Today’s agenda

1. Background and purpose
   1.1. WASC accreditation and program review cycle
   1.2. What are we trying to accomplish for LLL (by developing an online evaluation system)?
   1.3. What is a student exit survey and how will it help us accomplish the project goals?

2. Project impetus and use
   2.1. Why prioritize student opinions/surveys in evaluating CLLL degree programs?
   2.2. Who are the users of this evaluation?

3. Methods: Participants, instrument, procedures
4. Evaluation planning: Personnel roles, timeline, tasks
5. Capacity support for implementing evaluation
1. Background and purpose

1.1. WASC Accreditation and program review cycle

2006
- Institutional proposal

2009
- Capacity and preparatory review
- Educational effectiveness review

2011
- Institutional Program Review - UHM

1.2. What are we trying to accomplish for LLL (by developing an online evaluation system)?

The College of LLL (CLLL) evaluation project for the 2008-9 academic year seeks to accomplish the following...
(a) respond to the internal (department) and external (institution and WASC) needs.
(b) facilitate programs to take actions based on evidence.
(c) build program evaluation capacity across departments in the CLLL.
(d) create a useful and sustainable program evaluation system.
(e) create and field-test a evaluation practice model for other colleges and for higher education in general.
1. Background and purpose

1.3. What is a student exit survey and how will it help us accomplish the project goals?

Student exit questionnaires or interviews...

- ... have been widely used in many American higher education institutions as part of program evaluation activities.
- ... are typically given to graduating majors (BA, MA, and PhD).
- ... can help answer **key evaluation questions** such as:
  - What is the value/strength of the program?
  - What are the areas that need attention to improve the program?
  - To what extent are the program objectives being met?
  - To what extent did the program take action based on the evidence gathered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasible: time, implementation, data analysis, feedback loop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires ➝ C ➝ Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized tests ➝ C ➝ Course-specific tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course-specific tests ➝ C ➝ Standardized tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized tests ➝ C ➝ Course-specific tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course-specific tests ➝ C ➝ Standardized tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized tests ➝ C ➝ Course-specific tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course-specific tests ➝ C ➝ Standardized tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Project impetus and use
   2.1. Why prioritize student opinions/surveys?

   - The OVCAA website published the latest/2008 external LLL program review report. The report, which seems to have been created largely based on departmental self-studies, provides evaluative analyses of faculty, students, staff, and organizational structure.

   - The student section documents findings from “student surveys” and interviews conducted by the review team.

   - The student section basically identifies what’s wrong with us or what general areas we need to work on…. (see Appendix A)
     - Inconsistency in quality of instruction.
     - Inadequate student advising system.
     - Revise undergraduate requirements to promote student learning and improve graduation rates.
     - Increase support for graduate students and communicate clear criteria for allocation of support.

   → Where is the good stuff!? Evaluation is not about just being negative. Don’t we deserve praise, too?
2. Project impetus and use
2.1. Why prioritize student opinions/surveys?

- The description and presentation of data-gathering methods do not seem professional/acceptable….
  - Data collection procedure is not adequately explained.
  - No mention of the number of respondents to the survey.
  - No instruments appended.
  - No descriptions of procedures.
  - No data presented.
- Where is the evidence?
- Shouldn’t we be able to engage in better evaluation based on evidence?

2. Project impetus and use
2.2. Who are the users of this evaluation?

EVALUATION USERS

- CLLL faculty and administrators
- Future students & parents interested in CLLL programs
- Make choices based on program values, goals/objectives, learner achievement, learner progress, etc.
- Enhance evaluation capacity, identify and articulate CLLL outcomes
- Improve teaching & learning. Demonstrate program values and effectiveness.
- Institutional improvement, WASC accreditation, capacity development
- The Chancellor’s office, Assessment office, VCAA, CPRC
- Other colleges at UH and higher education in general
- Use of evaluation model.
3. Methods

3.1. Participants

Undergraduate and graduate majors who filed for graduation (See Appendix B)
**3. Methods**

3.2. **Data collection Instrument: Electronic student exit surveys**

**EXIT SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

- The surveys will have **common questions** to all departments. **Questions specific to individual departments/programs** may also be included.

**A. COMMON QUESTIONS**

- How do we create common questions (i.e., identify common program concerns and learning outcomes)?
  - Gather information via **Online Exit Survey Construction Instrument (ESCI)** by mid October.
  - **Participants:** Individuals designated by department chairs (e.g. directors, section heads/chairs, curriculum coordinators, graduate/undergraduate representatives, evaluation liaison, etc.)

---

**B. DEPARTMENT-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS**

- How do we create department-specific questions?
  - Which program elements should be under focus?
  - What is the pressing agenda that requires graduating students’ input?
  - **What I need to know about the program is X.**
    - **With this information I will be able to do Y.**
    - It is important to do this because Z.

**PROGRAM DECISION MAKERS:**
What do program decision makers want to know from their students about the program? Any recent changes in the program students experienced?

**FACULTY:**
Are there any course-specific questions faculty would like to ask graduating students?

**STUDENTS:**
What are some opinions students often express about the program?
3. Methods
3.3. Exit survey implementation

EXIT SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION SYSTEM

Gather information from department chairs (and possibly from key informants) through interviews to identify…

(a) the current evaluation practices
(b) necessary support
(c) ways to implement the evaluation project
(d) department-specific evaluation use

(Appendix C lists interview questions)

3.4. Issues to discuss about data collection procedure

- Sampling issue: Should student participation be voluntary or compulsory?
  ✓ Compulsory for all graduating CLLL students
  ✓ Voluntary for all graduating CLLL students
  ✓ Individual departments decide

- What is the best time to administer the exit survey?
- How often should we administer the exit survey?
- When is the best time for the department to receive the results summary?
4. Evaluation Planning
4.1. Personnel and roles

**LLL Evaluation liaison:**
*Dean Joseph O’Mealy*
- Encourage faculty to participate in evaluation activities
- Communicate about the project with UH upper administration and seek support.

**LLL Evaluation Resource Team (LLL-ERT):**
*Kimi Kondo-Brown, John Davis, and Yukiko Watanabe*
- Build resources and capacity for evaluation.
- Facilitate survey development, upload online surveys (LLL website).
- Analyze data and report the results for each department.
- Disseminate evaluation and project outcomes.

**Web Master (LLC/NFLRC staff member):**
- In order to make the process transparent, open, and facilitative, Web Master regularly upload evaluation materials & resources to the LLL website.

**LLL Assessment Council (LLL-AC):**
*Department chairs, JD Brown, Thom Hudson, and John Norris*
- Provide feedback/advice on project planning, instruments, evaluation system building, etc.

---

---

4. Evaluation Planning
4.1. Personnel and roles

**Department evaluation liaison:**
Either the department chair or a designated evaluation liaison person will be identified to...

- Represent department views and issues on evaluation.
- Be the contact person for the LLL-ERT.
- Facilitate department-specific evaluation activities (e.g., coordinate department-specific survey items.)

**In choosing a liaison person, consider:**
- enthusiasm for and interest in evaluation
- teaching load, administrative load
- a member with some decision making power
- representation of different program interests
- long-term commitment
## 4. Evaluation Planning
### 4.2. Timeline, Tasks, & Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Department &amp; LLL-AC</th>
<th>LLL Eval Resource Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sept--Oct (2008)</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Chair:</strong> Reports back to the department about the project. Explains the purpose and use of the Exit Survey Construction Instrument (ESCI).&lt;br&gt;• <strong>Chair:</strong> Identifies evaluation liaison&lt;br&gt;• <strong>Individuals (faculty and/or students) designated by Chair:</strong> Respond to ESCI by 10/12.&lt;br&gt;• <strong>Chair:</strong> Meets with LLL-ERT for an interview session</td>
<td>• <strong>Administer ESCI.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• <strong>Conduct interview sessions with chairs</strong> (by Oct 31st).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov-Dec, (2008)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair and liaison(s):</strong> Submit department-specific questions to LLL-ERT (by Nov 30). If SLOs are available, please include them as SLO questions.</td>
<td><strong>Summarize and report the results of the ESCI and interview findings.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Draft the exit surveys based on the ESCI and interviews.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>LLL-AC and LLL-ERT</strong> meet to review the instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jan-March, (2009)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Departments</strong> clarify procedures and how to make decisions based on results.</td>
<td><strong>Pilot-test the exit surveys and revise the survey.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Create guidelines for reporting.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Offer capacity development opportunities for analyzing and interpreting survey data.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Evaluation Planning
#### 4.2. Timeline, Tasks, & Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Department &amp; LLL-AC</th>
<th>LLL Eval Resource Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>• Administer the survey</td>
<td>• Compile and disseminate results to individual departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late May 2009</td>
<td>• Chair and liaison(s): Interpret results and create a list of possible action items for program improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-July 2009</td>
<td>• Chair and liaison(s): Discuss results and action items in the department. Finalize program decisions.</td>
<td>• Interview chairs and liaisons to find out how each department plans to use the survey results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chair and liaison(s): Participate on an interview with LLL-ERT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Department &amp; LLL-AC</th>
<th>LLL Eval Resource Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June-July 2009</td>
<td>• CLLL Dean, LLL-AC, and LLL-ERT meet to discuss how best to institutionalize and maintain evaluation system (including the exit survey system).</td>
<td>§ Facilitate evaluation planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (? Chair and liaison(s)) Plan the next evaluation cycle for Fall 2009.</td>
<td>• Summarize the project, evaluation findings, and program actions on the LLL website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Capacity support for implementing evaluation

5.1 Possible capacity support we hope to be able to offer...

Provide information (brochures, worksheets, workshops, etc.) on:

- Strategies for the chair to **obtain buy-in** from faculty members
- Ways to solicit faculty opinions for **defining SLOs**
- **How to write SLOs**
- Training on how to **create an online survey**
- Capacity development for **analyzing and interpreting data**
- Strategies for **reporting and action taking**
- Facilitation of **evaluation planning**

---

5.2 Capacity & resource support we seek from UHM Assessment Office and OVCAA

**Funding for 2008-09**

- LLL evaluation resource staff for spring, 2009: 2 full-time GA positions
- Stipend for 6 evaluation liaisons

**Capacity development and resource support**

- Collaboration on capacity building (e.g. collaborative workshops and brochures)
- Evaluation grant application information & writing
5. Capacity support for implementing evaluation

5.3. With capacity & resource support from UHM Assessment Office and OVCAA, we can continue....

What now?
Immediate Action Plan for the Chairs

1. Communicate the project to faculty members (We will send you pdf files of today’s materials).

2. Find out who is capable of being a liaison or on the department evaluation committee.

3. Schedule an interview (in October)

4. Identify ESCI-survey respondents and distribute survey links via email.
Discussion questions

- Should student participation in the online exit survey be voluntary or compulsory?
- Should we also invite students graduating with a minor/certificate?
- When is the best time to administer the survey?
- When is the best time for the department to receive the results summary?
- How often and when should the department submit their interpretation and action plans to CLLL?
- Do you think the timelines and tasks are feasible? Any suggestions?

Any comments or questions?