**Annual Assessment Report for 2018-2019 AY**

**Department/Program:** Communicative Sciences and Deaf Studies (CSDS)

**Degree**: Graduate Speech-Language Pathology Program (MA)

**Assessment Coordinator:** Stephen D. Roberts, PhD, MBA, CRC, CLCP, CCC-A, FAAA

1. **Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.**

**Graduate Outcomes Measures Specified for 2018-20189AY**

The graduate outcome measures specified for this period in the Student Outcome Assessment Plan included**:**

**(1) Graduate-level Writing Requirement**

**(2) Advisory Committee Minutes**

**Learning Outcomes Assessed for the 2018-2019 AY**

1. Analyze ideas, make critical evaluations, and come to well-reasoned conclusions. **(Graduate-level Writing Requirement)**
2. Read, understand, and apply research literature and engage in productive research activities as appropriate to their chosen career goals. **(Graduate-level Writing Requirement)**
3. Demonstrate professional communication skills. **(Graduate-level Writing Requirement)**
4. Understand and apply foundational information in anatomical, physiological, neurological, psychological, and sociological aspects of human communication. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**
5. Assess an individual’s ability or performance and will appropriately interpret and apply this information. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**.
6. Plan, implement, evaluate and modify educational or clinical interventions across a wide range of students and clients. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**
7. Develop effective professional relationships with individuals, their family members, caregivers, and with professionals across disciplines. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**
8. Appreciate, understand and productively apply multicultural information. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**
9. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.

**MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT:**  **Graduate Writing Requirement Results***.* The percent of students passing the graduate level writing requirement each year. Major reasons for fails will be noted for program review.

**LEARNING OUTCOMES THAT WERE ASSESSED:**

1. Analyze ideas, make critical evaluations, and come to well-reasoned conclusions.
2. Read, understand, and apply research literature and engage in productive research activities as appropriate to their chosen career goals.
3. Demonstrate professional communication skills.

**MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT: Minutes of Speech-Language Pathology Advisory Committee***.* Selected professionals from Fresno County are members of the 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.

**LEARNING OUTCOMES THAT WERE ASSESSED:**

1. Understand and apply foundational information in anatomical, physiological, neurological, psychological, and sociological aspects of human communication. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**
2. Assess an individual’s ability or performance and will appropriately interpret and apply this information. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**.
3. Plan, implement, evaluate and modify educational or clinical interventions across a wide range of students and clients. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**
4. Develop effective professional relationships with individuals, their family members, caregivers, and with professionals across disciplines. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**
5. Appreciate, understand and productively apply multicultural information. **(Advisory committee Minutes)**
6. **What did you learn from your analysis of the data?** Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient.

**MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT:**  **Graduate Writing Requirement Results***.* The percent of students passing the graduate level writing requirement each year. Our goal states that 80% of our graduate students will pass it on their first attempt. Major reasons for fails will be noted for program review.

The **graduate writing requirement** is required by the University Graduate Studies Department. In the graduate Speech-Language Pathology program, this requirement is addressed in the CSDS 200: Research Methods in Communicative Disorders course. This requirement is twofold. First, students are required to complete a spontaneous essay in response to a question given in the course. The essay should demonstrate:

* Clear organization and presentation of ideas
* Correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling
* Well-constructed paragraphs, including topic sentences, points supporting the topic sentences, and sentences that logically make the transition either to or from a new paragraph

The essay writing assignment will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis and does not count toward the final grade assigned to a student in CSDS 200. Second, 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. The spontaneous essay will be considered along with the research paper in determining whether or not the student has achieved writing proficiency commensurate with the requirements of Fresno State Division of Graduate Studies and also with the requirements of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) for demonstrating skills in oral and written or other forms of communication sufficient for entry into professional practice. Both the research paper and the essay assignment must be judged by the instructor to meet those requirements for the Division of Graduate Studies and ASHA to pass this competency. Our goal states that 80% of our graduate students will pass it on their first attempt.

**Graduate Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) Program**

* **Fall Semester 2018 – SLP Program:** 
  + CSDS 200: 15/15 (100%) met graduate writing proficiency requirement.

**Outcome:** Fall 2018 Results for SLP Program - Goal met (> 80%) of students passed the graduate writing requirement.

* **Spring Semester 2019 – SLP Program:** 
  + CSDS 200: 23/23 (100%) met graduate writing proficiency requirement

**Outcome:** Spring 2019 Results for SLP Program - Goal met (> 80%) of students passed the graduate writing requirement.

* **AY 2018 – 2019 – SLP Program:** 
  + CSDS 200: 38/38 (100%) met graduate writing proficiency requirement

**Outcome:** AY 2018-2019 Results for SLP Program - Goal met (> 80%) of students passed the graduate writing requirement.

**MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT: Minutes of Advisory Committees***.* Selected professionals from Fresno County are members of the Speech Pathology Advisory Committees. These committees meet to provide feedback regarding program development in the Graduate Speech-Language Pathology Program. The minutes of this committee’s meeting will be analyzed and areas of strength or needed change will be noted and summarized.

**Outcome:** In Fall 2018, the CSDS faculty and staff unanimously voted that the CSDS Advisory Committee would be organized into two committees: (a) Speech-Language Pathology Advisory Committee and (b) Deaf Education Advisory Committee. The Community Speech-Language Pathology Advisory Committee members met on March 27, 2019 in in the Communicative Sciences and Deaf Studies Department’s (CSDS) Conference Room where Dr. Freed took minutes of the meeting. First, the Advisory Committee had unanimous praise for the performance of Sabrina Nii, Director of California State University, Fresno’s CSDS Speech, Language and Hearing Clinic. Second, the Speech-Language Pathology Advisory Committee recognized the limits of preparing students in the academic setting while noting that the majority of the students are generally prepared for their off-campus placements. With this preface, the following is a list of their concerns coupled with our responses from the SLP faculty and staff.

1. **Concern:** The students need to have a better understanding of what is a standard score and how it predicts a client’s performance. This is especially important in school settings.

**Response:** Standard scores and their interpretation are first introduced in to undergraduate students in **CSDS 107: Observation in Communicative Disorders and Deaf Studies: Speech-Language Pathology** and **CSDS 110: Diagnostic Procedures.** Scales of measurement (including standard scores) and their interpretation are further discussed as part of the graduate course curriculum in **CSDS 200: Graduate Studies and Research Methods in Communicative Disorders.** Since the Advisory Committee mentioned that the importance of interpreting standard scores is within the school setting specifically, this comment may be related to difficulties in determining eligibility. State criteria under the "Language Disorder" component of "Specific or Language Impairment" relies heavily on standard score interpretation. Since much of the application of interpreting standard scores comes during the students’ clinical practicum and student teaching, some of this needs to be learned during their clinical experience.

1. **Concern:** The students must be more flexible when assessing clients and knowing when to use informal assessment procedures if a client is not able to participate in formal assessment tasks. Overall, the students are not as strong on assessment as they should be. There was general agreement that supervising assessments, in both on- and off-campus settings, is difficult.

**Response:** Undergraduate students are initially exposed to both formal and informal assessment procedures in **CSDS 107: Observation in Communicative Disorders and Deaf Studies: Speech-Language Pathology** and **CSDS 110: Diagnostic Procedures.** Moreover, the **CSDS 230: Advanced Clinical Practice in Speech-Language Pathology** placements further provide them with supervised clinical experience on both formal and informal assessment procedures. The individual Clinic supervisors determine and approve the actual assessment plan for their particular group of students and clients. Students are completing multiple assessments every semester during their on-campus Clinic placement, but they may not have received a client who needed some type of alternative assessment procedure. Moreover, the application of both formal and informal assessment procedures emanates during their clinical practicum and student teaching externship settings. It is during these externship clinical placements that they will need to be taught both informal and formal assessment procedures.

1. **Concern:** The students are weak on matching goals to actual levels of client performance.

**Response:** This concern is vague and respectfully, we disagree. We teach our students to develop goals that go well beyond levels of client performance so that we can help them achieve a higher level of performance. If this vague concern is in reference to working with children who are pre-, minimally-, or non-verbal communicators, this is addressed with our students in both **CSDS 214: Seminar in Child Language Disorders** and **CSDS 218: Autism Spectrum Disorders and Augmentative or Alternative Communication.**

1. **Concern:** SOAP notes are not done well. The students do not seem to know what information should be recorded in the four sections of this type of notes.

**Response:** The **SOAP** (i.e., subjective, objective, assessment, plan) notes used in our on-campus speech-language pathology clinics are different than in the medical setting. Specifically, **S** is for subjective - impressions regarding the client's status (e.g. alert, cooperative, or not; motivation level); **O** is for objective data; **A** is for assessment - how the therapy session went and/or if there were adjustments that needed to be made (e.g., changes in the exemplars presented or type of reinforcement used); and**P** is for the next session’s plan.

One way to address this concern is for us to create a mock SOAP to more closely match the SOAP used in a medical setting. We have explored this option; however, there is no consistent format for SOAP notes employed in the medical setting. That is, each type of medical setting as well as the various sites within the same medical setting often requires different SOAP formats.  Moreover, the use of electronic medical record (EMR) for SOAP is vastly different based on who owns the building and the company where students are placed. This situation is further complicated by the various SOAP formats used in the schools and private practices.

Students receive written materials and instructions for SOAP notes in their meeting packet before each clinic. As such, we provide our students with the basic SOAP notes structure and format for on-campus clinics as noted above. We rely on each individual medical, education, and private practice site to teach students their specific SOAP formats. Sabrina Nii recommended that she could spend time on this area in our pre-clinic meeting each semester to emphasize the purpose and clinical function for SOAP notes in our Clinic.

1. **Concern:** Student knowledge of continuum of care in a medical setting is weak. They tend to look at the aspects of medical care in isolation.

**Response:** Sabrina Nii recommended that she could spend more time educating ~~the~~ students, who are scheduled at their externships during our clinic meeting, about continuity of care in a medical setting (e.g., intensive care, acute care, medical rehabilitation, outpatient clinic). In addition, changing the title of our Clinical Supervisors for our on-campus clinic setting to Clinical Educators is another excellent idea. The expectation of having this knowledge before the students begin their externship is a more realistic expectation since it is the supervisor’s job to expose them to the special procedures associated with their externship site. With that said, this is the reason that students have a medical externship.

1. **Concern(s):** (6) The students need a better understanding of eligibility for school services. (7) The students do not have enough exposure to the entire IEP process.

**Response:** There are several ways in which we have addressed this concern. First, in the beginning of the Spring 2019 semester, Dr. Brooke Findley was able to obtain district access to the Special Education Information System (SEIS). SEIS is the primary online program used for IEP development throughout the State of California. Once access was available, Dr. Findley then developed a series of videos that guide the students through the SEIS program. Moreover, Dr. Findley accessed a handbook for compliant IEP development that was published by the State of California. Currently, Dr. Findley is actively working to address this concern/area of improvement at both the graduate and undergraduate level of instruction.

Second, Dr. Brooke Findley and Dr. Serena Johnson are working collaboratively to address this concern at the undergraduate level. Dr. Serena Johnson is the instructor of **CSDS 114: Education of Exceptional Children**. Dr. Johnson has graciously allowed Dr. Findley to present to her **CSDS 114: Education of Exceptional Children** class on this topic during the Spring 2019 semester.

Third, students in Dr. Findley’s graduate **CSDS 204: Seminar in Stuttering** class are completing a culminating project in which they must use these resources to develop an IEP for a hypothetical student.  Each student was provided SEIS log-in credentials for this assignment. .

Fourth, Dr. Findley plans on providing a similar activity in **CSDS 218: Autism Spectrum Disorder and Augmentative Communication** during the Fall 2019 semester.

Fifth, Dr. Findley has offered to help coordinate other IEP/SEIS-based projects if other faculty or staff are interested.

Thus, this IEP improvement action was underway at both the undergraduate and graduate level prior to the Advisory Committee bringing this concern to our attention.  Since this is the first semester in which Dr. Findley has implemented these actions, it will take time before the impact is seen with our students in the community.

1. **Concern:** Are off-campus supervisors evaluated by students?If so, what is process of getting that information to the supervisors?

**Response:** Graduate students are instructed to complete a “Supervisor Evaluation Form” at the end of each semester. These evaluation forms are uploaded to Google Drive. The students; however, have expressed concern about their supervisors gaining access to their evaluations due to their fears that negative comments may potentially “burn a bridge.” For this reason, Sabrina Nii stores each evaluation, but only address areas of concern after grades are posted or when the students have secured a job during their last semester in the program. However, beginning with the Spring 2019 cohort, the supervisor evaluations are done on CALIPSO. This new procedure means that supervisors will gain access to their evaluations one month after the end of each semester.

1. **Concern:** Advise undergraduate students to take nursing/medical classes as electives.

**Response:** This is an excellent idea should the nursing program either at the Community College or California State University, Fresno allow non-nursing students to take nursing courses as electives and that students have flexibility in the elective coursework for their major in Communicative Sciences with a focus on Speech-Language Pathology. We will explore this option.

1. **Concern:** Make sure that off-campus supervisors know in advance if a student or group of students needs help with any specific aspect of clinical work.

**Response:** Sabrina Nii keeps the off-campus supervisors informed if there are considerations regarding a student’s specific need. It is rare that Ms. Nii needs to provide this type of additional support. If the issue is significant, she allows the supervisor to interview the student ahead of time to further determine if the student is a good Otherwise, the supervisors are aware of the level of the student’s knowledge according to where the students are in the program.

1. **Concern:** Students seem to have a better knowledge of medical abbreviations compared to when the committee met last time.

**Response:** Medical abbreviations are discussed during our pre clinic meeting each semester with students scheduled for their externship placements.

1. **What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?**

**Review and Discussion of Assessment Data**

First, the results of the Fall 2018 graduate writing requirement were presented at the February 2019 CSDS faculty meeting for review and discussion. Whereas, the results of the Spring 2019 graduate writing requirement were presented on September 11, 2019 at the CSDS faculty meeting for review and discussion.

Second, the results of the Community Advisory Committee for Speech-Language Pathology were presented via email to the faculty on April 25, 2019 for review and discussion. This information was presented again at the September 11, 2019 CSDS faculty meeting.

The CSDS staff and faculty have actively participated in the review, discussion and recommendations of the 2018 – 2019 SOAP data for the SLP graduate program regarding ongoing program improvement throughout the academic year. The following information provides actions taken for each of the two outcome assessment activities.

1. **MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT:**  **Graduate Writing Requirement Results***.*

**ACTION TAKEN.** For theGraduate SLP program, no specific actions were taken nor are required at this time because the overall goal for this activity was met for AY 2018-2019. It should be noted that there is no change compared to the last time the **Graduate Writing Requirement Results**passing rate was evaluated and reported during AY 2014-2015, which revealed 49/54 (92%) passing rate for the overall CSDS Department. It is important to note that we continue to meet this goal in **Graduate Writing Requirement Results**pass rate during the 2018-2019 AY as noted in the current SOAP report. Continue to track and address, as needed.

1. **MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT: Minutes of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Advisory Committee**

**ACTION TAKEN.** The following summarizes the actions taken for each of the identified concerns.

* 1. **Concern:** SOAP notes are not done well. The students do not seem to know what information should be recorded in the four sections of this type of notes.

**Action:** Sabrina Nii recommended that she could spend more time educating students, who are scheduled at their externships during our clinic meeting, about continuity of care in a medical setting (e.g., intensive care, acute care, medical rehabilitation, outpatient clinic). In addition, changing the title of our Clinical Supervisors for our on-campus clinic setting to Clinical Educators is another excellent idea. The expectation of having this knowledge before the students begin their externship is a more realistic expectation since it is the supervisor’s job to expose them to the special procedures associated with their externship site. With that said, this is the reason that students have a medical externship.

* 1. **Concern:** Student knowledge of continuum of care in a medical setting is weak. They tend to look at the aspects of medical care in isolation.

**Action:** Sabrina Nii recommended that she could spend more time educating students, who are scheduled at their externships during our clinic meeting, about continuity of care in a medical setting (e.g., intensive care, acute care, medical rehabilitation, outpatient clinic). In addition, changing the title of our Clinical Supervisors for our on-campus clinic setting to Clinical Educators is another excellent idea. The expectation of having this knowledge before the students begin their externship is a more realistic expectation since it is the supervisor’s job to expose them to the special procedures associated with their externship site.

* 1. **Concern:**The students need a better understanding of eligibility for school services. The students do not have enough exposure to the entire IEP process.

**Action**: There are several ways in which we have addressed this concern. First, in the beginning of the Spring 2019 semester, Dr. Brooke Findley was able to obtain district access to the Special Education Information System (SEIS). SEIS is the primary online program used for IEP development throughout the State of California. Once access was available, Dr. Findley then developed a series of videos that guide the students through the SEIS program. Moreover, Dr. Findley accessed a handbook for compliant IEP development that was published by the State of California. Currently, Dr. Findley is actively working to address this concern/area of improvement at both the graduate and undergraduate level of instruction.

Second, Dr. Brooke Findley and Dr. Serena Johnson are working collaboratively to address this concern at the undergraduate level. Dr. Serena Johnson is the instructor of **CSDS 114: Education of Exceptional Children**. Dr. Johnson has graciously allowed Dr. Findley to present to her **CSDS 114: Education of Exceptional Children** class on this topic during the Spring 2019 semester.

Third, students in Dr. Findley’s graduate **CSDS 204: Seminar in Stuttering** class are completing a culminating project in which they must use these resources to develop an IEP for a hypothetical student.  Each student was provided SEIS log-in credentials for this assignment. .

Fourth, Dr. Findley plans on providing a similar activity in **CSDS 218: Autism Spectrum Disorder and Augmentative Communication** during the Fall 2019 semester.

Fifth, Dr. Findley has offered to help coordinate other IEP/SEIS-based projects if other faculty or staff are interested.

Thus, this IEP improvement action was underway at both the undergraduate and graduate level prior to the Advisory Committee bringing this concern to our attention.  Since this is the first semester in which Dr. Findley has implemented these actions, it will take time before the impact is seen with our students in the community.

* 1. **Concern** Advise undergraduate students to take nursing/medical classes as electives.

**Action:** This is an excellent idea should the nursing program either at the Community College or California State University, Fresno allow non-nursing students to take nursing courses as electives and that students have flexibility in the elective coursework for their major in Communicative Sciences with a focus on Speech-Language Pathology. We will explore this option.

1. **If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in last year’s assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.**

N/A

1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting during the next academic year?**

**Graduate Outcomes Measures Specified for 2019-2020 AY**

The graduate outcome measures specified for this period in the Student Outcome Assessment Plan included**:**

**(1) Clinic/Student Teaching Evaluations**

**(2) Comprehensive Examinations**

**Learning Outcomes Assessed for AY 2019-2020 AYc**

1. Analyze ideas, make critical evaluations, and come to well-reasoned conclusions. **(Clinic Evaluations, Comprehensive Examinations)**
2. Read, understand, and apply research literature and engage in productive research activities as appropriate to their chosen career goals. **(Comprehensive Examinations)**
3. Solve problems in educational or clinical settings by creatively generating multiple solutions and selecting those most appropriate to meet the needs of the individual in question. **(Clinic Evaluations)**
4. Demonstrate professional communication skills. **(Clinic Evaluations)**
5. Understand and apply foundational information in anatomical, physiological, neurological, psychological, and sociological aspects of human communication. **(Comprehensive Examinations)**
6. Assess an individual’s ability or performance and will appropriately interpret and apply this information. **(Clinic Evaluations, Comprehensive Examinations)**
7. Plan, implement, evaluate and modify educational or clinical interventions across a wide range of students and clients. **(Clinic Evaluations, Comprehensive Examinations)**
8. Develop effective professional relationships with individuals, their family members, caregivers, and with professionals across disciplines. **(Clinic Evaluations)**
9. Appreciate, understand and productively apply multicultural information. **(Clinic Evaluations)**
10. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**

There were no items from the Graduate SOAP 2017-2018 AY action plan by the CSDS faculty for our graduate SLP program. We are continuing to monitor, as needed.