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PRFACE TO THE ASSESSMENT TASK FORCE REPORT

Part I: Brief history and motivation for current attention to academic assessment at UHM

Pressure on universities in the United States to “assess” their educational effectiveness has been growing over the past several decades. As the culture that styles itself “accountability-based” has gained prominence in publicly funded education, so has the insistence that universities “measure” the “outcomes” of their efforts to teach students and do so in a way that will demonstrate their effectiveness and justify increasing costs to individuals and demands on public funding. Threats by the federal government to establish uniform standards and assessment procedures at the college level have become increasingly explicit, and accrediting agencies, in order to maintain as much of their independence as possible, have transmitted the pressure to campuses by asking with increasing urgency how each campus will be assessing its educational outcomes. While campuses (for now) are left to devise their own responses to this demand, the pressure from accrediting bodies to have some regime that will provide meaningful guidance for the improvement of education at each institution has become acute.

There is no question whether assessment will happen in U.S. college education—it will and it does. At stake (still) is who will drive the assessment process, how assessment information will be used, and whether the results will be to the benefit or detriment of the valued learning that takes place in our institutions of higher learning. The choice is simple. Either assessment will be done to us, or we will take control of assessment and ensure that it is designed, implemented, and used as it was intended to be: that is, as an integral component of effective educational practice, alongside and in support of curriculum and instruction.

At the University of Hawaii at Manoa, it is time to resolve the role that assessment is to play on our campus. In the 1999 report of our last accreditation site visit, examiners from WASC noted under Standard 4 (Program Review and Student Evaluation) that “Review of UHM assessment activities suggests that there is much to be applauded and still much to be done” (p. 29). They recommended that “Cross-functional teams of institutional research staff (system, campus, department) should be created to share data sources and develop a more seamless presentation of data” (Recommendation 7, p. 19). Appendix A of the report was rather more blunt: “the absence of an assessment plan or any comprehensive statement about assessment in the self-study appeared to be symptomatic of a more deep-seated lack of coordination around collection and use of assessment data.” (p. 47).

Following the Special Visit by WASC in 2003, Ralph Wolff (head of the special visit team) wrote to the Chancellor, applauding the efforts the campus was making to address “issues of Educational Effectiveness under the new Commission Standard of Accreditation” but insisting that “These efforts need to become more systemic and embedded within the campus culture and incorporated more effectively in departmental reviews and assessment of general education outcomes” (p. 3).

Thus far at UHM, the only response to these accreditation concerns has occurred via administrative initiatives. In preparation for the next Special Visit that WASC will pay to the campus this March, and the full accreditation process that will be completed in 2011, early drafts of our institutional proposal to WASC noted the increased efforts made by individual
departments to set up plans for assessing student learning outcomes, the annual reports programs are required to make to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the establishment in 2005 of the Manoa Academic Assessment Council (MAAC). Missing from the proposal, however, was any clear indication of the ways in which UHM intended to develop and sustain a culture within which assessment of student learning would lead to important decisions and improvements in our educational efforts. Indeed, related tensions and unresolved issues had arisen within discussions of the MAAC and within the committee that helped to prepare the institutional proposal. Of particular concern were the proposed techniques and procedures for assessing student learning in the general education program, as well as more fundamental questions regarding the intended uses and roles for assessment at UHM. Faculty involved in these committees were growing increasingly concerned over proposals to adopt assessments that might not reflect the academic values and learning expectations that characterize the UHM campus and our educational mission. The following observations emerged from these discussions:

• There are many uses for assessment across the UHM campus, in response to different purposes and at different levels of decision making
• Different uses for assessment call for different assessments—one ‘measure’ cannot meet all purposes
• Not all learning outcomes, or other factors associated with educational effectiveness, are amenable to ‘measurement’ in the technocratic psychometric sense of the term; however, all student learning in all programs at UHM is amenable to assessment of some sort
• Standardized, external, and commercial assessments may provide one source of information useful for understanding some aspects of student learning at UHM, and this information may facilitate some types of decisions to be made about educational programming at UHM, but any proposed use of such assessments must be carefully considered and articulated to a specific and circumscribed set of interpretations and decisions prior to selecting and implementing a particular assessment instrument
• Despite trends and pressures in this direction, adoption of a single standardized assessment will by no means ‘fix’ UHM’s assessment problems; on the contrary, the unconsidered adoption of external assessments is likely to contribute to UHM’s assessment problems
• In order for assessments to lead to appropriate changes, improvements, revisions, and the like, they must provide information that is immediately useful to specific and diverse decision makers, including in particular the faculty who are responsible for implementing educational programs at UHM
• If faculty are intended to base their education and programmatic decisions on assessments, they must be involved in all aspects of assessment, from the specification of intended uses, to the development and/or selection of instruments, to the interpretation of data
• There are currently virtually no resources available at UHM for supporting faculty in their assessment efforts
• Beyond a mechanism for departmental annual assessment reports, there is currently no infrastructure available at UHM for guiding, coordinating, or ensuring the utility of assessment practices
• UHM lags far behind peer institutions in all aspects of assessment

These tensions remained unresolved when Ralph Wolff visited the campus in November. When asked about one of the proposed commercial instruments for assessing general education and the problems with getting students to take it seriously, his reply included the suggestion that
faculty should run pilot projects with such instruments to determine their suitability (and for which purposes) before the campus adopted them. It was out of such conversations with Ralph Wolff that the VCAA and the Faculty Senate agreed to set up a Task Force to examine how faculty could take “ownership” of assessment.

According to Appendix A of WASC’s 1999 report on Manoa,

“An effective assessment plan:
1. Insures faculty ownership
2. Establishes the student outcomes, instructional and co-curricular, to be assessed. ...
3. Identifies appropriate indicators/measures to evaluate specific outcomes ...
4. Establishes a clear and consistent feedback loop between the assessment findings and faculty.

Ultimately the utility of assessment findings will depend upon faculty's willingness to revise and improve courses and programs based on the information generated.” (p. 48)

Clearly, at the heart of WASC’s persistent attention to assessment at UHM, and at the heart of our own current attention to assessment, is the disjuncture between faculty and assessment. Accordingly, the final institutional proposal sent to WASC in November of 2006 reported that Manoa Faculty Senate had set up a Task Force “to recommend specific ways in which the faculty and the OVCAA ... working in collaboration can design and implement meaningful assessment” (p. 3). The recommendations of the Task Force have been framed with these positive ends in view, particularly faculty ownership, concomitant resources and support, and a feedback loop to ensure that assessment does contribute to the improvement of the education we offer. If faculty are not inspired by the positive possibilities that assessment affords, indeed the integral role that assessment plays in comprehensive educational programming, they should nevertheless bear in mind that the external pressure for assessment of all aspects of our educational efforts (general education as well as special programs) will not soon dissipate. A rod is being fashioned for us and the only way to keep it off our backs is to place it firmly in our hands.

References

1999 WASC report

Executive Memorandum and Policy on Institutional Accountability (June 1999)
http://www.hawaii.edu/apis/ep/e5/e5210.pdf

Assessment Structure and Procedures for General Education (Appendix A of GEC governance document passed by the Manoa Faculty Senate in December of 2000)
https://mail.hawaii.edu/attach/gec_appendixA.pdf

2003 Letter from Ralph Wolff to Chancellor Englert

November 2006 Institutional Proposal to WASC
http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/proposal/
Part II: Questions and Answers

Q: Do we need to institutionalize assessment policy and practice?

A: Apparently, yes; see the documents referenced above. If the outside pressures for institutionalized assessment disappear, and we decide that the benefits of the MA* (Manoa Assessment Committee and Office) are no longer worth the cost, the Faculty Senate can dissolve both committee and office.

Q: Doesn’t this duplicate assessment activity already being done on campus?

A: The only direct duplication is with efforts (such as the now-disbanded MAAC) in the OVCAA. This proposal is meant as a replacement for those efforts.

One of the main jobs of the MAO will be to assess General Education at UHM; this desperately needs doing, and there is currently no mechanism in place for this assessment.

Q: Many units already have an assessment process in place. For some of the professional schools, the nature of that assessment is dictated by accreditation requirements. Won’t the MA* conflict with those efforts, or put more strain on those units?

A: A very high priority when writing the proposal was to not interfere with such efforts, and to not add to the workload of academic units. It will be the responsibility of the MAO to find a way to collate and interpret the results of the various efforts on campus in order to provide a unified assessment report to the bodies (such as WASC) that are calling for unified assessment.

Q: How will the departments pay for assessment activities mandated by the MA*?

A: The MA* does not plan to require departments to engage in any particular kinds of assessment activities. As such activities become required by the institution, the job of the MAO will be to help the departments decide which activities will best suit them, and then work with them to obtain whatever resources are required to carry it out.

Like the GE* (General Education Committee and Office), the MA* will be a faculty organization that is subordinate to the will of the Faculty Senate.

Q: Isn’t this a lot of money?

A: Most of the budget is for personnel. If this job is not done within the MA*, then it will be done elsewhere on campus, and will either cost just as much, or not be done as carefully, or become the job of unpaid faculty conscripts.

Q: Why not just send the money directly to the departments and let them spend it on their assessment efforts?
A: Who decides where the money goes? If a faculty committee (like the URC), where is the expertise to ensure that the money is appropriately spent? Once the assessment is complete, who collates and interprets the results for WASC et al?

Currently this is done under the OVCAA. How much money has your department been given for assessment they've mandated over the last 2-3 years?

Q: Should the departmental cost of carrying out the assessments be included in the budget?

A: We do not know how much that will be; this is one of the tasks for the MAO. However, if Senate bodies wish to estimate a figure and attach it as a budget line, that is consistent with the vision of the task force.

Q: Shouldn’t the MAO staff include an expert position at the level of Associate Specialist instead of the senior APT?

A: This might cost more, but is consistent with the vision of the task force. There are a number of matters which the Task Force has left open for Senate Committees to determine.

The entire Task Force Report will be found on the Senate’s website at
Executive Summary of Activities and Recommendations

On October 18, 2007, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC) established the Task Force on Assessment. The charge given to this ad hoc task force was: (a) to draft a charter for a Senate-authorized council on academic assessment at UHM; (b) to propose an organizational structure and budget to support the work of this council; and (c) to clarify the distribution of responsibilities for academic assessment at UHM, including the work to be undertaken by this council.

Members of the task force were appointed by the SEC to represent a diversity of faculty perspectives on assessment at UHM: Helen Baroni, Tep Dobry, Donna Grace, Joan Harms, Randall Hensley, Thomas Hilgers, John Norris, David Ross, Todd Sammons, and James Tiles. John Norris was elected to chair the committee; David Ross was elected to serve as vice-chair.

The task force met five times between October 2006 and January 2007: 10/27/06, 11/17/06, 12/05/06, 12/13/06, 01/09/07. Additional discussions were held on e-mail. The outcomes of these meetings and discussions are presented in this report.

Summary of major recommendations:

1. Establish a new standing committee of the UHM Faculty Senate: the Mānoa Assessment Committee (MAC). The MAC voting membership should represent academic units, faculty, and students across the campus. Additional non-voting members should represent the offices with direct responsibility for facilitating the implementation of student learning assessment.

2. The UHM administration must allocate permanent and sufficient budget and resources if effective assessment of student learning is to be made possible at UHM, including:
   - Funding for the Mānoa Assessment Office (support office of the MAC, with a full-time faculty director, full time APTs, additional support staff and resources)
   - Funding for a full-time Assessment Specialist in the Office of Faculty Development and Support, and funding for faculty-initiated assessment activities
   - Funding for an Assessment Specialist in the UHM Institutional Research and Assessment Office

3. The faculty-driven Mānoa Assessment Committee must take the lead in setting assessment policy, reviewing and advising on assessment practice, and coordinating assessment activities, if assessment is to be used to help the UHM community understand and improve its educational effectiveness at all levels. The Office of Faculty Development and Support, given sufficient resources, should play a key role in raising faculty awareness and developing faculty capacity to engage in useful assessment of student learning. The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should provide essential logistical support in ensuring that assessment data are collected, analyzed, reported, and used in support of the UHM mission.

---

1 This document was drafted by John Norris, with assistance from David Ross and Randall Hensley, and in consultation with the other members of the Task Force on Assessment.
ENVISIONING USEFUL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I AT MĀNOA

Introduction

We perceive academic assessment to be the collection and use of systematic information about student learning—and the factors that contribute to it—for the purposes of understanding and improving our educational practices and programs. At the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM), assessment occurs for many purposes and across multiple levels of intended use, from decisions about individual learners, to the improvement of courses and degree program curricula, to campus-wide articulation and awareness-raising in pursuit of UHM’s unique educational mission. In order for academic assessment to fulfill these crucial educative roles, and to contribute maximally to the realization of UHM’s mission, substantial reorganization, investment, and capacity-building in assessment is currently needed.

While important assessment work has occurred in recent years—most notably the contributions of the Mānoa Academic Assessment Council—it has proceeded largely without the awareness and investment of the UHM faculty. Although this preceding work has helped us to meet essential accreditation requirements for the assessment of student learning, the Mānoa campus lacks to date the comprehensive organizational structure, as well as fundamental infrastructure, needed to ensure that assessment is practiced at all educational decision-making levels, that assessment data are useful and used in informing improved practices, and that faculty, students, and administration develop the awareness and capacity to put assessment to work for the benefit of UHM.

In this proposal, we articulate an initial vision of the changes that will be required in order for academic assessment to play a useful role at UHM. We first present a draft charter establishing a new standing committee of the Faculty Senate, the Mānoa Assessment Committee, which we perceive as an essential step in shifting the ownership and responsibility of assessment into the hands of those who are most directly responsible for educational effectiveness at this university (i.e., the faculty). We then propose an annual budget for the associated Mānoa Assessment Office, including funding for full-time professional staff trained in higher education assessment practices, whose job it will be to coordinate academic assessment activities across the campus and to provide direct outreach/support to faculty and academic units. Finally, we outline our current understanding of the roles and responsibilities for assessment at UHM, including the work that will be tasked to the Mānoa Assessment Committee and Assessment Office, as well as our vision of the cooperative functions of the Office of Faculty Development and Support (in developing faculty capacity in assessment) and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (in supporting the implementation of assessment).

We feel that the changes proposed here will provide the appropriate initial impetus and structure for further development of useful academic assessment at UHM. However, without adequate levels of resource investment by the university, we cannot expect to see adequate levels of investment by the faculty in terms of the time, energy, and commitment required for a new vision of assessment to be realized. With this caveat in mind, we present the following proposal.
Charter

The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Assessment Committee (MAC) is a Standing Committee of the UHM Faculty Senate, established according to Faculty Congress and Senate Bylaws [article and section numbers needed] as of [date needed]. The MAC is a representative body comprised of faculty, students, and professional staff from across the Mānoa campus. It replaces and expands upon the previous Mānoa Academic Assessment Council.

The MAC is responsible for developing policies, providing oversight, and monitoring student learning assessment activities that are directed at understanding and improving educational effectiveness at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. It also identifies gaps in available assessment information, recommends changes in assessment processes, reviews the usefulness of assessment strategies, and ensures that assessment data are used to inform decision-making and the improvement of student learning at UHM.

The MAC reports to the Faculty Senate. It also coordinates all academic assessment activities at UHM, working in particular with the Senate’s Standing Committee for General Education, the Office of Faculty Development and Support, and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to ensure useful campus-wide assessment of student learning. The MAC also maintains communication with other relevant committees, administrative bodies, and academic units involved in the promotion of educational effectiveness at UHM.

Membership and terms of office

Membership of the MAC consists of voting and non-voting representatives from Mānoa schools and colleges as well as other units directly involved in student learning assessment. Voting members shall be appointed by the UHM Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Service (with the exception of student members from ASUH and GSU, who are appointed by their respective executive boards). Voting members will serve three-year terms in rotation (renewable for a maximum of one additional term), such that there is at least 50% overlap in committee composition over consecutive terms. Non-voting members will represent those units on campus directly responsible for coordinating, implementing, improving, and reporting on academic assessment activities.

Committee composition option #1:

18 Voting members (including one representative from each of the following units):

- School of Architecture
- College of Arts and Humanities

---

2 We are providing two distinct proposals here in terms of the voting membership of the committee. Proposal #1 includes representation from ALL colleges and schools at UHM, as a means of indicating that all academic units have a responsibility to engage in assessment (and a concomitant right to have a voice in shaping assessment policy). This comprehensive representative approach has been implemented successfully at other institutions (e.g., UH Hilo, Northern Arizona University, among many others), and it may lead to a richer exchange of ideas and a more communal development of the UHM assessment culture.
• College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature,
• College of Natural Sciences
• College of Social Sciences
• Shidler College of Business
• College of Education
• College of Engineering
• School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies
• School of Law
• School of Medicine
• School of Nursing and Dental Hygiene
• School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology
• School of Travel Industry Management
• College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources
• Associated Students of the University of Hawaii at Manoa
• University of Hawaii at Manoa Graduate Student Organization
• University of Hawaii at Manoa Library

Quorum:
A quorum consists of 50% +1 of the voting membership.

Five Ex officio (non-voting) members:
• MAO Faculty Director (Support Office)
• Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
• Director of General Education Office
• OFDAS Assessment Specialist
• Representative of the Vice Chancellor for Students

Committee composition option #2:

12 Voting members:

One member from each of the following units (total of 8):

• College of Arts and Humanities
• College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature,
• College of Natural Sciences
• College of Social Sciences
• College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources
• Associated Students of the University of Hawaii at Manoa
• University of Hawaii at Manoa Graduate Student Organization
• University of Hawaii at Manoa Library

---

3 Proposal #2 borrows largely from the structure of other standing committees of the Faculty Senate, and it acknowledges the fact that UHM consists of a very large number of colleges and schools. This proposal seeks to strike a balance between permanent representation from those units with greatest persistent need for assistance in developing and implementing student learning assessment and rotating representation from the UHM professional schools.
One member each from four of the following units, rotating such that no one unit is represented for more than two consecutive terms (total of 4):

- School of Architecture
- Shidler College of Business
- College of Education
- College of Engineering
- School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies
- School of Law
- School of Medicine
- School of Nursing and Dental Hygiene
- School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology
- School of Travel Industry Management

Quorum:
A quorum consists of 50% +1 of the voting membership.

Five Ex officio (non-voting) members:
- MAO Faculty Director (Support Office)
- Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
- Director of General Education Office
- OFDAS Assessment Specialist
- Representative of the Vice Chancellor for Students

Officers

CHAIRPERSON: The Chair will be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to serve a two-year term, with the following duties:
- Preside at all meetings (at least two per semester) of the committee and ensure that minutes are taken
- Develop an agenda for each meeting in consultation with ex-officio members
- Appoint subcommittees as necessary
- Coordinate the writing of MAC reports
- Liaise with the Faculty Senate, the UHM administration, and the university community

VICE-CHAIR: The Vice-Chair will be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, serving a 2-year term, and will perform the duties of the chair in the event that the designated chair is unable to serve.

Support office

The support office of the MAC, the Mānoa Assessment Office (MAO) carries out the daily tasks of coordinating student learning assessment activities. The support office consists of at least: (a) a full-time director appointed from the UHM faculty, (b) a full-time assessment specialist, and (c) a full-time administrative assistant. The UHM administration shall allocate a permanent budget sufficient for the staffing and successful functioning of the MAO.
Amendments

This charter may be amended by the UHM Faculty Senate in accordance with Senate Bylaws. Particular responsibility falls upon the MAC to periodically and regularly review this charter in terms of its structure, faculty participation on the committee, and the success of its resulting operations, and to report on needed revisions to the Faculty Senate.
Budget

In order to serve as a useful instrument of institutional improvement, and not merely a token effort designed to satisfy nominal accreditation requirements, student learning assessment will require institutional support and funding commensurate with its importance in ensuring our educational effectiveness. While the Mānoa Assessment Committee will consist of individuals engaged in voluntary service to the institution, its activities will require the support of full-time professional staff and the allocation of material resources. The Mānoa Assessment Office (MAO) will act as the professional support office of the MAC, with the primary responsibility of facilitating its work and coordinating day to day assessment activities across the university.

Budget Proposal A = First year ($198,500), Subsequent years (a minimum of $178,500) \(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Years 2+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$166500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive</td>
<td>Breakdown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25000 (two</td>
<td>$166500 (+salary increases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class C each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>courses);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$130000 (one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Band C and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one Band B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APT including</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fringe);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1500 (SA5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 hours at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15/hour or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equivalent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>casual hire;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10000 (3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>workers, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>week)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative</td>
<td>$22000</td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakdown:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20000 for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>permanent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2000 for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consumables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$10000</td>
<td>$10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(based on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2000/trip)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Office space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to house MAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment (</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>computer and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consumable</td>
<td>copy equipment and furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>office supplies, telephone, postage, copy costs, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$10000</td>
<td>$10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 annual</td>
<td>(based on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conference/consultation trips to be divided between the directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2000/trip)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Proposal B = First year ($303,500), Subsequent years (a minimum of $283,500) \(^5\)

\(^4\) We provide here two budget proposals for the MAO. Budget A adopts the model of two faculty directors with part-time course releases and the continuance of other duties in their host departments.
**Category** | **Year 1** | **Years 2+**
--- | --- | ---
**Personnel** | $271500 | $271500 (+salary increases)
- **Executive**: One full-time tenured faculty member will serve as director of the MAC in a 3-year renewable term. In order that the director can give attention to the job commensurate with the importance to the University, the director will work full-time (11 months) for the MAC, and his or her salary will be released to the home department to hire a replacement.
- **Administrative**: Two permanent non-faculty staff specialist positions (APT personnel) will be assigned exclusively within this office. One position will be a trained Assessment Specialist; the other will serve a primarily administrative/secretarial role.
- **Miscellaneous**: Graduate Student Casual Hires as needed; Undergraduate student workers as needed.

**General Support** | $22000 | $2000
- Office space sufficient to house MAO personnel
- General office equipment (including computer and copy equipment) and furniture
- Consumable office supplies, telephone, postage, copy costs, etc.

**Travel** | $10000 | $10000 (based on $2000/trip)
- 5 annual conference/consultation trips

---

5 Budget B adopts the model of one full-time faculty director working exclusively within the MAC and with no additional duties.
**Roles and Responsibilities**

While many assessment responsibilities fall to individual faculty, departments, administrators, and others, three campus entities assume primary responsibilities for setting academic assessment policy, enabling and supporting useful assessment practices, reviewing and improving assessment activities, and generally fostering a campus-wide commitment to the use of assessment in support of UHM’s educational value and effectiveness. These three entities are: (a) the Mānoa Assessment Committee; (b) the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support; and (c) the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In the spirit of shared faculty governance, the Mānoa Assessment Committee acts as the central coordinating body for all assessment activities that are directed at understanding and improving educational effectiveness at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.

**Mānoa Assessment Committee**

In order to determine appropriate and useful academic assessment practices, and to oversee their implementation in support of UHM’s educational mission, the representative Mānoa Assessment Committee (MAC) will play a critical policy-setting, review, and oversight role. The MAC will:

- Represent key constituencies across the UHM campus, including colleges and schools, other academic units, and student government, in order to identify their assessment needs/concerns and support useful assessment practices.
- Coordinate assessment of student learning activities across campus and among the entities charged with ensuring educational effectiveness at UHM.
- Establish academic assessment policies and recommend practices as necessary to foster a campus-wide understanding of and commitment to improvement-oriented educational assessment.
- Identify the most appropriate methods and uses for assessment of student learning in: (a) the General Education program; (b) degree programs and departmental program review; (c) graduate as well as undergraduate programs; and (d) co-curricular programs.
- Review assessment resource needs and recommend concomitant budgetary allocations by the institution.
- Liaise with departments, colleges/schools, and other campus constituencies in promoting effective academic assessment practices, especially in support of degree programs.
- Recommend assessment support and implementation activities to be undertaken by the OFDAS and the OVCAA.
- Undertake the periodic review and evaluation of assessment practices at all levels across the UHM campus, in order to ensure the educational value of assessment.
- Produce an annual report to the Faculty Senate on the status of academic assessment at UHM.

**Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support**

In order to raise awareness about academic assessment at UHM, and to enhance faculty capacity to engage in useful assessment practices, the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support (OFDAS) will play a key educational and supportive role. Faculty training and direct
assistance in assessment will be essential to further developing a culture of useful assessment on the UHM campus. The OFDAS will:

- Incorporate an introduction to and overview of academic assessment at UHM into expanded new faculty induction procedures.
- Provide regularly scheduled workshops on effective practices in assessing student learning at the individual student, course, and degree program levels.
- Sponsor occasional workshops, symposia, guest speakers, and related opportunities in response to requests by the faculty for attention to specific assessment issues and topics.
- Offer a direct assistance service to faculty in need of advice on student learning assessment practices.
- Encourage research on improvements in academic assessment by overseeing annual competitive grants for faculty-initiated assessment projects.

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

In order to articulate assessment activities at multiple levels across the campus, and to enable and ensure the implementation of assessment in support of educational effectiveness (in compliance with institutional accreditation), the UHM administration, via the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA), will provide key budgeting, staffing, data-collecting, and reporting services to a variety of UHM constituents. The OVCAA will:

- Allocate an annual budget for academic assessment to include: (a) staff and associated budget for the Mānoa Assessment Office (support office of the MAC); (b) assessment specialist staff and associated budget for the OFDAS; (c) fund for faculty-initiated assessment grants; (d) assessment staffing for the Institutional Research and Assessment Office and associated budget within the OVCAA; and (e) assessment instruments, materials, and associated expenses as required in order to get assessment done.
- Liaise with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to ensure UHM compliance with institutional accreditation and public accountability requirements in the area of assessing student learning in order to improve educational effectiveness.
- Communicate regularly with UHM campus constituents regarding assessment expectations from external entities, WASC in particular.
- Implement academic assessment activities as requested by the MAC.
- Identify institution-wide and administrative uses for assessment in support of student learning, and carry out associated data collection and analysis via the Institutional Research and Assessment Office under the advisement of the MAC.
- Maintain records on academic assessment activities at all levels across the UHM campus and produce required accreditation reports.
- Interact regularly with the MAC, in particular in the area of departmental assessment of student learning.