

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

Notes:

**Evidence Presentation:** Clear and succinct. However, it appears that the MATH SAP indicates that they were going to use final grades for both MATH 320/420 and 350/450. They've done something a little different than their SAP both in terms of from which courses they collected data as well as their method of direct assessment (student ratings -- which is definitely better than the SAP's indication of using final grades!). Going forward, MATH should make sure to consistently collect data in both 320 and 350. For CSCI: consider updating the SAP to reflect the fact that you're using CSCI 151 and 335 for DA of LG4.

**Use of Evidence:** Great analysis. Very thorough.

**Evidence of Collaboration and Communication:** Yes. One-on-one meetings to discuss the report and contribute to its construction. Maybe a little more explanation as to why only "most" of the faculty participated in the conversations.

**Other notes:** Already collecting data for every LG every year. Allows for multiple years of data on hand. // What is POGIL? Spell out what this is for an outside audience. // Good follow-up on closing the loop from 2021-2022. // Overall message: keep doing what you're doing. // They have a rubric for each LG!