

Rubric for Assessment Meeting Report 2023

Enter M, A, or N

	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.

Selection

M
M
M

Notes: Overall, very good report. The direct assessment evidence is collected, presented, and contextualized effectively. The indirect assessment evidence has some issues (e.g. the 22/23 data was not available at the time of the meeting), but the department is transparent about this issue and provides meaningful workarounds, which include using previous years' IA data. The department also notes their discovery that the IA tool does not ask about both parts of LG4, but they have already submitted a new SAP for 23-24 which includes updated language with the IA tool questions. The department finds, both in the DA and IA tools, that the vast majority of students are reaching "proficient" or above on both parts of this LG. As a result, they do not offer ideas for changes because students are performing well. The changes the department does note have to do with refining their assessment tools (e.g., the update to the LG4 questions on the Senior Survey). One recommendation I have for future years of assessing LG4 is to find a way to collect the IA data and have it in hand at/before the assessment meeting so it can be taken into consideration. Another recommendation: create a rubric for each level of achievement/effectiveness for both individual and group work. The AAC&U VALUE Rubrics could be helpful for this. Regarding the LG itself, the AComm wondered whether it's necessary to include the "individual" work -- is that piece of the LG not being assessed elsewhere? Or, does the department believe it's important to have both individual and group work in this same LG? Whatever the case, it would be helpful to have a rubric for assessing what a high level of individual work and what a high level of group work looks like. Again, the VALUE rubrics could be helpful in establishing that language.