Collaborative Development of Evaluation Criteria
Workshop Evaluation Report

Executive Summary:
The Assessment Office (AO) offered a workshop titled Collaborative Development of Evaluation Criteria on February 11, 2015 led by Yao Hill. The workshop was advertised as a beginner- to intermediate-level session suitable for faculty and assessment coordinators seeking to learn techniques in facilitating collaborative development of evaluation criteria using structured observation guide and rubric adaptation. The format of this workshop included a presentation and hands-on activities.

Sixteen participants participated in the workshop. Thirteen participants completed and submitted an evaluation survey (81% response rate). Overall, respondents found the workshop useful and effective in increasing their ability to facilitate collaborative development of evaluation criteria among faculty.

1. State the SLO(s) that was Assessed, Targeted, or Studied

Evidence was collected on the extent to which participants achieved the learning outcomes and the extent they were satisfied with the usefulness and effectiveness of the workshop in relation to the workshop outcomes: (1) articulate the benefits of and need for faculty collaboration; and (2) their ability to facilitate collaborative development of evaluation criteria using three-person interview and collaborative rubric adaptation. Four quiz questions were used to assess whether participants could identify benefits of faculty collaboration and their self-perceived ability to facilitate collaborative development of evaluation criteria. An evaluation form was used to determine if the workshop was effective and useful in increasing their understanding of the outcomes, as well as aspects of the workshop that were most and least valuable.

2. State the Type(s) of Evidence Gathered

The facilitator distributed a paper evaluation form with four quiz questions and five evaluation questions.

3. State How Many Pieces of Evidence Were Collected

Out of the 16 who attended the workshop, 13 completed and submitted an evaluation survey (81% response rate).
4. State How the Evidence was Interpreted, Evaluated, or Analyzed

The workshop facilitator scored the quiz questions. The workshop facilitator used descriptive statistics to examine the learning gained on each outcome and summarize closed-ended questions. The facilitator identified themes from a close reading of the open-ended responses on valuable/least valuable aspects and other constructive comments.

5. Summarize the Actual Results

69% of the respondents were able to list at least one benefit of promoting faculty collaboration. 85% felt that they were able to facilitate collaborative development of criteria with the assistance of the AO and 85% believed they could do so on their own, which provides very encouraging evidence for achieving the second outcome (i.e., ability to facilitate collaborative development of evaluation). Additionally, 62% wrote down at least one facilitation technique they found useful.

**Workshop Participant Evaluation results**

- 8 out of 13 respondents (62%) said the workshop was ‘Very Useful’, and 4 (31%) said it was ‘Useful’.
- 6 out of 13 respondents (46%) said the workshop was ‘Very Effective’, and 6 (46%) said it was ‘Effective’.
- Overall, the majority of the respondents found the workshop very helpful. They mostly appreciated the hands-on activities (e.g., role play, modeling), the presenter’s organization and presentation, and the content (e.g., examples, walking through methods).
- 100% of the respondents reported that the workshop was useful and effective.

Detailed results are presented in Appendix A.

6. In addition to the actual results, were there additional conclusions or discoveries?

No.

7. Use of Results/Program Modifications:

Respondents mostly appreciated the use of hands-on activities, such as modeling and role playing. These features should be continued. In response to the feedback from a previous training in which the workshop facilitator asked a participant to role-play the facilitator in the rubric adaptation simulation, the workshop facilitator played the role herself in this workshop, which seemed to work well. One participant voiced the issue of using the established rubrics and one respondent commented that time spent discussing rubric revisions was too long and felt disjointed due to the diversity of participants’ fields. The workshop facilitator can consider explaining more of the context and situation in which the tools and the process can be best used and the challenges to be expected.
8. Reflect on the Assessment Process

The combination of direct assessment and participants’ perceptions seem to work well.

8. Other Important Information.

None.
Appendix A. Responses to Open- and Closed-Ended Questions

Stem: Overall usefulness of the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Useful</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Little Use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Useful At All</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stem: Workshop effectiveness in increasing understanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Effective</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most valuable aspect of the workshop

- Modeling the process of collaborative program evaluation
- The activities - put into practice what is being discussed or taught.
- Seeing the classroom from student perspective again! How intimidating it can be to speak in front of peers. Facilitators made great effort to make everyone comfortable.
- We can share clear evaluation criteria.
- Role play
- The example and group participation gave a deep understanding
- 3 different program assessment methods & going through it
- resource sheet
- dynamic presenter (Dr. Hill) very responsive
- All of it - thanks. It worked well as a package. You are focused and organized but facilitated our participation.
- Writing evaluation exercise - I noticed a useful instruction for assignments: "use one of these three ideas to justify" will force deeper analysis.
Least valuable aspect of the workshop
- The note taking - because it was a little difficult to see.
- The formula rubric was NOT very helpful. Better to take the format and create our own from ideas in interviews.
- Discussion of rubric revisions went too long, and was disjointed because participants are from wide range of fields.

Other constructive comments
- Thank you for the hand-outs.
- If follow up workshops were held at the same time and day, it would be helpful and I would be able to attend more.
- Thank you!
- good training
- Thank you.