

## Assessment Report review checklist

	yes	no	
<b>Assessment Report header</b>			
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This year's Report header has the correct year (Year 1, Year 2, ...) on every page
<b>First page, top</b>			
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Full department & program names are indicated (no acronyms or abbreviations)
<b>Assessment table</b>			
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The assessed PSLO is identical to the one on the Assessment Plan for this year
The following information on the Report table matches the Plan table:			
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- ISLO
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Class, semester, year, assessment tool
6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Target goals
7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Number of students assessed is included
8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Result percentages = 100%
<b>Name &amp; date</b>			
9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Person completing the Report is indicated
10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Report submission date is indicated
<b>Looking back to last year's PSLO</b>			
11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Response to whether a change(s) was implemented is satisfactory
12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Initial perception about the efficacy of the change(s) is satisfactory
<b>Did faculty find the assessment(s) effectively captured how students were performing on PSLO?</b>			
13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The focus is on the assessment tool(s) and/or rubric(s)
<b>Faculty engagement during assessment analysis &amp; decision-making</b>			
14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Faculty were collectively engaged in discussing assessment results & improving student learning
<b>Recommendation for improving student learning</b>			
15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A realistic change is proposed, or a reasonable justification for why change is currently not warranted; see rubric below

<b>Recommendation for improving student learning*</b>			
	<b>Not Acceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	
		<b>Acceptable with Advice for Improvement</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>Connection to assessment results</b>	Narrative does not demonstrate how the recommendation is connected to assessment results and will improve student learning.	Narrative includes some discussion of the recommendation’s connection to assessment results and how learning will be improved but would benefit from development.	Narrative clearly demonstrates how the recommendation is connected to assessment results and will improve student learning.
<b>Specificity</b>	Recommendation is broad and does not reflect a specific change to curriculum or teaching.	Recommendation somewhat specifies change to a curriculum or teaching but would benefit from more detail.	Recommendation includes a specific change to curriculum or teaching.
<b>Practicality</b>	Recommendation is impractical given available resources.	Recommendation is practical with some modifications.	Recommendation is practical, given available resources.
<b>Timeliness</b>	Recommendation cannot (or is not planned to be) implemented within a reasonable time frame. [Ideally, the next time the course is taught or at the latest, in the next assessment cycle.]		Recommendation will be implemented in a timely manner (e.g., the next time a course is taught or at the latest, in the next assessment cycle).
<b><u>Alternately: Justification for no change*</u></b>			
<b>Connection to assessment results</b>	Narrative does not demonstrate discussion of the assessment results and why a change to teaching or the curriculum is not currently warranted. [Examples include a lack of desire to change pedagogy or curriculum due to 100% achievement or an unwarranted reliance on ‘low N’.]	Narrative includes some discussion of the assessment results and why a change to teaching or the curriculum is not warranted but further exploration of potential changes may be warranted.	Narrative clearly demonstrates discussion of the assessment results and why a change to teaching or the curriculum is not currently warranted.
<b>Specificity</b>	Justification for no change is broad in nature and does not reflect a specific reason why no change to teaching or the curriculum is currently warranted.	Justification provides reason for no change to teaching or the curriculum but would benefit from greater specificity.	Justification for no change to teaching or the curriculum is clearly specified.
<b>Timeliness</b>	No timeline is established to revisit the assessment results and discuss potential changes to teaching or the curriculum, or the timeframe is unacceptable (e.g., timeline specifies potential changes to be made beyond the next cycle).		The timeline established to revisit the assessment results and discuss potential changes is clearly identified.

\*Each criterion must be scored as “Acceptable” to meet the standards of an acceptable annual report.