

Dear Classics department,

As you will recall, your 2018 Departmental Assessment Report was guided by the Assessment Committee's suggestions in our letter from last Spring. This year, the committee read and discussed your department's 2018 Assessment Meeting Report and filled out a new rubric, focusing on your Narrative of Strength and your Action Plan for Improvement.

Your 2019 Departmental Assessment Report should include three things and be e-mailed to Sasha Pfau (Assessment Committee Chair) by May 31, 2019:

1. A copy of the Rubric that your department developed at the 2018 Fall Faculty Conference.
2. An updated Student Assessment Plan.
3. A response to the Assessment Committee's targeted feedback.

1. Rubric

First, we would like you to share the Rubric that your department developed during Fall Faculty Conference. These Rubrics will be posted on the Academic Affairs website so that departments can share in each other's expertise. We would also like to ask you to use the draft Rubric to consider some of your majors this year and provide a brief summary of that conversation.

2. Student Assessment Plan

In examining your Student Assessment Plan, we are recommending that all departments take a look at what is online here:

<https://www.hendrix.edu/academicaffairs/annualassessments/>

You will need to be logged in to view your SAP. We know that you updated your plan last year, but we would like you to check to be sure that the one online reflects your changes.

A strong SAP includes:

- Departmental Learning Goals
- Curriculum Mapping
- Plans for Gathering Information:
 - At least one form of indirect assessment (student survey, exit interview, etc.)
 - At least one form of direct assessment (rubric for a capstone, common course, or learning goal, standardized exam, etc.)
 - A planned cycle for assessment of the goals (i.e. you don't have to assess all goals every year)

3. Response to Targeted Feedback

For your response to our targeted feedback, we have attached a rubric that the Assessment Committee developed in order to give you a high-level view of your

department's responses to the prompts from 2018. This is intended to assist you in developing future action. You should be aware that this cannot be an assessment of what you are doing but only an assessment of what you said on the form you submitted.

As you can see from the rubric, we thought your Narrative of Strength approaches standards and your Action Plan for Improvement does as well. The committee would like you to provide us with more information about exactly what your indirect and direct evidence is for student learning and how it is being used. We would like you to develop (or explain to us if you already have one) a more formalized mechanism for recording the results of your discussions of case studies. We hope that this would help your department in developing a longer view of student achievement over time as well as allow outside parties to better understand your processes. We understand that the Capstone may not be the best mechanism for assessing the department's learning goals. What other avenues might better help you do so?

We welcome you to invite members of the Assessment Committee to come to one of your department meetings this Spring if you think that would be helpful. We have been impressed with your dedication to improvement of student learning, and hope that you will carry on with the momentum that our whole campus developed in our preparation for the Higher Learning Commission's visit.

Thanks in advance,
Sasha and Megan

Rubric for Department Assessment Meeting Report 2018			
Narrative of Strength (Evidence Based Reason)	Changes made were in response to evidence of student development	Changes were made using weak, anecdotal, or indirect evidence of student development	Changes were made with no reference to evidence of student development OR no changes were made
	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
Narrative of Strength (Concise)	Changes were explained clearly and concisely	Changes were explained	Changes were not explained
	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
Narrative of Strength (Plan for Continual Evaluation)	Department has a clearly outlined, defined plan to monitor this going forward	Department has a plan to monitor this going forward, but the plan needs to be reevaluated (see comments)	Department does not have a defined plan for follow-up
	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
Action Plan for Improvement	Action plan addresses committees recommendations	Action plan is not related to the committee's recommendation, but still seems relevant	Action plan is unclear and cannot be measured
	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
	Evaluation Plan is evidence-based and evidence collected clearly speaks to the evaluation of the action plan and can be used in decision making	It is unclear how the evaluation plan will be executed and how it will be used in decision making	Evaluation plan is not evidence based or it is unclear how evidence collected can be used in decision making
	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
Departmental Goals	Department has clear learning goals that reflect desired student outcomes	Learning goals are a work in progress	Department has no discernable learning goals
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
	Learning Goals are mapped to curriculum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No