

**Graduate Degree Program Assessment Progress Report Cover Sheet:**

**Degree: Ph.D. Communication Sciences and Disorders**

**For Calendar Year: 2010**

(Date submitted to college committee: April 4, 2011 By: Betholyn Gentry)

(Date posted on college assessment website: \_\_\_\_\_)

Overall Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Respond to all six parts following the “Degree Program Assessment Progress Report Instructions.” (NOTE: Parts 1 through 4 can be copied from the relevant sections of your assessment plan.) Attach additional pages as needed.

(1) Student learning goal(s) addressed this year:

The overall goal of the program is to prepare high-quality scholar-teachers who 1) will engage in research to expand the knowledge base in communication sciences and disorders and 2) will educate the audiologists and speech pathologists of the future.

(2) Learning outcomes/objectives for those goals addressed this year:

**Objective #1:** The CSD consortium will be effective in attracting and graduating high quality students

**Objective #2:** The student will display competence in teaching by exhibiting refined communication skills and knowledge of the subject matter; by promoting critical thinking and lifelong learning; by organizing and managing course elements; by implementing a variety of media and technology and by being sensitive to individual student circumstances.

**Objective #3:** Students will display competence in research, grant writing and in their specialty area by demonstrating research skills and disseminating information; by writing and submitting a grant; and by disseminating information in their specialty area.

(3) Courses & activities where assessed:

The Ph.D. program assessment plan and procedures were assessed through a thorough evaluation of current procedures. Specifically, the assessment feedback loop was evaluated for any needed changes.

(4) Methods used:

The Audiology and Speech Pathology Department has historically assessed graduate students using a variety of assessment tools that have been useful for program building

and improvement. Now as part of the doctoral program consortium with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences and the University of Central Arkansas, we continue this tradition. During 2010 the name was changed for the Ph.D. program. We are now the Arkansas Consortium for the Ph.D. in Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD). The CSD consortium was developed with assessment serving a critical role. The doctoral program was assessed in 2010 using the following assessment tools: CSD Admissions Report, CSD Recruitment Report, CSD Student Scholarship Report, CSD Faculty Scholarship Report, CSD Student Feedback Report, as well as an assessment of the feedback loop.

(5) What are the assessment findings? How did you analyze them?

### **CSD Admissions Report**

One of the first steps to take with a new program is to develop admission standards and admit new students. During the 2010 academic year, the CSD Ph.D. program received several requests for general information. Over 100 contacts were made at state and national conventions. Ten application packets were sent to interested individuals, and we received 3 completed and 2 incomplete applications for the 2010 admissions year. Of these five completed applications, three were female and two were male; all five were Caucasian; four were in the area of speech-language pathology, and one was in the area of audiology. Of the three completed applications, the faculty voted to admit two individual into the program. However, none of these applicants actually started the program in 2010. The reasons given for not coming included personal issues and funding. The final status of the applications was as follows:

- Applicant(s) incomplete = 2
- Applicant(s) complete = 3
- Applicant(s) admitted full time = 2
- Applicant(s) admitted part time = 0
- Applicant(s) denied = 0
- Applicant(s) starting program = 0

The average verbal GRE scores, the average score on the verbal section for this applicant class was 467.5, and the average score for the quantitative section was 632.5 and the average writing score was 3.75. The average GPA for applicants during 2010 was 3.75. We plan to review our admissions procedures this year and make any modifications that we deem necessary. Data was collected using the *Admissions Report Form* in Appendix A. Three of the applicants were international students and two were from Arkansas. Additionally there were seven telephone/email inquiries from students in the US and five inquiries from international students who did not follow up with an application.

### **CSD Recruitment Report**

During 2010 recruitment efforts for the doctoral program consortium concentrated on professional conferences and branding of the program. Recruitment activities at conferences involved purchasing recruitment tables at each conference and staffing the tables with consortium faculty. Additionally, our funded budget allowed us to purchase new recruitment materials that included posters, flyers, pens, koozies and bags. We were also able to purchase consortium letterhead stationery and envelopes. These promotional materials will help get the name of our consortium out to the public. Recruitment activities at these conferences were achieved with the help of several consortium faculty members (UALR, UAMS, and UCA) who attended the conferences listed below during 2010. Recruitment efforts also included 50 emails to students who made inquiries about the program at requirement tables.

### **CSD Student Scholarship Report**

Our Ph.D. students were encouraged to participate in scholarly activities this past year and data was collected using the *Student Scholarship Form* in Appendix B. Nine of our Ph.D. students were responsible for 14 presentations at state, regional and national conventions. Additionally, our Ph.D. students received funding from two grants and submitted three articles for publication. These results are very encouraging. Our doctoral students are getting experiences presenting at the state and national levels. We will continue to encourage this type of scholarship in our doctoral students in the future.

### **CSD Faculty Scholarship Report**

The consortium faculty (UALR, UAMS and UCA) were very productive during 2010. Data from sixteen consortium faculty were compiled on the *Faculty Scholarship Form* in (See **Appendix C**) and used for the Faculty Scholarship Report. The consortium faculty were very visible professionally as can be seen from the number of presentations and publications reported. A total of 45 presentations were made at local, regional and national professional conferences by the consortium faculty. With regard to grant applications, the consortium faculty submitted a total of 10 grants, 3 of which were funded. This resulted in an 30% funding rate for the consortium faculty which is lower than the 88% funding rate reported last year. Additionally, the consortium faculty submitted 28 manuscripts for publication and a total of 15 articles were published in professional journals. Additionally, four books were published by consortium faculty. This equals an impressive publication rate of 53% which is lower than the 932% publication rate reported last year.

### **CSD Student Feedback Report**

Student feedback is an important component for assessing the doctoral program. This year we were able to get feedback from eight of our fourteen Ph.D. students using the revised *Student Feedback Form* (See Appendix D). Four second/third year students responded and four fourth and fifth year students responded. There were no first year students for 2010. Based on the information obtained from doctoral student feedback our Ph.D. program is providing the necessary advising and program planning for most of our students early in their enrollment. Early advisement appears to be given during the first

semester of enrollment part-time students this past year. We will continue to make it our goal to provide advising and program planning early in the students' course of study. Also the current students in the program are satisfied with the consortium program as a whole and rate satisfaction from "very good" to "excellent."

### **Assessment of Feedback Loop**

The CSD consortium assessment committee examined the effectiveness of the current plan and determined that no actions are required to be taken at this time. After a complete cycle of the assessment plan another evaluation of the plan will be done. This information will be disseminated to the intercampus committee for feedback on any necessary changes to the assessment process.

(6) What conclusions were drawn and what decisions were made as a result? How were stakeholder groups involved?

### **Conclusions**

Our unique consortium Ph.D. program is a model of intercampus cooperation and commitment to providing the next generation of researchers and educators in the discipline of speech language pathology. Assessment efforts on the part of the consortium will be invaluable as we finalize and confirm the matriculation process for our students. This year's report contains the curriculum map of doctoral courses and their relationship to the consortium goals established by the intercampus faculty.

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

The major stakeholders for our Ph.D. consortium include: faculty, students, employers and working graduates. The CSD assessment committee participated in collecting, analyzing, and summarizing relevant assessment data for this report. As students graduate from our program we will be able to assess our performance in meeting the needs of these primary stakeholders. Additionally, major stakeholders to the consortium Ph.D. include the administrators of three university campuses. Their commitment to providing funding for Ph.D. student stipends is invaluable as we seek to attract the qualified students.

Doctoral students are important stakeholders in our doctoral program and they were given the opportunity to complete the Student Feedback Form and evaluate the advising process and their program development. These data will be reviewed in years to come for trends that require our attention.

Employers and working graduates will be able to evaluate the doctoral program in the future when we have graduates employed in the community.

**ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORT**  
**Arkansas Consortium for the Ph.D. in Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD)**  
**Betholyn Gentry, Ph.D. and Susan Moss-Logan, Ph.D., Co-Directors**  
**College of Professional Studies (UALR)**  
**Angela Brenton, Ph.D., Dean**  
**College of Health Related Professions (UAMS)**  
**Douglas Murphy, Ph.D., Dean**  
**College of Health and Allied Sciences (UCA)**  
**Neil Hattlestad, Dean**  
**Thomas Guyette, Ph.D., Chair**  
**Audiology and Speech Pathology Department (UALR/UAMS)**  
**Brent Gregg, Ph.D., Interim Chair**  
**Department of Speech-Language Pathology (UCA)**  
**Betholyn Gentry, Ph.D., College Assessment Committee**  
**ANNUAL REPORT - APRIL 2011**

**Faculty Contributors:** Betholyn Gentry, Ph.D., Brent Gregg, Ph.D., Thomas Guyette, Ph.D., Kimberly McCullough, Ph.D., Susan Moss-Logan, Ph.D., and Kathy Shapley, Ph.D.

### **CSD Mission**

The mission is to develop students' intellectual curiosity and abilities so that they desire to discover and disseminate knowledge. This in turn will benefit persons with communication disorders, their families and the community as a whole, while encouraging a lifelong desire to learn.

### **Program Goals**

The overall goal of the program is to prepare high-quality scholar-teachers who 1) will engage in research to expand the knowledge base in communication sciences and disorders and 2) will educate the audiologists and speech pathologists of the future.

### **Program Objectives**

Effectiveness of the program is based on student learning outcomes (objectives #2-5) as well as internal and external benchmark measures. Because completion of student outcomes could take 6-10 years, internal and external benchmarks must be used to provide information about the program as it evolves along the way.

**Objective #1:** The CSD consortium will be effective in attracting and graduating high quality students

**Objective #2:** The student will display competence in teaching by exhibiting refined communication skills and knowledge of the subject matter; by promoting critical thinking and lifelong learning; by organizing and managing course elements; by implementing a variety of media and technology and by being sensitive to individual student circumstances.

**Objective #3:** Students will display competence in research, grant writing and in their specialty area by demonstrating research skills and disseminating information; by writing and submitting a grant; and by disseminating information in their specialty area.

**Arkansas Consortium for the Ph.D. in Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD)**

**FIVE-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN**

The five-year assessment plan for the CSD consortium between the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, the University of Arkansas at Little Rock and the University of Central Arkansas is explained below. The doctoral program assessment plan includes changing the focus of assessment each year following a five-year cycle.

**First Year Assessments (2007):** The first year of the five-year cycle involves gathering data related to assessment of the doctoral program admissions, curriculum and faculty. This assessment process includes: reviewing the admissions policy (number of applications completed, average GRE scores of applicants, and average GPA of applicants); reviewing the curriculum (student feedback, and accrediting agency feedback when available); reviewing faculty effectiveness (student course evaluations, student scholarship). These data will be utilized to evaluate program effectiveness and help determine if the program is attracting high quality students. Results from this data can be used for program improvement and decision-making.

**Second Year Assessments (2008):** During the second year of the five-year cycle assessment efforts for the doctoral program will focus on assessment of doctoral student teaching. Assessment efforts for the doctoral program will include data reported from Teaching Evaluation Team, course and clinical evaluations, and employer surveys when available. These data will be used to determine if the doctoral students are competent in teaching by evaluating their communication skills and knowledge of the subject matter; their critical thinking skills, their organization and course management skills and their ability to utilize media and technology in the classroom.

**Third Year Assessments (2009):** During the third year of the five-year cycle assessment efforts for the doctoral program will focus on assessment of doctoral student scholarship. Assessment efforts for the doctoral program will include data reported from comprehensive examinations, dissertation completion rate (when available), doctoral students grant funding rate and employer surveys (when available). These data will be used to determine how well the program is meeting the goal of producing students who are competent in research, grant writing and in their specialty area.

**Fourth Assessment Year (2010):** During the fourth year of the five-year cycle the doctoral program assessment will involve examination of the assessment feedback loop. The CSD consortium assessment committee will examine the effectiveness of the current plan and determine if any actions have been taken as a result of feedback from the assessment plan.

**This information will be disseminated to the intercampus committee for feedback on any necessary changes to the assessment process.**

**Fifth Year Assessment (2011):** During the fifth year of the five-year cycle the focus of assessment will again shift to evaluating the program philosophy, mission and goals. Review of the program philosophy, mission and goals will include examining the employment of students in academic settings; surveys of former students; student exit interviews; employer surveys; and student performance as teachers, researchers, and grant writers.

**CSD Assessment Plan - Five-Year Cycle  
(2011 Report)**

<b>Assessment Tool</b>	<b>Cycle</b>	<b>Report Year</b>
<b><u>Assessment of program admissions, curriculum and faculty</u></b>		
Admissions Report Data	yearly	2011
Recruitment Report	As Needed	2011
Student Scholarship Data	yearly	2011
Faculty Scholarship Data	yearly	2011
Student Feedback Data	yearly	2011
<b><u>Assessment of doctoral student teaching</u></b>		
Teaching Evaluation	2 years	2009
Clinical Evaluation	2 years	2009
Employer survey	2 years	TBA
<b><u>Assessment of doctoral student scholarship</u></b>		
Comprehensive Examination	3 years	2010
Dissertation completion rate	3 years	TBA
Student grant writing	3 years	2010
Employer Survey	3 years	TBA
<b><u>Assessment of the feedback loop</u></b>	4 years	2011

## **Use of Assessment**

The Audiology and Speech Pathology Department has historically assessed graduate students using a variety of assessment tools that have been useful for program building and improvement. Now as part of the doctoral program consortium with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences and the University of Central Arkansas, we continue this tradition. During 2010 the name was changed for the Ph.D. program. We are now the Arkansas Consortium for the Ph.D. in Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD). The CSD consortium was developed with assessment serving a critical role. The doctoral program was assessed in 2010 using the following assessment tools: CSD Admissions Report, CSD Recruitment Report, CSD Student Scholarship Report, CSD Faculty Scholarship Report, CSD Student Feedback Report, as well as an assessment of the feedback loop.

## **CSD Admissions Report**

One of the first steps to take with a new program is to develop admission standards and admit new students. During the 2010 academic year, the CSD Ph.D. program received several requests for general information. Over 100 contacts were made at state and national conventions. Ten application packets were sent to interested individuals, and we received 3 completed and 2 incomplete applications for the 2010 admissions year. Of these five completed applications, three were female and two were male; all five were Caucasian; four were in the area of speech-language pathology, and one was in the area of audiology. Of the three completed applications, the faculty voted to admit two individual into the program. However, none of these applicants actually started the program in 2010. The reasons given for not coming included personal issues and funding. The final status of the applications was as follows:

- Applicant(s) incomplete = 2
- Applicant(s) complete = 3
- Applicant(s) admitted full time = 2
- Applicant(s) admitted part time = 0
- Applicant(s) denied = 0
- Applicant(s) starting program = 0

The average verbal GRE scores, the average score on the verbal section for this applicant class was 467.5, and the average score for the quantitative section was 632.5 and the average writing score was 3.75. The average GPA for applicants during 2010 was 3.75. We plan to review our admissions procedures this year and make any modifications that we deem necessary. Data was collected using the *Admissions Report Form* in Appendix A. Three of the applicants were international students and two were from Arkansas. Additionally there were seven telephone/email inquiries from students in the US and five inquiries from international students who did not follow up with an application.

## **CSD Recruitment Report**

During 2010 recruitment efforts for the doctoral program consortium concentrated on professional conferences and branding of the program. Recruitment activities at conferences involved purchasing recruitment tables at each conference and staffing the tables with consortium faculty. Additionally, our funded budget allowed us to purchase new recruitment materials that included posters, flyers, pens, koozies and bags. We were also able to purchase consortium letterhead stationery and envelopes. These promotional materials will help get the name of our consortium out to the public. Recruitment activities at these conferences were achieved with the help of several consortium faculty members (UALR, UAMS, and UCA) who attended the conferences listed below during 2010. Recruitment efforts also included 50 emails to students who made inquiries about the program at requirement tables.

### ***CSD Recruitment Activity Report (2010)***

<b>Recruitment Conference</b>	<b>Date</b>
American Speech Language and Hearing Association	November
Arkansas Speech Language and Hearing Association	October
American Academy for Cerebral Palsy & Developmental Medicine	September
National Black Association for Speech Language and Hearing	April
American Academy of Audiology	April
UCA Spring Conference	March
Mid South Conference	March
AAC Special Interest Division	February

## **CSD Student Scholarship Report**

Our Ph.D. students were encouraged to participate in scholarly activities this past year and data was collected using the *Student Scholarship Form* in Appendix B. Nine of our Ph.D. students were responsible for 14 presentations at state, regional and national conventions. Additionally, our Ph.D. students received funding from two grants and submitted three articles for publication. These activities are represented on the table below:

### ***CSD Student Scholarship for 2010***

# of Consortium Students reporting	#Presentations (State, regional, national)	#Grant Applications/ # Funded	#Articles Submitted
9	14	2	3

These results are very encouraging. Our doctoral students are getting experiences presenting at the state and national levels. We will continue to encourage this type of scholarship in our doctoral students in the future.

### **CSD Faculty Scholarship Report**

The consortium faculty (UALR, UAMS and UCA) were very productive during 2010. Data from sixteen consortium faculty were compiled on the *Faculty Scholarship Form* in (See **Appendix C**) and used for the Faculty Scholarship Report. The consortium faculty were very visible professionally as can be seen from the number of presentations and publications reported. A total of 45 presentations were made at local, regional and national professional conferences by the consortium faculty. With regard to grant applications, the consortium faculty submitted a total of 10 grants, 3 of which were funded. This resulted in an 30% funding rate for the consortium faculty which is lower than the 88% funding rate reported last year. Additionally, the consortium faculty submitted 28 manuscripts for publication and a total of 15 articles were published in professional journals. Additionally, four books were published by consortium faculty. This equals an impressive publication rate of 53% which is lower than the 932% publication rate reported last year. These data can be seen in the table below.

#### ***CSD Faculty Scholarship for 2010***

# of Consortium Faculty reporting	#Presentations (State, regional, national)	#Grant Applications/ # Funded	#Articles Submitted	#Articles Published
18	45	10/3	28	15 & 4 Books

#### ***CSD Faculty Scholarship for 2009***

# of Consortium Faculty reporting	#Presentations (State, regional, national)	#Grant Applications/ # Funded	#Articles Submitted	#Articles Published
18	27	9/8	30	28

#### ***CSD Faculty Scholarship for 2008***

# of Consortium Faculty reporting	#Presentations (State, regional, national)	#Grant Applications/ # Funded	#Articles Submitted	#Articles Published
16	37	8/6	32	26

## CSD Student Feedback Report

Student feedback is an important component for assessing the doctoral program. This year we were able to get feedback from eight of our fourteen Ph.D. students using the revised *Student Feedback Form* (See Appendix D). Four second/third year students responded and four fourth and fifth year students responded. There were no first year students for 2010. The results are listed below.

### *CSD Ph.D. Student Feedback for 2010*

Questions for 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students (n=0)	%Yes	%No	Comments
<b>Questions for Second &amp; Third Year Students (n=4)</b>			
1. During your course of study, did you have the opportunity to learn and develop the skills necessary to develop, conduct and disseminate research? If yes, please describe the opportunities you were given and the outcomes of each.	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	Examples: Coursework, Research projects. Manuscripts, collaboration with other students, presentations at national conventions
2. During your course of study, did you have the opportunity to learn and develop the skills necessary to write grants? If yes, please describe the opportunities you were given and the outcomes of each.	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	Examples: Coursework on Grant writing, faculty guidance, writing actual grants that were funded; writing grants for ASHA.
3. During your course of study, did you have the opportunity to learn and develop the skills necessary to teach and provide clinical supervision at the University level? If yes, please describe the opportunities you were given and the outcomes of each.	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	Examples: supervision and teaching coursework, opportunities to teach an actual course,.
<b>Questions for Fourth &amp; Fifth Year Students (n=4)</b>			
1. Have you completed your prospectus and received approval from your dissertation committee? ___Yes ___No	<b>75%</b>	<b>25%</b>	
2. If not, what deterrents have prevented you from completing your prospectus?			Scheduling a time for faculty to meet

3. Have you started collecting data for your dissertation?	<b>75%</b>	<b>25%</b>	
4. If not, what deterrent have prevented you from starting to collect data?			<b>Waiting on committee approval. Then I have to get IRB approval</b>
5. When do you expect to complete your degree?			<b>August 2011; December 2011; Spring 2012; Summer 2012;</b>
6. Please circle your rating of satisfaction with the Ph.D. Consortium program on the scale below:			<b>Excellent = 3 Very Good = 1</b>

Based on the information obtained from doctoral student feedback our Ph.D. program is providing the necessary advising and program planning for most of our students early in their enrollment. Early advisement appears to be given during the first semester of enrollment part-time students this past year. We will continue to make it our goal to provide advising and program planning early in the students' course of study. Also the current students in the program are satisfied with the consortium program as a whole and rate satisfaction from "very good" to "excellent."

### **Assessment of Feedback Loop**

The CSD consortium assessment committee examined the effectiveness of the current plan and determined that no actions are required to be taken at this time. After a complete cycle of the assessment plan another evaluation of the plan will be done. This information will be disseminated to the intercampus committee for feedback on any necessary changes to the assessment process.

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

The major stakeholders for our Ph.D. consortium include: faculty, students, employers and working graduates. The CSD assessment committee participated in collecting, analyzing, and summarizing relevant assessment data for this report. As students graduate from our program we will be able to assess our performance in meeting the needs of these primary stakeholders. Additionally, major stakeholders to the consortium Ph.D. include the administrators of three university campuses. Their commitment to providing funding for Ph.D. student stipends is invaluable as we seek to attract the qualified students.

Doctoral students are important stakeholders in our doctoral program and they were given the opportunity to complete the Student Feedback Form and evaluate the advising process and their program development. These data will be reviewed in years to come for trends that require our attention.

Employers and working graduates will be able to evaluate the doctoral program in the future when we have graduates employed in the community.

### **Summary**

Our unique consortium Ph.D. program is a model of intercampus cooperation and commitment to providing the next generation of researchers and educators in the discipline of speech language pathology. Assessment efforts on the part of the consortium will be invaluable as we finalize and confirm the matriculation process for our students. This year's report contains the curriculum map of doctoral courses and their relationship to the consortium goals established by the intercampus faculty.

## Curriculum Map

### Curriculum Assessment Map: Degree Program Assessment Arkansas Consortium for the Ph.D. in Communication Sciences and Disorders: Ph.D.

**Emphasis:** Extensive      Somewhat      Little      None  
**Assessed:** Exam      Paper      Project      Other      Not Assessed

		<b>Goal #1: The overall goal of the program is to prepare high-quality scholar-teachers who 1) will engage in research to expand the knowledge base in communication sciences and disorders and 2) will educate the audiologists and speech pathologists of the future.</b>		
<b>Courses and Activities</b>	<b>How Outcomes are Addressed and Assessed</b>	<b>Outcome # 1 - The student will display competence in teaching by exhibiting refined communication skills and knowledge of the subject matter; by promoting critical thinking and lifelong learning; by organizing and managing course elements; by implementing a variety of media and technology and by being sensitive to individual student circumstances.</b>	<b>Outcome #2 - Students will display competence in research, grant writing and in their specialty area by demonstrating research skills and disseminating information; by writing and submitting a grant; and by disseminating information in their specialty area.</b>	
<i>AUSP 8110 Teaching Internship</i>	Emphasis: Assessed	Extensive Other	None	
<i>AUSP 8207 Teaching Pedagogy</i>	Emphasis: Assessed	Extensive Exam Other	None	
<i>AUSP 8104 Research Project I</i>	Emphasis: Assessed	None	Extensive Other	
<i>AUSP 8204 Research Project II</i>	Emphasis: Assessed:	None	Extensive Other	
<i>AUSP 8300 Advanced Research Methods</i>	Emphasis: Assessed:	None	Extensive Exam Other	
<i>AUSP 8109 Grant Writing Internship</i>	Emphasis: Assessed:	None	Extensive Other	

<i>AUSP 8205 Grant Writing Pedagogy</i>	Emphasis: Assessed:	None	Extensive Exam Other	
<i>AUSP 8111 Supervision Internship</i>	Emphasis: Assessed:	None	Extensive Other	
<i>AUSP 8206 Supervision Pedagogy</i>	Emphasis: Assessed:	None	Extensive Exam	
<i>AUSP 9199-9999 Dissertation</i>	Emphasis: Assessed	None	Extensive Project	
<i>AUSP 8301 Doctoral Seminar in Hearing</i>	Emphasis: Assessed	None	Extensive Exam Other	
<i>AUSP 8302 Doctoral Seminar In Speech</i>	Emphasis: Assessed	None	Extensive Exam Other	
<i>AUSP 8303 Doctoral Seminar in Language</i>	Emphasis: Assessed	None	Extensive Exam Other	



**APPENDIX B**  
**ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM FOR THE PHD IN COMMUNICATION SCIENCES & DISORDERS**  
**Student Scholarship Form**  
**Reporting for \_\_\_\_\_ (Calendar Year)**

<b>Student</b>	<b># of Presentations</b>	<b># of Grant Applications # Funded</b>	<b># of Articles Submissions</b>

CSD Student Scholarship Form 3/11

**APPENDIX C**  
**ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM FOR THE PHD IN COMMUNICATION SCIENCES & DISORDERS**  
**Faculty Scholarship Form**  
**Reporting for \_\_\_\_\_ (Calendar Year)**

Faculty	Presentations	Grant Applications # Funded	Articles Submitted	Articles Published

**Grants Key:** 1) Indicate funded amount; 2) Approved not funded; 3) Not approved; **Publications Key:** 1) In-Press; 2) Approved with Revisions; 3) Submitted  
**CSD Faculty Scholarship Form 1/0**

**APPENDIX D**  
**ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM FOR THE PHD INCOMMUNICATION SCIENCES & DISORDERS**  
**Student Feedback Form Regarding Curriculum:**  
**Reporting for \_\_\_\_\_ (Calendar Year)**

**Questions for Second and Third Year Students:**

1. During your course of study, did you have the opportunity to learn and develop the skills necessary to develop, conduct and disseminate research? If yes, please describe the opportunities you were given and the outcomes of each.

---

---

---

2. During your course of study, did you have the opportunity to learn and develop the skills necessary to write grants? If yes, please describe the opportunities you were given and the outcomes of each.

---

---

---

3. During your course of study, did you have the opportunity to learn and develop the skills necessary to teach and provide clinical supervision at the University level? If yes, please describe the opportunities you were given and the outcomes of each.

---

---

---

**Questions for Fourth or Fifth Year Students**

1. Have you completed your prospectus and received approval from your dissertation committee? \_\_\_Yes  
\_\_\_No

2. If not, what deterrents have prevented you from completing your prospectus?

---

3. Have you started collecting data for your dissertation? \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_No

4. If not, what deterrent have prevented you from starting to collect data (i.e. IRB, finding subjects, illness, personal reasons, etc.).\_\_\_\_\_

5. When do you expect to complete your degree? \_\_\_\_\_

6. Please circle your rating of satisfaction with the Ph.D. Consortium program on the scale below:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>