



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		
Program documented in this report	Speech-Language Pathology	
Name of Program	Communicative Disorders and Deaf Studies	
Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)	traditional	
Credential awarded	Speech Language Pathology Services	
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 #	559-278-2443	
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	Sharon Inouye	
Title	Clinic Director	
Phone #	559-278-2422	
E-mail	sinouye@csufresno.edu	

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information

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 Table 4 below). 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 this 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 undergraduate outcome measures specified for this period were the **Final Practicum Evaluations for CDDS 164** and the **Undergraduate Exit Questionnaire**.

I. Timeline for Implementation of Assessment Methods and Summary Evaluations

Table 4. Implementation Schedule of Outcome Measures.

MEASURE	YEAR				
	1 '06- '07	2 '07- '08	3 '08- '09	4 '09-'10	5 '10- '11
Clinic/Student Teaching Evaluation					X
Employer Survey (Grad & Undergrad)	X				
Alumni Survey	X				
Advisory Comm. Minutes				X	
PRAXIS Results		X			
Graduate students exit interview	X	X	X	X	
Graduate Writing Requirement	X		X		X
Comprehensive Examination			X		X
Undergraduate Exit Questionnaire					X
Undergraduate Final Practicum Evaluations (110/107, 164, 175)				X (110/107)	X (164)

II. Timeline for Implementation of Assessment Methods and Summary Evaluations

Table 4. Implementation Schedule of Outcome Measures.

MEASURE	YEAR
---------	------

	1 '11- '12	2 '12- '13	3 '13- '14	4 '14- '15	5 '15- '16
Clinic/Student Teaching Evaluation				X	
Employer Survey (Grad & Undergrad)	X				
Alumni Survey	X				
Advisory Comm. Minutes			X		
PRAXIS Results		X			
Graduate students exit interview	X		X		X
Graduate Writing Requirement			X		X
Comprehensive Examination		X		X	
Undergraduate Exit Questionnaire	X		X		X
Undergraduate Final Practicum Evaluations (110/107, 164, 175, ASL4)	X (175)	X (ALL)		X (ALL)	

Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2010-11		2011-2012	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
<u>California State University, Fresno</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>29</u>

Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity (Biennial Report, Program Assessment or Site Visit).

- Spring 2010 - Added CDDS 218 – Autism class in response to feedback given by Professional Advisory Board regarding community needs.
- Spring 2011 - Added Autism preschool to clinical practicum services offerings to expand students' clinical experiences.
- August 2011 – Added two new tenured track faculty
- 2010-2011 academic year – Added new undergraduate measure (undergraduate exit questionnaire).

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

- a) **What are the primary candidate assessment(s) the program uses up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential?** What **key assessments** are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential? Because this section is focused on candidate development while enrolled in the program, please do not include admissions data.
1. Praxis II Speech-Language Pathology Test Scores
 2. Clinic-Student Teaching Evaluation
 3. Pass Rate for Graduate Writing Requirements
 4. Comprehensive Examinations
1. Praxis II Speech-Language Pathology Test scores - The Praxis II Speech-Language Pathology Test evaluates the beginning clinician's knowledge of fundamental speech-language pathology concepts, as well as current practices in the field. Passing this test is necessary to obtain the ASHA Certificate of Clinical Competence and state licensure. In addition, California Assembly Bill 2837 requires candidates for the California clear Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential to pass this test. Nearly all speech pathology graduate students in our program take this test near the end of their graduate studies.
 2. Clinic-Student Teaching Evaluation - 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 are 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.
 3. Pass Rate for Graduate Writing Requirements - 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. The percent of students passing the graduate level writing requirement is calculated each year. Major reasons for fails are noted for program review. This information is presented to the faculty.
 4. Comprehensive Examinations - Graduate students are required to pass comprehensive exams in 4 areas: I. Basic Communication Processes, II. Disorders, III. Assessment, and IV. Treatment. 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. Comprehensive Exams were used to assess learning outcomes # 1-5, 9, and 10.
- b) **What additional information about candidate and program completion performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?**
1. Knowledge and Skills Acquisition (KASA) forms. This data includes: (a) # of students enrolled in class, (b) # of students that successfully completed classroom presentation and research paper on the first try, (c) # of students that needed remediation, and (d) the # of students who ultimately passed by the end of the semester.

2. *Employer Survey.* With the approval of each alumnus, a survey will be sent to their employer. The results for each item on the numeric scale will be averaged per year. Employers of interpreting students who completed their B.A. during the assessment period will also be included. (See Appendix C: *Employer Survey Protocol.*)
3. *Alumni Survey.* Each alumnus will be sent a survey. The results for each item on the numeric scale will be averaged per year. Interpreting students who completed their B.A. during the assessment period will also be included. (See Appendix B: *Employee Survey Protocol.*)
4. *Minutes of Advisory Committees.* Selected professionals from Fresno County are members of the Deaf Education and Speech Pathology Advisory Committees. These committees meet to provide feedback regarding program development in the Department. The minutes of these committees' meetings will be analyzed and areas of strength or needed change will be noted and summarized.

c) **Include aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that were described in (a) and (b).** Once the assessments and data collection methods have been described, report aggregated data from 4-6 of those assessments.

1. Comprehensive Exams

Graduate students are required to pass comprehensive exams in 4 areas: I. Basic Communication Processes, II. Disorders, III. Assessment, and IV. Treatment. 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.

RESULTS: This goal was met for all areas. In Fall, the overall pass rate was 93.5% with scores in each area ranging from 87% to 100%. In Spring, the overall pass rate was 98% with scores in each area ranging from 93% 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 87% in Fall for Area 4 where this skill was included in the exam. We will re-assess again next Spring.

In regards to **Comprehensive Exams** 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.

2. 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.

RESULTS:

A total of 139 Student Practicum Evaluations were completed on SLP Graduate students during the 3 semesters making up this 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%
6.	Area VI: Professionalism & Ethics, Quest#2, 4, 7	100%
7.	Area VI: Professionalism & Ethics, Quest# 4, 7, 10	100%

In regards to the **Clinic and Student Teaching Evaluations** 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. This way problems can be addressed as quickly as possible. If the student continues to have problems, a meeting is held with the clinical director 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.

3. 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. This measure assesses outcomes # 1, 2, and 3.

RESULTS:

A total of 36 students participated in the graduate writing exam. In Fall, 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, however, only 2 out of 18 students passed the first time, for a pass rate of 11.11%.

In regards to the **Graduate Writing Requirement** the high failure rate in Spring 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, 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 the next semester. This new procedure has been adopted for the time being.

4. PRAXIS Results (SLP Only)

The number of graduate students passing or not passing the *PRAXIS Examination in Speech Pathology and Audiology (PRAXIS)* are summed for the academic year.

The Praxis II Speech-Language Pathology Test evaluates the beginning clinician's knowledge of fundamental speech-language pathology concepts, as well as current practices in the field. Passing this test is necessary to obtain the ASHA Certificate of Clinical Competence and state licensure. In addition, California Assembly Bill 2837 requires candidates for the California clear Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential to pass this test. Nearly all speech pathology graduate students in our program take this test near the end of their graduate studies. Here are the passing rates for our students for the past 2 years:

Results:

2011 - # of students 23; # passed 22 = 96 %

2010 - # of students 25; # passed 21 = 84 %

Biennial reports for Multiple Subject or Single Subject programs must include the following assessor information related to the implementation of the TPA **in addition** to data for 4-6 key assessments:

- 1) Number of Assessors: The total number of assessors the program uses and the number of assessors who scored in the years for which the biennial report data is being submitted.
- 2) Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration: The number of assessors who successfully completed initial training and the number who recalibrated for the applicable biennial report years.
- 3) Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (% of score agreement).
- 4) Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration. (May also be addressed in Section A, Part IV)

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Each program provides analyses of the information provided in Section II. **Please do not introduce new types of data in this section.** Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analyses of the data. Describe what the analyses of the data demonstrate about your program relative to: a) candidate competence; and b) program effectiveness.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

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

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)
Praxis Results	No specific actions were taken because our 3-year average passing rate was 93%, which is above the requirement of ASHA's Counsel on Academic Accreditation.	Common Standards 2 & 9
Graduate Comprehensive Examinations	In regards to Comprehensive Exams, 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.	Common Standards 2 & 9
Student teaching evaluations	No specific actions were taken because the overall goal was met. We currently have a system in place that requires speech clinic supervisors to evaluate and provide feedback to students at least 3 times during the semester. This way, problems can be addressed as quickly as possible. If the student continues to have problems, a meeting is held with the clinical director 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.	Common Standards 2, 7, & 9
Graduate Writing Exam	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.	Common Standards 2 & 9