**Course Assessment Report Review Form**

**Oakland University General Education Committee**

|  |
| --- |
| Part I: General Information |
| Date Submitted |  |  | Course |  |
| Date Reviewed |  |  | Reviewer |  |
| Gen Ed Area |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Part II: Assessment Activities |
| 1) Quality of the Assessment Measures |  |  |
|  | How well developed were the assessment measures?  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mature: Measure(s) provides direct observable evidence of achievement of *both* GESLOs |
|  |  | Developing: Measure(s) provide observable evidence of achievement of *one* of the SLOs |
|  |  | Minimal: Measures provide little evidence relevant to the GESLOs |
|  |  | None: Evidence is not relevant to the GESLOs |
|  |  | Comments: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2) Appropriateness of Sample Size |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Were all students assessed? |
|  |  | Was only a sample of students assessed? |
|  |  | Was the sample randomly chosen? |
|  |  | Was the sample size sufficient to provide evidence of achievement in the GESLOs? |
|  |  | Was assessment data collected for *all* sections of the course? |
|  |  | Comments: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3) Review of Results |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | How many raters were used? |
|  |  | Was the instructor one of the raters? |
|  |  | Comments: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4) Presentation and Discussion of Results |  |  |
|  |  | Were summaries of the results provided for each measure?  |  |
|  |  | *Describe the quality of the rubric or assessment criteria* |  |
|  |  | Mature: Criteria/Rubric articulates specific levels of performance or proficiencies  |
|  |  | Developing: Criteria/Rubric provides some guidance, but lacks specificity |
|  |  | Minimal: The criteria/rubric is vague and allows for wide discrepancies |
|  |  | Comments: |  |

Part III: Analysis of Results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5) Analysis and Interpretation of Results |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | Mature: Analysis explains what the statistical results indicate about student achievement and identifies possible causes for weak performance. |
|  |  |
|  |  | Developing: Analysis attempts to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses  |
|  |  | Minimal: Analysis provides little interpretation of the meaning of the results |
|  |  | Comments: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6) Use of Results to Improve Student Learning |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | Mature: The report describes specific changes to improve student learning |
|  |  | Developing: The report is vague about how results will be used to improve student learning  |
|  |  | Minimal: The report does not discuss how the assessment results will improve learning |
|  |  | Comments: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 7) Assessment process |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Does the department plan on changing their assessment process? |
|  |  | Is there evidence that earlier changes have resulted in improvements in student learning? |
|  |  | Comments: |  |