**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 University. Reflects the  University ’s mission. | Clearly states broad aspects of the department’s function. Alignment with the University ’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 University ’s mission. | No formal mission statement on file or the statement does not clearly identify the unit’s purpose. |
| **Comments:** | | | |
| **Implemented Improvements Based on Previous Reviewers’ Feedback** | Provides clear and concrete evidence of how improvements from the previous assessment review were implemented. Documents that appropriate actions were addressed. | 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. | The report acknowledged receiving feedback from previous reviews and outlined a plan for implementing these suggestions. However, the changes have not been implemented. | Reviewers’ feedback from previous assessment cycles was not reflected in the current report, and there is little to no explanation for why this is so. |
| **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. When it is reasonable to do so, multiple methods, both direct and indirect, are used to measure each goal. Methods focus on quality and effectiveness, not merely on quantity. Targets and/or benchmarks are clearly indicated and reflect reasonable but challenging expectations. | Assessment methods are appropriate measures for each goal. Methods are limited and don’t necessarily measure quality or operational effectiveness. Targets and/or benchmarks are identified, but it is not clear how they were determined. | Assessment tools are vague, non-specific, or poorly defined. There is no apparent relationship between the goals and the assessment methods, or not appropriate to the goal. Targets/benchmarks not indicated. | It is 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 is shared with and discussed by all appropriate members of the department or other key stakeholders. Supporting evidence is attached. | Well-organized results are presented, but 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. All or most departmental members are involved in planning, and plans are shared with stakeholders.  If no changes are reported or necessary, an explanation is provided. | Identifies key areas that require attention and indicated internal solutions to address continuous improvement. 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. | The report does not demonstrate that the department is using assessment findings to inform planning or continuous improvement. |
| **Comments:** | | | |

**Recommendations:**