



WRITTEN COMMUNICATION ASSESSMENT REVIEW ANALYSIS 2020 CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

Summary of Analysis

For AY 2019-2020 the Assessment Committee reviewed and rated 22 (of 49) written 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 written 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 Written Communication Assessment Review Ratings Table

	Process Section	Performance Section	Progress Section	Overall Ratings
# Met/Exceeded Expectations	16	9	9	9
# Needs Minor Improvement	5	11	9	11
# Needs Improvement	1	2	4	2
Average	3.18	2.80	2.61	2.86

Overall Analysis

Of the 22 completed written communication reports, the overall average rating was 2.86 (out of 4). Nine programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Eleven 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 Written Communication Assessment Review Ratings Table

	Process Section	Performance Section	Progress Section	Overall Ratings
# Met/Exceeded Expectations	24	18	21	21
# Needs Minor Improvement	18	17	13	16
# Needs Improvement	1	5	7	4
NA	0	3	2	2
Average	3.07	2.82	2.61	2.93

This year's overall average (2.86) is slightly lower than last year's overall average (2.93). However, this slight increase is not statistically significant, and the difference in sample size does not warrant confidence in the improvement of the written 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' written 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 3.18 (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 (3.18) 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 Analysis

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. Eleven 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).

This year's performance average (2.80) is slightly lower than last year's process average (2.82). 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 2.61 (out of 4). Nine programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Nine 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 (2.61) is lower than last year's process average (2.81). The 0.2 ratings difference has been noted. While the difference in sample size may attribute to the difference between the last year and this year, we will be monitoring next year's data to get a better year-over-year progress understanding.