

### Issue III—Notes from Discussion Groups

Two general areas of concern came out of the discussions of this issue. Three additional suggestions and needs concerned with related issues also are included here.

1. Are we conducting formative assessments already?

We may be doing so in many programs. This is probably being done more by clinical faculty than by academic faculty at this time. We should use these as a baseline and build upon them. We are already doing many things well! However, we are probably not documenting these formative assessments adequately. Implementation will be easier than documentation. In fact, many programs are not clear about what type of documentation will be required and how programs should monitor progress toward meeting competencies. These will need to be integrated with the present grading systems required by universities. Formative assessments will need to be varied to fit the level of student experience and the site. The importance of student input to develop self-evaluation must be emphasized. Journals and portfolio formats would lend themselves to this type of assessment, especially in outside practicum sites. Most groups reported a need for more guidance on concrete measurement of competencies, skills, outcomes, and so forth. The increase in flexibility in the standards has left many programs wanting definitions and samples of forms. There were many suggestions that CAPCSD or ASHA should create and maintain an electronic repository of formative and summative assessment forms developed by member programs. These should be accompanied by workshops, packets and/or cd's of sample cases for case-based instruction, and objectives to be learned from particular cases.

2. Can all programs develop competencies (outcomes) in their students in all areas of the scope of practice?

The increased emphasis on “breadth” of experience and outcomes may be at the expense of “depth” of learning, especially in smaller programs or those in smaller communities. Many plans for meeting this problem were discussed. In fact, students may be forced to stay in-house longer to gain skills that can be documented more closely than at outside sites. There will be an increased need to provide information and help (compensation such as tuition waivers, continuing ed opportunities, recognition dinners, etc.) to off-campus supervisors if requiring additional documentation from them. There will also be a need for more regular contact between campus and off-campus supervisors. If broad-based outcomes (rather than disorder-specific outcomes) are developed, the implementation across programs may be simpler.

Additional Suggestions/Needs:

1. The PRAXIS exam needs to be updated to fit the new standards and outcomes.
2. Maybe standards should affect SLP students entering in 2005 because of the usual lag between development of new procedures, implementation, catalog changes, and so forth.
3. An interesting resource for developing student learning outcomes:  
Walvoord, B. E., & Anderson, V. A. (1998). *Effective grading: A tool for learning and assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.