

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

This year The Study of the Mind was assessing LG 5, 6, and 7; (5) critical reading and thinking skills that allow students to assess interd. literature, (6) an understanding of ethical issues in the field, and (7) competency in oral and written communication skills. For all 3 LG's the report says -direct assessment was done in Senior Seminar, and as a department as a whole throughout required courses. I thought this language was a little too general because it was unclear to me how those numbers in the first rubric were arrived at. For all 3 LG's the indirect assessment was done through the senior survey. That evidence seemed pretty straightforward except that on the rubric we cannot see the questions; we only see the LG listed, so I'm presuming it asked students "How would you rate the department's accomplishment of learning goal #5" for example, but I'd prefer to see how the question was worded. As scores were very high, the changes discussed were ways to fine tune the language of their assessment tools and data collection. Regarding LG6, I'd be curious why there was no discussion about the one student who did not meet standards. Regarding LG7, its unclear if the dept. is motivated to strengthen their oral communication requirements and assessment tools.