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Introduction

Request from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education

At its session on November 19, 2015, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted:

“To accept the Periodic Review Report and to reaffirm accreditation. To request a monitoring report, due April 1, 2017, documenting further development and implementation of

(i) a comprehensive, organized and sustained institutional assessment process to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services and to inform planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal (Standard 7); and

(ii) an organized and sustained assessment process that provides direct evidence of the achievement of expected student learning outcomes in all programs, including outcomes for general education and the senior thesis, with evidence that assessment results are used to improve teaching and learning at all levels of the curriculum (Standard 14).

A small team visit may follow submission of the monitoring report. To direct a prompt liaison guidance visit to discuss the Commission's expectations. The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2019 - 2020.”

Overview of the College

Haverford College is a small, private, residential, undergraduate, liberal arts college, located outside Philadelphia, known for its academic rigor, Honor Code, and campus arboretum. Haverford meets the full demonstrated financial need of all admitted students. While non-sectarian today, Quaker values still resonate distinctly within the institutional culture. Academic excellence, offered in a setting of tolerance and mutual respect, serves the larger goal of "educating the whole person," and Haverford's intentionally diverse curricular requirements ensure that our 1,300 students (including those studying abroad) are well-rounded, expansive thinkers. The student-faculty ratio is 9:1. The Haverford faculty is composed of approximately 130 full-time scholars dedicated to working closely with undergraduates, involving and mentoring students in disciplinary and interdisciplinary research. Our Academic Centers expand the traditional classroom, providing funding, support, and resources for students to design their own high-level scholarship and engage co-curricularly, both within the U.S. and abroad. Haverford is a place where students are trusted with self-governance, engage directly with their education, and are given great opportunity, support, and encouragement to shape their own paths. Our most recent 6-year graduation rate is 90% (additional detail on 4-year, 6-year, and 8-year graduation rates, as requested in the MSCHE letter, is included below). Haverford’s 13,000 living alumni have gone on to lead lives of purpose across a broad array of fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>2006 (N=314)</th>
<th>2007 (N=315)</th>
<th>2008 (N=327)</th>
<th>2009 (N=323)</th>
<th>2010 (N=325)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 year (100%)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 year (150%)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 year (200%)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Recent Graduation Rates
Recent Developments

Much has been accomplished since the submission of our Periodic Review Report. Kimberly Benston, provost and professor of English, was appointed president of the College effective July 1, 2015. Fran Blase, associate professor of Chemistry and previously Associate Provost, is now Provost. The senior leadership team has led the community to the midpoint assessment of our strategic plan, the Plan for Haverford 2020. The Lives That Speak capital campaign reached its initial $225 million goal a year early and recently surpassed the $250 million mark en route to its closing date of June 30, 2017. New initiatives in sustainability, civic engagement, ethical leadership, and diversity are underway. Renovations to Sharpless Hall have been completed, providing state-of-the-art learning spaces for the Departments of Biology and Psychology. The innovative VCAM facility (Visual Culture, Arts, and Media) will open in the fall of 2017. Plans for extensive renovations to our historic library are advancing on schedule. On July 1, 2017, Haverford will begin using Workday, a cloud-hosted enterprise software system to manage all of our human resources, payroll, and finance activities and data. The formalized and expanded assessment initiatives described in this report are now fully functional and support the advancement of our education mission.
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Chapter 1
Standard 7: Institutional Effectiveness

The Haverford College Institutional Effectiveness System

Haverford College is pleased to report on the implementation of an expanded, comprehensive, integrated, sustainable Institutional Effectiveness (IE) system. This IE system is designed to evaluate and improve the full range of services and programs at Haverford, and to support the collective achievement of our educational mission as expressed in the Statement of Purpose (Appendix 1). As seen in Figure 2 below, there are four linked structural components at the highest level: 1) Academic Programs (of which Student Learning assessment is a vital element, detailed in chapter 2 of this report); 2) Resource Allocation/Budget; 3) the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC); and 4) Administrative and Academic Functional Units. In this chapter, we focus on the detailed workings of the last of these four components.

![Haverford College Institutional Effectiveness System Diagram](image)

Figure 2. Haverford College Institutional Effectiveness System

Our efforts over the past 18 months have focused on formalizing assessment of Student Learning (detailed subsequently), and in building out the Divisional and Departmental Assessment portion of the IE system to include a common framework across the College. We also formalized previously-implicit linkages between our assessment and resource allocation processes. The cross-functional Institutional Effectiveness Committee was tasked with leading this exercise.

To accomplish these systemic improvements, we utilized lines of authority from College leadership and provided extensive consultative support for departments so that the overlay of this system complemented existing planning activities. Formalized departmental assessment for institutional improvement is now functioning throughout the College in its inaugural year, following pilot exercises in 2015-16.

Within Haverford’s Institutional Effectiveness System:

- Strategic institutional goals are operationalized through the hierarchical structure of Divisional and Departmental goals and objectives; the linkages among these organizational levels are articulated within our Division/Department Assessment Plan (DAP) documentation detailed below.
• Resource allocation is driven by the strategic and tactical objectives detailed in the DAPs.
• The annual departmental assessment process is designed to link to the operating budget request process.
• The departmental assessment process is simple, aligned with existing structures, and includes assigned responsibility so that it is sustainable from year to year.
• Assessing departmental effectiveness for the purpose of improvement is intentionally separated from employee performance evaluation.
• Direct assessment of student learning results inform both local academic department discussions and broader curricular development. Mechanisms are in place to aggregate, share, and consider assessment results with those overseeing the curriculum and academic policy.
• Annual reflection on our institutional culture of assessment is built within the system, led by the College’s Senior Staff.
• The cross-functional Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) continues to support assessment for institutional improvement across the College.

Assessment of Administrative and Academic Functional Units in Detail

Overview
After starting this work in the fall of 2015, Haverford has now completed its shift from ad hoc, localized planning and evaluation processes to a systematic formalization of departmental assessment for each of the College’s administrative and academic units. This revised system continues to complement our established budgeting processes and the ongoing assessment work of the IEC. Departmental assessment is structured within the nine functional divisions of the College, and linkages are explicitly articulated, connecting goals between lower and higher organizational levels and then with the strategic goals of the College. Conceptually, we began by selecting the following IE Cycle for the College (see Figure 3), which is operationalized in greater detail in the timeline for our pilot and inaugural year in Appendix 2. The Executive Affairs Division, led by the Vice President & Chief of Staff, has ongoing responsibility for the development and maintenance of our IE system across departmental, divisional, and institutional levels.
Haverford College Institutional Effectiveness Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step and Timeframe</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June - September</td>
<td>STEP ONE: Plan. Articulate/revise goals and objectives within the Departmental Assessment Plan (DAP), aligned with institutional priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September - May</td>
<td>STEP TWO: Implement plans and monitor progress using identified metrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May - July</td>
<td>STEP THREE: Analyze and Assess results, prepare DAP report and discuss assessment results, plans for improvement, and possible resource implications (for the budget request process beginning in the early fall) with leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Haverford College Institutional Effectiveness Cycle

*Initial Process and Pilots*

We began in 2015-16 with an iterative process engaging all departments in the articulation of high-level goals and SMART (Specific, Measureable-Action oriented-Realistic-Timely) objectives. The Office of Institutional Research provided consultative assistance to departments in the creation of their Departmental Assessment Plans (DAPs), as step one of the IE cycle. One department from each of the nine divisions of the College was asked to pilot the DAP report and conversation with their leadership (Step 3 of the IE cycle) by summer 2016, and each division leader prepared a divisional report (Step 3, at the division level) for discussion at the August 2016 Senior Staff retreat (institutional level).

The 2015-16 pilot process was successful in several respects. The Finance and Administration division chose to encourage all units, not just one department, to complete DAP reports for 2015-16, and 13 out of 19 divisional departments did so. Within other divisions, the experience of creating and reporting on an initial 2015-16 DAP led to strikingly more sophisticated DAPs for 2016-17. Leadership within the Student Affairs division capitalized upon the DAP-creation process, and subsequent refinements for the 2016-17 DAPs, to recraft and disseminate evolving expectations and roles in the context of a divisional reorganization. Particularly for small departments, the creation of the separate DAP report also allowed for more focused and efficient employee performance review processes.

*Functional System*

A total of 78 DAPs (68 Departmental Assessment Plans, nine Divisional Assessment Plans, and one Presidential Assessment Plan) are in place for 2016-17, aligned by division, and linked to our strategic goals and the Institutional
Assessment Plan overseen by the President. An inventory of all departments with a completed DAP is presented in Figure 4. Later this spring, a full complement of DAP Reports will be prepared for discussion with divisional leadership. These reports will include the quantitative and qualitative metrics associated with each objective noted in the DAPs, as well as plans for improvement and possible resource needs. A sample DAP, from Instructional Technology Services, is available in Appendix 3. Most important to the process is the annual conversation with supervisors about the DAP report to assess performance of the unit against its goals and objectives and to identify priorities for improvement. Departmental conversations with leadership are scheduled for this spring/summer.

The DAP reports and subsequent conversations inform the development of each of the nine Senior Staff Divisional Assessment reports prepared for the President and for discussion at the annual August Senior Staff retreat. Here the goals and priorities for the upcoming academic year are finalized, allowing for the iterative modification of some divisional or departmental assessment plans for the year ahead.

**Designed for Sustainability**
Each Divisional Assessment Plan includes the following common goal, directly linked to the President’s Assessment Plan goal on Governance, thereby creating collective ownership of the IE enterprise across the College:

**Common Divisional Goal: Implement policies and procedures pertaining to planning, assessment, and management.** [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]

**Objective 1:** 100% of divisional units successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed timeframe and report as prescribed by the division leader.
- Metric 1: Number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities.
- Metric 2: Number/percentage of units completing annual report.
- Metric 3: Number/percentage of units having annual review meeting with division leader.

**Objective 2:** 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford policy.
- Metric: Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete.

**Objective 3:** 100% of divisional units effectively steward financial resources.
- Metric 1: Number/percentage of units operating within current year budget.
- Metric 2: Number/percentage of units submitting timely budget requests aligned with Divisional goals.

**Objective 4:** Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.
- Metric: Qualitative Report
The final objective in the common divisional goal refers to a tool for evaluating and advancing our institutional culture of assessment. The Culture of Evidence Continuum (Appendix 4), includes five dimensions (intentionality, perspective, critical links, initiatives and directions, and planning processes) against which an organizational unit can be measured in terms of fostering a culture of good intentions, justification, strategy or evidence. We have deployed this tool both generally to assess institutional culture and in a targeted fashion to spur progress in particular areas. Within our system, it is the foundation for assessing our assessments, and its inclusion within all divisional plans creates a mutual accountability that will sustain our system and ensure we are using it to optimal institutional benefit.

Leadership responsibility for the IE system is vested with the Vice President & Chief of Staff, who coordinates Senior Staff’s collective workflow and will ensure IE processes are rolled out on schedule within each cycle. In the VP & Chief of Staff’s DAP for the Executive Affairs Division, below, note the close association of institutional effectiveness initiatives with strategic planning and accreditation, and the supporting role to be provided by Institutional Research.

**Goal 3: Facilitate planning and assessment across the institution in order to advance College goals**

[Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship]

**Objective 1:** Oversee (with president) strategic planning. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 1]

Metric 1: Status of the Plan for Haverford 2020 Oversight Committee
Metric 2: Progress toward strategic goals and 2017 midway check-in
Objective 2: Utilize Institutional Research to advance institutional priorities. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 2]

Metric 1: Completion of reporting
Metric 2: Qualitative review of IR decision support on critical issues

Objective 3: Facilitate and monitor the Institutional Effectiveness Plan. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]

Metric 1: Qualitative review of Institutional Effectiveness Committee productivity
Metric 2: Report of Divisional completion rates for Departmental Assessment Plans (DAP) to the President
Metric 3: Report of Divisional completion rates for Employee evaluation to the President

Objective 4: Proactively plan and steward accreditation-related processes. [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 4]

Metric 1: Progress assessment on monitoring report-related topics
Metric 2: Successful submission of all periodic MSCHE reporting requirements

Transparency and Documentation

Our 78 plans for administrative and academic units will reside in a cloud-based file-sharing system available to the internal Haverford community (that particular enterprise-wide folder system will be launched this summer). While the annual plans will be broadly visible, the corresponding annual reports will be shared only within the divisional supervisory structure. This arrangement provides transparency around responsibilities and departmental priorities while maintaining appropriate boundaries among departments. The Institutional Effectiveness website illustrates our expanded IE system, while the portion restricted to the Haverford community provides additional resources in support of the system.

Integration of and Linkages between Assessment Plans

Integration is a key feature of our system. An “X” appears in Figure 5 only when there is a direct link between a divisional goal or objective, and one of the President’s Institution-level objectives. These linkages are documented within the collection of 2016-17 Presidential/Institutional and Divisional Assessment Plans presented in Appendix 5. Particularly for the College’s large and complex divisions, we will continue the process of documenting linkages between departments and their respective divisions as we move into the DAP revision process for 2017-18. Figure 6 shows an example the initial grid of integrations evident within the Student Affairs Division.
The creation of our current strategic plan, the Plan for Haverford 2020, preceded the development of the DAP process. However, Senior Staff developed an “Assessment Checklist” as a companion document to the Plan, the contents of which have since been translated into the DAP framework. Our ongoing Plan for Haverford 2020 Status Report references connections to the revised Middle States Standards and summarizes the various assessments associated with each area of activity.

**Integration and Linkages with Resource Allocation**

Institutional improvement often requires the allocation of incremental resources (dollars, time, space, technology, etc.) to priorities, whether at the strategic (institutional) or tactical (departmental) level. Both the articulation of institutional priorities early each fall and the results of the DAP process over the summer precede the initiation of the budget development process in October.

Over the past year, we have more clearly articulated the essential connections between assessment results and resource allocation in the annual operating budget process. Below is an excerpt from the budget memo sent to all department heads in October of 2016:

**FY 2017-18 budget discussions will focus on the continuing transition to a more comprehensive budget that is based on realistic parameters in an effort to reduce the variance between budget and actual results.**

**There will be resources for investment in strategic initiatives.** We know that you have worked to develop departmental goals and assessment plans to align with strategic initiatives. There will be careful review and consideration of requests where there is a compelling need for additional resources to advance strategic initiatives, such as those outlined in the Strategic Plan and department goals. But, unless there is a compelling need, departments are asked to continue to hold staffing and operating requests level for the next year or two.

Budget request forms were modified to ask for evidence of compelling needs as a requirement for additional operating funds, thereby linking assessment results to the resource allocation process:

**Budget increases are likely to be made under only the most compelling circumstances for FY 2017-18. Departments with a compelling need for additional operating funds must provide a detailed description of...**

---

**Student Affairs Division - preliminary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean of the College</th>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>CCPA</th>
<th>CAPS</th>
<th>Diversity, Access, and Comm. Initiatives</th>
<th>1st Year Student Support</th>
<th>Health Services</th>
<th>International Academic Programs</th>
<th>Learning Resources</th>
<th>Student Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Promote healthy student lives and balanced minds in a supportive environment that fosters the foundation for individual learning and personal development.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Integrate services and programs across student affairs to efficiently support a well-rounded and caring student experience.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Develop and maintain partnerships to advance a common and consistent environment for inclusive, aligned, and integrated institutional and academic initiatives.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Lead and monitor progress toward the student affairs strategic initiatives outlined in the College’s Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Support student affairs staff to manage workload and the operational challenges that arise as the student population increases and students’ needs evolve.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6: Implement and/or improvements for planning, assessment and management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6. Student Affairs Division and Department Linkages**

**Integration and Linkages with Strategic Priorities**

**Integration and Linkages with Resource Allocation**
Reflective assessment of the previous year’s budget allocations is also planned as an integrated part of our system. In fall 2017, for example, Senior Staff will reflect on the need-aware admission policy and Workday implementation resource allocation decisions of FY17 to assess whether those resource shifts were successful in meeting our strategic goals. These particular initiatives relate to managing our discount rate and improving campus information infrastructure in specific ways, and preliminary indicators for both are positive.

The internally accessible budget process website is being revised to more fully describe the integration of the above dimensions of assessment, planning, and budgeting, i.e. how the budget process is designed to direct resources toward areas of demonstrated institutional need and opportunity.

Evidence That Assessment Results are Shared and Discussed

Because of the annual cycle we have defined for department assessment plans, we have completed only our preliminary set of pilots. Within the Student Affairs division pilot, the Center for Career and Profession Advising (CCPA), identified a disconnection between their goal to robustly track alumni career trajectories and their current methods of data collection and communication. Recognizing this opportunity, CCPA leadership shared their findings with cross-divisional partners, including the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Institutional Research, College Communications, Institutional Advancement, and the President’s Office, in order to collaborate in the development of a more comprehensive data collection and reporting protocol. Such discussions have led to multiple ongoing projects. These include the exploration of a web-based interactive outcomes visualization tool and mechanisms for improved data generation from a comprehensive alumni survey instrument and externally validated sources of educational outcomes data. The envisioned methodology will provide robust and valid data to inform strategic decision making within the CCPA, and improve information on alumni achievement. The methods, the tools, and, above all, the habits of communication and planning practiced in this pilot project point the way towards the implementation of similar practices in other parts our institution as DAPs are put to work in this system of reflection and improvement.

The first cycle of full DAP reporting will occur later this spring/summer, which will inform budget development for FY19 (or reallocation within FY18). As mentioned above, the first reflective assessment of the major resource allocation decisions for FY17 will occur after the close of the fiscal year, in fall 2017. Nevertheless, pre-existing mechanisms of assessment have long been part of how Haverford does business, and the College is well accustomed to incorporating assessment data into its deliberations and strategic decisions. For example, the College has historically monitored and evaluated tuition revenue generation under its need blind financial aid policy. Recent results triggered an extensive review of the financial aid program, culminating in revised financial aid policy and practice as well as adjusted assessment mechanisms, which are now embedded in our DAP framework. We are presently in our first admission cycle under the need-aware model, and we are satisfied with our initial tuition revenue results as well as our ability to monitor them within our DAPs and other routine business practices. The 2016 budget message documents our considerations and processes as we grappled with the need aware resource allocation decision.

Next Steps for Departmental Assessment

We have initiated a sustainable system of departmental assessment for administrative and academic units and will complete our first full cycle engaging all units between the submission of this Monitoring Report and the end of the fiscal year. Below is a summary of ongoing activities through next fall, when the next cycle begins:

- All departments will complete steps 2 and 3 of the DAP process: monitoring performance, assessing and DAP reporting, and subsequent conversations with leadership. Note: the cadence will be different for assessment of the administrative functions of academic departments (within the Academic Affairs divisional structure), as discussed in the next section of this report.

- Linkages between levels within divisions will be documented for remaining divisions as DAPs are updated for 2017-18.
• All statements of departmental goals and objectives (DAPs) will be moved to Box, the College’s new file sharing system, to provide easy access to all faculty, staff, and students.

• A plan for periodic, longer-term review of the departmental assessment process will be developed. (For example, perhaps a survey of department heads after the first full cycle, then every 5 years, coupled with reflections on the Culture of Evidence Continuum at the departmental level.)

**Update on other IE System Components: Academic Programs, Resource Allocation, and IEC**

We present the following updates on the three other components of institutional effectiveness at Haverford (Figure 2) since our reporting in the 2015 PRR:

**Academic Program Assessment**

• Our well established program of external reviews for academic departments has continued. Comparative Literature was reviewed in 2015-16. Reviews of French and Classics are anticipated for 2017-18. The Provosts of Haverford and Bryn Mawr Colleges are currently in discussion over the schedule of reviews for the next few years, as often the two institutions coordinate these assessments.

• Program Evaluation models to assess impact and program effectiveness are under development or discussion for the Chesick Scholars Program serving underrepresented and first generation students; the Ethical Leadership Summer Institute (ELSI); MAST (Mentoring And Student Teaching) Program, a longstanding outreach program to area students typically underrepresented in STEM fields; and the Haverford Innovations program, designed to foster innovation and entrepreneurship among students and faculty.

**Budgeting**

• Migration to the GAAP-based budget approach is continuing. Over the past two years, several reserve accounts have been incorporated, including Serendipity summer day camp for FY17 and likely Study Abroad for FY18. An overview of our integrated budgeting process is included in Appendix 6 for reference.

• The 2017 debt refinancing structured all existing College debt at favorable rates. Principal repayment is now included within budgeted annual debt service.

• Facilities R&R (renewal and replacement) funding continues to increase, and an additional $150,000 was allocated in the proposed FY18 budget for Instructional and Information Technology Services (IITS) R&R in support of strategic initiatives.

• Our monitoring of capital budgets and projects continues in the form of “Gateways and Project Status tracking.” This includes four phases: Pre-planning, Planning & Review, Preliminary Approval, and Documentation, with predetermined pauses for assessment and decision making about next steps. This process also links capital expenditures and long term budgeting with debt assumptions, cash flow forecasts, and philanthropic support targets. Once a project receives final approval, progress is tracked via the “Expected Outcome Summary.” This protocol has permitted management and appropriate Board committees to assess program and financial development throughout the Sharpless renovation and VCAM projects. The implementation of Workday will allow us to more readily define and monitor capital budgets and expenditures.

• The Plan for Haverford 2020 Oversight Committee, which includes the College’s Senior Staff, continues to monitor the Plan’s implementation to ensure that resource allocation is appropriate to realize the Plan’s goals.
Institutio
Institutional Effectiveness Committee

• This cross-functional committee, reporting to the President of the College, has overseen the development of our institutional effectiveness and assessment of student learning processes described within this Monitoring Report.

• IEC working groups also have been exploring academic advising; student retention; assessment of student support services; communication, data and, transparency initiatives; data development for strategic plan assessment; and data stewardship and visualization of the curriculum.

Summary

Taken together, the four components just described articulate a coherent system for the evaluation and improvement of the full range of services and programs at Haverford and inform planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal, in compliance with the MSCHE Standard 7. Meanwhile our commitment to similarly robust and sustainable systems for assessment of student learning (Standard 14) are presented in the next chapter of this report.
Chapter 2
Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

The Haverford College Assessment Plan for Student Learning in Brief

Haverford College is pleased to report on the implementation of a sustainable plan for direct assessment of learning outcomes in General Education and Senior Capstone Project coursework. This Assessment Plan, developed by our Educational Policy Committee (EPC) working in collaboration with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), was recently endorsed by the Faculty, and will be a permanent part of our ongoing efforts to review, revise, and improve curricular programs. Key features of the scheme include:

- Direct assessment of student progress towards learning goals in a wide array of courses that fulfill our core and distribution requirements for General Education, representing all departments and programs.
- Direct assessment of student progress towards learning goals in the context of Haverford’s Senior Capstone Project, for all departments and programs offering a major, and involving all students in each major.
- Two sets of complementary rubrics (one for General Education, the other for the Senior Capstone Project) that allow individual faculty and departmental or programmatic groups to gather information about the pedagogical issues they find important.
- A simple, sustainable system for data entry using web forms and permission-controlled, templated spreadsheets that allow for easy aggregation of results.
- Live analysis and dynamic view of data, all available to individual departments, EPC, and the Provosts.
- Clear statements of responsibility for various phases of work in a cycle of assessment that ensures communication about challenges, at the department level, by EPC, and by the Provosts.
- Documentation of the entire system on a convenient website, with instructions, tools, an archive of memoranda and findings, and with a clear plan for data management.

This report explains in detail the history and methods of the assessment plan, and how it will be used.

Work on Assessment at Haverford Since 2010

Haverford College has been working on various aspects of assessment since our most recent Self Study in 2010, which gave special focus to the Senior Capstone Project as a distinctive aspect of the College curriculum, and also suggested the need for a review of our General Education requirements, which involve both core courses (such as our Freshman Writing Seminars) and a wide array of courses fulfilling various distribution requirements (in quantitative reasoning, study of a language other than English, and courses from the three traditional academic divisions). Discussions have been underway since that time on various options for changing those basic requirements in some ways so as to allow students to take greater advantage of the many interdisciplinary programs now available at the College, and to recognize the many ways in which courses in a single department might align with interests beyond the traditional intellectual divisions of the Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences.

At about the time of the 2010 Self Study Haverford also began a series collaborations on assessment with nearby Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore Colleges in a project devoted wholly to assessment in departmental contexts, thanks to generous support from the Teagle Foundation. This work unfolded in two rounds (2009-2012 and again in 2012-2014). Colleagues from across the College gathered to discuss the challenges of evaluating student work in various disciplines—from History to Economics and from Spanish to Computer Science—and to explore case studies of what such evaluative work might look like.
As noted in our Periodic Review Report of 2015, five key points emerged from this work that have guided our subsequent development during 2015 to the present of a sustainable system for assessment here at Haverford. In brief:

1. Ensure that the questions posed about student learning are relevant to what faculty want students to discover in a given discipline.
2. Construct (and discuss) rubrics that clearly embody faculty priorities, and that can be clearly communicated to students in the given discipline.
3. Encourage the development of new pedagogical tools (including assessment routines) that will be of interest to faculty within departments and in cognate disciplines.
4. Communicate the value of assessment to all faculty, above all through the Office of the Provost, which can convene meetings and discussions to advance the culture of continuous improvement.
5. Promote mutual accountability among departments, as we recognize the institutional (no less than departmental) value of processes that aim to improve our work as educators.

Meanwhile during 2012-2015 still other work relevant to assessment was promoted by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), which called upon departments to formulate and publish clear learning goals for their curricula in general and for the Senior Capstone projects in particular. These goals were subsequently published on the College website; this work is also summarized in the Periodic Review Report of 2015. They also served (as explained below) as the basis of a new round of textual curation and publication during 2015-2016, as the Associate Provost supervised the complete review and revision of our College Catalog (in both web and print/pdf formats).

IEC continued its work on assessment during the last 18 months as the Associate Provost worked with members of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), the Registrar, deans and faculty to create a sustainable system of assessment for both General Education courses and Senior Capstone Projects. We established basic principles of assessment (detailing lines of responsibility and reporting), gathered focus groups to help us develop and revise rubrics and other rating systems that might work, and developed systems of data gathering and analysis that will be simple enough to maintain, but also flexible enough to provide the basis of future discussions and inquiry. The Faculty agree that:

- the Faculty, as the body responsible for the curriculum and its requirements, must also be responsible for articulating how we will evaluate student accomplishment, and in turn how best to improve those outcomes. We are obliged by our participation in the MSCHE to undertake regular assessment of our programs, but we also owe it to ourselves to do so in ways that are meaningful in the context of our vision for a liberal arts education.

- individual members of the Faculty have responsibility and authority for the evaluation of student work in their courses. The larger need of the institution to understand the effectiveness of its curriculum (as manifest in the general education requirements and senior capstone project) must avoid interfering with the routine work of individual courses, either in its methods of information gathering or in its conclusions.

- individual departments will know best how to measure student work, particularly in the context of senior projects, which inevitably will involve specialized disciplinary tools, perspectives, and materials. When departments themselves notice patterns of student work that fall short of their ideals, they will also know how to make revisions to address the needs, possibly bringing changes in programs or courses to EPC (and in turn to the Faculty as a whole for approval and dissemination). When departments judge that new resources are needed (in their area/discipline or perhaps elsewhere in the College) the merits of those needs are considered by the Provost as part of the annual process of budgeting, and by EPC when it calls for proposals for new faculty positions.
the College as a whole can nevertheless benefit when departmental reports about the challenges faced by their students as a group are prepared in ways that permit them to be compared and aggregated by our usual modes of academic planning in EPC and the Provost’s Office. Such information (again, in the aggregate) will also be essential for the Institutional Effectiveness Committee as it prepares both internal and external reports on the state of student experiences in the classroom and beyond.

We brought all of this to the Faculty for review and endorsement, and have successfully brought all departments to participate in the system, first in the spring of 2016, again in the fall of 2016; more rounds of assessment will take place in April and May 2017, and of course indefinitely into the future.

Institutional Learning Goals, General Education Requirements, and the MSCHE Proficiencies

In spring of 2010, the Board of Managers and the Faculty endorsed a set of institutional learning goals that a Haverford education is designed to achieve. This document, our "Educational Goals and Aspirations," continues to evolve as faculty consider and articulate the many facets of a Haverford education. It affirms the following broad aspirations for our students:

Mastery and Critique

Haverford College's curriculum is designed not only to help students acquire a particular body of knowledge but to develop the capacity to learn, to understand, to make sound and thoughtful judgments, and to balance creativity and analysis. Within each discipline, academic work evolves from the mastery of key concepts through critical analysis to active participation in the construction of scholarship. This intellectual preparation culminates in our academic requirement that each senior produce a piece of independent work in the form of a senior thesis or project. Students cultivate the ability to critique and analyze primary texts, to appreciate theoretical rigor, and to learn through observation, experiment, or empirical methods, as appropriate. Students thus gain mastery of their chosen disciplines.

Ownership, Contribution, and Accountability

In all disciplines, students are expected to contribute original ideas for which they are accountable. They learn to present and defend their ideas both orally and in writing. Students are encouraged to interrogate and articulate why they think what they think, both inside and outside of the classroom.

Translation and Interpretation

Students engage in acts of translation, interpretation, and cultural inquiry in every area of their studies. These intellectual habits encourage students to formulate questions, explore areas of difference, and understand their own positions vis-à-vis various forms of history, politics and knowledge. Such practices develop models of reading and analysis that illuminate students' scholarship and judgments across disciplines and contexts.

Breadth and Depth

In addition to mastering a discipline, all students are required to acquaint themselves with the breadth of intellectual approaches exemplified in the classic divisions of natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities; they must have experience of a second language and acquire quantitative skills. As distinctions among the divisions continue to blur, students are encouraged to explore interdisciplinarity through minors and areas of concentration.

Communication and Representation

All academic majors require students to communicate and represent ideas in modes that are appropriate to the discipline. The primary form of communication is often written prose, but students also learn to express themselves and their original contributions in a variety of presentation forms (e.g., oral, artistic, creative). A College Writing requirement is implemented during the first year to ensure that all students enter their academic disciplines with basic skills of written argument and persuasion.
Non doctior, sed meliore doctrina imbutus

Our Quaker heritage is expressed in the Haverford motto: "Not more learned, but imbued with better learning." We offer our students many opportunities to engage fundamental issues of inequality and social justice. The college encourages students to put learning into action for greater ethical purposes. Our Quaker principles turn classrooms into communities where faculty and students learn from each other, and where all voices are heard. In such contexts, students and faculty alike become better thinkers, listeners and speakers, making them partners in the creation of knowledge.

Our General Education Requirements encourage students to address these goals through a process of advised selection and systematic exploration. Each student takes a Freshman Writing Seminar in their first year—a course of seminal importance as a space for strategies of written and oral expression in a small, focused class of fellow beginning students. Over the course of the four years they also must take a full year of a new language and must take a course that grapples with the challenges of quantitative reasoning.

Each student must take also three courses from each of the three academic divisions of the College (Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences), representing at least six different departments. No more than 13 courses can be in the student’s major (thus 19 must come from beyond it; courses chosen to complement their special fields of interest). In all of this they are advised by peers, deans, and faculty (one advisor for years 1-2, then a major advisor for years 3-4).

Taken together, this combination of courses ensures that students will explore the curriculum in a balanced way, encountering ideas of interest through a variety of disciplinary lenses, and thus honing critical perspectives on their chosen areas of intellectual and creative activity as they culminate in the ‘mastery and critique’ to which they aspire in their Senior Capstone Projects (for a synoptic view of the MSCHE Proficiencies as they are manifest in our Institutional Learning Goals and distributional general education requirements, see Appendix 7).

From Departmental Learning Goals to Shared Rubrics

The MSCHE Proficiencies also correlate with learning goals at the local level, both in the general learning goals for individual departments (which in turn are manifest in the syllabi of individual courses) and in the learning goals for the Senior Capstone Projects completed by students in their respective majors. During 2015-2016 IEC worked with departments to systematically review and update their formal articulations of their learning goals for these two stages of work, and also to publish them in print/pdf and web format as part of a parallel process to edit and update our entire Catalog. (The creation of sustainable systems for the curation and publication of the Course Catalog and other academic regulations has been another priority for the IEC during 2015-2017.) The resulting statements now appear prominently in departmental materials, and are available in aggregated form from the IE webpage on student learning assessment (also see Appendix 8 for samples of learning goals from representative departments).

Each department is of course free to formulate goals that articulate the processes, methods, perspectives, and milestones appropriate to the discipline at hand. Individual instructors are also free to spell out the particular goals of their individual courses (indeed, our New Faculty Orientation and Teaching and Learning Institute for new tenure-track faculty helps all instructors understand the importance of clear communication about learning goals and other expectations). But in addition to these “from the ground up” processes of formulating and promulgating learning goals, we have also noticed a number of recurring priorities that resonate deeply across the Haverford curriculum, and with the MSCHE proficiencies noted above, although they are not confined to those proficiencies alone. These common areas of interest, in turn, provide the basis of our Rubrics for Assessment, and of the continuous cycle of reflection on the curriculum that we detail below, at the departmental level, and College-wide.

The process of developing this shared set of rubrics for both General Education and Senior Capstone Courses began with the Associate Provost and members of EPC, who are in any event charged by our institutional governance structures with the large-scale view of the curriculum and its integrity. We looked across departmental learning goals for common interests and priorities, and for ways in which these common threads could be used to connect General Education assessment with that to be undertaken for the Senior Capstone Projects. Some of the resulting categories aligned neatly with the MSCHE proficiencies. Others ranged out to include aspects of non-English
language instruction, artistic creativity and expression, as well as questions of ethical conduct and intellectual integrity. But, taken together, they point students towards the methods and understanding they will need to meet our Institutional Learning Goals as they move from introductory to intermediate, and at last advanced courses in their areas of interest. For General Education, our current categories are:

- Critical Analysis and Synthesis
- Oral Communication
- Quantitative Reasoning
- Scientific Method
- Written Communication
- Non-English Language
- Artistic Craft and Vision
- Information Literacy
- Technological Competency
- Ethics, Personal Responsibility, Professional Conduct

Contained within each of these general headings are various detailed “criteria” for evaluation, representing essential facets of the work at hand, from prose style to treatment of evidence, and from the selection of the correct analytic tool to the documentation of laboratory data. For some of these headings we turned to commonly used sets of guidelines, such as the VALUE Rubrics of the AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities), which we adapted and edited in a series of conversations with small groups of scholars from related specialties. We also looked to various disciplinary rubrics created as part of the Teagle-sponsored Tri-College Sustainable Departmental Assessment of Student Learning Project. Finally, we created criteria of our own, grouping them under related headings (for example under the Artistic Craft and Vision heading, or for Non-English Language courses). The precise number of criteria within each rubric vary from one heading to the next, but normally there are between four and six. Each of the criteria, moreover, include short descriptions of four successive levels of accomplishment, from inadequate to excellent (the assembled General Education rubrics appear as Appendix 9).

Among our guiding principles in the Assessment Plan is that the system should always attend to (and not dictate) the goals and pedagogies of individual faculty and the departmental contexts in which they teach. Any set of common headings or rubrics needs to flexibly adapt to particular disciplines, courses, and assignments around which they are deployed. Haverford students do not develop their capacities in scientific method or critical analysis, or written communication in some generic standard class, but rather in their disciplinary varieties.

Our system assures individual instructors of the intellectual freedom to select the evaluative criteria they deem most appropriate. They can select any “set” of criteria from the headings given above, or mix and match any 4-6 facets from different headings if they find no single set that is suited to the pedagogical task at hand. They are also free to ignore facets that have no relevance to the given work. The Educational Policy Committee (as explained below) will take responsibility for annual discussion (and if appropriate, revision) of the rubrics, and for suggesting particular focal points for assessment in a given year. In this way we will make sure that the range of rubrics offered is of value to the concerns of the Faculty and of the College, and that we correspondingly see to it that we gather information about (and discuss) all areas of interest on a regular basis. The evolving sets of rubrics for General Education assessment were shared with departments and with the faculty as a whole for comment and revision. Indeed, our ongoing Assessment Plan anticipates the need for periodic revision of the rubrics, both in their number, focus, and the wording of the individual criteria used.

For the Senior Capstone Projects, the overall categories recall some aspects of those for General Education, but differ in both structure and scope. Unlike the “sets” of criteria packaged together for the rubrics just considered, these consist of a larger array of nearly two dozen individual facets representing both process (the various stages of work) and product (variously oral, written, or visual work). These emerged as we regarded departmental Senior Capstone Learning Goals and Process statements produced for the College Catalog (as explained above). Now armed with the common themes, we worked with Chairs and various focus groups to identify language that would (in the words of one participant) avoid the pitfall of “meaning everything to one department, but nothing to any other.” The categories include those below (see Appendix 10 for the complete Senior Capstone Project rubrics):
Gathering (the initial stages of work)

- Data Collection and Management
- Assembling Primary and Secondary Literature
- Identify Resources and Requirements

Formulating (the development of a plan)

- Articulation of Research Question
- Experiment Design
- Research Plan
- Collaboration in Lab or Seminar
- Creative Concept

Interpreting (the analytic or reflective process)

- Data Analysis
- Show Understanding of Theory and Method relevant to Discipline
- Situate Work in Intellectual Context
- Sustained Argumentation
- Textual Analysis
- Revision and Review

Demonstrating (the final product)

- Oral Presentation
- Oral Defense or Examination
- Oral Comprehension
- Performing
- Graphical Presentation
- Exhibiting
- Written Argument

Senior Capstone Projects are normally undertaken over the course of a full academic year, and involve many stages of preparation, analysis, and documentation, and we realized that giving departments the freedom to build their own set of 4-6 criteria would in this case allow them to evaluate and compare students within their domains and also expose hidden commonalities at higher level for the institution as a whole. The target of 4-6 considers the value of measurements that might reasonably be expected to move independently of each other, thus obliging individual departments to consider differences among various dimensions of achievement in a given field, and in turn using such differential diagnoses to inform their conversations about how to improve programs or pedagogy. They can in principle use more than six, but we believe that they will be best served by choosing criteria that they understand to reflect what they view as the most pressing or important pedagogical challenges they face. Our first round of assessing Senior Capstone Projects in this way (conducted in the spring of 2016) has already revealed connections of this sort. As we observe below in the explanation of the annual assessment loop, we will use such connections to identify small groups of faculty or departments keen to develop new pedagogies and revise curricula, perhaps in collaboration with existing structures such as the Office of Academic Resources or the Teaching and Learning Institute, or by proposing new initiatives.
Designating Courses and Collecting Data

Each Haverford student is required to have a major, and thus is also required to undertake a Senior Capstone Project. It thus seems both reasonable and appropriate that each department assess all the seniors in their programs each year. Each spring we will ask departments to select between four and six criteria they will use for this portion of our Assessment Plan. A simple electronic form (created with Google Suite for Education, the basis of our email and other collaborative systems on campus) invites chairs to select the specific criteria they will use. Armed with a list of each departmental Senior Capstone course and selection of rubrics, the Registrar builds spreadsheets for each departmental cohort of seniors. The system is both simple to administer and easy to complete: each spreadsheet follows the same basic template, with the names of students in the first column, and the selected criteria from the rubrics in subsequent columns (see Appendix 11 for instructions concerning these).

Only the selected criteria are displayed in the final sheets prepared for each departmental Senior Capstone Project. The on-line spreadsheets (permission- and version-controlled through Google Drive) are built in such a way as to protect the confidentiality of faculty ratings about individual students: only the Chair (or departmental delegate) and administrative assistant can view and enter data, which is done simply by selecting from a pre-defined scale of “1” (inadequate) through “4” (excellent) as defined by the detailed rubrics that are available to each faculty member. Faculty have rapidly acclimated to this system of designation, selection, and data entry. And since each departmental spreadsheet shares the same set of master criteria (albeit with irrelevant columns hidden from view), the data can easily be combined for further analysis, or layered year after year as our experience grows.

The data gathering process for General Education Proficiencies must take into account the basic fact that students can fulfill their curricular distribution requirements in courses from many different disciplines, and at several different levels, including writing courses, quantitative courses, and courses from across the divisions. The system deployed here thus resembles the one for the Senior Capstone Projects in its technical means, but hinges on a two-step sequence involving the designation of classes and the selection of rubrics:

- Each semester, each department is asked designate at least two courses (at any level), with a target of about 50 students in all to be assessed. If the enrollments in one or more of the courses is very large (over 40) instructors can use an unbiased sampling system to select a subset of student work to evaluate. If the department is keenly interested in a core competency (rubric) which is best studied in a course at the 200 or 300 level, there might be reason for the combined enrollment of the designated courses to fall below the 50-student target. This process, when spread across all 24 academic departments will result in a sampling of about 25% of the student body each academic year.

- The kind of student work to be used as the basis of the assessment is left to the discretion of the instructor (who of course consults with departmental colleagues about the pedagogical challenges they seek to understand). Assessment can be based on a single assignment, exam, or project; or it could be some evaluation based on a pre- and post-test, or some portfolio of work. Assessment data is meant as a tool for the instructor and program; it need not correspond to the grade or feedback given to the student for that assignment or for the course as a whole.

Designation of courses and selection of rubrics and criteria is handled with the same simple online form as used for Senior Capstone Projects. Data entry (limited in this case to instructor and administrative assistant) happens just as it does for the Senior Capstone Project, with a spreadsheet containing alphabetical lists of students and pull-down ratings for each selected criterion. Once again, all course-level spreadsheets share the same (hidden) overall array of rubrics, so data aggregation is extremely rapid, and lends itself to future adaption and analysis.

Interpreting Results and Closing the Annual Assessment Loop

It is thus still too early to draw definitive conclusions from the data collected in the spring of 2016 (Senior Capstone Projects and General Education courses) and the fall of 2016 (General Education courses). But we have a good idea of how to proceed, and who will be responsible for the work. The College Registrar has crafted a powerful and elegant system for data analysis, using Tableau proprietary software (a free “reader” version allows any member of the faculty or staff to create their own interactive charts with our data). Tableau readily aggregates all of our assessment spreadsheets in a browser-like dashboard (as shown in Appendix 15), allowing any faculty member to
see College-wide data (but no information that would identify an individual student’s scores). It also allows individual departments to filter information for review of their own results, as well as filtered views to identify “birds of a feather” across several departments who have used similar rubrics. EPC and the Provost’s Office will convene such small groups of faculty in order discuss concerns or challenges of mutual interest, and encourage others to form as they see fit.

Information about the scores of individual students will not be exposed to general view. But since student ID numbers are associated with assessment data via the original enrollment documents for courses and seniors, we will be able to track the progress of student pathways in the aggregate, discovering (for instance) whether student achievement advances over the course of a career, or whether the timing of particular general education milestones has any effect on their command of a particular aspect of assessed work. These assessment data could also help us see larger patterns in the context of overall enrollment patterns, putting resources to work in areas where need is deemed greatest by EPC and the Provosts.

We will also put these data to work in an annual cycle of assessment involving departments, EPC, and Provosts. In some cases assessment data will provoke discussion about new initiatives by small groups of faculty (within departments, or perhaps those with mutual interests revealed by the Tableau system and selection of rubrics). In other instances reactions to assessment data might come from EPC, which either notices a new trend or is curious to have faculty focus on some pedagogical challenge for the next cycle or two of assessment. And thoughts about assessment results might come from the Office of the Provost or the Office of the Dean, which variously have responsibilities to assure the right resources are at hand for departments and academic support systems.

Now armed with a full year of systematic assessment results, EPC has regarded the data with caution, understanding that it would be easy to over-interpret the information at hand. Ours is small institution (even by standards of liberal arts colleges) and our data are certainly not yet large (since we only have two semesters of General Education and one year of Senior Capstone data). We will need year-over-year sets of data in order to understand trends and trajectories, and to have time for colleagues across the College to have the all-important discussions about expectations for students at different levels and in different programs. We are curious to understand more about patterns among the data that strike us as counter-intuitive, as when (in the case of General Education results) the proportion of students receiving a score of “1” (unacceptable) is higher in an intermediate-level course than in an introductory-level one, despite the fact that both can be taken in fulfillment of our General Education requirements. It is not clear whether such patterns indicate differences in student learning or latent bias among different instructors (even within the same department). We are likewise curious to hear more from departments (in our case both Linguistics and Fine Arts) for whom Technological Competency was selected for assessment. The numbers here, too, are small, but we note that the common interest in this proficiency across such widely different disciplines encourages us to view the curriculum holistically, and to highlight the common pedagogical goals and challenges that unite seemingly different modes of inquiry.

Meanwhile, individual departments (as we explain below) are undertaking local evaluation of their learning goals, curriculum, and advising processes in ways that make direct use of the assessment data they have contributed to the project, from introductory levels to the Senior Capstone. But no matter when and where such ideas emerge, they can enter a continuous cycle of internal evaluation of the curriculum:

- Early each fall term, EPC takes up assessment data from the previous year, looking for new or emerging trends, and signaling to the Faculty the need for discussion of an emerging trend, or the need for special focus in upcoming assessment cycles.

- During the fall term individual departments also take up the lessons learned from their assessment work in the previous year, considering learning goals, requirements, advising practices and other aspects of the program in light of assessment data; if appropriate they can adjust the pace or structure of work in the Senior Capstone Projects; and if appropriate they can prepare requests for new instructional resources in time for the annual budget process in November. Finally, they can propose major curricular changes in time for EPC’s review of such revisions early in the spring term.

- By March of each year, each department or program chair submits (via simple electronic form) narrative responses to a set of questions that ask them to reflect on their evaluation of the curriculum, including how
they made use of assessment data (see Appendix 12). These responses are fielded by the Provost as part of the annual “DAP” cycle. The Provost’s sense of the academic needs can in turn inform plans for EPC early in the fall term, with the start of the next phase of the cycle. See Appendix 13 for sample DAP reports from two academic departments.

**Review and Revision of the Assessment Plan**

EPC has responsibility for review of graduation requirements, learning goals, and approval of credentials offered by each department or program. It thus makes sense that EPC should assume responsibility for the mechanisms by which we assess the effectiveness of those curricular programs, and how students are meeting the goals we set out for them. But they will also need to work with other administrative bodies on campus, chiefly the Office of the Provost (with responsibility for review of departments and programs) and the Deans (with responsibility for advising, the Office of Academic Resources, the Registrar, and other vital services). Indeed, delegates from these offices are regular members of EPC, so we already have clear lines of communication in hand. With respect to the Assessment Plan, EPC, the Provosts, and the Deans will guide Faculty in periodic review and revision of rubrics, undertake periodic review and improvement of the systems by which we collect, share and analyze data. EPC will also discuss and solicit Faculty views on the need for periodic changes in the overall Assessment Plan. Above all, EPC will encourage the cyclic study and deployment of assessment data through conversations at the department level (as part of DAPs) and inter-departmental levels (as part of broader initiatives or areas of interest) around particular pedagogical challenges that might emerge from year to year.

**Documentation and Data Management**

The methods and results of our system are both scalable and interoperable. We have also undertaken steps to ensure the secure preservation of the data.

- An assessment web hub is an internal resource for Faculty and Administrative staff where we assemble instructions, rubrics, memos, links for forms and results. The files are thus available for consultation, and can also easily be linked to Provost or Registrar Web, with access control. See Appendix 14.

- Data entry is done through a simple set of permission-controlled spreadsheets, as explained above and illustrated in Appendix 11. They are currently hosted through the secure College-supported Google drive service, which allows us to extend viewing and editing privileges to authorized members of the faculty and staff, while also preserving the confidentiality of evaluations about individual students.

- The sheets (no matter which set of rubrics are selected by a given department or instructor) share a common overall structure, so that they can easily be aggregated into master data sets.

- The individual sheets and the master data sets themselves can also easily be exported as CSV or other standard interchange formats, and thus used alongside other structured data for purposes of institutional research (for instance, we can use student ID number to associate assessment data with other information about a student’s academic career).

- Data validation is used in the sheets to ensure that faculty ratings can only be along the designated scale (1-4), thus ensuring that all sheets will work with subsequent stages of analysis, with any kind of software.

- Our current approach to analysis relies on proprietary Tableau software, which is used by the Registrar in various reports. Data are easily assimilated to the software itself, which then generates files that can be shared via the Tableau Reader, a free tool that allows anyone to configure dynamic views of the underlying information directly in a browser-like environment, capturing images or making slide shows of relevant combinations of data, complete with graphical diagrams and statistical analysis. In this instance, users can filter by course level, by level of achievement in the given criterion, by department, by rubric, etc. (The identities of individual students are nevertheless invisible to end users.) See Appendix 15 for images of Tableau reports.

- Privacy statements concerning information about students and instructors (see Appendix 16).
Summary

This chapter documents our organized, sustainable process for direct assessment of student learning in General Education and in all programs via the summative capstone experience. It also demonstrates the mechanisms through which assessment results are reviewed and utilized to improve outcomes, in compliance with Standard 14.
Conclusion:

Sustainability for Continuing Compliance

As in many aspects of life at Haverford, sustainability was a primary design principle guiding the improvements in our systems of institutional effectiveness and assessment of student learning. The components that we have created over the past 18 months, as detailed in the previous two chapters, are compatible with Haverford’s culture and complement our existing mechanisms for stewarding institutional improvement. For instance, there is intentional flexibility for faculty in the selection of assignments, rubrics, and criteria within rubrics for assessing student learning or competencies. Departmental assessment for administrative units, moreover, incorporates existing methods of planning into a common institutional framework, rather than replacing them. By working within the culture, in appropriately sized and resourced ways, the improvements that we have put into place will be sustained going forward to ensure continuing compliance with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education standards.

More specifically, each system is sustainable because:

- it is relatively simple, aligned with existing organizational structures and processes, and includes documented assignment of responsibility.
- it draws on institutional strength for deep discussion and collaboration.
- It includes mechanisms for data and process management.

The preceding chapters and appendices provide evidence for each of these points. In concluding this monitoring report, we will summarize to highlight their intentionality.

Simplicity, Alignment, Accountability

Our approach to departmental assessment for administrative units strategically invested time and support in the initial articulation of goals and objectives (Specific, Measureable-Action oriented-Realistic-Timely), so that the data collection and assessment phases can naturally follow. For both our General Education and Senior Capstone assessment processes, we apply technology to simplify data collection and facilitate analysis.

In each case, the systems are aligned with existing structures and processes. Departmental assessment for administrative units is based on our divisional organizational structure, with departments reporting hierarchically to a member of the Senior Staff, and each division sharing a common goal to steward institutional effectiveness processes as part of the overall institutional effectiveness plan. Departmental assessment is also connected to resource allocation through the regular operating budget development process. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) collaboratively supports the comprehensive system. The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) of the faculty is responsible for General Education, and reviews the collective results from academic departments across the College. The Provost’s Office launches and monitors the feedback loop for academic department capstone assessment, and introduces new faculty to assessment expectations through New Faculty Orientation.

Lines of responsibility for the stewardship of Haverford’s assessment processes are formalized via the new DAPs, with roles reflective of pre-existing planning structures, committee charges, handbooks, and various position responsibilities. This formalization complements the adaptive nature of our institutional culture and Quaker traditions for respectful dialogue and shared responsibility.

Institutional Strengths

Deep, thoughtful discussion and meaningful collaboration are the norm in life and work at Haverford College. Our processes for improvement and innovation are supported by these institutional strengths. Our mechanisms of assessment, including those recently formalized, leverage these capacities for collaborative exploration of effectiveness.

As described previously, we are utilizing the Culture of Evidence Continuum (Appendix 4) to benchmark and facilitate discussion of assessment, particularly at the divisional leadership level. This tool functions as sustaining mechanism because its inclusion within divisional assessment plans annually creates the intellectual space to
evaluate our processes and progress, both generally across the College and in particular areas of strategic importance.

The formalization of departmental assessment also relies on thoughtful discussion and collaboration. For academic departments, discussion and annual reporting to the Provost on questions such as those below can sustain assessment initiatives and further improvements in student learning:

- What did you and your colleagues learn from your discussion of the assessment data you collected last year? In light of the College’s general educational goals? In light of your goals for the senior capstone?
- What changes or adjustments to the academic program have you considered, proposed, or enacted? What challenges do you see in implementing any of these ideas or plans?

For each administrative department, the annual conversation with supervisors to discuss a department’s achievement of goals and plans for improvement is the most significant step in the effectiveness cycle. Cross-functional structures, such as the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) assemble stakeholders to produce action.

Data and Process Management

Key protocols support the sustainability of our comprehensive systems of institutional effectiveness and assessment of student learning. Student learning assessment data is stored securely at the unit record level by the Registrar, with archives on the Provost’s secure server. Procedures are in place so that each academic department has access to its own results and aggregated results from across the College, but not data from other individual departments. A folder system accessible to all internal constituents has been designed to house statements of goals and objectives for all administrative departments. DAP reports (with assessment results, recommendations for improvement and resource needs) are maintained privately by Division leadership. Each system includes a website for process documentation and related information.

Summary

Innovation and continuous improvement are hallmarks of the Haverford ethos, carried out within a community valuing collaboration and mutual respect. Appropriately resourced and sustainable practices guide the achievement of our educational mission. With the recent enhancements to our processes of institutional effectiveness and student learning assessment documented throughout this report, we are committed to ensuring Haverford's fulfillment of its mission.
Haverford College

Statement of Purpose

Haverford College is committed to providing a liberal arts education in the broadest sense. This education, based on a rich academic curriculum at its core, is distinguished by a commitment to excellence and a concern for individual growth. Haverford has chosen to remain small and to foster close student/faculty relationships to achieve these objectives.

The College’s rigorous academic program is flexible in form and content to meet the needs of individual students, and rests on the assumption that the able students who come here will use their capacities fully. Haverford’s faculty is noted for its strength in both scholarship and teaching, and its members expect to transmit to students their enthusiasm and high standards. The faculty members are teaching at an undergraduate college of arts and sciences by choice and they expect to learn, as well as to teach, in this close relationship with undergraduates.

The full resources of the College, in and out of the classroom, are designed to promote the personal and intellectual growth of students. Through an ambitious program of visiting lecturers and cultural activities, a conscious effort to recruit faculty and students representing diverse backgrounds and perspectives, student self-governance and service programs, an athletic program focused on participation and the scholar-athlete, and through day-to-day living in a residential community, the College seeks to broaden and enrich each person’s development. Students are asked to give of themselves, even as they draw new strength from others. We seek to foster the pursuit of excellence and a sense of individual and collective responsibility throughout the entire environment.

Haverford strives to be a college in which integrity, honesty, and concern for others are dominant forces. The College does not have as many formal rules or as much formal supervision as most other colleges; rather it offers an opportunity for students to govern their affairs and conduct themselves with respect and concern for others. Each student is expected to adhere to the Honor Code as it is adopted each year by the Students' Association.

Haverford College, while a non-sectarian institution, has Quaker origins which inform many aspects of the life of the College. They help to make Haverford the special college that it is, where the excellence of its academic program is deepened by its spiritual, moral, and ethical dimensions. These show most clearly in the close relationship among members of the campus community, in the emphasis on integrity, in the interaction of the individual and the community, and in the College's concern for the uses to which its students put their expanding knowledge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td><strong>Divisions</strong> and Administrative/Academic Support <strong>Departments</strong> articulate high-level goals and <strong>SMART</strong> objectives (Specific-Measurable-Action oriented-Realistic-Timely). This is the <strong>DAP</strong>...the <strong>Departmental Assessment Plan</strong>.</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June (division dependent)</td>
<td><strong>Selected Departments</strong> undertake annual self-assessment and make plans for improvement; <strong>Selected Departments</strong> prepare DAP Report for Supervisor. (Bullet points of narrative under DAP objectives or similar information in a table format)</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June (division dependent)</td>
<td>Department <strong>Supervisor/Senior Staff member</strong> reviews this annual report and, if appropriate, collects additional information (i.e. if the goals include collaboration with other departments, the supervisor might have a conversation with those other departments)</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-July (division dependent)</td>
<td><strong>Supervisor/Senior Staff member meets with those selected Department leaders</strong> to review performance for 15-16</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End June</td>
<td><strong>Preferred Deadline for all Admin/Academic Support Departments to have created a DAP for 2015-16.</strong></td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td><strong>Senior Staff member</strong> prepares a draft 2015-16 divisional assessment plan, based on divisional goals and objectives.</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July- August, 2016</td>
<td><strong>Departments</strong> --Adjust goals and objectives for <strong>CORE RESPONSIBILITIES</strong> for 2016-17 based on what was learned through evaluation stage. --reallocate within FY17 department budget as necessary</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Staff Plans</td>
<td><strong>August 17 retreat</strong> <strong>President and Senior Staff discussion of institutional priorities for the year.</strong></td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td><strong>Senior Staff members reconnect with Departments</strong> for discussion of new department goals or enhanced department objectives,</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Haverford College**

**Institutional Effectiveness Cycle Timeline**

5/19/2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Departments/Divisions</td>
<td>Update Goals and Objectives for Departmental/Division Assessment Plan (DAP) to incorporate 2016-17 INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September - May</td>
<td>Departments/Divisions</td>
<td>“do” and “watch” their functions and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Prepare FY18 operating budget requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Receive approved FY18 budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Conducts Senior Staff evaluations (parallel process). Senior Staff members attach divisional goals/objectives, with a preview of divisional performance, to the usual self-evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June (division dependent)</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Undertakes annual self-assessment and plans for improvement; Prepares Annual Departmental Assessment Plan (DAP) Report for Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June (division dependent)</td>
<td>Supervisor/Senior Staff member</td>
<td>Reviews this DAP report and, if appropriate, collects additional information (i.e. if the goals include collaboration with other departments, the supervisor might have a conversation with those other departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-July (division dependent)</td>
<td>Supervisor/Senior Staff member</td>
<td>Meets with Department to review 16-17 performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late June Senior Staff Retreat</td>
<td>Senior Staff member</td>
<td>Updates the April/May preview of divisional performance as appropriate for use in the June Senior Staff retreat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the August Senior Staff retreat</td>
<td>Senior Staff member</td>
<td>Finalizes the 16-17 divisional assessment plan report, and submits to the President.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructional Technology Services

Department Assessment Plan 2016-17

Mission Statement: *Instructional Technology Services provides students, faculty, and staff with Instructional Technology, Classroom Technology, Digital Media and AV support to enhance teaching and learning.*

Goal 1: Promote an inclusive learning environment by enhancing teaching and learning through the effective application of instructional technologies.

**Objective 1:** Collaborate with at least 4 faculty members, per academic year, to pilot the implementation of the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Initiative

   **Metric:** Number of faculty collaborating in the pilot of the UDL Initiative

**Objective 2:** Create a UDL advisory task force to gain buy-in for UDL from the wider community

   **Metric:** Qualitative report on task force creation and strategies developed

**Objective 3:** Promote the application of instructional technology by partnering with at least four faculty members per semester on strategic course re-design and syllabus enhancement

   **Metric:** Number of faculty members collaborated with per semester

**Objective 4:** Communicate instructional technology best practices and resources by sponsoring at least one event and six published newsletters per academic year

   **Metric:** Qualitative report discussing the number of events and newsletters published and communicated best practices and resources
Goal 2: Proactively manage the Instructional Technology Center (ITC) and its resources to encourage technology utilization and media creation for teaching and learning.

**Objective 1:** Maintain and promote the availability of College media equipment  
**Metric:** Qualitative report on maintenance, availability, and utilization of College Media equipment

**Objective 2:** Provide the essential hardware and software training needed for course-related media production  
**Metric:** Number of in-class workshops provided.  
**Metric:** Offer at least three media production workshops per semester

**Objective 3:** Provide students with opportunities to gain in-depth media production knowledge and skills through the implementation of the ITC Media Production Cohort  
**Metric:** Qualitative report on the challenges and successes of implementing the ITC Media production cohort

**Objective 4:** Leverage the implementation of the Digital Storytelling Initiative to facilitate student expression of ideas  
**Metric:** Qualitative report on the impact to student expression from the implementation of the Digital Storytelling Initiative

Goal 3: Lead the strategic development, management, and support of the College learning management system and related external programs

**Objective 1:** Successfully coordinate the maintenance and upgrade of Moodle with the IITS Core group, faculty, and other institutional partners  
**Metric:** Qualitative report including upgrade/maintenance schedules, and summary of accomplishments and challenges

**Objective 2:** Create Moodle shells for all courses each semester  
**Metric:** Number/Percentage of courses for which Moodle shells were created, by semester
Objective 3: Promote the utilization of, and provide client support for, Moodle tools, Panopto, and VoiceThread

Metric: Qualitative report highlighting the strategies employed to increase the use of and support for the clients of Moodle tools, Panopto and VoiceThread.

Goal 4: Successfully deliver audio-visual client services through the effective management of College technology platforms, equipment and client support.

Objective 1: At least 99% of all classroom projection systems are operationally available for use.

Metric: Qualitative report indicating projection system down-times and measures taken to remedy

Objective 2: Effectively promote and support all instructional audio-visual systems and equipment

Metric: Qualitative report discussing utilization, accomplishments and challenges pertaining to existing and newly installed systems and equipment.

Objective 3: Assist campus event coordinators requesting AV services with timely and appropriate client and technical support

Metric: Qualitative reports highlighting demand, accomplishments and challenges of AV requests for events.

Objective 4: As needed for large campus-wide events, coordinate appropriate services with external audio visual vendors

Metric: Qualitative reports highlighting cases, accomplishments and challenges

Objective 5: Promote the self-service use of Panopto for small events

Metric: Utilization of Panopto

Metric: Qualitative report highlighting the strategies employed to increase the use of Panopto
The Culture of Evidence Continuum

**Directions**: Where would you place your department/program on the culture of evidence continuum? Read the descriptions in the table below. Put an X on the box in each row that best represents where your department/program is with each aspect of assessment located on the Y-Axis. When you are done, circle the heading on the X-Axis that best fits your department/program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture of Good Intentions</th>
<th>Culture of Justification</th>
<th>Culture of Strategy</th>
<th>Culture of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intentionality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have a sense that they are doing good things.</td>
<td>People can describe what they are doing (i.e., operational or procedural specificity).</td>
<td>People can describe what they are accomplishing (i.e., strategic pertinence, how what they are doing relates to mission and goals).</td>
<td>People know that they are doing the right things and can describe why they are doing them and what they are accomplishing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Perspective</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incidental/opportunistic: Recognize that data are important, but do not make any particular efforts to collect them.</td>
<td>After the fact: Data are used retroactively as justification for predetermined positions or previous decisions.</td>
<td>Before the fact: Assessment is designed with an end in mind (e.g., identification of learning outcomes, how the data will be used).</td>
<td>Real time/continuous: Data are collected and regularly used to inform processes. Data help close the loop on improvement processes and educational outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Critical links</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opaque: Data, when collected, are not shared beyond assessors, so connections cannot be made.</td>
<td>Cloudy: Assessment is conducted from a defensive posture, especially related to questions of budgetary and operational efficiency.</td>
<td>Translucent: Assessment is understood and shared but only with allies or key partners. Scope is limited to mid-managers.</td>
<td>Transparent: Outsiders can see and understand contributions to student and institutional success. Assessment is shared with all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Initiatives and directions</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determined by whim, interest, opportunity.</td>
<td>Administration initiates assessment and it is done only when asked for or required</td>
<td>Directors own and initiate assessment. Data describe the current situation.</td>
<td>All stakeholders own assessment. Success is operationalized, concretely described, and evaluated on the basis of evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Planning processes</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vague and individualized: Success is vague or interpretive, and evaluated on the basis of “feel,” intent, and effort. Collective or strategic planning does not exist.</td>
<td>Sporadic and limited to immediate question or application: Data are linked retroactively to strategic context, goals, and expectations, but the process is not planning-oriented.</td>
<td>Organized, routinized, and localized: Data inform deliberate cyclical or episodic strategic planning exercises.</td>
<td>Ongoing, strategic, and clearly linked to past and future: Triangulation of findings through multiple/established assessments. Data are incorporated into continuous strategic thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Assessment Plan: Haverford College
President of the College
Year: 2016-17

Mission: Steward the strategic direction and resources of the College so that current and future generations of students fully experience the advantages of a Haverford education in the liberal arts, characterized by personal and intellectual growth, appreciation of difference, ethical engagement in communities, and service and leadership in the world.

Goal 1: Promote and enhance the educational experience to fulfill the College's mission.

Objective 1: Support campus-wide collaboration on College initiatives in the recruitment, retention, academic achievement and post-graduate success of all students.
   Metric: Qualitative report including admission results, retention and graduation rates, and various student outcomes.

Objective 2: Steward the direction and development of the integrated academic plan so as to promote and enhance the educational experience for all students.
   Metric 1: Qualitative report
   Metric 2: Plan for 2020 Status Report

Objective 3: Encourage faculty excellence in teaching, research and creative activities so as to enrich Haverford's educational experience.
   Metric: Qualitative report

Objective 4: Steward the human resources of the College for the collaborative achievement of our institutional mission.
   Metric: Qualitative report

Objective 5: Steward the physical and technological infrastructure of the College in support of learning and in attainment of our institutional mission.
   Metric: Qualitative report

Goal 2: Guide Haverford College, with the counsel and advice of campus stakeholders, through appropriate agencies of institutional governance towards the achievement of the mission of the College.

Objective 1: Lead planning processes to set institutional direction
   Metric 1: Qualitative report
   Metric 2: Plan for 2020 Status Report
Objective 2: Effectively leverage resources to guide the delivery of staff and programs to realize the strategic goals of the College.
   Metric 1: Qualitative report
   Metric 2: Plan for 2020 Status Report

Objective 3: Direct and support the long range, fiscal planning and the College’s financial health in order to sustain the institution’s long-term academic excellence and standing in higher education.
   Metric: Qualitative report with metrics noting progress on achieving financial equilibrium

Objective 4: Engage and lead the Community in responding to affairs in the world, nation and the neighborhood.
   Metric: Qualitative report on issues addressed.

Objective 5: Steward the successful administration of Haverford policies and procedures pertaining to institutional effectiveness processes
   Metric: Qualitative report on annual DAP, employee evaluation, and budget process cycles, accomplishments, assessments.

Objective 6: Steward the relationships with the Board of Managers and Corporation of Haverford College.
   Metric: Qualitative report

Goal 3: Secure external support for the College

Objective 1: Engage alumni, friends, and other external constituents in order to provide financial support, build reputation, support students, and otherwise advance the mission of the College.
   Metric: Qualitative report with selected measures

Objective 2: Communicate the goals, objectives, accomplishments, and contributions of Haverford College to the community at-large and serve as a primary voice of the College.
   Metric: Qualitative report

Objective 3: Collaborate to improve the Bi-College, Tri-College, and other consortia relationships.
   Metric: Qualitative report on issues addressed.

Objective 4: Ensure the continued accreditation of all programs subject to accreditation.
   Metric: Qualitative report
Goal 4: Identify, champion and achieve Presidential initiatives

Objective 1: Increase campus diversity and advocate for its educational value.
   Metric: Qualitative report with appropriate measures

Objective 2: Foster the creation and support of initiatives encouraging and developing ethical leadership skills in Haverford students.
   Metric: Qualitative report on the activities created and administered

Objective 3: Further sustainability initiatives to steward the land, natural resources, and ecosystems supporting the living and learning environment.
   Metric 1: Qualitative report
   Metric 2: Sustainability Dashboard

Objective 4: Mark progress on strategic plan related capital projects
   Metric 1: Qualitative report
   Metric 2: Plan for 2020 Status Report
**Division Assessment Plan:** Academic Affairs  
**Senior Staff Member:** Provost  
**Year:** 2016-2017

**Mission:** The Provost serves as the Chief Academic Officer and oversees the academic program, including co-curricular activities, supports faculty members in their roles as educators and scholars, oversees the three Academic Centers (CPGC, HCAH and KINSC), the Libraries, academic departments and all other academic and instructional support services. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 2]

**Goal 1:** Successfully administer the academic program of the College in support of the liberal arts curriculum.  
[Strategic Goal: Academic Plan]

**Objective 1:** Ensure all disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs, instructional support services, Academic Centers, Library and Standing Committees are appropriately staffed to successfully carry out their educational mission and agendas, and produce any scheduled reports, documentation and assessment.  
[Links to Presidential Goal 1: objective 2]  
Metric: Qualitative report on the functioning, accomplishments, and challenges for related departments, Centers, programs and committees.

**Objective 2:** Effectively leverage resources to guide the delivery of staff and programs to realize the strategic goals of the College.  
[Links to Presidential Goal 1: objective 2 and Presidential Goal 4, Objectives 2, 3 and 4].  
Metric: Qualitative report discussing achievement of academic strategic initiatives including curricular innovations and capital projects

**Objective 3:** Collaborate with departments and programs to develop strategic plans for curricular innovation, diversity hires and inclusive classroom experiences.  
[Links to Presidential Goal 4: objective 1]  
Metric: Qualitative reports describing initiatives

**Objective 4:** Engage in ongoing collaborations with Bi-College, Tri-College and regional institutions to support academic programs and faculty initiatives.  
[Links to Presidential Goal 3: objective 3]  
Metric: Qualitative report

**Objective 5:** Steward the relationship between the curriculum and the academic centers to facilitate interdisciplinary connections and co-curricular programming.  
[Links to Presidential Goal 1: objective 2]  
Metric: Qualitative report discussing programmatic linkages, programs and community partnerships
Objective 6: Collaborate on College initiatives to support the recruitment, retention, academic achievement and post-graduate success of all students. [Links to Presidential Goal 1: objective 1]

Metric: Qualitative report highlighting collaborations with OAR, the Writing Program, Disability Services, Instructional Technology specialists, Chesick, Horizons and Tri-Co programs.

Goal 2: Steward the Haverford College Faculty Experience [Strategic Goal: Academic Plan] [Links to Presidential Goal 1: objective 3]

Objective 1: Support individual faculty in the pursuit, and administration of, awarded external grants.

Metric: Qualitative report highlighting support provided to faculty.

Objective 2: Support individual faculty through internal funding options for scholarly research; strategically develop new sources to increase support.

Metric: Qualitative report discussing achievements and challenges with internal faculty fund administration

Objective 3: Develop, administer and support policies and programs related to professional and personal development of individual faculty.

Metric: Qualitative report addressing faculty diversity, recruitment, performance, retention, dual career partners, quality of life, and career lifecycle, including sabbatical support for research, recognition of curricular innovation and compensation for chairs.

Goal 3: Manage the Office of the Provost to effectively support the academic mission of the College

Objective 1: Effective management of resources for current challenges and preparation for compelling future needs.

Metric: Qualitative report

Objective 2: Successful implementation and maintenance of policies and procedures

Metric: Qualitative report.

Objective 3: Steward the Educational Affairs Committee of the Board of Managers and consortia relationships to effectively support institutional function. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 6]

Metric: Qualitative Report

Goal 4: Effectively steward the academic assessment processes of the College. [Links to Presidential Goal 1, objective 2]
Objective 1: Annual General Education assessment processes are managed effectively, results are analyzed, and implications are discussed and communicated by and to appropriate stakeholders.
   Metric: Qualitative report

Objective 2: Annual Capstone assessment processes are managed effectively, results are analyzed, and implications are discussed and communicated by and to appropriate stakeholders.
   Metric: Qualitative report

Objective 3: Academic Department External Reviews, in collaboration with Bryn Mawr College, following schedules and processes.
   Metric: Qualitative report

Goal 5: Implement policies and procedures pertaining to planning, assessment, and management. [Links to Presidential Goal 2: objective 5]

Objective 1: 100% of divisional units successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed timeframe and a report as prescribed by the IE plan and division leader.
   Metric 1: number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities.
   Metric 2: number/percentage of units completing annual report
   Metric 3: number/percentage of units having annual DAP review meeting with division leader

Objective 2: 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford Policy.
   Metric: Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete

Objective 3: 100% of divisional units effectively steward financial resources.
   Metric 1: Number/percentage of units operating within current year budget.
   Metric 2: Number/percentage of units submitting timely budget requests aligned with Divisional goals

Objective 4: Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.
   Metric: Qualitative Report
**Division Assessment Plan:** Admission and Financial Aid  
**Senior Staff Member:** Vice President and Dean of Admission and Financial Aid  
**Year:** 2016-17

**Mission:** Foster the College’s pursuit of excellence by annually recruiting and enrolling a talented and diverse cohort of students well-suited to benefit from and contribute to Haverford’s rigorous academic program and inclusive community. [*Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 2*]

The division includes the Office of Admission and the Office of Financial Aid.

**Goal 1:** Enroll targeted number of first-year Class and Transfer cohort to meet institutional goals. [*Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 1*]

**Objective 1:** Develop a strong applicant pool  
**Metric 1:** Quantitative assessments (e.g., application numbers, academic markers, demographic numbers)  
**Metric 2:** Assessment of qualitative characteristics of applicants

**Objective 2:** Matriculate strong class of first year students and cohort of transfer students  
**Metric 1:** Quantitative assessments (e.g., total numbers, academic markers, demographic markers)  
**Metric 2:** Qualitative review

**Goal 2:** Manage transition to need-sensitive admission [*Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship*] [*Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 3*]

**Objective 1:** Establish decision-making process that allows us to build an incoming class in support of Haverford’s mission and values, within the context of a fixed financial aid budget  
**Metric 1:** Quantitative assessments of incoming class (see above) alongside of budget  
**Metric 2:** Qualitative assessment of process  
**Metric 3:** Assessment of change from previous years in decision-making and outcomes.

**Objective 2:** Work with other senior administrators to establish appropriate enrollment targets  
**Metric 1:** Quantitative and qualitative assessment of enrollment target  
**Metric 2:** Establishment of an ongoing process for determining appropriate enrollment

**Objective 3:** Strengthen communications efforts around Haverford’s commitment to access and affordability, in light of change from “need-blind”  
**Metric:** Qualitative review of communications relating to access and affordability

**Goal 3:** Complete transition from Admin to full use of PowerF aids in Financial Aid  
[*Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship*]

**Objective 1:** Conclude implementation process and extraction from Admin system  
**Metric:** Qualitative and quantitative assessment of process
**Objective 2:** Realize process improvements – both internally and externally
  Metric 1: Quantitative and qualitative assessments of improvements (including the ability to do necessary processes as fast or faster, improved automations and efficiency, and better communications and data flow across the College).
  Metric 2: Report on the establishment of improved business practices

**Goal 4:** Continue to develop and assess communication strategy [Strategic Goal: Haverford in the World] [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 2] 

**Objective 1:** Continue implementation of Art & Science findings, and assessment of efforts thus far.
  Metric 1: Qualitative review
  Metric 2: Inventory of communications outreach
  Metric 3: Assessment of substantial changes: new viewbook, essay questions, on-campus presentations, etc.

**Objective 2:** Continue refinement and development of communications strategies
  Metric 1: Development of Junior Year piece
  Metric 2: Continued development of video content
  Metric 3: Continue making updates to existing pieces, especially reflecting Art & Science learnings

**Objective 3:** Assess effectiveness of various outreach strategies
  Metric 1: Quantitative review (e.g., click rates, open rates, print distribution)
  Metric 2: Qualitative review
  Metric 3: Holding periodic ‘Communications Summits’ to review communications work and assess strategy.

**Objective 4:** Support internal and external College communication processes through the provision of standard reports, and ad hoc analyses.
  Metric: Qualitative report on support for College fiscal planning, policy review, and external communications pertaining to admission and financial aid (e.g. CDS, IPEDS).

**Goal 5:** Development of Key Project Areas [Strategic Goal: Haverford in the World]

**Objective 1:** Steward Multicultural recruitment. [Links to Presidential Goal 4, Objective 1]
  Metric 1: Quantitative and qualitative reviews of recruitment and admission
  Metric 2: Assessment of special outreach programs
  Metric 3: Review and articulation of desired outcomes

**Objective 2:** Steward International admission. [Links to Presidential Goal 4, Objective 1]
  Metric 1: Quantitative and qualitative reviews of recruitment and admission
  Metric 2: Assessment of special outreach programs and travel
  Metric 3: Review and articulation of desired outcomes
  Metric 4: Assessment of staffing structure

**Objective 3:** Steward the recruitment of Athletes
Metric 1: Quantitative and qualitative reviews of recruitment and admission
Metric 2: Review and articulation of desired outcomes

Goal 6: **Further develop use of technology in our operations** [Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship]

**Objective 1:** Monitor and assess Slate
- Metric 1: Qualitative review of our use of Slate
- Metric 2: Evaluation of further capabilities of Slate
- Metric 3: Report on improved staff training

**Objective 2:** Assess implementation of Front Rush for athletic recruitment
- Metric: Evaluation of benefits and efficiencies created

Goal 7: **Manage the division to effectively support the mission of the College**

**Objective 1:** Effective management of human and capital resources for current challenges and preparation for compelling future needs.
- Metric: Qualitative report

**Objective 2:** Steward the External Affairs committee of the Board of Managers and other relationships, as needed, to effectively support institutional functions.  **[Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 6]**
- Metric: Qualitative Report

Goal 8: **Implement policies and procedures pertaining to planning, assessment, and management.** **[Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]**

**Objective 1:** 100% of divisional units successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed timeframe and a report as prescribed by the IEP and division leader.
- Metric 1: Number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities.
- Metric 2: Number/percentage of units completing annual report
- Metric 3: Number/percentage of units having annual review meeting with division leader

**Objective 2:** 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford Policy.
- Metric 1: Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete

**Objective 3:** 100% of divisional units effectively steward financial resources.
- Metric 1: Number/percentage of units operating within current year budget.
- Metric 2: Number/percentage of units submitting timely budget requests aligned with divisional goals
Objective 4: Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.  
   Metric: Qualitative Report
Division Assessment Plan: College Communications
Senior Staff Member: Assistant Vice President for College Communications
Year: 2016-2017

Mission:
College Communications is responsible for the College's overall imaging and strategic positioning in the marketplace, with all efforts linked directly to the mission of the College. College Communications is guardian of the Haverford brand, and also partners with the Office of the President and the Board of Managers in the drafting and distribution of leadership communiqués. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, objective 2]

The Division is organized into five areas of responsibility
- Admission Communication
- Development and Alumni Communications
- News and Media relations
- Digital Asset Management
- Web Communications

Goal 1: Both internally and externally, message Haverford’s identity and impact--as evident in the activities of students, faculty, staff, and alumni-- to support the overall success of the College. [Strategic Goal: Haverford in the World] [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 2]

Objective 1: Develop strategic communications to attract and enroll an exceptionally qualified student body. [Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 1]
   Metric: Qualitative report on admission marketing support

Objective 2: Actively inform and engage multiple audiences about the work and life of the College.
   Metric: Qualitative report including achievements in alumni communications, news and social media engagements.

Objective 3: Produce high-quality information delivery products for campus events and clients, through effective collaboration with campus constituencies.
   Metric: Qualitative report on projects and collaborations.

Objective 4: Collaborate with Institutional Advancement to meet targets and expand fundraising outreach via effective communication strategies and tactical assistance.
   Metric: Qualitative report on activities and accomplishments
Goal 2: **Steward the channels and modes by which the College conveys news and information.**  [Strategic Goal: Haverford in the World]

**Objective 1:** Steward effective media coverage, actively position the College externally, drawing upon relevant market research.  [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 2]
  Metric: Qualitative report

**Objective 2:** Develop and promulgate internal communications standards and practices for brand management.  [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 2]
  Metric: Qualitative report

**Objective 3:** Manage Haverford.edu website and electronic broadcast communications.  [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 2]
  Metric: Qualitative report

**Objective 4:** Develop, deliver, and manage digital and print content for use in College operations, publications, and media products.  [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 2]
  Metric: Qualitative report

**Objective 5:** As requested, consult with the President and colleagues to strategize, message and manage leadership communications with various constituencies.  [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objectives 4 and 6]
  Metric: Qualitative report

**Goal 3: Effectively manage Division operations**

**Objective 1:** Effectively manage resources and work flow for current ongoing challenges and in preparation for compelling future needs.
  Metric: Qualitative report

**Objective 2:** Successfully implement and maintain division-specific policies and procedures.
  Metric: Qualitative report.

**Goal 4: Implement policies and procedures pertaining to planning, assessment, and management.**  [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]

**Objective 1:** 100% of divisional units successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed timeframe and a report as prescribed by the IE plan and division leader.
  Metric 1: number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities.
  Metric 2: number/percentage of units completing annual report
  Metric 3: number/percentage of units having annual DAP review meeting with division
leader.

**Objective 2:** 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford Policy.

   Metric: Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete

**Objective 3:** 100% of divisional units effectively steward financial resources.

   Metric 1: Number/percentage of units operating within current year budget.
   Metric 2: Number/percentage of units submitting timely budget requests aligned with Divisional goals

**Objective 4:** Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.

   Metric: Qualitative Report
**Division Assessment Plan:** Executive Affairs  
**Senior Staff Member:** Chief of Staff  
**Year:** 2016-17

**Mission:** The Executive Affairs Division is led by the Chief of Staff who represents the President and the College on wide ranging business and is the administrative lead in the Office of the President, serving as Secretary of the Board of Managers and Assistant Secretary of the Corporation, as well as Chief Sustainability Officer. The Division leads institutional planning and assessment, and includes the Office of Institutional Research.  

[Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 2]

**Goal 1: Support the President on wide range of institutional business**

**Objective 1:** Advance presidential priorities.  
[Links to Presidential Goal 4, all objectives]  
Metric: Qualitative review

**Objective 2:** Manage Office of the President  
Metric 1: Qualitative review  
Metric 2: Budget performance

**Objective 3:** Advance BiCo collaboration.  
[Links to Presidential Goal 3, objective 3]  
Metric 1: Qualitative review  
Metric 2: Implementation of MOU

**Objective 4:** Manage Commencement and other event planning  
Metric 1: Qualitative review  
Metric 2: Execute honorary degree program  
Metric 3: Investigate tent option

**Objective 5:** Steward ad hoc projects  
Metric 1: Connections with Phila  
Metric 2: Status of ombuds proposal  
Metric 3: Others: qualitative review

**Goal 2: Enable effective institutional governance**

**Objective 1:** Facilitate effective governance at the senior staff / divisional level.  
[Links to Presidential Goal 1, objective 4]  
Metric: Qualitative review

**Objective 2:** Facilitate effective Board governance.  
[Links to Presidential Goal 2, objective 6]  
Metric 1: Qualitative review  
Metric 2: Completion of presidential review process  
Metric 3: Determine Board leadership for July 1, 2017  
Metric 4: Governance review status
Objective 3: Facilitate partnership with the Corporation.  [Links to Presidential Goal 2, objective 6]
  Metric: Qualitative review

Objective 4: Facilitate effective governance with campus constituencies: faculty, staff, and students.  [Links to Presidential Goal 1, objective 4]
  Metric: Qualitative review

Goal 3: Facilitate planning and assessment across the institution in order to advance College goals [Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship]

Objective 1: Oversee (with president) strategic planning.  [Links to Presidential Goal 2, objective 1]
  Metric 1: Status of 2020 Oversight Committee
  Metric 2: Progress toward strategic goals and 2017 midway check-in

Objective 2: Utilize Institutional Research to advance institutional priorities.  [Links to Presidential Goal 2, objective 2]
  Metric 1: Completion of reporting
  Metric 2: Qualitative review of IR decision support on critical issues

Objective 3: Facilitate and monitor the Institutional Effectiveness Plan.  [Links to Presidential Goal 2, objective 5]
  Metric 1: Qualitative review of Institutional Effectiveness Committee productivity
  Metric 2: Report of Divisional completion rates for Departmental Assessment Plans (DAP) to the President
  Metric 3: Report of Divisional completion rates for Employee evaluation to the President

Objective 4: Proactively plan and steward accreditation-related processes.  [Links to Presidential Goal 3, objective 4]
  Metric 1: Progress assessment on monitoring report-related topics
  Metric 2: Successful submission of all periodic MSCHE reporting requirements

Goal 4: Advance Sustainability at Haverford [Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship] [Links to Presidential Goal 4, objective 3]

Objective 1: Demonstrate visible institutional commitment to sustainability
  Metric: Qualitative review

Objective 2: Improve governance and coordination around sustainability functions
  Metric: Qualitative review/Status of CSSR

Objective 3: Complete Sustainability Plan for Haverford
  Metric: Qualitative review/Status of Sustainability Plan

Objective 4: Begin implementation of Sustainability Plan
  Metric 1: Greenhouse completion
Metric 2: Investor responsibility
Metric 3: Corrugated pallets
Metric 4: Farm management
Metric 5: Communications: web, signage, etc.
Metric 6: Civic engagement
Metric 7: Waste stream / anaerobic digestors
Metric 8: Water bottles / stations
Metric 9: External collaborations
Metric 10: Real Food Challenge

Goal 5: Implement policies and procedures pertaining to planning, assessment, and management. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, objective 5.]

Objective 1: 100% of divisional units successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed timeframe and a report as prescribed by the IEP and division leader.
   Metric 1: number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities.
   Metric 2: number/percentage of units completing annual report
   Metric 3: number/percentage of units having annual review meeting with division leader

Objective 2: 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford Policy.
   Metric 1: Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete

Objective 3: 100% of divisional units effectively steward financial resources.
   Metric 1: Number/percentage of units operating within current year budget.
   Metric 2: Number/percentage of units submitting timely budget requests aligned with Divisional goals

Objective 4: Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.
   Metric: Qualitative Report
**Division Assessment Plan:** Finance & Administration  
**Senior Staff Member:** Senior Vice President of Administration, Finance and Treasurer.  
**Date:** 2016-2017

**Mission:** The Office of the Senior Vice President of Administration and Finance, Treasurer provides oversight of the College’s administrative, operating, business and financial activities. In this role, he serves as the College’s Chief Administrative Officer and combines the functions of the COO and CFO managing the College’s human, fiscal and physical resources, embracing sound, ethical and transparent practices to ensure the long-term financial viability of the institution. The Division structures the environment through which operational needs are addressed in creating, sustaining and growing a vibrant learning community. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 2]

Primary Departments:  
Campus Safety, Finance and Budget (Accounting, Financial Services, Information Systems), Human Resources, Event Management, Dining Services, Facilities Management (Planning/Project Management, Maintenance/Housekeeping, Grounds/Sustainability/Arboretum), Central Services (reprographics and post office), Purchasing, Procurement and the Bookstore.

**Goal 1:** Manage the long range, fiscal planning and the College's financial health in order to sustain the institution's long-term academic excellence and position in higher education. [Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship] [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 3]

**Objective 1:** Enhance the financial health and stability of the College by developing financial models and presenting scenarios that can assist the institution’s collective decision-making in the prioritization of resources to advance its academic mission and student experience.  
Metric: Qualitative report on continued progress toward (full-accrual) GAAP breakeven operations over the next few years.

**Objective 2:** Facilitate and staff regular meetings of the Audit and Risk Management Committee, the Finance Committee, and the Property Committee of the Board of Managers in order to continually create value-added dialogue with the Board and its designated committees in support of its oversight and governance of all financial, operating and property matters, related decision-making, and financial reporting and risk management that are aligned with the Board's and Corporation's directives and consistent with, and in support of, the College's Strategic Plan. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 6]

Metric 1: Quantitative report on progress made towards GAAP break-even.  
Metric 2: Qualitative report on passing of Resolutions by the Board.  
Metric 3: Quantitative report monitoring the construction and renovation of College assets.
Objective 3: Create and provide enhanced transparency of financial data, budgeting processes, and financial and operating policies; enhance communications with the College community and external audiences for financial, business and operating matters. [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 2]

Metric 1: Qualitative report including the monitoring publication of financial material on the Division’s homepage.

Metric 2: Qualitative report on facilitation of open forums and collaboration with Administrative Advisory Committee (AAC), which is the primary campus-wide budgeting advisory committee connecting operating resources and their allocation with the College’s mission and strategic goals.

Goal 2: Provide leadership throughout the six primary administrative Departments and manage the Division.

Objective 1: Conduct frequent meetings with Direct Reports and departmental staff.
   Metric: Qualitative summary, including coordination of departmental DAP’s

Objective 2: Mentor and provide professional development opportunities for Direct Reports and personnel throughout the six administrative Departments.
   Metric: Qualitative report discussing catalog of trainings, attendance/participation, increased knowledge/professional development, and cross-training.

Goal 3: Nurture a culture of accountability and instill a sense of shared responsibility and interdependence among divisional departments.

Objective 1: Support collegiality through enhanced inter and intra departmental communication, information transparency and local decision making for departmental accountability.
   Metric: Qualitative report discussing strategies leveraged to share pertinent and current information across departments and functions.

Objective 2: Develop and nurture a well-informed staff aware of each department's roles and impact upon strategic planning.
   Metric: Qualitative evaluation.

Goal 4: Identify and foster enhanced standards to drive operational excellence and meet constituent expectations.

Objective 1: Provide consistent, superior support by managing, resolving, and preventing problems efficiently; communicating effectively; and exceeding constituent and colleague expectations.
   Metric: Qualitative report discussing policies and existing standards in place or new, enhanced policies in development.
Objective 2: Enhance the Dining Center experience.
Metric: Qualitative report pertaining to the provision of in-house services creating nutritious and sustainable meals and good value through the creation of a welcoming environment that helps foster community growth around the student's dining experience, and providing dining options that support the nutritional and special dietary needs of students.

Goal 5: Provide for the automation of systems, change management culture in process implementation and the use of available and appropriate technology in financial and operating divisions. [Strategic goal: Institutional Stewardship]

Objective 1: Improve the Division’s business processes, coordination with other divisions, and the establishment of action plans in order to increase efficiency and improve constituent or colleague service.
Metric: Qualitative report discussing current system efficiencies and examples of cross-divisional coordination, as well as highlighting special projects being undertaken during the current fiscal period.

Goal 6: Maintain and enhance the physical assets of the College in an efficient and sustainable way in order to support our academic mission and the overall student experience. [Strategic goal: Academic Plan] [Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 5; Presidential Goal 4, Objective 3]

Objective 1: Leverage capital investments and annual R & R allocations, project timing and synergies for the physical plant and grounds to improve campus infrastructure and in support of the College’s goals and values. [Links to Presidential Goal 4, Objective 4]
Metric: Qualitative report covering the construction/renovation of Sharpless, VCAM, Library, Union, Dining Center and academic buildings, residence halls, student and administrative spaces as outlined through the Property Committee's intake and the “Gateway Process”.

Objective 2: Support use of the campus as a living laboratory for teaching and student research by maintaining the aesthetic qualities of the landscape, appropriately preserving historic or significant trees, enhancing, and supporting sustainability, and restoring native plant communities where possible.
Metric: Qualitative report

Objective 3: Provide a safe, efficient, clean, and well maintained interior environment which contributes to the success and positive experience of faculty, students, staff and visitors.
Metric: Qualitative report including improvements made in space utilization, the delivery of building maintenance and utilities, and the management of service and skilled trade professionals to meet the needs of the College.
Goal 7: To provide a safe and secure learning and working environment. [Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 5]

Objective: Provide for the safety, security and physical well-being of students, faculty and staff.
Metric: Qualitative and quantitative reviews and analyses.

Goal 8: Provide for an effective and efficient Human Resources Department. [Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 4]

Objective 1: Provide a positive Human Resources service experience for applicants, employees, and retirees and collaborate with departments to recruit, develop, support, and retain diverse and talented employees. [Links to Presidential Goal 4, Objective 1]
Metric: Qualitative review of programs and policies developed to enhance HR functional performance.

Objective 2: Manage and/or develop, as applicable, organizational policies and practices, in employment benefit areas in support of legal and regulatory requirements.
Metric: Qualitative review of compliance-based procedures and practices.

Objective 3: Communicate with and train employees to manage and maximize organizational performance. Support a workplace that is free from harassment and discrimination. Oversee a fair and competitive compensation system. Oversee and manage an objective, fair disciplinary system and process.
Metric: Qualitative review of risk management and disciplinary practices.

Goal 9: Ensure effective compliance mechanisms for Administrative and Finance functions

Objective: Structure a system where compliance efforts, processes and reporting is ongoing within a formal and coordinated framework.
Metric: Qualitative report and analysis discussing compliance standards and procedures instituted, the allocation of resources to enable successful implementation and dissemination of information, and the ongoing management of enterprise risk or risks associated with the divisional operating activities.

Goal 10: Implement policies and procedures pertaining to planning, assessment, and management. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]

Objective 1: All departmental units within the division successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed timeframe and a report as prescribed by the Office of the Senior Vice President.
Metric 1: number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities.
Metric 2: number/percentage of units completing annual report
Metric 3: number/percentage of units having annual DAP review meeting with Senior Vice President.

**Objective 2:** 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford Policy.
   Metric: Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete

**Objective 3:** All departments within the division effectively steward financial resources.
   Metric 1: Number/percentage of units operating within current year budget.
   Metric 2: Number/percentage of units submitting timely budget requests aligned with Divisional goals.

**Objective 4:** Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.
   Metric: Qualitative Report
Division Assessment Plan: Institutional Advancement
Division Senior Staff Member: Vice President for Institutional Advancement
Year: 2016-2017

Mission: Institutional Advancement builds and sustains understanding, appreciation, and philanthropic support for the educational mission of Haverford College by nurturing long term and mutually enriching relationships with alumni, students and prospective students, parents and other friends of the college. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 2]

Institutional Advancement is organized into the following five operational units: Individual Giving (Annual Giving, Leadership & Major Gifts, and Parent Programs); Foundation, Corporate & Government Relations; Gift Planning; Alumni & Parent Relations; and Advancement Services (Gifts & Records, Reporting & Analytics, Research, and Stewardship).

Goal 1: Successfully complete “Lives that Speak” Campaign for Haverford [Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship] [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 3; Presidential Goal 3, Objective 1; Presidential Goal 4, Objective 4]

Objective 1: Total campaign gifts and pledges meet or exceed $245 million by 6/30/17 with focus on funding remaining campaign priorities.
  Metric 1: Total Amount ($) gifts and pledges
  Metric 2: Percent of target priorities funded.

Objective 2: Annual Cash in of at least $20 million for FY17
  Metric: Total Amount ($) Cash in for FY17

Objective 3: Annual Fund Goal of $5.6 million met with at least 48% participation
  Metric 1: Total amount ($) raised: Annual Fund
  Metric 2: Participation rate

Goal 2: Steward executive involvement in institutional giving initiatives, including the successful conclusion of the Campaign. [Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship] [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 6]

Objective 1: Introduce/Brief President and Board leadership on Key Donor Relationships/Volunteer Leaders
  Metric: Qualitative review of 1:1 meetings, Haverford Conversation events with top rated prospects, and campaign events.

Objective 2: Orient and Deploy President in Stewardship events and acknowledgements
Objective 3: Staff External Affairs Committee of the Board
   Metric: Qualitative review

Objective 4: Support Nominations and Governance on strategic board cultivation and recruitment
   Metric: Qualitative review highlighting the identification, orientation, development, and cultivation of new, existing, and past Board members, with prioritized recruitment of women and persons of color.

Goal 3: Strategically implement Development initiatives with a focus on key donors and building of a robust donor pipeline for the post-campaign era. [Strategic Goal: Haverford in the World] [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 1; Presidential Goal 3, Objective 2; Presidential Goal 4, Objective 2; Presidential Goal 4, Objective 4]

Objective 1: Introduce Stewardship Club at the $250k level to encourage repeat or stretch Major Gifts
   Metric 1: Number of introductions/new members
   Metric 2: Qualitative review

Objective 2: Successfully expand the Campaign’s reach through the targeted deployment of regional activities.
   Metric: Qualitative review highlighting the campaign branded events in select Tier 1 cities.

Objective 3: Sustain Tier II and turn-key “campaign in a box” events
   Metric: Qualitative review

Objective 4: Effectively collaborate with CFO and Project Teams to finalize plans for Campaign-related capital projects
   Metric: Qualitative review discussing the status of VCAM/Sharpless/Library/Music projects

Objective 5: Secure $2 Million in responding gifts for the Board Scholarship Challenge in FY’17
   Metric: Total amount ($) of gifts raised by 6/30/17

Objective 6: Cultivate the alignment of key individual donors and foundational giving with strategic institutional initiatives.
   Metric 1: Qualitative report on donor participation in various institutional program initiatives
Metric 2: Qualitative review discussing Institutional Advancement’s role in catalyzing related program initiatives.

Objective 7: Leverage technology and content for refreshed solicitation communication
   Metric 1: Qualitative Review of GiveCampus deployment
   Metric 2: Reported open rates and fundraising results

Goal 4: Enhance Alumni and Parent Programs to broaden reach and deepen engagement. [Strategic Goal: Haverford in the World] [Links to Presidential Goal 3, Objective 1]

Objective 1: Implement “alumni Journey” and final recommendations of Milestone Reunion Task Force
   Metric: Qualitative review

Objective 2: Steward the establishment, development, and/or re-engagement of constituency and affinity groups.
   Metric: Qualitative report discussing support given to targeted constituencies and affinity groups.

Objective 3: Ongoing promotion of Friends of Athletics website to enable support by sport (within NCAA rules)
   Metric: Qualitative review indicating Dollars raised by sport.

Objective 4: Assess and realign Haverford’s social media strategy to effectively reach and engage all alumni, particularly recent graduates.
   Metric: Qualitative review highlighting strategic changes suggested by divisional analytics and associated market research

Objective 5: Spearhead successful annual themed Friends and Family Weekend.
   Metric: Qualitative Review of fall 2017 Sustainability-themed event

Objective 6: Steward the development and alignment of the international Council with institutional strategic objectives and priorities
   Metric: Qualitative review discussing governance and accomplishments of the International Council
Goal 5: Advance data-informed decision-making through the effective leveraging of Advancement Services resources.

Objective: Increase automated interfaces to Raisers Edge database to enhance efficiency and data accuracy, and develop new reports to enhance targeted fundraising and alumni engagement.
   Metric: Qualitative review

Goal 6: Implement policies and procedures pertaining to planning, assessment, and management. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]

Objective 1: 100% of divisional units successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed timeframe and report as prescribed by the IEP and division leader.
   Metric 1: Number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities
   Metric 2: Number/percentage of units completing annual report
   Metric 3: Number/percentage of units having annual review meeting with division leader.

Objective 2: 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford policy.
   Metric: Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete.

Objective 3: 100% of divisional units effectively steward financial resources.
   Metric 1: Number/percentage of units operating within current year budget.
   Metric 2: Number/percentage of units submitting timely budget requests aligned with Divisional goals

Objective 4: Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.
   Metric: Qualitative Report
**Division Assessment Plan:** Institutional Investments  
**Senior Staff Member:** Chief Investment Officer  
**Year:** 2016-2017

**Mission Statement:** The Investment Office, under the direction of the Investment Committee of the Board of Managers, is responsible for day-to-day oversight and management of the endowment, including the development and implementation of investment policy, investment manager due diligence and monitoring, and portfolio administration. The endowment is managed with the dual objectives of preserving the purchasing power of assets for future generations and maintaining sufficient liquidity and income to support the near-term operating needs of the College. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 2]

### Goal 1: Day-to-day oversight and management of the endowment investment portfolio  
[Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Planned Improvements and/or Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Monthly review and reporting of portfolio information, including asset allocation, performance, liquidity and risk measurement</td>
<td>Completion and distribution of monthly reporting with required data</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintain endowment portfolio within policy guidelines and recommend rebalancing, as necessary</td>
<td>Monthly review of portfolio allocations and equity beta compared to policy ranges</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Measure endowment investment performance versus defined benchmarks</td>
<td>Endowment relative investment performance over extended time periods compared to benchmarks</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Research and monitoring of current and prospective investment managers, with recommendations for additions to or removals from the portfolio, as necessary | Record of and meeting notes for contact and monitoring of investment managers  
• Recommendation and approvals of new investments  
• Termination recommendations, as necessary, for existing investments  
• Background research into asset classes and market conditions in support of recommendations | • | |
| 5. Specific portfolio management priorities:  
• Risk premia strategies / hedge fund portfolio strategy  
• Healthcare private equity  
• Active emerging markets manager  
• Venture capital approach  
• Liquid real assets | Completion of research on individual priorities  
• Recommendation of funds / identification of next steps for portfolio priorities | • | |

### Goal 2: Ensure effective and proper governance procedures and policies for the endowment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Planned Improvements and/or Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Distribution, review and updating of investment policies (annually). [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 6] | Policies included for review in Investment Committee meeting early in fiscal year  
• Discussion of policy updates | • | |

---

Appendix 5: Presidential/Institutional and Divisional Assessment Plans

---

Institutional Investments
2. Long-term planning for investment management approach. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 3]

- Develop long range plan to further institutionalize the endowment management process
- Discuss plan with Investment Committee and senior administration
- Develop action items/plan based on results of discussions

- Evaluate our decision-making process and determine if any changes/enhancements should be made based on the information learned during the summer IC session
- Implement changes as necessary

**Goal 3: Manage the operations, administration and communications for the endowment and Investment Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Planned Improvements and/or Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Further development and automation of reporting through endowment administrator</td>
<td>Improved and optimized use of the Conifer system to generate monthly reporting data</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explore further development of the Investment Office website, considering posting of additional information</td>
<td>Expansion of website information, possible shift from use of SharePoint website</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide support for finance department, including audit support and budget support</td>
<td>Completion of audit schedules provided by Investment Office and endowment-related budget information for budget process</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compose the annual letter that reviews the endowment portfolio for the prior fiscal year.</td>
<td>Completion and distribution of endowment letter</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 100% of divisional units (just one, the Investment Office) successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed time frame and a report as prescribed by the IEP and division leader. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]</td>
<td>Number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford Policy. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]</td>
<td>Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.</td>
<td>Qualitative Report</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Division Assessment Plan: Instructional and Information Technology Services (IITS)
Senior Staff Member: Chief Information Officer
Year: 2016-2017

Mission: IITS at Haverford provides our community with consistent, sustainable, reliable and service-oriented technology resources in strategic support of the teaching, learning, research and operational success of the College. Our approach taps the common spirits of creativity, innovation, consensus and collaboration to enhance institutional effectiveness. \[Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 2\]

Functional areas include Instructional Technology, Client Services and Networking, Enterprise Systems, and Core Technologies.

Goal 1: Ensure, in collaboration with others that faculty, staff, and students have access to appropriate, high quality technology in service of teaching and learning. \[Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship\] \[Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 5\]

Objective 1: Collaborate with faculty and staff in VCAM and Sharpless to ensure both buildings open with agreed-upon technology as defined during the planning process. Cross connectors: campus infrastructure.
Metric: cross-check technology infrastructure at opening with specifications in RFP’s and with any changes made during the construction process.

Objective 2: Work with campus partners to deploy, encourage use of, train, and support identified technology, including classroom, lab, and digital media tools, in service of pedagogy.
Metric: Qualitative report indicating support provided to campus partners.

Objective 3: Work with campus partners to ensure existing learning spaces contain appropriate technology, and that spaces are well maintained and functional. Cross connector: campus infrastructure.
Metric: Qualitative summary of replacement cycle work undertaken each year, including the planning and decision process, including IITS contributions to the annual work of various committees and projects devoted to learning spaces.

Goal 2: Ensure that the College’s communications and computing infrastructure meets current needs, anticipates future needs, and is secure. \[Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship\] \[Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 5\]

Objective 1: Partner with campus, particularly the Business Office and Human Resources, to implement Workday and associated policies and procedures.
Metric 1: Percent of modules successfully launched.
Metric 2: Qualitative report discussing revised policies and procedures, initial staff training and areas for follow-up.

**Objective 2:** Implement a major upgrade to Shibboleth, an important authentication tool for campus use and for collaboration, and use where appropriate.

- Metric 1: Successful go-live for IDP3 update, including new authentication screens (successful is that everything that is supposed to work works)
- Metric 2: Hathi Trust authentication brought on line using the new update

**Objective 3:** Continue to modernize campus infrastructure, including re-wiring Founders Hall, bringing a new telephone system on line, and implementing Box.

- Metric: Qualitative report on project completions with go-live/deployment dates and evaluation of systems working as specified.

**Goal 3:** Provide high quality service to campus, including assistance with instructional technology, consulting services, assistance with computing problems, and assistance with enterprise tools and platforms. [Strategic Goal: Institutional Stewardship]

**Objective 1:** Engage in outreach to faculty and provide effective faculty support for integrating technology into their teaching and learning. Contribute to program and support planning for VCAM. [Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 4] Cross-connector: teaching technology infrastructure

- Metric: Qualitative report highlighting faculty outreach efforts, participation in VCAM planning meetings and effectiveness of support plan.

**Objective 2:** Analyze the 2016 edition of MISO, the Measuring Information Services Outcomes survey, and determine how results can be incorporated into division planning process and whether they can be used to identify new collaborative potentials with the library. MISO measures use, importance, and satisfaction with a wide variety of library and IT services and resources.

- Metric: Qualitative summary of MISO outcomes and collaboration potentials.

**Objective 3:** Ensure that campus community technology-related problems are solved effectively and efficiently.

- Metric 1: Client satisfaction survey results from ProDesk,
- Metric 2: Percentage of new solution uptime/downtime within acceptable parameters
- Metric 3: Qualitative reports analyzing major project outcomes.

**Goal 4:** Manage IITS to effectively support the academic mission of the College

**Objective 1:** Effective management of resources for current challenges and preparation for compelling future needs.

- Metric: Qualitative report
Objective 2: Successful implementation and maintenance of policies and procedures
   Metric: Qualitative report.

Objective 3: Steward Board of Managers and consortia relationships to effectively support institutional function. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 6]
   Metric: Qualitative Report

Goal 5: Implement policies and procedures pertaining to planning, assessment, and management. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]

Objective 1: 100% of divisional units successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed timeframe and a report as prescribed by the IEP and division leader.
   Metric 1: number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities.
   Metric 2: number/percentage of units completing annual report
   Metric 3: number/percentage of units having annual review meeting with division leader

Objective 2: 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford Policy.
   Metric: Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete

Objective 3: 100% of divisional units effectively steward financial resources.
   Metric 1: Number/percentage of units operating within current year budget.
   Metric 2: Number/percentage of units submitting timely budget requests aligned with Divisional goals

Objective 4: Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.
   Metric: Qualitative Report
Division Assessment Plan: Student Affairs
Senior Staff Member: Dean of the College
Year: 2016-2017

Mission: The Office of the Dean of the College fosters student development as intentional learners and engaged members of a diverse community and world. Our role is to support students in situating themselves for success in all aspects of their lives while at Haverford, and beyond. The division provides strategic leadership for the residential living learning character of the College, is generally responsible for student life on campus, and coordinates Haverford’s network of academic support and student services. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 2]

The division is organized into ten areas of responsibility:
- Academic Affairs (Registrar, Academic Advising, Fellowship Advising);
- Student Life (Residential Life, Student Activities and Leadership);
- Access, Diversity and Community Initiatives (Multicultural Affairs, International Student Services, Eight Dimension, Access and Disability Services, Women’s Center);
- Athletics;
- International Academic Programs;
- Health Services;
- Counseling and Psychological Services;
- Learning Resources (Office of Academic Resources);
- Career and Professional Advising (Pre-Health Advising);
- First-Year Advising and Programming.

Goal 1: Promote healthy student lives and balanced minds to ensure the well-being of the community and as the foundation for individual learning and personal development.
[Strategic Goal: Educating the Whole Student] [Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 1; Presidential Goal 1, Objective 4]

Objective 1: Lead and support to the offices within the Student Affairs division in delivering appropriate/innovative, effective and timely support services to students.
Metric 1: Qualitative report on covered offices, opportunities for regular communication, issues reported and areas of concern and celebration.
Metric 2: Measures of student satisfaction

Objective 2: Ensure existing support resources are available and known to students, allowing them to take the fullest possible advantage of their Haverford experience.
Metric 1: Analysis of timing and content of messaging to students
Metric 2: Measures of feedback from students
Metric 3: Feedback from and discussion with campus partners

Objective 3: Identify, adapt, and implement student affairs best practices.
Metric: Qualitative report discussing opportunities and initiatives undertaken

Goal 2: Integrate the services and programs across student affairs departments to efficiently support a self-directed and an empowering student experience. [Strategic Goal: Educating the Whole Student]
Objective 1: Encourage the development and delivery of efficient cross-departmental programs
Metric: Qualitative report discussing integrated programs, associated content and communication, program attendance and scheduling strategies

Objective 2: Promote sharing of resources and expertise among Student Affairs offices
Metric: Qualitative report indicating strategies utilized to promote an efficient leveraging of departmental resources

Goal 3: Develop and maintain collaborative partnerships to achieve a seamless learning environment for students that links, aligns, and integrates programmatic and academic endeavors so as to make Haverford’s commitment to the “whole student” a lived reality
[Strategic Goal: Educating the Whole Student] [Links to Presidential Goal 1, Objective 1: Presidential Goal 3, Objective 3]

Objective 1: Facilitate a College-wide team approach to a balanced student experience through the identification of programmatic overlap and the development of synergies across competing divisional offerings and requirements
Metric 1: Qualitative report on cross-divisional collaboration and efficiencies identified and developed across campus divisions
Metric 2: Track and monitor number and nature of collaborative programs and initiatives
Metric 3: Analysis of student and non-student attendance at cross-divisional programs

Objective 2: Partner with campus constituencies to support and continuously improve our comprehensive system of student advising.
Metric: Qualitative report on initiatives

Objective 3: Steward the Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Managers and consortia relationships to effectively support institutional function. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 6]
Metric: Qualitative Report

Goal 4: Lead and monitor progress toward the student-affairs aspirations outlined in the College’s Strategic Plan [Strategic Goal: Educating the Whole Student] [Links to Presidential Goal 4, Objective 1: Presidential Goal 4, Objective 3]

Objective 1: Effectively articulate and link divisional priorities, projects, and initiatives to Strategic Plan goals and objectives. [Links to Presidential Goal 4, Objective 2]
Metric: Qualitative report on linkages between divisional priorities, programs and initiatives and the strategic plan

Objective 2: Undertake regular consideration of resources available for elements of the Plan as the College’s situation evolves, as well as re-assessment/realignment as appropriate.
Metric: Qualitative report on the leveraging of resources

Goal 5: Support student-affairs staff in managing workload and the physical/emotional challenges associated with working closely with students in a wide range of settings

Objective 1: Ensure that departmental goals are known, achievable and appropriate.
Metric 1: Assessment of departmental accomplishments
Metric 2: Assessment of departmental and staff time management
Objective 2: Coordinate departmental workload within the division
   Metric 1: Monitor the nature and number of programs offered and functions undertaken by each department
   Metric 2: Analysis and discussion of task assignments among and within departments

Objective 3: Provide interpersonal and developmental support for staff, including structured opportunities for information-sharing, debriefing, and the time and resources for professional development.
   Metric: Qualitative report

Goal 6: Implement policies and procedures pertaining to planning, assessment, and management. [Links to Presidential Goal 2, Objective 5]

Objective 1: 100% of divisional units successfully produce goals, objectives, metrics within prescribed timeframe and a report as prescribed by the IE plan and division leader
   Metric 1: number/percentage of units appropriately revising departmental goals/objectives based on institutional priorities
   Metric 2: number/percentage of units completing annual report
   Metric 3: number/percentage of units having annual DAP review meeting with division leader

Objective 2: 100% of divisional units successfully complete employee performance evaluations as prescribed by Haverford Policy
   Metric: Number/percentage of divisional employee evaluations complete

Objective 3: 100% of divisional units effectively steward financial resources
   Metric 1: Number/percentage of units operating within current year budget.
   Metric 2: Number/percentage of units submitting timely budget requests aligned with Divisional goals.

Objective 4: Annually reflect on the Culture of Evidence Continuum and strive, where appropriate, to move programs and departments toward a Culture of Evidence, and at a minimum strengthen a Culture of Strategy.
   Metric: Qualitative Report
The College commences all new budgeting processes for the next fiscal year with two crucial starting points: first, what is actually occurring in expenses and revenues “on the ground” on-campus; and second, what is the College’s long term plan (articulated by the Plan for Haverford 2020) included in the 10-year budget model (discussed further below). The 10-year model is one of the more tangible and direct connections of a strong link between the College’s budgeting process and its institutional planning.

Haverford uses a modified “incremental” budgeting system--meaning some lines increase to accommodate inflation, some begin at zero, and some remain flat. The faculty, administration and staff review all expenditures at a departmental level in the first instance, plus some expense categories--such as salary, benefits, and R&R--are reviewed across the institution by a) the budgeting team, b) Senior Staff and c) the Administrative Advisory Committee (AAC). Automatic increases to budget lines for operating expenses are not provided. Rather, each department makes expenditure decisions locally and, as undertaken by IITS for FY16 budgeting, may employ a zero-based budgeting approach within the department in order to allocate constrained resources consistent with the institution’s plan and mission.

Following the priorities of the College and the multi-year strategic planning process, departments are permitted and encouraged to request additional funding for strategic initiatives that support the stated goals of the College. Forms are completed by the department and submitted as follows: new funding requests are first presented to the department’s Senior Staff member (e.g. the head of the operating or academic division) who further prioritizes the requests and advances the program for consideration in the next operating budget. These initiatives and new expenditures are discussed at both AAC and by the College’s Senior Staff, who both prioritize and recommends funds for those that are in support of, and consistent with, the short-term and longer-term strategic plan. The President reviews the needs in total and confirms alignment of the budgeting requests and the initiatives with the institutional plan.

Process Overview
The budget process is, largely, a continuous effort throughout the year to confirm that the goals and initiatives of the institution are captured within the operating budget.

In creating a new budget for the next year, during late summer and early fall, the prior year results are analyzed. Areas of significant budget variance in income or expense are reviewed further to determine if the future year budget figures should incorporate new revenue and expense levels. Current year and prior variances will be reviewed in order to determine whether such variances were anomalies and one-time events or were likely, instead, to continue as the new expected revenue or expense level at the given
programming assumption. Department chairs and directors, Senior Staff, and budget staff monitor the current year operating budget as it compares to actual figures throughout the year.

During the late Fall and Winter, the operating budget for the upcoming year is developed and the 10-year budget projection is reviewed and revised. The 10-year model is the cornerstone of the College’s forward-looking budgeting to make sure that both near term and longer term needs and expectations are correctly captured in the plan. Long term initiatives are incorporated into the 10-year model, and in FY16, the 10-year model was updated to include estimated GAAP projections.

For example, if the College were to plan to increase its enrollment, that assumption would be discussed in-depth and if it were to proceed (including all of the associated complications and factors) the initiative would then be used as the new assumption for the 10-year model. Similarly, if the College elected to add new faculty lines, those positions would be incorporated, as and when appropriate, into the 10-year model. If new buildings and campaign support were planned, those incremental costs and revenues would be included. If positions or programs were to be halted, those assumptions would be captured, as well. The 10-year model is updated several times over the course of each year, presented to the Board and becomes the base for the next year’s budget. When implemented correctly, new assumptions, initiatives and long term planning are the fundamental elements for the 10-year model. Naturally, the 10-year model is comprehensive and many categories of revenues and expenses, operating, capital and other non-operating are all built into the model. The 10-year model connects long term planning with budgeting and the model itself becomes the base for the next year’s budget. Unless changed by future action or Board direction, assumptions built into future years roll-forward as those dates for implementation arrive.

Creating Next Year’s Budget
The AVP and Controller of the College prepares and distributes the budget climate memo and request forms to all departments. The budget request forms cover operating funds, staffing, and student wages. Historical information is available via Kuali Financial systems. Requests for increases in operating resources to meet strategic College objectives which are supported by departmental goals and objectives will be prioritized and should be supported by evidence. Requests for new non-faculty staff positions must be carefully justified. When a person departs, a replacement request must be submitted. This process allows the College the opportunity to either: a) replace the departure with a new employee in a similar position, or b) alter the position and re-allocate the funds and the FTE to a new higher-priority within the department that better advances the mission or supports the institution, or c) the position (FTE and funding) may be re-assigned to another priority-area of the College, or d) close the position or leave it vacant for an extended period. This process permits the President of the College and Senior Staff to be sure that not only are new resources fully aligned with the mission and long term plans but existing resources are reviewed and may be reallocated as well. A key question in replacing the person or
reassigning the position is how the position allocation advances the College’s goal or the criticality of the mission.

Important operating expenses are carried forward each year but are still reviewed in-depth for competitiveness, equity, resource allocation and relative position. These budgets are often based on last year’s results, plus an increment if the need is critical, and changes due to actual results. These expense categories often include student charges, salary pools, and the discount rate. Benefit rates and program design for all employees may be similar to the previous category of expenses but often are reviewed separately. The Working Group on Benefits, another administrative, faculty and staff committee (without student representation), delves in-depth into benefit programs, expenses and cost-shares, forecasting and program design. The Working Group on Benefits recommends changes, if any, to the President of the College and to Senior Staff on these topics.

The budget development process entails the use of both Excel spreadsheets and macros that are not integrated with the Kuali Financial System or with an HR/Payroll database. With the implementation of Workday, we expect that the budget process will change for development of the FY19 budget. The current budget development spreadsheets are integrated with the 10-year budget model, which allows for review of the long-term impact of a change in budget parameters and to confirm that changes in the near term budget are not missed within the 10-year model.

**Budget Cycle and Features**

Below is a general description of the budget cycle as well as the College’s budgeting principles and the charge to the AAC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July-September</td>
<td>● Faculty compensation spreadsheet is finalized for upload to Kuali Financial Systems (KFS) through FY17; Workday (WD) for FY18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Calculations for medical premiums and cost-sharing are completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Draft of EOY budget report is prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● AAC meetings begin in September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>● EOY budget report is finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Budget planning spreadsheet and 10-year model are updated to include EOY actual figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Background materials for budget requests (staffing, student wages, operating history) are prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Endowment spending for upcoming year is calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● AAC reviews EOY budget report, assumptions for the major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>- Budget planning spreadsheet is updated to include department requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AAC and senior staff review major budget parameters and suggest revisions, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AAC and senior staff discuss requests for additional staffing and requests from various areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>- Budget requests are reviewed with appropriate senior staff and directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cash flow (from working capital) projections and capital expenditures for sources and uses of funds are managed consistent with the draft budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget planning spreadsheet is updated / revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AAC and senior staff continue to review progress and suggest revisions to parameters and funding priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>- End of December budget-to-actual performance is reviewed and appropriate action is taken for significant variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget planning spreadsheet is finalized with balanced revenue / expense for upcoming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Capital expenditures and long term budgeting is refined with debt assumptions, cash flow forecasts and philanthropic support targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget recommendation is prepared for February Finance Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget presentation is prepared for review by AAC, Board of Managers, and campus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>- Recommended draft operating budget is presented to Board of Managers for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Long term goals are reviewed and captured in the budget within the near term operating parameters and then assigned to future year’s planning if not included in the near term budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Draft operating budget is continually refined and presented to AAC, Senior Staff and the Working Group on Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>- Based on ongoing review, feedback and alignment, adjustments are made for the upcoming year’s operating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foundations of Budgeting
Several principles (discussed in detail below) were developed over decades of constructing operating budgets at Haverford College. Past long range planning and Board of Managers committees have also articulated a series of specific statements of policy. Together they are another basis for connecting long term goals and plans with budgeting procedures and mechanics.

As an essential foundation, Haverford recognizes and embraces the critical importance of a budgeting process that is fully collaborative and inclusive. The long-standing and fundamental role of the AAC (a representative group of faculty, staff, administrators, and students) is at the heart of this process. See further description of AAC below. Periodically, AAC hosts open meetings, such as those of FY16 and FY17.

Second, open and candid conversations that occur within Senior Staff meetings confirm organizational priorities and institutional cohesiveness in the budgeting process. The President’s role as the principal decision-maker in approving and directing resource allocation and revenue targets establish near and intermediate-term objectives for the College. The President also is instrumental in directing the growth of programs and the creation of new initiatives, in capital spending and campaign goals, and in long term
planning.

Finally, the budget that is agreed-to by the College community is then discussed and reviewed by the members of the Finance Committee and the full Board to confirm the College’s immediate, short term and long institutional priorities and Haverford’s direction. In some cases, the direction and assumptions are multi-generational, such as those related to campaigns, building programs, focus on affordability, and endowment spending and investments.

**Budgeting Principles**
The resources allocated through the budgeting process should directly align with the priorities of the College and advance the College’s mission. Our budgeting principles include:

First, the operating budget (Non-GAAP) must be presented and constructed to be balanced each fiscal year. To do so, the College must be able to reasonably project that the growth of future revenue streams will increase at least at the same rate as expenditures so that Haverford is in financial equilibrium. In extremely challenging times, the Board may approve an exception to this primary objective, if necessary. In such cases, the assumption is founded on the potential for irreparable harm to the institution if significant disinvestment and budget cuts occurred in too short a period of time.

Second, the College should invest in and sustain Haverford’s human capital. As a labor intensive teaching organization, Haverford can only remain a superior academic institution consistent with the people it employs. As the College operates in a highly competitive environment for attracting and retaining the best people—faculty, staff, administrators and professionals, investment in people remains a high priority through careful benchmarking and optimization.

Third, the College must maintain and grow its capital stock. Equilibrium analysis suggests that the College must budget sufficient funds in the operating budget to maintain its physical plant in prime condition, offsetting the effects of capital consumption (wear and tear, and obsolescence). Haverford should also attempt to budget adequately for equipment needs on an annual basis, including the growing needs of information technology.

On the revenue side of its capital stock, the College should attempt to balance the needs of current generations of students with those of future generations by spending annually from the Endowment at or below levels that preserve the purchasing power of that Endowment. That is, the standard spend rate should be equal to, no more than, the total long return forecast and the actual return results over a long time, using a market value smoothing basis as appropriate, and net of all fees and net of inflation, considering net additions or deductions.
Fourth, the College attempts to provide access to a Haverford education to the most highly qualified students regardless of their ability to pay. The College’s primary means of doing so is to maintain policies of need-blind admission and meet the need of all regularly admitted students. The College should also be sensitive to total student charges and the growth rate thereof.

To ensure the long-term financial health of Haverford, tradeoffs among these competing demands must be made based on the best judgments of the administration, AAC, and the Finance Committee of the Board of Managers. Furthermore, AAC members are expected to provide updates on the progress of the budget construction to their various campus constituencies during the year.

**Capital Budgeting**

The College has not historically used a capital budgeting process, although components of one have been included recently and are outlined in the table above. In the past, both large and small investments in the physical plant were made from three sources: a) operating transfers, b) new philanthropic support and capital campaign receipts, and c) external funding including bonded debt. Transfers from the operating expenses were directed to the typical renewal and replacement expenses of the physical facilities. These expenses included both operating and non-operating expenses. The capital expenditures paid from the operating account were offsets to lifecycle and depreciation expenses, under GAAP, but the allocation of these dollars were not tied to depreciation.

The College continues to use the Long Term Planning Summary. The Long Term Planning Summary is presented at each meeting of both the Property Committee and the Finance Committee of the Board, and periodically to Senior Staff. The summary includes data regarding timing/phasing, potential costs, potential sources of capital and relative priority as directed by the institutional collectively. The timing, scope, phasing and prioritization outlined in the Long Term Planning Summary is also influenced by on-campus committees, including ASPC (Academic Space Planning Committee) and CSPEC (College Space Planning Executive Committee). CSPEC considers all buildings on-campus, optimal utilization, efficiency and coordinated utilization to advance the College’s mission consistent with the approved Strategic Plan.

From this data and direction, the capital budgeting process and long term planning is a collaborative effort that further combines proposed funding strategies with Institutional Advancement support.

The College’s ongoing migration to a GAAP-based budgeting approach includes increased investment in R&R needs for facilities and IITS, as well as principal repayment for debt. This approach will further encourage the connection between the operating budget and long term institutional planning.
Administrative Advisory Committee (AAC)
The Administrative Advisory Committee offers advice to the President and other senior Administrators on all matters relating to the financial health and operation of the College.

This responsibility includes:

• Participation in the preparation of the annual budget for the coming fiscal year and a review of the previous year’s performance. As part of this process, AAC reviews data pertaining to all of the major areas of revenue and expenditure and gives its advice as to the proper balance between competing needs;

• Review of progress towards the College’s long term plans;
• Review of general salary and fringe benefit policies;
• Advice on planning for and maintenance of the College’s buildings and grounds; and,
• Review of the College’s development priorities and plans.

The AAC membership, representative of the institution broadly, includes one faculty member from each division (of whom one is chair and one is designated chair-elect), three students, two representatives of the Staff Association, one representative of the Dean’s office, the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, the Budget Director, the Chief Investment Officer, the Provost, the Associate Provost, and the President ex-officio.

Subcommittee on Faculty Compensation, Study, and Research.
The Faculty members of AAC form a separate Subcommittee on Faculty Compensation, Study, and Research. The Subcommittee meets occasionally to advise the Provost and the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, as appropriate, on matters where faculty concern is strong such as:
• Faculty salary administration and compensation policy;
• Research and travel funds;
• The environment for faculty research and study; and,
• Faculty housing.

The Subcommittee coordinates its advice with that of the Faculty Affairs and Planning Committee (FAPC), especially in areas where there are significant budgetary implications.
Institutional Learning Goals, General Education Requirements and the MSCHE Proficiencies

In Spring of 2010, the Board of Managers and the Faculty endorsed a set of institutional learning goals that a Haverford education is designed to achieve. This document, our "Educational Goals and Aspirations," continues to evolve as faculty consider and articulate the many facets of a Haverford education. It affirms the following broad aspirations for our students:

**Mastery and Critique**

Haverford College's curriculum is designed not only to help students acquire a particular body of knowledge but to develop the capacity to learn, to understand, to make sound and thoughtful judgments, and to balance creativity and analysis. Within each discipline, academic work evolves from the mastery of key concepts through critical analysis to active participation in the construction of scholarship. This intellectual preparation culminates in our academic requirement that each senior produce a piece of independent work in the form of a senior thesis or project. Students cultivate the ability to critique and analyze primary texts, to appreciate theoretical rigor, and to learn through observation, experiment, or empirical methods, as appropriate. Students thus gain mastery of their chosen disciplines.

**Ownership, Contribution, and Accountability**

In all disciplines, students are expected to contribute original ideas for which they are accountable. They learn to present and defend their ideas both orally and in writing. Students are encouraged to interrogate and articulate why they think what they think, both inside and outside of the classroom.

**Translation and Interpretation**

Students engage in acts of translation, interpretation, and cultural inquiry in every area of their studies. These intellectual habits encourage students to formulate questions, explore areas of difference, and understand their own positions vis-à-vis various forms of history, politics and knowledge. Such practices develop models of reading and analysis that illuminate students' scholarship and judgments across disciplines and contexts.

**Breadth and Depth**

In addition to mastering a discipline, all students are required to acquaint themselves with the breadth of intellectual approaches exemplified in the classic divisions of natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities; they must have experience of a second language and acquire quantitative skills. As distinctions among the divisions continue to blur, students are encouraged to explore interdisciplinarity through minors and areas of concentration.

**Communication and Representation**

All academic majors require students to communicate and represent ideas in modes that are appropriate to the discipline. The primary form of communication is often written prose, but students also learn to express themselves and their original contributions in a variety of presentation forms (e.g., oral, artistic, creative). A College Writing requirement is implemented during the first year to ensure that all students enter their academic disciplines with basic skills of written argument and persuasion.

**Non doctior, sed meliore doctrina imbutus**

Our Quaker heritage is expressed in the Haverford motto: "Not more learned, but imbued with better learning." We offer our students many opportunities to engage fundamental issues of inequality and
social justice. The college encourages students to put learning into action for greater ethical purposes. Our Quaker principles turn classrooms into communities where faculty and students learn from each other, and where all voices are heard. In such contexts, students and faculty alike become better thinkers, listeners and speakers, making them partners in the creation of knowledge.

Our General Education Requirements encourage students to address these goals through a process of advised selection and systematic exploration. Each student takes a First-Year Writing Seminar in their first year—a course of seminal importance as a space for strategies of written and oral expression in a small, focused class of fellow beginning students. Over the course of the four years they also must take a full year of a new language and must take a course that grapples with the challenges of quantitative reasoning.

Each student must take also three courses from each of the three academic divisions of the College (Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences), representing at least six different departments. No more than 13 courses can be in the student’s major (thus 19 must come from beyond it; courses chosen to complement their special fields of interest). In all of this they are advised by peers, deans, and faculty (one advisor for years 1-2, then a major advisor for years 3-4).

Taken together, this combination of courses ensure that students will explore the curriculum in a balanced way, encountering ideas of interest through a variety of disciplinary lenses, and thus honing critical perspectives on their chosen areas of intellectual and creative activity as they culminate in the ‘mastery and critique’ to which they aspire in their Senior Capstone Projects.

Regarded from the standpoint of the MSCHE Proficiencies, we see our institutional goals and general education requirements in the following light:

**Oral and Written Communication** is aligned with our **Communication and Representation** and **Ownership, Contribution, and Accountability** goals. They are encountered by students in courses throughout the divisions, and in our required Freshman Writing Program. It is also encountered in courses that fulfill our Non-English Language requirement.

**Scientific Method** is aligned with both our **Breadth and Depth** category, and also via the aim of **Mastery and Critique**, ensured as they are by the range of courses that each student must take in courses among the Natural Sciences, and also in methodologically scientific courses such as Linguistics.

**Quantitative Reasoning** is likewise aligned with several of the large goals articulated above, including **Communication and Representation** (particularly with respect to symbolic notations), and with **Breadth and Depth** (since students apply quantitative tools in a variety of contexts). Foundations for these approaches are developed in courses that fulfill our Quantitative Reasoning requirement.

**Critical Analysis** is key to each of our Institutional Learning Goals, particularly the themes of **Mastery and Critique** and **Translation and Interpretation**, which are encouraged at all stages of the curriculum, culminating with work in the senior year. Critical analysis occurs in all disciplines, and thus is ensured by our Divisional Requirements.

**Information Literacy** is a key skill of a liberal arts education, affording students access to data, primary texts, and secondary literature of each discipline. The foundations of this work are established in the Freshman Writing Program, then developed at intermediate and advanced levels in the individual departments. Information literacy is also a crucial part of our Quantitative Requirement, which introduces students to the challenges of interpreting the structure and meaning of numerical data.
Technological Competency is often a matter of knowing the right tool for the job, how to select it, and how to interpret the results it produces. As such it aligns with Breadth and Depth (as students encounter the tools deployed in different disciplines), with Translation and Interpretation (since the products of technologies are invariably subject to examination), and Critical Analysis (through which students question the basis of the assumptions behind the tool itself, no less than the evidence that it produces). Students become competent with various technologies of knowledge production mainly in courses in the Natural Sciences, and in courses in the Fine and Performing Arts.
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Anthropology

The anthropology major teaches students the methods of social and cultural research and analysis and introduces them to the history of anthropology. Students are encouraged to think critically and self-reflectively about several areas of intellectual inquiry, including:

The discipline of anthropology:

- To understand the unique contribution that anthropology makes to the study of the social, and addresses the most pressing issues of our times.
- To learn how to situate strange and familiar social practices and cultural categories in shifting and contingent historical, economic, and political formations and structures.
- To recognize the impact of the position of the scholar in the production of knowledge.
- To know the key figures in anthropology and their specific theoretical, methodological, and empirical contributions to the history and development of the discipline.
- To understand key contemporary debates in the field and how older notions of race, culture, nation, and language have shaped recent theoretical innovations.
- To be familiar with the subfields of the discipline (e.g., political and legal anthropology, medical anthropology, the anthropology of religion, environmental anthropology, etc.) and their contributions to knowledge.

The craft and theory of anthropological research:

- To have first-hand experience of data-collection methods, including ethnographic field research, interviewing, and archival research.
- To understand the ethical obligations of an ethnographic researcher and to be able to engage others with respect and compassion.
- To be versed in the ethnographic record of more than one society; to develop a capacity to think comparatively across cultures; to problematize and analyze familiar practice and “common sense” in a new light.
- To understand the relationship between theory and empirical data, i.e.:
  - how specific anthropologists have used theory to interpret and explain social and cultural formations, and
  - how particular ethnographic situations and circumstances have allowed or required specific anthropologists to revise, critique, and improve theoretical models.
To understand ethnography as a methodology and a genre of writing.

The basic skills of anthropological writing and communicating anthropological knowledge:

- To be able to write a critical essay, a field note, an academic book review, and a review of the literature for a topic of anthropological interest.
- To understand the difference between a scholarly argument that proves a particular point (interpretive, explanatory), and an argument that advocates an attitude or action.
- To be able to construct a sound argument supported by evidence and to be able to engage in scholarly debate.
- To understand the diverse media and forums through which anthropological knowledge is communicated to the public.

Peace, Justice and Human Rights

Students who complete the Interdisciplinary Concentration in Peace, Justice and Human Rights will possess:

- knowledge of the various schools of thought and modes of practice of peace, justice and human rights.
- familiarity with diverse approaches to conflict and peace.
- fluency with various schools of ethical and legal thought.
- understanding of the complexity of international and domestic issues of peace, justice and human rights.
- confidence in the ability to understand and analyze philosophical and practical problems, and come up with creative solutions to these problems.
- good oral and written communication skills, gained through discussion of ideas, the practice of writing, and the practices of speaking and teaching, commenting on the work of peers, and revision of work over time.
- a working sense of the ways in which theory and practice are different but inseparable.
- ability to formulate and advance original arguments about issues of peace, justice and human rights.
- sensitivity to the different factors affecting reception of arguments about divisive or emergent issues.
- experience with field methods, archival research, practical internships or other work or study outside of the traditional classroom setting.
- insight into what interdisciplinary study entails and how it complements or augments work within the disciplines, including a sense of the differing methodological approaches: historical/archival, philosophical, legal, ethnographic, institutional, textual.
aptitude for communicating and collaborating with peers—and audiences in the wider world—whose disciplinary language, values and methodological concerns differ.

- humility with regard to the complexity of conflict and its resolution.

**Religion**

The Haverford religion major is unique in that it provides students with a comprehensive curriculum that includes carefully designed areas of concentrations, specialized coursework, supervised research, a lengthy written research product, and a departmental oral conversation with the entire department as the minimum requirements for fulfilling the major. Through coursework, senior thesis research, and the Tri-College Senior Colloquium with Swarthmore and Bryn Mawr Colleges, the department seeks to fulfill the following learning goals:

- Expose students to the central ideas, debates, scholars, methods, historiography, and approaches to the academic study of religion.
- Analyze key terms and categories in the study of religion, and utilize the diverse vocabularies deployed among a range of scholars in religion and related fields.
- Develop critical thinking, analytical writing, and sustained engagement in theory and method, together with the critical competence to engage sacred texts, images, ideas and practices.
- Cultivate the learning environment as an integrative and collaborative process.
- Expand intellectual opportunities for students to broaden and critically assess their worldviews.
- Encourage students to supplement their work in religion with elective languages (Arabic, Chinese, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi/Urdu, Japanese, Latin, Sanskrit, Yoruba).
- Foster interdisciplinary methods and perspectives in the study of religion, while continuing to model this through the curriculum.
- Prepare students for professional careers, for graduate studies in religion or related fields, and for leadership roles as reflective, critically-aware human beings.

Like other liberal arts majors, the religion major is meant to prepare students for a broad array of vocational possibilities. Religion majors typically find careers in law, public service (including both religious and secular organizations), medicine, business, ministry, and education. Religion majors have also pursued advanced graduate degrees in anthropology, history, political science, biology, Near Eastern studies, and religious studies.
1. Critical Analysis and Synthesis
2. Oral Communication
3. Quantitative Reasoning
4. Scientific Method
5. Written Communication
6. Non-English Language
7. Artistic Craft and Vision
8. Information Literacy
9. Technological Competency
10. Ethics, Personal Responsibility, Professional Conduct

1. CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation:</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issue or Formulation of Problem</td>
<td>Issue/problem is stated without clarification or description.</td>
<td>Issue/problem is stated but description leaves many terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries or limits undetermined.</td>
<td>Issue/problem is stated, described, and clarified; the possibilities of the argument or proof are not seriously impeded by omissions.</td>
<td>Issue/problem is articulated in a comprehensive, integrated way, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Evidence | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. | Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence in the literature is taken as fact, without question.</th>
<th>Evidence in the literature is taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.</th>
<th>Evidence in the literature is questioned and weighed thoroughly in the course of the work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coherent analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td>Synthesis. Evidence in the literature is subject to questioning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Context and Assumptions

| Shows little awareness of present assumptions. Student's perspective is simplistic, obvious or unexamined. | Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa). | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position. |

### Conclusions

| Conclusion absent or poorly tied to the evidence at hand, or departs wildly from relevant issue. | Conclusion is logically tied to information in a basic way, but the whole offers no new insight or perspective on the issue or question. | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical, reflecting reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order. |

### Oral Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation:</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>The main claim is incoherent or self contradictory. Claims are asserted rather than argued (i.e., not supported by textual, or graphical.</td>
<td>The argument's main claims and reasons are discernible but not organized as well as they could be. Reasons may not be compelling or may not support the whole.</td>
<td>The argument is clear and well supported and the speaker has given adequate thought to how to present it to an audience.</td>
<td>The logic of the argument is solid and is articulated clearly. Claims are backed by good reasons and supported with evidence or examples. The overall argument is organized so that the audience can...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Argument.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough consideration has been given to possible objections or alternative viewpoints.</td>
<td>follow it easily. The presentation is lucid and professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Selection of supporting materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing or poorly selected texts, images and graphs, or to explain representation of data and processes</td>
<td>Makes appropriate use of images and graphs or other supporting materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images, graphs, and other supporting materials are expertly explained and deployed in the context of the presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>The speaker does not engage with the audience or has clearly not prepared in advance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The speaker hasn't given enough thought to structure and audience engagement.</td>
<td>The speaker maintains a conversational style and reasonable eye contact with audience. The presentation is reasonably well organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker has given thought to how to engage an audience right away and then keep them engaged, and has also anticipated areas of confusion or disagreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Incapable of answering questions in coherent ways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some capacity to answer questions</td>
<td>Answers most questions in way that shows decent understanding of the material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers post presentation questions completely and succinctly, stimulating much discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Quantitative Reasoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application/Analysis:</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>Attempts with minimal success to describe assumptions, or fails to address assumptions altogether.</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions.</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why assumptions are appropriate.</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses Tools</td>
<td>Applies wrong tool, or method restricted to only one tool where multiple tools are needed</td>
<td>Deploys the correct tool(s), but only once directed to the right one</td>
<td>Reasonable choice of tools for different types of questions</td>
<td>Uses multiple tools to analyze subtle situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeated errors in programming, calculation, or estimation</td>
<td>Programming, calculation, or estimation have some errors, but are mostly correct</td>
<td>Competent and reliable programming, calculation, estimation</td>
<td>Creative application of tools beyond uses encountered in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery of tools and routines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Draws incorrect conclusions about what the information derived from the tools might mean</td>
<td>Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information derived from quantitative tools</td>
<td>Provides mostly accurate explanations of information derived from quantitative tools</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information derived from quantitative tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No attempt to connect results to the problem at hand</td>
<td>Limited sense of how to connect or apply the results to the problem</td>
<td>Connects results to problem in a reasonable way</td>
<td>Makes incisive inferences based on that information with respect to problem at hand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Communication
- Quantitative or logical results not linked by coherent narrative
- Minimal narrative explanation connects quantitative or logical results to the questions posed, but in a way that remains unconvincing
- Coherent narrative explains results
- Stated conclusions are reasonable in light of the evidence and methods
- Results smoothly and professionally embedded in prose narrative
- Conclusions expressed clearly, and backed up with multiple threads of evidence

### 4. Scientific Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation:</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Formulation and Testing, Understanding of Motivation or Purpose of the Experiment</td>
<td>Research question is not testable; background context is either missing or misconstrued, inaccurate or superficial</td>
<td>Background context is poorly developed and/or some aspects of the research question are not amenable to the empirical method</td>
<td>A research question that can be tested and is fairly well contextualized within the past literature</td>
<td>Develops and articulates testable hypotheses that are well contextualized within the past literature, demonstrating depth of thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical Method</td>
<td>Lack of internal validity and empirical control such that any results/conclusions are suspect</td>
<td>Some but not full attention to rigor of empirical method and internal validity</td>
<td>Empirical rigor is reasonable but not exceptional</td>
<td>Designs and conducts a rigorously conceived empirical study to test the stated hypotheses, using methods that are normative within that discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative &amp; analytic scientific tools and techniques</td>
<td>Statistical techniques are inappropriate and/or incorrectly implemented many research questions are not statistically addressed</td>
<td>Statistical techniques are mainly appropriate, but fail to address all research questions of interest</td>
<td>Statistical techniques are well chosen, and most of the important research questions have been addressed</td>
<td>Selects and implements the appropriate statistical techniques to test the stated research hypotheses and thoroughly addressing all questions of interest with depth of thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation of Results</td>
<td>Tables, figures and other graphical representations and/or equations and an accompanying description are poorly made or labeled, and confuse rather than instruct</td>
<td>Tables, figures and other graphical representations are not professional and/or self explanatory; Results recorded but lacking any annotation or notes</td>
<td>Tables, figures and other graphical representations are professional and visually pleasing, but do not always tie to the arguments and hypotheses being tested; Data recorded and labelled with notes</td>
<td>Relates the results of the study using correct scheme of representation, e.g. statistical notation, graph, or other symbolic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation and Conclusions</td>
<td>Either doesn't realize what claims have already been made, or makes no effort to situate claims in their context; Lacks some important knowledge of relevant history and current debates, but showed some understanding of the need for theory or method; Conclusion presentation as a restatement of the observations</td>
<td>Shows an understanding of relevant history and current debates, and understanding of relevant theory or method; Conclusions presented with some suggestions for next steps noted</td>
<td>Interprets the results relative to the initial research hypotheses, past research findings, and or relevant theoretical frameworks; Succinct recap of the experiment with reflections on purpose, suggestions and thoughts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 9: General Education Assessment Rubrics

#### Evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose, Relevance, Focus</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text is inappropriate for the job, revealing scant understanding of readings. Central claim too obvious or too odd to motivate intended</td>
<td>Text responds adequately to the topic, but the claim advanced is unambitious. Thesis is murky, limited, or scattered</td>
<td>Offers a thoughtful response to the issue at hand, making a viable claim. The writer has something at stake, some promising</td>
<td>The essay grapples with an important issue for analysis or debate, and responds with insight. The writer makes a perceptive contribution to the intellectual conversation at hand. Exceptional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Development of Evidentiary Chain</td>
<td>Organization is haphazard, without logic or order, ignoring needs of readers for clear scheme of argumentation. Evidence missing, incomplete, unreliable, and are mismatched to claims.</td>
<td>The structure fits the purpose reasonably well, with an arrangement that is typical but no more than that. Includes enough evidence to make a competent case, moving between generalities and particulars in an acceptable way.</td>
<td>Arrangement is logical and thoughtful, respecting disciplinary conventions, with useful navigational clues. Readers don't feel lost. Selects and deploys evidence convincingly, with details that deepen the argument or narrative. Readers are drawn in and convinced.</td>
<td>The design is purposeful, leading readers through the text without hesitation. The piece does not just follow disciplinary conventions, but also innovates as needed. Anticipates alternate perspectives and counter arguments. The evidence is complete, reliable, and compelling, here marshalled to support and amplify key points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured and Logical Argumentation</td>
<td>Attempt at logical argument lacks coherence and/or fails to follow conventions of logical argumentation in the discipline in question. Logical flow of argument can be discerned, but some deviation from conventions of logical argumentation in the discipline in question.</td>
<td>Logical argument is coherent and largely follows the conventions of logical argumentation in the discipline in question.</td>
<td>Logical argumentation is elegant and shows mastery of the conventions of logical argumentation in the discipline in question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style, Editing, Conventions</td>
<td>Problems on each page. Source attribution missing or seriously flawed. Surface problems impede comprehension and frustrate readers, with tangled and obscure prose. Multiple grammatical or spelling errors. Prose is readable but flat or choppy, dull or bureaucratic in tone. Occasional distracting errors (odd phrasing or word choice, flawed punctuation). Source documentation present but does not follow disciplinary standards consistently.</td>
<td>Prose is controlled and lean, with purposeful transitions and some compelling turns of phrase. The text meets expectations of the disciplinary audience, but it also has occasional typos, awkward phrases, etc. Documentation follows disciplinary standards.</td>
<td>Eloquent prose, with wellcrafted sentences, varied pacing and transitions. Writer adopts stance well tuned to expectations of audience, but with distinctive voice. Seamless grammar, syntax, word choice, edited with precision. Impeccable documentation of sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Non-English Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation:</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary and Grammar</td>
<td>Does not understand basic vocabulary; grammar confused, confusing.</td>
<td>Masters basic vocabulary; manages simple sentences correctly.</td>
<td>Has a good command of vocabulary; can manage complex sentences.</td>
<td>Has a wide vocabulary, including unusual or technical words. Can manage complex sentences and strings of sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>Cannot grasp general meanings.</td>
<td>Gets the gist of things.</td>
<td>Can understand advanced concepts.</td>
<td>Can understand allusive language, idioms, poetic language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken Communication</td>
<td>Uses simple or broken phrases, cannot complete sentences, is repetitive, stops and starts.</td>
<td>Uses simple sentences correctly.</td>
<td>Uses simple sentences correctly, strings them together, occasionally uses complex sentence structure.</td>
<td>Can use complex sentence structure, can use language creatively and confidently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>Uses simple or broken phrases, cannot complete sentences, is repetitive, stops and starts.</td>
<td>Uses simple sentences correctly.</td>
<td>Uses simple sentences correctly, strings them together, occasionally uses complex sentence structure.</td>
<td>Can use complex sentence structure, can use language creatively and confidently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthography and Graphical Conventions</td>
<td>Inadequate command of basic graphical system</td>
<td>Marginal command of graphical system</td>
<td>Adequate command of graphical system</td>
<td>Advanced understanding of the graphical system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for non-Roman alphabets)</td>
<td>system</td>
<td>Can read and write in the relevant script, but without fluidity or unreliably</td>
<td>Can read and write reliably</td>
<td>Can read and write with fluidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Shows little awareness of another culture in its own terms.</td>
<td>Demonstrates some awareness of another culture in its own terms.</td>
<td>Is generally aware of another culture in its own terms.</td>
<td>Demonstrates appropriate awareness of another culture in its own terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Artistic Craft and Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation:</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure and style</strong></td>
<td>Lacks stylistic or structural cohesion, no engagement with historical or artistic models</td>
<td>Shows basic craft, but nothing more, in terms of scope and concept</td>
<td>Shows promise and ambition in terms of scope and overall conception relative to genre</td>
<td>Substantive in scope, in terms of size, duration and genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent style and not well integrated structure</td>
<td>Style aligns with models, but not always consistent</td>
<td>Some good understanding of models</td>
<td>Has stylistic and structural integrity, demonstrates an awareness of models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not fully conversant with models</td>
<td>Exhibits a distinctive creative voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idea/Concept</strong></td>
<td>No guiding conception or idea behind the work</td>
<td>The work is based on elementary research, shows some understanding of the underlying conceptual framework, and shows a basic development of an</td>
<td>The student has an understanding of the historical and cultural context for the work, and while lacking innovation takes a</td>
<td>The work shows a strong conception and guiding set of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Technical Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The work shows poor command of technique appropriate to the medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The work shows command in the basic technical skills and craft appropriate to the medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The work shows proficiency in a range of technical skills and craft appropriate to the medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The work shows strong command of technical aspects of the medium, with innovative use of tools and materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sketches and Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very few sketches or preliminary versions, little responsiveness to critique in studio or classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The work is based on a basic set of preliminary investigations relevant to the media or performing forces, but shows only minor improvement from earlier versions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The work is based on a comprehensive set of preliminary investigations relevant to the media or performing forces, and shows measurable improvement from earlier versions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The final work was the result of a long and consistent process of preliminary versions, sketches, drafts, proofs, models, appropriate to the medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibition, Curation, and Notation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does not meet standards for accurate notation for performance, or expected standards of curation and exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Notation conveys the basics, but many aspects of performance left unstated or poorly notated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Notation carefully worked out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work was carefully noted and prepared for performance, and nicely organized for players</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student responded well to critique and advice given in studio or classroom sessions.
### 8. Information Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation: Determine and Access the Information Needed</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question or thesis. Has difficulty determining key concepts.</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.). Can determine key concepts.</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the research question or thesis completely. Can determine key concepts.</td>
<td>Effectively defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Effectively determines key concepts.</td>
<td>Effectively defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Effectively determines key concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Types of information (sources) selected partially relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accesses information randomly, retrieves information that lacks relevance and quality</td>
<td>Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources</td>
<td>Accesses information using variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search</td>
<td>Accesses information using effective, well designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources</td>
<td>Accesses information using effective, well designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation: Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chooses a few information sources. Selects sources using limited criteria (such as relevance to the research question and currency).</td>
<td>Chooses a variety of information sources. Selects sources using basic criteria (such as relevance to the research question).</td>
<td>Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources using multiple criteria (such as importance to the researched topic).</td>
<td>Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering the importance (to the researched topic) of the multiple criteria used</td>
<td>Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering the importance (to the researched topic) of the multiple criteria used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 9: General Education Assessment Rubrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citation and Disciplinary Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar with rules of attribution or citation particular to discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not understand differences among paraphrase, summary, quotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands existence of different models for attribution of citation, but does not apply the right one for the job, or does so inconsistently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows disciplinary standards only with repeated effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient with rules of attribution or citation particular to discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capably paraphrases, summarizes, quotes, adapts, cites, or quotes material from sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to understand difference between sources that are common knowledge and those requiring attribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar with ethical and legal restrictions the use of intellectual property in its varied forms (text, music, image, data, code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not understand privacy issues implicit in digital domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands difference between sources that are common knowledge and those requiring attribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes responsibility and credit for own contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar with ethical and legal restrictions the use of intellectual property in its varied forms (text, music, image, data, code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands how to publish, license, or share own intellectual property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respects privacy issues implicit in digital domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 9. Technological Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Does not recognize the appropriate tool, technology, or software to approach the situation</td>
<td>Can identify the appropriate tool, technology, or software with guidance</td>
<td>Can identify an appropriate tool, technology, or software but does not independently consider an alternative</td>
<td>Can identify the appropriate tool, technology, or software best suited for the task from among a range of possible options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Does not know how to use the tool, technology, or software. Unsafe or inappropriate use of the tool</td>
<td>Uses the tool competently, safely, and appropriately under supervision but would not be able to work independently</td>
<td>Uses the tool competently, safely, and appropriately with minimal supervision</td>
<td>Uses the tool competently, safely, and appropriately while working independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Significant errors arise from inappropriate applications of the tool or from a failure to recognize its limitations</td>
<td>Does not recognize the limitations or the underlying assumptions for the use of a tool but can use it in routine situations</td>
<td>Recognizes the limitations and underlying assumptions involved with using the tool and applies its use appropriately</td>
<td>Applies the tool creatively, or is capable of developing an alternative approach. Can correct problems or errors that arise during its use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 10. Ethics, Personal Responsibility, Professional Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation:</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Personal Responsibility/Professional Conduct</strong></th>
<th>Absenteeism a problem</th>
<th>Attends all classes</th>
<th>Attends all classes well prepared and provides insightful comments with some frequency</th>
<th>Attends all classes well prepared and plays a significant role in elevating the intellectual experience of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fails to meet deadlines with advisor or work group</td>
<td>Meets all deadlines though perhaps needs an occasional extension</td>
<td>Meets all deadlines without extensions or the need for excuses</td>
<td>Meets all deadlines without extensions or excuses, fulfills all work responsibilities in a thoroughly professional manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research and writing lacks effort</td>
<td>Research and writing indicates some effort though more is possible</td>
<td>Research and writing demonstrates substantial effort and a solid work ethic</td>
<td>Research and writing demonstrates extraordinary effort and a professional work ethic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Ethical Conduct** | Insufficient understanding of responsible and ethical interactions with human or animal subjects, or communities | Minimal understanding of responsible and ethical interactions with human or animal subjects, or communities | Very clear understanding of responsible and ethical interactions with human or animal subjects, or communities | Professional understanding of responsible and ethical interactions with human or animal subjects, or communities |

| **Ownership and Authorship** | Does not take responsibility for ideas presented | Able to differentiate own ideas, yet still reliant on those from the literature as more authoritative | Clearly separates own ideas from that in existing scholarship. | The thesis displays evidence of the author’s ownership of the material in the form of original insights |
| | Lacks independence expected in process of research | Primarily reliant on peers or faculty for developing research and writing | Remains reliant on others to set deadlines, while showing a degree of independent initiative | Author displays independence in and ownership of the researching and writing process |
## Haverford College Senior Capstone Assessment Rubrics

The four large headings below reflect different stages of work, from initial phases of gathering information and formulating a research question to the hard work of interpretation and public manifestation. Within them we identify the various categories of work that might take place. And nested within these (on the rubrics themselves) are detailed criteria by which faculty might evaluate student work. Note that the stages are meant simply as a tool to help you look over the categories; they are not part of the assessment process itself.

### The Stages and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gathering</th>
<th>Formulating</th>
<th>Interpreting</th>
<th>Demonstrating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1 Assemble Primary Sources</td>
<td>F1 Articulate Research Question</td>
<td>I1 Situate Work in Context of Theory, Method, or Discipline</td>
<td>D1 Craft Written Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 Evaluate Secondary Literature</td>
<td>F2 Design Research Plan or Experiment</td>
<td>I2 Analyze and Interpret Data</td>
<td>D2 Deliver Oral Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3 Collect and Manage Data</td>
<td>F3 Implement Solution</td>
<td>I3 Interpret Texts</td>
<td>D3 Complete Oral Defense or Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4 Collaborate in Lab or Seminar</td>
<td>I4 Revise and Review</td>
<td>D4 Perform Musical Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G1 Assemble Primary Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources (HC History)</td>
<td>- Demonstrates poor grasp of primary sources relevant to the topic; coverage is very slight</td>
<td>- Documentation of the evidence, but merely a collection of loosely related summaries of primary sources rather than a well organized synthesis directly tied to research question</td>
<td>- Primary source evidence is well organized, displays substantial depth, and is clearly presented in terms of its relationship to the research question</td>
<td>- Primary source evidence is well organized, exhaustive, and seamlessly presented in terms of its relationship to the research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No interesting contribution to existing knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Creativity in research finds new evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### G2 Evaluate Secondary Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria:</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with relevant</td>
<td>- Very few</td>
<td>- Quality and quantity of secondary sources is acceptable, but not more</td>
<td>- Draws from many high quality journal articles and books, appropriately selected</td>
<td>- As in &quot;proficient&quot;, but in addition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary literature (HC</td>
<td>sources of</td>
<td>than that</td>
<td>- Synthesizes existing knowledge but does not do much to identify areas of consensus, debate, and</td>
<td>- Bibliography is extensive, appropriately selected and innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History + Econ)</td>
<td>limited quality</td>
<td>- Engagement with existing scholarship but bibliography lacks depth</td>
<td>gaps in established knowledge;</td>
<td>- Demonstrates comprehensive mastery of scholarly literature as pertains to the thesis topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Minimal</td>
<td>- Has a familiarity with central scholarly debates though understanding</td>
<td>- Nevertheless at times some sharp analysis of relevant literature</td>
<td>- Synthesizes existing knowledge in topic area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge of</td>
<td>is superficial</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Identifies areas of consensus, debate, and gaps in knowledge;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>- Summarizes each source without making connections between them or to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scholarship</td>
<td>existing project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bibliography</td>
<td>- Weak or lazy effort to explore secondary sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ignores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>important and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>easily available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
## G3 Collect and Manage Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Management (HC Linguistics + Psych)</td>
<td>-Grossly inadequate and/or highly disorganized data</td>
<td>- Barely sufficient data, not usefully organized into appropriate paradigms</td>
<td>-Sufficient data, generally organized into appropriate paradigms</td>
<td>- Exhaustive data, masterfully organized into appropriate paradigms clearly demonstrating relevant patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Raw data missing or incorrectly collected</td>
<td>- Raw data correctly collected, but manipulation of that data is incorrect or missing</td>
<td>-Raw data collected and manipulated correctly, with those procedures documented in a basic form</td>
<td>-Raw data collected and manipulated correctly, with detailed documentation of those procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Issues of sampling or other systemic bias are ignored or glossed over</td>
<td>- Issues of sampling and other systemic bias are raised implicitly or explicitly but insufficiently addressed</td>
<td>-Issues of sampling and other systemic bias are addressed</td>
<td>-Relevant issues of sampling and systemic bias are thoughtfully considered and discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## F1 Articulate Research Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization of Research Question/Historical Argument (HC History + Econ)</td>
<td>-Thesis is never clearly stated; hard to determine what the topic of study is</td>
<td>-Thesis is eventually made clear, but only after significant reading or after significant effort on the part of the reader to extract it from the text</td>
<td>-Thesis is stated clearly at the very beginning, but with digressions</td>
<td>-Thesis is concise, complex and stated clearly at the very beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Thesis is stated but is utterly simplistic or trivial</td>
<td>-Thesis is more of a topic area than a question; unfocused and unconvincing discussion of importance</td>
<td>-Some wider implications of thesis are acknowledged and explored, but without being overly convincing.</td>
<td>-Full implications of thesis are acknowledged and explored. Subsidiary, embedded, or implicit questions and assumptions are made explicit and relations among them are specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-No case is made for why the question is interesting or worth asking</td>
<td>-A case is made for why it matters, but it needs to be more convincing</td>
<td>-Importance of question and what is at stake is demonstrated, but there is more to do</td>
<td>-Importance of question and what is at stake in answering it is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### F2 Design Research Plan or Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: HC PSYCH + Comp Sci</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem is not defined carefully, or ambiguously. No attempt to explain the problem, why it is important, or provide an example of application.</td>
<td>-Reflects a research question that is only a marginal extension of the past literature</td>
<td>-A research question that represents an adequate extension of the past literature</td>
<td>-Problem is stated precisely with concise language. Good motivation for why the problem is important and relevant to the particular domain.</td>
<td>-Reflects a research question that extends the previous literature in important ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question is not grounded within or misunderstands the relevant literature and/or lacks originality (e.g., is merely a replication of past research)</td>
<td>-Relies on a research methodology that may be appropriate but not the most effective or efficient</td>
<td>-Relies on a research methodology that adequately addresses the questions of interest</td>
<td>-Relies on an appropriate research methodology that generates testable hypotheses, and both effectively and efficiently addresses the questions of interest</td>
<td>-Will yield results or data amenable to analysis or interpretation by the appropriate tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of internal validity and experimental control such that any results/conclusions are suspect</td>
<td>-Some but not full attention to experimental rigor and internal validity</td>
<td>-Experimental rigor is reasonable but not exceptional</td>
<td>-Is rigorously conceived with internal validity (for instance: clearly operationalized independent and dependent variables, or appropriate experimental controls, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### F3 Implement Research Plan or Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deploy Research Plan or Experiment</td>
<td>Substantial errors in performing experiments, computations or equivalent prevent any useful results from emerging</td>
<td>Experiments, computations, or equivalent are correct enough to produce some results but contain significant errors and/or substantial intervention by faculty advisor was required.</td>
<td>Experiments, computations, or equivalent are mostly correct, given only light guidance by the faculty advisor</td>
<td>Experiments, computations, or equivalent are performed expertly and independently, producing results that can undergo subsequent analysis and possible revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### F4 Collaborate in Lab or Seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Lab (HC Psych + Chem)</td>
<td>-No contributions; passive presence in the group discussion</td>
<td>- Minimal contributions; performs tasks when asked, but lacks initiative</td>
<td>-Does their share of the laboratory or seminar work &lt;br&gt;-Has some ownership of and responsibility for the ideas discussed &lt;br&gt;-Works well with members of the group &lt;br&gt;-Interacts productively with outside visitors</td>
<td>-Takes a leadership role and shows initiative in moving the project forward &lt;br&gt;-Makes novel, creative, or insightful contributions to the research project or theme of seminar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Situate Work in Context of Theory, Method, or Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Situating work in its intellectual context (PJHR + Spanish)** | - Either doesn’t realize what claims have already been made, or makes no effort to situate claims in their context  
- Does not understand that all scholarly work is part of a conversation  
- Student was provided with a critical theory/framework, but was unable to incorporate it in the service of a critical question | - Lacks some important knowledge of relevant history and current debates, but showed some understanding of the need for theory or method  
- Tends to describe what has been read rather than offering a contribution to a field (and so is a listener rather than a participant in the scholarly conversation)  
- Student with some help identified a critical theory/framework and was able to incorporate it in the service of the critical question in a basic way | - Shows an understanding of relevant history and current debates, and understanding of relevant theory or method  
- May lack a sense of being part of a conversation, or tend to repeat established points rather than synthesizing or creating new ones  
- Student was able to engage theory or method in ways appropriate to the critical question at hand | - Demonstrates strong command of relevant history and/or current debates, identifying key methods or theories relevant to the research  
- Situates work within an ongoing scholarly conversation  
- Is able to show how their work contributes to or challenges that conversation |

### Analyze and Interpret Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Analysis and Tool Selection (MB)**          | - Statistical techniques are inappropriate and/or incorrectly implemented  
- Many research questions are not statistically addressed | - Statistical techniques are mainly appropriate, but fail to address all research questions of interest  
- Statistics and graphical | - Statistical techniques are well-chosen, and most of the important research questions have been addressed | - Correctly selects and implements the appropriate statistical techniques to test the stated research hypotheses, thoroughly addressing all questions of interest |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Interpretation (adapted from AAC&amp;U Reading)</td>
<td>- Deeply confused about the elements of a text, its organization, or design. Picks out features for consideration at random, and without understanding of their significance - Comments about texts in ways that misconstrues the author's meanings, or simply impose the reader's own meanings without regard for assumptions</td>
<td>- Recognizes basic relations among parts or aspects of a text, such as effective or ineffective arguments or literary features - Regards the text from the author's standpoint (or one proposed by instructor), but does so in a mechanical way that fails to reflect on alternatives. Reiterates a flat, accepted, or surface meaning of the text</td>
<td>- Identifies relations among ideas, structure, or other textual features well; evaluates how parts of a text hold together (or remain in tension with each other) - Allows for the possibility of different meanings or interpretive frames or intended meanings. - Elaborates on the texts (through interpretation or questioning) so as to deepen or enhance an ongoing discussion.</td>
<td>- Sharp and well-expressed observations about the ideas, structure, or features found in the text; original insights about the whole, no less than the parts - Explores how parts of a text hold together (or remain in tension with each other) - Discusses texts with a mature and independent intellectual frame of mind, but in ways that sustain or extend conversation in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I4 Revise and Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation:</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drafts, Revisions, and Response to Feedback (RF)</strong></td>
<td>Fails to respond to comments from faculty or peer readers</td>
<td>- Corrects only those things marked by readers, or does so in a partial way, and does not see how comments apply to analogous situations in the work</td>
<td>- Responds to all reader comments, and shows capacity to carry over from marked to related problems</td>
<td>- Attends promptly to comments and suggestions from readers, and carries over from one situation to the next, anticipating related problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not take initiative to revise own work, or seek out additional advice</td>
<td>- No initiative to revise own work</td>
<td>- Growing capacity to review and revise own work</td>
<td>- Assumes initiative to review and revise own work, and seeks out advice from peer or faculty readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keeps poor records of drafts and previous versions</td>
<td>- Some capacity to keep track of versions, problems</td>
<td>- Good control over versions, with some lapses or confusion that introduces errors</td>
<td>- Has excellent control over versions, files, and problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D1 Craft Written Argument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written Argument (PJHR + HC History)</strong></td>
<td>Pages have been filled up but there is no discernible argument and very little attention to organization, syntax, or prose</td>
<td>- The paper makes a decent claim and supports it with reasons, but has not paid enough attention to structure or coherence, or hasn’t offered adequate support for claims/reasons.</td>
<td>- The paper makes a recognizable claim and supports it well with reasons and evidence but the claim itself may not rise to the level of excellence.</td>
<td>- The paper makes a strong claim, supports it with reasons and offers good evidence or examples to back these up. There is a thread leading the reader through the paper, such that it is always clear why what is being said currently matters to the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks proper citation format according to approved disciplinary guides.</td>
<td>- The prose may be awkward, or perhaps not enough attention has been paid to editing and proofreading, and that has negatively impacted the paper’s capacity to communicate its points.</td>
<td>- The writing gets the job done but would benefit from more work done on structure, polish and syntax.</td>
<td>- The paper is well structured, with thought given to organization and argumentative strategy. The prose is lucid and polished and the paper has been proofread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB: Failure to meet disciplinary citation standards in terms of giving proper credit to authors would be plagiarism, and thus a violation of Professional Conduct below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D2 Deliver Oral Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria:</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Formal oral argument or presentation (PJHR + Classics)** | - The main claim is incoherent or self-contradictory. Claims are asserted rather than argued (i.e., not supported by textual, or graphical evidence)  
- The speaker does not engage with the audience or has clearly not prepared in advance.  
- Incapable of answering questions in coherent ways | - The argument’s main claims and reasons are discernible but not organized as well as they could be. Reasons may not be compelling or may not support the whole argument. Not enough consideration has been given to possible objections or alternative viewpoints.  
- Some attempt to illustrate the presentation with texts, images and graphs, or to explain representation of data and processes  
- The speaker hasn’t given enough thought to structure and audience engagement.  
- Some capacity to answer questions | - The argument is clear and well supported and the speaker has given adequate thought to how to present it to an audience.  
- Makes appropriate use of images and graphs or other supporting materials  
- The speaker maintains a conversational style and reasonable eye contact with audience. The presentation is reasonably well organized.  
- Answers most questions in a way that shows decent understanding of the material | - The logic of the argument is solid and is articulated clearly. Claims are backed by good reasons and supported with evidence or examples. The overall argument is organized so that the audience can follow it easily. The presentation is lucid and professional  
- Images, graphs, and other supporting materials are expertly explained and deployed in the context of the presentation  
- The speaker has given thought to how to engage an audience right away and then keep them engaged, and has also anticipated areas of confusion or disagreement  
- Insightful selection of the parts of the project best suited for oral communication  
- Answers post presentation questions completely and succinctly |
## D3 Complete Oral Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Defense (HC History)</td>
<td>- Unprepared, unenthusiastic</td>
<td>- Displays adequate preparation, interest in topic is evident</td>
<td>- Well prepared, presents with enthusiasm</td>
<td>- Superbly prepared, presents with enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Weak demonstration of understanding of topic, responds poorly if at all to questions</td>
<td>- Knowledge of topic is significant, though perhaps with some gaps or is only drawn out by questioning</td>
<td>- Understands topic without any gaps and is able to respond to all questions</td>
<td>- Demonstrates comprehensive understanding of topic and is able to provide innovative and intelligent answers to all questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lacks confidence, unclear articulation, anxiety evident</td>
<td>- Speaks clearly, is relaxed and confident for most of the exam or presentation</td>
<td>- Excellent presentation, displays relaxation and self-confidence</td>
<td>- Superb presentation, articulate, engaging, time flies!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D4 Perform or Compose Musical Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>- Poor tone, intonation, rhythm and dynamics; poor control of hands and breath</td>
<td>- Inconsistent or little sense of style appropriate to the repertory. Performance at times mechanical</td>
<td>- Musical interpretation is stylistically appropriate most of the time. Some passages lacking.</td>
<td>- Excellent tone quality and intonation. Clear sense of rhythm and accent appropriate to the repertory. Good use of dynamic and timbral contrasts. Hands and breath expertly controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>- No sense of musical style or phrasing. Wooden or rigid interpretation, with no sense of an original vision for the whole.</td>
<td>- Mostly fluid recall of music</td>
<td>- Meaningful and stylistically appropriate nuances. Insightful and original take on the pieces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorization OR Language Skills</td>
<td>- Not memorized (depending on instrument).</td>
<td>- memorized, but with occasional lapses</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Excellent and effortless recall of the music.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 10: Senior Capstone Assessment Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Program Curation and Notes</th>
<th>Original Composition</th>
<th>D5 Give Graphical Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Unprofessional demeanor, dress, or behavior</td>
<td>-Program lacks conceptual unity or organization. Selection of repertory inappropriate. -Notes or commentary poorly written, or serve only to communicate biographical facts rather than guide listener. -Texts and translations used from copyrighted sources without permission or acknowledgement. [This would be a violation of Fair Use, and thus of Honor Code]</td>
<td>-does not meet expectations for scope or overall conception of the work. -does not meet standards for accurate notation for performance -lacks stylistic or structural cohesion -no obvious understanding to engage with models</td>
<td>- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are poorly made or labeled, and are not integrated with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pronunciation mainly under control, but not always consistent</td>
<td>-programming and selection show promise, but some odd choices or gaps -notes are workmanlike, but nothing more. -texts and translations mostly in hand, but with various problems</td>
<td>-shows basic craft, but nothing more, in terms of scope and concept. -notation conveys the basics, but many aspects of performance left unstated or poorly notated -inconsistent style and not well integrated structure -not fully conversant with models</td>
<td>- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are professional and visually pleasing, with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-accurate delivery of texts</td>
<td>-shows promise and ambition in terms of scope and overall conception relative to genre. -notation carefully worked out -style aligns with models, but not always consistent -some good understanding of models</td>
<td>-shows promise and ambition in terms of scope and overall conception relative to genre. -notation carefully worked out -style aligns with models, but not always consistent -some good understanding of models</td>
<td>- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are professional and visually pleasing, with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Text is artistically declaimed, with clear understanding of nuances of meaning and affect</td>
<td>-Program and notes show exceptionally clear and cohesive vision. Nicely organized and paced -Nicely written notes, aimed to inform audience about musically important moments -Texts and translations carefully edited, with appropriate credits and permissions</td>
<td>- substantive in scope, in terms of duration and genre -shows deep understanding of notation for the given forces -has stylistic and structural integrity -demonstrates an awareness of models -exhibits a distinctive creative voice</td>
<td>- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are professional and visually pleasing, with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1 Unacceptable</strong></th>
<th><strong>2 Basic</strong></th>
<th><strong>3 Proficient</strong></th>
<th><strong>4 Excellent</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are poorly made or labeled, and are not integrated with</td>
<td>- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are not professional and are not self-explanatory</td>
<td>- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are professional and visually pleasing, with</td>
<td>- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are professional and visually pleasing, with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Original Composition*

- shows basic craft, but nothing more, in terms of scope and concept.
- notation conveys the basics, but many aspects of performance left unstated or poorly notated.
- inconsistent style and not well integrated structure.
- not fully conversant with models.

*Program Curation and Notes*

- Program lacks conceptual unity or organization.
- Selection of repertory inappropriate.
- Notes or commentary poorly written, or serve only to communicate biographical facts rather than guide listener.
- Texts and translations used from copyrighted sources without permission or acknowledgement. (This would be a violation of Fair Use, and thus of Honor Code).

*Professionalism*

- Unprofessional demeanor, dress, or behavior.

*D5 Give Graphical Presentation*

- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are poorly made or labeled, and are not integrated with.
- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are not professional and are not self-explanatory.
- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are professional and visually pleasing, with.
- Tables, figures and other graphical representations are professional and visually pleasing, with.
Appendix 10: Senior Capstone Assessment Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea/Concept</td>
<td>No guiding conception or idea behind the work</td>
<td>The work is based on elementary research, shows some understanding of the underlying conceptual framework, and shows a basic development of an idea into a body of work.</td>
<td>The student has an understanding of the art historical and cultural context for the work, and while lacking innovation takes a thought-out approach toward developing an idea into a coherent body of work.</td>
<td>The work shows a strong conception and guiding set of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>The work shows poor command of technique appropriate to the medium</td>
<td>The work shows command in the basic technical skills and craft appropriate to the medium</td>
<td>The work shows proficiency in a range of technical skills and craft appropriate to the medium</td>
<td>The work shows strong command of technical aspects of the medium, with innovative use of tools and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sketches and Productivity</td>
<td>Very few sketches or preliminary versions, little responsiveness to critique in studio</td>
<td>The work is based on a basic set of preliminary investigations relevant to the media, but shows only minor improvement from earlier versions.</td>
<td>The work is based on a comprehensive set of preliminary investigations relevant to the media and shows measurable improvement from earlier versions.</td>
<td>The final work was the result of a long and consistent process of preliminary versions, sketches, drafts, proofs, models. The student responded well to critique and advice given in studio sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D6 Exhibit Artworks

- Tables, figures, and other graphical representations confuse rather than instruct
- References to the tables and the figures in the text or poster are perfunctory without being instructive
- References and captions are not totally self-explanatory; the references in the text or poster do not always tie to the arguments and hypotheses being tested
- Refers to the tables and figures clearly and concisely tying them to the arguments and instructing the reader or listener

Idea/Concept

1. No guiding conception or idea behind the work
2. The work is based on elementary research, shows some understanding of the underlying conceptual framework, and shows a basic development of an idea into a body of work.
3. The student has an understanding of the art historical and cultural context for the work, and while lacking innovation takes a thought-out approach toward developing an idea into a coherent body of work.
4. The work shows a strong conception and guiding set of ideas

Technical Skills

1. The work shows poor command of technique appropriate to the medium
2. The work shows command in the basic technical skills and craft appropriate to the medium
3. The work shows proficiency in a range of technical skills and craft appropriate to the medium
4. The work shows strong command of technical aspects of the medium, with innovative use of tools and materials

Sketches and Productivity

1. Very few sketches or preliminary versions, little responsiveness to critique in studio
2. The work is based on a basic set of preliminary investigations relevant to the media, but shows only minor improvement from earlier versions.
3. The work is based on a comprehensive set of preliminary investigations relevant to the media and shows measurable improvement from earlier versions.
4. The final work was the result of a long and consistent process of preliminary versions, sketches, drafts, proofs, models. The student responded well to critique and advice given in studio sessions
| Curation and Exhibition | The show was poorly organized and displayed. The work with gallery coordinator and fellow students was late, partial, or unprofessional | The work presented is complete, but it could benefit from additional revisions. While the presentation of the work requires refinement it is properly installed. The written statement communicates the basic ideas for the work, but it lacks clarity and cohesion. The student is responsive and follows the directions of the gallery coordinator. | The student completed a body of work that is coherent and ready for exhibition. The work is properly installed but the exhibition format requires additional improvements to meet professional gallery standards. The student is prepared and organized for the installation and worked well with the gallery coordinator. The student presents a well-written artist statement and other supporting materials, but overall the presentation and/or supporting materials lack innovation and/or could improve with additional revisions. | The exhibition was professionally curated and organized, with appropriate attention to captions, explanations, and other materials for the audience. Efforts with gallery coordinator and fellow students were timely and showed a strong sense of responsibility |

| D7 Demonstrate Ethical Conduct, Personal Responsibility, Professional Standards |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Basic</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Responsibility/Professional Conduct (HC History)</td>
<td>Absenteeism a problem</td>
<td>Attends all classes</td>
<td>Attends all classes well prepared and provides insightful comments with some frequency</td>
<td>Attends all classes well prepared and plays a significant role in elevating the intellectual experience of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fails to meet deadlines with advisor or work group</td>
<td>Meets all deadlines though perhaps needs an occasional extension</td>
<td>Meets all deadlines without extensions or the need for excuses</td>
<td>Meets all deadlines without extensions or excuses, fulfills all work responsibilities in a thoroughly professional manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research and writing lacks effort</td>
<td>Research and writing indicates some effort though more is possible</td>
<td>Research and writing demonstrates substantial effort and a solid work ethic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices

### Appendix 10: Senior Capstone Assessment Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ethical Conduct (HC Linguistics)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ownership and Authorship (HC Math)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Insufficient understanding of responsible and ethical interactions with human or animal subjects, or communities</td>
<td>- The thesis suggests the author relied heavily on a small number of sources and has not developed an independent understanding of the key ideas. -The student relied heavily on the faculty advisor throughout most of the research and writing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimal understanding of responsible and ethical interactions with human or animal subjects, or communities</td>
<td>- The key ideas in the thesis are mostly in the author's own words, but some elements of the thesis are recognizable as relying closely on the main sources -The student required regular guidance over the main hurdles of the thesis, but by the end managed a degree of independent mastery and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very clear understanding of responsible and ethical interactions with human or animal subjects, or communities</td>
<td>- The thesis displays evidence that the main sources have been appropriately absorbed by the author and presented in the author's own words -The student relied at times on the faculty advisor, but substantial portions of the final product were arrived at independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional understanding of responsible and ethical interactions with human or animal subjects, or communities</td>
<td>- The thesis displays evidence of the author's ownership of the material in the form of original insights -Author displays independence in and ownership of the researching and writing process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Research and writing demonstrates extraordinary effort and a professional work ethic.
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• We will collect assessment data using Google Sheets, a system that allows for easy sharing and management of access.

• For Senior Capstone Assessment, the Registrar will prepare a spreadsheet containing the names of all seniors in your department. *Unless you request otherwise, only the Chair and Administrative Assistant will have permission to view and edit this document.*

• For General Education Assessment, the Registrar will prepare a spreadsheet containing the names of all students enrolled in those courses designated by the department for purpose. *Unless the instructor of the course requests otherwise, only the Instructor and Administrative Assistant will have permission to view and edit this document.*
The Registrar will also combine all these sheets in ways that allow EPC, the Provost, and Institutional Research to prepare reports that will help the Faculty evaluate our programs in light of learning goals, and help the College prepare reports on the process as required by the MSCHE.

The following pages explain how to enter information about your students. The sheets themselves will be linked for easy access via the Assessment Web Resource:

https://sites.google.com/a/haverford.edu/haverford-assessment/data-entry-and-instructions

You can also try out a ‘test’ version of the Assessment Data Document here:

![Haverford Assessment](https://sites.google.com/a/haverford.edu/haverford-assessment/data-entry-and-instructions)

- READ ME: Learn how to navigate and use the documents (more detailed instructions are contained within the sheets themselves)
- Experiment with a sample sheet
Assessment Sheets, What’s Where?

• Follow the Assessment Data Entry page to the listing for your course (first group of links) or department (second group of links--scroll down):

Data Entry

Data Entry for Assessment relies on a series of Google Sheets. Before you start . . .

- READ ME: Learn how to navigate and use the documents (more instructions are in the sheets themselves)
- Experiment with a sample sheet

Access Your Data Entry Sheets via the links below:

- For General Education, find your course (instructor or administrative assistant only)
- For Senior Capstone, find your department (chairs and administrative assistants only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL EDUCATION</th>
<th>LAST MODIFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTH103 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Aug 31 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH259 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Aug 31 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS123 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Sep 1 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS224 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Sep 1 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS243 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Sep 1 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Sheets, What’s Where?

Find your general education class in the top group (visible only to instructor and administrative assistant)

Or senior capstone sheet in the second group (visible only to chair and administrative assistant)

Data Entry

Data Entry for Assessment relies on a series of Google Sheets. Before you start...

- READ ME: Learn how to navigate and use the documents (more instructions are in the sheets themselves)
- Experiment with a sample sheet

Access Your Data Entry Sheets via the links below:

- For General Education, find your course (instructor or administrative assistant only)
- For Senior Capstone, find your department (chairs and administrative assistants only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL EDUCATION</th>
<th>LAST MODIFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTH103 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Aug 31 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH259 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Aug 31 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS123 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Sep 1 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS224 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Sep 1 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS243 AY1516 Gen Ed</td>
<td>Sep 1 Jim Keane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENIOR CAPSTONE</th>
<th>LAST MODIFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology AY1516 Senior Capstone</td>
<td>May 4 Kathleen McGee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology AY1516 Senior Capstone</td>
<td>Jun 1 Rachel Hoang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry AY1516 Senior Capstone</td>
<td>May 31 Alex Norquist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics AY1516 Senior Capstone</td>
<td>May 30 Brett Mulligan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science AY1516 Senior Capstone</td>
<td>May 24 Steven Lindell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Languages &amp; Cultures Senior Capstone</td>
<td>Jun 1 Hank Glassman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics AY1516 Senior Capstone</td>
<td>May 10 Kim Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English AY1516 Senior Capstone</td>
<td>Jun 10 Laura McGrane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts AY1516 Senior Capstone</td>
<td>May 12 Hau Sock Kim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Navigation and Data Entry

Your document might open in a “view only” mode (like this). To enter data, click the ‘pop-out’ button at top right:
### Navigation and Data Entry

- **Students, Department, Course, Term**
  - already filled
  - one student = one row

---

**Assessment Worksheet (Sandbox)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open Gen Ed Rubric</td>
<td>Resolve Error Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONS**

For a quick reference, click the "Instructions" tab at the bottom of the page.

---

**Critical Analysis and Synthesis**

- **Explanation of Issue or Formulation of Problem**
- **Evidence**
- **Context and Assumptions**
- **Conclusions**
- **Argument**
- **Evidence**
- **Eng**

---

**Enter scores (range of 1-4) here with pull-downs.**

---

**Appendix 11: Assessment System Instructions for Data Entry**
This is the ‘sandbox’ version of the sheet, so the “Submit” button is missing!

But you will find it on your custom sheet!

### Assessment Worksheet (Sandbox)

- **Open Gen Ed Rubrics**
- **Resolve Error Request**

#### INSTRUCTIONS - For a quick reference, click the "Instructions" tab at the bottom of the page.

#### Critical Analysis and Synthesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Crse Nbr</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Context and Assumptions</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Eng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boyko, Brett</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford, Sam</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradham, Nigel</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braman, Bryan</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Brandon</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Ron</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunche, Malcolm</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton, Trey</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll, Nolan</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celek, Brent</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couplin, Jerome</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Fletcher</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry, Vinny</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel, Chase</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorenbos, Jon</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ertz, Zach</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Randall</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, Andrew</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givens, Chris</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goode, Majee</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, Brandon</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you need to see more student names, use vertical scroll bar at the right.

The top rows describing the rubrics will remain ‘frozen’ so you can see them.
If you have lots of rubrics, use the bottom scroll bar to move right and left

(student names will remain visible as you scroll)
Save and Submit

Google Sheets save automatically as you work! **THERE IS NO ‘SAVE’ BUTTON**

But when you are finished with all data entry, use the SUBMIT button

(And expect to see request for ‘authorization’ — **this is normal!**)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Crse Nbr Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science 131 Spring 2016</td>
<td>2 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science 131 Spring 2016</td>
<td>1 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science 131 Spring 2016</td>
<td>2 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science 131 Spring 2016</td>
<td>2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science 131 Spring 2016</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science 131 Spring 2016</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science 131 Spring 2016</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science 131 Spring 2016</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After you select SUBMIT expect to see these dialogues (and ‘continue’ or ‘allow’ as requested)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Critical Analysis and Synthesis</th>
<th>Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td>Explanation of Issue or Formulation of Problem</td>
<td>Purpose, Relevance, and Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Organization St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td>Context and Assumptions</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authorization Required

This app needs authorization to run.
You can change ratings at any time—as long as you have NOT selected “Submit”

But if you note an error after you have selected “Submit”—use Resolve Error Request
Help and Instructions

Need more information? Click the “instructions” tab at the bottom of the sheet!

Use the scroll bar at right to move up or down through the instructions

Or click “Data Entry” tab to go to the data entry page
DAP Report Questions for Academic Departments and Programs

Learning goals

● What did your department conclude from its discussion of your general educational goals? For those of the senior capstone project?
● What challenges, if any, appear to impede the advancement of these goals by your department?

Academic program requirements

● What changes or adjustments to the academic program have you considered, proposed, or enacted? What challenges do you see in implementing any of these ideas or plans?
● How did assessment results inform these developments?

Student Advising

● What did you and your colleagues learn from your discussion of advising practices in your department or program? At various levels in a student’s career?
● How have you taken steps to make sure that students are aware of your thoughts on the best ways for them to meet your stated objectives for the program?

Annual Assessment process

● What did you and your colleagues learn from your discussion of the assessment data you collected last year? In light of the College’s general educational goals? In light of your goals for the senior capstone?
● What changes have you considered in the assessment process that might help you better evaluate the progress of students towards your objectives?
● If your department has recently undergone an external review, what discussions have you had about your efforts to respond to the lessons learned from it, in particular with respect to learning goals, the organization of the academic program, and advising? If your department will undergo such a review in the next year or two, what aspects of your learning goals, academic program, or advising processes would you like that review to address?
Sample Pilot DAP Reports for Academic Departments, Spring 2017

Department: Psychology

Submitted by: Benjamin Le

======================================

Learning Goals

Result of discussion of goals for general education and senior capstone?

Our general education goals include the following:

(a) Students will gain a broad understanding of human behavior, from a variety of perspectives.
(b) Students will learn to treat questions and claims about behavior rigorously, with an empirical approach.
(c) Students will master the skills to contribute new knowledge in the field.

With regards to (a), our ability to offer breadth to our students is hampered by the size of our faculty. In particular, we do not offer any courses or research opportunities in developmental psychology, which is a cornerstone subdiscipline in our field. In terms of (b), our sense is that this is an area where our students excel; they tend to have a critical eye when evaluating research findings. However, this was not the explicit focus of this round of assessment. Finally, overall, our senior research program (c) is successful.

In examining the quantitative data, our students are largely successful regarding the criteria assessed. At the 100-level very few students were in the lowest category for any proficiencies. When examining the average scores, when it comes to written communication, the lowest scores were for Structured and Logical Argumentation, which is a skill that is developed over time, so it is not surprising that this is where first-year students struggled.

At the 200-level, when expectations are higher, students were not particularly strong in all aspects of Critical Analysis and Synthesis; scores here were lower which likely reflects that the instructor(s) have higher expectations and that students are just beginning to move from the introductory level to a more advanced and demanding level requiring them to master new disciplinary skills.
Our senior thesis program is successful; no student scored in the lowest category for any proficiency. However, criteria related to writing, as well as those related to data-analysis, tended to be the lowests.

**Challenges faced in the advancement of these goals?**

The problem with breadth in our curricular offerings is largely an issue related to staffing; a tenure-track line in developmental psychology would solve this problem.

Our 100- and 200-level courses are relatively large by Haverford standards (“These 35 students). Smaller classes would result in faculty being able to dedicate more time to working with students individually on writing and drawing conclusions from empirical evidence.

**Academic Program**

**Changes or adjustments planned or proposed?**

We have added a writing course for our majors (PSYC 305: Communicating Psychological Science), and have discussed changes to our statistics and research methods sequence to further bolster students data analytic skills. However, it is difficult to increase the amount of lab work we require of sophomores and juniors because sophomores have not yet declared the major, thus so it is hard to require them to do more (i.e., an advising problem; what happens if a sophomore declares the major without the requisite coursework?), and juniors often go abroad, so we are constrained from requiring additional coursework then.

As mentioned above, we would like to broaden our coverage of the field to include developmental psychology, which could be accomplished via a tenure-track position. We will be proposing this position to the administration this year.

Furthermore, we are discussing if the way we currently conceptualize “breadth” in the department still makes sense given changes in the field over the last 30 years. These discussions are ongoing.

**How were these informed by assessment results?**
The quantitative results are consistent with our anecdotal observations that students’ writing could be stronger, and squares with our department’s decision to offer a new course on dedicated to writing this semester.

**Student Advising**

*Insights from departmental discussion of advising?*

Major advisors in our department have between 15-17 major advisees each, not including non-major advising. This is just too many students to have meaningful contact with each and every one. There are certainly instances when faculty do not know all of their advisees well.

*Steps taken to inform students of objectives and how to meet them?*

In addition to communicating departmental expectations via one-on-one advising, our department has assembled and continuously updates a Student Guidebook (http://haverford.edu/psychology/guidebook) that outlines the departmental academic vision and describes pathways through our curriculum.

**Assessment Data and Processes**

*Insights gleaned from discussion of assessment data with respect to General Education goals?*

Based on the data collected, students are succeeding in our program. We will continuously work to evolve and enhance our curriculum, but a massive overhaul of the program as a whole does not seem necessary at this point. Our faculty are on the same page in terms of our aspirations for our students, however half of the tenure-track faculty in the department are on leave this semester, so much of this conversation will continue next year.

*Insights gleaned from discussion of assessment data with respect to Senior Capstone goals?*

(see above answer; these were written together before these two prompts were separated)

*Suggestions for changes to assessment practices within your department?*
We have discussed whether we should assess the same class/assignment across time (to track changes) versus sample from across our curriculum and assess a diverse set of courses. At this point our goal is to do a little of both, by regularly assessing our Introductory course, and then sampling across other classes at the 200-level.

*Continued follow up to recent external review?*

Our department was reviewed about five years ago. At that point, reviewers commented that many of our classes had a similar format (e.g., “35 student lectures). Based on that feedback we added a seminar course requirement (i.e., that all students must take at least one 300-level seminar course), and are actively working to add diversity of format of classes beyond seminars. This semester we are offering the previously mentioned workshop on writing (PSYC 305) and next year we will be offering a practicum course for the first time. The reviewers also commented on our outdated facilities, which has been addressed with the recent renovation of Sharpless Hall.

The review team also recommended 2-3 additional tenure-track lines. We have been able to increase staffing by one full-time position with visitors, but would like to convert that to a tenure-track position, which would help with advising and add to the diversity of offerings for senior thesis research. A long-term plan which moved the department to 40 class units per year (i.e., eight tenure track faculty) would be ideal and promote the sustainability of our program.
Department: Math and Stats

Submitted by: Josh Sabloff

---------------------------------------------

Learning Goals

Result of discussion of goals for general education and senior capstone?

The department reaffirmed its commitment to its learning goals for general education within the department as well as its goals for the senior capstone project.

General learning goals:
** Students will develop the ability to think rigorously through practice, exposure to new strategies, and careful reflection on them.
** Students will develop techniques to approach mathematical problems, breaking them down where appropriate and invoking a variety of tools to solve them.
** Mathematical literacy: As they progress through the curriculum, students will become familiar with the landscape of mathematics, its history, its fundamental paradigms, and its seminal ideas.
** Students will develop the ability to communicate mathematical and statistical material to a variety of audiences.

Capstone learning goals:
Our students will engage advanced content and techniques in pure mathematics, applied mathematics and statistics. They will gain ownership of the process and material, will write clear, careful and correct mathematics/statistics, and will develop an oral presentation that highlights the central ideas of their thesis work at a level appropriate for an audience in the mathematical/statistical sciences.

Challenges faced in the advancement of these goals?

Increasing enrollments at all levels of the curriculum put pressure on pedagogical techniques that the department has developed to help its students achieve its learning goals. Examples include:
** High enrollments in introductory classes have made it increasingly difficult to carry out writing projects that enhance students’ ability to communicate mathematics and to apply
techniques in a more synthetic setting than in their weekly problem sets.

** Demand for intermediate statistics classes (203 and 218) is double the seats available, impeding our students from encountering rigor in statistical thinking.

** A doubling of the enrollment in Analysis II (318) to 28 this spring made it impossible to use a student-centered seminar format that put a premium on developing oral communication skills and a sense of ownership of the rigorous process of mathematics.

** An increase of our major class from its recent levels of 15-20 students to over 30 this coming year and almost certainly the next has forced the department to reconfigure the senior thesis experience to eliminate several of the intermediate deadlines. We hope that this will not significantly reduce the quality of our students' final products.

** Academic Program

*Changes or adjustments planned or proposed?*

We have re-conceptualized our curriculum as having the structure of a tree: a trunk of fundamental pure mathematics with branches of statistics, advanced pure mathematics, and applied mathematics coming off of the core. Our goal is to have the core and all three branches be robust and sustainable. As of now, this is true of the core, statistics, and (barely) advanced pure mathematics; we need additional tenure-track staffing in order to develop our applied mathematics program just as we developed our statistics program from being almost non-existent in 2007 to its current state.

*How were these informed by assessment results?*

These developments were, for the most part, conceptually driven. Our general education assessments have been limited to one 200-level course in general education. Since senior capstone assessment at present consists of only one data set, we prefer to take this up later this spring, once we have two annual cycles in hand.

** Student Advising

*Insights from departmental discussion of advising?*

Our advising structure, where students choose advisors of their preference, is not sustainable at our current levels of enrollment. We need to restructure our advising to better distribute students across faculty members so that we may better concentrate on each student.

*Steps taken to inform students of objectives and how to meet them?*
We are in discussions to revise our structure to better distribute students across faculty members.

**Assessment Data and Processes**

*Insights gleaned from discussion of assessment data with respect to General Education goals?*

Our assessment data seems inconsistently scored despite the specificity of the rubrics, as the same class experienced a full point gain from one semester to the next. We need to have discussions about how best to keep the assessment data consistent from year to year so as to be able to draw well-founded conclusions.

*Insights gleaned from discussion of assessment data with respect to Senior Capstone goals?*

Still too early to interpret trends, based on one year.

*Suggestions for changes to assessment practices within your department?*

See above.

*Continued follow up to recent external review?*

n/a
Haverford College Assessment Web Hub. URL: https://sites.google.com/a/haverford.edu/haverford-assessment/
# Appendix 15: Assessment Data in Tableau Viewer

## Haverford College Assessment Data

### Tableau Viewer

All data for Fall 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Assessed</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Enroll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>000</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Craft and Vision</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Analysis and Synthesis</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classical S.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Stud.</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace, Just.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political S.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Lit.</td>
<td>Political S.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English Language</td>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Pro.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological C.</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>Classical S.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Sc.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Performance

Filter by Department: (All)  
Crse Level: (All)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Avg. Colle Score</th>
<th>Avg. Dif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1. Critical Analysis and Synthesis] Conclusions</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1. Critical Analysis and Synthesis] Context an.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1. Critical Analysis and Synthesis] Evidence</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1. Critical Analysis and Synthesis] Explanatio.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2. Oral Communication] Argument</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2. Oral Communication] Dialogue</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2. Oral Communication] Engagement</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3. Quantitative Reasoning] Application/Analysis</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3. Quantitative Reasoning] Assumptions</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3. Quantitative Reasoning] Communication</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3. Quantitative Reasoning] Interpretation</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5. Written Communication] Organization and Dev.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5. Written Communication] Purpose, Relevance,</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5. Written Communication] Structured and Logic.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5. Written Communication] Style, Editing, Conv.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6. Non-English Language] Oral Comprehension</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6. Non-English Language] Cultural Comprehension</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6. Non-English Language] Orthography and Graph.</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6. Non-English Language] Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6. Non-English Language] Spoken Communication</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Haverford College Assessment Data
### Tableau Viewer

**All data for Fall 2016**

#### Rubrics and Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Rubrics and Criteria</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Rubrics and Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Class Level</td>
<td>Score College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filter by Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Filter by Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(All)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(All)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Comm.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comm.</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Competency</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Craft and Vision</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Analysis and Synthesis</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English Language</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1. Critical Analysis and Synthesis] Conclusions</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1. Critical Analysis and Synthesis] Context and Setting</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1. Critical Analysis and Synthesis] Evidence</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2. Oral Communication] Argument</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2. Oral Communication] Dialogue</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2. Oral Communication] Engagement</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2. Oral Communication] Evidence</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3. Quantitative Reasoning] Interpretation</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3. Quantitative Reasoning] Application/Analysis</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6. Non-English Language] Aural Comprehension</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6. Non-English Language] Cultural Comprehension</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6. Non-English Language] Cultural Relevance</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Frequency | "Unacceptable" Score

250 students received an "unacceptable" score in 20 course(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>95 (39.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Analysis and Synthesis</td>
<td>74 (29.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>42 (16.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English Language</td>
<td>34 (13.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>4 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Appendix 15: Assessment Data in Tableau Viewer
Haverford College Assessment Data
Tableau Viewer

All data for Fall 2016, showing scores 1 + 2 at all levels
Haverford College Assessment Data
Tableau Viewer

Filtered for Written Communication for Fall 2016, showing all levels and scores
Haverford College Assessment Data
Tableau Viewer

Filtered for Written Communication for Fall 2016, showing Scores 1 + 2

Tableau Viewer - General Education Assessment Results Fall 2016
Privacy Statement

Gathering and Archiving

In the case of general education assessment, only the individual instructor and authorized administrative assistant can view and edit student data. In the case of senior capstone assessment, only the chair (or authorized delegate) and administrative assistant can view and edit student data (although departments will in any event have already discussed how to evaluate and score all the projects in their discipline).

The Registrar secures and maintains all data gathered as part of the assessment process. Student names and other individually identifiable information will be removed as part of internal reports and discussions.

Analysis and Interpretation

As noted on the Assessment web site (maintained by the Office of the President), responsibility for analysis and interpretation of assessment data rests with a number of bodies on campus: individual departments, the Educational Policy Committee, the Office of the Provost, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

Reporting

Data collected as part of this process are for internal use only. They are not for publication or communication to outside bodies. The information we collect is studied by the Faculty and its governing bodies in order to demonstrate (as required by the MSCHE) our capacities to mount:

1. a comprehensive, organized and sustained institutional assessment process to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services and to inform planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal (Standard 7); and...
2. an organized and sustained assessment process that provides direct evidence of the achievement of expected student learning outcomes in all programs, including outcomes for general education and the senior thesis, with evidence that assessment results are used to improve teaching and learning at all levels of the curriculum (Standard 14).
We already describe the general contours of our approach to assessment on the public web site of the Office of President (see above), explaining the steps we take to evaluate student progress towards the standards we set for them in the context of general education and senior capstones alike. It should not be surprising to see here (or on individual departmental pages, or in the College Catalog) lists of learning goals, assessment criteria, and other expectations, along with descriptions of the many office and programs that support student learning. Assessment data we collect might at some point be published here in highly aggregated form (for instance, concerning an entire class year), but without any breakdown that would identify individual students, faculty, courses, programs, or departments.

We should nevertheless note that in keeping with Federal requirements under the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System we already publish aggregate data about graduation rates, demographic cohorts, and other information concerning students at Haverford. The assessment data are not part of these records and reports.