

2020-21 Program Review Assessment Report Feedback Guidelines

Keep feedback focused on responses that faculty gave, not an evaluation of the program itself. Please be sure to stay positive with feedback—we want to celebrate the awesome things that our colleagues are doing in their programs. At the same time, we also want to provide constructive criticism (suggestions) so that we can help our peers generate a stronger assessment section in the Program Review so that they may use it to boost their arguments for resource requests, faculty requests, etc. **It is advisable to write any positive comment or constructive feedback for each section, even if short.**

- 1) **Assess** – Look at assessment table (Part I) of report
 - a. Meets Expectations:
 - i. All courses should be listed along with data, even if there was no assessment (i.e., include 0%). Look for courses outside discipline (not all programs will have those, so refer to required courses for program in the catalog). Feedback: if all zeroes, maybe suggest more frequent assessment, even if 1 SLO. Positive feedback OK (i.e., having data for all courses in a program).
 - b. Doesn't Meet Expectations:
 - i. Courses listed but no numbers, data not directly entered in report (i.e., if sent as attachment or note to refer to eLumen). Feedback: maybe suggest that SLO data needs to be entered so it will appear on the Program Review Assessment Report.
- 2) **Plan**
 - a. Meets Expectations:
 - i. Detail must be provided about both the assessment tool and when assessment is to occur. Other things to look for: discussion of how courses fit within the program (only core courses—keep courses within the program). If courses outside program not listed, it still meets.
 - b. Doesn't Meet Expectations:
 - i. Did not describe assessment tool(s) or when assessments occur.
- 3) **Reflect**
 - a. Meets Expectations:
 - i. Addresses *both* strengths and weaknesses. Ideally, strengths and weaknesses should be addressed separately. Feedback could include whether weaknesses/strengths were addressed directly or implied. Up to reviewers to decide meets/doesn't meet depending on how clear language is.
 - b. Doesn't Meet Expectations:
 - i. If only strength *or* only weakness is mentioned (response only addresses half of the question).
- 4) **Refine**
 - a. Meets Expectations:
 - i. Mention specific changes (goals, etc.) to strengths and weaknesses tied to reflection piece. A timeline is suggested. Feedback: suggestion to provide feedback about effectiveness of assessment tools used.
 - b. Doesn't Meet Expectations:
 - i. No plan to implement potential changes

5) **Dialogue**

- a. Meets Expectations:
 - i. Show specific evidence of assessment discussion among discipline faculty (including adjunct, as appropriate for program). Evidence of formal or informal discussion. Specific timelines or specific examples are good to have. Feedback: “informal meetings are great; is there a way to move those to formal meetings?”
- b. Doesn't Meet Expectations:
 - i. If does not meet expectations, consider mentioning that one purpose of this question is to provide evidence for future ACCJC visits.