

2006-2007 :: B.S. in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology

1. Mission Statement:

The mission of the Program in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology is to provide students with foundation knowledge in the speech, language, and hearing sciences, and in the disorders of communication. It is also the mission of the program to assist students to discover their clinical potential through introductory opportunities observing and participating in clinical practice. The program prepares students for entry to graduate professional programs in speech-language pathology or audiology, or for licensure as a speech-language pathology assistant.

2. Objectives:

2.1 Speech and Language Foundations:

Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge in speech, language, and hearing sciences and disorders.

2.1.1 Related General Education Outcome Item(s): 4. Natural Science; 9. Social & Behavioral Science

2.1.2 Related Strategic Plan Item(s): V-1 Life Science Health Collaborations

2.1.3 Student Related Objective: Yes - This is a student related objective.

2.2 Assessment and Intervention:

Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge and beginning level skills for culturally sensitive assessment and intervention of communication disorders.

2.2.1 Related General Education Outcome Item(s): 9. Social & Behavioral Science

2.2.2 Related Strategic Plan Item(s): V-1 Life Science Health Collaborations

2.2.3 Student Related Objective: Yes - This is a student related objective.

2.3 Foundation in Clinical Practice:

Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge and beginning level skills in clinical practice: develop appropriate intervention plans with measurable and achievable goals that meet client needs, implement intervention plans, select appropriate materials, measure and evaluate client's performance and progress, modify intervention plans as appropriate, complete administrative and reporting functions.

2.3.1 Related General Education Outcome Item(s): 9. Social & Behavioral Science

2.3.2 Related Strategic Plan Item(s): V-1 Life Science Health Collaborations

2.3.3 Student Related Objective: Yes - This is a student related objective.

2.4 Foundation in Ethical Practice:

Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge regarding the ASHA Code of Ethics and principles of ethical practice and apply that knowledge to clinical practice.

2.4.1 Related General Education Outcome Item(s): 9. Social & Behavioral Science

2.4.2 Related Strategic Plan Item(s): V-1 Life Science Health Collaborations

2.4.3 Student Related Objective: Yes - This is a student related objective.

3. Measures & Findings:

3.1 Embedded multiple-choice benchmark item-sets : Embedded multiple-choice benchmark item-sets (SPAU 3303, 3341, 3344)

3.1.1 Success Criteria: 75% of students score above 75%.

3.1.2 Related Objective(s): Speech and Language Foundations

3.1.3 Results Related To Success Criteria:

Embedded multiple-choice questions in 3 core courses were used to assess student learning related to the scientific foundations of speech-language pathology and audiology. The criterion used to evaluate success was that 75% of the students would correctly answer 75% of the questions. The results show that 69% of the students met criterion. These scores were consistent across the 3 courses which contributed to the evaluation.

3.1.4 Numerical Results:

69% of the students achieved criterion which was that 75% of the benchmark multiple-choice items would be correctly answered.

3.1.5 Influencing Factors:

The courses included in evaluation of this learning objective are basic science courses considered by students to be very challenging. Because this coursework prepares students for graduate study and perhaps 50% of the program graduates do not pursue graduate work, it may be that the criterion for success is set too high.

3.1.6 Achievement Level: Partially Met**3.1.7 Further Action:** No**3.2 Items on senior exit survey :** Items on senior exit survey asking how successfully SPAU meets it's goals**3.2.1 Success Criteria:**

At least 80% of students report the program is successful or very successful in meeting its learning objectives.

3.2.2 Related Objective(s): Speech and Language Foundations**3.2.3 Results Related To Success Criteria:**

13 of the 23 graduating students in speech-language pathology completed an on-line survey seeking to determine satisfaction with their experiences at UTD. Students were asked whether the program achieved its learning objectives. Criterion for success was set at 80% of the students would indicate that the program was successful or very successful in achieving its learning objectives. In objectives related to the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the foundations of speech, language, and hearing science and disorders, criterion was achieved. No student felt the program was unsuccessful or very unsuccessful in achieving these learning objectives.

3.2.4 Numerical Results:

Below are the the specific items and results. The survey used the categories of: Very Successful, Successful, Neutral, Unsuccessful, Very Unsuccessful. The percentages for each of the rating categories, in sequence, is below. The number of students responding in each rating category is in parentheses. Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge in speech, language, and hearing sciences. 38% (5) 54% (7) 8% (1) 0% (0) 0% (0) Met criterion: 92% Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge in communication disorders (including their biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental/lifespan, linguistic, and cultural bases). 38% (5) 46% (6) 15% (2) 0% (0) 0% (0) Met Criterion: 84%

3.2.5 Influencing Factors:

The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) which is the national certification and accreditation body for speech-language pathology and audiology has encouraged undergraduate programs to focus on the basic communication sciences and the foundations of communication disorders. It is evident that students feel that the program is effective in the students' acquisition of this foundation knowledge.

3.2.6 Achievement Level: Met**3.2.7 Further Action:** No**3.3 Paper assignment evaluated with rubric :** Paper assignment evaluated with rubric (SPAU 3343)**3.3.1 Success Criteria:** 75% of students score above 75% on scoring rubrics.**3.3.2 Related Objective(s):** Assessment and Intervention**3.3.3 Results Related To Success Criteria:**

Students learning in the area of speech assessment was evaluated through a paper assignment in which students transcribed a narrative of a non-native speaker of English and compared it with General American English. They also completed a paper describing their results which was evaluated using rubrics. Criterion for success was 75% of the students score above 75% on the combined transcription and paper. 87% of the students achieved an average score of 75% on the 2 projects.

3.3.4 Numerical Results:

87% of the students achieved a score of 75% correct on the transcription and the interpretive paper exceeding the criterion of 75%.

3.3.5 Influencing Factors:

Most students perform well in detecting the differences in accents, a skill needed in distinguishing language differences from disorders.

3.3.6 Achievement Level: Met**3.3.7 Further Action:** No**3.4 Writing exercise evaluated with rubric:** Writing exercise evaluated with rubric (SPAU 3340)**3.4.1 Success Criteria:** 75% of students score above 75% on scoring rubrics.**3.4.2 Related Objective(s):** Assessment and Intervention**3.4.3 Results Related To Success Criteria:**

Students were required to conduct a phonological analysis, report the results, prepare goals for intervention, and provide rationales for their goal selection and prognosis for outcome. Criterion for success was that 75% of the students would achieve a score of at least 75% on the scoring rubrics. Criterion was exceeded with 90% of the students scoring above 75%.

3.4.4 Numerical Results:

90% of the students exceeded the 75% criterion score for the rubrics used to measure culturally sensitive assessment and intervention.

3.4.5 Influencing Factors:

The students performed well indicating the ability to apply knowledge in culturally sensitive assessment and intervention. However, the instructor noted that additional practice in dialect scoring might be advantageous.

3.4.6 Achievement Level: Met

3.4.7 Further Action: No

3.5 Writing exercise evaluated with rubric: Writing exercise evaluated with rubric (SPAU 3340)

3.5.1 Success Criteria: 75% of students score above 75% on scoring rubrics.

3.5.2 Related Objective(s): Assessment and Intervention

3.5.3 Results Related To Success Criteria: This is an inadvertant duplicate of item 4.4 above.

3.5.4 Numerical Results: NA

3.5.5 Influencing Factors: NA

3.5.6 Achievement Level: Met

3.5.7 Further Action: No

3.6 senior exit survey : Items on senior exit survey asking how successfully SPAU meets it's goals

3.6.1 Success Criteria:

At least 80% of students report the program is successful or very successful at meeting its goals

3.6.2 Related Objective(s): Assessment and Intervention

3.6.3 Results Related To Success Criteria:

13 of the 23 graduating students in speech-language pathology completed an on-line survey seeking to determine satisfaction with their experiences at UTD. Students were asked whether the program achieved its learning objectives. Criterion for success was set at 80% of the students would indicate that the program was successful or very successful in achieving its learning objectives. In objectives related to assessment and intervention with persons having communicative impairments, criterion was not reached since 69% of the students considered the program very successful or successful. However, no student felt that the program was unsuccessful or very unsuccessful in achieving these learning objectives.

3.6.4 Numerical Results:

Below are the the specific items and the results. The survey used the categories of: Very Successful, Successful, Neutral, Unsuccessful, Very Unsuccessful. The percentages for each of the rating categories in sequence is below. The number of students responding in each rating category is in parentheses. Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge and beginning level skills of the principles and methods of assessment and intervention for people with communication disorders including consideration of anatomical/physiological, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates of the disorders. 54% (7) 15% (2) 31% (4) 0% (0) 0% (0) Criterion not met: 69%. Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge and beginning level skills for assessment and evaluation of communication disorders: understanding case history information, evaluation procedures such as behavioral observations and standardized and non-standardized tests. 38% (5) 31% (4) 31% (4) 0% (0) 0% (0) Criterion not met: 69%.

3.6.5 Influencing Factors:

The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) which is the national certification and accreditation body for speech-language pathology and audiology has discouraged programs from providing extensive clinical information at the graduate level and asked programs to focus on the basic communication sciences. Students may be seeking primarily clinical knowledge and feel that have been short-changed by the program.

3.6.6 Achievement Level: Partially Met

3.6.7 Further Action: No

3.7 Embedded multiple-choice benchmark item-sets : Embedded multiple-choice benchmark item-sets (SPAU 3301, 4308)

3.7.1 Success Criteria: 75% of students score above 75%.

3.7.2 Related Objective(s): Foundation in Clinical Practice

3.7.3 Results Related To Success Criteria:

12 embedded benchmark multiple choice items were used to evaluate student learning in the foundations of clinical practice. The questions were embedded in 2 courses and 2 exams in each course. The criterion was that students

would average at least 75% correct on the items. Students exceeded criterion achieving an average of 88% correct.

3.7.4 Numerical Results:

The criterion was that students would average at least 75% correct on the items. Students achieved an average of 88% correct.

3.7.5 Influencing Factors:

The students clearly met criterion. However, one faculty member plans to re-evaluate the benchmark items to assure that the high percentage of correct responses truly reflects students achievement of the learning goal.

3.7.6 Achievement Level: Met

3.7.7 Further Action: No

3.8 Senior Exit Survey: Items on senior exit survey asking how successfully SPAU meets it's goals

3.8.1 Success Criteria:

At least 80% of students report the program is successful or very successful at meeting its goals.

3.8.2 Related Objective(s): Foundation in Clinical Practice

3.8.3 Results Related To Success Criteria:

13 of the 23 graduating students in speech-language pathology completed an on-line survey seeking to determine their degree of satisfaction with their experiences at UTD. Students were asked whether the program achieved its learning objectives. Criterion for success was set at 80% of the students would indicate that the program was successful or very successful in achieving its learning objectives. In objectives related to the foundations of clinical practice, 77% of the surveyed students indicated the program was successful or very successful in the students' acquisition of knowledge of clinical practice attained through observation and interaction with clinicians. They felt the program was less successful in their acquisition of the foundations of practice through actual experience with clients. Nonetheless, 69% indicated that the program was successful or very successful in meeting this learning objective. No students indicated that the program was unsuccessful or very unsuccessful in achieving this learning objective.

3.8.4 Numerical Results:

Below are the the specific items and the results. The survey used the categories of: Very Successful, Successful, Neutral, Unsuccessful, Very Unsuccessful. The percentages for each of the rating categories in sequence is below. The number of students responding in each rating category is in parentheses. Students will demonstrate a broad based knowledge at an introductory level of the profession of Speech-Language Pathology through interaction with clinicians in a variety of treatment settings. 54% (7) 23% (3) 23% (3) 0% (0) 0% (0) Approached criterion: 77% Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge and beginning level skills in clinical practice: develop appropriate intervention plans with measurable and achievable goals that meet client needs, implement intervention plans, select appropriate materials, measure and evaluate client's performance and progress, modify intervention plans as appropriate, complete administrative and reporting functions. 31% (4) 38% (5) 31% (4) 0% (0) 0% (0) Criterion not met: 69%

3.8.5 Influencing Factors:

At the undergraduate level, students have extensive opportunity to observe and interact with clinicians, including clinical faculty. They have less opportunity to actually engage in hands-on practice. Thus, they may feel they have not acquired the tools for clinical practice as well as they might have wished. However, certification and licensure in speech-language pathology or audiology requires a graduate degree and students who pursue graduate study will have ample opportunity for supervised clinical practice.

3.8.6 Achievement Level: Partially Met

3.8.7 Further Action: No

3.9 Embedded multiple-choice benchmark item-sets : Embedded multiple-choice benchmark item-sets (SPAU 3301)

3.9.1 Success Criteria: 75% of students score above 75%.

3.9.2 Related Objective(s): Foundation in Ethical Practice

3.9.3 Results Related To Success Criteria: Benchmark multiple choice-items embedded in 4 quizzes in SPAU

3301 were used to evaluate student learning in the foundations of ethical practice. A criterion of an average of 75% correct across the items was established. The results show that the criterion was exceeded with 88% of the questions correctly answered.

3.9.4 Numerical Results:

88% of the questions were correctly answered compared to the criterion expectation of 75%.

3.9.5 Influencing Factors:

Although the students exceeded criterion, the instructor will insert additional benchmark questions referring specifically to the ASHA Code of Ethics.

3.9.6 Achievement Level: Met**3.9.7 Further Action:** No**3.10 Senior Exit Survey:** Items on senior exit survey asking how successfully SPAU meets its goals**3.10.1 Success Criteria:**

At least 80% of students report the program is successful or very successful in meeting its goals

3.10.2 Related Objective(s): Foundation in Ethical Practice

3.10.3 Results Related To Success Criteria: 13 of the 23 graduating students in speech-language pathology completed an on-line survey seeking to determine their degree of satisfaction with their experiences at UTD. Students were asked whether the program achieved its learning objectives. Criterion for success was set at 80% of the students would respond that the program was successful or very successful in achieving its learning objectives. In objectives related to ethical and culturally-sensitive practice, criterion was not met since 69% of the students indicating the program was successful or very successful on each of the 3 relevant items.

3.10.4 Numerical Results:

Below are the the specific items and the results. The survey used the categories of: Very Successful, Successful, Neutral, Unsuccessful, Very Unsuccessful. The percentages for each of the rating categories in sequence is below. The number of students responding in each rating category is in parentheses. Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge in the cultural correlates of communication with patients and families from diverse cultural/linguistic backgrounds. 23% (3) 46% (6) 15% (2) 15% (2) 0% (0) Criterion not met: 69%. Students will demonstrate foundation knowledge regarding the ASHA Code of Ethics and principles of ethical practice and apply that knowledge to clinical practice. 38% (5) 31% (4) 23% (3) 8% (1) 0% (0) Criterion not met: 69%. Career Planning and Development. Students should gain realistic ideas about how to implement their knowledge, skills, and values in occupational pursuits. 23% (3) 46% (6) 8% (1) 15% (2) 8% (1) Criterion not met: 69%.

3.10.5 Influencing Factors:

It is likely that the lack of practical experience resulted in some of the students being unsure of their knowledge in the areas of ethical and culturally-sensitive practice. In addition, the topic is not taught separately, but is infused throughout the curriculum. The extent to which these issues are addressed in coursework needs to be investigated.

3.10.6 Achievement Level: Partially Met**3.10.7 Further Action:** Yes**5. Closing the Loop:**

5.1 Investigate differences between student satisfaction reports and student performance.: The program will investigate the difference in the students' satisfaction reports on their attainment of learning goals reported on the exit interview and measures of student learning obtained through analysis of student performance on embedded examination questions and rubric-evaluated written material. We have noted that on some objectives, performance lags perception while on other perception lags performance. We need to know, for example, whether there are cases in which our criteria for success are too high or too low or whether the performance/perception measures are orthogonal.

5.1.1 Related Objective(s):

Speech and Language Foundations; Assessment and Intervention; Foundation in Clinical Practice; Foundation in Ethical Practice

5.1.2 Related Measure(s):

Embedded multiple-choice benchmark item-sets ; Items on senior exit survey ; Paper assignment evaluated with rubric ; Writing exercise evaluated with rubric

5.1.3 Responsible Person: Program Head and faculty**5.1.4 Target Date:** Implementation in Fall '07.**5.1.5 Priority:** Medium Priority

5.2 Evaluation of performance in clinical practicum.: The students' application of learning in the clinical realm may be best evaluated through data collected on student performance in clinical practicum. This includes supervisor evaluation of hands on skills and written reports. Application data can be used to triangulate with test/writing-sample performance in evaluating program learning goals. The clinical faculty will establish a pilot project to evaluate program learning goals through clinical performance.

5.2.1 Related Objective(s):

Assessment and Intervention; Foundation in Clinical Practice; Foundation in Ethical Practice

5.2.2 Responsible Person: Clinical Faculty**5.2.3 Target Date:** Initiate in Fall '07. Ongoing.**5.2.4 Priority:** High Priority

6. Analysis:

6.1 Program/Unit Strengths:

6.1.1 Objectives/Outcomes Exceeded or Met: Classroom-based assessment findings showed that the students in the program achieved or exceeded criterion in each learning goal. This suggests that our ongoing system of program improvement has been effective. Embedded questions on examinations indicate an acceptable level of student learning. The development of clearer learning goals has improved the program focus. We see this as particularly important because it is typical for instructors to change across semesters and for multiple sections of a given course to be taught by different instructors. Making instructors aware of program goals and expectations has improved the quality of instruction and made it more consistent.

6.1.2 Other Strengths:

Given the diverse group of students based on background, aspiration, and major the coursework seems to provide a stimulating and productive environment for student learning.

6.2 Program / Unit Weaknesses:

6.2.1 Objectives / Outcomes Partially or Not Met: We have noted that our classroom-based learning assessments and program satisfaction data derived from exit interviews with graduating students are sometimes discrepant. We need to determine the origin of these discrepancies to understand whether student performance and perception truly differ or whether there are problems with our methods of measurement.

6.2.2 Other Weaknesses:

The students perceive the program as not offering the expected level of clinical preparation. In part, this reflects our accrediting agency's mandate for undergraduate programs to focus mainly on basic communication sciences and reserve most clinical coursework and practicum for the graduate level.

We are unable to distinguish the multiple cohorts within classes to effectively assess each groups' performance and determine whether performance varies across cohorts.

6.3 Other Areas Needing Improvement:

The distance between the Callier-Dallas and Richardson campuses has a negative impact on undergraduate students because most of the faculty teaching in the undergraduate program have their offices at Callier-Dallas. The tight inventory of office space makes it impossible for faculty to have an office on each campus. This makes the natural opportunities for interaction between students and faculty more difficult outside class and office-hours. In addition, most faculty research is conducted at Callier-Dallas making undergraduate observation of and participation in clinical research unlikely.

7. Report:

7.1 Executive Summary:

The B.S. program in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology has dual functions. It provides the foundation coursework, especially in the basic communication sciences for students planning to enter graduate school in speech-language pathology or audiology and it prepares graduates seeking the bachelor's as a terminal degree and who plan to seek employment as a speech-language pathology assistant. The program has grown in recent years, but now appears to have stabilized at about 125. The program's Fast-Track which allows the top students to enroll in 12 hours of graduate coursework in their senior year has been very effective in routing excellent undergraduates in to the UTD masters program in Communication Disorders.

Most students in the program are community college transfer students who enter in their junior year and many are part-time, but about 25% are 4-year, full-time students some of whom have entered UTD as merit scholarship recipients and are among the brightest in the university. Because some of the program's courses are part of the University Core curriculum or a component (required or elective) in another major, . Finally, a subset of courses form a prerequisite cluster for students admitted to the graduate programs in Communication Disorders or Audiology who are entering from out-of-field or are seeking to learn if speech-language pathology or audiology is an appropriate career choice. Thus, the classes contain a mix of transfer and 4-year undergraduate students, out-of-field graduate students, and non-majors. Furthermore, the students are divided between those planning to attend graduate school and those seeking a terminal bachelor's degree. Formulating relevant learning goals and assessment measures appropriate for the diversity of constituents served has been particularly daunting.

In the past 2 years, the faculty established program learning goals and developed a mechanism for assessing student learning. Faculty review of the assessment results has given the faculty confidence that despite the previous lack of an ongoing assessment program, the students were acquiring the knowledge expected. The measures used in the first round of assessments were mainly based on classroom performance on examinations (embedded multiple choice questions and essays evaluated with a rubric.) The faculty has decided that in the future, data should be collected on the students' performance in clinical practicum. This includes evaluating written treatment and progress reports using rubrics, but also supervisor evaluation of clinical performance using measurement criteria based on the student learning goals. This will allow for greater focus on the program's major in the assessment because only majors are permitted to participate in practicum.

Our current assessment results indicate program effectiveness in student learning as measured through a variety of

techniques. We have noted some discrepancies between measures of student satisfaction obtained through online exit data gathered from graduating students and in-class assessments obtained through evaluation of test and written materials. We will investigate the sources of the discrepancies to determine if there are real differences between performance and perception or whether these differences reflect problems with our measurements or criteria of success. We also need a more effective way of differentiating cohorts within classes to establish whether we are serving all of our different constituencies well.

7.2 Top 3 Program/Unit Accomplishments: New Faculty hires-The past two years has seen significant additions to our family:

Dr. John Hart – Cognitive Neuroscience
 Dr. Tom Campbell – Speech Pathology, Director Callier Center
 Dr. Christine Dollaghan – Speech Pathology
 Dr. Christa McIntyre – Neuroscience
 Dr. Mandy Maguire – Language Development
 Dr. Shayla Holub – Social Development
 Dr. Candice Mills – Social Development
 Dr. Daniel Krawczyk – Cognitive Neuroscience
 Dr. Bart Rypma – Cognitive Neuroscience
 Dr. Deborah Wiebe – Medical Psychology

Significance of hires - These hires, in various ways, advanced several important School and Institutional objectives:

- 1) develop the joint brain-imaging Center with UT Southwestern and UT Arlington (Hart, Krawczyk, Maguire, Rypma)
- 2) develop the Center for BrainHealth (Hart, Krawczyk, Maguire, McIntyre, Mills, Rypma)
- 3) develop strong new leadership and programs at the Callier Center (Campbell, Dollaghan, Maguire)
- 4) strengthen faculty range for proposed Center for Children and Families (Campbell, Dollaghan, Holub, Maguire, Mills)

7.3 Research Activities or Publications:

The School conducts research both within and across its three subsuming divisions: Psychological Sciences, Communication Sciences and Cognition and Neuroscience. Additionally School faculty conduct collaborative projects with institutions around the country, most notably UT Southwestern Medical Center, but also such institutions as Johns Hopkins, University of California at San Francisco, University of Wisconsin, Baylor Medical Center, University of Dijon, and University of Hamburg among numerous others. Collaborative projects with industry provide a small but growing part of the School's research programs, particularly in the area of bioengineering. During 2006 research on cochlear implants, hearing aids, neural stimulation and neural interfaces for prostheses were conducted. School faculty generated approximately 100 scholarly articles, over 100 presentations at national conferences, 20 chapters in edited volumes and 10 books. Faculty were featured speakers at several national or university meetings. The School also hosts its own speaker series to enhance the scholarly life of its programs. The central vehicle for this is the School's colloquium series which hosted 6 nationally prominent speakers during 2006. The Callier Center's Bruton Conference also brings prominent speakers to campus, as well as providing outreach to the community. Similarly the Center for Brain Health's "The Brain: An owner's Guide" disseminates current research information to the lay public.

Grants

PI

Funding Agency

Title

Total Award

Assmann

NSF

Perception of Frequency-Shafted Speech

223,418

Atzori

NIH/NIDCD

Acetylcholine and Dopamine Modulation in Auditory

1,223,284

Cortex

Bharadwaj

NIH
Speech Production in Children with Cochlear Implants
200,310
Buckley
NIH
Cross-modal Plasticity in Pre-Lingually Deaf Children
83,490
Chapman
Baylor
Neurobehavioral Outcome of Head Injury in Children
396,968
Chapman
Baylor
Neurobehavioral Outcome of Head Injury in Children
45,587
Chapman
NIH
Genetic Factors in Outcome from Traumatic Brain
87,627
Dodd
DEPT OF ED
Projects FAMILY 2001+: Facilitating and Mentoring
1,206,914
Interdisciplinary Learning for the Years 2001+
Geers/Tobey
NIH/NIDCD
Long-term Outcomes of Cochlear Implantation in Early Childhood (Shannon Award)
100,000
Golden/Perwaiz
NSF
Doctoral Dissertation Research: Statistical Models of Hypertext Comprehension
10,560
Holub
Timberlawn Foundation
The Role of Parents' Restrictive Feeding Practices and General Parenting Style in Children's Eating
27,357.00
Jerger, S.
NIH
Auditory Processing in Hearing Impaired Children
1,783,366
Katz, W.
Veteran's Affairs
Treatment of Apraxia of Speech Following Stroke
77,000
Kilgard
JAMES S MCDONNELL
Brain Plasticity and Neuro-Rehabilitation
446,000
Kilgard
NIH
Cortical Plasticity and Processing of Speech Sounds
224,250
Kilgard
NIH Supplement
Cortical Plasticity and Processing of Speech Sounds
41,711

King/Hart
UNCF Merck Foundation
Quantification of Cortical Atrophy by Fractal Dimension
85,000
Lomber
NIH
Cerebral Organization Following Cochlear Implant
224,250
Lomber
NIH
Dev of fMRI Compatible Reversible Deactivation
380,290
Lomber
NSF
Cerebral Control of Aurally-Mediated Behavior
451,179
Lomber
NSF supplement
Cerebral Control of Aurally-Mediated Behavior
10,000
Malhotra
NIH
Cerebral Control of Sound Localization
31,069
Moore
UTSWMCD
Personality Theories and Dynamics
23,500
O'Toole
ONR
Evaluating Face and Person Recognition Algorithms
325,545
with Human Benchmarks
O'Toole
ONR
Face recognition performance: Humans vs Machines
175,000
Olness
NIH/NIDCD
Narratives in African Americans & Caucasians with
202,500
Aphasia
Owen
Child Care Group
Relationship-Centered Child Care & Children's Dev
82,012
Owen
Timberlawn
Relationship-Centered Child Care
37,165
Owen
NIH/NICHD
Study of Early Child Care and Youth
42,500
Roeser

CALLIER FN

Service, Training and Research for Cochlear Implant

795,898

Children

Stillman

OHSU

Validation of Evidence-Based Assessment Strategies

190,000

to Promote Achievement in Children who are Deaf-

Blind

Thompson

RBC Life Sciences

Nootropic Effects of Microhydrin and Microhydrin-Plus in Aging

101,132

Tobey

UT AUSTIN

Motor Control of Serial Organization of Speech

138,041

Tobey

JOHN HOPKINS U

Lang Outcomes in Pediatric Cochlear Implantation

1,531,219

Tobey

MED EI CORP

SPECT rCBF in Adult Cochlear Implant Users

12,000

Underwood

NIH

Social Aggression: Precursors and Outcomes

1,470,400

Underwood

NIH

Social Aggression: Origins, Development and Outcomes

597,320

7.4 Instructional/Training Activities (presented or received): Some students have attended professional meetings especially the Texas Speech-Language-Hearing Association annual meeting. Students had the opportunity to supplement their knowledge in speech-language pathology through attendance at poster and presentation sessions.

7.5 Public Service:

The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences provides very extensive community service through numerous service programs of its Callier Center and Center for Brain Health, as well as collaborative efforts of various faculty. The Callier Center offered over 25 different clinical service programs generating over 40,000 patient contacts during 2006. Examples are its programs with such clinical populations as hearing impaired individuals across the age spectrum, language disorders, speech problems and autistic spectrum disorders. Similarly the Center for Brain Health offers service programs in Alzheimer's disease and Brain-injury in children. The School has extensive programs with numerous school districts providing educational programs for all hearing-impaired preschoolers in the Dallas Independent School District and audiological consultation with the Plano School District. Individual faculty in our neuroscience programs have also provided seminars for Plano and Richardson Schools in the area of brain research. The Center for Brain Health hosts an annual public lecture series on aspects of brain research and the Callier Center offered two Bruton Conferences in 2006 primarily for professionals in the field of communication disorders. Callier audiologists also participated in outreach programs for hearing assessments in Panama and Mozambique.

7.6 Other External Activities:

The School has a number of international collaborations both via its academic programs and through clinical initiatives. During 2006 visiting scholars came from the Czech Republic, Mexico, Germany, France and Britain to engage in collaborative research programs. We have agreements in place for exchange with the University of Dijon, University of Hamburg, University of Chile, University of Montpellier and the University of Guanajuato. Faculty from the School were invited speakers at numerous international conferences and were Scholars-in-Residence at

Dijon, Prague, Oxford and Tokyo. Clinical initiatives through the Callier Center took place in Mozambique and Panama. Ross Roeser is Editor of the International Journal of Audiology.

7.7 Contributions to UTD:

The faculty in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences are unusually broad in the scope of their interests, subject populations studied, level of analysis employed in their work and the methodologies utilized. The diversity of these endeavors, coupled with the geographic proximity of two of the School's facilities to Southwestern Medical Center, has made the School a natural collaborator with other units of the University, the Medical School, as well as other institutions around the country. Examples of these efforts include investigations on developing new hearing technologies, combining efforts of surgeons, hearing, language and speech researchers and electrical engineers; developing new prostheses, engaging neuroscientists, computer science and electrical engineering faculty and neurosurgeons, and investigations on long-term consequences of pediatric brain injury, joining cognitive neuroscientists, pediatricians and virtual world engineers. In addition to these research partnerships, the School provides extensive direct service to the community through its various clinical programs. This community involvement has resulted in significant levels of philanthropic support for the School's programs.

7.8 Top 3 Program / Unit Challenges:

1. Serving diverse cohorts of students including those who are or are not bound for graduate school or who enter the major with strong or weak academic backgrounds.
2. Distance between the Richardson and Callier-Dallas campuses which limits student participation in faculty research and in interactions with faculty.
3. Accommodating student wishes for a strong clinical focus with our accrediting agencies mandate to focus undergraduate programs on the basic communication sciences.

7.9 Detailed Resources Needed to Improve and Fulfill Mission: Additional office space and space for faculty research on the Richardson campus.