

# **Assessment Ad-Hoc Committee 2022-2023 · End of Year Report to the Executive Committee Shaun Adamson, Committee Chair**

## **I. Committee Accomplishments**

Comments on and responses to charges for 2022-23 are in *italics*.

### **1. Joint Charge – Work with CRAO to formalize Program Assessment Committee in PPM 1- 13 bylaws. (New)**

*Members reviewed the wording describing the purpose of the Assessment Committee and made revisions in October and November 2022. Additional detail was drafted that described the makeup of the committee and its primary responsibilities. The revised committee description was unanimously approved in January of 2023 and presented to CRAO in their January meeting. Minor changes in wording were suggested (see below) and were unanimously approved in the Assessment Committee's January meeting.*

*4.12. The Assessment Committee shall review current assessment practices and templates using scholarly assessment literature as guidance. The committee will provide direction to department chairs in completing assessment reports and shall assume responsibility for the peer-review and feedback of these reports. The committee will review the annual feedback to identify training that will support program assessment and reporting practices (e.g., technology use, data gathering and reporting within assessments) in coordination with Academic Affairs. The committee shall seek to have representation from each organizational unit and the Director of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness shall serve on the committee as an ex officio member.*

*This language was presented to faculty senate on April 13.*

- 2. Evaluate the biennial assessment evaluation rubric and revise if necessary. (New)**
- 3. Oversee peer-review and feedback of biennial assessment reports. Develop training materials for departments/programs and reviewers. Continue to monitor and alter process as necessary. (Ongoing/New)**

*Both of these charges focus on the primarily responsibility of this committee, and that is the biennial assessment evaluation; both will be discussed here. Committee members discussed both the review process and the biennial assessment evaluation rubric, and suggested improvements to the training videos that are currently housed in a Canvas training course. Suggestions for course improvements included adding exemplar reports, giving new chairs access to the course, and creating a simple and clearly defined grading scale. Suggestions for improving the review process included aligning at least one reviewer to programs within their broader field knowledge/program familiarity and other reviewer(s) those not familiar*

*or less familiar with the discipline since both kinds of feedback are valued. Also, all graduate level programs should include at least one reviewer with graduate level experience and requisite academic qualifications. All of these were implemented for this year's review.*

*In December, information about the Biennial Program Assessment Report Evaluation was sent to the deans of each college, requesting it be shared with all college departments and calling for faculty volunteers to evaluate the reports. Volunteers were selected by the committee with the intent to have representation from each organizational unit and were notified in January. All colleges and the library were represented, and we were fortunate to have a total of six volunteers who participated in 2021-22.*

*Gail Niklason conducted the training workshop for volunteers on Jan 27, and six teams of 2-4 individuals reviewed and evaluated the assessment reports. A list of the faculty volunteers is included in Appendix A. A brief follow up survey with the volunteers was administered and a Zoom meeting was scheduled to receive feedback on the biennial evaluation process, the quality of feedback, the evaluation rubric, the ability of the report template to provide useful and actionable feedback, and general suggestions for improving initial training for evaluators. This meeting took place on Mar 31. Overall, reviewers responded positively and provided useful suggestions for all of these areas.*

**4. Establish a task force made up of representatives from each college's Community of Practice to (a) help departments and programs prepare assessment reports, (b) communicate with each other and faculty about best practices in assessment. (Ongoing/New)**

*Committee members from each college reported on the status of the COPs in their college:*

- *A&H: Next year the chairs of department assessment committees and other faculty who write department and program assessment reports will be brought together. The college will have an open lunch once per semester to discuss assessment practices, ask and answer questions, etc.*
- *EAST: An invitation was sent to faculty in EAST asking for participation in the COP, but there was no interest. It was suggested that the timing of the invitation (end of the school year) may have been a factor and that another call be sent in the fall.*
- *COE: The College of Education COP meets three times each academic year (once in fall, and twice in spring). Department chairs and program directors that are preparing biannual reports are invited. The discussions are guided by questions and needs of the attending members. Examples of topics from this year are report structure, quality vs. quantity, tips and tricks, continuous improvement lens, and closing the loop.*
- *COS: No formal COP was set up by the college.*
- *COSBS: There are currently no COP or plans at present.*
- *LIBS: The library has a very small number of faculty, and three members expressed interest in forming a COP. All three participated in the biennial review process last year and/or this year and intend to work with biennial report author(s) to offer suggestions for the library's next report and encourage participation in the biennial review process.*
- *GSBE: While there is no established "Assessment Community of Practice" and no interest for starting a new activity for program assessment, there are existing practices*

*focusing on AACSB accreditation that bring faculty together for discussion of assessment. These include:*

- *Formal GSBE college committee and department assignments for assessment of learning that focus on AACSB accreditation.*
- *A school-wide meeting held at least once per year for all faculty and staff to review and discuss AOL processes, closing the loop, needs and opportunities for improvement of AOL and curriculum. This meeting takes the perspective of AACSB accreditation and is an activity planned by the school's AACSB accreditation point persons and the school's AOL committee.*
- *The MBA program (and possibly other school programs) hold a periodic meeting with faculty representing all departments to review and discuss the program's AOL processes.*
- *Regarding WSU program reviews by dept programs, these are handled at the dept program level without any particular school-wide umbrella for coordination or support.*

- 5. Ensure that language of new/updated documents is inclusive. Review documents to ascertain their impact on particular communities. As issues are identified, consult with EDI committee for guidance (Ongoing)**

## **II. Meetings and Attendance**

We held six committee meetings, plus a training workshop for biennial review faculty volunteers and a follow up meeting with that same group.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Sep 20</b>	<b>Oct 25</b>	<b>Nov 22</b>	<b>Dec 13</b>	<b>Jan 24</b>	<b>Apr 25</b>
Shaun Adamson, LIB (Chair)	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rachel Ardern, HP	X	X	X	X	X	-
Kristen Hadley, ED (Admin)	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kirk Hagen, EAST	X	X	X	X	-	X
Brooke Jenkins, S	X	X	X	-	X	X
Gary Johnson, SBS	X	X	X	X	X	X
*Casey Neville, HP	X	-	X	-		
Gail Niklason, OIE (Ex-Officio)	X	X	X	X	X	X
Carrie Ota, ED	X	X	X	X	X	X
Thom Priest, A&H	X	X	X	X	X	X
Shane Schvanevelt, B&E	X	-	-	X	-	X
*Kelley Trump, HP						-
Barbara Wachocki, S (Liaison)	X	X	X	X	X	-

\*Kelley Trump replaced Casey Neville in January, 2023

### **III. Outstanding Committee Members**

- Gail Niklason provided valuable information on all aspects of the biennial review process and assessment in general. Notably, she prepared and facilitated the workshop and follow up for faculty volunteers, and shared reviewer feedback with the committee to help next year's process.

### **IV. Subcommittees or Special Assignments**

None

### **V. Charges to carry forward to next year**

1. Oversee peer-review and feedback of biennial assessment reports. Develop training materials for departments/programs and reviewers. Continue to evaluate the biennial assessment rubric and the review process, and revise as necessary. (Ongoing)\*
2. Ensure that language of new/updated documents is inclusive. Review documents to ascertain their impact on particular communities. As issues are identified, consult with EDI committee for guidance (Ongoing)
3. Establish a task force made up of representatives from each college's Community of Practice to (a) help departments and programs prepare assessment reports, (b) communicate with each other and faculty about best practices in assessment. (Ongoing)

\*The first proposed charge was listed as two separate charges in 2022-23 (see charges 2 and 3 in section I: Committee Accomplishments, above). However, both are incorporated in the biennial report assessment and evaluation, so the committee felt they should be combined.

### **VI. New Charges**

4. Explore a) standardizing department evaluation questions to minimize bias in the campus course evaluation instrument, b) opening up the personal question feature of Explorance, and c) options for the dissemination of student evaluations.

### **VII. Suggestions for the Committee**

- The ongoing charge to establish Communities of Practice (COP) in each college got a slow start this year, with some colleges reporting no interest or plans to develop a COP, and others having either a formal COP in place, or existing practices in place that could be considered a COP. This charge would benefit from discussion to clarify the purpose and makeup of these groups, ways to elicit participation, and suggestions to establish a

more formal mechanism for monitoring communication between faculty regarding the preparation of assessment reports (in 2021-22, it was suggested that each COP should communicate with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness while programs prepare biennial assessment reports) and best practices in assessment.

## **Appendix A**

### **2022-23 · Faculty Volunteers for Evaluation of Biennial Program Assessment Reports**

- \*Tariq Arif, Mechanical Engineering
  - \*Nicole Batty, Manufacturing Systems Engineering
  - Justin Burr, Health Sciences
  - Shirley Dawson, Teacher Education
  - Electra Fielding, Foreign Languages
  - Courtney, Goodwin, Associate Provost's Office
  - Robin Haislett, Communications
  - Abdulnaset Kadan, College of Social Science
  - Justin Lee, Social Work
  - Diana Meiser, Library
  - \*Alyssa Mock, Electrical and Computer Engineering
  - Thom Priest, Performing Arts
  - Bradford Reyns, Criminal Justice
  - \*Sheryl Rushton, Teacher Education
  - \*Eric Smith, Business and Economics
  - \* Barbara Wachocki, Botany
  - Jamie Weeks, Library
  - Lisa Wiltbank, Microbiology
- \*volunteers who participated in 2021-22