Assessment Office
Crawford Hall 230 & 231
2550 Campus Road, Honolulu, HI 96822

UNIVERSITY
of HAWAIʻI®
MĀNOA

(808) 956-4283
(808) 956-6669
manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment

Workshop Topics: Needs Analysis Study Report, AY 2014-2015

Department/Program and Degree:	Assessment Office
Assessment Project Name:	Needs Assessment for 2014-15 Workshops
Semester/Yr Evidence Collected:	Fall 2014
Program Assessment Coordinator:	Monica Stitt-Bergh and Yao Hill
Person Submitting:	Yao Hill
Date Submitted:	9/30/2015

Executive Summary:

The Assessment Office (AO) at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa (UHM) regularly conducts needs analyses to guide the development of assessment-related workshops for faculty. In the Academic Year (AY) 2014 to 2015, the AO relied on two methods in identifying workshop needs for the campus: new reporting requirements in response to recently approved institutional learning objectives for undergraduates and an analysis of the annual program assessment reports (APAR) submitted by programs in 2014.

Given the new campus reporting requirement that all undergraduate programs align their program learning outcomes to the Institutional Learning Objectives, the AO office planned six sessions of the workshop *Map Your Program Student Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Objectives* in the fall 2014 semester.

In October 2014, AO collected APARs from 100% of the academic programs (n = 238). After reading each report, an AO faculty evaluated the assessment status, analyzed the program's needs, and when deemed appropriate, suggested workshop topics for that program. We tallied the topics and found the following had the highest frequency: evaluate evidence (e.g., rubrics) (n = 31); identify learning evidence (n = 19); assessment report 101 (n = 14); graduate program assessment (n = 12); transforming individual student assessment to program assessment (n = 8); assessment planning (n = 5); embedded, capstone, and signature assignments (n = 5). The findings supported the fall 2014 workshop plans and guided the development of four workshops and one panel session in spring 2015.

Needs Analysis Report

1. **Outcome(s) that was Assessed, Targeted, or Studied**

   AO outcome 2: Programs & the Institution complete the assessment cycle.

   Needs Analysis Question: What workshop topics should be covered?

2. **Type of Evidence Gathered**

   i. The new question on the annual assessment report (APAR) that asked all undergraduate programs to map their program learning outcomes (PLOs) to the Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs).
   ii. The completed APARs for 238 programs.

3. **Method for Analyzing and Interpreting the Evidence**
   i.   Given the new reporting requirement on the APAR, the two AO faculty members anticipated potential questions and challenges in mapping PLOs with ILOs and decided it was necessary to offer training on the process and handling the online reporting interface.
   ii. Each AO faculty member analyzed half of the APARs. When reading each report, we analyzed the program assessment status. For example, a program that completed student learning outcomes and the curriculum map would be ready to identify learning evidence to collect and an evaluation method. We further analyzed other program assessment needs. For example, in a program that one person does all the work, that program needs assistance increasing faculty engagement and collaboration. After this analysis, we suggested a workshop topic or multiple topics for that program in our note. All the topics were tallied. The results are in Appendix A. We also identified the programs who could serve as panel experts facilitating the discussion on a certain topic (e.g., capstone, embedded assignment). We also noted them as the facilitator of a workshop topic in the needs analysis.

4. **Results**

   i.   The new reporting requirement led to our decision of offering six workshop sessions on *Map Your Program Student Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Objectives* in fall 2014.
   ii. The APAR analysis showed that there were 143 workshop ideas; these were grouped into 36 distinct topics. The following topics were most frequently mentioned in our annotation:
        a) evaluate evidence (e.g., rubrics) (n = 31);
        b) identify learning evidence (n = 19);
        c) assessment report 101 (n = 14);
        d) graduate program assessment (n = 12);
        e) transforming individual student assessment to program assessment (n = 8);
        f) assessment planning (n = 5);
        g) embedded, capstone, and signature assignments (n = 5).
        We also identified five exemplary cases of using embedded, capstone, and signature assignments. The assessment coordinators from these programs can form a panel to address 4.ii.g.

5. **Additional Conclusions and Discoveries**

   Using the completed APARs to analyze program assessment needs gave us a more objective evaluation of the needs compared to faculty self-reported needs. Very often, for faculty that have not gone through a full cycle of assessment and in programs that lack personnel who is knowledgeable about assessment, it is difficult for them to articulate the actual needs. Analyzing the program assessment status allowed us to develop workshop topics that can provide just-in-time help. Using the challenges that emerged through the APARs as questions to answer in our workshops would make the content particularly meaningful and useful for the programs in need.

6. **Use of Results and/or Program Modifications**

   We decided to offer six sessions of one workshop in fall 2014 and four workshops and one panel session in spring 2015. The workshop in fall 2014 is
   - *Map Your Program Student Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Objectives* (addressing new reporting requirement and 4.ii.14)

   Workshops in spring 2015 are
   - *Collaborative Development of Evaluation Criteria* (addressing 4.ii.a)
   - *Identify Learning Evidence for Program-level Assessment Uses* (addressing 4.ii.b)
   - *From Evaluation of Individual Students to Program Level Assessment of Learning – Implications for Graduate Programs* (addressing 4.ii.d)
   - *Make Undergraduate Program Decisions Based on Evaluation of Individual Student Learning* (addressing 4.ii.e)

   The panel session in spring 2015 is
   - *Examples of Embedded Assessment: Using Existing Student Work for Program-level Assessment* (4.ii.g)

   We identified the programs who we think needed to attend one or more of the topics addressed in a workshop and sent out special invitations to their assessment coordinators and department chairs.

7. **Reflections on the Assessment Process**

   The needs analysis process in general is very constructive. We can make further improvement by developing a coding scheme. For example, we can use the stages in assessment cycle and common challenges to annotate the workshop. In addition, we also need a common code scheme to identify exemplary reports and the reason why. We can use this year's data to establish a code book to use in analyzing next year's APAR.

8. **Other Important Information**
   NA

Appendix A: Summary of Workshop Ideas from Annual Program Assessment Report Analysis

Workshop Idea (from 2014 assessment reports)	Number of mentions
Evaluate evidence (e.g., rubrics)	31
Identify learning evidence	19
Assessment report 101	14
Graduate program assessment	12
Transforming individual student assessment to program assessment	8
Assessment plan: meaningful, effective, efficient	5
Embedded, capstone, signature assignments	5
FACILITATOR: Embedded, capstone, signature assignments	5
POSTER CANDIDATE	4
Take action on results	4
FACILITATOR: Graduate program assessment	3
FACILITATOR: Portfolio	3
Assessment 101	2
How to evaluate "function as a professional in the discipline"	2
How to use number of publications, etc., for SLO assessment.	2
Surveys for direct assessment	2
Take action on results: indirect assessment	2
Map evidence/items to SLOs	2
Analyze results	1
Department meetings on assessment	1
Employer surveys	1
FACILITATOR: Civic engagement rubric	1
FACILITATOR: evaluating student professional development	1
FACILITATOR: external exams	1
FACILITATOR: pre-post tests	1
FACILITATOR: tying course grades to SLO achievement	1
How to assess individuals in group projects	1
How to use a pre-post test for SLO assessment	1
How to use external exams to guide program decision making	1
issues related to assessment in large programs (lots of faculty and lots of students)	1
issues related to assessment in small programs (small faculty and/or few students)	1
Maximizing employer/supervisor evaluation for program SLO assessment	1
Using assessment results for requesting resources	1
using performance tasks for evaluating higher order SLOs	1
Issues related to flexible curriculum	1
Technological solutions	1