

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
M or A
M

The Psychology department is assessing the learning goals associated with scientific inquiry/critical thinking and communication. Direct evidence includes 3 sections of Research Methods and 2 sections of their senior capstone courses (History & Systems and Theories of Psychotherapy). Indirect evidence includes senior surveys and other supplemental evidence.

Most of the evidence collected and presented makes sense. Some of the supplemental evidence (e.g., number of students presenting at conferences, completing internships, etc.) may not indicate the quality of the work and whether the student is able to do the things indicated in the learning goals. Assessing final project papers and presentations from Research Methods and capstones, the direct evidence, makes sense. Perhaps some concern might exist due to using course letter grades as the assessment tool - is a D or an F still "Basic" knowledge?

The report could have been streamlined some. It did not need to include all of the student responses. The department concludes that "the vast majority" of students are meeting the learning goals. For the scientific inquiry/critical thinking goal, the department will discuss the students' concerns of reaching the goals, but no plan was considered.

The report concludes with a discussion of the timing issue of collecting spring data and having the assessment meeting in the spring. They plan to hold their assessment meeting in the fall so the data will be available for consideration.

There was a concern about assessment coordination across capstone choices. New rubrics will be developed to help with the consistency of those courses. But, the report doesn't indicate they would change the content of the courses.

Five of the nine departmental members were present for the meeting. Two of the absentees are term positions. Two were FT faculty who had conflicts.