

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_87269
Title of the Manuscript:	OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION ASSESSMENT PRACTICES OF COLLEGIATE FACULTY MEMBERS: BASIS FOR A TRAINING DESIGN
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Justify and explain how you used Slovin's formula. There are many cases of inappropriate use. See https://www.psai.ph/docs/publications/tps/tps_2012_61_1_9.pdf</p> <p>Did you establish validity and reliability of your instrument? For example, piloting, cognitive interviews, theory based, statistical analysis, and Delphi, etc.? If not, this is a major limitation and should be included there.</p> <p>DO NOT run all the tables together. Introduce one after each paragraph. They provide little information. Cut the number of tables in half and introduce each one. Much better would be to provide the context in the reading.</p> <p>What statistical program did you use? Did you not perform inferential statistics?</p> <p>How did you establish the true/false? Any grey areas?</p> <p>What are the demographics? Did you collect that data? If you cannot describe the sample and context, then that is a major limitation and harms generalizability.</p> <p>You need a limitations section. All good articles have a limitations section.</p> <p>Conclusion is especially weak. Only 2 sentences. Develop it to either 5 sentences or two paragraphs. Could use a citation.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>First reference leads with a date. Fix this to lead with an author or organization, never a date. (Not even listed in the article.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>results need significant updates and limitations section. Fix conclusions. Discussion seems strong.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	Fort Hays State University, United States of America

Review Form 1.6