

Speech Language Pathology Services Program

Signature Assignment for CD 669A-L Clinical Diagnostic Report

Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed:

SLO #2: Candidates can write professional clinical reports, research papers, and documentation using organized structure and accurate content.

SLO #4: Candidates can administer and interpret appropriate measures to diagnose communication disorders.

SLO #5: Candidates can write and implement clear and effective intervention plans, with measurable and achievable goals.

Description of the Signature Assignment

The *Clinical Diagnostic Report* is a pre-professional report required by candidates in each of the six on-campus clinics. The report presents the results of the comprehensive assessment conducted by the candidate to identify the presence/absence of a communication disorder, and if present, would include the effects the disorder could have on the individual and the actions recommended.

Directions for Students

N/A

Fall 2011-Present

CSULB: Department of Communicative Disorders

CD669 A-L: Writing Rubric for Clinical Diagnostic Report							
CATEGORY	Exceeds Expectations 4	Meets Expectations 3	Marginal 2	Unacceptable 1	Score		
I. Mechanics: Form (Organization & Syntax)	 Accurately and completely reported ALL relevant areas of a professional assessment report Well organized arrangement of topics Clear summations within all topic areas Sophisticated sentences; word choices are apt and varied 	 Accurately and completely reported most relevant areas of a professional assessment report Generally organized arrangement of topics Acceptable summations within most topic areas Varies sentences effectively; word choices are adequately varied and appropriate 	 Missing relevant areas of a professional assessment report Lacks organized arrangement of topics Unacceptable summations within TWO OR MORE topic areas Marginal sentence variety; word choices lack variety and often inappropriate 	 Little or no inclusion of relevant areas of a professional assessment report Disorganized arrangement of topic areas Lacks summations within all topic areas Poor &/or unvaried sentence construction; word choices poor and without variety 			
II. Mechanics: Usage (Intended Reader & Grammar, Spelling & Punctuation)	 Written language is appropriate for audience or implied reader Perfect or near-perfect grammar, punctuation, and spelling 	 Written language is generally appropriate for audience or implied reader Adequate grammar, punctuation, and spelling 	 Written language is marginally appropriate for audience or implied reader Inadequate grammar, punctuation, and spelling 	 Written language is inappropriate for audience or implied reader Poor grammar, punctuation, and spelling 			
III. Content (Analysis)	 Strong evidence of critical thinking skills Fully integrates connections between client profile and test measures to determine clients strengths and needs 	Good evidence of critical thinking skills Adequately integrates connections between client profile and test measures to determine clients strengths and needs	 Little evidence of critical thinking skills Marginally integrates connections between client profile and test measures to determine clients strengths and needs 	 No evidence of critical thinking skills Fails to integrate connections between client profile and test measures to determine clients strengths and needs 			
IV. Content (Interpretation & Judgment)	 Information and evidence are accurate, appropriate and integrated effectively Independent thinking solid and evident Interpretation of assessment results is insightful Recommendations are appropriate and indicated from analysis of assessment in its entirety 	 Information and evidence is generally accurate, appropriate and integrated Good evidence of Independent thinking Interpretation of assessment results is adequate Recommendations are generally appropriate and indicated from analysis of assessment in its entirety 	 Information and evidence are only marginally accurate, appropriate and integrated Little evidence of independent thinking Inconsistent interpretation of assessment results Recommendations are marginally appropriate and indicated from analysis of assessment in its entirety 	 Lack of an appropriate critique Information and evidence are inaccurate, inappropriate and not integrated Independent thinking absent Misinterpretation of assessment results Recommendations are inappropriate and counterindicated from analysis of assessment in its entirety 			

Category:	Instructions to Score Clinical Diagnostic Report: [Multiply percentage by score earned in each category
I. 10% x	(i.e., 4,3,2,1). Add I-IV for Total Score]
II. 10% x	<u>-</u>
III. 40% x	<u>-</u>
IV. 40% x	_
TOTAL I-IV/4	.0 Possible

Fall 2011-Present 2

Legend

Using Scale	College of Education Assessment Scale Equivalent		
Above			
3.1-4.0	4 (Exceeds Expectations)		
2.1-3.0	3 (Meets Expectations)		
1.1-2.0	2 (Meets Some Expectations)		
.1-1.0	1 (Does Not Meet Expectations)		
	0 (Can't Score)		

Fall 2011-Present 3