

Rubric for Assessment Meeting Report 2023			
	Meets/Exceeds Standards	Approaches Standards	Needs Attention
Evidence Presentation	All evidence from the SAP has been collected and is provided in the report. The evidence is presented in a way that makes sense to an outside audience.	Most evidence from the SAP has been collected and appears to be included in the report. The evidence is presented in a way that leaves an outside audience with some remaining questions	Evidence either bears no relation to the SAP or is not included in the report.
Use of Evidence	There is an explicit, well-reasoned connection between the assessment results and the proposed changes. If no changes are proposed, the evidence provided backs up this decision.	There appears to be an adequate connection between the assessment results and the proposed changes, but it is not explicitly explained. If no changes are proposed, the evidence provided raises some questions about this decision.	The connection between the assessment results and proposed changes are indiscernible. If no changes are proposed, the evidence provided does not support this decision.
Evidence of Collaboration and Communication	There is explicit and documented evidence of departmental discussions and faculty collaboration on assessment, proposing any changes, and report preparation. If the department learning goal is assessed in an individual course, discussions take place at the program level.	Evidence exists of either departmental discussions or faculty collaboration on most assessment activities. If the department learning goal is assessed in a course, discussions are mostly at the course level but do include participation by the full department.	There is insufficient evidence of departmental discussions or faculty collaboration on assessment activities. If the department learning goal is assessed in a course, no participation of the wider department is evident.

Enter M, A, or N

Selection
A
A
N

Presentation: I found that the indirect evidence is presented in a very clear manner that seemed entirely appropriate for the five graduates. I felt that the direct was not as clearly connected the department's rubrics in their SAP. For example, essays and presentations were scored on a Basic/Sufficient/Exemplary scale. Something to consider is whether these data help the department determine what learning goal they want to invest time on? For example, if the essays are "primarily art historical research," how does the department know that the score is a measure of written communication and not, say, their knowledge of history of art? Moving forward, we recommend that the department sharpen up what exactly is being assessed and how the grades/marks translate into the assessment of a specific learning goal.

Use: I see that the department is using evidence to support their conclusions. For example, when the department concludes that "more work needs doing in communicating to our seniors what it is we expect," I see how they came to that conclusion from their direct assessment. We are curious, however, how does indirect evidence inform that choice? I could see how indirect evidence suggests that there may need to be some scaffolding through the major. Another recommendation the department should consider is whether separating out the written communication question from the oral communication question in their survey to seniors would give the department a better sense of what students feel their strengths are. (I think the department's language is about "verbal" communication, but "oral" communication may be a better descriptor.)

Collaboration: There may have well been great collaboration here, but I don't know how to assess that with what I read. It mentions Huss's help in getting Senior Survey participation, but I'm not sure how the department came to these conclusions.