

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Course (400-level course)</li> <li>2. Assignment</li> <li>3. Type of Student Artifact</li> <li>4. Rubric or other instrument</li> </ol>	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BBA– ACCOUNTING	NO  Business Administration program PLO's currently the standard for accounting program too	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/bba-with-major-in-accounting.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/bba-with-major-in-accounting.html</a>  <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/business-administration.htm">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/business-administration.htm</a>	YES  Communicate clearly, logically, and persuasively.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MGT 490 (Capstone course)- All business and accounting students take the capstone course.</li> <li>2. Case Study: Students study a business with a real-world problem. Individuals write a comprehensive analysis describing the business a problem, perform an environmental assessment (SWOT analysis) complete with external research, and develop solutions/recommendations.</li> </ol>	A random sample of seven case assignments and the GE writing rubric were distributed to five faculty members. This approach allows more faculty discussion for each assignment and decreases the possibility that scoring misses key elements of writing assignments. The overall average is 2.54 suggesting student writing levels are emerging.	To improve writing scores, the College is implementing several changes. First, a new business course emphasizing critical thinking (BUS 290) has been adopted as a core business class starting Fall 2013. Students taking this course will be ready for the capstone class next year. Second, students did not see the writing rubric before this assignment. The College intends to adopt the GE writing rubric for all assignments.	Accounting's first five-year review is in-progress; being sent out for external review.  2009 AACSB Fifth Year Maintenance of Accreditation Report (PDF) <a href="http://business.uhhawaii.edu/document/s/Fifth-YearReport-2009_013.pdf">http://business.uhhawaii.edu/document/s/Fifth-YearReport-2009_013.pdf</a>  2004 Memorandum of Understanding

				<p>3. Case Study Report (4-5 pages plus Appendices, APA style source)</p> <p>4. GE Rubric for written communications  <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/policies/documents/PR2013wc.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/policies/documents/PR2013wc.pdf</a>          (Appendix F)</p>	<p>Writing content is the weakest area. Student papers tend not to move beyond descriptive writing. Generally weak cases are made for assignment recommendations.</p>	<p>Finally, the Curriculum committee recommends more writing assignments embedded in various courses. Students need more feedback and a chance to revise their writing.</p>	<p>Program Review  <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/VC/AA/ProgramReview.php">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/VC/AA/ProgramReview.php</a></p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	---	--

<i>Case</i>	<i>Reader</i>	<i>Line of Reasoning</i>	<i>Organization &amp; Structure</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Language/Prose/Syntax</i>	<i>Average</i>
<b>1</b>	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	
	2	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	3	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	
	4	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
	5	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.25</b>
<b>2</b>	1	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	
	2	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	3	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	
	4	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	
	5	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.30</b>
<b>3</b>	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	2	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	3	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	4	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	5	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.95</b>
<b>4</b>	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	2	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
	3	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	4	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
	5	<u>4.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>
<b>5</b>	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	2	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	3	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	
	4	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
	5	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.05</b>

<b>6</b>	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	2	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	3	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	4	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	
	5	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>
<b>7</b>	1	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	2	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	
	3	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	
	4	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	
	5	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>1.80</b>

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA— ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE	YES; “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/administration-of-justice.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/administration-of-justice.html</a>	Yes, “All graduates ... should [. . .] be proficient in writing, [...] be able to develop a research design.”	1. POLS/GEOG 325 “Legal Geography”  2. Students will critically analyze a locally researched place of legal geography and will engage with how that place is a site of legal geography.  3. 3800 Word Research Paper with 11 supporting academic sources  4. GE Rubric for Written Communication	Twenty-one papers ( <i>n</i> = 21) were read by the Assessment Committee, with a majority (13 or approx. 60%) of papers scored below or near “emerging” (score of “2”). The readers noted that the papers showed the most weakness with grammar and syntax; papers exhibited mistakes not normally seen with native speakers of English (i.e.	The Department has reviewed the data and will adopt the following: ( 1) Increased peer review with drafting and revision strategies; (2) Solicit help of tutoring services (such as Kilohana); and (3) Request TESOL involvement to assist with writing difficulties	Slated for AY 2014-2015

					irregular pronoun usage, awkward particle and preposition usage, awkward plural/singular shifts, irregular tense shifts, lack of parallel construction in sentences, etc.) It was also noted that a substantial number of students referred to themselves as non-native speakers.		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	1	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	1	2	1	1	
		1	2	1.5	1.5	1.50
Paper 2	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	2	2.00
Paper 3	Reader 1	2	2	2	1	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	1.5	1.875
Paper 4	Reader 1	3	3	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2.5	2.5	2	2	2.25
Paper 5	Reader 1	3	2	2	2	

	Reader 2	2	1	1	1	
		2.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.75
Paper 6	Reader 1	2	2	3	2	
	Reader 2	1	1	2	1	
		1.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	1.75
Paper 7	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.50
Paper 8	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.50
Paper 9	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.50
Paper 10	Reader 1	2	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2.5	2	2.5	2.25
Paper 11	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	1	2	1	
		2	1.5	2	1.5	1.75
Paper 12	Reader 1	2	3	1	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	1	
		2	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.875
Paper 13	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3	3	3.00
Paper 14	Reader 1	3	2	2	3	
	Reader 2	2	1	2	2	

		2.5	1.5	2	2.5	2.125
Paper 15	Reader 1	2	2	3	1	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	1	
		2	2	2.5	1	1.875
Paper 16	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	2	2.00
Paper 17	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	1	
		2	2	2	1.5	1.875
Paper 18	Reader 1	2	3	3	2	
	Reader 2	1	2	2	2	
		1.5	2.5	2.5	2	2.125
Paper 19	Reader 1	2	3	3	4	
	Reader 2	2	3	3	3	
		2	3	3	3.5	2.875
Paper 20	Reader 1	2	3	3	2	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	2	
		2.5	3	3	2	2.625
Paper 21	Reader 1	3	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2.5	2	2.5	2.5	2.375
	AVERAGES	2.190476	2.261905	2.285714	2.095238	



	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level course) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BS-AGRICULTURE	YES; "Goals for Student Learning"	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/coll-ge-of-agriculture-forestry-and-natural-resource-management.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/coll-ge-of-agriculture-forestry-and-natural-resource-management.html</a>	"Effective written and oral communication skills as required for professional objectives."	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HORT 450</li> <li>2. Students will produce a science report that must include all the proper parts of a scientific journal article: introduction, literature review, results &amp; discussions, conclusion and citations</li> <li>3. 15-20 page research paper</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	Sixteen paper ( $n = 16$ ) were read by the Assessment Committee. Of the sixteen, 10 of 16 (or 62%) exhibited skill above "competent" (score of "3"), with only one paper receiving a score of less than "emerging." While the assignment was not included with the papers, the papers themselves uniformly communicated the expectations	The College has reviewed the data and will initiate the following: (1) to improve the structure of the paper we will require students to prepare outlines before writing the reports, (2) provide examples of well-structured scientific reports, and (3) to improve content and grammar the reading of exemplary scientific articles will be required and peer review will be required as part of the revision process.	2003 <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/VC/AA/documents/CAFNRMprogramreviewMOUJuly2003.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/VC/AA/documents/CAFNRMprogramreviewMOUJuly2003.pdf</a>

						for the writing assignment. The Committee felt that the overall quality of the papers exhibited college-level research of writing, especially in terms of scientific method, data description, and analysis.		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.50
Paper 2	Reader 1	3	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	2	3	
		3	2	2	3	2.50
Paper 3	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	4	3	3	3	
		3.5	3	3	3	3.12
Paper 4	Reader 1	2	2	2	1	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	1.5	1.87
Paper 5	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	4	3	3	3	
		3.5	3	3	3	3.125
Paper 6	Reader 1	4	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	4	3	4	3	

		4	3	4	3	3.50
Paper 7	Reader 1	2	1	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	2	2	3	
		2.5	1.5	2.5	3	2.37
Paper 8	Reader 1	4	4	3	4	
	Reader 2	4	3	3	3	
		4	3.5	3	3.5	3.5
Paper 9	Reader 1	3	2	3	2	
	Reader 2	3	2	3	2	
		3	2	3	2	2.5
Paper 10	Reader 1	4	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	4	3	4	4	
		4	3	3.5	3.5	3.5
Paper 11	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3	3	3.00
Paper 12	Reader 1	3	3	3	2	
	Reader 2	3	2	2	3	
		3	2.5	2.5	3	2.75
Paper 13	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	2	2.00
Paper 14	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	4	4	3	3	
		3.5	3.5	3	3	3.25
Paper 15	Reader 1	4	4	3	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	3	4	
		4	4	3	4	3.75
Paper 16	Reader 1	4	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3.5	3	3.5	3	3.25
		3.25	2.78	2.90	2.93	

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA-ANTHROPOLOGY	YES; "Goals for Student Learning in the Major"	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/anthropology.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/anthropology.html</a>	The main goals for student learning in anthropology are to think and communicate more broadly and holistically by gaining a basic understanding and integrated perspectives of the following: (including) the nature and range of cultural diversity worldwide and through time; the major theoretical orientations in anthropology as they relate to our general	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ANTH 475</li> <li>2. Students will critically analyze two different cultures by applying anthropological theories related to historical and gendered perspectives</li> <li>3. 10-12 page essay based on 2 ethnographies</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	Ten readers took part in evaluating twenty four ( $n = 24$ ) artifacts. Of the 24 papers, 9 fell short of "Competent—3" with students exhibiting the most difficulty with line of reasoning (average = 3.0625). However, it should be noted that the department displayed a high level of disagreement between readers that could not be rectified by	The department realizes it needs to work on better calibrating teachers in terms of uniform expectations of writing for students. The department plans to revisit some of its lower-division writing intensive courses to see if they adequately prepare majors for their final year. The department is also planning to revamp the capstone to focus on the coalescing of curriculum and universal skills.	2005 <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/AnthropologyMOU.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/AnthropologyMOU.pdf</a>

			understanding of human cultural behaviors and cultural and biological adaptations;		further calibration.		
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------	--	--

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	3	2	3	2	
	Reader 2	2	3	3	2	
		2.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5
Paper 2	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Paper 3	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Paper 4	Reader 1	2	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.75
Paper 5	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	4	4	4	
		3.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.375
Paper 6	Reader 1	3	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.25
Paper 7	Reader 1	4	4	3	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.875
Paper 8	Reader 1	3	2	2	3	
	Reader 2	4	4	3	4	
		3.5	3.0	2.5	3.5	3.125

Paper 9	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Paper 10	Reader 1	4	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	2	3	3	2	
		3.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0
Paper 11	Reader 1	3	2	3	2	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		3.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.25
Paper 12	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Paper 13	Reader 1	3	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	2	
		3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.75
Paper 14	Reader 1	4	4	3	4	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.375
Paper 15	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	3	
		2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.625
Paper 16	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	3	2	3	
		2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.75
Paper 17	Reader 1	3	4	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	3	
		2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.75
Paper 18	Reader 1	3	3	3	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	4	3	
		2.5	2.5	3.5	2.5	2.75
Paper 19	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5

Paper 20	Reader 1	2	2	3	2	
	Reader 2	4	3	3	3	
		3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.75
Paper 21	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	1	2	3	3	
		2.5	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.0
Paper 22	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Paper 23	Reader 1	3	3	3	2	
	Reader 2	2	3	2	3	
		2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.625
Paper 24	Reader 1	3	4	4	3	
	Reader 2	2	3	3	4	
		2.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.25
AVERAGE		3.0625	3.145	3.166	3.166	

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA-ART	YES; "Goals for Student Learning in the Major"	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/art.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/art.html</a>	"Critical thinking skills and the ability to express this process are significant aspects of studio practice." [The Department will meet to revise SLOs to align with the new Core Competencies required by WASC]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Art 321</li> <li>2. Students will articulate their conceptual approach and the material processes that are of significance in their practice in a well-organized, concise, and articulate self-reflective narrative</li> <li>3. A 1-2 page artist's narrative that accompanies the student portfolio</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	The exercise was the first time many in the group had been required to develop an artist statement. In all, nine (N = 9) 1.5 - 2 page documents were reviewed by the full time department faculty. The mean rating of 2.5 and average score of 2.3 (emerging) are clear indication more work needs to be done to raise the level of written communication	There was general agreement the practice should be implemented for all upper division studio classes as supplement to the standard studio department portfolio requirement. In the future the department will provide exemplar samples to better assist students in crafting their own Artist Statements. It was also agreed that a "blind" review of student writings, from majors and non-majors, include	



					skill.	formal compositions developed in conjunction with upper division art history courses and seminar.	
--	--	--	--	--	--------	---	--

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Course (400-level)</li> <li>2. Assignment</li> <li>3. Type of Student Artifact</li> <li>4. Rubric or other instrument</li> </ol>	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BS- ASTRONOMY	YES: "Goals for Student Learning in the Major"	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/astronomy.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/astronomy.html</a>	"Acquisition of basic scientific reasoning, critical thinking, and communications skills."	The faculty in Astronomy have reviewed their classes and have found that there are no major writing requirements in the upper division courses. The Department will use AY 2013-2014 to review their SLOs and the curriculum to better incorporate this competency.			

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication )?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level course) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BBA– Business Administration	YES	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/business-administration.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/business-administration.html</a>	YES Communicate clearly, logically, and persuasively.	1. MGT 490 (Capstone course) 2. Case Study: Students study a business with a real-world problem. Individuals write a comprehensive analysis describing the business a problem, perform an environmental assessment (SWOT analysis) complete with external research, and develop solutions/recommendations. 3. Case Study Report (4-5 pages plus Appendices, APA style source) 4. GE Rubric for written	A random sample of seven case assignments and the GE writing rubric were distributed to five faculty members. This approach allows more faculty discussion for each assignment and decreases the possibility that scoring misses key elements of writing assignments. The overall average is 2.54 suggesting student writing levels are emerging. Writing content is the	To improve writing scores, the College is implementing several changes. First, a new business course emphasizing critical thinking (BUS 290) has been adopted as a core business class starting Fall 2013. Students taking this course will be ready for the capstone class next year. Second, students did not see the	2009 AACSB Fifth Year Maintenance of Accreditation Report (PDF) <a href="http://business.uhh.hawaii.edu/documents/Fifth-YearReport-2009_013.pdf">http://business.uhh.hawaii.edu/documents/Fifth-YearReport-2009_013.pdf</a>  2004 Memorandum of Understanding Program Review <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/VCAA/ProgramReview.php">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/VCAA/ProgramReview.php</a>

				communications <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/policies/documents/PR2013wc.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/policies/documents/PR2013wc.pdf</a> (Appendix F)	weakest area. Student papers tend not to move beyond descriptive writing. Generally weak cases are made for assignment recommendations.	writing rubric before this assignment. The College intends to adopt the GE writing rubric for all assignments. Finally, the Curriculum committee recommends more writing assignments embedded in various courses. Students need more feedback and a chance to revise their writing.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

<i>Case</i>	<i>Reader</i>	<i>Line of Reasoning</i>	<i>Organization &amp; Structure</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Language/Prose/Syntax</i>	<i>Average</i>
<b>1</b>	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	
	2	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	3	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	
	4	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
	5	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.25</b>
<b>2</b>	1	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	
	2	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	3	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	
	4	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	
	5	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.30</b>
<b>3</b>	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	2	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	3	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	4	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	5	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.95</b>
<b>4</b>	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	2	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
	3	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	4	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
	5	<u>4.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>
<b>5</b>	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	2	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	3	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	
	4	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
	5	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.05</b>
<b>6</b>	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	

	2	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	3	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
	4	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	
	5	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>
<b>7</b>	1	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
	2	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	
	3	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	
	4	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	
	5	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	
	<b>Average</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>1.80</b>

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Course (400-level)</li> <li>2. Assignment</li> <li>3. Type of Student Artifact</li> <li>4. Rubric or other instrument</li> </ol>	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA-CHEMISTRY BA-CHEMISTRY: HEALTH SCIENCES	YES; "Goals for Student Learning in the Major"	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/chemistry.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/chemistry.html</a>	At this time, the Department does not have written communication explicitly stated in its PLOs but will review them this coming year.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chem 431</li> <li>2. Students will describe the procedures utilized in the assignment experiment and discuss their results in a coherent analysis</li> <li>3. 6-10 page lab report with rendered data</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	Twelve ( $n = 12$ ) papers were read and assessed by one reader, so at this time the reliability of the data is a little unclear. However, five out of 12 (or 41%) of papers scored below competency when all skills were averaged. Students exhibit the greatest difficulty with language/prose/syntax.	It is recommended that the department do blind double reading of papers in the future to ensure that the scores are accurate. The department will also consider requiring multiple drafts of lab reports so the instructor can provide feedback on students' writing skills.	2004 <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/ChemistryMOU.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/ChemistryMOU.pdf</a>

	Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Prose/Syntax	AVERAGE
Paper 1	4	4	4	4	4
Paper 2	3	3	3	2	2.75
Paper 3	4	4	4	4	4
Paper 4	2	3	3	2	2.5
Paper 5	4	3	3	4	3.5
Paper 6	4	4	4	3	3.75
Paper 7	4	4	4	3	3.75
Paper 8	3	3	2	3	2.75
Paper 9	3	2	2	3	2.5
Paper 10	4	4	4	4	4
Paper 11	4	4	4	4	4
Paper 12	3	3	3	2	2.75
AVERAGE	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.35



	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Course (400-level)</li> <li>2. Assignment</li> <li>3. Type of Student Artifact</li> <li>4. Rubric or other instrument</li> </ol>	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA– COMMUNICATION	YES; “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/communication.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/communication.html</a>	We have PLOs for oral communication but not for written communication. A new PLO for written communication will be under consideration this summer.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. COM 400 (Seminar in Human Dialogue)</li> <li>2. Students will write a paper in which they examine their real-life communication for the presence of those conditions that are conducive to human dialogue, using a model from class. They will record their observations and learning.</li> <li>3. A 7-page narrative of approximately 1500 words.</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	19 papers ( $n = 19$ ) were collected and distributed for blind reading by members of the assessment support committee, which found that 16 of the 19 papers fell below competency for written communication (competency = “3”). Per the average scores for each category, students appear to have the most difficulty in organization and	<p>The Department will attend more specifically to “Organization/Structure” and “Line of Reasoning” in or future written communication assignments. These focal areas will be highlighted in future teaching efforts.</p> <p>The Department urges that training be made available for faculty to more effectively teach writing.</p> <p>The Department also requests the development of a</p>	2013 FORTHCOMING

					<p>structure (2.42) and maintaining a clear, logical line of reasoning (2.5). Readers commented on the possibility that the assignment may have been interpreted by students as a “self-reflective” narrative as opposed to an analytic assignment. Readers also commented that while these papers were not being evaluated for information literacy that the lack of independent research and the integration of sources outside of lectures may be problematic for a 400-level course.</p>	<p>rubric for “reflective writing” assignments that do not fit the mode of the traditional library research paper.</p> <p>The Department also wishes to point out that inter-rater reliability for the Assessment Committee is problematic with exact agreement of scores of 58% to 63%.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	2	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	3	2	3	
		2	3	2.5	3	2.625
Paper 2	Reader 1	3	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	2	2	3	
		3	2	2.5	3	2.625
Paper 3	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	3	3	
		2.5	2.5	3	3	2.75
Paper 4	Reader 1	2	2	1	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	3	3	
		2	2	2	3	2.25
Paper 5	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Paper 6	Reader 1	3	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	3	3	
		2.5	2	3	3	2.875
Paper 7	Reader 1	2	2	2	3	
	Reader 2	2	1	2	3	
		2	1.5	2	3	2.125
Paper 8	Reader 1	2	3	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	3	
		2	2.5	2	2.5	2.25
Paper 9	Reader 1	2	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	3	3	3	
		2	3	3	3	2.75
Paper 10	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	2	2.00

Paper 11	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Paper 12	Reader 1	4	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	4	3	3	4	
		4	3	3.5	3.5	3.5
Paper 13	Reader 1	3	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2.5	2	2.5	2.5	2.375
Paper 14	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3	3	3.00
Paper 15	Reader 1	2	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	3	3	
		2	2.5	3	3	2.625
Paper 16	Reader 1	2	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2.5	3	2.5	2.50
Paper 17	Reader 1	4	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		4	3.5	4	3.5	3.75
Paper 18	Reader 1	3	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	2	3	3	
		3	2	3	3	2.75
Paper 19	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	2	2.00
		2.5	2.421053	2.684211	2.815789	

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA-ECONOMICS	Yes	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/economics.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/economics.html</a>	Upon graduating with a B.A. degree in Economics, students should be able to: Apply Economic theory to practical problems [and] Write and speak effectively and confidently.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ECON 416 Asia-Pacific Economic Integration</li> <li>2. Students will chose one country from the Asia-Pacific Region, develop a narrative of the relationship of that country with the U.S., then apply economic theory in their analysis of the relationship.</li> <li>3. 6-8 page research paper in Chicago Format</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	The Department undertook a reading of 11 paper ( $n = 11$ ). The class average for each paper was 2.875, indicating students are approaching competency (score of 3), with weaknesses noted in two categories: line of reasoning and organization/structure.	In light of this data, the department will undertake the following: (1)To improve line of reasoning, we plan to add short analytical writings into our assignments in addition to short definition and essay writings; (2) to improve structure of the paper, we start to require students to provide detailed outlines before writing any essay; and (3) Seeking support from Kilohana to improve overall writing skills.	2007 <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/2007ProgramReviewMOU.M10.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/2007ProgramReviewMOU.M10.pdf</a>

Paper 1		Line of Reasoning	Organization and Structure	Content	Language/Prose/Syntax	Average
	Reader 1	3	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3.5	3	3.125
Paper 2	Reader 1	2	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	2	3	3	
		2.5	2.5	3	3	2.750
Paper 3	Reader 1	4	3	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		4	3.5	4	4	3.875
Paper 4	Reader 1	2	2	3	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2.5	2	2.125
Paper 5	Reader 1	3	4	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	4	4	
		3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.375
Paper 6	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	3	2	2	
		2	2.5	2	2.5	2.125
Paper 7	Reader 1	3	4	4	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	4	3	
		3	3.5	4	3	3.375
Paper 8	Reader 1	2	2	3	2	
	Reader 2	2	3	2	2	
		2	2.5	2.5	2	2.250

Paper 9	Reader 1	2	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	2	3	3	
		2.5	2	3	3	2.625
Paper 10	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	2	2.000
Paper 11	Reader 1	3	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	2.5	3	3	2.875
		2.63	2.68	3.00	2.81	Class Average 2.875

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA-ENGLISH	Updated SLOs	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/english.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/english.html</a>	Students will: Demonstrate proper citation styles for the humanities (MLA) in their writing; Develop original research projects and/or original creative work that communicates ideas/arguments effectively and persuasively; Integrate complex ideas and theories from multiple sources in their writing; Analyze various types of texts (including literature, non-fiction, film, and visual media) using appropriate techniques, such as	1. ENG 489 Magical Realism 2. Final Research Paper 3. Students must synthesize 3 primary texts with a minimum of 5 academic secondary sources in a 6-8 page MLA formatted paper 4. GE Written Comm Rubric	Tables of scores for 2 readers of 15 final papers is included below.  The 15 sample papers from ENG 489 Magic Realism were an end-of-term argumentative research paper on a topic of the student's own choice. The assessment results show that the majority of the papers were at an advanced or competent level. None were assessed to be at the beginner level (1). Most papers scored at 3 or 4 on	Based on these scores, we conclude that most are near or at competency in written communication (86%) with $n = 15$ . However, the Department will discuss recommendations for future work to enable seniors who are below competency to receive additional support for their writing.	2005 <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/ChemistryMOU.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/ChemistryMOU.pdf</a>



			paraphrase, synthesis, and comparison/contrast; Demonstrate an understanding of writing as a process that requires revision, editing, and compliance with writing conventions; Write college-level prose and use appropriate grammar.		the language section, which suggests that most English majors have strong language competency, including those whose thesis writing, analysis, and organization scored at 2; 4 of the 15 did exhibit problems with “line of reasoning” (receiving scores below 3) though the scores from the other categories offset this one area.		
--	--	--	---	--	---	--	--

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	4	3	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	3	3	4	
		4	3	3.5	4	3.625
Paper 2	Reader 1	3	3	3	4	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3	3.5	3.125
Paper 3	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	3	
		4	4	4	3.5	3.85
Paper 4	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		4	4	4	4	4
Paper 5	Reader 1	2	3	2	3	

	Reader 2	2	2	2	3	
		2	2.5	2	3	2.35
Paper 6	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	
		4	4	4	4	4
Paper 7	Reader 1	3	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	2	3	3	3	
		2.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.25
Paper 8	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	3	4	
		4	4	3.5	4	3.85
Paper 9	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	3	
		4	4	4	3.5	3.85
Paper 10	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	4	4	3	
		4	4	4	3.5	3.85
Paper 11	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	3	3	4	3	
		3.5	3.5	4	3.5	3.625
Paper 12	Reader 1	3	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	2	3	3	3	
		2.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.25
Paper 13	Reader 1	2	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	2	3	3	3	
		2	3	2.5	3	2.65
Paper 14	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3	3	3.00
Paper 15	Reader 1	3	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3.5	3	3.125

Inter-reliability:

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA– ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES BS– ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE BA– GEOGRAPHY	YES; “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/geography.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/geography.html</a>	No, but the Department will use AY 2013-2014 to rewrite the SLOs to incorporate Core Competencies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GEOG 495</li> <li>2. Students will articulate a research question, explain the significance of the question they want to explore, undertake a literature review of the subject, and finally develop a methodology and scope of work</li> <li>3. 3. 6-8 Research Proposal</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	<p>1. Nineteen (n=19) senior thesis papers were evaluated by two readers on the GES faculty.</p> <p>2. The papers ranged from a score of 2 (emerging) to 4 (advanced) based on an average of all four areas.</p> <p>3. Averages for all students assessed (n=19): Reasoning, 3; Organization 3.2; Content 2.9; Language, 3.2.</p> <p>The overall averages suggest</p>	<p>Department suggestion based on review of these data are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional faculty review at the outline stage of writing to help students develop conceptual content.</li> <li>2. Greater emphasis in GEOG 201 and GEOG 280 on data analysis and its translation into written analyses.</li> <li>3. GES students currently take ENG 225 or now ENG 287 to satisfy the GES writing requirement. We will revisit if these</li> </ol>	<p>2011</p> <p><a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/MOU2010-11ProgramReviewDeptofGeographyandEnvironStudies.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/MOU2010-11ProgramReviewDeptofGeographyandEnvironStudies.pdf</a></p>

					<p>that our senior students are competent rather than advanced. 4. However, the number of students in the emerging range (4/19) is too high. 21% of our graduating seniors are not at the emerging level.</p>	<p>courses prepare students adequately. 4. Our low scoring students were both native and non-native English speakers, but students need to be more proactive in using tutoring resources. We will encourage students to use tutoring.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA–GEOLOGY; BS–GEOLOGY	YES; “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/geology.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/geology.html</a>	“Graduates are also expected to [. . .] Express earth science concepts in writing.”	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GEOL 320 (The Department does not have a required 400-level course that all seniors take and has thus chosen this course)</li> <li>2. Students will analyze modeling and partial melting of the earth’s mantle</li> <li>3. A 7-8 page research paper in NAGT format what incorporates secondary research of scholarly materials as evidence</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	Three readers evaluated six assignments by seniors ( $N = 6$ ). The overall average for each paper based on the 4-point rubric was 2,85. The overall range in individual categories fell between 2.8 and 2.9. Of the six, two met or exceeded competence, three were close to attaining competence, and one fell below competence.	Upcoming majors will be (and already have been) assigned more of this specific type of assignment in both lower- and upper-division courses so that the Department can start to track the progress of individual students over time with regard to writing skills.	2004



	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA-HAWAIIAN STUDIES	YES: "Goals for Student Learning"	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/hawaiiian-studies-program.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/hawaiiian-studies-program.html</a>	1.) Hiki i ka haumāna ke 'ōlelo a kākau me ka pilina'ōlelo pololei ma ka pae makahiki IV, 'o ia ho'i ka ho'opili me ka ho'okokoke 'ana aku i ka pae mānaleo i 'ike 'ia i loko o nā nūpepa, nā palapala, a me nā līpine i hana 'ia e nā mānaleo o nā kenekulia 19 a 20. (The student is able to speak and write using grammatically correct prose at the fourth-year level of language study, approaching the level of native speaker fluency found in Hawaiian language	1. HAW 404 2. Research and explain the meaning of five examples for each of four kinds of "momi waiwai" (valuable pearls) not taught in KH'UOK Hawaiian language courses: 1.) terms not found in any major Hawaiian-English/English-Hawaiian dictionary; 2.) grammatical patterns; 3.) idioms; and 4.) metaphors or similes 3. Typewritten paper (double spaced, minimum 10 pages) using the Chicago Manual of Style 4. Written Communication Rubric	Fourteen paper (N = 14) were assessed by three readers according to Rubric for Written Communication, with the two closest set of scores used to attain high inter-rater reliability (>75%). Most scores were within one point difference; however, the two instances where the scores differed by more than two points suggests a lack of consensus about what constitutes "competent"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One of the three readers, the teacher of the course, will increase the focus on all four aspects of the rubric but especially on organization and structure, the aspect of greatest difficulty.</li> <li>Discussion by the three readers and other, future readers about what constitutes "competent" senior level writing will provide valuable direction in future writing curriculum and assessment in the College of Hawaiian Language.</li> </ul>	2010 Click on link to MOU (PDF) <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/VC/AA/ProgramReview.php">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/VC/AA/ProgramReview.php</a>

			<p>newspapers, documents, and recordings made by native speakers of the 19th and 20th centuries.)</p> <p>2.) Hiki i ka haumāna ke 'ōlelo a kākau ma ka pae walewaha e kūpono ai ka nohona a me ka 'oihana ma ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i. (The student is able to speak and write at a level of proficiency suitable for living and working in Hawaiian medium environments.)</p> <p>3.) Hiki i ka haumāna ke ho'opili aku i kona 'ike 'ōlelo Hawai'i i ke kākau pono 'ana i ka pepa kālai'ike a me ka ha'i'ōlelo pono 'ana ma ka pae makahiki IV i wehewehe 'ia ma ka hopena a'o mua o luna a'e nei. (The student is able to apply his/her Hawaiian language knowledge to</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



			properly writing an academic paper and to properly delivering a speech at the fourth-year level explained in the first learning outcome above.)				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	2	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	2	3	3	
	Reader 3	3	2	3	3	
		3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.75
Paper 2	Reader 1	2	1	1	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 3	3	3	2	3	
		3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	2.87
Paper 3	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 3	3	3	2	3	
		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Paper 4	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 3	2	3	2	3	
		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Paper 5	Reader 1	4	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	4	3	3	3	
	Reader 3	3	3	3	3	
		4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.25
Paper 6	Reader 1	3	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	3	4	4	4	
	Reader 3	3	4	3	4	
		3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.75

Paper 7	Reader 1	3	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	2	3	3	
	Reader 3	3	2	3	3	
		3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.75
Paper 8	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	4	3	4	4	
	Reader 3	3	3	4	4	
		4.00	3.5	4.00	4.00	3.87
Paper 9	Reader 1	3	3	4	4	
	Reader 2	3	3	4	4	
	Reader 3	3	4	4	4	
		3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.50
Paper 10	Reader 1	1	1	1	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	3	3	
	Reader 3	2	2	2	3	
		2.00	2.00	2.5	3.00	2.37
Paper 11	Reader 1	2	1	1	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 3	2	2	2	2	
		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Paper 12	Reader 1	1	1	1	1	
	Reader 2	3	3	4	4	
	Reader 3	3	3	3	3	
		3.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.25
Paper 13	Reader 1	4	3	3	4	
	Reader 2	3	3	4	4	
	Reader 3	3	3	3	3	
		3.50	3.00	3.50	4.00	3.50
Paper 14	Reader 1	1	1	1	1	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 3	2	1	2	2	
		2.00	1.50	2.00	2.00	1.87
AVERAGE		2.92	2.69	3.03	3.11	

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA– HISTORY	yes	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/history.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/history.html</a>	<p>“The History major assists students in the development of their ability to communicate clearly, both orally and in writing, and in the development of their ability to gather, process, and analyze information from various sources, including primary and secondary source material found in print and Internet formats.”</p> <p>Students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present a historical interpretation in a well-</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. History 491-Senior Thesis</li> <li>2. Assignment: Students will write a paper on a topic of choice in the students' area of emphasis that will: (a) -answer analytically and historiographically significant research questions; (b) analyze evidence from both primary and secondary sources; (c) construct an interpretation that answers the questions posed in the project; (d) situate the interpretation in the historiography of the topic; (e)</li> </ol>	Eleven senior thesis papers (n=11) were read by the Assessment Committee. The class average for overall score was 2.759 indicating that students are approaching competency (score of 3), with the following areas noted as needing improvement: grammar and syntax; quality of research; analysis.	The department will address these areas of concern through the following: (1) to improve grammar and syntax issues, we plan to increase the availability of history-writing tutors (both within the department and through university services, eg. Kilohana) along with increased peer-review; (2) research and analysis concerns will be addressed in both HIST 300 'historical methods' and HIST 490 'historiography'	2005

			organized, readable, and logical manner; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow proper rules of grammar and syntax, and accepted style of the profession (Chicago Style).</li> </ul>	present their historical interpretation in a well-organized, readable, and logical manner; and (f) follow proper rules of grammar and syntax, and the accepted style of the profession			
			3. 30-40 page paper thesis utilizing primary and secondary sources in Chicago format	4. GE Writing Communication Rubric			

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	2	2	2	3	
	Reader 2	2	1	2	3	
		2	1.5	2	3	2.125
Paper 2	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	3	2	3	
		2	2.5	2	2.5	2.25
Paper 3	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	2	2	3	
		3	2.5	2.5	3	2.75
Paper 4	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.50

Paper 5	Reader 1	4	3	4	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3.5	3	3.5	3	3.25
Paper 6	Reader 1	2	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	3	3	
		2	2	3	3	2.50
Paper 7	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	2	3	
		3	3	2.5	3	2.85
Paper 8	Reader 1	2	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2.5	2.5	2.25
Paper 9	Reader 1	2	2	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	3	2	3	
		2	2.5	2.5	3	2.50
Paper 10	Reader 1	4	4	4	3	
	Reader 2	4	3	4	4	
		4	3.5	4	3.5	3.75
Paper 11	Reader 1	3	4	4	4	
	Reader 2	2	4	4	4	
		2.5	4	4	4	3.625
AVERAGE		2.59	2.63	2.81	3.00	

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA– JAPANESE STUDIES	YES; “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/japanese-studies.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/japanese-studies.html</a>	In reviewing the current SLOs, the Department realizes the need to revise them in order to include written communication as a required skill	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. JPNS 451</li> <li>2. Students will analyze the history and culture of Japan in relation to its language</li> <li>3. 7-10 page research paper in standard MLA format</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	Readers undertook a blind reading of fourteen ( $n = 14$ ) papers; each paper was read by two readers. In the instance that two papers received scores more than 1 point apart, they were given to a third reader for better inter-rater reliability. The results showed that more than 50% of students fell below “Competency—3” and that many exhibited difficulty with the	The instructor of the course will begin requiring multiple drafts of papers prior to final submission. Students who exhibit difficulties will be asked to report to Kilohana for tutoring services. The department will also consider requiring more writing assignments in lower-division courses.	2009 <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/JapaneseStudiesMoU.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/JapaneseStudiesMoU.pdf</a>

					<p>content (average = 2.42)</p> <p>The readers made the following observations: (1) Some papers seem more descriptive as opposed to analytical; (2) One paper was almost fully plagiarized which was why the scores were removed (#007); (3) Some papers fell short of the original length or actual purpose of the assignment; and (4) Some papers exhibited problems maintaining a logical train of thought and/or comprehensive thesis (argument), resulting in going off-topic or</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					drifting away from the original thesis		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	3	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	2	3	
		3	3	2	3	3.50
Paper 2	Reader 1	3	3	4	4	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3.5	3.5	3.25
Paper 3	Reader 1	2	2	2	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	2.5	2.125
Paper 4	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	3	2	
		2	2	2.5	2	2.125
Paper 5	Reader 1	3	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	2	3	
		3	3	2	3	2.75
Paper 6	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3	3	3.00
Paper 7	Reader 1	*	*	*	*	
	Reader 2	*	*	*	*	
		*	*	*	*	*
Paper 8	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3	3	3.00
Paper 9	Reader 1	3	2	2	3	
	Reader 2	3	2	2	2	
		3	2	2	2.5	2.125



Paper 10	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	3	3	3	3.00
Paper 11	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2	2	2	2	2.00
Paper 12	Reader 1	3	2	2	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		3	2.5	2.5	3	2.75
Paper 13	Reader 1	3	2	2	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	
		2.5	2	2	2.5	2.25
Paper 14	Reader 1	2	2	2	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	2	3	
		2	2	2	3	2.25
AVERAGE		2.63	2.50	2.42	2.76	

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA-LINGUISTICS	YES: "Mission and Goals for Student Learning"	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/linguistics-program.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/linguistics-program.html</a>	"Locate and utilize reliable scholarly information in academic journals and books as a part of engaging in academic linguistic research and write a cohesive research paper on a pertinent linguistic topic."	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LING 442</li> <li>2. Students will gather linguistic evidence/data on a language or a specific social context and then analyze the data and formulate a theory about how language is used in Hawai'i.</li> <li>3. 10-15 page research paper in MLA or APA format</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	The two full-time faculty in the program read the final research papers for the course LING 442 (Languages in Hawai'i) based on the rubric provided. This course was chosen because it is an upper level course where students are expected to research and write on a topic relevant to the environment in which they receive their education. Scores were	The Linguistics Program is already undertaking measures to improve the writing ability of the students. We have created a capstone course at the 400 level entitled "Research and Methods in Linguistics" in which the major goal is for students to produce a research paper that may be submitted as part of graduate school applications. Approximately one-third of Linguistics majors go on to graduate school in	2007

					<p>calculated for Linguistics majors and for non-majors because the majors would have taken several Linguistics courses prior to LING 442 while the non-majors are required only to take our introductory Linguistics course. Accordingly, their scores would not reflect their education within the Linguistics Program. The scores indicate that the majors scored higher than the non-majors on all 4 features. However, the majors scored lower on "Line of Reasoning" and "Organization/Structure" than the</p>	<p>Linguistics or a related field and accordingly this is a very important area for us. This course, in addition to modifications to the Linguistics major, was passed by the university-wide curriculum committee in 2012, but due to an understaffed Office of the Registrar, is only appearing in the catalogue for 2014-2015. Nonetheless, we are excited at the prospect to work more closely with the Linguistics majors on their writing, especially in terms of developing their "Line of Reasoning" and "Organization/Structure".</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					other two features.		
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------	--	--

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA–MARINE SCIENCE BS–MARINE SCIENCE	YES: “Goals for Students in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/marine-science.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/marine-science.html</a>	“The scientific method and critical thinking, including the ability to design and carry out an inquiry-based research or internship project, analyze primary scientific literature, write a scientific proposal, and write a research paper or compile a portfolio.”	BA 1. MARE480: Senior Internship in Marine Science 2. Students will write a summative final report on their Internship field experience, in the format that would be required by a granting agency as follow up to a formal proposal. 3. 4-8 page written report 4. GE rubric for written communication  BS 1. MARE470 and 471 2. Senior Thesis 3. Thesis written in a	BA: MARE 480 Results: 12 students papers (N = 12) were weighed against the Written Communication Rubric. One artifact was rated as “advanced,” three scored between “competent” and “advanced,” and seven as approaching competent (scores were between 2.63 to 2.95)  BS: MARE 471 Results:	BA: MARE 480: The Written Communication Rubric was found to be a valuable tool for the course. The instructor will use this next semester more aggressively on all of the written assignments and drafts, and will introduce it into lower level courses as well, which will serve to scaffold assignments towards the capstone papers.  BS: MARE 471: Overall, the results of this assessment	

				<p>scientific journal article format</p> <p>4. GE rubric for written communication</p>	<p>Overall, students performed well on this assessment and generally scored “competent” to “advanced” in all four categories defined by the rubric. 12 papers were reviewed (<math>N = 12</math>) with the average scores approaching these bands:</p> <p>Line of Reasoning 3.4 ±0.5</p> <p>Organization and Structure 3.7 ±0.7</p> <p>Content 3.6 ±0.7</p> <p>Language/Prose/Syntax 3.8 ±0.5</p> <p>While all students scored at least “competent” for their line of reasoning, few were advanced.</p>	<p>indicate that there is no immediate and severe issue with written communication skills, especially in senior-level assignments that involved instructor feedback and resubmission. However, there is of course room for improvement. This assessment will be used as a basis and one of the models we will follow in the Marine Science Program Review that will happen over 2015-2016.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>Students were competent largely because they identified a thesis, presented original data, and stated how their data supported their thesis. A smaller fraction of students were able to take this to the next level, and analyze their results within the larger framework of other published studies. While some of this comes down to the ability of the individual student, some students were focused on completing other aspects of the assignment (mainly the Quantitative Reasoning portion of the assignment,</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					including data presentation and analysis), and simply ran out of time to make these connections.		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA– MATHEMATICS	YES; “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/mathematics.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/mathematics.html</a>	“The skills necessary to [. . . ] Read, write, translate, and articulate mathematically-related materials.”	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MATH 441</li> <li>2. Students will create a comprehensive lesson plan that is consistent with the Hawai'i Common Core Standards. The Lesson Plan (which should be appropriate for a high school-level course) will include: learning targets, content concepts and skills covered, the CCSS standard(s) covered, and formative assessment strategies. Accompanying the lesson plan will be a logical justification for how the lesson addresses the standards, how teachers will elicit student progress, and possible actions that may be necessary to remove understanding gaps.</li> </ol>	The department reviewed 14 student papers, each of which provided a proof of a mathematical theorem with emphasis on the line of reasoning and organization. The average score in both areas was identically 3.19, which indicated the students on average were competent, with 10 of the 14 scoring 3.0 and above. No deficiencies were noted.	Since no deficiencies were noted there is no need to adjust the curriculum. What the department did learn was that it needs to be more specific on the level of detail we want for the assignment and the care that needs to be taken in preparing the rubric to reflect that level of detail.	2013 FORTHCOMING

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. Complete lesson plan and 4-5 page narrative</li><li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li></ol>			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes or Student Learning Outcomes been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency in written communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level course) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student artifact 1. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
<b>BA– NATURAL SCIENCE</b>	YES; “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/natural-science.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/natural-science.html</a>	Written communication is not specifically addressed in the PLOs	Natural science majors specialize in one of seven science sub-specialties, which means that different seniors are taking different classes. We contacted graduating seniors (in November for fall candidates and April for spring candidates) requesting a writing product such as a research paper from any upper division class taken during their senior year. Submitted papers were evaluated against the standard GE	The response rate to the request for writing samples was 20%. One senior (out of five polled) submitted two writing products: a term paper from a non-science class and an essay from a non-science class. The term paper was rated 3.88 (on 1-4 scale, average of two reviewers) and the essay was rated 2.38. The average score for “organization” (2.75) was lower than that for reasoning, content, and prose (3.25).  The Department’s interprets results as follows:  1) Voluntary submission of writing products is not a viable means of collecting statistically representative samples for evaluation. 2) The quality of student writing varies with the nature of the assignment. For example, a paper	For this particular major, two courses of action suggest themselves. The first is to replace the existing capstone course (which emphasizes oral communication and is offered on a rotating basis by three departments and serves five majors) with a new capstone course (designed for the natural science major) that includes written communication about contemporary science issues. Unfortunately this would be a low-enrollment course and would require resources that presumably are not available.  Development of an upper division scientific writing	It appears that Interdisciplinary programs do not undergo review.

				<p>writing rubric.</p>	<p>that has undergone revision following feedback will be better written than a low-stakes assignment.</p> <p>3) It is not possible to evaluate writing competence unless writing samples are standardized in the sense that all samples are drawn from the same high-stakes assignment in a single class.</p> <p>Based on qualitative feedback from one students, the department notes that only a few of the courses taken by Natural Science majors include science-oriented writing. The planned phase-out of Eng 225 (scientific and technical writing) removes one option for teaching the conventions of scientific writing.</p>	<p>course would be beneficial to majors, but again, the resource limitations are problematic. (Students in the natural science major already take too many lower-division courses so an upper division course would be preferable.)</p>	
--	--	--	--	------------------------	---	---	--

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level class) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BS– NURSING	YES; “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/nursing.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/nursing.html</a>	Communicates effectively with healthcare providers and consumers in order to assess, plan, implement and evaluate health care	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NUR 457 Collaborative Health Care, Leadership, and Management</li> <li>2. Students will assess community health needs and develops a plan of action (including budget and proposal)</li> <li>3. Formal 15-20 page project report in APA format</li> <li>4. GE Written Communication Rubric</li> </ol>	<p>Tables of scores for 2 readers of 13 final papers are included below.</p> <p>The 13 sample papers from NURS 457L were end of term, group project reports on the implementation of a project with an agency in the community. Included in the final report was the proposal for the project and literature review. The assessment results show that the majority of</p>	<p>Based on these scores, we conclude that the scores were at the competency (100%) level (n=13). Further breakdown reveals that there were 62% that even exceeded the competency level at the Advanced level and while 35% were at the competent level. The department will continue to support students for their future work.</p>	<p>2004  <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/NursingProgramReviewMOUJanuary2004.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/NursingProgramReviewMOUJanuary2004.pdf</a>            Last accreditation 2007</p>

					<p>the papers were at an advanced or competent level. There were none assessed to be at the Emerging or beginning level. Papers scored at a 3 or 4 on with an average. The highest score of 3.96 was in the content section followed by the line of reasoning at 3.92. Organization scored a mean of 3.88 and the lowest score was in Language at 3.76. This suggests that most BSN nursing majors have strong written skills in all areas.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level course) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA— PERFORMING ARTS	NO	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/performing-arts.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/performing-arts.html</a>	The Performing Arts Department currently does not have published SLOs in place; they will use AY 2013-2014 to work on developing them for the catalog.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DRAM/MUS/DNCE 499 (Senior Project)</li> <li>2. Students will effectively communicate the artistic value of the project, articulate the goals of their proposed project, and describe the challenges (including identifying the artistic team’s personnel and their responsibilities), and the evaluation process for the overall project</li> <li>3. 4-6 page Senior Project Narrative</li> </ol>	Eight readers from the Assessment Support Sub-Committee on Written Communication read six ( $n = 6$ ) senior papers that were required for all graduating students. All six papers fell below “Competency—3,” with most students exhibiting extreme difficulty with Line of Reasoning. The Committee also made the following	The department proposes the following revised learning outcomes for the Senior Project Paper: (1) Students will articulate the artistic value of their projects by placing them in historical context and aligning them with contemporary examples of similar or contrasting artistic projects; (2) Students will research and cite historical and contemporary examples of similar/contrasting artistic projects,	

				<p>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</p>	<p>observations: (1) Most of these papers appeared to be narrative in form and based on recollections of senior projects. It was not clear if the papers actually “communicate[d]” the artistic value of the project.” This is reflected in the lowest averaged score for the category of ‘Line of Reasoning,” where students fell below “2—Emerging”); (2) The lack of analysis as part of the exercise may be the reason why students don’t engage in this kind of deeper critical thinking; some members of the committee recommend</p>	<p>emphasizing their relationship to the student's project; (3) Students will reflect in writing on the place their project holds in the history of their project's particular art form, and express how they personally chose this project at this time in history and at this stage in their artistic development.</p> <p>The department will also require a first draft that will be reviewed for relevance, style, and adherence to the rubric and data requirements. Gaps in these areas will be returned for revision. Students will also turn in a completed paper that addresses all areas of the core competency</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--



					revising the language of the assignment to make it more challenging in this regard; (3) While not all papers need to be research driven, the department may want to consider how such writing should be reflective of senior-level (college) writing ; (4) Students nevertheless did reflect a great deal of enthusiasm for their work, which perhaps explains for the clarity of grammar and sentence structure.	assessment and data requirements, including areas the instructor returned for review/ expansion/inclusion from the first draft.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	
	Reader 2	1	2	2	2	
		1.5	2	2	2	1.85
Paper 2	Reader 1	2	1	2	3	

	Reader 2	1	1	1	3	
		1.5	1	1.5	3	1.75
Paper 3	Reader 1	2	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	1	2	2	2	
		1.5	2.5	2	2.5	2.125
Paper 4	Reader 1	2	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	2	3	2	3	
		2	3	2	3	2.50
Paper 5	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2	2	3	3	
		2.5	2.5	3	3	2.75
Paper 6	Reader 1	2	3	2	3	
	Reader 2	3	3	3	3	
		2.5	3	2.5	3	2.75
AVERAGE		1.91	2.33	2.16	2.75	

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Course (400-level)</li> <li>2. Assignment</li> <li>3. Type of Student Artifact</li> <li>4. Rubric or other instrument</li> </ol>	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA-PHILOSOPHY	YES; "Goals for Student Learning in the Major"	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/philosophy.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/philosophy.html</a>	Yes, "Students who successfully complete the major in Philosophy are expected to: Be able to think critically about philosophical issues and express philosophical ideas in an articulate and well reasoned manner."	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PHIL 312, Fall 2013. (Though this is officially a 300-level course, it is as demanding as many 400-level courses and adequately reflects the upper-level pedagogical goals of the department.)</li> <li>2. Write a 6-8 page paper connecting at least two of the philosophical positions presented in the semester</li> <li>3. 6-8 page paper in Chicago format</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	Ten papers ( $n = 10$ ) were read by the Assessment Committee, with an overall average score just over 3 (competent). The readers noted that the papers showed the most weakness in formulating and defending their theses, with even the most generous assessor noting some key limitations in this capacity; the readers were on the whole	The Department has reviewed the data and will adopt the following: (1) Increased emphasis during class time on developing and proving thesis statements; (2) Increased peer review with drafting and revision strategies; (3) Reminding students of the existence of on-campus tutoring services (such as Kilohana)	2005

					<p>pleasantly surprised by the quality of the language and grammar of the submissions, though they noted that the fact the papers had already gone through two rounds of revision probably elevated these scores. Reviewers also noticed some systematic differences in their scoring and decided to meet again to ensure that grading is approximately uniform across the department.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		Line of Reasoning	Org/Structure	Content	Language/Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	2	3	2	3	2.5
	Reader 2	2	3	2	3	2.5
	Reader 3	4	4	4	3	3.75
		2.67	3.33	2.67	3	2.92
Paper 2	Reader 1	3	2	3	3	2.75
	Reader 2	2	2	3	3	2.5

	Reader 3	3	3	4	3	3.25
		2.67	2.33	3.33	3	2.83
Paper 3	Reader 1	3	3	3	2	2.75
	Reader 2	2	2	2	2	2
	Reader 3	4	4	4	4	4
		3	3	3	2.67	2.92
Paper 4	Reader 1	3	3	3	3	3
	Reader 2	3	3	3	4	3.25
	Reader 3	4	4	4	4	4
		3.33	3.33	3.33	3.67	3.42
Paper 5	Reader 1	3	3	4	4	3.5
	Reader 2	2	2	2	3	2.25
	Reader 3	4	4	3	4	3.75
		3	3	3	3.67	3.17
Paper 6	Reader 1	4	4	4	4	4
	Reader 2	4	4	4	4	4
	Reader 3	4	4	4	4	4
		4	4	4	4	4
Paper 7	Reader 1	2	2	2	3	2.25
	Reader 2	2	2	1	3	2
	Reader 3	4	4	3	3	3.5
		2.67	2.67	2	3	2.58
Paper 8	Reader 1	3	3	4	4	3.5
	Reader 2	3	4	4	4	3.75
	Reader 3	4	4	4	4	4
		3.33	3.67	4	4	3.75
Paper 9	Reader 1	2	3	2	3	2.5
	Reader 2	1	2	2	2	1.75
	Reader 3	4	3	3	3	3.25
		2.33	2.67	2.33	2.67	2.5
Paper 10	Reader 1	2	2	2	2	2
	Reader 2	1	2	2	2	1.75

	Reader 3	4	4	4	3	3.75
		2.33	2.67	2.67	2.33	2.5
	AVERAGES	2.97	3.10	3.06	3.23	3.09

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Course (400-level)</li> <li>2. Assignment</li> <li>3. Type of Student Artifact</li> <li>4. Rubric or other instrument</li> </ol>	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA – PHYSICS	YES: “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/physics.html	Yes. “Appropriate oral and written communication skills that enable the student to explain his or her work to people from a wide variety of backgrounds”.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PHYS 394: Special Topics: Modern Physics Laboratory</li> <li>2. Students will write a lab report for each of five mandatory experiments.</li> <li>3. A laboratory report in standard scientific format.</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	Two papers were evaluated by a two-person Assessment Committee. The Table below contains a breakdown of the data. Average score is 2.88, slightly below “Competent”. Weaknesses were identified in the “Line of Reasoning” and “Content” rubrics.	The following will be discussed at a future department meeting: (1) the design and implementation of laboratory courses that emphasize student writing; (2) the addition of writing assignments throughout the curriculum that focus on content and reasoning.	Circa 2005.

		Line of Reasoning	Organization and Structure	Content	Language and Grammar	Average
Paper 1	Reader 1	3	3.5	2.5	3	
	Reader 2	2.5	3	3	3.5	
		<b>2.75</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.0</b>
Paper 2	Reader 1	2.5	3	3	3	
	Reader 2	2.5	3	2	3	
		<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>2.75</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>2.88</b>



Category	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (How are the Findings Used?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA- PSYCHOLOGY	YES	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/psychology.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/psychology.html</a>	YES: PO1, PO2, PO5	<u>PSY 438 Child Cognition</u> 1. Students will expand their knowledge about child cognition by researching and preparing a scholarly literature review paper on a topic in child cognition. The paper must be at least 12 double-spaced typed pages (excluding cover page and list of citations) and written in APA format. 2. Literature review paper prepared in APA format 3. Grading Rubrics: a. Instructor developed rubric b. Campus Written Communication rubric	Twenty-three (23) papers were read independently by 3 Psychology Dept faculty. Inter-rater reliability was 92%. (Table 1)  Twelve papers (52%) were rated as competent (range=3.5 - 4.0) and eleven papers (48%) were rated as emerging (range=1.5 - 2.4)  Papers showed the most strength in language/syntax (M=2.67, SD = 0.60) and the most weakness in content (M=2.42, SD = 0.53).	In Fall 2014 the Psychology Department will discuss the results of the written communication assessment to determine appropriate next steps to enhance students' understanding of the content requirements in literature review papers and their writing and organizational skills in creating these types of papers.	2010 <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/PsychologyMOUMay2010.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/PsychologyMOUMay2010.pdf</a>

Note: Inter-rater reliability was based on the percent of paired ratings with differences  $\leq 1$  point

Table 1. Independent ratings of undergraduate literature review papers for Psy 438 Child Cognition (SP 14)

Paper	Reader	Line of reasoning	Organization/Structure	Content	Language/Prose/Syntax	Average
1	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
	2	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	
	3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
	Average	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4
2	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
	2	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	
	3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
	Average	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3
3	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	
	3	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	
	Average	2.8	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.0
4	1	2.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	
	2	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	
	3	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	
	Average	2.7	2.3	2.8	3.3	2.8
5	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
	2	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	
	3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
	Average	3.5	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.2
6	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	
	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	
	3	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
	Average	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.7
7	1	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	
	2	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	
	3	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
	Average	2.5	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.3
8	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
	2	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	
	3	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	
	Average	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.3

9	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	
	2	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
	3	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	
	Average	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.3	1.8
10	1	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	
	2	2.0	2.0	1.5	3.0	
	3	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	
	Average	2.0	2.3	1.5	2.7	2.1
11	1	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	
	2	2.0	2.0	1.5	3.0	
	3	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
	Average	2.3	2.0	1.8	2.7	2.2
12	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	
	3	2.0	4.0	1.0	3.0	
	Average	2.7	3.3	2.5	3.2	2.9
13	1	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	
	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	
	3	2.0	4.0	1.0	3.0	
	Average	2.5	3.2	2.0	2.5	2.5
14	1	3.0	2.5	2.5	1.0	
	2	2.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	
	3	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	
	Average	2.5	2.2	2.3	1.7	2.2
15	1	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	
	2	2.5	2.5	2.0	3.0	
	3	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	
	Average	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.3	2.3
16	1	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	
	2	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	
	3	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	
	Average	3.0	2.3	2.8	2.7	2.7

17	1	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	
	2	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
	3	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	
	Average	3.2	2.7	3.0	3.2	3.0
18	1	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	
	2	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	
	3	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	
	Average	1.5	2.2	1.7	1.5	1.7
19	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
	2	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	
	3	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	
	Average	2.3	3.0	2.8	3.3	2.9
20	1	2.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	
	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	
	3	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
	Average	2.2	2.2	1.8	2.7	2.2
21	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	
	2	2.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	
	3	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
	Average	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.7	2.4
22	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
	2	2.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	
	3	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	
	Average	2.2	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.2
23	1	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	
	2	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	
	3	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	
	Average	2.3	2.2	2.2	3.3	2.5

Average	2.56	2.56	2.42	2.67	2.55
Standard deviation	0.49	0.48	0.53	0.60	0.46

Note: Ratings were made on a scale of 1-4 in which: 1 = Beginning; 2 = Emerging; 3 = Competent; 4 = Advanced

	Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: 1. Course (400-level course) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
BA– SOCIOLOGY	YES; “Goals for Student Learning in the Major”	<a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/sociology.html">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/sociology.html</a>	“Sociology majors and minors should also develop basic skills in social research, equipping them to apply what they have learned in real-life settings.”	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SOC 430</li> <li>2. Students will engage in a policy analysis in which they focus on a specific issue then write an op ed suitable for publication</li> <li>3. Three to five page paper with sources.</li> <li>4. GE Rubric for Written Communication</li> </ol>	A random sample of ten final papers was drawn from SOC 430 (Seminar in Social Change). The chart below shows average scores for the sample across the four rubric dimensions. The weakest of all scores can be found in the line of reasoning scores (critical thinking), with an average score of 1.7 (of a possible 4), suggesting students are close to but have not achieved	Meet with the Department to discuss the nature of written assignments at the 300 level, ensuring that students are exposed to the Sociological literature. SOC 380, our research methods course, and SOC 390, our theory course, should be a primary targets for increasing competency in critical thinking. Learning outcomes for all courses should be reviewed.	2010 <a href="http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/PsychologyMOUMay2010.pdf">http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/PsychologyMOUMay2010.pdf</a>

					'emerging' competence. None of the other average scores surpass 'emerging' competence (3).		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Soc 430 Final Paper  
Average Scores  
N=10

