Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Report
2017-2018

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE TEXT IN BLUE REFERS TO 2017-18 AND/OR IS REVISION. TEXT IN BLACK REFERS TO 2016-17 REPORTED ON LAST YEAR'S ALOAR.

Degree Program Information	
Academic Degree Program *(Major)*	Communication Sciences and Disorders
Brief Description of the Program	This is a 2-year graduate professional program that prepares graduate students for entry level jobs as speech-language pathologists who work in the schools, medical centers and private practices. The program has national accreditation and is authorized to recommend graduates for their California Preliminary SLP Services credential.
Degree *(BS, BA, BFA, MFA, MBA, etc.)*	MS
Department/ School	Crean College of Health and Behavioral Sciences
Number of students currently enrolled (as majors) in the program:	83
Contact Person	
Name *(Person coordinating program's assessment effort)*	Mary Kennedy
Title	Department Chair and Program Director
E-mail address	markenne@chapman.edu
Learning Outcomes	
How many learning outcomes for the program?	Four

Please list all learning outcomes below:

1. **Students must demonstrate** knowledge of basic human communication and swallowing processes, including the appropriate biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases. The applicant must have demonstrated the ability to integrate information pertaining to normal and abnormal human development across the life span. (IV-B, ASHA Certification standards in speech-language pathology; CTCC program standard 1).

2. Students must have demonstrated knowledge of communication and swallowing disorders and differences, including the appropriate etiologies, characteristics, anatomical/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates in the following areas: articulation; fluency; voice and resonance, including respiration and phonation; receptive and expressive language (phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, prelinguistic communication and paralinguistic communication) in speaking, listening, reading, writing; hearing, including the impact on speech and language; swallowing (oral,

pharyngeal, esophageal, and related functions, including oral function for feeding, orofacial myology); cognitive aspects of communication (attention, memory, sequencing, problem-solving, executive functioning); social aspects of communication (including challenging behavior, ineffective social skills, and lack of communication opportunities); augmentative and alternative communication modalities (aligns with CCTC Program standard 4 and ASHA Certification standards in speech-language pathology IV-C).

3. For each of the above mentioned areas in SLO #2, students must gain knowledge of the principles and methods of prevention, assessment, and intervention for people with communication and swallowing disorders, including consideration of anatomical/physiological, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates (aligns with CTC Program standard 4 and ASHA Certification standards in speech-language pathology IV-D).

4. Students must have demonstrated knowledge of processes used in research and of the integration of research principles into evidence-based clinical practice. This must include demonstrated knowledge of the principles of basic and applied research and research design, knowledge of how to access sources of research information, and have demonstrated the ability to relate research to clinical practice. This aligns with the ASHA 3.1.1B Professional practice competencies in evidence-based practice and 3.1.6B General knowledge and skills applicable to professional practice in ethical conduct. **This also aligns with CTC program design standard #1 for the Calif. SLP credential programs.**

LEARNING OUTCOME 1

I. PROCESS	
1. Learning Outcome	**Students must demonstrate** knowledge of basic human communication and swallowing processes, including the appropriate biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases. The applicant must have demonstrated the ability to integrate information pertaining to normal and abnormal human development across the life span. (IV-B, ASHA Certification standards in speech-language pathology; CTCC program standard 1)
2. Supports University Theme *(Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes)* • *Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing* • *Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome*	Case studies, shared topic-based research presentations, and research papers and that support the themes of faculty/student research and student writing.
3. Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only *(Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)* • *Oral Communication* • *Written communication* • *Information Literacy* • *Quantitative Reasoning* • *Critical Thinking*	NA
4. Where is the outcome published for students? • *Syllabi (If syllabi, list course numbers)* • *Website* • *Handbook*	Course syllabi for CSD 501, 503, 506, 507, ~~509,~~ 510, 515, 517, and 698.
5. Evidence of Learning • *capstone project* • *presentation* • *performance* • *course-embedded exam* • *assignment* • *standardized test* • *portfolio* Attach assignment prompts	• Completed key assignments in the above courses, except for CSD 698, which has no key assignment. • Completed comprehensive capstone projects. • Passed comprehensive exam questions that target the areas: described in the SLO. Starting in 2017-18, we now include the percent that passed each exam question to determine if any one area was problematic. • Earned a 'B' or higher in the courses listed above. • Submitted a portfolio with specific entries showing academic and clinical accomplishments prior to graduation as a requirement of CSD 698.
6. Collecting and Analyzing the Data	Samples of 41-43, 1st year students and 32, 2nd year students in the CSD graduate program were used in 2016-17. Samples of 41, 1st year students

• *How did you select the sample?* • *What was your sample size (number of students)?* • *Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.* • *How did you assess the student work/data collected?* • *Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio template* Required: Attach all assessment tools	and 42, 2nd year students in the CSD graduate program were used in 2017-18. 2016-17: Sample numbers are the same as the population, i.e., all of the students enrolled in the program or course. • Data was collected on 32 students who were completing their second year and graduating. Data was collected on 41-43 students who had completed their first year in the graduate program. • Key assignments varied by course and were graded by faculty. • Faculty graded students' capstone projects at the end of the second year. • Faculty graded comprehensive exams (at the end of the second year) using a grading rubric of 1 to 5, where a score of '3' is considered passing. • Grades of "B" or higher in the courses listed above were collected for both groups of students. 2017-18: Sample numbers are the same as the population, i.e., all of the students enrolled in the program or course. • Data was collected on 42 students who were completing their second year and graduating. Data was collected on 41 students who had completed their first year in the graduate program. • Key assignments varied by course and were graded by faculty. • Faculty graded students' capstone projects at the end of the second year. • Faculty graded comprehensive exams (at the end of the second year) using a grading rubric of 1 to 5, where a score of '3' is considered passing. For grades lower than a 3, students were required to retake a comprehensive exam question in that area only. • Grades of "B" or higher in the courses listed above were collected groups of students depending on when they took them, i.e., some courses are taken by 1st year students and other courses are taken by 2nd year students. • Portfolio descriptions are included in the CSD 698 course syllabus.
7. Expected Level of Achievement • *What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above.)*	Targets were: • Passing grade of 'B' or higher on key assignments – 90% • Grade of "B" or higher in the courses listed above – 90% • Passing grade of 'B' or higher on comprehensive capstone project – 100% • Passing scores on comprehensive exam – 100% • Submitting a completed electronic portfolio - 100%
II. PERFORMANCE	
1. Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.	2016-17: In general, yes. Both groups of students met the expected levels of achievement. Data is presented below.

2017-18: Yes. Both groups of students met the expected levels of achievement. Data is presented below.

2. Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table (or attach actual student performance data), along with a brief analysis of the results. **Two years of assessment data is presented in adjacent column.**	(content below)

2016-17: Two student assessment targets for 41-43, 1 year students

Year	Grades of 'B' or higher on key assignments in CSD 501, 503, 506, & 507	Course grades of 'B' or higher in CSD 501, 503, 506, & 507
2016-17	CSD 501 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 503 – 42/43 (98%) CSD 506 – 40/43 (93%) CSD 508 – 37/43 (86%)*	CSD 501 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 503 – 42/43 (98%) CSD 506 – 43/43 (100%) CSD 508 – 42/43 (98%)

*This is below the 90% target.

2016-17: Four student assessment targets for 32, 2nd year students

Year	Passing Capstone project	Passing comprehensive exam	Course grades of B or higher in CSD 509, 510, 515, & 698	Completed electronic portfolio
2016-17	32/32, 100%	32/32, with retakes**	CSD 507 CSD 510 – 32/32 (100%) CSD 515 – 32/32 (100%) CSD 698 – 32/32 (100%)	32/32, 100%

**Although all 32 students passed comprehensive exams, 17 of the 32 (53%) did so with retaking the questions they had not passed initially. There was one student that did not pass the question she retook; the faculty member created a remediation plan for her, for which she successfully passed.

2017-18: Two student assessment targets for 41, 1 year students

Year	Grades of 'B' or higher on key assignments in CSD 501, 503, 506, & 507	Course grades of 'B' or higher in CSD 501, 503, 506, & 507
2017-18	CSD 501 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 503 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 506 – 27/41 (65.8%)* CSD 507 – 41/41 (100%)	CSD 501 – 38/41 (92.6%%) CSD 503 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 506 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 507 – 41/41 (100%)

*This is below the 90% target.

2017-18: Four student assessment targets for 42, 2nd year students

Year	Passing Capstone project	Passing comprehensive exam; passing rates for each exam question area.	Course grades of B or higher in CSD 509, 510, 515, & 698	Completed electronic portfolio
2017-18	42/42, 100%	*42/42 (100%) Performance by exam question: Adult Language disorders– 100% Child Language disorders – 100% Motor speech/Voice – 97.5% Dysphagia – 74%	CSD 510 - 100% CSD 515 - 100% CSD 517 – 100% CSD 698 – 100%	42/42, 100%

	Articulation/Phonology question – 95.7% Augmentative & Alternative Comm/Autism question – 100%
	42 students passed comprehensive exams with retakes; 6 of the 42 (14%) did so with retaking the questions for which they received a score of 1 or 2.
3. How did this year's achievement level compare to past two years? Required: Two year summary is presented in adjacent column.	We have 2 years of data, not three years because 2015-16 ALOAR report was not submitted by the outgoing departmental chair. Because we have included some new types of evidence starting 2017-18, some are not comparable. In general, there are few differences over the two years of data. Most targets were achieved. 1. There was a substantial improvement in the percentage of students who passed comprehensive exams without retakes; 53% retook parts of the exam in 2016-17, while only 14% retook parts of the exam in 2017-18. 2. On the comprehensive exam, only 74% of students passed the Dysphagia question without retaking it. 3. The key assignment in CSD 506, Neuroanatomy challenging for the class of 2017-18. Only 65.8% earned a 'B' or higher compared to 93% in 2016-17. To ensure that students achieved this key assignment and this part of SLO#1, students had to remediate the key assignment earning a 'B' or higher; all students did this.

LEARNING OUTCOME 2

I. PROCESS	
1. Learning Outcome	The applicant must have demonstrated knowledge of communication and swallowing disorders and differences, including the appropriate etiologies, characteristics, anatomical/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates in the following areas: articulation; fluency; voice and resonance, including respiration and phonation; receptive and expressive language (phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, prelinguistic communication and paralinguistic communication) in speaking, listening, reading, writing; hearing, including the impact on speech and language; swallowing (oral, pharyngeal, esophageal, and related functions, including oral function for feeding, orofacial myology); cognitive aspects of communication (attention, memory, sequencing, problem-solving, executive functioning); social aspects of communication (including challenging behavior, ineffective social skills, and lack of communication opportunities); augmentative and alternative communication modalities (aligns with CCTC Program standard 4 and ASHA Certification standards in speech-language pathology IV-C).
2. Supports University Theme *(Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes)* • *Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing* • *Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome*	Case studies, topic-based research and clinical presentations, research papers and clinical reports, that support the themes of faculty/student research and student writing. Student-selected projects on specific topics of interest supports the theme of personalized education.
3. Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only *(Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)* • *Oral Communication* • *Written communication* • *Information Literacy* • *Quantitative Reasoning* • *Critical Thinking*	NA
4. Where is the outcome published for students? • *Syllabi (If syllabi, list course numbers)* • *Website* • *Handbook*	Syllabi for courses including CSD 501, ~~502,~~ 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 510, 511, 512, 515, and 517
5. Evidence of Learning • *capstone project*	2016-17:

• *presentation* • *performance* • *course-embedded exam* • *assignment* • *standardized test* • *portfolio* Attach assignment prompts	• Comprehensive test at the end of the 2nd year, required for graduation. Starting in 2017-18, we now include the percent that passed each exam question to determine if any one area was problematic. • The national PRAXIS exam, required to apply for national certification. • A grade of 'B' or higher on key assignments for courses listed above (CSD 501, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 510, 511, 512, 515, 517)
6. Collecting and Analyzing the Data • *How did you select the sample?* • *What was your sample size (number of students)?* • *Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.* • *How did you assess the student work/data collected?* • *Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio template* Required: Attach all assessment tools	2016-17: Sample numbers are the same as the population, i.e., all of the students enrolled in the program or course. A sample of 31-32, 2nd year students in the CSD graduate program was used. • Comprehensive exam data was collected on students who were completing their second year and nearing graduation. • The national PRAXIS exam scores are automatically posted; we reviewed only those who completed the program on August 1, 2017. • The final course grade in CSD 512, Multicultural, 2nd language acquisition. 2017-18: Sample numbers are the same as the population, i.e., all of the students enrolled in the program or course. A sample of 41, 1st year students, and 42, 2nd year students in the CSD graduate program was used. • Comprehensive exam data was collected on students who were completing their second year and nearing graduation. • Faculty graded comprehensive exams (at the end of the second year) using a grading rubric of 1 to 5, where a score of '3' is considered passing. For grades lower than a 3, students were required to retake a comprehensive exam question in that area only. • The national PRAXIS exam scores are automatically posted; we reviewed only those who completed the program on August 1, 2018. • The final course grade in CSD 512, Multicultural, 2nd language acquisition.
7. Expected Level of Achievement • *What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above.)*	• Students who passed comprehensive exams – 100% • Students who received a passing score on PRAXIS – 80% • Students who received a 'B' of higher in CSD 512 Multicultural, 2nd language acquisition – 90%
II. PERFORMANCE	
1. Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.	2016-17: Yes. Students met the expected levels of achievement. Data is presented below. 2017-18: In general, yes. Students met the expected levels of achievement. Data is presented below.

| 2. Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table (or attach actual student performance data), along with a brief analysis of the results.

Two years of assessment data is presented in adjacent column. | **2016-17**: Three student assessment targets for 32, 2nd year students |

2016-17: Three student assessment targets for 32, 2nd year students

Year	Passing comprehensive exam	Passing PRAXIS exam	'B' or higher in CSD 512
2016-17	32/32, with retakes*	31/31	100%

*Although all 32 students passed comprehensive exams, 17 of the 32 (53%) did so with retaking the questions they had not passed initially. There was one student that did not pass the question she retook; the faculty member for that question, created a remediation plan for her, for which she passed.

2017-18: Three student targets based on 41, 1st students and 42, 2nd year students in CSD

Key Assignments	Passing comprehensive exam	Passing PRAXIS exam
CSD 501 – 38/41 (92.7%) CSD 503 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 504 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 505 - 41/41 (100%) CSD 506 – 27/41 (65%) CSD 507 - 41/41 (100%) CSD 510 – 40/41 (97.6%) CSD 511 – 42/42 (100%) CSD 512 – 41/42 (97.6) CSD 515 – 42/42 (100%) CSD 517 – 42/42 (100)	*42/42 (100%) Percent who passed without retakes Adult Language Disorders – 100% Child Language – 100% Motor speech/Voice – 97.5% Dysphagia – 74% Articulation/Phonology – 95.7% Augmentative & Alternative Comm/Autism – 100%	42/42 (100%)

*42 students passed comprehensive exams with retakes; 6 of the 42 (14%) did so after retaking the question(s) for which they received a score of 1 or 2.

| 3. How did this year's achievement level compare to past two years?

Required: Two year summary is presented in adjacent column. | We have 2 years of data, not three years because 2015-16 ALOAR report was not submitted by the outgoing departmental chair.

Because we have included some new types of evidence starting 2017-18, some are not comparable.

In general, there are few differences over the two years of data. Most targets were achieved.
1. There was a substantial improvement in the percentage of students who passed comprehensive exams without retakes; 53% retook parts of the exam in 2016-17, while only 14% retook parts of the exam in 2017-18.
2. On the comprehensive exam, only 74% of students passed the Dysphagia question without retaking it.
3. The key assignment in CSD 506, Neuroanatomy challenging for the class of 2017-18. Only 65.8% earned a 'B' or higher compared to 93% in 2016-17. To ensure that students achieved this key assignment and this part of SLO#1, students had to remediate the key assignment earning a 'B' or higher; all students did this. |

LEARNING OUTCOME 3

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="2" style="background-color:#8B1A33; color:white;">I. PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Learning Outcome</td>
<td>For each of the above mentioned areas in SLO #2, students must gain knowledge of the principles and methods of prevention, assessment, and intervention for people with communication and swallowing disorders, including consideration of anatomical/physiological, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates (aligns with CTC Program standard 4 and ASHA Certification standards in speech-language pathology IV-D).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supports University Theme
(<i>Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes</i>)
• <i>Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing</i>
• <i>Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome</i></td>
<td>Case studies, intervention plans, and clinical reports of their clients/patients/students in clinical and practicum courses support the student writing theme of the university.

To some extent, students identify their clinical interests and are placed in clinical practicum courses where they will gain experience with these populations. This supports the theme of personalized education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only
(<i>Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies</i>)
• <i>Oral Communication</i>
• <i>Written communication</i>
• <i>Information Literacy</i>
• <i>Quantitative Reasoning</i>
• <i>Critical Thinking</i></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Where is the outcome published for students?
• <i>Syllabi (If syllabi, list course numbers)</i>
• <i>Website</i>
• <i>Handbook</i></td>
<td>2016-17:
• Course syllabi of clinical courses and clinical practicum courses including CSD 640, 650, 660, and 509.

• Some student learning outcomes are posted on the CSD website as required by the Council on Academic Accreditation, our national accrediting organization.

2017-18:
• Course syllabi of clinical/professional courses including CSD 502, 508, 509 and 512; clinical practicum courses including 620, 630, 640, 650, and 660.</td>
</tr>
</table>

	• Some student learning outcomes are posted on the CSD website as required by the Council on Academic Accreditation, our national accrediting organization.
5. Evidence of Learning • *capstone project* • *presentation* • *performance* • *course-embedded exam* • *assignment* • *standardized test* • *portfolio* Attach assignment prompts	**2016-17:** • Key assignments for the clinical/professional and practicum courses listed above. • Final course grades for those listed above. • The national PRAXIS exam, required to apply for national certification. • A grade of 'B' or higher in CSD 512, Multicultural, 2nd language acquisition course. **2017-18:** • Key assignments for the professional courses listed above. Key assignments in the practicum courses are no longer collected. • Final course grades for those listed above. • The national PRAXIS exam, required for national certification.
6. Collecting and Analyzing the Data • *How did you select the sample?* • *What was your sample size (number of students)?* • *Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.* • *How did you assess the student work/data collected?* • *Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio template* Required: Attach all assessment tools	**2016-17:** Sample numbers are the same as the population, i.e., all of the students enrolled in the program or course. A sample of 31-32, 2nd year students in the CSD graduate program was used. • Key assignments varied by course for 2nd year students, and were graded by faculty. • Course grades were collected at the end of the second year. • The national PRAXIS exam scores are automatically posted; we reviewed only those who completed the program on August 1, 2017. • The final course grade in CSD 512, Multicultural, 2nd language. **2017-18:** Sample numbers are the same as the population, i.e., all of the students enrolled in the program or course. A sample of 41, 1st year students and 42, 2nd year students in the CSD graduate program was used. • Key assignments for professional courses for 1st and 2nd year students were graded by faculty. • Course grades were collected at the end of the second year. • The national PRAXIS exam scores are automatically posted; the data reflects only those who completed the program during the 2017-18 year, and degrees conferred on August 1, 2018.
7. Expected Level of Achievement • *What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and*	A sample of 31-32 students in their second year of the CSD graduate program was used in 2016-17. A sample of 41, 1st year students and a sample of 42, 2nd year students of the CSD graduate program was used in 2017-18. • Passing grade of 'B' or higher on key assignments – 90%

collected and analyzed data in the section above.)	• Students who received a 'B' of higher in professional and clinical practicum courses – 90% • Students who received a passing score on PRAXIS (162) – 100%

II. PERFORMANCE

1. Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.	Yes, students met the expected levels of achievement in 2017-18. Data is presented below.
2. Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table (or attach actual student performance data), along with a brief analysis of the results. **Two years of assessment data is presented in adjacent column.**	(see tables below)

2016-17: Four student assessment targets for 31-32, 2nd year students

Year	'B' or higher on key assignments in clinical and practicum courses	'B' or higher in clinical and practicum courses	Passing PRAXIS exam	'B' or higher in CSD 512
2016-17	CSD 509 – 31/31 (100%) CSD 640 – 31/31 (100%) CSD 650 – 31/31 (100%) CSD 660 – 31/31 (100%)	CSD 509 – 30/31 (97%) CSD 640 – 31/31 (100%) CSD 650 – 31/31 (100%) CSD 660 – 31/31 (100%)	31/31 (100%)	32/32 (100%)

2017-18: Three student assessment targets for 41, 1st year and 42, 2nd year CSD students

2017-18	'B' or higher on key assignments	'B' or higher in professional & clinical practicum courses	Passing PRAXIS exam
	CSD 502 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 508 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 509 – 42/42 (100%) CSD 512 – 41/42 (97.6%)	CSD 502 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 508 – 41/41 (100) CSD 509 – 42/42 (100%) CSD 512 – 40/42 (95.2%) CSD 620 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 630 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 640 – 42/42 (100%) CSD 650 – 42/42 (100%) CSD 660 – 42/42 (100%)	42/42 (100%)

3. How did this year's achievement level compare to past two years?	We have 2 years of data, not three years because 2015-16 ALOAR report was not submitted by the outgoing departmental chair.

Required: Two year summary is presented in adjacent column.	Because we have included some new types of evidence starting 2017-18, some are not comparable. Overall, SLO#3 targets were achieved over two years of data.

LEARNING OUTCOME 4

I. PROCESS	
1. Learning Outcome	Students must have demonstrated knowledge of processes used in research and of the integration of research principles into evidence-based clinical practice. This must include demonstrated knowledge of the principles of basic and applied research and research design, knowledge of how to access sources of research information, and have demonstrated the ability to relate research to clinical practice. This aligns with the ASHA 3.1.1B Professional practice competencies in evidence-based practice and 3.1.6B General knowledge and skills applicable to professional practice in ethical conduct. **This also aligns with CTC program design standard #1 for the Calif. SLP credential programs.**
2. Supports University Theme *(Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes)* • *Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing* • *Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome*	This SLO supports the university theme of faculty/student research and student writing by learning how to interpret research, by learning how to apply research findings to clinical recommendations, and by learning how to analyze and write a synthesis that translates the science into clinical recommendations. This SLO supports the university theme of student writing.
3. Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only *(Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)* • *Oral Communication* • *Written communication* • *Information Literacy* • *Quantitative Reasoning* • *Critical Thinking*	NA
4. Where is the outcome published for students? • *Syllabi (If syllabi, list course numbers)* • *Website* • *Handbook*	Course syllabi including CSD 500 Research Methods, 505 ASD and Early Communication Assessment
5. Evidence of Learning • *capstone project*	• Key assignments from CSD 500 Research methods and 505 Autism Spectrum disorder and Early Communication Assessment

• *presentation* • *performance* • *course-embedded exam* • *assignment* • *standardized test* • *portfolio* Attach assignment prompts	• Course grades for CSD 500 and 505

6. Collecting and Analyzing the Data
• *How did you select the sample?*
• *What was your sample size (number of students)?*
• *Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.*
• *How did you assess the student work/data collected?*
  • *Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio template*
 	
Required: Attach all assessment tools
	2016-17:
	Sample numbers are the same as the population, i.e., all of the students enrolled in the program or course.
	  • The sample is 41- 43 1st year CSD graduate students.
	  • Students were enrolled in CSD 500 and CSD 505.
	
	Key assignments vary. For <u>CSD 500</u> the key assignment was a paper summary of a peer reviewed publication of an experimental study in the field. Students are assessed for content, APA formatting and writing clarity. For <u>CSD 505</u>, the key assignment required that students select a relevant and current topic and provide a written critical assessment with five or more current sources of which at least three are from peer-reviewed journal articles or other scholarly references (e.g. books, monographs). Students were assessed for content, ability to translate research into practice, and APA formatting and writing clarity.
	
	2017-18:
	Sample numbers are the same as the population, i.e., all of the students enrolled in the program or course.
	  • The sample is 41 1st year CSD graduate students.
	  • Students were enrolled in CSD 500 and CSD 505.
	
	Key assignments vary. For <u>CSD 500</u> the key assignment was a paper summary of a peer reviewed publication of an experimental study in the field. Students are assessed for content, APA formatting and writing clarity. For <u>CSD 505</u>, the key assignment required that students select a relevant and current topic and provide a written critical assessment with five or more current sources of which at least three are from peer-reviewed journal articles or other scholarly references (e.g. books, monographs). Students were assessed for content, ability to translate research into practice, and APA formatting and writing clarity.

7. Expected Level of Achievement • *What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above.)*	• Grades of 'B' or better in key assignments in CSD 500 Research methods, and CSD 505 Autism Spectrum Disorders & Early Childhood Assessment – 90% • Grades of a 'B' or better in both courses, CSD 500 and CSD 505 – 90%
II. PERFORMANCE	
1. Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.	2016-17: Yes. Student achieved the expected levels of achievement. See data below. 2017-18: Yes, students achieved the expected levels of achievement.

2. Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table (or attach actual student performance data), along with a brief analysis of the results. Attach current year assessment data	Two student assessment targets for 41-43, 1st year students (2016-17) 	Year	Grades of 'B' or higher on key assignments in CSD 500 & 505	Grades of 'B' or higher in CSD 501 & 505
---	---	---
2016-17	CSD 500 – 37/41 (90%) CSD 505 – 42/42 (100%)	CSD 500 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 505 – 42/42 (100%) | *Two student assessment targets for 41, 1st year students (2017-18) | Year	Grades of 'B' or higher on key assignments in CSD 500 & 505	Grades of 'B' or higher in CSD 501 & 505
---	---	---
2017-18	CSD 500 – 40/41 (97.5%) CSD 505 – 41/41 (100%)	CSD 500 – 41/41 (100%) CSD 505 – 41/41 (100%)	 *Key assignments and rubrics are attached.
3. How did this year's achievement level compare to past two years? Required: Two year summary is presented in adjacent column.	2017-18: There was a slight improvement the student performance of the key assignment in CSD 500 in 2017-18 compared to 2016-17. Course grades remained the same; all student received a 'B' or higher in both courses. Overall, students met the targets for SLO#4.

III. PROGRESS: FOR ALL LEARNING OUTCOMES	
1. How will the results be shared and evidence used to make decisions? Was it shared with faculty (full time and adjunct) and students?	Results will be shared in several ways: 1. At a fall 2018 departmental meeting full-time faculty. 2. National *Praxis* exam pass rates are updated annually and posted on the CSD website in November. This is a requirement of the Council of Academic Accreditation (CAA), our national accreditation agency. 3. Information will be shared with part-time faculty in November 2018 in a written summary.
2. How have previous years' findings been used to improve learning, courses and program in relation to this outcome? Specify. • *Refer to previous years' assessment reports/responses for this section.* • *Did you find any notable performance difference this year?* • *Based on your evaluation, what improvements (if any) will the program initiate in the coming academic year?*	The most notable change in the program occurred in how comprehensive exams were conducted in 2017-18. Having such low pass rates without retakes was problematic in 2016-17. The faculty discussed this, and decided to allow students to bring resources and notes into the exam to use while they answered each question; internet access was forbidden, only typed/printed notes and resources were allowed. This not only had the effect of markedly improved passing rates, but it also allowed students to create 'resource guides' that they would then use as practicing, new speech-language pathologists in their initial jobs. It is worth noting that students are challenged by the Dysphagia comprehensive exam question. We will review how this question was written to figure out which part of this question is the most challenging for them. Furthermore, CSD 506 Neuroanatomy is a challenging course for students. This particular cohort of students (2017-18) were especially challenged by this course. The key assignment has not changed; another year of data will provide better evidence if there is a problem which assignment or not.