

# **Assessment Committee 2024-2025**

## **End of Year Report to the Executive Committee**

### **Tariq Arif, Committee Chair**

#### **1. Accomplishments of the committee and objectives yet to be addressed**

Accomplishments of the committee and objectives yet to be addressed are outlined below (in italics) as responses to the 2024–25 charges.

##### **1. Review the recommendations of the Shared Governance task force related to the Assessment committee in September to prepare for a vote of the Faculty Senate on October 10th 2024 and share feedback with the Executive Committee to facilitate the vote.**

*Committee reviewed 'GenEd improvement and Assessment' part from the PPM 1-10, 1-12 and 1-13 (Shared Governance task force). Nothing in the PPM raised concern, and committee agreed with the proposed changes. Therefore, no proposal change was brought forward to the executive committee.*

##### **2. Oversee peer-review and feedback of biennial assessment reports. (Ongoing)** **a. Develop training materials and provide resources for departments/programs** **b. Develop training materials and resources for reviewers** **c. Continue to evaluate the biennial assessment rubric and the review process, and revise as necessary.**

*Committee had discussions on program review process mandated by state as well as the potential impact on biennial reporting. On our first meeting in September Gail shared few new materials that can help changing evaluations focus from data to reflections. All the committee members were assigned to check with their colleges and see what kind of support they would need in creating biennial assessment reports. The feedback was mixed, and no specific requests for assistance were made by the programs. The committee also explored the idea of gradually collecting assessment data related to learning outcomes through a survey to support the biennial report.*

*In multiple meeting from Oct 2024 to Dec 2024, committee discussed feedback from the NWCCU mid-cycle accreditation visit. Evaluators mentioned that there is no post-hoc quality check (cross-evaluation) in place for biennial report evaluations and suggested developing a plan for quality check of evaluation feedback. Some committee members believe it might involve unnecessary duplication of effort and question its significance. Instead, the committee could concentrate on outliers (exceptionally good or poor reports) and reassess those, rather than using a random selection approach.*

*Committee discussed aspects of online teaching and evaluations. To ensure that assessment reporting includes the evaluation of online courses separately from other courses, the committee suggested that the assessment template could include data on online courses, such as the number offered each semester across different programs.*

*In one of the Fall meetings, committee discussed the use of AI-based detection tools for student assessment and agreed that this depends on individual faculty members and their policies for using AI in their courses.*

*Committee discussed that newer chairs should be trained in assessment principles and report writing. This suggestion arises from the mid-cycle evaluation feedback that many faculty members may not have the necessary knowledge, tools, or motivation to effectively assess program learning outcomes. The committee also discussed offering an option to meet with chairs in person to provide feedback.*

*Gail made some updates to the new Canvas training course for reviewers and discussed the changes with the committee for feedback. The committee approved the updates, agreeing that they would improve the training process for the reviewers.*

*Gail introduced few changes to the last biennial assessment rubric that has very detailed instructions for the evaluators. After some updates to the rubric, the committee voted to adopt the updated rubric for the upcoming assessment cycle. After the January 24 training session, a few additional adjustments were made. In the February 2025 meeting, the committee decided to use the rubric template to provide descriptive feedback rather than relying on a strict 'met' or 'not met' rating system.*

*In December and January, committee recruited 15 faculties from different colleges to participate in the review process. All colleges and the library had representations, and a total of 24 reviewers took part in this year's session.*

*Gail led the training workshop for committee members and volunteers on January 24. After the training, eight teams (each with 3 to 4 members) were assigned to evaluate 5 to 6 reports. One report was distributed to all teams as a common assessment. All teams were asked to complete the evaluation of the common report by the first week of February. After that, in February, the assessment committee met to discuss various aspects of the evaluations standard. Committee found significant discrepancies between the assessments. After discussion, committee concluded that some of these reports are difficult to evaluate on one single scoring criteria. So, the committee voted to provide only descriptive feedback for the remaining reports.*

*Besides regular monthly meetings, the teams had multiple meetings throughout February to complete the evaluation process. A list of the faculty volunteers is available in Appendix A. The assessment reports and feedback were sent to the respective chairs and program coordinators. Additionally, a brief follow-up survey was administered to the volunteers to gather feedback on various aspects of the biennial evaluation process. Overall, the reviewers provided positive responses and offered valuable suggestions.*

### ***Removed Charge:***

*The following charges were explored this year and removed from the 2025-26 charges.*

*“1. Review the recommendations of the Shared Governance task force related to the Assessment committee in September to prepare for a vote of the Faculty Senate on October 10th 2024 and share feedback with the Executive Committee to facilitate the vote.*

*3. Establish a task force made up of representatives from each college’s Community of Practice to: (Ongoing)  
help departments and programs prepare assessment reports communicate with each other and faculty about best practices in assessment.”*

**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)**

*The assessment committee members kept this charge in mind during every discussion, ensuring that all wording was checked for inclusiveness. The committee reviewed language of revised rubrics used, feedback templates, and updated Canvas course content before incorporating them into the review process.*

**3. Establish a task force made up of representatives from each college’s Community of Practice to: (Ongoing)  
help departments and programs prepare assessment reports communicate with each other and faculty about best practices in assessment.**

*Committee members from each college discussed the status of the COPs in their college. Some colleges reported a lack of interested faculty to volunteer for this task. As a result, the committee was unable to make progress. In the April 2025 meeting, the committee voted to remove this charge in future years.*

**4. Revise the existing biennial template, provide recommendations to make the template more meaningful, reduce redundancy, and improve clarity.**

*The committee discussed various updates on existing biennial template that would make it more meaningful and improve clarity. One key issue noted was that departments use different terminology when evaluating learning outcomes. For example, terms like "introduced" or "mastered." The committee considered whether adopting standardized terminology in the template could help address this inconsistency. No changes were made at this time, and committee agreed that this topic, along with other ideas for improving clarity and reducing redundancy, could be revisited in future years.*

## 2. Number of committee meetings held since August 2024

We conducted eight committee meetings (From Sep 2024 to Apr 2025) and an additional training workshop for faculty volunteers involved in the biennial review. Additionally, eight subgroups (review teams) held several meetings (one to three) in the month of February outside of the eight regular monthly meetings.

## 3. Attendance of committee members

Meeting dates and attendance information are given below:

Name	Sep 19	Oct 8	Nov 12	Dec 3	Jan 14	Feb 11	Mar 11	Apr 8
Tariq Arif, EAST, Chair	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Don Davies, S	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	X
Shaun Adamson, LIB	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sandra Stennett, HP	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	-
Dan Bedford, SBS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
Andrew Keinsley, B&E	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	-
Susan McKay, A&H	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Marilyn Taft, ED	X	X	-	-	X	-	X	X
Tamara Bergout, HP	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X
Gail Niklason, Ex-Officio	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Michele Culumber, Liaison	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X
Toni Nakai, Student Senator	X	X	-	-	X	-	X	-
Mia Foster, Student Proxy	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ivana Fredotovic, Administration	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X

\*never attended

## 4. Outstanding Committee Members

Gail Niklason provided valuable guidance on the biennial review and the overall assessment process. She updated rubrics and templates, and conducted the two-hour training workshop in January 2025. Additionally, she followed up with faculty volunteers and compiled reviewer feedback for the committee to improve the evaluation process for the next year.

Dan Bedford was an active participant in the committee and offered valuable ideas. His contributions were especially helpful in guiding discussions and making the committee's decisions.

## 5. Subcommittees or Special Assignments

None

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

2. Oversee peer-review and feedback of biennial assessment reports. (Ongoing)
  - a. Develop training materials and provide resources for departments/programs
  - b. Develop training materials and resources for reviewers
  - c. Continue to evaluate the biennial assessment rubric and the review process, and revise as necessary.
4. Revise the existing biennial template, provide recommendations to make the template more meaningful, reduce redundancy, and improve clarity.

\* Charges 1 and 3 from last year were removed. So, the ongoing charge number 2 was renumbered as 1, and charge number 4 was renumbered as 2.

## **New Charges**

The committee discussed and approved the following new charges for 2025-26 session.

3. Revise biennial template to account for the recent updates in HB265, explore expectations according to new law, and provide recommendations for compliance.
4. Evaluate existing assessment practices for dual enrollment and online programs, and develop strategies for improvement in alignment with accreditation recommendations.

**Proposed draft charges for 2025-26 are given in Appendix B.**

## **6. Suggestions for New Directions**

In the coming years, the biennial rubrics and template should be updated to ensure the reports more clearly summarize the assessment without posting excessive data. We can place greater emphasis on reflections rather than on data. It can reference the data in the appendix, but the data should not be the central focus.

We could also consider providing mandatory canvas training to all faculties on the importance of internal assessment and the expectations set by recent legislation. This could be helpful to raise awareness. The committee should also consider exploring other strategies to promote greater faculty participation.

## Appendix A

### 2024-2025 · Faculty Volunteers for Evaluation of Biennial Program Assessment Reports

Aminda O'Hare	Psychological Science
**Diana Meiser	Library
*Becky Marchant	English
Electra Fielding	Spanish and Translation
David Folsom	Accounting
Branden Little	History
**Sheryl Rushton	Teacher Education
Brooke Jenkins	Chemistry
**Lisa Wiltbank	Microbiology
Kolleen Marchand	Health Professions
**Eric Smith	Business
*Bharath Babu Nunna	ME
**Nicole Batty Falkenberg	MSE
Jenny Turley	Nutrition
Jason Francis	Library

\*volunteers who participated in 2023-24

\*\*volunteers who participated in both 2023-24 & 2022-23

## Appendix B Draft Charges for 2025-26

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHARGES FOR 2025-2026

Tariq Arif, Chair  
Michele Culumber, Liaison

### ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

*The Assessment Committee shall review current assessment practices and templates using peer-reviewed assessment literature as guidance. The committee shall assume responsibility for the peer-review and feedback of biennial assessment reports and shall identify needed training in support of assessment practices in Academic Affairs.*

1. Oversee peer-review and feedback of biennial assessment reports. (Ongoing)
  - a. Develop and revise training materials and provide resources for departments/programs.
  - b. Develop and revise training materials and resources for reviewers.
  - c. Continue to evaluate the biennial assessment rubric, review process, and revise as necessary.
2. Revise the existing biennial template, provide recommendations to make the template more meaningful, reduce redundancy, and improve clarity. (Ongoing)
3. Revise biennial template to account for the recent updates in HB265, explore expectations according to new law, and provide recommendations for compliance.
4. Evaluate existing assessment practices for dual enrollment and online programs, and develop strategies for improvement in alignment with accreditation recommendations.