



WRITTEN COMMUNICATION ASSESSMENT REVIEW ANALYSIS 2019 CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

Summary of Analysis

For AY 2018-2019 the Assessment Committee reviewed and rated 43 Written Communication (WC) assessment reports. Of the 43 reports, 40 reports satisfactorily completed all three sections (i.e., process, performance, and progress) of the WC assessment reports. When the Committee identifies missing sections, they are rated as incomplete and responded to as such. These missing sections were omitted from the calculations below. The reports with missing sections also were omitted from the overall ratings calculations. The institution expects all undergraduate programs to participate in the core competencies assessment.

	Process Section	Performance Section	Progress Section	Overall Ratings
# Met/Exceeded Expectations	24	18	21	21
# Needs Minor Improvement	18	17	13	16
# Needs Improvement	1	5	7	4
NA	0	3	2	2
Average	3.07	2.82	2.81	2.93

Overall Review

Of the 40 completed WC reports, the overall average rating was 2.93 (out of 4). Twenty-one programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Sixteen programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And four programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement). As mentioned, the assessment committee also provides qualitative responses to elaborate on the ratings and support program improvement on assessment. These individualized comments can be accessed through our assessment system.

Given that this is the first year of aggregated analysis, there is no previous year's data for comparison. In the future, we plan to include year-over-year analysis.

Process Section Review

The overall average rating for the process section was 3.07 (out of 4). Twenty-four programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Eighteen programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And one programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

Given that this is the first year of aggregated analysis, there is no previous year's data for comparison. In the future, we plan to include year-over-year analysis.

Performance Section Review

The overall average rating for the performance section was 2.82 (out of 4). Eighteen programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Seventeen programs received a

rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And five programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

Given that this is the first year of aggregated analysis, there is no previous year's data for comparison. In the future, we plan to include year-over-year analysis.

Progress Section Review

The overall average rating for the progress section was 2.81 (out of 4). Twenty-one programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Thirteen programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And seven programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

Given that this is the first year of aggregated analysis, there is no previous year's data for comparison. In the future, we plan to include year-over-year analysis.