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

UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

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

Assessment Office
Assessment Report
December 2017
Monica Stitt-Bergh & Yao Hill

1. Program Outcomes

1) Faculty are aware of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

2) Academic degree programs and the institution complete the assessment cycle.

3) Department leaders & administrators use results to guide planning.

4) The campus community (faculty members, administrators, staff, students) perceives program-level assessment as supporting student learning.

2. Publication of Program Outcomes

Published on the office website: http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment/ao_planning.htm

3. Program Activity & Outcome Matrix

OFFICE ACTIVITIES	OUTCOMES			
	1. Faculty are aware of the scholarship of teaching and learning	2. Programs and the institution complete the assessment cycle	3. Dept. leaders & admin. use results	4. Community perceives assessment as supporting student learning
Workshops for faculty		X		
Consultations with faculty	X	X		
Events for students, faculty, administrators	X	X	X	X
General Ed & Institutional assessment projects		X		
Research educational/ assessment contexts	X	X	X	X
Dissemination of good assessment practices	X	X	X	X
Assessment report collection, analysis, summarization, and response		X		

4. Did your program engage in any program assessment activities in the last two years (2015-2017)?

Yes.

5. What assessment activities took place in the last two years (2015-2017)?

Program Outcome	Assessment Activities
1) Faculty are aware of the scholarship of teaching and learning.	We (a) tracked the scholarship activities of the Assessment Leadership Institute (ALI) past participants and (b) surveyed participants attending Assessment for Curricular Improvement Poster Exhibits
2) Academic degree programs and the Institution complete the assessment cycle, which includes faculty members using assessment results to improve student learning.	We (a) analyzed degree program assessment reports to determine the extent to which programs had completed the assessment cycle; and (b) critically reflected on the completed institutional assessment projects in order to plan future activities.
3) Department leaders & administrators use results to guide planning.	We categorized programs' use of results and monitored use of institutional results.
4) The campus community (faculty members, administrators, staff, students) perceives program-level assessment as supporting student learning.	We surveyed participants attending the annual Assessment for Curricular Improvement Poster Exhibit.
Other	To guide office planning, we administered a needs assessment survey to 2017 program assessment coordinators.

6. What types of evidence were gathered and analyzed?

Outcome 1: Faculty engagement in scholarship of teaching/learning/assessment.
Scholarship in assessment is part of the scholarship of teaching and learning. We observed and **tracked the assessment-related scholarship activities** of the Assessment Leadership Institute (ALI) participants. We tracked the **number of posters** and presenters at our annual Assessment for Curricular Improvement Poster Exhibit. We **surveyed** the poster exhibit participants on their perceptions of the posters as examples of scholarly inquiry.

Outcome 2: Degree program learning assessment activities.
We analyzed the **assessment reports** from all degree programs (n=238) for the last three years and from **institutional assessment projects** on critical thinking, information literacy, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, and written communication.

Outcome 3: Departments and administrators use results.
We **analyzed the assessment reports** from all degree programs. In these reports, assessment coordinators describe the evidence collected, how it was evaluated, and how results were used. We **monitored the use** of institutional results by administrators.

Outcome 4: Perception of assessment as supporting student learning.
We **surveyed** the poster exhibit participants on their perception of assessment as supporting student learning.

Other: Needs assessment.
We administered a **needs assessment survey** to 137 program assessment coordinators in fall 2017.

7. **How many persons submitted evidence?**

Outcome 1: Faculty engagement in scholarship of teaching/learning/assessment.
We tracked the scholarly activities of the 45 ALI participants (2013-2016 cohorts). We tracked the number of posters presented at the 2015-2017 annual poster exhibits. We surveyed a total of 262 poster exhibit attendees:

Year	Total Attended	Responded (Response Rate)
2015	97	82 (85%)
2016	85	53 (65%)
2017	80	42 (51%

Outcome 2: Degree program learning assessment activities.
138 individuals submitted assessment reports for 238 degree programs. Nearly all of these individuals were faculty members who lead assessment for their program/department.

The two Assessment Office faculty members completed the reports for institutional assessment; the number of students and faculty involved in institutional assessment projects ranged from 85-172 students and 23-87 faculty per project (see the institutional project reports for the number in particular projects). We distributed the results to various faculty groups and administrators and monitored usage.

Outcome 3: Departments and administrators use results.
138 individuals submitted assessment reports for 238 degree programs. All academic deans and directors received institutional results as well as the Vice Chancellor and Associate VC for Academic Affairs.

Outcome 4: Perception of assessment as supporting student learning.
We surveyed 262 poster exhibit participants. We collected responses from 187 attendees in total over three years.

Other: Needs assessment.
77 (57%) academic coordinators completed the needs assessment survey.

8. **Who interpreted or analyzed the evidence that was collected?**

Assessment Office faculty members and student workers.

9. **How did he/she/they evaluate, analyze, or interpret the evidence?**

We compiled results from activity tracking, the surveys, and the assessment reports. We also used qualitative methods to analyze and interpret the evidence.

10. **Summarize the actual results.**

Outcome 1: Faculty engagement in scholarship of teaching/learning/assessment.
(a) As of 11/30/2017, 43 (96%) ALI participants presented their assessment projects at least

once at a poster exhibit (on or off campus). Nine presented at a regional or national conference. One collaborated with colleagues and published in a peer-reviewed journal.

(b) A total of 76 posters were presented at the Assessment for Curricular Improvement Poster Exhibit (2015-2017).

(c) 90% or higher of the poster exhibits' survey respondents reported that the posters demonstrated examples of scholarly inquiry to a *moderate extent* or to a *large extent*, that is 92% in 2015, 95% in 2016, and 90% in 2017, respectively.

Outcome 2: Degree program learning assessment activities.

The programs' submitted reports are posted on the Assessment Office website under **Reports** > *Degree Programs*. Comprehensive summary charts for each year are posted on the *Summary Reports* page.

A summary of the 2017 degree program results is forthcoming. Below is a brief summary of the 2015 reports in comparison to 2013 and 2014. [Note: reports were not collected in 2016.]

In comparison to previous years' reports, the percentage of programs completing an assessment cycle—i.e., used results—was highest in 2015. In 2013-2015, programs reported the following:

	Conducted assessment	Collected evidence	Presented results	Used results
2015 (N=238)	89%	88%	69%	70%
2014 (N=238)	83%	75%	66%	66%
2013 (N=232)	74%	69%	55%	54%

	Program SLOs exist	Program SLOs published	Course SLOs produced for most courses	Curriculum map exists
2015 (N=238)	99%	97%	86%	92%
2014 (N=238)	98%	96%	84%	87%
2013 (N=232)	94%	91%	87%	82%

Outcome 2: Institutional learning assessment activities.

We undertook a variety of undergraduate institutional learning assessment projects. Reports for each project are available upon project completion on the Assessment Office's *Institutional Reports* webpage. In brief, results are as follows:

Undergraduate Outcome	Year	Project goal	Result
Critical thinking	2016	Evaluate artifacts	44% of artifacts met expectations
Information literacy	2015	Evaluate artifacts	50% of artifacts met expectations
Oral communication	2015	Set standard of performance	Artifacts with an average score of 2.4 or higher (VALUE oral communication rubric, 0-4 range) have met exit-level performance expectations
Oral communication	2017	Collect data; train scorers (project in process)	Video recorded over 90 student presentations with 79 usable for scoring; recruited 17 faculty to participate in scorer training

Undergraduate Outcome	Year	Project goal	Result
Quantitative reasoning	2016	Evaluate artifacts	32% of artifacts met expectations
Quantitative reasoning	2017	Evaluate artifacts	Upper division: 33% of artifacts met expectations
			Lower division: 22% of artifacts met expectations
Written comm.	2015	Evaluate artifacts	66% of artifacts met expectations
Written comm.	2016	Evaluate artifacts	75% of artifacts met expectations

Outcome 3: Departments and administrators use results.
In 2015, 70% of degree programs used assessment results. Specifically, out of the 209 programs that reported collecting and evaluating evidence, 166 reported use of results and 45 reported that use was pending. Specific use of institutional results by administrators is unknown although discussion has occurred.

Outcome 4: Perception of assessment as supporting student learning.
Almost all poster exhibits' survey respondents reported that the event showcased examples of assessment as supporting student learning to a *moderate extent* or to a *large extent*, that is, 95% in 2015, 100% in 2016, and 98% in 2017, respectively.

Other: Needs assessment.
The survey of assessment coordinators focused on professional development needs, technological challenges related to assessment, and the effect of moving to a 2-3 year reporting cycle from an annual cycle. Key findings include the following:

A) The top areas that respondents reported wanting assistance were faculty engagement in the assessment process (50% of respondents), interpretation of results (42%), and use of results (39%).

B) 99% (69 out of 70) of respondents reported they were *somewhat likely* or *will absolutely use* a format other than traditional workshops, with short YouTube videos receiving the highest percentage of *will absolutely use*.

C) Only 36% of respondents identified a technological challenge(s) related to the assessment process.

D) The overall effect of moving from an annual reporting cycle to a 2-3 year cycle appears to be positive (73% reported *positive change* or *no change*).

11. **How were the results used?**

Outcome 1: Faculty engagement in scholarship of teaching/learning/assessment.
Given the positive results (e.g., the number of ALI participants and other faculty engaged in assessment scholarship), we sought and received additional support for faculty to pursue the scholarship of teaching and learning: $2,000 (annually) for faculty development from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. To date, we have used the fund to **sponsor nine faculty/staff to participate in additional assessment and/or facilitation training**.

Outcome 2: Degree program learning assessment activities.
Because degree program assessment is impressive with over two-thirds of programs reporting they completed the assessment cycle in 2015, we agreed to **move to a two to three year**

reporting cycle from an annual reporting cycle. After analyzing the programs' assessment reports, we used the results to identify programs that had not completed the assessment cycle and then we **reached out to those program assessment coordinators** and offered to meet with him/her. In addition, we encouraged them to apply to the Assessment Leadership Institute (ALI). These programs were asked to submit a report in 2017; all other programs will submit a report in 2018.

We used our analysis of the assessment reports to guide workshop planning. Because nearly all programs have learning outcomes and a curriculum map, **we offered workshops in areas that fewer programs reported having completed**, e.g., identifying learning evidence, evaluating evidence, and facilitating use of results. (Workshops and materials are [posted online](#).)

Outcome 2: Institutional learning assessment activities.
For each institutional assessment project, the use of results included **distribution and discussion of results by stakeholder groups** of faculty such as the General Education Committee and its five Boards, Institutional Learning Objectives Committee, Committee on Educational Effectiveness, as well as faculty who participated in the project. In addition, results were typically distributed to and discussed with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Center for Teaching Excellence, and Mānoa Deans and Directors.

We used the institutional assessment results to shape office activities. Given the results from quantitative reasoning, and in anticipation of similar results in the area of oral communication, we facilitated **faculty professional development sessions** on quantitative reasoning and oral communication assignment design for interested faculty.

Outcome 3: Departments and administrators use results.
We **celebrated and showcased programs** who did an excellent job using assessment results through both [poster presentations](#) at the local and regional level and annotating the programs in a [public Google Map](#). We **requested meetings** with faculty groups and administrators to discuss institutional results in 2018.

Outcome 4: Perception of assessment as supporting student learning.
We compiled sample **effective faculty professional development models** and encouraged the deans and directors to adopt and adapt. We **expanded collaboration** with the Center for Teaching Excellence and the General Education Office to develop a faculty professional development program on the topic of assignment design in the areas identified through institutional learning assessment projects. The program will take place in July 2018.

Other: Needs assessment.
The results from the needs assessment survey will be used to **plan spring 2018 workshops** and to **plan new formats** for delivering technical assistance to faculty such as short videos.

The reporting cycle will continue to be 2-3 years instead of annual, pending further review.

12. **Beyond the results, were there additional conclusions or discoveries?**

At the program level, faculty are using results for program evolution or improvement. At the institutional level, faculty stakeholder groups have not yet taken it upon themselves to use the results relevant to their area and we continue to work in toward this goal.