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Preamble: Why Do Program Review?

Through the program review process, faculty examine what we do and how well we do it, so we can better achieve broader university-wide goals.

WASC Accreditation Standards

2.7 All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examinations and placement, and evidence from external constituencies and professional organizations.

What are the Major Components of a Program Review?

I. Mission Statement and Goals of the College, Department, or Program

A mission statement is a general explanation of why your entity exists and what it hopes to achieve in the future. It articulates the College’s, Department’s, or Program’s essential nature, its values, and its work. Goals are general statements of what your program wants to achieve.

II. Secondary Accreditation (if applicable)

Colleges, Departments, and Programs are encouraged to coordinate specialized program accreditation processes (i.e. ABET, AACSB, NASPE) with institutional program review processes to avoid duplication of labor. If this is the case with your program, please state the goals and requirements for specialized accreditation here.

III. Executive Summary by Dean, Department Chair, or Program Chair

An executive summary typically interprets quantitative and qualitative data (addressed in the next sections) as evidence of program performance. Its purpose is to report on a program’s strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement. This summary also evaluates the annual follow-ups to the previous Program Review and Memorandum of Understanding MOU). Questions to consider:

- What functions does the College/Department/Program serve for students, for the larger Institution, and/or for the Community?
- How has the College/Department/Program and/or mission changed since the last MOU from the previous Program Review?
- What has been done by the College/Department/Program since the last MOU?
- What has administration done to address items in the action plan since the last MOU?
IV. Evidence of Program Quality

This section is a compilation of Annual Assessment Projects, Evidence of Faculty Quality, and Annual Data Reports that are described in Appendices A-C. This section should also include a Curriculum Matrix and an Annual Assessment Plan, which are described in Appendix A.

V. Annual Reviews of Progress on the Previous Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

In order to make this process manageable, short Annual Reports will be compiled in this section to serve as the body of the larger, cumulative Program Review (which is submitted every seven years).

These Reports should be encapsulated in 1-2 page narratives, which document the discussions undertaken by the faculty, the Chair, the Dean and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in addressing (1) What has been done by the College, Department, or Program since the previous year? (2) What has administration done to facilitate program success since the previous year? and (3) What deficiencies and problems have emerged since the last MOU. In other words, these short reviews serve as routine follow-ups to the Memorandum of Understanding that starts every cycle.

Annual Reportss should involve collective input by the entire unit and should be sent to involved parties, including the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee, which serves to ensure the consistency of policy across the institution.
APPENDIX A: Annual Assessment Projects

This section outlines assessment requirements. Since assessment is our most challenging and difficult requirement, this section offers in-depth details of the types of qualitative and quantitative evidence that is used in evaluating the performance of a College, Department, or Program.

Student Learning: An Introduction

Our vision for 2020, per our new Strategic Plan, challenges us to become “a university community that works together across disciplines and diverse perspectives to prepare student scholars to thrive, compete, innovate and lead in their professional and personal lives.” This aspect of Program Review presents Colleges, Departments, and Programs with the opportunity to demonstrate how they are facilitating that learning and helping students achieve desired institutional learning outcomes. As stated on the cover page, this first 7-year Program Review cycle detailed in this document stipulates Colleges, Departments, and Programs to target Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). Please refer to Appendix E on pages 11 to 14 for the rubrics for Information Literacy, Communication, Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning, and Human Interaction and Cultural Diversity.

Colleges, Departments, and Programs can choose to annually target two of the following ILOs over the next seven years per an annual assessment plan. Units may choose the same ILOs every year based on their mission, or they may choose to assess a variety of these ILOs.

1. Information Literacy/ Critical Thinking
2. Communication/ Critical Thinking
3. Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning /Critical Thinking
4. Human Interaction and Cultural Diversity (including an understanding of Hawai‘i’s indigenous history)
6. Other learning goals as determined by programs/departments/colleges (which are not required for this current cycle)

Results will be compiled into short, annual assessment reports that will help faculty and administration engage in a yearly dialogue on program performance and student learning.

Assessment

Assessment begins with an inventory of courses vis-à-vis the Major/Minor. Colleges, Departments, and Programs should start with a Curriculum Matrix, which (1) helps faculty to visually map the sequencing of courses from the introductory level to increasing stages of proficiency, and (2) aligns the sequencing of courses with increasing levels of student learning. The Matrix also outlines how courses meet ILOs and Program-specific goals. (See Appendix F for a sample matrix with ILOs. Please note that the example is generic and is not meant to be prescriptive. More examples will be posted online at a later time.)
APPENDIX A: Annual Assessment Projects

A multi-year Assessment Plan further aids Colleges, Departments, and Programs to manage the work needed to undertake annual assessment. Annual assessments must not exceed the ability of faculty to engage in this work, nor exceed the resources available to the Program or Department. (See Appendix G for a Sample Assessment Plan)

Once the Curriculum Matrix is devised, Colleges, Departments, and Programs must then develop methods for evaluating student work or performance to see if it is at the level indicated in the matrix. Examples of direct assessment are as follows:

1. Utilizing an identical embedded question or problem across multiple sections with multiple teachers.
2. A sampling of research papers from different levels of classes.
3. Capstone classes may collect student portfolios that allows faculty to assess student mastery of skills over time.
4. Multiple faculty observations of student performances.

College, Departments, or Programs may also deploy indirect assessment (such as focus groups, surveys and reflective essays) to enhance their understanding of how students learn. Obtaining feedback from students on their learning can provide faculty with additional insight that may escape faculty attention.

Compilation of Annual Assessment (Indirect and Direct) Projects

Small, manageable yearly assessment activities based on anonymized student artifacts that are evaluated for how well a College, Department, or Program is meeting ILOs produce objective data that cannot be otherwise reflected in grades (that are often the compilation of multiple expectations and requirements over a protracted period of time).

The compilation of these projects is part of the larger Program Review, that reflects on the longitudinal (long-term) performance of student learning.

All data should be accompanied by faculty evaluation of the information provided by assessment results and must include recommendations and future plans for improving weaknesses identified by these activities. When evaluating indirect assessment (i.e. surveys), faculty should discuss ways of meaningfully addressing student concerns. Data from these activities may include requests for resource allocations to address deficiencies in staffing and infrastructure identified by assessment that impede student learning.

Colleges, Departments, or Programs may choose to submit an Assessment Plan that frames future assessment activities along with a manageable timeline and specific forms of assessment.

Colleges, Departments, and Programs are encouraged to work with the Congress Assessment Support Committee to develop best practices in assessment that suit the needs of the former as well as align with larger, institution-wide assessment activities.
Goal 2 of our new strategic plan stresses the need to “Inspire excellence in teaching, research and collaboration.” This section highlights how faculty members’ teaching expertise, research, and other professional work contribute to the quality and mission of the program and to the larger institution. Each category should be documented in explanatory and evaluative narrative.

1. Teaching

Innovations in teaching and curriculum development not already addressed in assessment data can be discussed and documented by evidence that the College, Department or Program generates.

2. Research

   a. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (publications, artistic work or output, presentations, sabbatical productivity);
   b. Grants and/or fellowships;
   c. Professional practice or development (participation in retreats, specialized training, seminars, etc.);
   d. Specialized credentialing or advanced certification achieved by faculty members.

3. Service

Discussion of service may include work done at the departmental level (i.e. advising, organizing symposiums, internships), college-level (i.e. serving on the Faculty Senate, college strategic planning committee), or institutional (i.e. Faculty Congress and Congress committees, Chancellor’s Diversity Committee). Professional memberships and service in the discipline nationally or internationally may also be included here.

4. Local Community

Such outside activities can indicate how faculty meet program goals, and may be documented by the hours per week, percentage of time, and types of partnerships (i.e. committee events, K-12 engagement, community boards, serving as volunteer or unpaid consultant within community).

5. Faculty Planning and Development

This section may include the following: (a) faculty employed (disaggregated by rank); (b) course releases and buy-outs (grants); (c) impending retirements and other attrition; (d) faculty promotions; (e) salaries vis-à-vis cost-of-living adjustments; (f) salary comparisons with peer institutions; (g) faculty development activities; (h) awards, (i) schedule of future sabbaticals; (j) anticipated faculty needs.
APPENDIX C: Quantitative Data

This section details the quantitative evidence, most of which is required by the University of Hawai’i system. This data may help Colleges, Departments, or Programs track the size of their major, changes in course caps, contributions to system and graduation requirements, linkages with other programs and certificates, and other such factors that impact the quality of student learning. This data, along with yearly assessment results, can help faculty evaluate the quality of instruction and course delivery.

Institutional Research (IR) will provide the following data on an annual basis to Deans, Department Chairs, or Program Directors to be then compiled into a larger report in the final year prior to the drafting of the MOU. Division Chairs may be also be asked to assist with data collection. (See Appendix H for a model table for this data)

1. Student Quality and Funding Information
   a. Admission Scores
   b. Pell Grant recipients

2. Student Count Information
   a. Number of Majors
   b. Number of Minors
   c. Number of Certificates
   d. Contributions to other Programs and Certificates

3. Course Offering Information
   a. Number of Student Semester Hours (SSH)
   b. Number of Full Time Equivalents (FTE) Course Enrollment (SSH divided by 15 for undergraduate and by 12 for graduates)
   c. Number of classes and sections of classes offered
   d. Number of Writing Intensive (WI)
   e. Number of GE Courses

4. Course Delivery
   a. Average class size
   b. Number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) faculty
   c. Number of Adjunct (Contingency) Faculty
   d. Number of Courses and SSH taught by Full Time Faculty
   e. Number of Courses and SSH Taught by Adjunct Faculty
   f. FTE student-faculty ratio
APPENDIX C: Quantitative Data

5. Graduation and Placement
   a. Number of overall graduates
   b. Number of Native Hawaiian graduates
   c. Student placement

6. Cost of Delivery
   a. Budgetary allocations
   b. Cost per SSH
APPENDIX D: The Cycle of Program Review (Timeline)

This timeline documents a 7-year process that culminates in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that then serves as the guide for the future course of the Department or Program. The Memorandum of Understanding serves as an agreement between faculty and administration in addressing perceived weaknesses in the program and plans for improving on those weaknesses.

AY1: First annual review of Data from IR
     Assessment of Selected Learning Outcomes
     First response to the Action Plan (from the previous MOU)
     An action plan is a seven-year plan developed by the faculty to guide a seven-year process of improvement.

     Review by the faculty, the Chair, the Dean and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs addressing (1) What has been done by the Department since the previous year? (2) What has administration done to facilitate program success since the previous year? and (3) What deficiencies and problems have emerged since the last MOU. This review should be encapsulated in 1-2 page narrative that is also sent to the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee.

AY 2-5: Annual Reviews

     Ongoing annual review of data by IR
     Assessment of Selected Institutional Learning Outcomes
     Annual review by the faculty, the Chair, the Dean and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs addressing (1) What has been done by the Department since the previous year? (2) What has administration done to facilitate program success since the previous year? and (3) What deficiencies and problems have emerged since the last MOU

AY 6: Annual Review of Data & Preparation for Program Review

     Final Annual review of data by IR
     Assessment of Selected Learning Outcomes
     Review by the faculty, the Chair, the Dean and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs addressing(1) What has been done by the Department since the previous year? (2) What has administration done to facilitate program success since the previous year? and (3) What deficiencies and problems have emerged since the last MOU

Jan: Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs formally notifies the Department of upcoming Program Review (to include appropriation of resources for Program Review)

June: IR provides comprehensive institutional data to Department Chair and faculty for review
APPENDIX D: The Cycle of Program Review (Timeline)

AY 7:  The External Review and the Drafting of the MOU

Aug:  Department Chair submits name and schedule for external reviewer

Fall Semester:
   Dean or Chair and Faculty compile the Program Review
   External Reviewer visits and evaluates the Department or Program

Spring Semester:
Jan:  External Reviewer will have submitted findings to the College, Department, or Program as well as to the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The College, Department, or Program will distribute this report to their faculty for input. The Academic Program Review Advisory Committee may also provide recommendations and suggestions for further consideration by the faculty in the unit undergoing Program Review.

Mar:  The Department collectively responds to the reports from the external reviewer and Academic Program Review Advisory Committee

April: The VCAA, Dean, Chair, and faculty in the Department begin drafting an Action Plan resulting in an MOU.

May:  MOU is signed and the action plan starts the next 7-year cycle for improvement.
## APPENDIX E: Rubric for Information Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation Conventions</th>
<th>Appropriateness of Sources</th>
<th>Evaluating Sources*</th>
<th>Integrating Sources*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4 (Advanced)** | • No errors with regard to citation format (in-text and bibliography)  
• Properly documents citations and sources | • All sources are relevant and appropriate to the assignment and course  
• Utilizes a variety of appropriate sources, including peer-reviewed material | • Student demonstrates in-depth examination of information and/or material which coincide with specific needs and goals in the paper  
• Examination of information shows a clear understanding of the material’s criteria for inclusion (i.e. authority, credibility, relevance, timeliness, and accuracy) | • Student synthesizes information with a clear sense of direction/purpose in the assignment  
• Student draws exceptional conclusions or insights based on the information cited  
• Use of information leads to highly developed arguments, follow-ups, ideas, appeals, proposals, etc. |
| **3 (Competent)** | • In-text citations match bibliography and vice versa.  
• Minor errors with citation format. | • Most sources are relevant and appropriate to the assignment and course  
• A majority of the sources are relevant but may not show variety or breadth | • Student demonstrates adequate examination of the material  
• There may be minor problems with the articulation of appropriateness of material to the assignment | • Student adequately synthesizes information  
• Student demonstrates some insight but conclusions or interpretations may seem obvious |
| **2 (Emerging)** | • Incorrect use of required citation format  
• May include a bibliography but entries may not correlate to sources used in the paper | • Uses mostly online (non-scholarly) sites  
• Sources do not appear to be peer-reviewed or from reputable (government or professional organizations) sites | • Student may exhibit some attempt to examine the information using academic criteria  
• Information and/or sources are questionable | • Student includes information but exhibits problems in synthesizing it into the assignment  
• Follow-up discussion of material may be minimal, unsubstantiated, and/or unoriginal |
| **1 (Beginning)** | • No citations and/or bibliography  
• Copies or paraphrases without documentation | • No relevant sources  
• Paper is mainly speculative on the part of the writer | • No effort to examine the information  
• Little awareness of the quality of the information | • No synthesis of material into the assignment  
• Student may plagiarize or paraphrase information without citing sources |

* These columns are used to simultaneously assess critical thinking
# APPENDIX E: Rubric for Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Line of Reasoning</th>
<th>Organization and Structure</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Technique*</th>
<th>Style &amp; Voice*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Well-defined thesis that is supported by coherent and relevant arguments</td>
<td>Organization is logical, well-planned, and organized; structure enhances the message or argument</td>
<td>Exhibits original insight into the content</td>
<td>Highly effective use or integration of language (grammar, sentence structure), literary (genre, rhyme scheme) or artistic techniques</td>
<td>The medium (e.g. language, body movement, composition, tone) enhances the intended message or purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideas and main points are based on logical and rational deductions</td>
<td>Paragraphs are well-developed, and paragraph breaks enhance the main points</td>
<td>Content illuminates the argument and/or message</td>
<td>Choice of techniques produces a highly original text (e.g. essay, poem, painting) or performance (e.g. speech or dance)</td>
<td>The project exhibits sophisticated and originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Well-defined thesis that is supported by coherent and relevant arguments</td>
<td>• Logical, well-planned, and organized; structure enhances the message or argument</td>
<td>• Exhibits original insight into the content</td>
<td>• Highly effective use or integration of language (grammar, sentence structure), literary (genre, rhyme scheme) or artistic techniques</td>
<td>• The medium (e.g. language, body movement, composition, tone) enhances the intended message or purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ideas and main points are based on logical and rational deductions</td>
<td>• Paragraphs are well-developed, and paragraph breaks enhance the main points</td>
<td>• Content illuminates the argument and/or message</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques produces a highly original text (e.g. essay, poem, painting) or performance (e.g. speech or dance)</td>
<td>• The project exhibits sophisticated and originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organization is logical, well-planned, and organized; structure enhances the message or argument</td>
<td>• Paragraphs are well-developed, and paragraph breaks enhance the main points</td>
<td>• Content is adequately addressed</td>
<td>• Recognizable use or integration of language, literary or artistic techniques</td>
<td>• The medium is adequate for its intended message or purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identifyable thesis with some gaps or inconsistencies in reasoning</td>
<td>Some organizational problems evident</td>
<td>Content supports main argument but may not be comprehensive</td>
<td>Choice of techniques produces a satisfactory text or performance</td>
<td>The project is appropriate for assignment but is predictable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some ideas or main points may not be fully integrated into the presentation and essay</td>
<td>Paragraphs are developed but exhibit a few inappropriate breaks, or transitions between paragraphs are awkward</td>
<td>• Content is adequately addressed</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques produces a satisfactory text or performance</td>
<td>• Presentation or text is well-received by the intended audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifiable thesis with some gaps or inconsistencies in reasoning</td>
<td>• Some organizational problems evident</td>
<td>• Content supports main argument but may not be comprehensive</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques produces a satisfactory text or performance</td>
<td>• The medium is adequate for its intended message or purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some ideas or main points may not be fully integrated into the presentation and essay</td>
<td>• Paragraphs are developed but exhibit a few inappropriate breaks, or transitions between paragraphs are awkward</td>
<td>• Content is adequately addressed</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques produces a satisfactory text or performance</td>
<td>• The project is appropriate for assignment but is predictable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thesis is weak, unclear or too broad for assignment, but has some relevance to the body of essay or presentation</td>
<td>Some attempt at organization but essay or presentation suffers from gaps in logic</td>
<td>Content is only superficially addressed or limited in breadth</td>
<td>Use or integration of technique is awkward or incorrect</td>
<td>The medium chosen may not fit well with the message intended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideas or main points are based on unsubstantiated reasons or speculations</td>
<td>Paragraphs are underdeveloped and/or transitions are highly problematic</td>
<td>• Content is only superficially addressed or limited in breadth</td>
<td>• Use or integration of technique is awkward or incorrect</td>
<td>• The project may not fully address the assignment and/or mimic what has already been done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thesis is weak, unclear or too broad for assignment, but has some relevance to the body of essay or presentation</td>
<td>• Some attempt at organization but essay or presentation suffers from gaps in logic</td>
<td>• Content is not fully support main argument</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques does not appear to enhance the text or performance</td>
<td>• Presentation or text may not be understood or engaging to the intended audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ideas or main points are based on unsubstantiated reasons or speculations</td>
<td>• Paragraphs are underdeveloped and/or transitions are highly problematic</td>
<td>• Content is not fully support main argument</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques does not appear to enhance the text or performance</td>
<td>• The medium chosen may not fit well with the message intended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No discernible thesis</td>
<td>Lack of organization (line of reasoning is absent)</td>
<td>Content is not appropriate to the assignment or minimally used</td>
<td>Poor or little use/integration of the techniques covered in or required by class</td>
<td>The medium chosen seems inappropriate for the message or may even lack a message or intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideas or main points of the presentation or essay are unclear, unsubstantiated, or unrelated</td>
<td>Transitions between paragraphs are nonexistent</td>
<td>Content does not relate to the argument being made</td>
<td>• Poor or little use/integration of the techniques covered in or required by class</td>
<td>• The project is highly unorganized and/or lacks any originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No discernible thesis</td>
<td>• Lack of organization (line of reasoning is absent)</td>
<td>• Content is not appropriate to the assignment or minimally used</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques appears random and/or without much thought</td>
<td>• Presentation or text alienates the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ideas or main points of the presentation or essay are unclear, unsubstantiated, or unrelated</td>
<td>• Transitions between paragraphs are nonexistent</td>
<td>• Content does not relate to the argument being made</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques appears random and/or without much thought</td>
<td>• The medium chosen seems inappropriate for the message or may even lack a message or intent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These columns are used to simultaneously assess critical thinking.
# APPENDIX E: Rubric for Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis*</th>
<th>Calculations</th>
<th>Visual Representations of Data and Information*</th>
<th>Scientific Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> (Advanced)</td>
<td>• Demonstrates advanced reasoning based on quantifiable information; judgments and conclusions are exceptionally insightful</td>
<td>• Accurately completes calculations for the assignment and presents results clearly and concisely • Chooses appropriate formulas or symbolic models to solve problems and justify choices</td>
<td>• Skillfully and precisely engages in the 6 steps needed in undertaking a science-based approach to gathering and interpreting evidence 1. Identify problem 2. Formulate a hypothesis 3. Design a project to test hypothesis 4. Collect data 5. Analyze data 6. Draw conclusions based on data • Exhibits highly accurate and exhaustive analysis of data • Produces work that contributes to the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> (Competent)</td>
<td>• Demonstrates competent reasoning based on quantifiable information; judgments and conclusions are adequate and reasonable</td>
<td>• Calculations are completed and largely successful • Chooses appropriate formulas or symbolic models to solve problems and justify choices</td>
<td>• Engages in all 6 steps needed in undertaking a science-based approach to gathering and interpreting data • Produces an analysis of data • Produces work that meets the requirements of the assignments/course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> (Emerging)</td>
<td>• Demonstrates emerging reasoning based on quantifiable information as exhibited by difficulty in formulating judgments or drawing conclusions</td>
<td>• Calculations contain multiple errors • May not choose the most appropriate or effective formula • May exhibit some problems justifying choices</td>
<td>• Engages in the 6 steps but may exhibit problems with a few • Analysis of data may reflect minor inaccuracies of observation • Work may not fully satisfy the requirements of the assignment/course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> (Beginning)</td>
<td>• Demonstrates beginning reasoning based on quantifiable information as exhibited by difficulty understanding what constitutes quantifiable information, inability to formulate reasonable judgments and/or drawing reasonable conclusions.</td>
<td>• Calculations may be unsuccessful or incomplete • Does not appear to understand the parameters of the appropriate formula • Is unable to select the right formula for the problem (decision-making unclear)</td>
<td>• Exhibits problems in many if not most of the steps required for the scientific process • Analysis of data is incomplete, inaccurate, or absent • Work does not satisfy the requirements of the assignment/course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These columns are used to simultaneously assess critical thinking
### APPENDIX E: Cultural Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Place (Engagement)</th>
<th>Sense of Humanity (Respect)</th>
<th>Sense of Others (Empathy)</th>
<th>Sense of Self (Humility)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homua Hawai‘i</td>
<td>Kākou</td>
<td>Oukou/Liikou</td>
<td>Au/Mākou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4 Hua**
(Advanced—the ripening of the full fruit)
- Demonstrates *kuleana* (responsibility) for and *‘ike kā hohonu* (sophisticated understanding) of Hawai‘i’s uniqueness as the home of indigenous people, immigrants and immigrant descendants.
- Expresses a multicultural approach to describing or interacting with others.
- Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of social and cultural complexities in and/or among different groups.
- Critically analyzes how s/he is shaped by diverse cultural and social experiences.

**3 Kamu**
(Competent—the forming of the tree)
- Demonstrates *mahalo* (appreciation) for and *‘ike pono* (clear understanding) of Hawai‘i’s uniqueness as the home of indigenous people, immigrants and immigrant descendants.
- Acknowledges diversity but still exhibits some bias.
- Meaningfully expresses social and cultural complexities in and/or among different groups.
- Meaningfully expresses how s/he is shaped by diverse cultural and social experiences.

**2 Mole**
(Emerging—roots emerge)
- Exhibits *hoihoi* (interest) in and *‘ike kumu* (basic understanding) of Hawai‘i’s uniqueness.
- Limited recognition of one’s own biases when describing or interacting with others.
- Identifies (without judgment) differences in and/or among cultures and social groups.
- Identifies differing views on his/her own cultural and social backgrounds.

**1 Kapu**
(Beginning—the budding of the plant)
- Exhibits *manakā* (disinterest), *‘ike ihi* (superficial understanding) or *‘ike hemahema* (faulty understanding) of Hawai‘i’s people, history and/or landscape.
- Expresses a cultural self-centered approach to describing or interacting with others.
- Descriptions of different cultures and/or social behaviors may reflect some judgmental bias or stereotyping.
- Has a limited understanding of his/her own cultural and social background.

---

The use of these Hawaiian terms comes from the story of Nī‘aupu‘o, as documented by Kawena Pukui. It describes the stages of the growth of the niu (coconut) tree that is found in a mele oli (chant) from that story. Note that these examples are taken from actual student work and are meant to help teachers and students engage in a discussion on what constitutes “growth” in cultural diversity/fluency.
APPENDIX F: The Curriculum Matrix

One way to analyze the alignment between curriculum, Institutional Learning Objectives, and courses is by organizing them into matrices. The tables in Appendix B and C are examples that are not meant to be prescriptive. Programs, Departments and Colleges may alter and refine the definitions of skills under each subcategory in the Rubrics in Appendix A. (Note: These Learning Goals and Curriculum Matrix is mapped to the rubrics for Information Literacy and Communication.

Learning Goals and Outcomes

Goal 1: Information Literacy

1.1. Documentation Conventions: Students will properly document citations and sources per APA guidelines

1.2. Appropriateness of Sources: Students will utilize sources of information appropriate to the assignment and the course

1.3 Evaluating Sources: Students will examine information/texts and demonstrate comprehension of the information given

1.4 Integrating Sources: Students will synthesize information and draw correct conclusions/insights or sustain a logical argument

Goal 2: Communication

2.1 Line of Reasoning: Students will craft research papers and presentations that include a well-defined argument based on logical and rational deductions

2.2 Organization and Structure: Students will exhibit clear and concise organization of ideas in their papers and/or presentations

2.3 Content: Students will incorporate content that illuminates a main point or argument

2.4 Technique: Students will utilize visual techniques (i.e. graphs) that support or enhance their scientific interpretations

2.5 Style & Voice: Students will demonstrate originality and creativity in their presentations

Curriculum Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 200-level courses</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level core requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level electives</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-level electives</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 (Capstone)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I=introduce    D=develop    M=show master
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1. Students will properly document citations and sources per APA guidelines | AY 1 | • Selected sampling of papers from 100, 200 & 300  
• Selected sampling of papers from 2 300-level electives and 2 400-level electives  
• Selected sampling from 495                                                                                          | Freshman survey                    |
| 1.2. Students will utilize sources of information appropriate to the assignment and the course  
1.3 Students will examine information/texts and demonstrate comprehension of the information given | AY 2 | • Selected sampling of papers from 100, 200 & 300  
• Selected sampling of papers from 2 300-level electives and 2 400-level electives  
• Selected sampling from 495                                                                                          | Senior exit survey                 |
| 1.4 Students will synthesize information and draw correct conclusions/insights or sustain a logical argument | AY 3 | • Selected sampling of papers from 100, 200 & 300  
• Selected sampling of papers from 2 300-level electives and 2 400-level electives  
• Selected sampling from 495                                                                                          | Freshman survey                    |
| 2.2 Students will exhibit clear and concise organization of ideas in their papers and/or presentations  
2.3 Students will incorporate content that illuminates a main point or argument | AY 4 | • Selected sampling of papers from 100, 200 & 300  
• Selected sampling of papers from 2 300-level electives and 2 400-level electives  
• Selected sampling from 495                                                                                          | Senior focus group                |
| 1.4 Students will synthesize information and draw correct conclusions/insights or sustain a logical argument | AY 4 | • Selected sampling of papers from 100, 200 & 300  
• Selected sampling of papers from 2 300-level electives and 2 400-level electives  
• Selected sampling from 495                                                                                          | Freshman survey                    |
| 2.2 Students will exhibit clear and concise organization of ideas in their papers and/or presentations  
2.3 Students will incorporate content that illuminates a main point or argument | AY 5 | • Selected sampling of papers from 100, 200 & 300  
• Selected sampling of papers from 2 300-level electives and 2 400-level electives  
• Selected sampling from 495                                                                                          | Senior exit survey                 |
| 1.1. Students will properly document citations and sources per APA guidelines | AY 5 | • Selected sampling of papers from 100, 200 & 300  
• Selected sampling of papers from 2 300-level electives and 2 400-level electives  
• Selected sampling from 495                                                                                          | Freshman survey                    |
| 2.4 Students will utilize rhetorical and visual techniques (i.e. graphs) that support or enhance their arguments | AY 6 | • Selected sampling of papers from 100, 200 & 300  
• Selected sampling of papers from 2 300-level electives and 2 400-level electives  
• Selected sampling from 495                                                                                          | Senior exit survey                 |
| 2.5 Students will demonstrate originality and creativity in their presentations | AY 7 | • Direct observations of oral presentations in 100, one 200-level course, one 300- or 400-level course and 495                                                                                            | Senior focus group                |
## APPENDIX H: Quantitative Data Report

### 1. Student Quality and Funding Information
- a. Admission scores
- b. Pell Grant recipients

### 2. Student Count Information (per academic year)
- a. Number of Majors
- b. Number of Minors
- c. Number of Certificates
- d. Contributions to other Programs and Certificates

### 3. Course Offering Information
- a. Number of Student Semester Hours (SSH) offered by term
- b. Number of Full Time Equivalents (FTE) Course Enrollment (SSH divided by 15 for undergraduate and by 12 for graduates)
- c. Number of classes and sections of classes offered per term
- d. Number of Writing Intensive (WI)
- e. Number of GE courses offered by term

### 4. Course Delivery
- a. Average class size
- b. Number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) faculty
- c. Number of Adjunct (Contingency) Faculty
- d. Number of Courses and SSH taught by Full Time Faculty
- e. Number of Courses and SSH Taught by Adjunct Faculty
- f. FTE student-faculty ratio

### 5. Graduation and Placement
- a. Number of overall graduates (annually)
- b. Number of Native Hawaiian graduates (annually)
- c. Student placement

### 6. Cost of Delivery
- a. Budgetary allocations
- b. Cost per SSH
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