

### Department/Program Assessment Report Feedback

Name of Department/Program:

	<b>2: Excellent</b>	<b>1: Good</b>	<b>0: Needs improvement</b>	<b>Score/Comments</b>
<b>Mission</b>	Mission clear and broadly reflects the goals of the program		Mission is unclear	
<b>Student learning outcomes</b>	Outcomes support the department/program mission	Some outcomes support the mission	Outcomes are not specific to the mission	
	Outcomes are written at an appropriate level (most outcomes require the demonstration higher level skills, e.g. analysis, synthesis, evaluation rather than focusing only on knowledge)		Outcomes are written an inappropriate level (e.g. expectations are too low for an graduating senior)	
	All outcomes are concise, clearly worded and limited in scope	Most outcomes are concise, clearly worded, and limited in scope	Most outcomes are difficult to understand, too broad, or include too many issues.	
	All outcomes focus on student learning		Some outcomes focus on administrative/program objectives	
<b>Measures</b>	Measures are able to support inferences about student mastery on specific outcomes, i.e. one is able to assess strengths and weakness related to specific objectives		Measures do not allow one to assess strengths and weakness related to specific objectives	

	<b>2: Excellent</b>	<b>1: Good</b>	<b>0: Needs improvement</b>	<b>Score/Comments</b>
<b>Measures (cont.)</b>	There are specifics about how results were obtained (i.e., description of measure, sampling method, when administered, who did the evaluation)		Unclear how results were obtained	
	Methods allow for collection of reliable and valid student learning data (e.g., appropriate sampling, use of rubrics rather than scales, evaluation of individual student work)		Inadequate methods (sampling process that is inappropriate, use of scales rather than rubrics, evaluation of group work)	
	Strong focus on direct evidence (with supporting indirect evidence)		Focus on indirect evidence	
	Multiple measures used for assessment of most outcomes	At least one measure for each outcome	No measure planned for assessing one or more outcomes	
<b>Achievement Targets</b>	Clear and reasonable target specified for each outcome/measure pair	Most outcomes/measure pairs have an achievement target specified	No/few achievement targets in place	
<b>Findings</b>	Aligned to outcomes, measures, achievement targets		Findings do not align with outcomes, measures, achievement targets	
	There is sufficient detail, including sample size		Insufficient detail for understanding findings	
	Data aggregated over students		Individual student results presented	
<b>Actions</b>	Actions suggested when targets not met/partially met	Actions suggested for most targets that were not met/partially met	No actions suggested for targets that were not met/partially met	

	<b>2: Excellent</b>	<b>1: Good</b>	<b>0: Needs improvement</b>	<b>Score/Comments</b>
	Descriptions of actions are specific and clear, and include information on when actions will be implemented		Unclear what action will be taken or when	
<b>Actions (cont.)</b>	Demonstrates understanding/reflection in the use of data, actions focused on continual improvement		Unclear how action is related to data collected	
<b>Analysis Questions</b>	Included number of graduates/majors		Not included	
	Reflects on strengths based on assessment data, not just restating findings		Restating findings without further reflection	
	Reflects on area that need attention, not just restating findings		Restating findings without further reflection	
	Data shared broadly among faculty. Decision-making based on assessment results is a collaborative process.	Data shared broadly among faculty.	No/little sharing of the data	
	Critical evaluation of the assessment process		No/superficial evaluation of the assessment process	
	Included actions and timeline for improving process	Included actions but no timeline for improving process	No plan for improving process (if plan was needed)	