

**ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT
Annual Report Review**

The Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology has reviewed the program's accreditation annual report and took the accreditation action indicated below.

Name of Program: Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania

File #: 169

Professional Area:

- Audiology**
 Speech-Language Pathology

Modality:

- Residential**
 Distance Education
 Satellite Campus
 Contractual Arrangement

Degree Designator(s): Au.D.

Current Accreditation Cycle: 10/01/2012 – 09/30/2020

Action Taken: Place on Probation

Effective Date: February 18, 2017

Next Review: End of Probation Report due January 15, 2018

Notices: The program is advised to adhere to the following notices that are appended to this report.

- PROGRAM COMPLIANCE EXPECTATIONS
- PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF DECISION AND ACCREDITATION STATUS

As a result of its review of the annual report, the CAA found the program to be in compliance with the Standards for Accreditation of Graduate Education Programs in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, except as noted below.

AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE

The CAA found the program to be not in compliance with the following standards for accreditation. Non-compliance means that the program does not have in place the essential elements necessary to meet the standard. The program must demonstrate its compliance with these standards in the Prior Concerns section of the next annual report (or, if appropriate, within the context of the reaccreditation application) or by the time line specified below. The CAA will indicate in its review of that report whether the program has addressed these areas sufficiently to achieve compliance.

There are no areas of non-compliance with accreditation standards.

AREAS OF PARTIAL COMPLIANCE

The CAA found the program to be in partial compliance with the following standards for accreditation. Partial compliance means that the program has in place some, but not all, of the essential elements necessary to meet all aspects of the standard. The program must demonstrate its compliance with these standards in the Prior Concerns section of the next annual report (or, if appropriate, within the context of the reaccreditation application) or by the time line specified below. The CAA will indicate in its review of that report whether the program has addressed these areas sufficiently to achieve compliance.

2008 Standard: 1.7 (2017 Standard 1.9)

Element of the standard to be met: Student achievement measures are accurate

Evidence of partial compliance:

Program completion rates shown on the program's website are incorrectly calculated and do not reflect the percent of students completing the program within the expected timeframe. The completion rate should be calculated as the number completed on time divided by the number of students completing on time + number completing late + number not completing.

Steps to be taken:

Effective immediately, revise the program's webpage to reflect the correct calculation for the 3-year average completion rate.

2008 Standard: 5.3 (2017 Standard 5.5)

Element of the standard to be met: Program completion rate threshold

Evidence of partial compliance:

The program was found in partial-compliance with this standard in 2014 and 2015 and remains in partial-compliance after review of the 2016 annual report. The 3-year average for students completing the program within the expected timeframe is 46% and falls below the CAA's 80% threshold.

When re-calculating the program completion rates to determine the percent of students graduating within the expected timeframe, data indicates the following:

- 2015-2016: 71% (10/14)
- 2014-2015: 55% (6/11)
- 2013-2014: 14% (2/14)

- Three-year average: 46% (18/39)

In the program’s 2014 response to CAA concerns, the low completion rate was attributed to the requirement that students complete an AuD thesis that made it difficult to graduate in the expected length of the program (11 semesters). The program implemented a non-thesis option, substituting 6 hours of academic coursework in lieu of the thesis.

Although the change was implemented in the 2015-2016 academic year, the completion rate improved, but remained below 80% (71%); the program noted that 2 of the 4 students with delayed completions had personal or health-related reasons. In the 2016 annual report, the program reports 2 of 9 students opted for the thesis tract.

Steps to be Taken:

While the adaptation of the non-thesis option has improved the on-time completion rate, it is not clear if the program has considered other avenues (e.g., recruitment and admission standards; length of the program, etc.) and how such modifications would result in improved on-time completion rates. At the time of the next report, describe how implementation of the non-thesis option will assure on-time completion for students choosing the thesis option. Also, describe alternative considerations to improve student completion rates.

AREAS FOR FOLLOW-UP (clarification/verification)

The program should provide an update in the next annual report (or, if appropriate, in the context of the reaccreditation application) on the issues related to the following standards for accreditation. The CAA did not find the program to be out of compliance with these standards at this time, but requires that additional information be provided in the program’s next report, in order to monitor the program’s continued compliance in the stated areas.

There are no areas for follow-up with accreditation standards.

The CAA has evaluated this program regarding its performance with respect to student achievement and provides the following report, required as an accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education [[34 CFR 602.17\(f\)\(2\)](#)].

PERFORMANCE WITH RESPECT TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Findings:

<i>The CAA assessed the program’s performance with respect to student achievement and found the program to meet or exceed the established CAA expectations (as described in accreditation standard 5.0-Assessment) in the following checked areas. Details regarding any of these areas found to be <u>not</u> in compliance are described earlier in this report in the context of the relevant standard.</i>	
	Program Completion Rates
x	Employment Rates
x	Praxis Examination Rates

PROGRAM COMPLIANCE EXPECTATIONS

As an accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education, the CAA must comply with Criterion §602.20 [[34 CFR 602.20\(a\)\(2\)\(iii\)](#)]. This criterion requires that if an accrediting agency's review of a program indicates that the program is not in compliance with any standard, the CAA must establish timelines for programs that are not in full compliance "to take appropriate action to bring itself into compliance with the agency's standards". As the programs that the CAA accredits are at least two years in length, the maximum time allowed under this criterion is two years. If, after review of a required report, the program remains out of full compliance with any standard and sufficient progress toward compliance has not been demonstrated, the CAA may act to place the program on probation or withdraw its accreditation status in accordance with the policy and procedures outlined in the [Accreditation Handbook](#). The CAA may place a program on probation or withdraw accreditation from a program prior to this time when there is clear evidence of circumstances that jeopardize the capability of the program to provide acceptable educational experiences for the students, as noted above. However, a program will be placed on probation or accreditation withdrawn after the review of a third consecutive report reveals that issues continue for the same standard(s) and the program remains not in full compliance with all standards.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF THIS DECISION AND ACCREDITATION STATUS

The CAA publishes a notice of final accreditation actions on its website after comprehensive reviews are completed in accordance with its published policies. In the event an adverse action is taken and becomes final (i.e., withdrawal or withholding of an accreditation status), the CAA is required to publish a brief statement summarizing the reasons for withholding or withdrawing the accreditation status of a program, together with the comments, if any, that the affected program may wish to make.

The Criteria for Recognition by the U.S. Secretary of Education requires all recognized accrediting agencies to provide for the public correction of incorrect or misleading information an accredited or preaccredited program releases about accreditation or preaccreditation status, contents of site visit reports, and accrediting or preaccrediting actions with respect to the program. [[34 CFR 602.23\(d\)](#) and [602.23\(e\)](#)] The program must make accurate public disclosure of the accreditation or preaccreditation status awarded to the program, using the language provided in the [Accreditation Handbook](#) (see Chapter XII Informing the Public) on the academic accreditation website. If the program chooses to disclose any additional information within the scope of the ED rule, such disclosure also must be accurate. Any public disclosure of information within the scope of the rule must include the CAA's name, address, and telephone number as described in the [Accreditation Handbook](#). If an institution or program misrepresents or distorts any action by the CAA with respect to any aspect of the accreditation process, its accreditation status, the contents of the site visit report, or final CAA accreditation actions or decisions, the CAA will inform the chief executive officer of the institution and the program director that corrective action must be taken. If corrective action is not taken, the CAA will release a public statement that provides correct information and may invoke other sanctions as may be appropriate.