University of Hawaii-West O'ahu

ILO 2. Cultural Awareness Assessment Report 2022-24

June 19, 2024

Table of Contents

ILO 2. Cultural Awareness Assessment Report 2022-24

Supported Initiatives Overview

1 INITIATIVES   **3** PROJECTS   **5** OUTCOMES   **19** MEASURES   **19** TARGETS   **19** FINDINGS

Institutional Priorities
Cultural Awareness

Projects including this Initiative (3)

PROJECT	MEASURES	FINDINGS / TARGETS	
EDUCATION - Academic Program Assessment Report	10	10/10	Action Plan
HUMANITIES - Academic Program Assessment Report	9	9/9	Action Plan
SOCIAL SCIENCES - Academic Program Assessment Report	2	2/2	Action Plan

EDUCATION - Academic Program Assessment   2022-2024 Report

Completed

1OUTCOMES **9** MEASURES **9** TARGETS **9** FINDINGS **0**ATTACHMENTS

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**
- Cultural Awareness

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

HUMANITIES - Academic Program Assessment 2022-2024 Report

Completed   **3** OUTCOMES   **9** MEASURES   **9** TARGETS   **9** FINDINGS   **1** ATTACHMENTS

1.1 Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes
DLO1

Demonstrate knowledge of the history, philosophy, arts, and/or literature of different cultures from different global regions and indigenous traditions including Native Hawaiian.

SI Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities
- Cultural Awareness

Action Plan

The average total score for DLO1 is 2.45 at the introducing level (expectation=2) and 2.96 at the reinforcing level (expectation=3). There is a sufficient difference in total average scores (>0.5) between the two levels, and expectations for success were met overall. There is, however, a wide range of scores at both the introducing and the reinforcing levels, perhaps because students take these courses at varying stages of their academic journeys and because both HUM majors and those from other disciplines were included in this assessment project. Three of the HUM concentrations/certificate programs participated in DLO1 assessment: ENG (2 courses), HIST (1 course), and MUS (1 course). The total number of assessed artifacts was 34. Assessed courses were taught in various modalities –– online asynchronous (3) and in-person (1) –– and student artifacts included a variety of genres: reflective essays, creative writing, book reviews, and exams. To produce more meaningful results, the following could be implemented for future assessment projects (i.e. potential action items): 1) assess only artifacts produced by HUM majors; 2) move to portfolio assessments; 3) increase sample size by increasing the number of faculty involved in assessment and/or by including adjunct faculty (who would need to be compensated for their labor); 4) increase representation of HUM programs by including artifacts from all concentrations/certificate programs.

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
In AY24/25, HUM faculty will collaborate on whether and how to integrate any of the following potential action items into our assessments moving forward: 1) assess only artifacts produced by HUM majors; 2) move to portfolio assessments; 3) increase sample size by increasing the number of faculty involved in	4/5/2024	5/1/2025	Planned

assessment and/or by including adjunct faculty
(who would need to be compensated for their labor);
4) increase representation of HUM programs by
including artifacts from all
concentrations/certificate programs.

1.1.1 Measures
ENG 260 British Literature I (800-1700)
ENG 260 introduces DLO1 and the associated ENG CLO2: Understand the historical, sociopolitical, ideological, and cultural contexts and effects of literature, writing, and/or methodological approaches. In the term when artifacts were collected (Fall 2022), the assessed section of ENG 260 was taught by Dr. Carmen Nolte-Odhiambo in the online asynchronous modality.
METHODOLOGY*
A total of 10 reflective essays were collected by the Humanities faculty member teaching the course. Along with the assignment prompt, these artifacts were submitted to the Humanities APT for coding. Once coding was complete, Dr. Nolte-Odhiambo scored the artifacts based on the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, which could be adjusted as needed to fit the assignment/course.

1.1.1.1 Target/Success Indicator
Since this course is categorized as "introducing" the above learning outcomes, success would consist of students demonstrating emerging cultural awareness. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR	The VALUE rubric allows for scores ranging from 1 ("benchmark") to 4 ("capstone") for each of six categories. Success in meeting the outcome would consist of student scores at or around the "2" (first milestone) level.
FINDINGS/RESULTS	The average score is 2.25, with scores ranging from 1 to 3. Please see the attachment "Assessment Scores by Course" for more detailed results.
ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS	The expectations for success have been met.

1.1.2 Measures
MUS 106 Introduction to Music Literature
MUS 106 introduces DLO1 and the associated MUS CLO4: Discuss music's historic and contemporary roles in our world. In the term when artifacts were collected (Fall 2022), the assessed section of MUS 106 was taught by Dr. Jon Magnussen in the online asynchronous modality.

METHODOLOGY*

A total of 10 final exams were collected by the Humanities faculty member teaching the course. Along with the assignment prompt, these artifacts were submitted to the Humanities APT for coding. Once coding was complete, Dr. Magnussen scored the artifacts based on the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, which could be adjusted as needed to fit the assignment/course.

1.1.2.1 Target/Success Indicator

Since this course is categorized as "introducing" the above learning outcomes, success would consist of students demonstrating emerging cultural awareness. `Exceeded`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR

The VALUE rubric allows for scores ranging from 1 ("benchmark") to 4 ("capstone") for each of six categories. Success in meeting the outcome would consist of student scores at or around the "2" (first milestone) level.

FINDINGS/RESULTS

The average score is 2.65, with scores ranging from 1 to 4. Please see the attachment "Assessment Scores by Course" for more detailed results.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS

The results exceed the expectations for success. There is a wide range of scores all the way from the lowest "1" to the highest "4," the latter of which seem unusual for a 100-level course. This is perhaps due to the fact that some advanced students may take this course toward the end of their college career, as they are signing up for and completing the Music certificate in their final semesters.

1.1.3 Measures

ENG 385 Fairy Tales & Their Adaptations

ENG 385 reinforces DLO1 and the associated ENG CLO2: Understand the historical, sociopolitical, ideological, and cultural contexts and effects of literature, writing, and/or methodological approaches. In the term when artifacts were collected (Fall 2022), the assessed section of ENG 385 was taught by Dr. Carmen Nolte-Odhiambo in the online asynchronous modality.

METHODOLOGY*

A total of 10 final projects, consisting of a creative work and a reflective essay, were collected by the Humanities faculty member teaching the course. Along with the assignment prompt, these artifacts were submitted to the Humanities APT for coding. Once coding was complete, Dr. Nolte-Odhiambo scored the artifacts based on the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, which could be adjusted as needed to fit the assignment/course.

1.1.3.1 Target/Success Indicator
Since this course is categorized as "reinforcing" the above learning outcomes, success would consist of students demonstrating evolving cultural awareness. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR
The VALUE rubric allows for scores ranging from 1 ("benchmark") to 4 ("capstone") for each of six categories. Success in meeting the outcome would consist of student scores at or around the "3" (second milestone) level.

FINDINGS/RESULTS
The average score is 3.07, with scores ranging from 2 to 4. Please see the attachment "Assessment Scores by Course" for more detailed results.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS
The expectations for success have been met.

1.1.4 Measures
HIST 363 20th Century Popular, Mass & Counter-Culture
HIST 363 reinforces DLO1 and the associated HIST CLO3: Analyze historical developments in Europe, the Americas, Asia, and the Pacific. In the term when artifacts were collected (Fall 2022), the assessed section of HIST 363 was taught by Dr. Kealani Cook in the in-person modality.
METHODOLOGY*
A total of 4 book reviews were collected by the Humanities faculty member teaching the course. Along with the assignment prompt, these artifacts were submitted to the Humanities APT for coding. Once coding was complete, Dr. Cook scored the artifacts based on the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, which could be adjusted as needed to fit the assignment/course.

1.1.4.1 Target/Success Indicator
Since this course is categorized as "reinforcing" the above learning outcomes, success would consist of students demonstrating evolving cultural awareness. `Partially Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR
The VALUE rubric allows for scores ranging from 1 ("benchmark") to 4 ("capstone") for each of six categories. Success in meeting the outcome would consist of student scores at or around the "3" (second milestone) level.

FINDINGS/RESULTS
The average score is 2.7, with scores ranging from 1 to 4. Scores were higher in the "skills" and "attitudes" than the "knowledge" categories. Please see the attachment "Assessment Scores by Course" for more detailed results.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS
The results partially meet the expectations for success. There is a wide range of scores all the way from the lowest "1" to the highest "4." Overall, expectations were met in the "skills"

and "attitudes" categories but scores fell slightly short of expectations in the "knowledge" section of the rubric. A larger sample size could help produce more meaningful results.

1.2 **Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes**
DLO2

Analyze contemporary issues from multiple cultural perspectives of global regions and indigenous traditions including Native Hawaiian.

SI **Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities**
- Cultural Awareness

Action Plan

The average total score for DLO2 is 2.75 at the introducing level (expectation=2) and 3.02 at the reinforcing level (expectation=3). There is only a small difference in total average scores (<0.5) between the two levels, and whereas expectations for success were met at the reinforcing level, they were exceeded at the introducing level. This finding might, in part, be due to the fact that students take these courses at varying stages of their academic journeys, so that courses at the introducing levels can include advanced students. In addition, it is worth considering that the unique student population at UHWO might enter college with a larger knowledge base and skill set related to cultural awareness than students elsewhere would. Two of the HUM concentrations/certificate programs participated in DLO2 assessment: HIST (1 course) and HPST (2 courses). The total number of assessed artifacts was 19. Assessed courses were taught in various modalities –– blended, online synchronous, and in-person –– and student artifacts included a variety of genres: book reviews, group discussion reports, and research papers. To produce more meaningful results, the following could be implemented for future assessment projects (i.e. potential action items): 1) move to portfolio assessments to track individual students' progress throughout their academic journeys; 2) increase sample size by increasing the number of faculty involved in assessment and/or by including adjunct faculty (who would need to be compensated for their labor); 3) increase representation of HUM programs by including artifacts from all concentrations/certificate programs;

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
In AY24/25, HUM faculty will collaborate on whether and how to integrate any of the following potential action items into our assessments moving forward: 1) move to portfolio assessments to track individual students' progress throughout their academic	4/5/2024	5/1/2025	Planned

journeys; 2) increase sample size by increasing the
number of faculty involved in assessment and/or by
including adjunct faculty (who would need to be
compensated for their labor); 3) increase
representation of HUM programs by including
artifacts from all concentrations/certificate
programs;

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
The division will also consider meeting with student advisors so as to discuss the sequencing of courses that students should follow on their graduation paths.	4/5/2024	5/1/2025	Planned

1.2.1 Measures
HIST 288 Survey of Pacific Islands History

HIST 288 introduces DLO2 and the associated HIST CLO3: Analyze historical developments in Europe, the Americas, Asia, and the Pacific. In the term when artifacts were collected (Fall 2022), the assessed section of HIST 288 was taught by Dr. Kealani Cook in the blended modality.

METHODOLOGY*

A total of 3 book reviews were collected by the Humanities faculty member teaching the course. Along with the assignment prompt, these artifacts were submitted to the Humanities APT for coding. Once coding was complete, Dr. Cook scored the artifacts based on the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, which could be adjusted as needed to fit the assignment/course.

1.2.1.1 Target/Success Indicator
Since this course is categorized as "introducing" the above learning outcomes, success would consist of students demonstrating emerging cultural awareness. Exceeded

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR
The VALUE rubric allows for scores ranging from 1 ("benchmark") to 4 ("capstone") for each of six categories. Success in meeting the outcome would consist of student scores at or around the "2" (first milestone) level.

FINDINGS/RESULTS
The average score is 2.6, with scores ranging from 1 to 3. Please see the attachment "Assessment Scores by Course" for more detailed results.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS
The results exceed the expectations for success. A larger sample size could help produce more meaningful results.

1.2.2 **Measures**

PACS 108 Pacific Worlds: Introduction to Pacific Islands Studies

PACS 108 introduces DLO2 and the associated HPST CLO5: Demonstrate knowledge of indigenous Hawaiian and Pacific world views and perspectives. In the term when artifacts were collected (Fall 2022), the assessed section of PACS 108 was taught by Dr. Sa'iliemanu Lilomaiava-Doktor in the in-person modality.

METHODOLOGY*

A total of 9 group discussion reports were collected by the Humanities faculty member teaching the course. Along with the assignment prompt, these artifacts were submitted to the Humanities APT for coding. Once coding was complete, Dr. Lilomaiava-Doktor scored the artifacts based on the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, which could be adjusted as needed to fit the assignment/course.

1.2.2.1 **Target/Success Indicator**

Since this course is categorized as "introducing" the above learning outcomes, success would consist of students demonstrating emerging cultural awareness. Exceeded

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR

The VALUE rubric allows for scores ranging from 1 ("benchmark") to 4 ("capstone") for each of six categories. Success in meeting the outcome would consist of student scores at or around the "2" (first milestone) level.

FINDINGS/RESULTS

The average score is 2.81, with scores ranging from 2 to 4. Please see the attachment "Assessment Scores by Course" for more detailed results.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS

The results exceed the expectations for success.

1.2.3 **Measures**

HPST 482 Pacific Islands

HPST 482 reinforces DLO2 and the associated HPST CLO5: Demonstrate knowledge of indigenous Hawaiian and Pacific world views and perspectives. In the term when artifacts were collected (Fall 2022), the assessed section of HPST 482 was taught by Dr. Sa'iliemanu Lilomaiava-Doktor in the online synchronous modality.

METHODOLOGY*

A total of 7 research papers were collected by the Humanities faculty member teaching the course. Along with the assignment prompt, these artifacts were submitted to the Humanities APT for coding. Once coding was complete, Dr. Lilomaiava-Doktor scored the artifacts based on the Intercultural

Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, which could be adjusted as needed to fit the assignment/course.

1.2.3.1 Target/Success Indicator
Since this course is categorized as "reinforcing" the above learning outcomes, success would consist of students demonstrating evolving cultural awareness. `Met`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR
The VALUE rubric allows for scores ranging from 1 ("benchmark") to 4 ("capstone") for each of six categories. Success in meeting the outcome would consist of student scores at or around the "3" (second milestone) level.

FINDINGS/RESULTS
The average score is 3.02, with scores ranging from 2 to 4. Please see the attachment "Assessment Scores by Course" for more detailed results.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS
The results meet the expectations for success.

1.3 Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes
DLO6
Analyze research questions, problems, and issues in Humanities subjects.

SI Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities
- Cultural Awareness

Action Plan

The average total score for DLO6 is 3.43 at the introducing level (expectation=2) and 3.5 at the reinforcing level (expectation=3). The difference in total average scores between the two levels is negligible, and whereas expectations for success were exceeded at the reinforcing level, they were exceeded even more so at the introducing level. This finding might, in part, be due to the fact that students take these courses at varying stages of their academic journeys, so that courses at the introducing levels can include advanced students. (It should also be noted that these results stem from the assessment of only 1 course per level.) In addition, it is worth considering that the unique student population at UHWO might enter college with a larger knowledge base and skill set related to cultural awareness than students elsewhere would. The only HUM concentration/certificate program that participated in DLO6 assessment is ENG (2 courses, both taught in the asynchronous online modality). The total number of assessed artifacts was 14, including papers and midterms. To produce more meaningful results, the following could be implemented for future assessment projects (i.e. potential action items): 1) move to portfolio assessments to track individual

students' progress throughout their academic journeys; 2) increase sample size by increasing the number of faculty involved in assessment and/or by including adjunct faculty (who would need to be compensated for their labor); 3) increase representation of HUM programs by including artifacts from all concentrations/certificate programs;

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
In AY24/25, HUM faculty will collaborate on whether and how to integrate any of the following potential action items into our assessments moving forward: 1) move to portfolio assessments to track individual students' progress throughout their academic journeys; 2) increase sample size by increasing the number of faculty involved in assessment and/or by including adjunct faculty (who would need to be compensated for their labor); 3) increase representation of HUM programs by including artifacts from all concentrations/certificate programs;	4/5/2024	5/1/2025	Planned

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
The division will also consider meeting with student advisors so as to discuss the sequencing of courses that students should follow on their graduation paths.	4/5/2024	5/1/2025	Planned

1.3.1 Measures
ENG 257C Literary Themes: Hip Hop Literature

ENG 257C introduces DLO6 and the associated ENG CLO2: Understand the historical, sociopolitical, ideological, and cultural contexts and effects of literature, writing, and/or methodological approaches. In the term when artifacts were collected (Fall 2022), the assessed section of ENG 257C was taught by Dr. Amy Nishimura in the online asynchronous modality.

METHODOLOGY*

A total of 5 papers were collected by the Humanities faculty member teaching the course. Along with the assignment prompt, these artifacts were submitted to the Humanities APT for coding. Once coding was complete, Dr. Nishimura scored the artifacts based on the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, which could be adjusted as needed to fit the assignment/course.

1.3.1.1 Target/Success Indicator

Since this course is categorized as "introducing" the above learning outcomes, success would consist of students demonstrating emerging cultural awareness. `Exceeded`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR
The VALUE rubric allows for scores ranging from 1 ("benchmark") to 4 ("capstone") for each of six categories. Success in meeting the outcome would consist of student scores at or around the "2" (first milestone) level.

FINDINGS/RESULTS
The average score is 3.43, with scores ranging from 2 to 4. Please see the attachment "Assessment Scores by Course" for more detailed results.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS
The results exceed the expectations for success.

1.3.2 Measures

ENG 441 Gender & Sexuality in Literature & Film

ENG 441 reinforces DLO6 and the associated ENG CLO2: Understand the historical, sociopolitical, ideological, and cultural contexts and effects of literature, writing, and/or methodological approaches. In the term when artifacts were collected (Fall 2022), the assessed section of ENG 441 was taught by Dr. Amy Nishimura in the online asynchronous modality.

METHODOLOGY*

A total of 9 midterms were collected by the Humanities faculty member teaching the course. Along with the assignment prompt, these artifacts were submitted to the Humanities APT for coding. Once coding was complete, Dr. Nishimura scored the artifacts based on the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, which could be adjusted as needed to fit the assignment/course.

1.3.2.1 Target/Success Indicator

Since this course is categorized as "reinforcing" the above learning outcomes, success would consist of students demonstrating evolving cultural awareness. `Exceeded`

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR
The VALUE rubric allows for scores ranging from 1 ("benchmark") to 4 ("capstone") for each of six categories. Success in meeting the outcome would consist of student scores at or around the "3" (second milestone) level.

FINDINGS/RESULTS
The average score is 3.5, with scores ranging from 2 to 4. Please see the attachment "Assessment Scores by Course" for more detailed results.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS
The results exceed the expectations for success.

Project Attachments (1)

Attachments	File Size
Assessment Scores by Course.pdf	53KB

Completed

1.2 Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes
DLO2 - Knowledge of Philosophical or Cultural Issues
DLO2 - Knowledge of philosophical or cultural issues associated with different Social Sciences.

SI Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities
- Cultural Awareness

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 source material on cultural knowledge.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress
Action Item 2 Design a written exercise that requires students to answer questions about a different culture.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress
Action Item 3 Have students respond to discussion prompts about authoritative source material on cultural skills.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress
Action Item 4 Provide online links on your syllabus or course management system to resources about cultural competence or skill.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress

Action Item 5	Created	Due	Status
Incorporate media resources on different cultures from the ʻUluʻulu Archive into course lessons and exercises.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress

Action Item 6	Created	Due	Status
Direct student to the HRAF (Human Resource Area Files) site at Yale University for authoritative source material on human culture.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress

1.2.1 Measures
Student Written Artifacts

The Intercultural Knowledge Value rubric published by the American Association of Colleges and Universities was applied to a sample of student artifacts to evaluate learning on DLO-2 about philosophical/cultural issues associated with different Social Sciences. The Social Sciences Assessment Team convened on 1/19/2024 to discuss edits to the Value rubric selected. The Intercultural Knowledge Value rubric originally held two iterations each for the Cultural Skills and Cultural Attitudes dimensions. The versions of these dimensions that reflected the cultural learning values of the Social Sciences Division and UHWO campus were selected, and an additional dimension of Social Science Philosophy was added to reflect the language of DLO2 which emphasizes, "knowledge of philosophical or cultural issues associated with different Social Sciences."

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 and DLO2. 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 Intercultural Knowledge 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

1.2.1.1 Target/Success Indicator

The target for DLO-2 learning in the Social Sciences is for students to demonstrate relevant cultural/philosophical knowledge as they progress through the courses of their Social Sciences degree. Met

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR

Evidence of improvement on rubric-based evaluations of relevant cultural/philosophical knowledge 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 intercultural knowledge 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-3 presents the compiled rubric ratings for the four dimensions of the Intercultural Knowledge 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. The 400-level artifacts again show a dip in this trend, but the overall pattern suggests that Social Sciences students advancing in their intercultural/philosophical knowledge as they matriculate through the requirements of the Social Sciences degree. The Intercultural Knowledge dimension that

received the lowest rating across the artifacts read was the Cultural Skills dimension.

On 2/13/2024 the Social Sciences Assessment Team convened to discuss the results of our rubric based assessment of Intercultural/Philosophical Knowledge. 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 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 (see Action Plan).

Table-3 Reduced rubric values compiled for each dimension or the Intercultural Knowledge Value rubric.

Intercultural Knowledge Rubric Dimensions

Class Level	Knowledge	Skills	Attitudes	Philosophy
100	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.7
200	2.9	2.6	2.6	3.0
300	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.3
400	2.7	2.4	2.7	2.7
Practicum	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.5
Project	3.7	3.3	3.4	3.5

Project Attachments (2)

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