University of Hawaii-West O'ahu

ILO 3. Critical Thinking Assessment Report 2022-24

June 19, 2024

Table of Contents

ILO 3. Critical Thinking Assessment Report 2022-24

Supported Initiatives Overview

Institutional Priorities
Critical Thinking

Projects including this Initiative (2)

PROJECT	MEASURES	FINDINGS / TARGETS	
EDUCATION - Academic Program Assessment Report	10	10/10	Action Plan
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION - Academic Program Assessment Report	1	1/1	Action Plan

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

- Critical Thinking

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

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION - Academic Program   2022-2024 Assessment Report

`Completed`   **1**OUTCOMES **1**MEASURES **1**TARGETS **1**FINDINGS **2**ATTACHMENTS

1.1 Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes
DLO 1: Critical Thinking

This assessment period, PUBA faculty focused on Division Learning Outcome (DLO) #1: Demonstrate critical thinking, research, and communication skills as applied to the public and private sectors. The focus of data collection and review was critical thinking.

SI Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities
- Critical Thinking

Action Plan

Results from the 36 reviews showed a increase in proficiency from Introduce to Mastery level courses (2.4 to 3.06). Students scored an average of 2.4 at the introduce level, 2.57 at the reinforce level, and 3.06 at the mastery level.

	Created	Due	Status
Action Item 1 Identify capstone, WI, or other higher-level courses and compare to lower-level courses. Select specific assignments and artifacts that better represent critical thinking, not just random assignments for future review.	9/26/2023	12/14/2024	Planned
Action Item 2 Review courses identified for critical thinking. Consider appropriate education and assignments to teach and support critical thinking. (What am I doing to introduce/reinforce/master critical thinking in this specific assignment and this course?)	3/20/2024	12/14/2024	Planned
Action Item 3 Conduct a calibrating activity before the next artifact review to ensure all faculty are evaluating student work consistently and in alignment with the scoring rubric.	3/20/2024	5/10/2025	Planned

1.1.1 Measures

PUBA Writing Intensive (WI) courses - list courses depending on semester.

DLO#1 is an outcome in all PUBA courses at all three levels - Introduce, Reinforce, and Master. For this assessment period, PUBA faculty focused on the critical thinking aspect of DLO #1 at all three levels.

METHODOLOGY*

Eight PUBA faculty participated in the review of 36 artifacts (12 artifacts from courses with DLO#1 at the introduce level, 12 artifacts from courses with DLO#1 at the reinforce level, and 12 artifacts from courses with DLO#1 at the mastery level). Faculty used the revised VALUE rubric for Critical Thinking, titled "UH West O'ahu Critical Thinking Rubric", to complete their reviews and scores.

1.1.1.1 Target/Success Indicator

The average proficiency score, using the UHWO Critical Thinking VALUE rubric, for students taking courses at the Introduce level will be at least a 1, at the Reinforce level will be at least a 2, and at the Master level will be at least a 3. Met

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR

Average Score based on course level.

FINDINGS/RESULTS

Results from the 36 reviews showed a increase in proficiency from Introduce to Mastery level courses (2.4 to 3.06). Students scored an average of 2.4 at the introduce level, 2.57 at the reinforce level, and 3.06 at the mastery level.

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS

After discussing the results with the PUBA faculty, the following points were noted:

1. Different interpretations between faculty of the rubric.

2. Very different documents were being compared.

3. Identify capstone, WI, or certain higher level courses, and compare to other lower level courses.

4. Select specific assignments that better represent critical thinking, not just random assignments.

5. All courses should teach analysis, not just WI; consider how we require analytical thinking.

6. Look at courses identified for critical thinking, consider appropriate education and assignments to teach and support critical thinking. What am I doing to introduce/ reinforce/ master critical thinking in this specific assignment and this course?

7. Continue this assessment conversation at future division meetings.

Project Attachments (2)

Attachments	File Size
Data collection Artifact Review - Sheet1.pdf	35KB
UHWO Critical Thinking Rubric 2.pdf	159KB