University of Hawaii-West O'ahu

ILO 4. Disciplinary Knowledge Assessment Report 2022-24

June 19, 2024

Table of Contents
ILO 4. Disciplinary Knowledge Assessment Report 2022-24

Supported Initiatives Overview

Institutional Priorities
Disciplinary Knowledge

Projects including this Initiative (3)

PROJECT	MEASURES	FINDINGS / TARGETS	
CYBERSECURITY - Academic Program Assessment Report	1	1/1	Action Plan
EDUCATION - Academic Program Assessment Report	10	10/10	Action Plan
SOCIAL SCIENCES - Academic Program Assessment Report	2	2/2	Action Plan

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

1.1 Learning Outcomes/Program Outcomes
DLO 5

DLO 5: Demonstrate proficiency in developing strategies to protect against, detect and respond to advanced cybersecurity threats, vulnerabilities and risks (Planning).

SI Supported Initiatives - Institutional Priorities
- Disciplinary Knowledge

Action Plan

There was an unforeseen departure of one of the BS Cybersecurity faculty in August 2023 who had been designated to serve as the Assessment Coordinator for AY2023-24. Given the timing of this change and the workload of the remaining BS Cybersecurity faculty, an Assessment Coordinator was not appointed for the program in AY2023-24. Dr. Michael Miranda led an assessment project in the ISA 320 course that served as the basis for the assessment project included in this report. The majority of students achieved target levels which demonstrates their proficiency in developing strategies to protect against, detect and respond to advanced cybersecurity threats, vulnerabilities and risks. There are three action items that have been identified for the BS Cybersecurity program based on this assessment project and on their need to assign a faculty member to serve as their Assessment Coordinator next academic year, and to expand their future assessment projects to include additional courses and instructors.

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Faculty will consider whether, based on the findings of this assessment project, it may be warranted to provide further learning opportunities focused on priority criteria to aid the students in their ability to clearly define criteria for vulnerability.	9/26/2023	1/13/2025	Planned

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
Expand BS Cybersecurity assessment project to include additional courses and instructors	4/12/2024	5/16/2025	Planned

Action Item 3	Created	Due	Status

| Appoint an Assessment Coordinator to serve in AY2024-25 for the BS Cybersecurity program | 4/12/2024 | 8/12/2024 | Planned |

1.1.1 Measures
ISA 320 "Prioritize Vulnerabilities" Assignment

"Assignment 4: Prioritize Vulnerabilities" assignment from ISA 320 Fundamentals of Secure Software Programming was utilized for the assessment project. The assignment requires the student to analyze the vulnerabilities identified on a software system. In many cases, the number of vulnerabilities could number from 10 to nearly 100 depending on several factors. Remediating vulnerabilities takes time and resources. In most enterprises, there are not sufficient resources to remediate vulnerabilities on all systems all at once. Cybersecurity analysts need to identify which vulnerabilities put the enterprise at risk and prioritize/plan remediating the most critical vulnerabilities first. The assignment requires the student to develop a strategy (define priorities and criteria), apply that criteria, and explain the resulting list of prioritized vulnerabilities to remediate.

METHODOLOGY*

ISA 320 is a required course for students in the BS in Cybersecurity program and the BAS Information Security and Assurance concentration. Data for all students (N = 27) registered in one Fall 2023 section of ISA 320 were utilized. The assignments were scored using a rubric (see attachment). The maximum score for the assignment was 20 points, based on the points earned according to the rubric's 4 criteria areas. The primary challenge with scoring this assignment is that students may not have sufficient technical knowledge at the 300-level to understand all the vulnerabilities they are assessing in the provided reports to review. Therefore, the focus of assessment was to ensure the students develop a reasonable procedure and apply it consistently. The 27 assessment artifacts were scored by the course instructor, Dr. Michael Miranda. Both rubric criteria scores, total score, and the instructor's written comments were analyzed.

1.1.1.1 Target/Success Indicator
Target levels for each rubric criteria: Priority Levels (5), Priority Criteria (5), Assign Priority Level to Vulnerabilities (3), Applying the Prioritization and Criteria (7). Partially Met

TARGET/SUCCESS INDICATOR: 80% or more of students score at the target level for each rubric criteria.

FINDINGS/RESULTS: The target was met for three of the four rubric criteria, and was close to being met for one criteria, Priority Criteria (see attached data table)

ANALYSIS/USE OF FINDINGS: The Assignment 4 scores by Rubric Criteria were:

1. Priority Levels: 82%

2. Priority Criteria: 78%

3. Assign Priority Level to Vulnerabilities: 100%

4. Applying the Prioritization and Criteria: 96%

The majority of students achieved target levels which demonstrates their proficiency in developing strategies to protect against, detect and respond to advanced cybersecurity threats, vulnerabilities and risks. The rubric criteria on "Priority Criteria" indicated that 22% of the 27 students (i.e. 6 students) scored below target. This indicates that those students assigned ambiguous criteria for vulnerability to the priority levels. Attention may be warranted in providing further learning opportunities focused on priority criteria to aid the students in their ability to clearly define criteria for vulnerability.

Project Attachments (2)

Attachments	File Size
GRADING RUBRIC - ISA 320 Assignment 4 - Prioritize Vulnerabilities - RUBRIC.docx	9KB
ISA 320 Fall 2023 Summary Assessment Data Table.xlsx	10KB

1 OUTCOMES **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**
- Disciplinary Knowledge

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

1.2   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
- Disciplinary Knowledge

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.

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Expand or refine course lessons about source material on cultural knowledge.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
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	Created	Due	Status
Have students respond to discussion prompts about authoritative source material on cultural skills.	3/5/2024	4/25/2025	In Progress

Action Item 4	Created	Due	Status
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