

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
M

Notes:

PRESENTATION. I found the evidence presented by the BCMB program to be very helpful, and I only raise here one concern. The program's SAP says that a form of indirect evidence will be "Tracking students after graduation." Many departments find that information to be important when assessing outcomes, but chairs in those departments also know the task is much easier said than done. I bring it up here to acknowledge the difficulty in collecting reliable information, but also to point out that I did not find a reference to this indirect evidence in the program's report nor updated assessment cycle. Should the program's SAP be revised and resubmitted to reflect that tracking data is not used in assessment, or might this have been an oversight on the program's or my part? Similarly, there are several instruments of direct assessment used in the program's updated assessment cycle spreadsheet that are not reflected in the online SAP for the program. I would suggest resubmitting the SAP with the updates so that it is in line with current practice.

USE. I wish to highlight here something the BCMB program does exemplary work towards that might be replicated elsewhere in their assessment. Specifically, in their LG2, conducting appropriate literature and database searches, the program is making very clear how their direct evidence is helping them assess their work with students. Could that clarity be made more apparent for other evidence and associated learning goals? For example, in LG1 the program is using average and grades on large assignments like capstone exams, final research reports, and final oral presentations. If a student has a B on such a large assignment with many components, how does the program know it is because the student shows above average work on all facets of the assignment (which presumably map on to different learning goals) or that the student is very strong in some learning goals but not others?

COLLABORATION AND COMMUNICATION. Excellent work.