**Annual Assessment Report from Administrative Departments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ELEMENT** | **Exemplary** | **Established** | **Developing** | **No Evidence** |
| **Mission** | Clearly and concisely identifies purpose, primary functions, and stakeholders. Describes a purpose that distinguishes it from other departments or units at the College. Reflects the College’s mission. | Clearly states broad aspects of the department’s function. Alignment with the College’s mission may be inferred. Identifies key stakeholders. | Provides a general statement or list of the department’s work but does not clearly describe the department’s purpose. Does not identify stakeholders. Does not provide a clear sense of how the mission aligns with the College’s mission. | No formal mission statement exists. |
| **Comments:** | | | |
| **Implemented Improvements** | Provides clear and concrete evidence of how improvements from the previous assessment cycle were implemented. This may include improvements made as a result of assessment or improvements made to the department’s assessment processes. Documents that appropriate actions were taken on all issues. | Provides evidence of how some improvements based on previous assessment results were implemented. Some but not all of the recommendations for improving the department’s assessment process were also implemented. If action was not taken when warranted, a reasonable explanation is given as for why. | Evidence is insufficient or not provided. Not all issues were addressed and there is little to no explanation for why this is so. Minor changes were made to strengthen assessment processes. | The report provides no evidence that any improvements to the department or its assessment processes were implemented. |
| **Comments:** | | | |
| **Goals & Outcomes** | Goals are clearly articulated, observable, measurable, and, in some cases, aspirational. They are congruent with the department’s mission. Goals include outcomes that indicate expected or aspirational results. | Goals are observable and measurable, but the language of some is vague. Each goal is appropriate to the department’s mission. The desired outcomes may lack clarity | The goals are more of an operational checklist or target than a measurable goal. As such, they are not necessarily measurable, and they may not indicate what strategic results the department aspires to achieve. | Most of the goals are unclear, not measurable, and/or inadequate for meaningful assessment. |
| **Comments:** | | | |
| **Assessment Methods and Targets or Benchmarks** | Assessment methods are appropriate measures for each goal. They are clearly described and appropriately designed. Each goal is assessed using multiple methods, both direct and indirect. Targets and/or benchmarks are clearly indicated and reflect reasonable but challenging expectations. | Assessment methods are appropriate measures for each goal. Some goals are assessed using only indirect methods, and/or some goals have only one assessment method assigned to them. Targets and/or benchmarks are identified, but it is not clear how they were determined. | Each goal is measured using only one assessment method, and the overall plan relies primarily on indirect measures. Assessment tools are vague, poorly defined, or not appropriate to the goal. Targets/benchmarks not indicated. | Unclear what the assessment methods are. |
| **Comments:** | | | |
| **Analysis of Assessment Results** | Clear and substantial evidence is presented that indicates whether or not the goals were achieved. Findings are specific enough to be meaningful, and a clear, succinct analysis, interpretation of, and reflection on the results are included. Trends or patterns over time are discussed. The analysis involved all appropriate members of the department or other key stakeholders. Supporting evidence is attached. | Clear and well-organized discussion of results is presented. Some results are incomplete or findings are not yet available, and it is not entirely clear how the results have been interpreted or what they mean to the department. Trends or patterns, even when appropriate, are not noted. Supporting evidence is included. | Results are reported, but they are too summative or general to be meaningful. There is little analysis of findings, and no interpretation is provided. Little supporting evidence is included. | No evidence of assessment results is reported, or the evidence is so general and so brief, it does not report anything meaningful. |
| **Comments:** | | | |
| **Action Plans: Using Assessment Results** | Identifies key areas that require attention and defines next steps. Action plans are directly linked to assessment findings and reflect what was learned through the assessment process. . If no changes are reported or necessary, an explanation is provided. | Identifies key areas that require attention, but burden for improvement was placed outside the department. Action plan may be overly broad or too general. No explanation provided when report concludes that no action is required. | Does not describe what was learned during the assessment process. Identifies one or two items for improvement, but these are not supported by assessment findings. | No evidence that the department is using assessment findings to inform planning or continuous improvement. |
| **Comments:** | | | |

**Recommendations for assessment process:**