

## Assessment Project Report

Department/Program and Degree:	Assessment Office (AO)
Assessment Project Name	Workshop: <i>Learning Outcomes &amp; Curriculum Maps</i>
Semester/Yr Data Collected	Fall 08 (workshop offered on October 14, 2008 and again on October 15, 2008)
Program Assessment Coordinator:	Marlene P. Lowe and Monica Stitt-Bergh
Department Chair:	NA
Person submitting this report:	Marlene P. Lowe
Date submitted:	December 5, 2008

### Executive Summary:

One of the Assessment Office's (AO) goals specified in its mission statement is to educate on how to assess, what to assess, and how to act on the results. To this end, the AO partnered with the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) and conducted the "*Learning Outcomes & Curriculum Maps*" workshop on October 14 and again on October 15, 2008. The workshop was an introduction to the what, why, and how's of learning outcomes and curriculum maps. It was designed for faculty and staff in the beginning stages of program-level assessment of student learning. Three data-collection methods were used: a learning outcomes activity and a curriculum map "puzzle" (direct assessments) and a pen & paper survey (indirect assessment).

At least 19 people participated in the direct assessments. Of the 21 people who signed-in, 19 completed the survey. Overall, the results were positive and the AO believes that an activities-focused workshop allows for a coaching approach to educating UHM faculty on assessment.

Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map Assessments: **The criteria for success were met.** All participants created at least 2 learning outcomes and created a curriculum map. The facilitators will use an activities approach for future workshops.

Pen & Paper Survey Results: **The criterion for success was met.** Over 95% of participants rated the presentation, discussion, handouts, and overall usefulness as either a "4" or "5." The open-ended responses, although interesting and generally positive, provided no common themes and therefore no actionable information.

### OUTCOME(S) ASSESSED:

- At the end of the workshop, participants can:
  - 1) Write good learning outcomes
  - 2) Create a curriculum map

- Participants will be satisfied with the quality and usefulness of the workshop.

Note: There was a 3<sup>rd</sup> learning outcome "Summarize the role of learning outcomes and curriculum maps in program assessment" which was not assessed due to time constraints.

### 1. Assessment Question(s) and/or Goal(s) of Assessment Activity

*What did the program want to find out?*

- The AO wanted to know if using an activities-focused workshop would achieve the outcomes.

**Complete the following grid:**

2. Outcome(s) assessed	3. Method(s) to Gather Evidence*	4. Method to Evaluate*	5. Program Size & Sampling Technique	6. Criteria for Success	7. Results**	8. Met/Not met (the criteria for success)
1. Write good learning outcomes	Participants formed teams, were given a topic, then asked to create and present 2 learning outcomes.	Each team presented their learning outcomes and received evaluation feedback from other participants.	At least 19 people participated. No sampling.	100% of participants can write good learning outcomes.	100% of participants demonstrated an ability to write good learning outcomes.	Met
2. Create a curriculum map	Participants formed teams then completed a “curriculum puzzle” and presented the results.	Each team presented their curriculum map and received feedback from other participants.	Same as above.	100% of participants can create a curriculum map	100% of participants demonstrated the ability to create a curriculum map.	Met
3. Quality of workshop	- Paper survey: participants were asked to use a scale where 1=low, 3=medium, and 5=high to rate the presentation, discussion, handouts, and overall usefulness of the workshop. - Participants submitted survey to the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) representative.	The CTE compiled the numeric results and emailed them to the AO.	21 people signed-in and 19 people completed the survey (90% response rate).	80% of participants rate the 4 areas as a “4” or “5.”	% of participants rated the following areas as a “4” or “5”: Presentation - 100% Discussion - 100% Handouts - 95% Overall Usefulness to You - 95%	Met

\*Examples of methods to evaluate evidence: apply a rubric, score a multiple-choice test, external evaluation by national testing agency, analyze interview transcripts, summarize survey responses

\*\*Results are based on both workshops combined.

**9. Conclusions and Discoveries**

- The AO concluded that using an activities-based approach where participants are given the opportunity to experiment with the material is an effective pedagogy for these topics.

**10. Distribution and Discussion of Results**

*a) Who distributed the results and who received results?*

The AO distributed the results to its facilitators and posted the results on the AO website.

*b) How did the distribution take place?*

The AO facilitators received the results through informal discussion while the “general public” viewed this report on the AO website.

*c) How and when did the discussion of the results take place?*

Discussion of the results took place in the office after each workshop.

**11. Use of Results/Program Modifications**

The AO facilitators were pleased with the results and plan to incorporate more activities-based workshops into the assessment curriculum.

**12. Assessment Modifications**

*Do changes in the assessment methodology need to be made?*

At present, the AO is satisfied with the assessment methodology used and does not feel changes need to be made.

**13. Other Important Information**