Annual Assessment Report Rubric for Departments and Programs

Department: **Final Determination:**

Date Submitted by Department: **Date Reviewed by RESL Committee:**

	Unacceptable	**Needs Improvement**	**Acceptable**
Student Learning Outcomes	• Not student-centered; not measurable; not clearly related to departmental mission statement. • Not useful for assessing department's effect on student achievement.	• Hard to demonstrate / measure. • Too many: need to be grouped / restated. • Need to better reflect departmental mission and desired impact on student learning.	• Clearly stated, measurable, student-centered, well organized. • Clearly related to departmental mission and departmental impact on student learning.
	Comments	Comments	Comments
Actions taken in response to prior year feedback	• No summary of actions taken. • Does not respond to last year's proposed modifications or RESL/Dean feedback. • Unrelated to Outcomes. •	• Good action, but unrelated to last year's report and RESL/Dean feedback. • Incomplete (but most items covered).	• Clearly describes action on all proposed modifications from last year's report, and RESL/Dean feedback.

	Comments	Comments	Comments
Descriptive summary of current year data	• Outcomes not assessed / measures insufficient to assess them. • Data points too general / not specific to Outcome. • Measures not specific to the department. • Data used by neither instructor nor department.	• Some items Unacceptable. Provides raw data, but no summary. • Data used only by individual faculty members, not shared / discussed with department. • Unsustainable: too complicated / labor intensive to use in department's busy years. • Jumps to interpretation of the data without description.	• Every Outcome measured sufficiently and specifically. • Data discussed / used by the whole department. Sustainable assessment structure, usable even in busy years. Succinctly summarizes data and identifies significant results (levels of achievement).
	Comments	Comments	Comments

Interpretation of current year data	• Not drawn from data / descriptive summary of data. • Is a data summary or description, not an interpretation of the data. • No statement of how the data summary points to departmental strengths / weaknesses in helping students achieve the outcomes.	• Addresses most, but not all, significant findings from the data. • Some interpretation is not useful for deciding whether the department should attempt to improve student achievement of outcomes, or improve departmental assessment.	• Clearly states the significance of the data summary in relation to the department's helping students achieve outcomes. • Describes departmental strengths / weaknesses; may include strengths / weaknesses of assessment process.
	Comments	Comments	Comments
Proposed modifications / actions in response to current year data	• Not drawn from data / summary / interpretation. • May modify assessment, but doesn't affect student achievement. • Not likely to improve student achievement of outcomes.	• Attempts to improve student achievement of outcomes, but is not clearly connected to interpretation of the data. • Comes from individual instructor / chair only, not informed by the whole department.	• Clearly connected to interpretation of the data. • Based on a full departmental discussion. • Could reasonably improve student achievement and perhaps assessment process.

	Comments	Comments	Comments
Overall report style / organization	• Content omitted / hard to find / unclearly stated.	• Good content but in wrong places. Not clearly stated/ organized for nondepartmental readers.	All content in correct sections. Clearly stated and organized for nondepartmental readers.
	Comments	Comments	Comments

Additional Comments