**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: |  | | |