

**Evaluation Form for Assessment Lead**  
**Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**  
**2017-2018**

Degree Program: MAT Multiple Subject  
 Department/School: Attallah College of Educational Studies  
 Program Chair/Director's Name: Meghan Cosier  
 Report Writer's Name (if different than chair/director):  
 Chair/Director or Report Writer's Email:coiser@chapman.edu

Previous year's ratings (1-4)		
Process: 3.5	Performance: 3	Progress:2.5

**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.					4
• Evidence of learning is sufficient for assessment of the learning outcomes.					4
• All assessment tools are attached.					4
• Assessment tools are clearly tied to the learning outcomes and contain distinctive levels of evaluation.					4
• Level of achievement seems appropriate for the learning outcomes.					4
<b>Overall Rating for Process Section</b>					<b>4</b>
<b>Comments for Process Section: The program has successfully redesigned the program and made significant progress in uniting the program sequence with outcome measures and program reflection. These improvements demonstrate a continuation of the commitment to overall student success. The committee looks forward to a standardization of outcome measures over time so that the program can more clearly compare student progress year over year.</b>					

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.					4
• Student performance data is attached or on the report with appropriate analysis.				3	
• Student performance data consistently supports the explanation of levels of achievement.				3	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>				<b>3</b>	
<b>Overall Rating for Performance Section</b>				<b>3.25</b>	
<p><b>Comments for Performance Section:</b> The program should be commended for the depth and breadth of program learning outcomes to key assignments and rubrics. The inclusion this year of a detailed course matrix with linked syllabi, key assignments, and associated rubrics makes it clear that the program is continuing to make progress in the alignment of program goals with state requirements for the teaching profession. Further, the addition of clarification of PLO goals (i.e. 80% pass rate) provides a clearer trajectory for the program moving forward. As mentioned in the prior year's report, we would expect as data under the new design to be collected and for the program to gather, reflect, and report on student performance outcomes within courses as well as those provided by outside assessors.</p>					

<b>III. Progress Section Ratings Criteria</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student performance data and analysis were satisfactorily shared with faculty and students.</li> </ul>				<b>3</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The narrative clearly responds to past years' recommendations.</li> </ul>				<b>3</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The narrative provides insights and learning points based on data analysis of student performance.</li> </ul>					<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The program articulates a good plan for program improvement (i.e., closing the loop).</li> </ul>				<b>3</b>	
<b>Overall Rating for Progress Section</b>				<b>3.5</b>	
<p><b>Comments for Progress Section:</b> The program has made clear alignments between TPEs, SLOs, key assignments, and in course assessment rubrics. Moving forward collecting and comparing student course performance data that aligns with SLOs will be essential to closing the loop between program operation and student outcomes. Further, the program successfully shares these results with program faculty through the "annual reports" and faculty meetings and with students during their workshops, yet the committee is not clear if the student learning outcomes identified in the matrix are shared with faculty and students.</p> <p>Additionally, the program may benefit by further developing a process for analyzing the student "key assignment" outcome data. The data linked to the program matrix is an excellent demonstration of the ways in which courses are designed to prepare students. As mentioned last year, we would hope to see program level student outcome data as well as the standardized test data demonstrating the development of students over time. Also, the program mentions "Taskstream Learning Management Software" yet there is no description of how this software is used for program reflection or analysis.</p> <p>Finally, the program is clearly making an intensive effort to align a complex stream of state requirements and should be commended for this effort. Aligned with this progression, we would hope the program would close the gap between program design and student outcomes by addressing class insights and learning points based on data analysis of student performance.</p>					