

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

Degree Program: MA in Counseling, MA in Counseling with an emphasis in Professional Clinical Counseling, Pupil personnel services credential in school counseling
Pupil Services Credential in School Counseling,
Department/School: Attallah College
Program Chair/Director's Name: Michael Hall
Report Writer's Name (if different than chair/director):
Chair/Director or Report Writer's Email:mhall@chapman.edu

Previous year's ratings (1-4)		
Process: 3	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.				3	
• At least two university assessment themes are supported (Interdisciplinary programs, Faculty-Student Research, Global Education, Personalized Education & Student Writing).				3	
• Curricular Map is attached and depicts a clear and sufficient crosswalk of learning outcomes and courses.				3	
• Learning outcomes are published across program materials.			2		
• Evidence of learning is sufficient for assessment of the learning outcomes.					
• 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	
Comments for Process Section: The program has included additional longitudinal data that is helpful to gain an understanding of student outcomes. There seems to be some confusion around course numbers and which assignments align with courses.					
We commended the program for include learning outcomes on two of the assignments submitted, they seem to be missing on CSP 640 assignment description. The program may be sharing learning outcomes, but no more sources of evidence were provided with the report. As stated last year, it is helpful for the committee to interpret the information when data is consistent, clear, and complete. The committee looks forward to improvements in this area moving forward.					

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.			2.5		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student performance data is attached or on the report with appropriate analysis. 			2.5		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student performance data consistently supports the explanation of levels of achievement. 				3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 				3	
Overall Rating for Performance Section				3	
Comments for Performance Section: The committee applauds the program on expanding student performance data. We also support the introduction of text books to help students struggling with meeting expected PLO outcome levels. We recommend the program more clearly describe the of faculty analysis of these data and potential program improvement plans to support struggling students.					

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. 			2		
<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. 			2		
<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				2.5	
Comments for Progress Section: The program has continued to improve on reporting student progress and has included additional longitudinal data. We find a challenge for the student outcome analysis in this report. It is unclear from the report that there is an analysis by faculty for shifting student success over the years.					