



WESTMONT

Program Review Committee

MEMORANDUM -- DRAFT

Date: February 26, 2026

To: Drs. Telford Work and Heather Keaney (GE Committee Chairs in 2025-2026)

Re: 2024-2025 Annual Assessment Report

Thank you for your commitment to the assessment process and your timely submission of the 2024-2025 Annual Assessment report. It is evident that the General Education Committee believes strongly in assessment as a means to better understand programmatic efforts and to improve effectiveness.

Two Program Review Committee members were assigned to evaluate your report. **Anna Jordan and Sarah Skripsky** evaluated your report using the Rubric for Evaluating Annual Assessment Reports, which is [posted on the PRC website](#). In assessing your report, we sought to both celebrate your ongoing good work on assessment and to provide constructive feedback for you and your colleagues.

You can see how we rated your responses in the seven categories listed on the annual report rubric. It is our goal that all departments should reach “Developed” (3) level of achievement on all of the criteria, or be making progress toward this level. The GE Committee report has accomplished this goal.

The committee would like to commend your department /program for:

- A clear and well-written report.
- Excellent collaboration both with multiple department chairs and other stakeholders.
- Clear descriptions of assessment measures and procedures.

Our comments related to your assessment are included below.

Previous PRC's Recommendations: Average Score – 2.5

- The GE Committee's response to the previous PRC recommendations are adequate but are not robust in the way we would hope. These responses are not yet complete, and the committee should close the loop on both of these items for the good of the GE Program. In future reports, include accountability for relevant departments, and address each item with a clear timeline.

Quality of Evidence and Measuring Instruments: Average Score – 3

- The PRC appreciates the thorough data collection and analysis you've done, particularly in the robust assessment of the Modern/Foreign Languages learning outcome.
- Appendices A, B, C are mentioned but were not attached or uploaded in a place where the PRC could locate them. It's clear from what has been submitted that the GE Committee has provided quality evidence, but confirming the inclusion of appendices will be important in future reports.

Methods of Assessment: Average Score – 3

- Only direct methods of assessment were used. Indirect methods could inform future assessments.
- Clear use of expertise to analyze data and identify points of success and concern.

Use of Evidence: Average Score – 3.5

[Use of evidence is the core of the report and therefore, it needs to be robust. Good assessments are those whose results are used to improve teaching and learning and inform planning or resource allocation decisions.]

- The evidence here *was*, in fact, robust, and clearly the core of the report. The report outlines intentional conversations/analysis of the evidence.
- Specific implications were identified with either completed or planned action steps closely tied to the results of analysis.
- While the conversation with the broader faculty is commendable, it is insufficient for closing the loop. Such conversation supports both transparency and integrity in GE assessment; however, it isn't a sufficient closing-the-loop activity. See also the "Previous PRC Recommendations" section at the start of this report.

Completeness: Average Score – 4

The report is complete.

Style: Average Score – 4

The report is clear and well-written.

Evidence of Collaboration and Communication: Average Score – 4

Substantial evidence of collaboration and communication within the committee and with other departments and stakeholders is evident throughout the report.

Summary of the PRC's recommendations

1. The findings of the Modern/Foreign Language assessment demonstrate concern that our GE requirement is insufficient in allowing us to meet the **cultural literacy** component of Modern Language courses. In addition to having a conversation with the broader faculty, the PRC suggests identifying ways to achieve the cultural competency component outside a traditional course model. *How might the department think about course (re)design in a way that allows them to accomplish these goals? Is there perhaps a "culture lab" component that could be paired with current courses? For a different approach, the department could pilot a "language lab" led by tutors outside of the primary class time to increase conversational competency while freeing up class time for other instructional goals.*
2. The PRC recommends revisiting the 2024 report recommendations and closing the loop on those responses.
3. The PRC recommends prioritizing additional closing-the-loop activities to extend the work documented in the 2024-2025 annual report.
4. The KQ survey results were helpful. Before archiving, the PRC recommends revisiting the Hawaiian/Pacific Islander data, as there may be a missing data point in the "total grads" column. Bio Chem and Education "total grads" data are also incomplete.

Thank you again for your good work. If you wish to discuss this memo or to discuss and finalize the current PRC's response to your annual report, please contact either **Anna Jordan** or **Sarah Skripsky** and we will schedule a meeting. If we have not heard from you by March 26, 2026, we will consider this "draft" memo final.