess an individual’s speech, language, auditory or communication skills.

The student will communicate effectively with potential clients, students, or consumers.

The student will demonstrate professional behavior within their discipline.

RESULTS:

| GOALS/ Learning Outcomes Addressed | Results |
|---|----------------|
| At least 80% of the DE students will demo. satisfactory performance in the application of knowledge gained in their UG coursework, as indicated by achieving a score of at least 30/40 on the Practicum Grading Rubric for CDDS 164. | Met (92%) |
| At least 80% of DE students will produce a satisfactory professional report within their discipline as indicated by a score of at least 15/20 on the Practicum Journal Rubric for CDDS 164. | Not Met (67%) |
| At least 80% of DE students will demo ability to establish appropriate goals & recommendations for their assigned clients or students by obtaining an average score of 2.5 or higher for questions #5 & 6 on the grading rubric for CDDS 164. | Met (100%) |
| At least 80% of DE students will demo satisfactory performance in the assessment of their student’s/client’s speech, language, auditory, or communication skills as indicated by obtaining an average score of 2.5 or higher for questions #3 & 4 on the grading rubric for CDDS 164. | Met (92%) |
| At least 80% of DE student will demo effective communication with clients, students, or consumers as indicated by obtaining an average score of 2.5 or higher for questions #3 & 4 on the grading rubric for CDDS 164. | Met (92%) |
| At least 80% of DE students will demonstrate satisfactory professional behavior as indicated obtaining an average score of 2.5 or higher for questions #7, 8, 9, 10 on the grading rubric for CDDS 164 | Met (100%) |

ACTIONS TAKEN:

The only objective that was not met was #2. As this was the first time data was collected for this item and using this rubric, the decision was made to continue monitoring it in order to determine whether this is a trend unique occurrence. In addition, the Deaf Education faculty has asked to review and evaluate the rubric to make sure that it is capturing the students’ professional writing

abilities in the way they intended. They will report back to the faculty regarding any potential changes to the rubric.

INSTRUMENT: Undergraduate Exit Questionnaire (indirect)

An on-line undergraduate exit survey was piloted during the 2010-2011 academic year. A total of 42 students completed the survey: 4 for Audiology, 5 for Deaf Education, 3 for Sign Language Interpreting, and 30 for Speech-Language Pathology. In the survey, students were asked to rate a number of statements with: No Opinion = 0, Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, or Strongly Disagree = 1. Our goal was that 80% of students would indicate that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with statements regarding their skill levels associated with the learning outcomes listed below.

LEARNING OUTCOMES THAT WERE ASSESSED:

The students will demonstrate understanding and application of basic knowledge within their selected discipline.

The students will write a professional report within their discipline.

The students will demonstrate the ability to assess an individual’s speech, language, auditory or communication skills.

Sign Language Interpreting and Deaf Education students will communicate effectively using ASL with potential clients, students, or consumers.

RESULTS:

| Learning Outcome | Average of the ratings for each learning outcome (0-4) | | | | 80% Goal: Met or Not Met (NM) |
|------------------|--|------|-----|-----|--|
| | AUD | SLP | DE | SLI | |
| 1 | 4.0 | 3.62 | 3.4 | 3.3 | Met for all |
| 2 | 3.0 | 3.36 | 3.2 | 3.0 | Met for SLP, DE, SLI NM for AUD (50%) |
| 4 | 3.25 | 3.41 | 3.0 | 3.0 | Met for all |
| 5 | 3.67 | 3.31 | 3.0 | 3.3 | Met for all |

In addition to the ratings described above, a number of narrative comments were received. These comments were shared, verbatim, with the faculty.

Graduate Program

MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT: Clinic/Student Teaching Evaluations

Each semester, Clinical Supervisors and Master Teachers complete an evaluation of students under their supervision. Those items reflecting on student performance for the learning outcomes below will be averaged and tracked across semesters. For SLP students, the goal is that 90% or more of students will achieve an average rating of at least 4 (on a 5 point scale) for applicable items. For DE students the goal is that 80% or more of students will achieve an average of at least 3 (on a 4 point scale) for applicable items.

LEARNING OUTCOMES THAT WERE ASSESSED:

- Students will analyze ideas, make critical evaluations, and come to well-reasoned conclusions. (SLP Eval: Area I) (DE Eval: Area II, #1, 2, 3)

- Students will solve problems in clinical or educational settings by generating multiple solutions and selecting those most appropriate to meet the needs of the individual in question. (SLP Eval: Area I)
- Students will demonstrate professional communication skills. (SLP Eval: Area IV & Area VI, #1-2) (DE Eval: Area I)
- Students will assess an individual's ability or performance and will appropriately interpret and apply this information. (SLP Eval: Area II) (DE Eval: Area III)
- SLP and DE graduates will demonstrate the skills needed to plan, implement, evaluate and modify educational or clinical interventions across a wide range of students and clients. (SLP Eval: Area III) (DE Eval: Area V)
- Graduates will establish a learning or clinical environment that enhances the maximum growth of students or clients. (DE Eval: Area IV)
- Graduates will develop effective professional relationships with individuals, their family members, caregivers, and with professionals across disciplines. (SLP Eval: Area VI, #2, 4, 7) (DE Eval: Area VI)
- Graduates will appreciate, understand, and productively apply multicultural information. (SLP Eval: Area VI, #4, 7, 10) (DE Eval: Area I, #4, 5, 6 & Area II, #4)

RESULTS:

A total of 139 Student Practicum Evaluations were completed on SLP Graduate students during the 3 semesters of the 2010-2011 academic year. This goal was met for all learning outcomes, as described below:

| Learning Outcome | Items Assessed | % of students meeting the objective |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Area II: Academic & Clinical Knowledge Base | 97% |
| 2 | Area I: Academic & Clinical Knowledge Base | 97% |
| 3 | Area IV: Writing Skills Area VI: Professionalism & Ethics, Quest#1-2 | 92% |
| 4 | Area II: Diagnostic Skills | 96% |
| 5 | Area III: Treatment Skills | 96% |
| 7 | Area VI: Professionalism & Ethics, Quest#2, 4, 7 | 100% |
| 8 | Area VI: Professionalism & Ethics, Quest# 4, 7, 10 | 100% |

A total of 6 Student Teaching Evaluations were completed on DE Graduate Students during the 2010-2011 academic year. This goal was met for all learning outcomes, as described below:

| Learning Outcome | Items Assessed | % of students meeting the objective |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Area II: Quest. 1,2,3 | 100% |
| 3 | Area I | 100% |
| 4 | Area III | 100% |
| 5 | Area V | 100% |
| 6 | Area IV | 100% |
| 7 | Area VI | 83% |
| 8 | Area I: Quest# 4, 5, 6 & Area II: Quest.4 | 100% |

ACTIONS TAKEN:

For both programs, no specific actions were taken because the overall goal was met. We currently have a system in place that requires supervisors to evaluate and provide feedback to students at least 3 times during the semester, allowing problems to be addressed as quickly as possible. If the student continues to have problems, a meeting is held with the supervisor and an action plan is developed in order to facilitate student success by the end of the semester. The results described above support this system as effective in promoting clinical competence in our students.

MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT: Pass Rate for the Graduate Writing Requirement

The graduate writing requirement requires the students to develop a research proposal that is supported by a substantial literature review and written in APA format. Our goal states that 80% of our graduate students will pass it on their first attempt.

LEARNING OUTCOMES THAT WERE ASSESSED:

Student writing will demonstrate a critical evaluation and well-reasoned conclusion regarding the assigned topic.

Student's will read, understand, and apply research literature and engage in productive research activities.

Student writing will reflect a professional level of written communication.

RESULTS:

A total of 36 speech pathology and deaf education students participated in the graduate writing exam. In Fall 2010, a total of 23 out of 24 students passed the first time, for an overall pass rate of 95.83%, thus meeting our goal. In the Spring 2011, however, only 2 out of 18 students passed the first time, for a pass rate of 11.11%.

ACTIONS TAKEN:

The high failure rate in Spring 2011 was concerning. Analysis of the reasons for failure showed that a high percentage of the lost points were due to errors in the students' use of APA format. Therefore, the importance of APA format was reviewed (all students are required to have the APA manual), and the students were asked to resubmit their papers with all students passing on the second try. In order to avoid this problem in the following semester (Fall 2011), the faculty had students turn in one portion of the paper in advance in order to receive feedback, prior to writing and turning in the entire paper. This was very successful and resulted in a 100% first time pass rate in Fall 2011. This new procedure has been adopted for the time being.

MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT: Comprehensive Exams

Graduate students in deaf education are required to pass comprehensive exams in 6 areas: sign language, speech, aural rehabilitation, school subjects, language, and assessments.

Comprehensive Exams include both a written portion and an oral portion. Our goal is that at least 80% of students will pass in each area.

LEARNING OUTCOMES THAT WERE ASSESSED:

Students will analyze ideas, make critical evaluations, and come to well-reasoned conclusions.

Students will read, understand, and apply research literature.

Students will solve clinical problems by generating multiple solutions and selecting those most appropriate to meet the needs of the individual in question.

Students will demonstrate professional communication skills.

Students will understand and apply foundational information in anatomical, physiological, neurological, psychological, and sociological aspects of human communication.

Students will assess an individual's ability or performance and will appropriately interpret and apply this information.

Students will plan, implement, evaluate, and modify interventions across a wide range of clients.

RESULTS:

This goal was met for all areas. In Jan 2012, the overall pass rate was 86% with scores in each area ranging from 83% to 100%. One specific skill we have been tracking since it was identified as a problem in Fall 2009 and targeted for correction, is the students ability to write measureable goals and objectives. Significant improvements have been noted since an action plan was put in place. There was a pass rate of 100% in January 2012 for Area 4 where this skill was included in the exam. We will re-assess again in January 2013.

ACTIONS TAKEN:

No specific actions were taken because the overall goal was met and the pass rate showed that the students demonstrated competency regarding the learning outcomes that were targeted during the comprehensive exams.

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Please also see notes of results and actions taken reported in the Student Outcomes Assessment Report for 2010-2011 in Part II above.

Review of candidate data indicates students are progressing through the program of study. Students who do not maintain the necessary 3.0 GPA for graduate program entrance, but meet the GPA requirements for other credentials have the option of completing a Multiple Subject credential only. Students who apply and are accepted into the Deaf Education graduate program take credential courses also required for a Multiple Subject credential. For students who cannot attend school full time throughout the graduate program, completing a semester of student teaching with hearing children allows them to return to the work force sooner than is required for the deaf and hard of hearing credential.

Program data shows graduate students in deaf education are progressing and most are completing the program. Student teaching evaluations show the greatest growth in evaluation scores in the area of teaching during the first eight week student teaching placement. Overall, student teachers scored well above a proficient level, moving toward exemplary teaching.

Analysis of comprehensive exams shows that sign language competency is an area of relative weakness for candidates for the written or preliminary section of the comprehensive exams. The pressure to use sign language in a testing environment may contribute to a high number of students returning for further assessment in the oral examination. All students did pass the sign language section of the exam following their individual oral examinations with the faculty team two weeks after the original assessment. The importance and complexity of addressing language

needs of deaf and hard of hearing students in the classroom is reflected in the scoring of the language section of comprehensive exams. Candidates showed adequate preparation in responding during the oral exams. Most candidates prepare for comprehensive exams in the months prior to student teaching. Comments from students indicate that the review and analysis needed to study for comps is very beneficial in preparation for student teaching.

Additional support and scaffolding of learning to apply theoretical information to practical application would be beneficial in graduate level coursework.

Part IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Please also see notes of results and actions taken reported in the Student Outcomes Assessment Report for 2010-2011 in Part II above.

Curriculum for the Deaf Education graduate coursework was updated to meet new credentialing standards for the California Education Specialist: Deaf and hard of hearing credentials. Additional content related to students who are deaf and blind and those who have additional disabilities along with being deaf was added to the assessments class and differentiated instruction was given more emphasis throughout the curriculum. The new curriculum will be taught beginning in Fall 2012.

Deaf Education faculty will apply for the United States Department of Education CFDA 84:325 K grant (Training Personnel in Minority Institutions to Serve Infants, Toddlers, and Children with Disabilities) grant when the current grant expires in May 2012. Funds from the current grant, Deaf Education Personnel Preparation Program (DEPP), have supported the use of sign language role models as tutors in both academic and social activities at Fresno State. Students' scores on national sign language proficiency instruments have increased; however ongoing data collection is needed to determine the relationship between the increased scores and the use of native sign language models.

Candidates preparing for final student teaching will take the Sign Language Proficiency Inventory (SLPI), a national examination that identifies levels of proficiency. More extensive feedback is provided with this exam than the American Sign Language Proficiency Inventory (ASLPI) previously utilized.

Campus proposals and WASC proposals for a hybrid online Master's Degree program that would allow students from a larger geographic area to have access to our Deaf Education graduate program are completed and will be submitted in Fall 2012 to begin courses in Fall 2013. Course syllabi have already been developed and approved by the university technology support team.

In designing the curriculum to meet the new CCTC standards and also utilize online teaching and learning resources, faculty added projects and assignments that would increase candidates' exposure to deaf children and adults prior to practicum and student teaching placements. Ongoing feedback between students and faculty will be a primary component of the hybrid online program.