



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing Biennial Report  
Academic Years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013**

<b>Institution</b>	San Jose State University
<b>Date report is submitted</b>	08-01-13
<b>Program documented in this report</b>	Communicative Disorders and Sciences (CD&S)
<b>Name of Program</b>	Communicative Disorders and Sciences (CD&S)
<b>Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)</b>	Traditional
<b>Credential awarded</b>	Speech Pathology
<b>Is this program offered at more than one site? No</b>	
<b>If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered</b>	N/A
<b>Program Contact</b>	Michael Kimbarow, Ph.D.
<b>Title</b>	Chair
<b>Phone #</b>	408-924-3688
<b>E-Mail</b>	Michael.Kimbarow@sjsu.edu
<b>If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:</b>	
<b>Name</b>	June McCullough, Ph.D.
<b>Title</b>	Professor/Department Assessment Coordinator
<b>Phone #</b>	408-924-3683
<b>E-mail</b>	June.McCullough@sjsu.edu

## **PART I – Contextual Information**

### **The Connie L. Lurie College of Education**

San José State University is a major, comprehensive public university located in the center of San José and in the heart of Silicon Valley. SJSU is the oldest state university in California. Among its most prized traditions is an uncompromising commitment to offer access to higher education to all persons who meet the criteria for admission, yielding a stimulating mix of age groups, cultures, and economic backgrounds for teaching, learning, and research.

As one of the seven colleges at the University, The Connie L. Lurie College of Education has been preparing the majority of the teachers, administrators, and counselors who serve throughout Silicon Valley and the South Bay area for over a century and a half. We offer credential and graduate programs that prepare teachers, administrators, and counselors for K-12 settings. We also offer undergraduate and graduate degrees in Child and Adolescent Development and Communicative Disorders and Speech Pathology.

The Lurie College of Education has a long history of close collaborative partnerships with the region's schools and social service providers. Although the majority of our students gain their experiences in Silicon Valley schools and clinics, our programs also reach students as far north as the Oregon border and as far south as the Monterey Peninsula.

We make extensive use of new technologies, many developed in the Silicon Valley, to offer quality education to students in all of our programs. Our goal is to prepare teachers, counselors, administrators and other service providers who are knowledgeable about and adept at using new technologies to educate their students and serve their clients.

### **Communicative Disorders and Sciences (CD&S)**

The Communicative Disorders and Sciences Department (CD&S) has been educating students at San Jose State University for over 40 years. The program is accredited by the Council of Academic Accreditation (CAA) of the American Speech-Language and Hearing Association (ASHA). The most recent ASHA site visit took place in April, 2010, at which time the program reviewers indicated that our program ranked in the top 25% of graduate programs in CD&S nationwide and awarded us a full 8-year accreditation.

Candidates who enroll in the MA program fulfill the academic and clinical practicum requirements leading to the Preliminary Credential Speech-Language Pathology. In order to obtain a Clear Credential Speech-Language Pathology, candidates must pass the national Praxis Examination in Speech-Language Pathology and complete a minimum of nine months of full-time employment under the supervision of a speech-language pathologist holding the Certificate of Clinical Competence from ASHA. The passing rate of our candidates taking the Praxis

Examination is over 90%. Currently, faculty members have been awarded over \$3.4 million dollars of federal grant support for preparing speech pathologists to specialize in children with disabilities.

***Communicative Disorders and Sciences (CD&S) Program***

<b>Table 1: CD&amp;S Program Candidate Information</b>						
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for three years reported						
	<b>2010-2011</b>		<b>2011- 2012</b>		<b>2012- 2013</b>	
Site and Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completer/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
Traditional	107	37	109	44	109	40

***Since the Spring 2011 NCATE/CTC site visit, the CD&S Program has made the following changes:***

- New tenure-track faculty member (Dr. Pei-Tzu Tsai, Fall 2011)*
- New clinic director (Ms. Marcella McCollum, Fall 2011)*

**PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information**

**Table 2: Overview of Key Assessments (Bold = Measures Used in Data Analysis)**

<i>Candidate Competency</i>			
<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data Collection</b>	<b>Use</b>
EDSP 254 Seminar in Neurological Disorders – Case study paper.	Case study demonstrating the ability to synthesize information re: etiology, history, and formal assessment to develop treatment goals for individuals with neurological disorders.	4-point rubric to measure the quality of individual student papers.	ASHA Standards: IV-C, IV-D, IV-F, V-A.  CTC: SLP 3  First semester in graduate school provides a representative sample of students' ability to synthesize information related to a specific communicative disorder.
EDSP 222 Seminar in Literacy – Reflection paper.	Student reflections on textbook chapters and articles related to developing literacy skills of children and/or adults with communicative disorders.	4-point rubric to measure the quality of student assignments.	ASHA Standards: IV-C, IV-D, IV-F, V-A.  CTC: 3  Assesses required ASHA competencies related to literacy.

<p>EDSP 251 Seminar in Phonological Disorders – Case study assignment.</p>	<p>Case study demonstrating the ability to synthesize information re: etiology, history, and formal assessment to develop treatment goals for children with phonological disorders.</p>	<p>4-point rubric to measure the quality of individual student papers.</p>	<p>Asha Standards: IV-C, IV-D, IV-F, V-A. CTC: SLP 2, 4, 5, Assesses required ASHA competencies related to phonological disorders.</p>
<p>EDSP 258 Seminar in Fluency Disorders – Literature Review assignment.</p>	<p>Literature review on the etiology, assessment, and treatment strategies for individuals with stuttering disorders.</p>	<p>4-point rubric to measure the quality of individual student papers.</p>	<p>ASHA Standards: IV-C, IV-D, IV-F, V-A. CTC: SLP 3, 4, 5. Assesses required ASHA competencies related to fluency disorders.</p>
<p>EDSP 259 Seminar in Childhood Language Disorders</p>	<p>Classroom presentation of group project to evaluate individual student oral communication skills.</p>	<p>4-point rubric to measure student performance.</p>	<p>ASHA Standards: V-A. Snapshot of oral communication skills during first semester in the program.</p>

EDSP 265 Seminar in Cognitive Disorders – term paper.	Comprehensive term paper involving the integration of anatomical/physiological bases of cognitive disorders, assessment strategies, and intervention approaches.	4-point rubric to measure individual student papers.	ASHA Standards: IV-C, IV-D, IV-F, V-A.  CTC: SLP 3  Assesses ASHA required competencies in cognitive disorders.
EDSP 288 – Seminar in Augmentative/Alternative Communication – Project.	Project involving selecting appropriate vocabulary for AAC devices.	4-point rubric to measure the quality of individual student projects.	ASHA Standards: IV-C, IV-D, IV-F, V-A.  CTC: 6  Assesses ASHA required competencies in AAC.
EDSP 298 – Special studies in Aural Rehabilitation	Student reflections on guest lecture topics.	4-point rubric to measure the quality of individual student work.	Special course for students in Project Aural Impact – assesses ASHA competencies in Aural Rehabilitation.
<b>EDSP 221 Seminar in Research Methods - Research Project</b>	<b>Research paper demonstrating mastery of the principles of evidence-based practices as well as oral and written communication skills.</b>	<b>4-point rubric to measure quality of individual student assignments.</b>	<b>ASHA Standards: IV-F, V-A.  CTC: 1  Gateway to second year off-campus internships.</b>

<p><b>EDSP 277 Advanced Clinical Practicum – Supervisor evaluation.</b></p>	<p><b>Supervisor evaluation of clinical skills, including professional behavior, setting appropriate treatment goals, and providing appropriate therapy for children and/or adults.</b></p>	<p><b>4-point rubric to measure student performance.</b></p>	<p><b>ASHA Standards: IV-E, V-A, V-B-1, V-B-2, V-B-3.</b></p> <p><b>CTC: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7,</b></p> <p><b>Students enroll in this on-campus practicum for three semesters prior to off-campus assignments. Students have a variety of supervisors and see individuals with a variety of communicative disorders.</b></p>
<p><b>EDSP 269 Student Teaching Practicum</b></p>	<p><b>Supervisor evaluation of clinical skills (assessment, treatment, and professional conduct) related to children with disabilities in the public school setting.</b></p>	<p><b>4-point rubric to measure student performance.</b></p>	<p><b>ASHA Standards: IV-E, V-A, V-B-1, V-B-2, V-B-3.</b></p> <p><b>CTC: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, SLP 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.</b></p> <p><b>Summative assessment of student clinical skills related to serving children with communicative disorders.</b></p> <p><b>Last year in program.</b></p>

<p>EDSP 278 Externship – Advanced clinical practicum in a non-public school (i.e., hospital or clinic) setting.</p>	<p>Supervisor evaluation of clinical skills (assessment, treatment, and professional conduct) related to children or adults in a medical or clinical setting.</p>	<p>4-point rubric to measure student performance.</p>	<p>ASHA Standards: IV-E, V-A, V-B-1, V-B-2, V-B-3.</p> <p>Summative assessment of student clinical skills related to serving children and/or adults with communicative disorders.</p> <p>Last year in program.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

***Program Effectiveness***

<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data Collection</b>	<b>Use</b>
<b>Praxis Exam</b>	<b>National certification examination.</b>	<b>Multiple-choice exam scored in terms of</b>	<b>Program improvement.</b>
Employment Data	Percentages of students employed serving children with disabilities within one year of graduation.	Survey of recent graduates.	Program improvement.
<b>Completer Survey</b>	<b>Student opinion of program effectiveness.</b>	<b>Survey of recent graduates.</b>	<b>Program improvement.</b>
Employer Survey	Employer opinion of student competence and preparedness.	Survey of employers of recent graduates.	Program improvement.



ASHA Report	Narrative of program strengths and weaknesses.	Annual report sent to ASHA in August; feedback returns in December.	Program improvement.
-------------	------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------

**Data Tables (All data based on 4-point rubrics, with 4 = exemplary, 3 = competent, 2 = developing, and 1 = unacceptable.)**

**Table 1. Candidate competency: synthesizing the etiology, anatomy and physiology, and assessment procedures for prevention and treatment of neurological disorders.**

<b>Title of Assessment Instrument</b>			
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
EDSP 254 Case Study Project			
Number of Scores	(no data collected this year – the assessment process was in revision)	N = 39	N = 42
Range (Min/Max)		1 – 4	1 – 4
<b>Mean Scores for each ASHA Standard</b>			
IV – C (Etiology, Anatomy, Physiology)		3.75	3.52
IV – D (Prevention, Assessment, and Intervention)		3.70	3.14

IV – F (Evidence-Based Practices)		3.20	3.11
V – A (Writing)		3.80	2.99
Overall mean performance		3.61	3.19

**Table 2. Candidate competency: evidence-based practices.**

<b>Title of Assessment Instrument</b>			
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
EDSP 221 Systematic Review Assignment			
Number of Scores	(no data collected this year – the assessment process was in revision)	N = 38	N = 41
Range (Min/Max)		1 - 4	1 - 4
<b>Mean Scores ASHA Standard</b>			
IV – E (Ethical Conduct)		3.90	3.90
IV – F (Integration of Research Principles for EBP)		2.90	3.64

IV – G (Knowledge of Contemporary Issues)		3.30	2.76
V – A (Writing)		3.25	(no data this year – assignment was revised)
V – B (Modify intervention)		(no data this year – assessment instrument did not include this component in 2011- 2012)	2.98
Overall mean performance		3.33	3.32

**Table 3. Candidate competency: onsite clinical practicum in speech-language pathology.**

<b>Title of Assessment Instrument</b>			
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
EDSP 277 Advanced Clinical Practicum			
Number of Scores		N = 26	N = 41
Range (Min/Max)		1 - 4	1 - 4
<b>ASHA Standards</b>			
Professionalism: Communication (V-B-3-a)		3.68	3.51
Professionalism: Listening (V-B-3-a)		3.62	3.46
Professionalism: Collaboration (V-B-3-b)		3.76	3.56
Professionalism: Counseling (V-B-3-c)		3.38	3.39
Professionalism: Professional Behavior (V-B-3-d)		3.79	3.61
Professionalism: Professional Demeanor (V-B-3-d)		3.69	3.60
Professionalism: Ethical Judgment and Behavior (V-B-3-d)		3.69	3.56
Assessment & Intervention: Goals & Session Objectives (V-B-2-a)		3.38	3.15
Assessment & Intervention: Lesson Plans (V-B-2-a)		3.59	3.54
Assessment & Intervention: Materials (V-B-1-c)		3.55	3.34
Assessment & Intervention: Strategy Use (V-B-2-e)		3.34	3.29
Assessment & Intervention: Treatment (V-B-2-e)		3.55	3.41
Writing: Appropriate Info (V-A)		3.66	3.24
Writing: Punctuation & Syntax (V-A)		3.48	3.39
Writing: Organization (V-A)		3.62	3.41
Writing: Integration & Clarity (V-A)		3.48	3.15

**Table 4. Candidate competency: student teaching practicum.**

<b>EDSP 269 Student Teaching Practicum</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
Number of Scores		N = 40	N = 34
Range (Min/Max)		1 - 4	1 - 4
<b>ASHA Standards</b>			
Professionalism: Communication (V-B-3-a)		3.90	3.67
Professionalism: Listening (V-B-3-a)		3.90	3.74
Professionalism: Collaboration (V-B-3-b)		3.85	3.71
Professionalism: Counseling (V-B-3-c)		3.53	3.46
Professionalism: Professional Behavior (V-B-3-d)		3.94	3.73
Professionalism: Professional Demeanor (V-B-3-d)		3.94	3.86
Professionalism: Ethical Judgment and Behavior (V-B-3-d)		3.91	3.91
Assessment & Intervention: Behavioral Observations (V-B-1-c)		3.74	3.63
Assessment & Intervention: Assessment Materials (V-B-1-c)		N/A	3.38
Assessment & Intervention: Instrumentation (V-B-1-c)		3.48	3.44
Assessment & Intervention: Data Interpretation (V-B-1-e)		3.72	3.53
Assessment & Intervention: Data Rec & Analysis (V-B-2-e)		3.73	3.44
Assessment & Intervention: Diagnostic Decision (V-B-1-e)		3.68	3.47
Assessment & Intervention: Flexibility (V-B-2-e)		3.77	3.65
Assessment & Intervention: Goals, Session Objectives (V-B-2-a)		3.70	3.64

Assessment & Intervention: Links to Curriculum (V-B-2-a)		N/A	2.75
Assessment & Intervention: Lesson Plans (V-B-2-b)		3.79	3.67
Assessment & Intervention: Materials (V-B-2-c)		3.80	3.73
Assessment & Intervention: Strategy Use (V-B-2-c)		3.78	3.61
Assessment & Intervention: Treatment (V-B-2-b)		3.80	3.65
Assessment & Intervention: Data Collection (V-B-2-d)		3.81	3.69
Assessment & Intervention: Data Driven Treatment (V-B-2-d)		N/A	3.38
Writing: Appropriate Information (V-A)		3.90	3.71
Writing: Punctuation and Syntax (V-A)		3.81	3.79
Writing: Organization (V-A)		3.89	3.76
Writing: Clarity (V-A)		3.76	3.76

**Table 5. Program effectiveness – Praxis examination scores.**

<b>Title of Assessment Instrument</b>			
<b>Praxis exam scores</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
Number of completers	37	44	40
<b>Percent passing Praxis examination within one year of program completion.</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Completer survey of program effectiveness (one-two years post graduation; 5-point scale with 1 = poor and 5 = excellent).</b>			
<b>Advising</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>(no data yet as students are surveyed one-year post graduation)</b>
<b>Graduate admission</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>3.61</b>	
<b>Classrooms and labs</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>2.94</b>	
<b>Graduate courses</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>2.89</b>	
<b>Preparation for practicum</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>2.89</b>	
<b>On-campus practicum</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>3.11</b>	
<b>Student-teaching</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>4.11</b>	
<b>Externship</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>3.61</b>	
<b>On-campus supervisors</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>3.28</b>	
<b>Off-campus supervisors</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>3.61</b>	
	<b>(N= 17)</b>	<b>(N=18)</b>	
<b>Employer survey of program effectiveness (5-point scale with 1 = poor and 5 = excellent).</b>			
	(survey in progress – our last survey of employers was conducted in 2010).	(survey in progress)	(survey in progress)

**PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data**

## **Strengths:**

### **A) Candidate Competence**

- Overall mean performance on assessment instruments (see Data Tables 1 – 4) suggests students generally exhibit competence in all areas related to ASHA Standards.
- Strongest areas include professionalism (ethical conduct, professional demeanor and behavior, and communication and collaboration) and oral communication skills (Data Tables 3 and 4).
- The largest year-to-year improvement in student competency scores was seen in the area of evidence-based practices (from 2.9 in AY 2011 to 3.6 in AY 2012, Data Table 2).
- By and large, most areas of weaknesses that are seen in the onsite clinical practicum courses (taken in the first year of the MA program, Data Table 3) have been resolved by the time students are evaluated in their off-site student teaching practicum courses (taken in their second year of the MA program, Data Table 4).

### **B) Program Effectiveness**

- In the last three years, over 90% of candidates have passed the national examination in Speech- Language Pathology, which is a pre-requisite for ASHA certification (Table B-5).

## **Areas for Improvement:**

### **A) Candidate Competence**

- Overall mean performance on the onsite clinical assessment instruments (first year of MA program, Data Table 3) indicates that students have some difficulty writing treatment goals and objectives, as well as developing appropriate lesson plans.
- Overall mean performance on the evidence-based practice assessment instrument indicates that students also struggle with using research evidence to modify treatment intervention strategies (Data Table 2).
- Overall mean performance on the Case Study project in the Seminar in Neurology (Data Table 1) indicates that students have some difficulty with selecting and administering appropriate assessment instruments, as well as with written communication.

### **B) Program Effectiveness**



- Program effectiveness data reported here (Praxis Exam scores, Data Table 5) indicate that virtually all students have sufficient knowledge and skills to pass the national certification examination in speech-language pathology.
- Unfortunately, completer survey data indicate that students who graduated in 2012 did not rate many aspects of our program as highly as students who graduated in the previous year, including advising, graduate courses, preparation for clinical practicum, and on-campus supervision.

Each program describes how it used the data from analyses of candidate assessments and program effectiveness to improve candidate outcomes and program effectiveness. The focus of this section should not be on the process employed by the institution to discuss changes (although it can be mentioned briefly), but on the actual considered, proposed, or implemented programmatic changes specific to the data. If proposed changes are being made, please connect the proposed changes to the data that stimulated those modifications and to the Program and/or Common Standard(s) that compels program performance in that area.

Since the last BDR, the CD&S program has made the following changes to the curriculum in response to candidate competency concerns, as outlined below:

1. Concerns with regards to ASHA Standards IV-C, IV-D, and V-A (specifically, developing and writing appropriate treatment goals and objectives, Table B-3):

- To address this issue, we developed a summer workshop series for students who were slated to begin their student teaching the following year. The workshop series consists of six two-hour presentations from “guest experts” who provided practical, hands-on training and practice as regards a variety of issues related to public schools, including writing treatment goals and objectives.

2. Concerns with regard to ASHA Standard IV-F (Evidence-Based Practice):

- To address this issue, faculty 1) revised the existing treatment plan worksheet to include an “Evidence-Based Practice” column so that students could indicate the evidence for their chosen treatment plan; and 2) infused an EBP component into all academic courses.

3. Concerns with regards to ASHA Standard IV-D (specifically, assessment):

- To address this concern, faculty members developed a core curriculum of assessment instruments and clinical supervisors were asked to provide students with sufficient opportunities to become proficient in administering the core group of assessments prior to exiting the assessment clinic.

4. Concerns with regards to program effectiveness, specifically completer survey from 2011 (where students rated our program less favorably in many areas than they had the year before):

To address the concern re: advising, our program designated one faculty member to do the advising so that all students would receive consistent advice.

To address the concern re: the academic course curriculum, we hired a new faculty member to shore up the expertise in voice and fluency disorders, which were specifically mentioned by students as areas in which they felt unprepared for practice.