

ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT
Re-Accreditation Review

The Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology took the following accreditation action at its March 15-17, 2023 meeting, as indicated below.

Name of Program: Kean University of New Jersey

File #: 226

Professional Area:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Audiology |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Speech-Language Pathology |

Modality:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Residential |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Distance Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Satellite Campus |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Contractual Arrangement |

Degree Designator(s): MA

Current Accreditation Cycle: 6/1/2014 – 5/31/2022

Action Taken: Continue Accreditation

Effective Date: March 17, 2023

New Accreditation Cycle: 6/1/2022 – 5/31/2030

Next Review: Annual Report due August 1, 2023

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

In the context of the institutional and program mission statements and in consideration of the credentials for which the program is preparing students, the CAA conducted its comprehensive review and 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 when responding to prior concerns in the next annual report or reaccreditation application or by the timeline specified below. The CAA will indicate in its review of that report whether the program has addressed these areas sufficiently to achieve compliance. **Failure to demonstrate compliance with the standards may jeopardize the program's accreditation status or require the CAA to place the program on probation. A program will be placed on probation or accreditation withdrawn after the review of a second consecutive report reveals that issues continue for the same standard(s) and the program remains not in full compliance with all standards (effective January 1, 2021- see [CAA Accreditation Handbook, Chapter XVII](#)).**

Standard 2.3 All faculty members (full-time, part-time, adjuncts), including all individuals providing clinical education, are qualified and competent by virtue of their education, experience, and professional credentials to provide academic and clinical education as assigned by the program leadership.

Requirement for Review:

- The program must demonstrate that the qualifications and competence to teach graduate-level courses and to provide clinical education are evident in terms of appropriateness of degree level, practical or educational experiences specific to responsibilities in the program, and other indicators of competence to offer graduate education.
- The program must demonstrate that all individuals providing didactic and clinical education, both on-site and off-site, have appropriate experience and qualifications for the professional area in which education is provided.
- The program must demonstrate that the faculty possess appropriate qualifications and expertise to provide the depth and breadth of instruction for the curriculum as specified in Standard 3.
- The program must demonstrate that the majority of academic content is taught by doctoral faculty who hold the appropriate terminal academic degree (PhD, EdD).

Evidence of Non-Compliance:

The CAA requires that programs demonstrate that qualifications and competencies of faculty are evident, that all individuals providing education have appropriate experience, that they possess the appropriate qualifications and expertise, and that the majority of academic content is taught by faculty with the appropriate terminal degree. The site visit report indicated concerns about the academic preparation of the instructors, as indicated by preparation at the PhD/EdD level. In the response to the site visit report, the program provided a list of courses and instructors along with the instructor credentials. The program stated that 7 of 13 courses were taught by faculty with a PhD/EdD. The total of 13 courses was reached by counting two Thesis courses, which are not considered academic content as defined within the

Standards for Accreditation. Excluding those courses, the CAA determined that 5 of 11 courses (45%) were taught by faculty with a terminal academic degree (PhD/EdD), which is less than the CAA's requirement that the majority of the academic content must be taught by faculty with either the PhD or EdD. Furthermore, three of the courses list two instructors; one that holds a PhD/EdD. degree and the other having obtained a clinical degree. It is not evident who the instructor of record is. If the faculty members with terminal degrees are responsible for 50% of the course content, this brings the total down to 3.5 of 11 courses (32%). When calculating the total by credit hours, the 11 courses represent 30 credit hours. The 3.5 courses that have terminal degree faculty listed represent 9 credit hours, which is 30% of the total credit hours.

The program also reported in the response to the site visit report that it has received approval to hire two additional faculty with the PhD/EdD degree, and provided a letter from the Provost as evidence of this approval.

Steps to Be Taken:

At the time of the next annual report, the program must demonstrate that the qualifications and competence to teach graduate-level courses and to provide clinical education are evident, that all individuals providing didactic and clinical education, both on-site and off-site, have appropriate experience and qualifications, that the faculty possess appropriate qualifications and expertise to provide the depth and breadth of instruction for the curriculum as specified in Standard 3, and that the majority of academic content is taught by doctoral faculty who hold the appropriate terminal academic degree (PhD, EdD). The program must provide a breakdown of course assignments that show evidence that the majority of academic content is being taught by individuals who hold either a PhD or EdD, as well as an update on the hiring process of additional faculty members with the proper terminal credentials.

Standard 5.11 The individual responsible for the program of professional education seeking accreditation effectively leads and administers the program.

Requirement for Review:

- The program director's effectiveness in advancing the goals of the program and in leadership and administration of the program must be regularly evaluated.

Evidence of Non-Compliance:

The CAA requires that the program director's effectiveness in advancing the goals of the program and in leadership and administration of the program is regularly evaluated. The site visit report indicated that "there was no process for the regular review of the effectiveness of the program director in advancing the goals of the program and in leadership and administration". In the response to the site visit report, the program stated that the program director has been assessed as part of the university's Tenure and Promotion process, in which the program director's service as director was assessed alongside their scholarship, teaching, and other service. While the program has created a form that the Executive Director of the CDD program will use to assess the program director going forward, this process has not been implemented, and it is not clear that the assessment of service includes advancement of the goals and administration of the program.

Steps to Be Taken:

At the time of the next annual report, the program must demonstrate that the program director's effectiveness in advancing the goals of the program and in leadership and administration of the program is regularly evaluated. The program must provide evidence that the program director's effectiveness in advancing the goals of the program and in leadership and administration of the program is regularly evaluated annually using the new assessment form and has been implemented.

Standard 6.6 The program has access to clerical and technical staff that is appropriate and sufficient to support the work of the students, faculty, and staff. The access is appropriate and sufficient for the program to meet its mission and goals.

Requirement for Review:

- The program must demonstrate adequate access to clerical and technical staff to support the work of the students, faculty, and staff.
- The program must demonstrate how access to the clerical and technical staff helps the program meet its mission and goals.

Evidence of Non-Compliance:

The CAA requires that programs demonstrate adequate access to clerical and technical staff to support the work of the students, faculty, and staff, and demonstrate how access to the clerical and technical staff helps the program meet its mission and goals. The site visit report indicated that the program has one full-time clerical support staff member, and that this person supports the undergraduate degree and doctorate in speech-language pathology programs as well as the graduate program in speech-language pathology. In the response to the site visit report, the program asserted that the program has been successfully managed using academic specialists and graduate assistants, but also that they have received approval to hire at least one additional staff member. However, the Council could not determine that the academic specialists and graduate assistants are able to devote enough time and support to the program.

Steps to Be Taken:

At the time of the next annual report, the program must demonstrate adequate access to clerical and technical staff to support the work of the students, faculty, and staff, and demonstrate how access to the clerical and technical staff helps the program meet its mission and goals. The program must provide an update on hiring additional clerical staff to demonstrate that there is adequate support for the work of the students, faculty, and staff, and for the program to meet its mission and goals.

AREAS FOR FOLLOW-UP (clarification/verification)

The CAA did not find the program to be out of compliance with the following Standards for Accreditation at this time. However, the program must provide additional information or an update in the program's next annual report or reaccreditation application for clarification or verification of these issues, in order to monitor the program's continued compliance in the stated areas.

- **There were no areas for follow-up with the Standards for Accreditation.**

PERFORMANCE WITH RESPECT TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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 US Secretary of Education [[34 CFR 602.17\(f\)](#)].

Comments/Observations:

<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>	
X	Program Completion 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](#)]. 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 provide a written timeline to the program to come into compliance that is reasonable, as determined by the CAA, based on the nature of the finding, the stated mission, and educational objectives of the program. The timeline may include intermediate checkpoints on the way to full compliance and must not exceed three years for programs, regardless of professional area. If the review of a second consecutive report reveals that issues continue for the same standard(s), regardless of which requirements for review were identified, and the program remains not in full compliance with all standards, 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.

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.