University of Hawaii-West O'ahu

ILO 1. Effective Communication Assessment Report 2022-24

June 19, 2024

Table of Contents
ILO 1. Effective Communication Assessment Report 2022-24

Supported Initiatives Overview

Institutional Priorities
Effective Communication

Projects including this Initiative (5)

PROJECT	MEASURES	FINDINGS / TARGETS	
APPLIED SCIENCE - Academic Program Assessment Report	4	4/4	Action Plan
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION - Academic Program Assessment Report	1	1/1	Action Plan
EDUCATION - Academic Program Assessment Report	10	10/10	Action Plan
NO'EAU CENTER - VCSA Administrative Assessment Report	6	6/6	Action Plan
SOCIAL SCIENCES - Academic Program Assessment Report	2	2/2	Action Plan

APPLIED SCIENCE - Academic Program Assessment Report
2022-2024

Completed

1.1 Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes
Write clearly and effectively using generally accepted scientific style, such as for research papers and lab reports.

The focus of this outcome is on writing for the specific BAS concentration discipline.

SI Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities
- Effective Communication

Action Plan

Additional artifacts need to be assessed from the BAS in Culinary Management program. However, given the enrollment in this specific concentration that may prove challenging.

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Implement more writing support in lower level classes required for this degree pathway.	9/26/2023		Planned

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
Provide additional instructions on outlining, creating an argument and other writing mechanics within the capstone course.	4/14/2024		Planned

Action Item 3	Created	Due	Status
Provide additional instruction on the creation of a position and conclusion within a presented written element.	4/14/2024		Planned

1.1.1 Measures
BAS in Culinary Management: The AACU Value Rubrics for Critical Thinking.

The measuring tool focused on written communication and critical thinking. The rubric had ratings from 1 Benchmark, to 4 capstone.

METHODOLOGY*

The BAS in Culinary Management is a smaller program at UWHO. Only one artifact, a 5 page paper from the capstone course APSC 490 was utilized for assessment. The paper was from October 2022.

1.1.1.1 Target/Success Indicator

The achievement of the capstone level in all measured categories of the rubric. `Not Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR

A target would be to present at least 10 artifacts for review and have the measurement of 80% be achieved.

FINDINGS/RESULTS

There were six categories measured for this one artifact. The mode was 3 for the areas of explanation of issues, influence of context and assumptions, and sources & evidence. For the areas of position and conclusion the rating was at a 2 level.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS

This assessment of DLO1 for the BUSA division and the BAS concentration in Culinary Management, needs to be redone with more artifacts.

1.2 Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes

Report orally on scientific subjects, using clear and objective style and well-reasoned sequences of information.

This outcome is focused on oral presentation content and style.

SI Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities

- Effective Communication

Action Plan

BAS in Health Professions: In future sections of this course, it may be advisable for students to present their findings orally after submission of the final paper. This may benefit the oral presentation but may limit the ability for the students to complete a proficient written paper.

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
BAS in Health Professions: An informal practice presentation, completed prior to the formal oral presentation may be warranted to help students shake off the early nervousness that comes with presenting in front of a group.	4/14/2024	5/3/2025	In Progress

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
BAS in Health Professions: A more detailed review of how to discuss/interpret results and relate them to previously published research would benefit the	4/14/2024	9/9/2024	In Progress

students in this course. This type of critical thinking is an essential component of graduate/professional school and practice honing this skill at the undergraduate level is imperative.

Action Item 3	Created	Due	Status
BAS in Hawaiian & Indigenous Health and Healing: Address social anxiety and public speaking specifically for bilingual and Hawaiian-Pidgin English speakers.	4/14/2024	5/3/2025	In Progress

Action Item 4	Created	Due	Status
BAS in Hawaiian & Indigenous Health and Healing: Emphasize the cultural importance of language and public speaking. The power of the spoken word ("I ka'olelo no ko ola, i ka'olelo no ka make"	4/14/2024	5/3/2025	In Progress

Action Item 5	Created	Due	Status
BAS in Health Information Management (HIM): Create a tailored rubric to meet the assessment needs of oral communication for the department and the HIM industry	4/14/2024	12/1/2024	In Progress

Action Item 6	Created	Due	Status
BAS in HIM: Focus future assessments for this SLO on a specific course or level.	4/14/2024	1/27/2025	In Progress

Action Item 7	Created	Due	Status
BAS in HIM: Review the oral presentation instructions for APSC 486H capstone course. Additionally include a practice session before the final oral presentation and additional materials related to the mechanics of creating and oral delivery.	4/14/2024	12/1/2024	In Progress

Action Item 8	Created	Due	Status
BAS in HIM: Utilize the biannual Student Research and Creative Works Symposium to provide a framework for reflection on delivery and presentation style. This would be implemented as a focus area in the HIM 200 level courses, including	4/14/2024	5/5/2025	In Progress

1.2.1 Measures

Three BAS concentrations assessed this specific SLO, Health Professions. Health Information Management, and Hawaiian and Indigenous Health & Healing.

The BAS in Health Professions assessed this SLO.

METHODOLOGY*

The capstone course for BAS in Health Professions was the source of the artifacts, APSC 486P Senior Project. Nine oral presentations were reviewed and assessed. A rubric was used for scoring. The rubric included five levels, highly proficient, proficient, developing, benchmark, and fails to meet basic level performance. There were five domains as well on the rubric, organization, language, vocal expressiveness, supporting material, and objective.

1.2.1.1 Target/Success Indicator

The target was a average score of 15. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR	Success would be evidenced by a high level result for this senior capstone course artifact element.
FINDINGS/RESULTS	Total evaluation scores for this sample ranged from 13-20, with an average of 16.11. The averaged domain scores ranged from 2.89 to 3.33.
ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS	For the BAS in Health Professions: Overall, the individual and averaged scores were high for the Oral Communication degree learning outcomes that was assessed for the academic year 2022-2023. Based on average scores, students demonstrated proficiency or high proficiency for the Organization, Language, Vocal Expressiveness, and Objective domains and developing proficiency for the Supporting Material domain. As expected, the scores for the student samples for this assessment are as this course occurs at the end of the undergraduate academic career.

1.2.2 Measures

The BAS in Hawaiian and Indigenous Health and Healing.

This BAS concentration assessed 15 oral presentations from the Spring 2023 semester course , HLTH 204 Introduction to Native Hawaiian Health and Healing.

METHODOLOGY*

A rubric was used for this assessment with ratings from Highly Proficient to Fails to meet basic level performance. The total number of points possible were 20.

1.2.2.1 Target/Success Indicator
A target indicator is 14 for an overall final score. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR
This target indicator is allowing for growth and also above average for entry level course within this concentration.

FINDINGS/RESULTS
Assessment scores ranged from 6 to 20 with a strong skew towards higher scores and an average of 14.93.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS
There 5 domains on the rubric used for scoring. The average score for the organization domain was 2.93. The average score for the language domain was 2.98. The average score for the vocal expressiveness domain was 2.80. The average score for the supporting material domain was 3.27 and the final domain objective resulted in an average score of 3.00.

1.2.3 Measures
The BAS in Health Information Management (HIM).
For this BAS Concentration, eight artifacts were accessed from three program courses, HLTH 243, HIM 408 and APSC 486H.
METHODOLOGY*
A rubric was used for scoring by the two departmental faculty members. The rubric contained four levels of performance and five categories.

1.2.3.1 Target/Success Indicator
The target was established with the framework of the HIM industry in mind - a remote workforce utilizing online platforms for oral professional interactions. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR
The target and success indicator was an overall score of 3.5 or above. At the category level, the target was 3.0 or above.

FINDINGS/RESULTS
For the five categories the average scores were: Organization 3.5, Language 3.5, Delivery 3.25, Supporting material, 3.125 and Central message, 3.875. Overall, for this group of artifacts the total overall score was at the highest level of 4 (57.5%).

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS
The overall high score demonstrates the level of oral communication exhibited by HIM students. However, using various courses may be a limitation of this analysis.

Project Attachments (4)

Attachments	File Size
⬧ Assessment of BAS HIM concentration.pdf	171KB
⬧ Assessment of BAS in Hawaiian and Indigenous Health and Healing.pdf	190KB
⬧ Assessment of BAS in Health Professions.pdf	161KB
⬧ Randall_BASCulinaryManagement.pdf	4MB

1.1 Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes

Business Administration Division Learning Outcome DLO: DLO 1: Demonstrate critical thinking, research and communication skills as applied to organizations.

Business Administration Division Learning Outcome DLO: DLO 1: Demonstrate critical thinking, research and communication skills as applied to organizations. Supporting Concentration CLOs: Accounting CLO 2: Demonstrate written communication utilizing information literacy skills in the field of Accounting. General Business CLO 1: Demonstrate written and oral communication skills in the field of business administration. Management CLO 2: Analyze and provide solutions to management problems, policy and ethical dilemmas through written communication skills. Marketing CLO 2: Analyze and provide solutions to marketing problems, policy and ethical dilemmas through written communication skills. Hospitality & Tourism CLO1 Demonstrate interpersonal and leadership skills through the usage of oral or written communication.

SI Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities

- Effective Communication

Action Plan

The findings from BUSA writing classes indicate that the Bachelor of Business Administration students are skilled in written communications. The program is doing well in this aspect of the curriculum. We will continue to monitor student performance to ensure that these positive results are maintained. Four of the seven concentrations within the Business Administration Division participated in the outcome-based assessment effort during the AY 2022-2023. A total of 11 classes were assessed by nine faculty within the Business Administration Division; participating faculty held the rankings of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor. The deliverance of courses included lower level and upper level courses as well as in-person and on-line modalities. Concentrations within the Business Administration Division that participated in the assessment effort reported the following: (a) Because of earlier assessments, updated CLOs were updated that better articulated the desired learning outcome (b) students appeared to be at the expected level for the outcomes assessed during the AY 2022-2023, (c) a number of student learning outcome strengths were identifiable. Future assessment, at both the course-level and the concentration-level, would benefit from input from faculty from all concentrations with the Business Administration Division, thus providing a more robust understanding of student learning outcomes.

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Continue to monitor student performance in written communication throughout all concentrations for Business Administration including but not limited to BUSA writing intensive classes such as BUSA486/490 capstone classes.	9/26/2023		Planned

1.1.1 Measures

Writing Intesnsive- Final Paper

The faculty that encompass the seven concentrations of the Business Administration Division (Accounting, Finance, General Business, Management, Marketing, Hospitality & Tourism and Facilities Management) were instructed upload writing artifacts to formally assess the Business Administration division learning outcomes (DLO1) scheduled for review, as described in the UHWO Assessment Guidelines. The DLO1 was assessed for the AY 2022-2023 varied by class in accordance with Table 1. Table 1. Division-specific DLO1 assessed for Spring 2023 and Concentration-specific CLO's assessed for AY 2022-2023 in Business Administration Division Business Administration Division Learning Outcome DLO: DLO 1: Demonstrate critical thinking, research and communication skills as applied to organizations. Supporting Concentration CLOs: Accounting CLO 2: Demonstrate written communication utilizing information literacy skills in the field of Accounting. General Business CLO 1: Demonstrate written and oral communication skills in the field of business administration. Management CLO 2: Analyze and provide solutions to management problems, policy and ethical dilemmas through written communication skills. Marketing CLO 2: Analyze and provide solutions to marketing problems, policy and ethical dilemmas through written communication skills. Hospitality & Tourism CLO1 Demonstrate interpersonal and leadership skills through the usage of oral or written communication.

METHODOLOGY*

Procedures: The Assessment Team decided to evaluate written communication for a select group of BUSA courses in Spring 2023. At the end of the spring semester. The Business Administration Division assessment team identified courses that demonstrate written communication and kindly requested specific faculty to submit artifacts and assignment instructions, prompt, and/or rubric given to students. Artifacts - Upload the last individual writing assignment that can be used to assess DLO1: Demonstrate critical thinking, research and communication skills as applied to organizations. Please submit to us the original, ungraded assignment files. That is, do not add comments, and leave student information on assignments so the evaluation data can be disaggregated later; assignments will be coded before given to evaluators. A random sample will be selected from the group of artifacts for evaluation.

Assignment instructions, prompt, and/or rubric given to students - This is to give evaluators context of what the students saw and what the goal of the assignment was. Please be sure to include "instructions" in the file name. The BUSA Assessment Leader directly contacted faculty that were teaching the relevant courses to participate in the assessment process. For those faculty that uploaded artifacts, they were provided the "Written Communication Value Rubric: and were asked to score artifacts based on the 5 criteria in the rubric: 1.Context of and Purpose for Writing 2. Content Development 3. Genre and Disciplinary Conventions 4. Sources and Evidence 5. Control of Syntax and Mechanics By ranking each of these criteria with a 4=capstone; 3-2=Milestones; and 1=Benchmark. Faculty were also provided with a short example which was put together by the BUSA Assessment Leader to help guide them through the process. The BUSA Assessment Leader meet with faculty (as needed) individually to provide guidance in relation to course-level assessment reports and the process in general. The BUSA Assessment Leader made sure a mix of online, in-person, lower level, and higher level courses were assessed whenever possible. The general rule for number of students assessed was to sample 5 student artifacts per course at minimum. The faculty were instructed to complete their individual course-level assessment based on the rubric provided to all business faculty, regardless of concentration. The concentration-level assessment reports were then to be compiled by the BUSA Assessment Leader into the following summary report.

1.1.1.1 Target/Success Indicator

Overall summary of 11 assessed classes by 6 faculty involved in conducting assessment of 182 artifacts = and average score of 3.28 out of 4= 82%. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR	80%
FINDINGS/RESULTS	Of the 162 students, 8% (n=20) scored 2 ("acceptable") or 3 ("exceeds expectations") level on all of the research criteria.
ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS	Findings: A total of 11 classes, from Fall 2022 to spring 2023 semesters, were assessed by six different faculty within the Business Administration Division. The assessed courses spanned the seven concentrations within the Business Division. The ranking of faculty who participated in the assessment process included one Professor, one Associate Professor, two Assistant Professors and two Instructors. The 11 courses assessed were comprised of 200, 300 and 400 level courses. It should be noted that the business department only has two 100 level course (120 Intro to Business and HOST101 Introduction to Hospitality) and two 200 level courses (Intro to Financial Accounting and Intro to Managerial Accounting), so the majority of

the courses were upper level. The delivery of courses included in-person and on-line modalities.

Overall summary of 11 assessed classes by 6 faculty involved in conducting assessment of 182 artifacts = and average score of 3.28 out of 4= 82%.

A summary of 4 assessed classes by four faculty involved in conducting assessment of 22 artifacts, are provided in Table 2.

A summary of 7 assessed classes by two faculty involved in conducting assessment of 160 artifacts are provided in Table 3.

Table 2: Criteria used to assess Artifacts

Summary of artifacts assessed based on

Four classes (300-400 level) from four different BUSA professors ranked 22 artifacts total.

Overall, 22 artifacts total were assessed above 84% = 3.36 on a scale of 4.

For the criteria "Context and Purpose of Writing" all artifacts were assessed as a 4.

For the criteria "Content Development" 82% were assessed as a 4 and 18% were assessed as a 3.

For the criteria "Genre and Disciplinary Conventions" 27% were assessed as a 4 and 73% were assessed as a 3.

For the criteria "Sources and Evidence" 18% were assessed as a 4 and 81% assessed as 3.

For the criteria "Control of Syntax and Mechanics" 9% were assessed as a 4 and 81% assessed as 3 and 9% were assessed as a 2.

Table 3: Summary of the business courses assessed, concentration assessing, learning outcome, modality, semester offered, sections of courses assessed, and faculty involved in conducting assessment.

Seven classes (200-400 level) from two different BUSA professors ranked 140 artifacts total.

Overall, 160 artifacts total were assessed 82%=3.27 on a scale of 4.73.92

Summary

Project Attachments (4)

Attachments	File Size
📄 2022-2024 Assessment MP.docx	166KB
📄 2022-24 ACC Assessment.docx	30KB
📄 2022-24 BUSA Division Assessment Report.docx	1MB
📄 WrittenCommunication Rubric.pdf	86KB

1.1 **Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes**

CAEP Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Effectiveness

R1.1 The Learner and Learning The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families. R1.2 Content The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1. R1.3 Instructional Practice The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students. R1.4 Professional Responsibility The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

SI **Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities**
- Effective Communication

Action Plan

A review of the analysis/findings from the nine measures suggests three themes identified as action items.

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Develop a plan to improve response rates.	9/26/2023	4/1/2024	In Progress

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
Disaggregate data when reporting.	12/15/2023	6/1/2024	In Progress

Action Item 3	Created	Due	Status
Conduct reliability and validity measures.	12/20/2023	4/1/2024	In Progress

1.1.1 Measures
Alumni Survey

The previous year's alumni are surveyed every year. The survey focuses on preparedness according to the 10 INTASC Standards.

METHODOLOGY*

The Alumni Survey was administered in Spring 2023 to all graduates from Fall 2022 and Spring 2023. 13 Elementary and 13 Secondary graduates were surveyed 3 out of the 26 replied. This is a 12% response rate. Alumni were asked to rate themselves on a 3-point scale - unprepared (0), prepared (1), and well-prepared (2). Alumni were also asked to support their rating in open-ended questions.

1.1.1.1 Target/Success Indicator
The Education Division wants 100% of alumni to feel prepared or well-prepared to meet all 10 INTASC standards. Met

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR	100%
FINDINGS/RESULTS	3 out of the 26 alumni replied. This is a 12% return rate. 100% of alumni surveyed felt well-prepared (target) for all 10 INTASC standards.
ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS	Develop a plan to improve response rate. CAEP requires at least a 20% response rate.
	Recommend Special Education licensure pathway for those seeking extended information on how best to work with special needs students.
	Continue to clarify HIDOE content area standards when in conflict with what is presented in Practicums and Student Teaching: CCSS vs HCPS (Still required by some Principals).
	Consider roll-playing activities, as well as readings, in the context of working with difficult people.

Social emotional well-being is a "hot topic." Consider using literature for children and young adults in this context.

Continue existing efforts as all alumni felt well-prepared to meet INTASC standards.

1.1.2 Measures
Graduate Exit Surveys

Graduates are surveyed every semester, The. survey focuses on preparedness according to the 10 INTASC Standards.

METHODOLOGY*

The Graduate Survey was administered in Spring 2023. There were no graduates in Fall 2022. 46 candidates replied (33 EDEE, 11 EDSE, 0 EDML, 2 SPED). 29 candidates did not respond. This is a 37% response rate. Candidates were asked to rate themselves on a 3-point scale - unprepared (0), prepared (1) and well-prepared (2). Candidates were also asked to support their rating using open-ended questions.

1.1.2.1 Target/Success Indicator
The Division of Education wants 100% of graduates to feel well-prepared or prepared to meet all 10 INTASC standards. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR	100%
FINDINGS/RESULTS	17 of 46 candidates replied. This is a 37% return rate. 100% of graduates felt prepared (acceptable) or well-prepared (target) to meet all 10 INTASC Standards.
ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS	To increase response rate to 100%, consider having student teachers complete survey in class before the end of the semester.

1.1.3 Measures
Mentor Teacher Evaluation of Program

Mentor teachers are surveyed once a year. The survey looks to determine satisfaction and obtain feedback on the teacher education program.

METHODOLOGY*

The program evaluation survey was administered in Spring 2023 to all mentor teachers for the academic year 2022-2023. 115 Mentor Teachers were sent evaluations. 54 mentor teachers responded.

This is a 47% response rate. Mentor teachers were asked to rate candidates on a 3-point scale - unprepared (1), prepared (2), and well-prepared (3). Mentor teachers were also asked additional questions that included open-ended questions, and other questions using rating scales. This survey looks to get feedback on: (1) candidate dispositions, (2) candidate demonstration of knowledge, skills, and delivery of instruction, (3) program strengths, weaknesses and ways to improve, and (4) challenges faced by mentor teachers.

1.1.3.1 Target/Success Indicator

The Division of Education wants 100% of mentor teachers to feel candidates are prepared or well-prepared in their dispositions and demonstration of knowledge, skills and delivery. Additional information provides suggestions for program improvements. `Partially Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS
INDICATOR

100%

FINDINGS/RESULTS

Data not disaggregated. Calls for candidates to spend more time in the field experience classroom. Lowest scores in management, differentiation, assessment; highest scores shown in math and science content knowledge. 97% extremely pleased.

ANALYSIS/USE OF
FINDINGS

Disaggregate data by type of field experience being evaluated; blind UHWO supervisor name if identified.

Discuss how to increase time spent in the field, but not at the expense of the non-traditional student who works full or part-time while in college.

Remind mentors that our field experience model is not the same as UH Manoa's "OP" [Observation/Participation] model.

Increase attention to classroom management, differentiation, and assessment across all blocked courses and student teaching.

1.1.4 Measures

Teacher Candidate Evaluation of Field Experience

Teacher candidates are surveyed every semester. The survey looks to determine satisfaction with the field experience according to the INTASC Standards.

METHODOLOGY*

The candidate evaluation of field experience was administered in Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 to all

candidates who took part in a field experience. Fall 2022 - 46 of 110 responded (42% response rate). Spring 2023 - 62 of 116 responded (53% response rate). Teacher candidates were asked to rate their level of satisfaction as to how well the field experience addressed the 10 INTASC standards. The survey used a 5-point scale - unsatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5). Teacher candidates were also asked an additional open-ended question.

1.1.4.1 Target/Success Indicator

The Division of Education wants 100% of teacher candidates to feel satisfied (3) to very satisfied (5). `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR

100%

FINDINGS/RESULTS

Fall 2022: 46/110, 41.8% Spring 2023: 62/116, 62% Overall, teacher candidates were very satisfied with field experience. Data was not disaggregated by field experience. No major areas for concern.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS

The average 47% response rate exceeds the CAEP acceptable threshold of 20%; nevertheless, candidates should be strongly encouraged to fill out the survey, especially those in spring semester courses where the response rate dropped by 12% during AY 2022-23.

Encourage mentor teachers to continue to model and communicate teaching strategies and resources.

Encourage mentor teachers to continue to model and communicate formal and informal assessment strategies.

Reminder: this data cannot be disaggregated by field experience due to our small program offerings. To do so would inadvertently identify individual faculty's courses, which are evaluated separately via student course evaluations

1.1.5 Measures

Field Experience Evaluation of Students Teaching

Teacher candidates who take part in a field experience are evaluated by mentor teachers and university supervisors every semester according to the INTASC Standards. This particulate evaluation applies only to student teaching.

METHODOLOGY*

The candidate evaluation of field experience was administered in Spring 2023 to all candidates who took part in student teaching. EDEE Spring 2023 (N=32) 5 mentors did not submit. EDSE Spring 2023 (N=10) 4 mentors did not submit. Mentor teachers and university supervisors rate candidates on a 3-point scale - unacceptable (0), acceptable (1), and target (2). Candidates are rated according to the INTASC progressions.

1.1.5.1 Target/Success Indicator
The Division of Education wants 100% of teacher candidates to be rated acceptable or target.

Met

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR
100%

FINDINGS/RESULTS
University supervisors consistently score candidates higher than mentor teachers. Low and high scores are reported.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS
Data trends over time reveal Mentor Teachers' candidate ratings to be consistently lower than university supervisors. This observation may be due to the fact that mentor teachers interact with, observe, and mentor their student teachers on a daily basis for a minimum 15 weeks. The mentors' perspectives are therefore quite different from the university supervisor who will have observed and interacted on site with the student teacher a minimum 3-4 times throughout the semester. A closer look at high vs low scoring by mentors and university supervisors is advised.

Mentors and university supervisors rated candidates high on Progression 9.3: "The teacher practices the profession in an ethical manner." Professionalism is a hallmark of our teacher preparation programs, and it is gratifying to know that candidates are perceived well by all who interact with them during their Student Teaching semester.

There were no common low ratings between mentors and university supervisors. However, opposing views are seen in data for Progression 10.2, "The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning and to advance the progression." Mentor teachers gave candidates low scores, while university supervisors rated the candidates highly. One reason could be the fact that Student Teachers participate in a "Lesson Study" seminar project in which they literally engage in Progression 10.2 "Target" objective: "The Teacher candidate engages in action research that provides evidence of

effective teaching and positive impact on student learning; results are shared within the school, as well as the community at large." Mentor teachers are viewing this progression on a much broader scale situated in the student teaching semester as a whole.

Areas of Concern: Mentor teachers rated candidates low on progressions that speak to their understanding of content knowledge (8.2) and their ability to engage student in critical thinking (5.2). University supervisors concerns were revealed on low scores all of which are associated with analyzing and using assessment (data) to inform practice (6.2, 7.2, & 7.3).

University faculty who teach content area methods courses, as well as content-driven practicum seminars, should take notice of the low ratings and determine if adjustments might need to be made to their respective course objectives (student learning outcomes).

1.1.6 Measures
Dispositions
Teacher candidates who take part in a field experience are evaluated by university supervisors every semester according to the Division of Education Dispositions rubric.
METHODOLOGY*

Dispositions of all candidates who took part in a field experience were assessed in Fall 2022 and Spring 2023. In Fall 2022, there were 80 candidates. In Spring 2023, there were 114 candidates. University supervisors rate candidates on a 3-point scale - 0 = Cause for Concern, 1 = No cause for Concern 2 = Exceptional. There are 13 dispositions. Mentor teacher evaluation of candidate dispositions is seen in the Mentor Teacher Program Evaluation survey. "Professional demeanor and attitude" and "Collegiality and ability to work collaboratively"

1.1.6.1 Target/Success Indicator
The Division of Education wants 100% of teacher candidates to be rated No cause for Concern or Exceptional. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR	100%
FINDINGS/RESULTS	Survey results show consistent "No cause for Concern" ratings. Qualitative data reveals strong, positive feedback for teacher candidates in various areas.
ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS	Faculty will continue to utilize its "Professionalism Alert" policy and procedures, in order to maintain the "No Cause for Concern" dispositions ratings that are consistent across all field

experiences and in line with mentor teacher observations.

Mentor Teacher recommendations to enhance candidate professionalism include: increasing field hours, participating in beginning-of-the-year routines & orientations, engaging in "practice scenarios" in which candidates would focus on relationship-building & lifestyle awareness in teaching, learning to embrace constructive criticism, understanding how continuous self-reflection improves one's knowledge, skills, and dispositions, as they emerge into the profession.

1.1.7 Measures
Candidate Knowledge of Content
Content area grades are reported.
METHODOLOGY*

All content area grades are reported in English, Math, and Social Studies courses. Elementary Education, Middle Level, and Secondary Education graduating seniors: N=42.

1.1.7.1 Target/Success Indicator
All candidates should be awarded grade of C or higher. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR	100%
FINDINGS/RESULTS	No areas of concern with regard to content area grades earned during the candidates' 4-year program of study.
ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS	These grades do not reflect the candidate's ability to "apply content and curricular knowledge in the elementary classroom," per CAEP Elementary Standard 2.
	Content Area Methods coursework (e.g., candidate's Best Lesson Plan) + Practicum Seminar grades that reveal effective lesson planning, instruction, and reflection is needed to supplement the content area grades earned. This would be in addition to the Practicum data that we already collect.
	Data table needs to be edited because it refers to graduating seniors, not "program completers," who are defined as Alumni, according to CAEP.

1.1.8 Measures
Institution Writing Assessment Evaluations

Candidate writing is evaluated according to the 5 Writing Dimensions four times throughout the teacher education program. These evaluations take part in WI courses where candidates receive intensive writing instruction.

METHODOLOGY*

Four Writing Intensive (WI) courses are offered as part of the teacher education program. In each course, candidates work through the writing process and final submissions are evaluated according to five Writing Dimensions.

1.1.8.1 Target/Success Indicator
Final papers are evaluated according to 5 Writing Dimensions: `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR	100%
FINDINGS/RESULTS	High levels of achievement across all UHWO Writing Dimensions, ranging from low target scores of 62% (Dimension 5) to high targets at 100% (Dimensions 2, 4, & 5). Ten years of longitudinal data (2013-2023) ranges reveal well above average scores.
ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS	Faculty incorporate the composing process into their courses, workshop drafts, and provide instructor and peer feedback, in order to help candidates reach target student learning outcomes. Problems with writing content and process are dealt with on an individual basis throughout the semester, with referrals to the UHWO No'eau Learning Center for tutorial support, as needed.

1.1.9 Measures
Signature Assignments

Courses throughout the teacher education program include "Signature Assignments" that reflect INTASC standards. Candidates must complete and upload Signature Assignments to Taskstream as part of these courses. Signature Assignments are then evaluated by faculty in Taskstream. The use of Signature Assignments was designed such that candidates are evaluated according to different INTASC standards repeatedly throughout the teacher education program.

METHODOLOGY*

Most Education courses require submission of a "Signature Assignment". Signature assignments are submitted to Taskstream where they are evaluated by faculty according to a 3-point scale - unacceptable, acceptable, and target.

1.1.9.1 **Target/Success Indicator**

Assignments are designed to illustrate candidate mastery of INTASC Standards over the course of the teacher education program. Progression to mastery is expected over the course of the teacher education program. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR

100%

FINDINGS/RESULTS

Candidates reaching target standards varies within and across assignments. In general, the scores are at or above the 50th percentile.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS

Faculty continuously review the impact of their signature assignments on candidate learning and revise/update as needed.

Middle-level and/or Secondary "Best Lesson Plan" Signature Assignment should also be included on the Accreditation website

Completed

1.4 Outcomes/Objectives
Student Leaders

Student Leaders: Ensure student leaders are able to speak knowledgeably on No'eau Center services

SI Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities
- Effective Communication

Action Plan

The target was met with at least 90% of student leaders able to effectively deliver presentations on No'eau Center. The following Action Item(s) were identified:

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Create additional level for returning student leaders, so that they are able to tailor the presentation for different audiences	6/6/2024	8/15/2024	Planned

1.4.1 Strategies/Measures
Assessments of student leaders' presentations

Administer ongoing assessments of student leaders' presentations

METHODOLOGY (DATA COLLECTION PROCESS DETAILS)

1. Rubric developed to record student leaders' presentation skills. 2. Student leaders complete mock presentations and are assessed by No'eau Center Professional Staff and other No'eau Center student leaders 3. Feedback is aggregated and distributed individually via email to each No'eau Center student leader.

1.4.1.1 Target/Success Indicator
90% of student leaders are able to effectively deliver presentation on No'eau Center services to tours and in classes. **Met**

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR

90% of student leaders are able to effectively deliver presentation on No'eau Center services to tours and in classes.

FINDINGS/RESULTS	91.6% of student leaders are able to effectively deliver presentation on No'eau Center services to tours and in classes.
ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS	Create additional level for returning student leaders, so that they are able to tailor the presentation for different audiences

SOCIAL SCIENCES - Academic Program Assessment Report

2022-2024

1 OUTCOMES 1 MEASURES 1 TARGETS 1 FINDINGS 2 ATTACHMENTS

1.1 **Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes**
DLO1 - Clear and Effective Writing

DLO1 - Clear and effective writing using the conventions of a particular Social Science discipline.

SI **Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities**
- Effective Communication

Action Plan

On 2/13/2024 the Social Sciences Assessment Team convened to develop actions that the Social sciences faculty can adopt to improve student learning about 1) citing authoritative sources in their writing, and 2) cultural skills. While the particular class exercise, resource, lesson, film, discussion prompt, or pedagogical approach deployed is up to each individual Social Sciences faculty member, the assessment team has compiled a list of suggestions for their consideration and possible adoption in the coming academic year. The Action Items below are the SSCI Assessment Team suggestions for enhancing student learning in the use of authoritative source material and cultural skills.

	Created	Due	Status
Action Item 1 Expand or refine course lessons about using valid source material, and/or media literacy.	9/26/2023	4/25/2025	In Progress
Action Item 2 Design a written exercise that requires students to use valid sources to answer a disciplinary question.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress
Action Item 3 Have students respond to discussion prompts about authoritative source material and/or media literacy.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress
Action Item 4 Provide online links on your syllabus or course management system to resources about media literacy and/or disciplinary referencing practices.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress

Action Item 5	Created	Due	Status
Direct student to UHWO Library workshops and resources about media literacy, finding, and citing authoritative disciplinary sources.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress

Action Item 6	Created	Due	Status
Direct students to the Noʻeau center for guidance on appropriate use of source material and correctly citing source material.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress

1.1.1 **Measures**

Student Written Artifacts

The Written Communication Value rubric published by the American Association of Colleges and Universities was applied to a sample of student artifacts to evaluate learning on DLO-1 about effective written communication using the conventions of a particular Social Science discipline. The Social Sciences Assessment Team convened on 1/19/2024 to discuss edits to the Value rubric selected. The language of the Written Communication Value rubric was simplified to improve clarity and reader reliability.

METHODOLOGY*

An assessment reader from each Social Sciences concentration was recruited to read and score a sample of student artifacts. Drs. Monique Mironesco (Political Science), Kirsten Vacca (Anthropology), Patricia Yu (Economics), Matt Lau (SCFS), and Mark Hanson (Psychology) served as readers and co-consultants in completing the Social Sciences assessment of DLO1. No reader was recruited from Sociology because Dr. Mota-back (a Sociologist) resigned and there were no other Sociology faculty available to participate (of the two remaining Sociology faculty, one was on sabbatical and the other serves as the Division Chair). A sample of Social Sciences written artifacts completed by Social Sciences students between Spring 2023 and Spring of 2024 was compiled for the readers to evaluate with the Value rubric. The artifact collection was sampled so that one written assignment from each academic level, capstone type, and Social Sciences concentration was represented in the artifacts read (100 - Economics, 200 - Psychology, 300 - Political Science, 400 - Sociology, Senior Practicum – Anthropology, and Senior Project-SCFS). Five artifacts from each course assignment were sampled by taking every third, fourth or whatever interval would result in 5 artifacts depending upon the size of the collection from a given course (i.e., for a collection of 25, taking every fifth artifact yields a sample of 5; for a collection of 15, taking every third artifact yields a collection of five). The senior projects were substantially longer (some over 50 pages) than the regular course artifacts, so only three of each type of capstone was sampled to maintain reader attention for scoring and to prevent the reading task from becoming onerous. In total, 26 artifacts were compiled across six Social Sciences concentrations,

four course levels, and two types of senior project. See table 1 for a summary of the artifacts read in terms of course-level/capstone type, concentration of origin, type of assignment, and number sampled. Each member of the SSCI Assessment Team received a collection of the 26 artifacts to read, the modified Written Communication rubric, and a reporting form with space for reporting each score for each dimension of the rubric for all 26 artifacts. After reading the artifacts and applying the rubrics, the completed reporting forms were returned to the SSCI Assessment Coordinator (Mark Hanson) for analysis. Table 1. Social Sciences artifact collection with information about course level, concentration, assignment type, and number sampled. Course level Concentration Assignment Number sampled 100 Economics Media critique 5 200 Psychology Research paper 5 300 Political Science Research Paper 5 400 Sociology Research Paper 5 Practicum Anthropology Capstone 3 Project SCFS Capstone 3

1.1.1.1 Target/Success Indicator

The target for DLO-1 learning in the Social Sciences is for students to demonstrate learning in written communication skills as they progress through the courses of their Social Sciences degree. Met

| TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR | Evidence of improvement on rubric-based evaluations of student writing effectiveness as students' progress through the different Social Science course levels (from 100-level through senior capstone courses). |

| FINDINGS/RESULTS | Analysis of the rubric scoring for the written communication rubric found a linear trend progressing from the lowest scores for the 100-level artifacts to the highest scores reported for the capstone projects. |

| ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS | Rubric data were reduced by calculating the mean rating of each reader's independent score on each artifact. These scores were reduced again by calculating arithmetic means (mean of means) for the five or three artifacts associated with each class-level or capstone type. |
| | Table-2 presents the compiled rubric ratings for the five dimensions of the Written Communication rubric by class-level or capstone type. Inspection of these data reveals a linear trend progressing from the 100-level and ascending to the Senior project artifacts which received the highest written rubric ratings. While the 400-level artifacts show a dip in this trend, the overall pattern suggests that Social Sciences students advance in their writing skills as they matriculate through the requirements of the Social Sciences degree. The written communication dimension that received the lowest rating across the artifacts read was the Sources and Evidence dimension. |

On 2/13/2024 the Social Sciences Assessment Team convened to discuss the results of our rubric based assessment of Written Communication. After reviewing the data and discussing the assessment process we had engaged, a consensus emerged that we develop actions that the Social sciences faculty can adopt to improve student learning about citing authoritative sources in their writing. While the particular class exercise, resource, lesson, film, discussion prompt, or pedagogical approach deployed is up to each individual Social Sciences faculty member, the assessment team has compiled a list of suggestions for their consideration and possible adoption in the coming academic year (see Action Plan).

Table-2 Reduced rubric values compiled for each dimension or the Written Communication Value rubric.

Written Communication Rubric Dimensions

Class Level	Context	Content	Genre	Sources	Mechanics
100	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.0	3.0
200	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.4	2.9
300	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.2	2.8
400	3.2	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.9
Practicum	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.3
Project	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.6

Project Attachments (2)

Attachments	File Size
📄 AACU_InterculturalKnowledge_Rubric_01.docx	2MB
📄 AACU_WrittenCommunication_Rubric_01.docx	2MB