

Annual Program Goal Report

Department:

Date:

ELEMENT	Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Implemented Improvements	Provides clear and concrete evidence of how improvements from the previous assessment cycle were implemented. Documents that appropriate actions were taken on all issues. This may include improvements made as a result of assessment or improvements made to the department's assessment processes.	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.
Student Learning Goals	Goals are clearly articulated, observable, and measurable. They are congruent with the department's mission. Learning outcomes are clear.	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 targets, not measurable goals. As such, they are not necessarily measurable.	Most of the goals are unclear, not measurable, and/or inadequate for meaningful assessment.
Plan for Student Learning Assessment	The program has a sustainable assessment plan that describes when and how each learning goal will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. Plan is based on thoughtful inquiry into student learning.	The program has an assessment plan, but does not indicate how improvements will be implemented and assessed. The plan may not be sustainable and does not seem to be informed by inquiry into student learning.	The program has an assessment plan, but not all of the learning goals are included in the plan. Assessment does not appear to be ongoing or systematic in the program.	The program lacks a formal plan for assessing the student learning goals; it relies on short-term planning, such as selecting the goal or course to assess in the current year.
Student Learning Assessment Methods and Targets	Multiple methods that align with learning goals are used to assess student learning. Methods are mostly direct, and assessment processes are efficient: more than one goal is measured using a single instrument. Student learning is assessed at multiple points in the curriculum. Targets and/or benchmarks are clearly indicated and reflect reasonable but challenging expectations.	Assessment methods align with the learning goals, but not all goals are measured by multiple methods. Some goals rely too heavily on indirect methods. Students are assessed only at certain points but not throughout the curriculum. Targets and/or benchmarks are identified, but it is not clear how they were determined.	Most of the methods are indirect or non-specific (e.g. "exam"). Only one method is used to assess each learning goal. Learning is not assessed throughout the curriculum. Assessment tools are vague, poorly defined, and targets/benchmarks not indicated.	There is no clear relationship between the goals and the assessment methods. Targets are not specified, and measures are not acceptable for good assessment. (E.g. course grades)

<p>Student Learning Assessment Results and Analysis</p>	<p>Program-level results are clearly presented and easy to follow. They relate directly to the goals being measured. Results are specific enough to indicate strengths and weaknesses; they show precisely where and how students are performing at or beyond expectations and where they are performing below expectations. Supporting evidence is attached.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Program-level results are presented, but the presentation is difficult to follow or the results are summative and do not identify specific areas of strength or areas where improvement is needed. There is little analysis of findings, and no interpretation is provided. Little supporting evidence is included.</p>	<p>No evidence of assessment results is reported, or the evidence is so general and so brief, it does not report anything meaningful.</p>
<p>Action Plans: Using Assessment Results</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates that assessment-based discussions have led to action or recommendations have been enacted. Improvements are <i>program</i> level, not course level, and concern curriculum or pedagogy. If appropriate, the program indicated a need based on assessment and stated how this need will be addressed. If no changes are reported or necessary, an explanation is provided.</p>	<p>Evidence suggests that assessment-based discussions have considered action, but these actions lack specificity or are confined to a single course or assessment method—i.e. they are not really program level. The program indicated a resource need based on assessment results, but did not indicate how the need might be addressed.</p>	<p>An action plan has been identified, but it is not clear how it resulted from assessment findings or assessment-based discussions. No explanation provided when report concludes that no action is required.</p>	<p>No evidence that the department is using assessment findings to inform planning or continuous improvement.</p>
<p>Operational Goals & Evidence</p>	<p>Goals are clearly articulated and measurable; they are assessed by valid measures, and solid evidence indicates the extent to which the goals have been achieved.</p>	<p>Goals are clearly articulated, but there is an over-reliance on one assessment method. Evidence that the goals have been achieved may be subjective. Further documentation might be required.</p>	<p>Goals are articulated, but the language is vague. There is a lack of alignment between the goals and the supporting evidence.</p>	<p>Goals are more of a process or action step than an outcome; questionable conclusions are made regarding the extent to which the goals were achieved.</p>
<p>Operational Planning & Resource Needs</p>	<p>Planned improvements are clearly identified; they are specific and relate directly to assessment findings. Action plans are appropriate given current resources and demonstrated need.</p>	<p>The connection between the action plan and/or resource request and the assessment results or other evidence is not readily apparent.</p>	<p>Action plans are identified, but they are vague and non-specific. Plans may not be clearly linked to evidence or assessment results.</p>	<p>No operational plan indicated.</p>

Recommendations for assessment process: