

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

Degree Program: MAT Single 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:cosier@chapman.edu

Previous year's ratings (1-4)		
Process: 4.5	Performance: 4	Progress: 3.5

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
Overall Rating for Process Section					4
Comments for Process Section: The program has clearly been dedicated to implementing the redesign and has made significant progress in that direction. The student outcome evidence and subsequent program narrative demonstrate an improvement. We look forward to seeing this process development contributing to improved student success on mandated standardized exams.					

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	
• 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.					

Overall Rating for Performance Section				3.25
Comments for Performance Section:				

III. Progress Section Ratings Criteria	N/A	1	2	3	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student performance data and analysis were satisfactorily shared with faculty and students. 				3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The narrative clearly responds to past years' recommendations. 				3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The narrative provides insights and learning points based on data analysis of student performance. 					4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program articulates a good plan for program improvement (i.e., closing the loop). 				3	
Overall Rating for Progress Section				3.5	

Comments for Progress Section:

The program has made clear alignments between TPEs, SLOs, key assignments as well as course assessment rubrics. As the program continues to progress it may benefit by continuing to collect, analyze, and discuss student course performance data and developing a deeper understanding of the connection (positive or negative) between program operation and student outcomes. The program successfully shares student outcome results with program faculty through their “annual reports” and faculty meetings and with students during their workshops. It is clear that the SLOs are identified on program syllabi.

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 expect 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.

We would expect student achievement data (within the coursework as well as on standardized tests) would be reviewed and clearer links between student achievement and course progression to be discussed.

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.