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History and Rationale – Pacific University

• Brand new program: 2012
  – Consistent frustration about use of analytical data only
  – OPTION: Interviews
    • Clinical relevance
    • Social – communication skills (“soft” skills)
    • Mechanism already available and in place
    • Unique position

Logistics

• Two days
  – Involves a breakfast, campus tours, lunch, dessert reception
• 7 teams
  – 2 people
  – Faculty + community member (if needed)
• 12 interviews per team
• Skype

• All coordinated by Assistant Director of Admissions within College of Education
  – All calls, scheduling, catering, paperwork, volunteers
  – Current graduate students also participate
Outcomes

• EXPERIENCE: 3 cohorts admitted
  – First cohort: 1 student withdrew, 1 student failed comprehensive exams / clinical issues
  – Second cohort: 1 student failed clinical practicum
  – Third cohort: 2 students excelled in interview with academics low average
    • Now having academic trouble
• Dedicated time
  – Shifted

Data

• RUBRIC
  – 5 levels
    • 5 = must have them in the program
    • 4 = strong student
    • 3 = fine
    • 2 = concerns / red flags
    • 1 = do not admit
  – Admission levels
    • 1 = admit (1 – 1.5)
    • 2 = waitlist (2 – 2.5)
    • 3 = reject

Data

• Last cohort admitted (2016 cohort)
  – UG GPA: 2.9 – 3.92
  – BCP GPA: 3.0 – 4.0
  – GRE: 281 – 321
  – Interview: 3.5 – 5.0
Data

- Statistical Analysis
  - Total percentage of points earned
  - Admit 1 different from Admit 2/3
  - Interview Average
  - Differences between all 3 groups
- GPA
  - No differences between 3 groups
  - GRE
    - Differences between all 3 groups
- LOR Score
  - Admit 1 different from Admit 2/3
- Essay Score
  - Admit 1 different from Admit 2/3
- Value Points
  - Differences between all 3 groups (1 > 3 > 2)

Benefits / Advantages

- “Weeding out”
  - And “weeding in”
- Students can stand out in different ways
  - Good stories, unique characteristics
  - Still strong academically
- Recruiting top students
  - Interviewing us // interviewing them
  - Something special happens

Challenges / Pushback

- “Mild” Skepticism from some
  - Investment of time and energy
  - Inflation of perception of certain students
    - We still interview students with borderline academics
  - Level of emphasis on the interview
    - More focus on academics
Lessons Learned

• Interviews work for our institution
  – Distinct advantages

• No perfect protocol
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University of the Pacific
Why did we consider videos?

• We kept getting 1-2 “OMG” students per cohort
• The problems always emerged in the clinic

Why videos, and not...?

• Not enough faculty with enough time to devote to interviews
• No other option (e.g., personal essay, letters) seemed to capture the OMG-ness

How did we use videos?

PART THREE: VIDEO RECORDING

Each applicant must submit a 3-5 minute video recording of him or herself that includes the following:
1) A brief introduction of yourself
2) Why you want to become a speech language pathologist
3) Where you see yourself professionally in 5-10 years
4) Why you feel the University of the North is the right program for you

CLICK HERE TO ACCESS STEP-BY-STEP INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO SUBMIT YOUR VIDEO

Submit Video

You may also email your video link directly by sending it to: speech@pacific.edu
Step 1: Create your video. Save it on your preferred device (USB drive, hard drive, DVD, etc.).
Step 2: Log onto YouTube.com. In the upper right corner click on “Upload.”

Step 3: Drag the video clip onto the YouTube window. In the following picture, the video is being dragged from the window on the right to the window on the left.

Step 4: To review your video, click on the tab given to you by YouTube.
Step 5: Keep your video unlisted, but copy/paste the url given to you by Youtube into your application.

Step 6: Click "Done."

Step 7: Copy/paste the url given to you.
Outcome?

• Are we convinced?
• How will we determine outcome?

• I’ll see you in 19 months