**2013-2014 CLASS FACT Assessment Year End Report, June, 2014**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Name(s)** | **FACT Faculty Fellow** | **Department Chair** |
| **Communicative Sciences and Disorders** | **Elena Dukhovny** | **Nidhi Mahendra** |

[NOTE: Items A, B, C, and D are identical to your Page 2 on your Annual Report for CAPR. Please simply cut and paste from there. Item E is unique to the CLASS FACT Project.]

**A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

|  |
| --- |
| Bachelor of Science in Speech-Language Pathology Students graduating with a B.S. in Speech-Language Pathology from California State University East Bay will:  1) Master the foundational knowledge for advanced professional training in speech-language pathology or related disciplines 2) Integrate knowledge from basic and behavioral sciences and humanities with contemporary theory and practice in speech-language pathology  3) Describe typical and atypical communicative development and behavior across the lifespan 4) Demonstrate skills in working collaboratively 5) Explain the importance of cultural competence, social justice, ethics, and advocacy in serving diverse individuals   Mapping to CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes: Thinking and reasoning – SLO1 Specialized Education – SLO 2, 3, 5 Collaboration – SLO4 Diversity – SLO 3 (lifespan), SLO 5  Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology  Students graduating with an M.S. in Speech-Language Pathology from California State University East Bay will: 1) Screen, assess and treat individuals with a variety of communicative disorders across the lifespan 2) Communicate and collaborate effectively with clients, families, and other professionals  3) Evaluate and apply clinical research, recognizing the need for evidence to support best practices in clinical service delivery  4) Consistently apply ethical professional standards, recognize and respect the limits of their professional preparation and clinical skills, and work effectively with other professionals 5) Demonstrate cultural competence and commitment to advocacy for persons with communicative disorders  Mapping to CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes: Thinking and reasoning – SLOs 1, 3, 4 Communication – SLOs 2, 5 Collaboration – SLO 2 Diversity – SLO 5 Specialized Education – SLOs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5ease list all outcomes in the box below, and append a curriculum map showing alignment of the Program Student Learning Outcomes and CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes. |

**B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

|  |
| --- |
| The assessment conducted in CSD was most closely related to Undergraduate SLO 2 (Integrate knowledge from basic and behavioral sciences and humanities with contemporary theory and practice in speech-language pathology) |

**C. Summary of Assessment Process**

|  |
| --- |
| In 2013-2014, we assessed levels of instruction and student performance in topics related to children’s development of literacy, over the years 2011-2014. (Literacy acquisition is closely related to oral language development and is an instructional area required for accreditation by the CTC.) To this end, we collected data, per course, on percentage of instructional time spent on literacy, areas of literacy addressed, assignments where literacy was targeted and student grade averages on these assignments.   The CSD program is accredited by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and by the American Speech, Language and Hearing Association (ASHA). This year, ASHA revised its educational standards. Therefore, as a component of this project, we also re-mapped our departmental SLOs to the new ASHA standards and to CTC standards. |

**D. Summary of Assessment Results**

|  |
| --- |
| We found that literacy instruction is embedded into twelve courses across the curriculum, including eight undergraduate and four graduate courses. In these courses, literacy instruction currently takes between 5-10% of instructional time and accounts for between 2-11% of the class grade. Literacy topics currently covered include:  a)SLP scope of practice within literacy  b)Oral language and literacy relationship c)Emerging literacy milestones d)Literacy acquisition across school age e)Assessing literacy skills via Response-to-Intervention (RTI) f)Facilitating pre-literacy (phonological awareness and oral narrative skills) g)Phonemic awareness and phonemic inventory h)Second language acquisition and biliteracy i)Supporting literacy through Augmentative / Alternative Communication j)Incorporating literacy and pre-literacy into therapy goals, activities and supports. k)Family training using literacy tools.   Literacy instruction is typically embedded into other topics within communicative disorders. Therefore, it makes sense that literacy-related skills of our students are assessed predominantly within the context of larger exams/assignments. Although we do not have extensive data to demonstrate specifically that our students are retaining this literacy information, available data show that students appear to be passing the vast majority of these assignments, with average scores of around 90% in graded assignments and passing scores on pass/no pass assignments.   There are two assignments devoted explicitly to literacy: an in-depth case study in our graduate course in Advanced Language Disorders and an assignment on supporting literacy through Augmentative/Alternative Communication in our graduate class in AAC. 100% of students have been passing both literacy-specific assignments in the reported years.  Closing the loop: We presented results at a faculty meeting, with two questions posed for discussion:  1.”Are there areas of literacy instruction missing from this list?”  Relevant areas of literacy appear to be well-represented in our instruction. 2. “Do you think we should have a way to assess literacy instruction specifically, given that it is part of the new CTC accreditation standards?”  We are considering several new ways to assess and highlight literacy knowledge specifically. We will do this in the following ways: (a) Add a literacy component to the “Competencies Portfolio” that our graduate students compile prior to graduation. In this portfolio, students report and collect evidence of various competencies they have developed in the program, using artifacts such as class projects and clinical documents. (b) Add a literacy component to one of the questions on our comprehensive exit exam. All graduate students take a comprehensive written exam that includes four in-depth case studies where students must draw on knowledge from different areas of communicative disorders. |

**E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CLASS FACT Project in the Future**

|  |
| --- |
| No suggestions at this point. |