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The National Context for Accountability

2006 Spelling’s Commission
• “No child left behind” for universities
• Called for greater accountability in higher education
  – Particular emphasis on documenting student learning outcomes
• Strides have been made by national organizations
  – Voluntary accountability system
    • Association of Public and Land Grant Universities
    • American Association of State Colleges and Universities
  – Rubrics for assessing learner outcomes
    • Association of American Colleges and Universities

National Changes at the Program/Department Level
• National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)
  – Even more assessment activity is occurring at the program level than at the institutional level
  – Assessment activities are being used to improve student learning
  – Accountability at the program level would be facilitated by “more substantive information about assessment techniques and experiences elsewhere” (Ewell, Paulson, & Kinzie, 2011, p. 20)
  – Calls for “more program level case studies”

Further Reading

Our Story
• Began with CAA call for formative and summative assessments
• Supported by our Provost’s Documenting Learner Success project (http://www.provost.ku.edu/areas/academic/outcomes/)
• Our steps:
  – Identify program goals
  – Identify experiences linked to those goals
  – Assess student learning at multiple points
  – Examine & discuss student data
MA SLP PORTFOLIOS!!!

The Portfolio
• Readily available
• Easy to use
  — Students
  — Faculty
• Demonstrates breath and depth of learning
• Encourages reflection
• See http://splh.ku.edu/ipcd/MASLP/documents/Portfolio_requirementsforwebsite.pdf

Keep Toolkit™
• Online program through Blackboard™
• Developed at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
• Added to by students each semester
• Monitored by advisors
• Formally reviewed with advisor at mid-program review
• Formally reviewed by committee of 3 faculty during final semester
• See https://portfolio.ku.edu/html/snapshot.php?id=95957602184226

Artifacts
• Designed to capture breadth and depth of learning
• Clinical and academic artifacts included
  – 4 clinical
  – 7 academic
• 6 of 9 ASHA content areas represented
• Evaluation and treatment represented
• From different courses and experiences

Artifact Description
• Student Name:
• Course number or Clinical Placement:
• ASHA Area (see grid or contact hours earned):
• Evaluation, Treatment, or Both?
• Instructor/Supervisor?
• Semester & Year:
• See http://splh.ku.edu/ipcd/MASLP/documents/3.Artifact_Description_Sheet_9.2.2011Fall2011Forward.docx
Artifact Description

Students answer whatever questions are relevant 1-4
All students answer questions 5 & 6
1. Foundational Knowledge: What foundational knowledge is demonstrated in this artifact? Specifically, what research evidence, theory, basic principles, etc. were needed to complete this assignment/work with this client/work in this setting?

2. Application & Use: How is this artifact (or what you learned from this artifact) relevant to other clients, situations, scenarios? Specifically, what settings, clients, situations is this applicable to? How would you change what you did if you had to do it all over again?

3. Analytical Processes: What analytical processes are relevant to/demonstrated by this artifact? What did you measure/examine/track to evaluate this client or track change in this client? What measures/procedures/etc. did you learn about in this class that are demonstrated in this artifact?

4. Communication/Professional Skills: What communication/professional skills are demonstrated by this artifact?

5. What strengths of yours are evident in this artifact? Consider foundational knowledge, application/use, analytical processes, communication/professional skills.

6. What needs/weaknesses of yours are evident in this artifact? Consider foundational knowledge, application/use, analytical processes, communication/professional skills.

Artifact Examples

- Diagnostic project from Speech Aerodynamics class (phonation/resonance, diagnostic)
- Evaluation of clinical skills from summer clinical practicum experience at Communication Camp (social, treatment)
- Case report from Language Disorders of School Age (receptive-expressive language, diagnostic and treatment)
- Article review for AAC in the Schools class (modalities, intervention)

Literacy-Based Intervention Project
SPLH 844
Julia Ubbenga 97/100 great job!*
5/18/11

Description of Target Student
Jake, a 7-year-old second grade student in the Olathe school district, was referred by his classroom teacher for a speech-language assessment. Per teacher report, Jake is having problems following group instruction and shows limited understanding of spatial and positional concepts in class. His writing is simple, lacks supporting details, and lack simple transitions (first, second, etc.). Jake's spontaneous language is disconnected and hard to understand at times. He struggles to express his thoughts and needs help from his listener to organize his message and use specific words. He is demonstrating problems with the second grade reading and writing curriculum. His social

ARTIFACT DESCRIPTION SHEET

Student Name: Julia
Course number or Clinical Placement: SPLH 844, Language Disorders of School-Aged Children
ASHA Area (see grid or contact hours earned): Receptive/Expressive Language
Evaluation, Treatment, or Both? Both
Instructor/Supervisor? Dr. Daniels
Semester & Year: Spring 2011
1. Why did you select this artifact? Consider both why you selected this particular experience (i.e., course or clinical placement) as well as this specific assignment/project/exam/feedback form.

I selected this particular artifact because it required me to synthesize course material to design a literacy-based instructional unit that targeted semantic, syntactic, oral, and written expression language obstacles. The project requirements were practical since they mirrored the responsibilities of school speech pathologist. I created a hypothetical second grade student with a diagnosed language learning disorder (LLD). I then described appropriate assessment procedures (standardized and non-standardized) and treatment approaches. I was able to justify the procedures I chose with literature citations to ensure my methods were evidence based.

I chose this course because this knowledge is essential to being an effective speech pathologist in a school setting. The information/resources about school aged language disorders and the assessment and treatment of these disorders would be needed if I would ever work in a school setting. After this course, I feel I could interpret assessments and develop appropriate intervention programs for children who present with communicative disorders in the school setting.

Also, I showed my ability to maximize therapy time by teaching strategies that would be useful in the classroom. An SLP will not have time to directly teach all vocabulary words, so should teach strategies to empower students to be more independent. These strategies included prewriting (using graphic organizers), reviewing work, using context clues and visuals to find word meanings, asking reflection questions to increase comprehension.

A final strength was my ability to use outside resources. I included references and strategies used in my field study, but not directly mentioned in class. For example, I used the story grammar chart from Westby (2003) as a visual to be used to scaffold an oral expression activity.

4. What did you learn from this experience (i.e., this course/clinical placement and this specific assignment/project/exam/feedback form) that you will apply in a future experience? If you selected a course artifact, how would you apply your knowledge of course content to a clinical setting/experience? If you selected a clinical artifact, explain how you utilized course information to guide your decisions and performance.

This assignment taught me the importance and flexibility of using literary based interventions to target speech and language deficits in school aged children. Since I was in a school field study setting at the time I did this assignment, I thought about how I would apply what I learned from this assignment when designing treatment goals for a second grader I had evaluated. For example, I would have first collaborated with his classroom teacher to see what content the class was covering. To have a general idea of classroom expectations, I also would have reviewed the Blue Valley school district’s learning standards for various curricular areas for second graders. I’d then design a unit that supported classroom concepts while targeting deficit areas of language. I’d be sure to focus on teaching strategies for

3. What needs/weaknesses of yours are evident in this artifact?
One area of weakness evident in this artifact is my tendency to take a long time to complete assignments because of my "information seeking" nature. Since this project was so comprehensive (pulling from class lectures, journal articles, and outside resources), I was tempted to explore many resources. In some ways this helped generate new ideas, leading to the formulation of better answers. In other ways, this made the paper writing process less efficient since I sometimes read about information purely out of interest instead of relevance to the assignment. I ended up submitting this paper at the exact time it was due (midnight). Overall, I feel time management is one of my strengths. However, in the future, I'd like to work on fine tuning these time management skills so that I'm consistently using my time in the best way. This will be important in balancing work with aspects of family and social life in the future.

2. What strengths of yours are evident in this artifact?
One strength evident in this artifact is my ability to design creative, evidence based therapy activities. For example, one semantic activity I included extended 10 target words from the book Tops and Bottoms by using these target words in a Math activity. The activity not only reinforced the state's 2nd grade math standards (children should demonstrate the ability to compare and order simple fractions using concrete materials), but also facilitated vocabulary building. I was able to see the "big picture" by knowing that target vocabulary words should be seen and practiced in various curricular activities.

learning (e.g., graphic organizers). Also, with the child I'd evaluated, I would have taught Tier 2 vocabulary words, which are high frequency words that capable language learners know (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002) that would be useful across the curriculum. As seen in the assignment, some instruction would be small group while other would be individual. I would design probes to evaluate therapy and would review in-class work to look for generalization (e.g., looking through recent writing assignments to see if the child is using higher level conjunctions.).
5. How do this course/clinical placement and this specific assignment/exam/feedback form extend your knowledge/performance in other areas of communication disorders?

This assignment extended my knowledge in other areas of communication disorders by encouraging me to think about details of therapy plans such as dosage and distribution of intervention strategies. In this assignment, for example, I looked at the number of exposures a child with a language impairment should receive during a treatment session (of usually 30 min). According to Baumann (2009), the clinician should provide at least 12 exposures per word during each instructional session. In other areas of communication disorders, whether providing therapy for a child with a phonological disorder or reviewing swallowing exercises with a person with dysphagia, I will want to have rationale for dosage.

Also, this assignment reminded me of the importance of collaborating with teachers, family members, other professionals, in order to make therapy plans that best treat the whole child/person.

Formative Portfolio Review

- Advisor Checklist

- Student Self-evaluation of Skills
  - http://splh.ku.edu/ipcd/MASLP/documents/5.Treatment_selfevaluation.doc

- Collaborative Student-Advisor Action Plan
  - http://splh.ku.edu/ipcd/MASLP/forms/Action%20Plan.doc

Formative Portfolio Review Advisor Checklist

- Meeting with Student -- Advisor Procedures -- Mid-Program Evaluation
  - Engage student in conversation re: strengths/weaknesses
    - What went well this year?
    - What were your strongest areas?
    - Add your own impressions to what student reports
    - What would you like to improve on for next year?
    - Add your own impressions to what student reports

- Engage student in conversation re: how to improve weaknesses.
  - How do you plan to work on X, Y, Z?
  - Add your own ideas to the student’s.

- MAKE NOTES ON THE ACTION PLAN
  - Save action plan and e-mail copy to student and to Becky Harris.
  - Update plan of study as needed and e-mail to student and Becky Harris
  - Complete SurveyMonkey survey to provide feedback on this process.

Formative Portfolio Review Advisor Checklist

- Meet with student to discuss strengths/weaknesses.
  - What went well this year?
  - What were your strongest areas?
  - What would you like to improve on for next year?

- Give student feedback/reasons for strengths/weaknesses.
  - What are the strengths/weaknesses?
  - What progress have you made?

- Let student give feedback and comments.
  - What are the strengths/weaknesses?
  - What progress have you made?

- Student's portfolio contains preliminary action plan? Yes No
  - Student's portfolio contains diagnostic self evaluation? Yes No
  - Student's portfolio contains treatment self evaluation? Yes No
  - Student's portfolio contains plan of study? Yes No
  - Student's portfolio contains preliminary action plan? Yes No
  - Student's portfolio contains diagnostic self evaluation? Yes No
  - Student's portfolio contains treatment self evaluation? Yes No
  - Student's portfolio contains plan of study? Yes No

- Student contains preliminary outline/proposal? Yes No
  - Student contains proposal for next year? Yes No

- Student contains portfolio plan of study? Yes No
  - Student contains portfolio plan of study? Yes No

- If any criteria are not met, do not continue with portfolio review. Notify student of missing elements and establish deadline for adding/correcting missing elements.
Interpretation

Formative Portfolio Review
Student Self-Assessment

- Assessment
  - Planning
  - Implementation
  - Interpretation and recommendations
  - Professionalism
- Treatment
  - Same categories

Agreed

Treatment

- Assessment
- Implementation
- Interpretation and recommendations
- Professionalism

Formative Portfolio Review
Student Self-Assessment

Formative Portfolio Review
Student Self-Assessment – Intervention Example

Formative Portfolio Review
Student Self-Assessment – Assessment Example

Formative Portfolio Review
Student Advisor Action Plan Example

- What skills would you like to improve in evaluating communication disorders?
  - Formulating specific questions when reviewing patient background information
  - Improving efficiency in scoring tests and comparing patient results to test norms
  - I need to choose the most relevant data to include in patient reports

Formative Portfolio Review
Student Advisor Action Plan Example

- Agreed upon plan for remainder of program
  - Field study experiences that build upon and expand knowledge gained from current placement at VA hospital
  - Develop reference list of websites and local support groups for adults with communication disorders
  - Develop a better understanding of the referral process from neurologists & geriatricians
  - Increase knowledge of AAC options for adults with communication disorders
  - Improving my ability to develop conversational communication supports for my patients

Formative Portfolio Review
Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good knowledge base and/or prepares well for specific clients/tasks/etc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills; client/family centered; rapport</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility/ability to adapt; creativity</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good generalization of skills/knowledge across situations (integration)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective; openness to feedback; willingness to change</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong ability to read/critique/apply research; strong evidence-based practice skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formative Portfolio Review Data
Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrow knowledge/skills (confined to certain skill areas or patient populations) OR limited experience in particular areas</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing (clarity, mechanics, and/or efficiency)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional skills: verbal communication, time management, stoppiness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superficial reflection</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting all skills together (e.g., integrating client strengths/weaknesses, client interest/goals, research evidence) to accomplish clinical task</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility; changing plan in response to client behavior; tailoring plans to client's specific needs/situations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor generalization of skill/idea/concept to new situations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formative Portfolio Review Data
Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional/planned coursework/clinical experience in a particular area to broaden knowledge/skills</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with supervisor to request particular experiences to broaden knowledge/skills OR gain knowledge of how supervisor approaches a particular skill/issue/area/client population</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing skills by creating report templates; closer proofreading; reviewing grammar rules; reading book on scientific writing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific activities/approaches recommended/suggested in response to a particular/specific weakness identified (e.g., create contingency plans; anticipate problems)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection issues; develop data collection systems/templates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with advisor on particular issues (scientific writing, professionalism)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summative Portfolio Review
Overview

- Advisor Checklist (similar to formative review)
- Similar to formative review, completion of:
  - Student Self-evaluation of Skills
  - Collaborative Action Plan
- Oral presentation of artifacts to committee
- Feedback to student (& program) via rubric
  - http://splh.ku.edu/ipcd/MASLP/documents/10Final_Exam_rubric_09_2_2011.xls

Summative Portfolio Review
Advisor Checklist

1. Student's portfolio contains 11 total artifacts? Yes | No
2. Of the 11 artifacts, 8 are complete? Yes | No
3. Of the 11 artifacts, 6 are complete? Yes | No
4. Of the 11 artifacts, 2 or more relate to evaluation? Yes | No
5. Of the 11 artifacts, 2 or more relate to treatment? Yes | No
6. Of the 11 artifacts, 6 (or more) AHA areas are represented (articulation/phonology, phonation/resonance, fluency; receptive/expressive language; hearing; dysphagia; cognition; social, modalities)? 5-9 areas | 1-5 areas
7. Student's portfolio contains final diagnostic self-evaluation? Yes | No
8. Student's portfolio contains final treatment self-evaluation? Yes | No
9. Student's portfolio contains final preliminary action plan? Yes | No
10. Student's portfolio contains plan of study? Yes | No
11. If all criteria are met, review content of portfolio. Student cleared for final exam. Yes | No

*“any” criteria are not met, do “best” continue with portfolio review, notify student of missing elements and establish deadline for adding/correcting missing elements. Final exam can not proceed.**

Summative Portfolio Review
Advisor Review

1. Review action plan from mid-term examination.
2. Review each “new” artifact (including the artifact description)
   - Artifact description – are the contents in sync with the instructor's?
   - Artifact – what weaknesses are apparent from instructor's comments?
   - Artifact – what strengths are apparent from instructor's comments?
3. Make notes on your portion of the student's action plan. What themes or recurring issues do you note across artifacts? What themes or recurring issues from the mid-program action plan continue or discontinue in the new artifacts? Consider both "process" issues (e.g., professionalism, time management, written communication, verbal communication) and "content knowledge" (e.g., recurring gaps/confusions/etc)
4. Review student self-reflection ratings and summarized strengths/weaknesses on action plan
   - Do you agree/disagree with student's assessment of strengths/weaknesses?
   - Add any further comments (e.g., strengths/weaknesses missed by student)
5. Send copy of Action Plan Draft to student via e-mail
Summative Portfolio Review

Instructions to Students

i. 1 slide = overview of the artifact – be sure to indicate ASHA area & evaluation or treatment (e.g., “This is a case report I did for Dr. XXX’s class on YYYY. For this case, we were given basic assessment information and had to formulate a diagnosis and treatment plan. I diagnosed this child as having a severe phonological disorder and recommended treatment of AA and BB using the CC approach.”). Note that your slide will just list brief bullets to support this verbal summary

ii. 1 slide = Foundational Knowledge. What foundational knowledge is relevant to this artifact?

iii. 1 slide = Application & Use. How is this artifact (or what you learned from this artifact) relevant to other clients, situations, scenarios?

iv. 1 slide = Analytical Processes. What analytical processes are relevant to this artifact?

Assignment: Determine Dx and Tx Plan

My Dx & Tx Plan

- Severe phonological disorder
  - Based on PCC of 50%
  - Singleton accuracy of 47%
  - Cluster accuracy of 12%
  - Several sounds in error and processes that were not developmentally appropriate

- Tx plan
  - /spl/ in nonwords
  - 2 individual sessions per week
  - Drill-play format
Area Potential Questions Low/Unacceptable Mid/Acceptable Top/Outstanding

Foundational Knowledge

- What are the data on X?
- How would you summarize data on X?
- Why that measurement interval?
- What are the characteristics of a good measure of X?
- What makes a good outcome measure?
- What would you measure to examine/tracking changes in X?
- How do you weight the evidence related to X vs. Y?
- How do you resolve the conflict between X & Y?
- Why do you do X instead of Y?
- What is the evidence to support or refute X?
- Why do you do X instead of Y?
- What are the ros/cons of X?
- Absence of critical analysis in content area
- Limited/narrow/cursory knowledge
- Limited/no knowledge of data on X
- Unaware of differences of opinion/conflicts in topic area
- Weak reasoning/justification for an appropriate measurement plan
- Limited/narrow/cursory knowledge
- Inadequate knowledge of appropriate avenues to acquire supporting evidence
- Weak knowledge of how to synthesize evidence relevant to a situation/scenario
- Unable to adequately apply and limit the material covered
- Unable to adequately adapt/modify the measurement plan
- Inadequate knowledge of how to synthesize evidence relevant to a situation/scenario

Rubric

Summative Portfolio Review
Rubric & Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Potential Questions</th>
<th>Low/Unacceptable</th>
<th>Mid/Acceptable</th>
<th>Top/Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>What are the data on X?</td>
<td>How would you summarize data on X?</td>
<td>Why that measurement interval?</td>
<td>What are the characteristics of a good measure of X?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students

- Agree (1)
- Strongly agree (5)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Summative Portfolio Review</th>
<th>Rubric &amp; Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Summative Portfolio Review</th>
<th>Rubric &amp; Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback from Students

1. The portfolio process (i.e., archiving artifacts, completing self-assessment, creating action plan, discussion with advisor) helped me learn about my strengths/areas needing attention and helped me set personal goals for my MA studies/CFTY position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Feedback from Students**

2. The online portfolio tool (KU Keep Toolkit) was easy to use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback from Students**

4. My performance during the FINAL SUMMATIVE exam accurately reflected my skills and abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback from Students

- 2011-2012 misc feedback/themes
  - People wanted to be briefed about how to select artifacts much earlier. Reported that they would have selected different artifacts early on if they had realized what the summative exam would be like.
  - Generally supportive of having observers
  - Some comments that people would have preferred written exams; other comments that people saw the value of the oral exam
  - Comments about anxiety
  - Comments about the need for “good” artifacts from all courses

**Feedback from Students**

3. The instructions and grading rubric for the FINAL SUMMATIVE oral exam were clear. I was well prepared and knew what to expect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Best” Comment from 2011-2012 –

- First, I think it is great that you are allowing the first year students to observe the summative exams. I think that will reduce a lot of the nerves. They will also know what to expect and be more prepared.

- Second, I think the summative exam is useful because it allows us to practice our clinical speaking skills, which will be a big part of our practice. When we are asked questions about our profession in real life, it will not be through a question and multiple choice answers, it will be on the spot and our face. We have to be able to answer these types of questions to the best of our ability.

- Thirdly, I think it is wise that we are allowed to pick three areas that we can present on that are our “strongest.”

- Lastly, I think it is imperative that there be a meeting held at the beginning of the program to discuss the portfolio presentation. I know we have a meeting like that to tell us how to use the portfolio, but there also needs to be another meeting that first year if we were to have last academic. So, the meeting should talk about what kinds of artifacts are good to choose, should talk about the rubric, how the presentation works, etc. If I would have had a similar meeting early in the program I would have used different artifacts for my portfolio and would have been able to present on things that I felt more comfortable with.
**Feedback from Faculty**

1. The full portfolio process (i.e., archiving artifacts, completing a mid-point self-assessment, drafting a mid-point action plan, meeting with advisor to discuss the portfolio) generally captured my ADVISEE’s learning. I was able to get a good picture of each ADVISEE’s strengths and weaknesses throughout the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The online portfolio tool (KU Keep Toolkit) was easy to use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback from Faculty**

3. The instructions and grading rubric for the FINAL SUMMATIVE oral exam were clear. I was well prepared and knew what to expect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Based on the final summative oral exam, I was able to get a good picture of each student’s strengths and weaknesses, even students who were NOT my advisees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The final summative oral exam was an EFFICIENT way to get an ACCURATE picture of each student’s relevant strengths and weaknesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>