

### Rubric for Assessment Meeting Report 2023

Enter M, A, or N

	Meets/Exceeds Standards	Approaches Standards	Needs Attention
<b>Evidence Presentation</b>	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.
<b>Use of Evidence</b>	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.
<b>Evidence of Collaboration and Communication</b>	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

<b>M</b>
<b>M</b>
<b>M</b>

### Notes:

**Presentation:** LG5 seems slightly vague, in that wanting to cater to the syllabi/coursework of CLAS 294 and 495, loses meaningful differentiation from the major's goal as a whole. Direct assessment of LG5 in CLAS 294 and 495 analyzes 2 different cohorts of students, with potential non-majors in CLAS 294. Report is supposed to analyze efficacy of LGs on major seniors, CLAS 294 analysis would be more relevant if analyzing senior cohort's results in CLAS 294 instead of the students who took it in '22-23. Similar issue with direct assesment of LG6.

**Use:** Unclear what added 'dimension' the reintroduction of a temporarily unused assignment will add to CLAS 250 and its imparting of LG6 unto students. While differences in student performance may be due to lack to student application, lackluster performace being separated teaching approaches can't be immedietly removed. Secondary justification or reasoning behind belief in lack of student application (attendance rates, professor evaluation of coursework, etc.) would be helpful. Direct Assessment analysis is clear and consice. Plan of action for changes to senior capstone are clear and make sense given relavent information.

**Collaboration and Communication:** Effectively closing the loop on 2021-22 report and plan of action, however there is vagueness in how CLAS 200 & 294 were changed to emphasize "tests for information and writing assignments for interpretation" of material, and lack of notation of effectiveness of changes. Stated that "student comprehension and engagement increased" due to other changes to CLAS 200, lack of clarification on how comprehension and engagement were measured, either numerically or from professor observation. Clear discussion of action with regards to senior capstone instructions. Potential major changes were discussed, but withheld until next meeting w/ professor currently on sabatical.