

REPORTING ON ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES & IMPROVEMENT

KAHIKOLUAMEA

I think we are getting very close to actually understanding our assessment process in a useful way. I think we need to use language with great precision, and understand what we assess, with which instrument, and what type of changes we would make based upon the data. For example, for Kahikoluamea (I know that Programs are different from programs),

We last assessed our competencies in 2012, and based on the data created the Library Research activity, it has successfully infiltrated ALL sections of Eng 22 and MOST or at least MANY Eng 100s. It also spurred a lot of dialogue between library and instructional faculty and how the library can support learning.

We opted for the "every five years" reporting, so we won't make major curricular changes until we do that again. However, we still do the assessment every semester (department portfolios for ENG and a departmental exam for math) and share the data with faculty, who use it to tweak their OWN curriculum at the course level.

And Program data is assessed using ARPD. Is that called "program outcomes assessment?" That's more like program health indicators to me. Retention, persistence, etc.

In response to our ARPD numbers, Kahikoluamea is:

- integrating counseling with FYE to create greater accuracy in post COMPASS advising and registration placement;
- adding a mandatory college success course IS 109 to all students to place into Math 24, our most vulnerable population;
- integrating success strategies and community engagement into Eng 22 courses;
- created a Math Pathway registration poster/brochure;
- endeavoring to create a faculty-engaged writing support lab; YES, I submitted an ARF for this project and it is in our CPR.

HOSPITALITY

HOST 100 - an assessment prepared in the fall of 2011 and a CLR that was prepared this semester for the fall 2013 semester. The 3-4 instructors will collaborate after this Spring semester to continue and discuss in the Fall of 2014 using this same CLR in preparation for a curriculum central update in the Spring of 2015. There comments are stated in the action steps or next steps boxes. This is an assessment being worked on this year.

SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

All SLT program courses are being revised now for fall review, which will include the curriculum proposals with changes based on course assessments.

(SLT 290 and others) Provide clearer directions and expectations about these discussion board posts to the students at the beginning of the semester, including a list of required discussion board posts, samples of quality posts, due dates, and the grading rubric.

https://laulima.hawaii.edu/access/content/user/sford/SLT_SLO_CLRs.htm

SLT 102 Continue to set firm due dates when discussion board posts must be submitted and provide a list of required discussion board posts. Continue to provide opportunities with clear responsibilities for students to link classwork with assignments. Continue to provide samples of quality work for each assignment. Work to provide clearer directions and expectations for each assignment.

ENGLISH

As a result of the assessment cycle ending 2013, every English course updated last semester was updated to streamline competencies -- both Gen Ed and Course Specific. And of course, streamlining the competencies:

- sharpens the focus of the instruction
- helps our students succeed in the course.

English assessment this semester in several courses will begin assessing these streamlined competencies over the 5- year cycle.

Our LLL English assessments are going fairly well this Spring. Some initial confusion, but mostly from trying to corral such a large group of faculty who teach a diverse collection of courses in one Department. We seem to be getting better at knowing what to do and do it with relative efficiency,

The positive experiences:

- We are talking to each other!
- We are being inspired through assignment sharing.
- We are discovering how to best serve our students.

What was VERY helpful was Davin Kubota's and Reid Sunahara's creation of rubrics using online applications such as Survey Monkey and Google Docs. We didn't have to mess with paper surveys and the data was available with a click. But we all agreed that the free versions of Survey Monkey and Google Docs are limited in scope and capabilities.

WRITING INTENSIVE CLASSES

The supplemental CLR that reflects the hard work of the 3-person portfolio cluster who evaluated materials not only in AY '11, AY '12 and '13 and now '14 but who are working to steadily codify and improve portfolio procedures and policies. We are excited about

- 1) building a shared rubric and portfolio guidelines;
- 2) building a shared peer-editing sheet;
- 3) figuring out how to incorporate 'mandated' study / make up sessions into the course.

--if a student does not have a peer-editing sheet, they need to come to the shared office hour space.

--if a student is really struggling with the Annotated Bibliography, they need to come to the shared office hour space and also meet with the instructional librarian paired with that course.

--if a student is really 'hurtin', they need to come to the shared office hour space and be directed to a primary Maida Kamber Center counselor. (etc.)

- 4) potentially mandating Brainfuse as embedded rubric content rather than A) supplemental extra-credit or B) up to the student's whim.

WI/WAC

2014 W.A.C. and W.I. Programmatic Assessment Report

Program Learning Report: Health of Writing Across the Curriculum (W.A.C.) via Direct Artefact Assessment of W.I. Classes

Spring 2014

Submitted by Davin Kubota, W.A.C. Coordinator

Student Learning Outcome	Assessment Methodology	Expected Level of Achievement	Assessment Results	Next Steps
<p>Primary K.C.C. S.L.O.'s related to W.A.C. and W.I.:</p> <p>Thinking/Inquiry: Make effective decisions with intellectual integrity to solve problems and/or achieve goals utilizing the skills of critical thinking, creative thinking, information literacy, and quantitative/symbolic reasoning.</p> <p>Communication:</p>	<p>In order to evaluate the outcomes, a generalized and modified rubric for Critical Thinking and Written Communication was created based on A.A.C.U. standard rubrics for those categories. W.I. faculty met and utilized</p>	<p>Given previous assessments, most of the W.I. faculty gathered expected results in the categories of "Meets Slightly" and "Meets" range; there was some measure of expected improvement in "Critical Thinking" and "Source Credibility,"</p>	<p>The artefacts depicted high percentiles (~Meets/Exceeds) in the following categories: thesis construction (60 percent); documentation of sources (62.86); clarity of thought (74.28%).</p> <p>The artefacts depicted lower performance (Does Not Meet/Meets</p>	<p>A large portion of the discussion fixated on W.I. students wanting to get the work done quickly and expediently and while library intervention has bolstered source credibility away from weaker sites like Wikipedia and Ask.com., students still struggle to include relevant content; this lack of relevant content feeds into a haphazard project structure, which also feeds into a weakened critical thinking, since material is 'glossed over' rather than analyzed in depth.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Identify sites and resources that are sanctioned by librarians and faculty as more 'credible';2. Provide students with clear

<p>Ethically compose and convey creative and critical perspectives to an intended audience using visual, oral, written, social, and other forms of communication.</p>	<p>SurveyMonkey for reportage purposes; these results were later compiled by the W.I. Coordinator. 35 artefacts were collected and assessed after a norming session and after a conversation regarding general strengths and improvements that could be discerned within the artefacts.</p>	<p>given faculty's direct and anecdotal evidence that students have not yet mastered critical, in-depth assessment of quoting conventions and quote meanings; students still need more scaffolding and patient engagement in terms of analyzing material that would enhance their critical thinking and quoting, paraphrasing, and documentation</p>	<p>Slightly) in the following categories: content development (57.14%); organization/form (54.29%); critical assessment (54.29%).</p> <p>The weakest categories were in Organization and Critical Thinking.</p> <p>Promising shifts indicated that from 2013, some improvement was made in Source Documentation and in Clarity. Qualitative assessment attempted to interpret this shift, and faculty</p>	<p>sample outlines and examples of how to critically parse through the evidence provided;</p> <p>3. Create a venue by which students can potentially receive free handouts related to writing and writing conventions: thesis construction; expected content; organization (PIE, et. al.); source credibility and formats; grammar fluency; critical assessment of pictures and quotes. (to be implemented in Fall 2014)</p> <p>Request: A shared login account for SurveyMonkey would allow for greater online efficacy in terms of 1) saving paper for assessment projects; 2) exporting data cleanly and efficiently. However, a 29 dollar a month service fee might not be appropriate for an entire year. It might be more feasible just to pay for the service when individuals charged with assessment need to use the</p>
---	---	--	--	---

		<p>efforts.</p>	<p>wondered if students were using more external resources such as Brainfuse or receiving library intervention in the form of Research Challenges.</p> <p>Regarding the trends meriting improvement, suggestions were as follows: the inclusion of sample outlines or outline boxes that students might fill out; the inclusion of faculty-crafted samples that indicates the types of “critical depth” that they expect from students. Anecdotally and during discussion, faculty noted that</p>	<p>program for a given month every Spring.</p>
--	--	-----------------	---	--

			<p>we often have seen expectations of 'what the finished product might look like' but, in an attempt to promote critical and independent thinking, do not necessarily provide a scaffolding architecture that indicates what that final product actually is.</p>	





