



ORAL COMMUNICATION ASSESSMENT REVIEW ANALYSIS 2020 CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

Summary of Analysis

For AY 2019-2020 the Assessment Committee reviewed and rated 22 (of 49) oral communication assessment reports. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the sudden transition to online learning format, many programs could not collect assessment data that they typically collect during the academic year (e.g., laboratory work, performances, etc.). These programs were provided the option to conduct an assessment check-up. For oral communication assessment, 25 programs opted to conduct an assessment check-up for AY 2019-2020. These check-ups also were reviewed by the Assessment Committee. The Committee also scheduled a follow-up meeting with the program to discuss the program's assessment and curriculum.

2019-2020 Oral Communication Assessment Review Ratings Table

	Process Section	Performance Section	Progress Section	Overall Ratings
# Met/Exceeded Expectations	16	9	10	10
# Needs Minor Improvement	5	10	8	10
# Needs Improvement	1	3	4	2
Average	3.21	2.80	2.73	2.91

Overall Analysis

Of the 22 completed oral communication reports, the overall average rating was 2.91 (out of 4). Ten programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Ten programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And two 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.

Comparison to Previous Years Data

2018-2019 Oral Communication Assessment Review Ratings Table

	Process Section	Performance Section	Progress Section	Overall Ratings
# Met/Exceeded Expectations	27	17	19	18
# Needs Minor Improvement	14	17	14	16
# Needs Improvement	2	6	8	6
NA		3	2	3
Average	3.07	2.69	2.70	2.85

This year's overall average (2.91) is slightly higher than last year's overall average (2.85). However, this slight increase is not statistically significant, and the difference in sample size does not warrant confidence in the improvement of the oral communication assessment process since last year. Nevertheless, the similar overall average does highlight the efforts of many programs to ensure proper assessment of our students' oral communication abilities despite

having to make extensive teaching and program adjustments. We look forward to next year's review ratings data to get a better year-over-year progress understanding.

Process Section Analysis

Of the 22 completed process section, the overall average rating was 3.21 (out of 4). Sixteen programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Five programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And one program received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

This year's process average (3.21) is slightly higher than last year's process average (3.07). However, as stated above, the difference in sample size and degree of difference does not warrant confidence in the improvement of this section since last year. We look forward to next year's review ratings data to get a better year-over-year progress understanding.

Performance Section Review

Of the 22 completed performance, the overall average rating was 2.80 (out of 4). Nine programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Ten programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And three programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

This year's performance average (2.80) is slightly higher than last year's process average (2.69). However, as stated above, the difference in sample size and degree of difference does not warrant confidence in the improvement of this section since last year. We look forward to next year's review ratings data to get a better year-over-year progress understanding.

Progress Section Analysis

Of the 22 completed progress section, the overall average rating was 2.73 (out of 4). Ten programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Eight 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).

This year's progress average (2.73) is slightly higher than last year's process average (2.70). However, as stated above, the difference in sample size and degree of difference do not warrant confidence in the setback of this section since last year. We look forward to next year's review ratings data to get a better year-over-year progress understanding.