

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
M
A
A

Presentation: Learning goal is clear and explicit. Direct and Indirect assessment methods are clear and easy to understand. The brief paragraph from the professor about the mechanisms for teaching the learning goal in class was helpful. Orientation year breakdown of data was an interesting approach and could help provide more in-depth analysis across longer time periods. The assessment report could be improved by a quick review/lookback of the previous year's assessment feedback.

Use of Evidence: Assessment results corroborate what is suggested in the conclusions. Analysis verbiage is strong; however, it appears that the conclusions do not take a hard line stance about whether the suggested changes will be made or about what would influence the enactment or lack of implementation of the suggested changed to the courses. The figures were clear and easy to read. Report talks about growth in written communication and how written communication in 300-level classes allows for insight into growth and development of the skill, but it seems incongruous that the same idea isn't applied to oral communication (having a lower level course also focus on oral communication to see growth and development in it).

Collab. & Comm. Evidence: All members of faculty were at the meeting. Report seems to skew perspective of voices in the report. Faculty did not see the Senior Exit Surveys at the meeting, and both classes were taught by the same professor who is the only professor mentioned in body of report. Would appreciate acknowledgement of other voices on the subject.