

Assessment Support Committee
 WI Assessment Report
 June 2020
 Submitted by Seri I. Luangphinit, ALO and Chair

The following constitutes a report of the WI assessment efforts that took place in tandem with Core Competency Assessment.

Writing Intensive (WI) is part of the UH System initiative to “incorporate more writing in courses from all disciplines.” WI serves as a major graduation requirement—a student must fulfill three WI designated courses, of which one must be upper division. According to the [UH Hilo WI website](#), the following are the stated hallmarks of courses certified for this graduation requirement:

1. Writing promotes learning of course materials.
2. Writing is considered to be a process in which multiple drafts are encouraged.
3. Writing contributes significantly to each student's course grade.
4. Students do a substantial amount of writing. Depending on course content and the types of writing appropriate to the discipline, students may write critical essays or reviews, journals, lab reports, research reports or reaction papers.
5. To allow for meaningful professor-student interactions on each student's writing, Writing Intensive classes are restricted to a maximum of 20 students.

So while WI is not intended to strictly promote academic writing, integration of a variety of writing assignments (that can include free-writing, blogs, Lualima posts, lab reports, journals, and other such discipline-specific exercises) is, in theory, meant to support higher cognitive learning of course materials.

In Spring of 2020, the Assessment Support Committee decided to test this theory and see if WI was indeed contributing to learning in the classroom. Twelve (12) separate courses in all five colleges were assessed using the newly created WI rubric:

Scale	Learning of course materials (vocabulary)	Prose/Discourse	Analysis/Insight
3--Mastery	Student effectively uses correct and specific vocabulary and concepts that enhance the writing; this indicates a full understanding of the subject	Uses sophisticated language that is highly appropriate to academia	Student communicates information in an advanced manner that leads to unique insight
2--Competent	Student uses some vocabulary and/or concepts but does not fully demonstrate a full grasp of the subject	Uses some high level terms but prose is at times simplistic and/or colloquial	Student communicates basic information and some analysis of the material
1--Needs further work	Student does not use vocabulary or concepts and the writing indicates a lack	Language is inappropriate for academia	Student does no communicate

	of understanding of the subject		information in a manner that is logical or rational
--	---------------------------------	--	---

The rubric was used by both the teacher of the source and by a member of the assessment committee, meaning that two readers reviewed each set of artifacts for each course to ensure external validation of the ratings. As predicted, ratings for artifacts by members of the committee tended to be a little higher.

The results for all classes are given below and include averages for both readers along with inter-rater reliability:

	Learning of course materials (vocabulary)	Prose/Discourse	Analysis/Insight
CAFNRM			
AG 263 <i>n</i> = 21 57% agreement Correlation = .68, <i>p</i> < .001 <i>k</i> = .48, <i>p</i> < .001	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.5 Reader 2: 2.59	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 1.85 Reader 2: 2.11	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 1.85 Reader 2: 1.92
HORT 262 <i>n</i> = 17 76.5% agreement Correlation = .856, <i>p</i> < .001 <i>k</i> = .663, <i>p</i> < .001	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.76 Reader 2: 2.82	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.64 Reader 2: 2.58	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.52 Reader 2: 2.47
CAS			
ANTH 387 <i>n</i> = 17 71% agreement Correlation = .89, <i>p</i> < .001 <i>k</i> = .61, <i>p</i> < .001	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.64 Reader 2: 2.76	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.41 Reader 2: 2.35	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.58 Reader 2: 2.64
ENG 257 <i>n</i> = 15 47% agreement Correlation = .61, <i>p</i> = .015 <i>k</i> = .33, <i>p</i> = .002	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 1.93 Reader 2: 2.26	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.06 Reader 2: 2.26	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.20 Reader 2: 2.33
ENG 285 <i>n</i> = 19 47% agreement Correlation = .61, <i>p</i> = .617 (correlation is not greater than 0) <i>k</i> = .19, <i>p</i> = .180 (kappa is not greater than 0)	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.57 Reader 2: 3.00	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.73 Reader 2: 2.78	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.63 Reader 2: 2.73
GEOG 430 <i>n</i> = 12 50% agreement Correlation = .88, <i>p</i> < .001 <i>k</i> = .35, <i>p</i> = .014	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.41 Reader 2: 2.41	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.16 Reader 2: 2.00	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.33 Reader 2: 2.16
SOC 377 <i>n</i> = 11 73% agreement Correlation = .84, <i>p</i> = .001 <i>k</i> = .56, <i>p</i> = .010	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.90 Reader 2: 2.90	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.63 Reader 2: 2.72	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.63 Reader 2: 2.63

CHHS			
BIOL 481 <i>n</i> = 4 75% agreement Correlation = .91, <i>p</i> = .048 <i>k</i> = .60, <i>p</i> = .070 (kappa is not greater than 0 due to small sample size)	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.75 Reader 2: 3.00	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.75 Reader 2: 2.75	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.75 Reader 2: 2.75
GEOL 432 <i>n</i> = 6 83% agreement Correlation = .98, <i>p</i> < .001 <i>k</i> = .79, <i>p</i> < .001	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.33 Reader 2: 2.33	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.16 Reader 2: 2.16	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.33 Reader 2: 2.16
NURS 410L <i>n</i> = 4 0% agreement Correlation = -.33, <i>p</i> = .367 (correlation is not greater than 0)	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.75 Reader 2: 3.00	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.00 Reader 2: 3.00	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.25 Reader 2: 2.75
CoBE			
MGT 490 <i>n</i> = 4 50% agreement Correlation = .93, <i>p</i> = .037 <i>k</i> = .333, <i>p</i> = .157 (kappa is not greater than 0 due to small sample size)	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.50 Reader 2: 2.50	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.25 Reader 2: 2.75	AVERAGES Reader 1: 2.50 Reader 2: 2.50
KHUOK			
KHAW 304 <i>n</i> = 11 55% agreement Correlation: .74 (<i>p</i> = .009) <i>k</i> = .375, <i>p</i> = .005)	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.00 Reader 2: 2.00	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.27 Reader 2: 2.00	AVGERAGES Reader 1: 2.09 Reader 2: 2.18

Generally speaking, most courses report student work at or above basic competency set forth in the rubric, with the exception of two. But of those two, only one course in particular—AG 263—reflected agreement by both readers (teacher and external reader) that more work was needed to improve instruction that would further stimulate analysis, which is a critical thinking skill. Steps are underway in CAFNRM to address this and will be reported in their upcoming Self-Study for Program Review.