<p style="text-align:center">**Evaluation Form for Assessment Lead**
Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Report
2017-2018</p>

Degree Program: MACI
Department/School: Attallah College of Educational Studies
Program Chair/Director's Name: Amy Ardell
Report Writer's Name (if different than chair/director):
Chair/Director or Report Writer's Email: ardell@chapman.edu

Previous year's ratings (1-4)		
Process: 1	Performance: 1	Progress:1

Rating Guide:
Rate each area as follows: **1 = Needs improvement**; **2 = Needs minor improvement**; **3 = Meets Requirement**; **4 = Exceeds Requirement**

I. Overall Process Section Ratings Criteria	N/A	1	2	3	4
• Learning outcomes are clearly and appropriately written.					4
• At least two university assessment themes are supported (Interdisciplinary programs, Faculty-Student Research, Global Education, Personalized Education & Student Writing).					4
• Curricular Map is attached and depicts a clear and sufficient crosswalk of learning outcomes and courses.					4
• Learning outcomes are published across program materials.				3	
• Evidence of learning is sufficient for assessment of the learning outcomes.				3	
• All assessment tools are attached.				3	
• Assessment tools are clearly tied to the learning outcomes and contain distinctive levels of evaluation.				3	
• Level of achievement seems appropriate for the learning outcomes.				3	
Overall Rating for Process Section				**3.5**	

Comments for Process Section: This program is to be commended for the development of a clear course matrix, assignments, rubrics, and collecting and documenting student outcomes on these assignments. The program does mention standardized exam (TPA) overall scores, yet an analytic link between these exams and scores and course requirements may benefit the program development. The program may wish to more clearly link the student learning course outcomes with a clear narrative description of how the assignment, rubric, and student scores support this student success. Also, the program has improved clarity regarding when students take TPAs. The committee looks forward to the program continuing to develop reflection and analysis.

II. Overall Performance Section Ratings Criteria	N/A	1	2	3	4
• Explanation of levels of achievement captures either satisfactory achievement levels or unsatisfactory achievement levels <u>with</u> strong justifications/rationale.				3	
• Student performance data is attached or on the report with appropriate analysis.			2		

	2			
• Student performance data consistently supports the explanation of levels of achievement.	**2**			
• 3-year performance data is attached or on the report; and the data is reasonably comparable. Any gaps in the data trend are appropriately explained.	**2**			
Overall Rating for Performance Section	**2.25**			

Comments for Performance Section: The program has included significant benchmark performance data. The program has provided a well-honed and detailed course matrix with clear and articulate student assignment/performance expectations. The program has not provided analytic analysis articulating the ways in which the program is supporting a clear path to student success. As the program is aware the data is developing (< 3 years), yet they have collected and reported a significant amount of student outcomes. The program has built on the prior year's clear and focused assessment. We anticipate with the new redesign the program will continue to ensure a transparent view of student performance.

III. Progress Section Ratings Criteria	N/A	1	2	3	4
• Student performance data and analysis were satisfactorily shared with faculty and students.			2		
• The narrative clearly responds to past years' recommendations.				3	
• The narrative provides insights and learning points based on data analysis of student performance.			2		
• The program articulates a good plan for program improvement (i.e., closing the loop).				3	
Overall Rating for Progress Section			**2.5**		

Comments for Progress Section: We commend the program for making substantial progress over the past year in data collection. This year, the program has provided a significant amount of student performance data. The narrative also responds to last year's recommendations. Moving forward, the committee recommends the program share student performance data and analysis with all faculty (FT & PT) as well as students. One area of focus for the program as they move forward is to consider an analytic narrative which reflects the programs insights and learning points based on student outcomes. Finally, with the program redesign, the program may wish to reflect on the ways in which the new design improves the challenges discovered in the prior program model.