14 September 2010

To: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Chair

Department of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Assessment Representative

From: Carrie Abele, Chair

University Assessment Committee

Subject: Reply to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Assessment Report Submitted \_\_\_\_(date)

Thank you for submitting the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ assessment report dated \_\_\_\_\_\_. *( in a timely manner, with complete documentation)* The University Assessment Committee (UAC) has reviewed and *accepted* the report. Your next assessment report will be due \_\_\_\_\_ 15, 201\_\_, with all future assessment reports due on a 2-year cycle. Please consult the OU Assessment website at

<https://www2.oakland.edu/secure/oira/assessment.htm>

for an updated schedule, copies of reporting forms, and copies of forms detailing the

criteria the UAC uses to review assessment plans and reports.

**In reviewing your report, the UAC was impressed with**:

•

•

***The UAC noted that***

•

•

***In your 201\_ report, the UAC looks forward to seeing:***

•

•

The UAC appreciates the time and effort that you have put into the assessment process, and commends you for the good work you are doing in using assessment to improve your program.

Representatives of the University Assessment committee are available to work with your faculty. The Committee representatives for your program are:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (x\_\_\_\_, e-mail address) or \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (x\_\_\_\_, e-mail address).

If you have any other questions or comments, please contact me. We thank you for your report, and we look forward to working with you and your faculty in continuing your assessment activities.

For information purposes, we are sending a copy of this to Dean **\_\_\_\_\_\_** and Provost Moudgil.

**Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Reports - Oakland University**

Program\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date reviewed\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Note: If criterion is not present, rating is 0

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 3 Mature | 2 Developing/Progressing | 1 Minimal | Rating |
| Student Learning Outcomes are clearly stated and make effective assessment possible | SLOs articulate specific, measurable expected competencies or outcomes to be demonstrated | SLOs broadly state expected outcomes | SLOs are too broad or vague to measure easily |  |
| Direct measure(s) | Direct measure(s) provide observable **evidence** of achievement of all SLOs |  | Direct measures miss important student learning outcomes or are not relevant to SLOs |  |
| Indirect measure(s) | Indirect measure(s) provide **evidence** of achievement of student learning outcomes |  | Indirect measures miss important student learning outcomes or are not relevant to SLOs |  |
| Implementation of assessment | Implementation provides sufficient data to evaluate SLOs effectively | Data collection allows for some evaluation of SLOs | Minimal data collected to evaluate SLOs |  |
| Evaluation of student learning | Criteria &/or rubrics articulate specific levels of performance required to meet expectations | Criteria are clear and provide guidance on how to evaluate performance | Vague criteria allow for wide discrepancies in interpretation |  |
| Sample size & selection | Sample is random (if appropriate) & size is clearly sufficient to provide evidence of performance |  | Sample is too small to provide evidence of performance |  |
| Analysis of Results | Presents specifics of data analysis that support of findings on student achievement of SLO | Some detail present in analysis, but links to student learning less clear | Analysis generalized; not clear how used to improve student learning |  |
|  | 3 Mature | 2 Developing/Progressing | 1 Minimal | Rating |
| Use of results to improve student learning (Change implemented as a result of assessment) | Specific changes made to curriculum &/or instruction to improve student learning | Not clear how results used to improve learning | Report provides no discussion of intent to improve learning |  |
| Program focus on student learning | Using assessment to improve student learning over time is integrated into fabric of program | Assessment & analysis of results are not fully developed or are episodic | Focus on assessment is not clearly connected to improvement in learning |  |
| Shared responsibility for learning & assessment; planning/implementation | All faculty actively participate in planning & implementing assessment activities | Assessment has broad but not full participation by faculty | A very small proportion of the faculty participate in assessment activities |  |
| Shared responsibility for learning & assessment; review/analysis of results | All faculty participate in analysis of results & discussions of how to improve learning |  | A very small proportion of the faculty participate in analysis of results & discussions of how to improve learning |  |
| **Rate as Yes/No/ Not Apply** |  |  |  | **Y/N/NA:** |
| Assessment of change | Assessment provides evidence that earlier changes have improved learning |  |  |  |
| Award system for faculty | Assessment treated as teaching &/or for merit & promotion | Assessment heavily weighted as service. | No recognition of assessment given |  |
| Assess/evaluate assessment | Evidence of evaluation of assessment methods |  | No evidence of evaluation of assessment |  |