# PEER REVIEW FEEDBACK FORM FOR ANNUAL REPORTS

**PROGRAM:**

**Assessment Day for PROGRAMS:** January 22, 2015  |  **Report Year:** Annual Report Data based on the 2013-2014 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Assessment Results</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (ME)</th>
<th>Best Practice (BP)</th>
<th>Not Able to Rate (NR)*</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (BG)</td>
<td>Data are aggregated for at least one of the student learning outcomes annually.</td>
<td>a. A summary table is provided with data associated with at least one student learning outcome.</td>
<td>Aggregated data are analyzed in a systematic manner to improve student learning and, as is possible, to evaluate prior actions.</td>
<td>Not Able to Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. A schedule is established to measure/collect data on all student learning outcomes within a six-year timeframe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Collected and aggregated data are linked to specific student learning outcomes. (In other words, data align with Assessment Plan.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analysis by Faculty</td>
<td>Assessment coordinator/leader and department chair received Annual Report with assessment results.</td>
<td>a. Designated relevant program faculty received annual assessment results.</td>
<td>Faculty synthesized results from multiple measures to form specific conclusions about student learning and/or assessment of student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Not Able to Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Designated relevant program faculty met to discuss assessment results in depth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Specific conclusions about student learning made based on assessment results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Actions to Improve Student Learning and Assessment</td>
<td>At least one issue involving assessment of student learning outcomes identified but no action was yet taken.</td>
<td>a. At least one action is identified to improve student learning and/or improve student learning outcome assessment.</td>
<td>Description of specific actions and assessment methods for improvement to student learning and/or improve student learning outcome assessment are based on analysis of actions for improvement defined in previous years.</td>
<td>Not Able to Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Description of specific action(s) to improve student learning and/or improve student learning outcome assessment relates directly to faculty conclusions about areas for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Description of specific action(s) to improve student learning and/or improve student learning outcome assessment includes a timetable for implementation and identifies who is responsible for the action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment(s):**

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**Not Able to Rate (NR):** The “Not Able to Rate” value may be assigned only if one of the following cases: (1) Insufficient data in prior academic year(s) (less than five students enrolled in the reporting year); (2) Program not offered in prior academic year(s); (3) Assessment Plan approved after the prior academic year(s); or (4) Information not submitted in Compliance Assist for the prior academic year(s).
PEER REVIEW FEEDBACK FORM FOR ANNUAL REPORTS

**Items (rows of table):**
- **Items** (aka rows) to be assessed are listed horizontally on the form.
- Raters evaluate three items (aka rows) including the following: “Assessment Results,” “Analysis by Faculty,” and “Actions to Improve Student Learning and Assessment.”

**Levels (columns of table):**
- This descriptive rubric includes four **levels** (aka columns) of specific criteria to be used as ratings per item.
- The four levels (aka columns) include the following: “Beginning,” “Meets Expectations,” “Best Practices,” and “Not Able to Rate.”

**Criteria (cells of table):**
- **Criteria** (descriptions per cell) are listed in each table cell, per item and per level.
- **Criteria** describe what must be provided in the Annual Report, per item, for any given level.

**How to get started with the rubric:**
- Use the feedback form as a matrix, working from right to left, assessing one item at a time.
- Start with item #1 (Assessment Results).
- Check the descriptors to identify what has been satisfied, starting with criteria for the “Beginning” level.

**Final decision for “Overall Rating” per item:**
- Mark the last column on the right (“Overall Rating”) to state the overall rating for the item making sure that all criteria in the prior level have been achieved.
- To achieve a rating, all criteria listed under each level must be satisfied. If some, but not all of criteria are satisfied, then the overall rating for that item should be the prior level.

**Comment(s) Section:** The comment section should be used to denote any one or more of the following:
   (a) Why a rating of “Not Able to Rate” (NR) is given for an item (using numbers 1 – 4 as defined at bottom of page 1),
   (b) If criteria are not sufficient to justify a rating, and/or
   (c) If reviewers would like to make a suggestion for improvement that needs to be recorded.