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

Notes:

EVIDENCE PRESENTATION: All evidence appears to be collected except for data from distinction interviews, which the department notes in their SAP should be collected to assess LG6. It would be worth checking with the department whether they perhaps did not have any distinction interviews and were therefore unable to provide this data. The department uses "course rubrics" to assess students in certain courses on their achievement of both LG5 and LG6, with additional DA evidence coming from internship supervisors for LG6. IA evidence includes the senior exit survey for both LGs, as well as W2 questions on course evals for LG5 and both model UN reflection papers and questions on course evals for LG6. I have two suggestions: 1) use bar instead of pie charts so that the shape of the "bell" curve can be better seen and more quickly understood and 2) definitely separate the oral/verbal skills part of LG5 to match the way the IA data is collected in the Senior Exit Survey.

USE OF EVIDENCE: There is a lack of clarity about exactly what the POLI department is going to do next. They say things like LG5 is "something we keep an eye on moving forward" (7) – specifically with regard to having more seniors achieve the level of "proficient" – but don't offer specifics as to what that will look like. In addition, for LG5, they note that they should "consider taking an inventory of what we're doing in our individual sections" (7-8) but again offer no specifics as to when or how that will happen. For LG6, they present evidence which suggests they are doing well with this goal and therefore do not need to make any major adjustments, beyond noting that they might look at the way TEC assesses engaged citizenship to see if their language/tools are more effective.

EVIDENCE OF COLLAB/COMM: In reading this report, there is evidence that they are working on the assessment process collaboratively, but it is unclear whether they 1) had an assessment meeting and 2) discussed the information they had gathered.

ADDITIONAL: The department asked for two things from the AComm: 1) comparative data from other departments on their writing-related LGs and 2) guidance from the AComm on next steps now that the department has completed its three-year cycle of assessment (e.g., process for reviewing dept LGs and evidence during the cycle).