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Outline for This Presentation

• Ranking Applicants
  • Layers of review
  • Current and alternate strategies
  • Tools, protocols, and processes currently invoked (letters, essays, interviews, scoring rubrics, etc.)
• Measuring outcomes
• Using CSDCAS for CAA Preparation
• Using CSDCAS for Grant Preparation
Ranking Applicants

- **TOP 15% “GAME CHANGERS”**
- **“B” PLAYER**
- **“C” PLAYER**

“What was I thinking” Hires | Average Hires | TARGET HIRES
Current State:

What our current admission process looks like, what students it yields, and what we’ve learned
Layers of Review

• What does your faculty value?
  • GPA
  • GRE
  • Writing skills
  • Critical thinking skills
  • Clinical potential
  • Scholarly potential
  • Personality
Grade Point Average—what makes sense in your program?

- GPA by Subject
- GPA by Year
- Prerequisite GPA
- Local GPA
GPA by Subject

• Biologic/Life Science
• Communication Sciences and Disorders
• Math & Statistics
• Physical Science
• Social/Behavioral Science
• Other GPA
• Total GPA
GPA by Year

- Freshman GPA
- Sophomore GPA
- Junior GPA
- Senior GPA
- Post-Bacc GPA
- Cumulative Undergraduate GPA
- Graduate GPA
- Overall Total GPA
Prerequisite GPA

• General Ed GPA
Local GPA

- Last 60 Credits GPA
  - Well...more recent
  - Likely to be CSD grades
  - But a more narrow focus of overall abilities
GRE Scores

- Verbal
- Quantitative
- Written
Verbal

• OK, so we are a verbal field
• Native speakers tend to do well here
• But ESL speakers tend not to do well here
Quantitative

Dr. Bernanke explains quantitative easing

If we feed the banks enough dollars, something good is bound to come out the other end eventually.
Current and Alternate Strategies
What Works For UOP

• Initial Screening
• Fine Tooth Comb
Initial Screening

• Last 60 units
• GRE

Careful what you capture!
Fine-tooth Comb

• Personal Essay
• Video
• Letters
• The Whims of the Individual Committee Member
Video

- Prompts
- Length
- Analysis

- But Why Videos?
Avoiding OMG—let’s try videos!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well do you think this applicant would do in coursework (i.e., not clinical assignments)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do you think this applicant would do in clinical assignments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do you feel the applicant engaged you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much “extra support” do you think this student would need, if accepted (extra support = more than usual office hour time, other accommodations)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We resisted interviews!

• Not enough faculty with enough time for interviews
• No other option (personal essay, letters) captured the OMG-ness
Measuring Outcomes

YOU WANT TO TAKE MY TEMPERATURE

WHERE EXACTLY?
An Ongoing Study at UOP
Predicting Graduate School Success

• What is “success”
• Research Question
• Method
• Results
• Discussion
What Is Success?

- SLP Success
- Graduate School Success
  - Praxis
Research Question

• What variables predict success?
Method

• Participants
• Data Collection (go CSDCAS!)
• Analysis
• Results
• Discussion
Methods—Participants

- $n = 93$
- Post-graduates who had taken the Praxis
Methods—Procedures

• Using CSDCAS, obtained the following:
  • GRE-V
  • GRE-Q
  • GRE-AW
  • GRE-Comb
  • UGPA-Comb
  • Speech/Language Dev.
  • Anatomy & Physiology
  • Language Disorders
  • Audiology
  • Speech & Hearing Science

• Physics
• Biology
• Psychology
• Statistics
• Child development
• Phonetics
• Articulation/Phonology
• Diagnostics
• Letter1
• Letter2
• Letter3
• SLP GPA
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>R-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRE-V</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE-Q</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE-AW</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE-Comb</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGPA-Comb</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Language Dev.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy &amp; Physiology</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Disorders</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiology</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech&amp;Hearing Science</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child development</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonetics</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation/Phonology</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostics</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter3</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP GPA</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ahem...AND?

• And combining variables in a multiple regression formula yielded this:

• GRE-Combined + grades in Phonetics, Speech & Hearing Science, and Speech and Language Development as predictors of Praxis (p=.000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.545a</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>8.51040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), AW, Phntc, Q, SpSci, Vrb, SLDv
Discussion/Conclusions

• No single variable was useful as a predictor of success

• However, it was easy to use CSDCAS to find a regression formula that did a reasonably good job of predicting graduate success
What Will We Do With These Conclusions?

• Feel confident that GREs are (with other data) useful
• Give close scrutiny to the “big three”
  • Phonetics
  • Speech & Hearing Science
  • Speech & Language Development
• Explore videos—use in formula or as second-round variable
CSDCAS and CAA Preparation, Grant Preparation

- Demographics of your Admits
- Demographics Compared to All CSDCAS Members’ Admits
Ethnicity of a Recent Cohort

Confirmed

Declined

Deny

Waiting List
Comments?
Questions?
What else?