

Rubric for Assessment Meeting Report 2023			
	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.

Enter M, A, or N

Selection
<b>N</b>
<b>N</b>
<b>A</b>

Notes: Overall, as an outside-the-department audience, this was difficult to follow. A key suggestion for future department assessment reports will be to communicate the information in a way that is concise and clear to an outside audience. I have a feeling this work will be greatly aided with the upcoming assessment report template.

EVIDENCE: Two issues here: 1) The SAP lists three IA measures and three DA measures for this goal, but evidence is presented (clearly) for only one IA.. 2) Two of the three IA measures are actually DA measures and that's what appears to be in the report, while not including any clear information about the DA regarding the capstone thesis project.

USE OF EVIDENCE: Overall, it is clear that the department is making efforts to understand and assess student learning, but the way they present the information is unclear. In addition to the issues surrounding IA vs DA measures and missing data, it is unclear how everything in the report connects together. In other words, the report seems to be shared in an abstract kind of manner -- which is fine in the context of the department making thoughtful decisions about how to improve student learning -- but it is difficult to comprehend as an outside audience member.

COLLAB/COMM: Definitely evidence of collaboration and communication, but it's unclear as to how exactly this happened.

ADDITIONAL: I am concerned about the statement "We are changing the thesis to meet what we have prepared students to do and what they are in fact capable of doing." This feels to me as though they are lowering their standards to meet where students are. On the surface, this is not a terrible thing -- students are (likely) less well prepared for college than previous generations BUT is lowering our Hendrix standards the best approach to solve this problem?