

**Assessment Committee 2023-2024 ·**  
**End of Year Report to the Executive Committee**  
**Tariq Arif, Committee Chair**

**I. Committee Accomplishments**

Comments on and responses to charges for 2023-24 are given below in *italics*.

**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)**

*Members reviewed peer evaluations and feedback from chairs and program coordinators on biennial assessment reports. A challenge the committee encountered was the missing feedback from the previous year's survey. To address this, the committee suggested forming subgroups from various colleges to obtain feedback from chairs who hadn't initially responded. Gail provided the survey questionnaires and the names of the chairs needing interviews. Subgroup members of assessment committee then personally reached out and interviewed them, either in person or via Zoom. The feedback received was generally constructive. However, some chairs and coordinators expressed their concerns about participating in the biennial report submission process. After discussing and analyzing all feedback, committee members agreed that an updated rubric template and additional resources or data from the committee could improve the overall assessment report writing and feedback process in the future.*

*A webinar discussion session was organized, during which committee members watched and discussed the NWCCU (Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities) Assessment Webinar. The committee agreed that this webinar would improve staff and faculty's ability to involve their institutional community in the assessment process. Additionally, various aspects highlighted in the webinar were discussed that can be applicable to Weber State.*

*The Canvas training course for reviewers was updated by Gail with new training materials and resources. To improve the quality of feedback from participants, the evaluation options were simplified to 'Met' or 'Needs Improvement' this year. The committee approved this change and agreed that it would facilitate more effective reviews.*

*Gail has updated the assessment rubric template, and the committee reviewed its various aspects, weighing the pros and cons. Overall, the new rubric received highly positive feedback from committee members. They unanimously agreed that the updated rubric offers reviewers a better perspective on evaluation. This year, committee used the updated rubric during the assessment evaluation.*

*In December, committee contacted faculties from various colleges and successfully recruited 16 volunteers to participate in the review process. All colleges and the library had representation, and a total of 24 reviewers took part in this year's session.*

*Gail led a training workshop for volunteers on January 26<sup>th</sup>, after which 8 teams (3 team members per group) reviewed and assessed the reports. These teams held multiple meetings throughout February to facilitate 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, including the quality of feedback, the evaluation rubric, the report template's effectiveness in providing useful and actionable feedback, and suggestions for improving the initial training for evaluators. Overall, the reviewers provided positive responses and offered valuable suggestions.*

***Updated language:***

*For the upcoming academic year, minor wording changes were suggested for charge 1 (see below in bold) and unanimously approved at the Assessment Committee's April meeting.*

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

***Removed Charge:***

*The following charges were explored this year and removed from the 2024-25 charges.*

*“4. Explore:*

- a. opening up the personal question feature of Explorance*
- b. options for the dissemination of student evaluations”*

*The reason for this removal is explained on page 3 in response to charge number 4.*

**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 (a) help departments and programs prepare assessment reports, (b)**

**communicate with each other and faculty about best practices in assessment.  
(Ongoing)**

*Committee members from each college discussed the status of the COPs in their college. More discussion is necessary on this in the coming years to establish a concrete outline of the best practices in assessment.*

*The committee plans to engage with the Arts & Humanities, College of Education, College of Library, and Business & Economics colleges regarding their ongoing and prospective initiatives. Additionally, updates will be sought from other colleges that are not yet involved in the COP, and resources will be provided to facilitate their participation.*

**4. Explore:**

- a. opening up the personal question feature of Explorance**
- b. options for the dissemination of student evaluations**

*The Committee explored the course evaluation survey regarding the option for customized questions or timelines. Although the assessment committee oversees the survey question content, the APAFT committee handles the timing of evaluations. The committee agreed to maintain the original evaluation timelines and decided not to activate the Personal Questions feature in Blue at this time. Gail agreed to work with Brenda on the idea of better marketing for course evaluations in the coming years.*

*The committee agrees that faculty members have many alternative resources, such as anonymous surveys in Canvas or Qualtrics, for mid-semester check-ins. However, if a faculty member or chair wants to add department-specific questions, they can be included for that particular department. Overall, the committee agreed not to introduce new charges for the personal question features in the upcoming academic year.*

**II. Number of Committee Meetings**

We conducted seven committee meetings (From Sep 2023 to Apr 2024) 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 seven regular committee meetings.

**III. Meetings and Attendance**

Meeting dates and attendance information are given below:

Name	Sep 19	Oct 17	Nov 14	Dec 12	Jan 16	Mar 12	Apr 16
Tariq Arif, EAST (Chair)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dan Bedford, SBS	X	X	X	-	X	X	X
Andrew Keinsley, B&E	-	X	X	X	X	X	X
Susan McKay, A&H	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Carrie Ota, ED	X	-	X	-	X	X	X
Rachel Ardern, HP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Shaun Adamson, LIB	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Brooke Jenkins, S	X	X	X	-	X	X	X
*Kelley Trump, HP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gail Niklason, OIE (Ex-Officio)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Michele Culumber, S (Liaison)	X	-	X	X	X	X	X
Brenda Kowalewski (Administration)	X	-	-	X	X	-	-
Kaitlyn Trips (Student Senator)	X	-	-	-	-	X	X
Cambri Hunt (Student Senator)	X	X	-	-	-	-	-

\*never attended

#### IV. 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 2024. Additionally, she followed up with faculty volunteers and compiled reviewer feedback for the committee to improve the evaluation process for the next year.

#### V. Subcommittees or Special Assignments

None

#### VI. Charges to carry forward to next year

1. Oversee peer-review and feedback of biennial assessment reports. Develop training materials and provide resources for departments/programs and reviewers. Continue to evaluate the biennial assessment rubric and the review process, and revise as necessary. (Ongoing)
2. Revise the existing biennial template to make it more meaningful and improve clarity.
3. 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)
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)

\*Wording for the first charge from last year was updated, and charge number 4 from last year was removed as the committee felt that no updates were necessary at this time. A new charge (number 2) is added to the 2024-25 charge.

## **VII. New Charges**

Committee discussed and approved the following new charge for 2024-25 session.

2. Revise the existing biennial template to make it more meaningful and improve clarity.

## **VIII. 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. The reports can reference the data in the appendix, but the data should not be the central focus.

The ongoing charge to establish Communities of Practice (COP) in each college requires attention this coming year. Last year, some colleges reported no interest or plans to develop a COP, while others either had a formal COP in place or existing practices that could be considered a COP. Further discussion is required to clarify the purpose and establish guidelines for this charge.

The committee will need to explore strategies to encourage participation. Also, recommendations for establishing a more formal mechanism for monitoring communication among faculty during the preparation of assessment reports are necessary.

## **Appendix A**

### **2023-24 · Faculty Volunteers for Evaluation of Biennial Program Assessment Reports**

Becky Marchant	English
Carey Campbell	Performance arts
*Lisa Wiltbank	Microbiology
Aminda O'Hare	Psychology
Bharath Babu Nunna	Mechanical
*Diana Meiser	Library
*Eric Smith	Business
Jishan Ahmed	Math
*Justin Burr	Health Science
Mariangelica Groves	Geography
Scott Moore	Medical lab science
*Nicole Batty Falkenberg	MSE
*Sheryl Rushton	Teacher Education
*Shirley Dawson	Teacher Education
Valerie Chambers	Accounting and Taxation

\*volunteers who participated in 2022-23