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and the general expectations of American higher education. In the process, we are able to identify weaknesses and challenges, as well as strengths. Finally, if done right, accreditation allows us to reenergize the campus community in the pursuit of our mission as we discuss what is most important to us and remind ourselves of why being involved in university education is incomparably important and rewarding.

The approach we have taken to the Educational Effectiveness Review reflects our institutional context in important ways. As will become clear throughout the essays that follow, we have been guided first and foremost by the mission of the university to “assist individuals in their quest for perfection and eternal life and in their efforts to influence the establishment of peace internationally.” The specific institutional goals that stem from this mission—and that inform this report as well as earlier reports submitted to WASC—include providing students with a rigorous education in an intercultural, faith-promoting environment; inculcating intercultural and leadership skills; and “maintaining a commitment to operational efficiency and continuous improvement.” (The university’s mission statement and the specific goals that flow from it can be seen on the university’s website at http://www.byuh.edu/about/mission.php.)

Our approach to reaccreditation has been driven by two things: our university mission, and our desire to make reaccreditation an ally in the advancement of internally-defined priorities. This is why the particular themes we have focused on from the beginning of this process are the organizing principle for this Educational Effectiveness Review. Understanding how those themes were identified and developed will help in understanding what is being reported here.

The first step was to identify major stakeholders, strategic university groups, and key institutional documents, all of which could provide insights as we developed a set of priorities for the future. A broad set of potential themes was developed, and feedback was sought through exploratory focus
groups and an online faculty survey, as well as through discussions in the Faculty Advisory Committee. Survey results and other forms of feedback were reviewed by the Accreditation Steering Committee, which then selected four major themes on which there was broad agreement across the university. These were outlined in our Institutional Proposal (2003) as four areas targeted for improvement, as follows:

- Improve learning through assessment of program outcomes.
- Improve learning through assessment of General Education.
- Improve efforts to help graduates find meaningful employment.
- Improve the ability of non-native English speakers to communicate in the English language.

The choice to conceive of all of these themes in terms of improvement was a conscious one, since we wanted to be reporting on progress. At the same time, we wanted that progress to be in line with WASC standards. We were therefore heartened that in its response to our Institutional Proposal, the Proposal Review Committee noted that “the selection of topics appear quite appropriate for the University and in alignment with the interests of WASC in its accreditation review process.”

While the next document (the Capacity and Preparatory Review) was largely concerned with processes and resources that would allow us to carry out the improvements we had targeted, we indicated that “as we prepare for the Educational Effectiveness Review we intend to approach all of these themes with an eye to gathering data that will help us make decisions geared toward the university mission and the goals that stem from that mission.” In accepting the Capacity and Preparatory Review and endorsing the report of the visiting team, WASC again acknowledged the value of the themes, while particularly encouraging us to continue to develop an “outcomes orientation” and intensify our efforts to find (and measure) effective strategies for encouraging home-country employ-

ment of our international students. This report addresses those suggestions in the appropriate theme essays. Responses to specific recommendations are included in an Appendix.

It is one thing to try to focus institutional energies on a set of goals. Reporting the data in a way that suggests something of the dynamic of improvement in which we were engaged is another matter. The Accreditation Steering Committee prepared a comprehensive, 91-item list of tasks and milestones to carry us through the entire Educational Effectiveness Review process, but preparing a report that simply went down the list and documented each step would have been hopelessly dry, and possibly incoherent. It certainly would not have captured anything like the “lived experience” of the university over the last several years. So while our thinking in the preparation of this report revolved around the BYUH mission statement, our four themes, and the WASC standards, we have chosen to organize the bulk of the report as a series of connected historical narratives, each discussing one of the themes and showing its past, present, and future.

Since we had organized our efforts around these themes, it made sense to mirror that in the organization of our report, rather than trying to determine yet other themes that would communicate as clearly what we have been doing. We approached the themes as research questions, but reported on them as narratives with case studies. That is the closest we could come to showing how we actually experienced the interface between reaccreditation and faculty work, and how we have used—or, where necessary, developed—institutional structures to assure the maintenance of quality and the sustainability of improvement.
As described in our Capacity and Preparatory Review, our General Education program has been substantially revised since our last accreditation. This process has generated university-wide discussion of the purposes and content of GE at BYU-Hawaii. It has also laid the foundation for continuous improvement. We have made important changes in our thinking about GE, and in our understanding of what we are doing well, and what we need to do better.

In its site report on BYU-Hawaii’s preparation for WASC reaccreditation in 1996, the visiting team noted that while “the rationale for the general education program is clearly articulated . . . the goals and commitment to general education among faculty is less clear.” They concluded that there was a “need for a systematic evaluation of general education and for broad faculty discussion about the principles and goals of general education as applied to teaching and learning at BYU-Hawaii.” The team described the need for a “more critical review of general education” at BYU-Hawaii as “particularly acute” and urgent. As one aspect of an overall strategy, they urged that overall program review be informed by “focused faculty attention and discussion.” (The entire report of the team, as well as other relevant documents, can be viewed at the website of BYU-Hawaii’s Office of Planning, Institutional Research, and Testing: https://apps.BYU-Hawaii.edu/apps/pirat/Accreditation.)

The university took this analysis of the situation seriously, and addressed the issue on two fronts: increased faculty involvement in articulating the purposes of GE and a concerted effort to assess the program at the level of program-wide objectives. A university-wide discussion of the GE program resulted in substantial reconfiguring, streamlining, and refocusing, as well as the creation of new courses which would respond directly to the university’s mission. In response to a suggestion from WASC that the university scale back the number of hours in the GE program, faculty met to carefully evaluate the various GE categories and the requirements within each category. The result of this process was that, in 1998, program hours were reduced by 30%, leading to a better balance among the GE program, major requirements, and university electives.

The GE program at BYU-Hawaii is subdivided into three major curricular categories: Basic Skills, Fundamental Knowledge, and Synthesis. Each of these areas underwent critical examination as part of the process of redefining GE in both content and approach. The English department, for example, revised the three required GE courses offered by their department—one in each of the three GE categories—adding integrated themes emerging from faculty expertise in order to supplement traditionally skills-based courses with a content-rich component to make both teaching and learning more interesting and rewarding. Next, the GE Committee worked with a cross-section of faculty to revise the two-course world civilization requirement (History 201 and History 202, part of the Synthesis category). In addition to providing a global perspective on the history of the world prior to 1500, History 201 became a valuable site for collaborative engagement between history faculty and library faculty as a strong information-literacy component was added. The two groups now work together to teach students how to conduct research and write a successful term paper.

Perhaps the most notable of the new courses is History 202, “World Communities,” created under the direction of the GE Committee. Both a reinterpretation of, and a replacement for, tradi-
tional world history courses. World Communities has become in many ways a signature GE class, drawing on the interdisciplinary expertise of many faculty from across the College of Arts & Sciences. One of the overt objectives of this course, required of all BYU–Hawaii students, is to increase intercultural understanding by introducing students to alternative perspectives from which events were experienced, histories were written, and judgments about self and others were formed. The intention is to broaden students’ worldviews while also helping them understand why the student in the next row may have a different perspective. With strong support from the administration of the university and the college, the course has an annual budget for outside speakers, student wages to provide instructional assistance, course materials and supplies, part-time faculty (in order to increase the disciplinary diversity and allow for the number of sections needed to teach most effectively), and professional development travel for faculty members who teach the course. Faculty members have traveled to China (2002), Mexico (2004), and New Zealand (2007). Though expensive, this course represents an interdisciplinary effort to intentionally internationalize our curriculum in response to the university’s mission and the international nature of our student body.

The GE Committee encouraged and approved changes in the curriculum in order to better prepare students in these fundamental competencies and ensure that the GE program could build on a predictable set of entry-level skills. For example, review by the Math Department of their GE requirements in comparison to other universities led the GE Committee to raise the GE math requirement to the level of Math 106 (Mathematical Reasoning, Problem-solving, and Applications—a course also created as part of the GE changes following the 1996 reaccreditation), and to lower the previous requirement (Math 100) to a pre-baccalaureate number (Math 97: Intermediate Algebra). Math 106 has provided one of the most valuable sites for embedded assessment of the GE quality, Solve Problems (discussed below). The new emphasis on developing a university-wide assessment culture—a direct response to the 1996 reaccreditation—emerged and developed in concert with the continuing process of generating greater faculty involvement in the articulation of GE objectives. This in turn led to an unprecedented synergy in the creation of an institutional culture where assessment could develop. The GE Committee sought to involve faculty in the entire process of defining outcomes, developing methods, carrying out assessment, and applying findings to decision-making. Faculty who teach GE courses, as well as those in the professional schools and programs that benefit from GE, were identified and asked to serve on committees tasked with carrying out the first stages of the assessment process. Each document, outcome, or assessment plan was finalized only after discussion and review by a substantial number of faculty members. Over a four-year period, dozens of faculty members have participated directly in committee work, workshops, or training sessions on assessment. This, however, represents only the hands-on involvement. Many more were involved in the discussions, as all GE and assessment documents were sent out to the faculty at large for review and comment. Furthermore, the ongoing process of reformulation and assessment of objectives was taken up in university-wide faculty meetings, which also became the forum through which committee members communicated ways in which their thinking had been informed through participation in national conferences and workshops. The ideas and documents that were generated through this process were taken to faculty, chairs, deans, and the President’s Council. The committee was determined to seek maximum input into the fundamental question at the heart of its efforts: “What defines the generally-educated person?”

The most significant document to come out of this process is the 2001 version of the General Education Mission Statement which outlines the “Seven Qualities of a Generally-Educated Person” that accompany it (http://apps.BYU-Hawaii.edu/catalog/2007-2008/General_Requirements/General_Education_et_Honors.php). This document, developed through the combined efforts of numerous faculty
members representing a cross-section of the university (and with input from many more), expresses the explicit outcomes of the revised GE program. It was then taken to the faculty as a whole for discussion and ratification. A particularly important underpinning of the document is the conviction that the GE qualities are the concern not of any specific department, but of the university’s entire academic program. These are the qualities with which every BYU-Hawaii student will graduate. The statement articulates the faculty’s broad acceptance of the view that the “generally-educated person will: 1) pursue truth, 2) communicate effectively, 3) solve problems, 4) respond aesthetically, 5) behave ethically, 6) integrate socially, and 7) be globally responsible.

Where We Are Now: Assessing GE Qualities

The combination of streamlining and refocusing paved the way for clear planning and assessment. Having laid the groundwork for wide faculty input into the aims and content of the GE program, the university was now ready, under the direction of the GE Committee, to undertake serious assessment of its efforts to achieve its objectives. Assessment, it was hoped, would also help us sharpen our thinking about the relationship between the GE program and the rest of the curriculum.

The 2006 WASC team noted that the GE program had been “transformed into a coherent, compact, and well-regulated system aimed at cultivating seven thoughtfully selected qualities of a generally educated person.” The challenge for the GE Committee since 2001 has shifted from generating faculty input and consensus to creating, testing, refining, and deploying means of assessing “qualities” that are not necessarily the domain of specific majors.

Case Study #1 - Communicate Effectively

The definition of the “communicate effectively” quality specifies that “the student will be able to demonstrate throughout the curriculum the abilities to read and listen with understanding and express complex ideas in spoken and written forms.” Understanding that both written and spoken forms of communication were essential parts of this quality, the GE Committee nevertheless chose to assess the writing component first. This decision was prompted in part by the ready availability of student texts that could be used to identify specific outcomes related to writing and to develop an assessment rubric that might have broad application. A working group of 11 faculty members from across the university engaged in an in-depth discussion of their expectations for university-level writing, after which they produced an initial draft of outcomes. A Writing Assessment Group (WAG), comprised of faculty from a range of disciplinary backgrounds, used these draft outcomes to develop an assessment rubric by reading papers submitted to Interdisciplinary Studies (IDS) classes, the capstone of the GE program. Unfortunately, the nature and length of writing assignments for IDS classes were inconsistent enough to make collection of data problematic. This inconsistency revealed the first findings of our GE assessment. These findings, reported to the GE Committee, resulted in the first feedback loop of our assessment, opening a review of IDS courses. The process and results of this review are discussed below in Case Study #3. Due to the identified inconsistencies in IDS courses, the WAG shifted its assessment focus to English 315/316, an advanced writing course required of all graduates.

The WAG was convened in 2003 and again in 2004 to use the rubric to gather data on student writing, as well as to test and refine the rubric itself. Roughly 150 papers were collected each time, from which a random sample of approximately 25 was selected for assessment. The WAG read these papers and rated each one in the areas of analy-
sis, coherence, language, and documentation (see comparative table below). Eighty-two percent of the papers were judged to be “acceptable” overall. Average scores dipped slightly in 2004. Given the number of non-native writers of English in our student body, and the importance of the development of English-language skills to our mission, the WAG also compared second-language writers with native writers of English in 2003. Non-native writers achieved average scores 0.3 lower in analysis, language, and documentation, and the same scores in Coherence. Overall averages were at the “acceptable” level.

The 2005 WAG assessed senior theses from majors whose senior seminar has been accepted as meeting the GE advanced writing requirement (the third kind of GE capstone writing, along with IDS and English 315/316). As compared with samples from the previous two years, 2005 senior theses showed lower scores in analysis and coherence. Language and documentation scores were essentially the same as in previous years. The comparative figure below summarizes the data from 2003 to 2005:

![WAG Comparative Table of Results for 2003, 2004, 2005](image)

Though the data reveal a slight downward trend in some areas, the GE Committee believes the difference in the 2005 sample may have been due to two primary factors: 1) the fact that most of the 2005 WAG members were faculty who work intensively with students on senior theses within their majors, and who therefore may have had higher expectations than the readers of the more general English 315/316 papers; and 2) the fact that papers in the 2005 sample came from several different disciplines, and may have been written in accordance with differing analytical and structural expectations and conventions.

The final WAG reported differences in 2005 scores to departments that teach GE-approved senior seminars, as they requested, though the sample from any given department may have been too small to support generalized conclusions for that department. The WAG report was also shared with English 315/316 instructors to give them the opportunity to see whether or not they were satisfied with the findings, or wanted to reassess their objectives and refocus their efforts. Our conclusion from three years of WAG work is that despite some inconsistencies in scores, the data and analysis demonstrate that GE capstone writing, filtered through the current Writing Assessment Rubric, is an acceptable means of assessing the writing portion of the Communicate Effectively quality. (The rubric is included Appendix D)

Finally, impromptu writing samples were collected from English 101, 201, and 315 classes. These three classes constitute the English-composition sequence required of all students. The collected samples were assessed in Spring 2007 in order to begin a longitudinal analysis of impromptu reading, writing, and response in incoming freshmen, sophomores, and advanced students. Results were reported in Fall 2007 to the GE Committee and the English Department, who will now determine where to go next in using the data. The WAG initiative is now in suspension while the GE Committee considers possible next steps in applying the rubric across the GE curriculum; it is currently scheduled to reconvene in 2008 or 2009.

Assessing effective writing was the first focus of the GE Committee’s formal assessment efforts, but the committee is now also working on ways to assess the oral communication skills that form part of the Communicate Effectively quality. Oral communication skills are more difficult to assess, in part because it is more difficult to achieve consensus on what constitutes effective oral communication. Nevertheless, after developing an
Oral Presentation Rubric (2004, see Appendix E), a sub-committee of the GE Committee in 2006 scored a sample of oral presentations videotaped the preceding semester (Fall 2005) from an IDS course in order to establish a baseline. In 2007, the Oral Communication sub-committee met again to evaluate four videotaped presentations from the Undergraduate Research Conference (2007a) and nine TESOL presentations (2007b). The results of the evaluations were reported to the GE Committee and the faculty in affected departments.

These data are preliminary and will have to be carefully analyzed and compared with data to be collected in the future. It is not the contention of committee members that the increases in 2007 the areas of thought, organization, and language indicate substantial campus-wide improvement in those areas in only a year. The 2006 presentations were selected from in-class assignments in a GE capstone class, while the 2007 samples came from students who had carefully prepared material from their senior projects for presentation to a university-wide conference and extemporaneous presentations based on poster presentations (TESOL).

The different kinds of oral presentations available for assessment will be further considered by the sub-committee. For now, the average scores from 2007 are not taken as evidence of a year’s improvement, but as a welcome sign of the oral communication skills that BYU-Hawaii students can gain without formal classes that specifically address those skills. If the evidence from future selections is consistent with that gathered to date, it will suggest that the GE program, along with the majors, is positively preparing our students for a world in which effective oral communication is essential. Particularly gratifying was finding that those students whose first language was not English did not score lower on the assessed categories than did native speakers. Again, this is an area that will require much more data collection and analysis before definitive conclusions can be drawn, but the limited quantitative data we have suggests that our non-native English speaking student body is succeeding in this crucial university objective.

Feedback from the GE Committee to academic departments has started to effect change. For example, the Science faculty decided based on the Oral Communications Sub-committee Report to require all of their senior students to present orally at the annual research conference.

The sub-committee set itself the task of establishing benchmarks for the four specific attributes of effective oral communication in order to determine whether or not consistent preparation is being achieved. The proposed plan is to set a standard score between 2.0 and 2.5 in all four attributes within all upper-level assessment sections over the coming years. If the average scores fall below 2.0, we would need to carefully explore the reasons why our students’ oral communication skills do not pass beyond “emerging” status to reach “competent” status—the minimum we would find acceptable. In both written and oral communication, we believe we have isolated key attributes of effectiveness, have developed instruments and processes to allow for assessment, and have generated sufficient interest among faculty to enable us to put together teams willing to read papers and listen to presentations. These are crucial steps in creating the robust culture of evidence that has been one of our goals.
Case Study #2 - Solve Problems

As we began a serious effort to assess the GE program as a whole, one of the first things we had to ascertain was the proper sites of assessment for each quality. To this end, in 2001 each department was asked to determine which of the seven qualities they felt were addressed in a sustained way in the GE classes taught within their department. Mathematics, the sciences (Biology and Biochemistry), and Exercise and Sport Science all indicated that they addressed problem solving. Members of the assessment committee for this quality were therefore chosen largely from these departments in order to maximize faculty interest and input. Course assignments for evaluation were also chosen from these three curricular areas.

The Solve Problems quality is defined this way: “The student will think innovatively, and apply appropriate strategies for resolution of life’s problems.” Beginning in 2004, efforts at assessing this quality focused on selecting measurement criteria for evaluating this ability in students. The committee determined that the student should be able to do four things: 1) identify the problem, 2) develop a plan to solve the problem, 3) analyze relevant information, and 4) solve the problem. The committee developed a rubric (See Appendix F) designed to determine whether or not it was possible to use these desired outcomes to effectively evaluate the problem-solving skills of BYU-Hawaii students. Having concluded that the use of such a rubric would yield usable results, the committee met in Fall 2005 to assess assignments collected from Physics 100 (Conceptual Physics) and a section of Math 106 (Mathematical Reasoning, Problem-Solving, and Applications), both of which are GE classes. Instructors from each of these classes were asked to embed a question in their final examination that could be used to determine the students’ ability to solve problems. The assessment tool was modified to include a pass/fail option for each of the four student outcomes. The results from this first trial show that the students had little difficulty identifying problems. In general, however, they lacked the ability to adequately solve the problem.

The GE Problem-solving Sub-committee met again in 2007, this time collecting problems from Biology 100 (Introduction to Biology), Math 110 (College Algebra), and Math 106. Twenty assignments were analyzed out of a respective total of 34, 105, and 78 assignments collected. The results of the subcommittee’s assessments demonstrate what might be seen as a natural progression in problem-solving ability for most students, from relative ease in identifying problems to relative difficulty in solving them. The findings were similar for the measurement of student outcomes for each of the selected assignments, and were also similar to the results from 2005. The results for Math 106, shown below, were chosen as representative.

The following graph shows the results of the assessment for the assignment in each of the three classes. The graph shows that only 20–35% of the math students were able to solve problems, as evidenced by scores above 3. Although the committee is aware that direct comparison between problems from different assignments and different subjects will yield little valuable information, it does appear that Biology students fared better. Still, only about half of those students were able to solve the problem. The committee noted that the students seemed to have a particularly hard time solving problems involving quantitative reasoning.

![Math 106 Problem Solving Assessment 2007](image-url)
Problem solving skills of exiting students in Math 110 and Math 106 were compared by measuring the students’ willingness to address the problem, as well as by measuring their success in solving the problem in front of them. In general, students in Math 110 have stronger mathematical backgrounds and have had problem-solving experience in class, while students in Math 106 have specifically addressed problem solving as a subject. There was a significant statistical difference between the proportions of students willing to address the problem. Students who have had classes in which direct instruction in solving problems is included in the curriculum are more likely to attempt to solve problems. The ability to carry problem-solving to a successful conclusion might be affected by mathematical background, although this assumption is not necessarily supported statistically. Directly teaching problem solving rather than just modeling it should result in more students attempting the problem-solving process.

The data collected so far are not exhaustive, and lead to as many questions as they begin to answer. Such is the nature of doing research on teaching and learning. For example, members of the committee expressed some reservations about the physics assignment because of the perception that some of the questions on the assignment were leading and therefore did not allow students to develop a plan on their own. Other concerns focused on the wording in the assessment rubric. What is “adequate”? Would “adequate” be the same for all types of assignments?

Furthermore, while we have begun to collect additional data on certain kinds of problems solving, and to compare the data across curricular areas, we do not yet know whether or not the same kind of approach will be useful for other kinds of problem solving, such as the identification and solution of what might be termed “life problems,” as opposed to mathematical or scientific problems. Our Solve Problems descriptor is intentionally open enough that it allows for the inclusion of many types of problem solving, and eventually we may want to find ways to assess multiple types. And although the data on quantitative-reasoning skills were somewhat disappointing, suggesting that changes need to be made to help our students improve these crucial skills, they also led to questions that suggest avenues for exploration. What is the connection between basic quantitative-reasoning skills and the ability—or even the willingness—to solve problems? Would the answers to such questions depend on the type of problem the student is faced with?

The work done to date on assessing this GE quality will provide us with valuable background data for establishing a baseline on which to improve our results in the area of solving problems. If we ourselves can learn from our experience of looking carefully at the quality of Solve Problems, we should be willing to follow the same strategy of identifying, planning, analyzing, and solving the problem.

**Case Study #3 - Interdisciplinary Studies: The GE Capstone**

All students at BYU-Hawaii must complete an Interdisciplinary Studies (IDS) course in order to graduate. This is the curricular expression of our strong belief in the importance of helping students use large quantities of information about themselves and the world to arrive at attitudes and practices that will help them function better in a complicated, multicultural, information-heavy
world. We feel so strongly about the IDS require-
ment, in fact, that even for transfer students who
come with Associate Degrees, it is waived only in
very rare circumstances.

Along with History of Civilization and Advanced
Writing, Interdisciplinary Studies is one of the
three subjects that form the “Synthesis” area of the
General Education curriculum. It is meant to be
taken very near the end of a student’s university ca-
reer. The catalog description of IDS courses cap-
tures the intent: “IDS courses are interdisciplinary
in nature and designed to provide the capstone GE
experience for BYU-Hawaii students. Each course
is small and interactive and draws on two or more
disciplines, incorporating multiple perspectives
through a variety of venues and sources. Group
projects and oral presentations are often course
components. In these writing intensive courses
students are expected to do research and produce
substantive written work. Students must be of
junior or senior standing, ready to critically engage
with course material and communicate ideas to
the larger group.” Nearly twenty distinct courses
are currently available to students, and the variety
of course topics suggests the breadth of faculty
expertise involved in IDS teaching: War and Cul-
ture, Business and Society, Christian Theology and
Western Science, Sports and Culture. Multicultural
Women’s Studies, Historical and Social Impact of
Technology, and so on.

Since IDS courses have no departmental “home,”
the GE Committee has overseen faculty recruit-
ment, scheduling, and course requirements. In
keeping with the university’s focus on program
outcomes in general and GE assessment in par-
cular as part of the reaccreditation process, the
GE Committee began taking a careful look at IDS
courses. After receiving feedback from the GE
Writing Assessment Group (WAG) about in-
consistencies in delivery and writing assignments
across courses, the committee reviewed the extent
to which IDS courses continued to meet the objec-
tives established for them. Part of the reason for
this was to ensure that IDS courses could become a
site for multi-faceted assessment of GE outcomes.

The committee reviewed syllabi and student eval-
uations, and held workshops for IDS faculty. In the
end, they found that the objectives of a high level
of interdisciplinary discussion, rigorous thinking,
and critical writing set out for these courses were
not always being met. The committee then ex-
plored ways to restructure the courses. In the pro-
cess, they developed a new pilot course—the first
IDS course actually created, rather than simply
overseen, by the GE Committee. This new course
involved three professors from different disciplines
in a team-teaching format. The faculty rotated
among three sections that met concurrently, allow-
ing each to deliver their discipline’s perspective on
a prescribed topic to each section once each week.
In this way, each faculty member would cover
one-third of the course material for each section.
Several class sessions were set aside for moments of
synthesis when all faculty were present for a discus-
sion and/or recap.

In the first pilot, taught in 2004, professors ex-
plored different vantage points on what it means
to Pursue Truth in their respective fields: science,
the humanities, and religion. Another pilot course
on the same topic was taught in 2005, after which
the GE Committee decided to make the course
a permanent addition to our IDS offerings. (It
is now listed as IDS 320, and is no longer taught
under the “Special Topics” label reserved for trial or
one-time courses.) A second course, Global Respon-
sibility, was initiated in 2007 and will also become
an annual IDS offering. The GE Committee is
beginning the formulation of yet another IDS
course based on a third core quality, Behave Ethically
to begin in Fall 2008. The intention behind these
moves was to experiment with the possibility of
having a course that explicitly addressed one of the
seven GE qualities. The possibilities for GE as-
essment were obvious, but the chance to creatively
link multiple perspectives—an explicit objective of
the “Synthesis” portion of the GE requirements—
was equally important. Finally, because by their
very nature they address questions of broad scope,
both the existing IDS courses and the new ones are
ideal vehicles for helping us understand how well
we are doing at our fundamental commitment to
produce graduates with the skills and attitudes that will enable them to make positive contributions in their families, communities, nations, and the world.

The relationship between the writing in IDS courses and our ongoing assessment of GE outcomes has already been briefly addressed. One of the reasons for creating these new courses was to infuse more critical writing into the GE capstone. The experiment is still reasonably young, and the committee will be monitoring the results of the courses and using the papers that come from them in the next phase of assessment on student writing. It is worth noting, however, that the work done on revising IDS courses—not only the creation of new quality-specific courses, but also the efforts to tighten the alignment between all IDS courses and program objectives—is a good example of the link between the first two of our four Educational Effectiveness themes: improving learning through assessment of program outcomes, and improving learning through assessment of General Education.

Where We Are Going: Continued Engagement, Greater Sophistication

In our first burst of assessment-related activity, the GE Committee had ambitious plans to assess all seven qualities within a relatively short period of time. Further reflection, however, along with advice from seasoned assessment consultants, led us to the decision to be less ambitious and more deliberate in our approach. This has paid off in a deeper engagement with assessment, while also providing us with a road map for the future.

While wide faculty involvement enabled us to generate a statement of outcomes to guide GE assessment, functional rubrics to assess capstone writing and problem solving, and other valuable tools to facilitate assessment, we have realized that in the future we probably cannot devote the same amount of faculty energy into each of the outcomes that await assessment. We will continue to involve faculty, but must find other ways that are not as time- and energy-intensive. First, we will rely mostly on embedded assessment, which will allow busy faculty to contribute to the assessment process, but without the need for serious reassignment of time. We are also considering new (perhaps more inviting) ways to engage faculty. For example, we can selectively use them to lead occasional faculty discussion groups or to facilitate student or faculty focus groups on assessment. We can also invite faculty to provide the GE with expert consultation in their areas of specialization.

What we have accomplished so far in assessing and redirecting our General Education efforts has been due to the valuable but somewhat demanding participation and critique from our faculty. By finding new ways to employ our faculty's expertise in the assessment process, we can strengthen our program without draining or alienating our most important resource. We must never take the goodwill—or the time—of our faculty for granted.

We have reached the point where we are ready to take our reflections on changes in our GE program to a wider audience. Teams of faculty and staff have made presentations on GE curricular developments and assessment at numerous regional and national conferences over the past several years. This is not because we feel we have all the answers. We do, however, feel that we have something to contribute to wider discussions. Just as important, we are eager to receive feedback from others who are wrestling with some of the same questions. A good example of our thinking on one aspect of curricular change is an article on the new “World Communities” class mentioned above, a GE requirement and one of the three legs of the “Synthesis” tripod. This article, by historian James Tueller and university archivist Matt Kester, was submitted in July 2007 to The History Teacher, the leading journal concerned with the teaching of history at the secondary and post-secondary levels in the United States. In their article, these two BYU-Hawaii professors describe the origins, structure, methodology, assignments, and expectations of this home-grown course, explicitly linking it both to the university-wide objectives of the GE program,
and to the historian’s aim of developing in students a “historical mode of thinking.” This is representative of the kind of reflection we hope will emerge broadly across the GE program.

The challenge for the General Education committee in the future will continue to be largely the same as it was when we submitted our Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2005. First, we must use the data gained from the assessment rubrics to develop ways to advance the GE curriculum. Second, we must continue to develop means of assessing the GE qualities not yet addressed. This will be a particular challenge for those that seem difficulty to quantify. We expect, however, that our methods and our measurements will become increasingly sophisticated as we learn from our own experience and pay attention to best practices elsewhere. The procedure the committee has used so far to identify outcomes, devise means of assessment, test and refine those tools, and then implement them in the curriculum, has worked well and should continue to be used. New GE qualities will be added to the assessment schedule, and new ways of directing the GE curriculum toward those qualities will be pursued. As has been the case to this point, the GE Committee will likely be at some stage in assessing at least 2-3 qualities in any given year.

**Conclusion**

In our Institutional Proposal for WASC (2003), we committed to develop embedded assessment for GE qualities, and specifically to focus on communicate effectively and solve problem. We wrote that “by the time of the Educational Effectiveness self-study, we should have initial data from which we can evaluate the effectiveness of the GE program in achieving these qualities in our graduates.” This report documents our accomplishment of that objective, and places it in the context of both the past and the future of GE assessment. Our assessment of the GE program is following two parallel strategies. First, we are looking at specific GE courses and the degree to which they meet program objectives. This will help us improve our ability to inculcate the specific qualities that are the core of the GE program. At the same time, we are constantly examining the program as a whole in light of the university’s mission, learning from our own experience in order to make adjustments where needed. In this way, we seek not only to maintain a commitment to learning and improvement as an institution, but also to focus our energy and our resources on the accomplishment of our educational objectives.
Where We Have Been: Building Capacity for Improvement

Since its last accreditation, BYU-Hawaii has focused much of its effort on an intentional shift from a focus on teaching to a focus on learning. Though we understand that teaching and learning are part of the same process, we felt strongly that redirecting our attention to student learning would reveal far more about changes in the minds and hearts of students—and thus about our ability to carry out our mission. As we wrote in our Institutional Proposal, the theme related to program outcomes “is intended to link ongoing assessment efforts to accreditation standards.” To forge such a link, it is necessary for faculty and departments to see the relationships among several key elements: the university’s core functions, the process of student learning, the need for evidence and documentation, and faculty members’ own professional identity.

The establishment of a University Assessment Committee (UAC) in 2001 was an important step in energizing this shift. Though the UAC has no direct supervisory or managerial responsibility, it has played a crucial role by providing a university-wide body, headed by a faculty member, to serve as a clearinghouse for information, an advisory group for units in their assessment efforts, and a monitor both to keep tabs on our progress and to provide encouragement and assistance to units struggling with assessment. Under the direction of the UAC, and in cooperation with a member of that committee, each department or academic program began to generate single-year and multi-year assessment plans, including outcomes, means of assessment, findings, and actions.

While department heads, under the supervision of deans, have had primary responsibility for assessment efforts, all departments have reported their assessment plans annually to the UAC since its inception. Each year’s plan is reviewed in a meeting with a sub-committee in order to help the department develop a sense of how reliable data may be gathered and utilized to evaluate curriculum and drive improvement. The results of the prior year are also reviewed. The involvement of the entire department is encouraged in these discussions, as efforts to improve programs will hinge on the level of commitment demonstrated by those involved directly in the program. It is important to note that the determination of the most appropriate means for assessing any program is primarily the stewardship of those responsible for the program, and not the UAC or the university administration.

This approach has provided a central position from which to encourage the culture of evidence that is a key university priority, while also allowing departments the freedom to assess their programs in ways they find most immediately helpful and most consistent with the canons, methodologies, and content of their disciplines. As a result, many faculty who were initially reluctant have become involved in assessment.

In addition to the annual assessment plans, and deriving from the same need to critically examine and document our ability to carry out our mission, we also began a vigorous, ongoing schedule of program reviews in 2004 that will result in each program being reviewed every five years. This process helps us assess broader issues in departments that may affect their ability to accomplish many of their learning outcomes.

Given the emphasis on constant learning and improvement that is a central tenet of the Church that sponsors it, BYU-Hawaii has always made vigorous efforts to improve the quality of its programs in support of a very clear mission. It is fair to say, however, that for much of the university’s history, improvement of programs has been assumed, rather than planned and documented. It is only relatively recently that we have begun a
systematic effort to collect reliable data to support decisions about the direction of our curriculum and our teaching efforts. The results of those efforts have been noticeable. Since our last accreditation, we have made serious strides toward developing a culture of evidence in which assumptions are examined, processes are scrutinized, and data drive decisions at all levels.

While this push has created a sense of urgency to develop assessment plans and instruments at BYU-Hawaii, it has also been generously and enthusiastically supported by the university administration with a variety of resources. In addition to a university wide assessment budget, each department can apply for up to $2000 per year to use in completing its assessment plan if they can make the case that such funds are needed. Departments have used this special allocation to purchase standardized tests, fund department retreats, and other spiral assessment efforts. Also, other university grants have been made for assessment purposes where needed. Since the assessment push began, many of our faculty have received funding and encouragement to attend conferences on assessment in order to receive training and participate in national discussions. In some cases, teams of faculty have been sent to conferences and workshops, and tasked with producing draft documents to further guide our thinking and processes. In 2006, for example, 11 faculty members received funding to attend the 6th Annual Texas A&M Assessment Conference; five more attended in 2007. Approximately 70 faculty and staff have been involved in some kind of assessment training, whether on-site at BYU-Hawaii or at one or more national or regional conferences.

In addition to faculty and staff going to conferences, external consultants have been brought to campus to help us examine our efforts and provide training to an even wider cross-section of university personnel, including:

- Randy Swing, Co-Director of the Policy Center on the First Year of College.
- Mary Allen, author of Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education.

During the course of careful program reviews since 2004, funds have also been made available to bring in outside reviewers from institutions deemed similar in relevant ways to ours. Conference attendance, consultants, and external reviewers for every academic program represent a substantial outlay of funds, but such is our commitment to improvement based on regular training and the collection and evaluation of data. With training and involvement by faculty, a system of regular reporting of assessment results, and financial resources provided by the university administration, we have laid the foundation for a deep, meaningful, sustainable program of assessment at BYU-Hawaii and have begun to build a collection of data on that foundation.

Where We Are Now: Measuring Educational Effectiveness

Having focused on building internal capacity and laying the groundwork for an institution-wide commitment to assessment and the collection of reliable, usable data on student learning, we have become thoroughly committed to documenting the results that we say we are achieving. At BYU-Hawaii, as at every university, not all faculty are equally motivated to incorporate demonstrable assessment work into their teaching. But it can safely be said that virtually all faculty, regardless of their reactions to the word “assessment,” are genuinely concerned with the question of whether or not their students are learning. This concern with understanding our level of effectiveness in promoting student learning has led to considerable creativity by departments and individual faculty members in utilizing different methods of gathering data about the effectiveness of their classes and programs. Many faculty new to the assessment process initially found it challenging to identify specific outcomes and devise means of assessment to measure achievement of those outcomes, but the yearly assessment cycle
has begun to yield the sort of data that are needed to drive departmental improvements.

**Annual Assessment Plans**

The tools that academic departments have used to collect data have varied, and indeed the university has not made any attempt to dictate or coordinate assessment methods. The UAC's belief is that, with committee support and advice, experts in the academic disciplines are in the best position to determine how to collect the kind of data that are meaningful to them and can be fed back into program improvements. While some departments have found commercially-published exams and rubrics to be useful, others have chosen to develop their own instruments that reflect their individually-established learning outcomes. Methods of assessment often include not only written work, but also senior oral presentations, reflecting the commitment to proficiency in both written and oral communication that is part of the university-wide objective for every student. English, Psychology, History, and International Cultural Studies are among the departments which have expended considerable effort in creating, evaluating, and revising rubrics and tests to evaluate student progress and achievement. In some cases, this process has taken several years, but the departments that have gone this route are now poised to use their developing rubrics in a multi-year data collection project to assess long-term effectiveness.

Several departments face the challenge of balancing assessment of their major programs with a heavy commitment to GE teaching, for which they also feel great responsibility. The English Department, for example, recently assessed the impromptu writing skills of students in GE classes. Although the university's GE Committee takes responsibility for overall assessment of the GE program (see Essay one), the English Department felt it was worth their effort to go beyond the committee's assessment work because of the department's deep commitment to GE and their desire to know how well they are doing in meeting both departmental and university educational objectives. Despite the challenges of time and of varying levels of commitment to, and expertise in, assessment practices, all 22 academic departments have assessment plans in place for 2006-2007. Eighteen of those departments have reported some findings for the 2005-2006 assessment cycle. This number is down from the 20 departments that reported results in 2003-2004, but when seen in context this slight dip actually reveals some encouraging developments. An example is the Religious Education Department. In this department, the responsibility to oversee assessment was recently assigned to a newly-hired faculty member. This faculty member was provided with training (he was sent to the 2007 TAMU Assessment Conference) and then embarked on a review of the department's earlier assessment plans in order to carry out the assignment of completing that year's plan. As he carefully examined results to date, he began to question the usefulness of the data for the kind of program evaluation that would be helpful to the department in meeting its objectives. As a result, members of the department spent time revising their assessment plan in order to align it with best assessment practices. A new plan has been produced that the department feels more confident in using to assess student learning in key areas and lead to improvement. So although there has been a gap in the reporting of results, this gap is itself one indication of the deepening engagement of faculty with the processes of assessment and of their potential to generate data that faculty care about and will use.

While most departments have generated helpful information, some are just beginning to produce results for all of the means of assessment identified for each assessment cycle. In many cases, however, this too can be seen as a sign of a maturing assessment process and a deeper level of engagement with that process. The English Department can be seen as representative of this tendency. The department has consistently offered the ETS field exam to their exiting majors, but they have found that assessing the writing of their majors in any kind of sophisticated way has been more complicated than the simple administration of a test. The department's 2005-2006 assessment plan included the evaluation of student writing, but no data were
The fourth-largest major, has been a leader in assessment and in the use of data to implement change. Consistent with its commitment to adhere to national standards, the department has adopted a nationally-recognized curriculum and examination supported by the Education Special Interest Group of the Association of Information Technology Professionals. The department also relies on several certification exams, such as the Comp TIA A+ certification exam, which tests the ability of students to perform hands-on troubleshooting of computer problems. At the same time, many of their assessment measures are based on actual performance of higher-level skills by students, measuring their ability, for example, to “set up and operate a local area network and network services,” the test for which is to “correctly use unassembled network pieces to make a working network” (quoted from the 2005-2006 assessment plan, see Appendix G). Such measures have led the department to begin teaching concepts they had previously taken for granted, and to institute a senior-level capstone course in order to help students understand and synthesize the standardized curriculum. The department has also been particularly good at using multiple testing methods to assess student progress. These methods include pre- and post-tests in individual classes, national exams such as the A+ and ISA exams, service learning, and group project assessments.

Beyond linking its curriculum to national standards and utilizing multiple assessment methods, however, the IS Department has created a powerful, coherent structure within which all of these activities take place. There are five essential components to this structure:

1. **Outcomes Statements.** The department has compiled a list of eleven outcomes to be achieved by Information Systems majors by the time they graduate. These outcomes are of three general types.
   a. Outcomes that are also reflected on the university’s general educational commitments.
   Examples:
      i. “Work effectively with others to solve problems.”

These two examples are representative of the updating of assessment plans that is taking place in many programs as faculty receive training and carry that training back to departments, enabling those departments to produce better, more reliable assessment data, even though the process may delay the production of results in some cases. The importance of these cases, and others like them, is that they demonstrate ways in which assessment plans become catalysts for thinking, reflection, and more intense engagement with assessment—all of which leads to a more sophisticated approach to assessment embedded in the values of the faculty. In the end, this type of engagement holds out the greatest prospect for making assessment sustainable.

**Case Study #1 - Multiple Testing Methods in Information Systems Department**

The Information Systems Department in the School of Computing, housing the university’s
ii. “Communicate proficiently both orally and in writing.”

b. Outcomes based on the specific subject matter of the major. Examples:
   i. “Demonstrate proficiency with personal productivity software.”
   ii. “Design normalized database structures to match organizational data realities.”

2. Outcomes Matrix. This matrix lists all of the core content area courses and advanced content area courses, and indicates which of the departmental outcomes are addressed in each of those courses, and at what level (introduced, practiced with feedback, or demonstrated at the mastery level). This matrix allows anyone to look at the department’s offerings and ask two questions: Which departmental outcomes are achieved, and at what level of mastery, by a given course? In which courses is any given outcome addressed, and at what point in the curriculum is mastery achieved? Being able to ask these sorts of questions is crucial not only as a guide to the most useful potential assessment sites, but also as a means for aligning the curriculum with departmental goals.

3. Annual Assessment Plans. The Information Systems department has filed an Assessment Plan every year since the 2001-2002 academic year, and has also reported findings every year. Perhaps most importantly, the data collected during annual assessment cycles have been turned into action items that are fed back into the teaching and assessment efforts of the faculty in the following year. The primary action item coming out of the assessment of all desired outcomes in the 2003-2004 academic year was to revise the outcome statements to better express departmental goals. Between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 plans, therefore, an important adjustment was made in the outcomes to be assessed, with a further refinement in the 2006-2007 plan. These changes are the result of curricular revision and departmental reflection on assessment procedures in place. The report for 2005-2006, (Appendix G) provides a good example of the links between outcomes, means of assessment, findings, and actions. Examination of the 2005-2006 assessment report shows not only the findings from assessment of specific outcomes, but the actions that resulted from reflection on those findings. Comparison with the 2006-2007 (Appendix H) assessment plan demonstrates how the action items generated by the previous year’s assessment findings were incorporated into the next plan.

4. Multi-Year Assessment Plan. The department has mapped out an assessment plan (Appendix I) that will take them through the 2009-2010 academic year. This plan indicates which outcomes will be the focus of assessment efforts in each year (four each year, with each of the eleven departmental outcomes assessed between one and three times over the five years of the plan). It also identifies the means of assessment to be used, including national exams and course assignments.

5. Alignment of Syllabi with Outcomes. A crucial element in the department’s assessment plan is the review of course syllabi to ensure that specific course objectives are aligned with departmental outcomes. A further aim of this review process is to determine whether or not embedded assessments are part of key IS courses.

With this structure in place, the department is well equipped to maintain a rigorous assessment program for years to come, and to use the data from that program to continuously revise their curriculum and refine their assessment practices.
Case Study #2 -
Testing Every Student in English as an International Language

The English as an International Language (EIL) program within the department of English Language Teaching and Learning plays a crucial role in the success of BYU-Hawaii because of the large number of our students who are non-native speakers of English. The mission of the EIL program is to “assist University students who are non-native speakers of English in accomplishing the goals envisioned in BYU-Hawaii’s mission statement by assisting these students in the development of the English language skills necessary for success at the University.” Because of EIL’s centrality to the mission of the university, accurate assessment of the academic English skills that students attain in the program is fundamental to our understanding of how well we are doing in meeting our objectives. Indeed, the team of reviewers (two external, two internal) that conducted the EIL program review in March 2007 noted that “all parties [students, faculty, staff, and administration] share a commitment to English proficiency and academic success for the English language learners that come through the EIL program.”

The average EIL enrollment per academic year since 2000 has been nearly 300 students in 57 sections per semester. (Note: In Fall 2007 the number of international and EIL students decreased due to an increase in the TOEFL test requirement and challenge in obtaining visas.) Program faculty have established specific program outcomes and developed testing methods to assess achievement. Initially there was a variety of assessment methods adopted, depending largely on the predilections of individual faculty members. Over time, however, the department accepted the need for collaborative development of exams in order to ensure that testing directly addressed agreed-upon course and program outcomes. The 2007 program review team recommended an even clearer articulation of goals across the program, but the program’s own self-study gives evidence that this process has been underway for some time. EIL has been ambitious in its assessment efforts, testing every one of the hundreds of students who pass through the program, and then using the data from those tests to better understand how successfully they are emphasizing program and course objectives. As the assessment plans filed with the university show, officially-reported assessment has focused on students who are leaving the EIL program and entering the general undergraduate curriculum. This does not, however, reveal the full extent of the assessment work going on in the department. Student progress is also measured incrementally throughout the EIL program, and the data from such inquiries is fed back into the department’s thinking on how best to prepare students to meet the exit outcomes.

The data table in Appendix J summarizes the assessment plans (including outcomes and means of assessment) and findings from 2001 to 2006.

While the determination to assess the progress of 100% of program students, both at exit and along the way, an impressive aspect of EIL’s commitment to assessment, the program’s faculty have also thought creatively about other ways in which they can determine whether or not the work done in EIL truly prepares students for success in their university work. In other words, it is not enough simply to know that students have reached a certain level of achievement as measured by uniform testing and agreed-upon objectives. EIL faculty have taken a serious interest in this issue, approaching it the way one might approach any topic for research: by framing a question, exploring sources of relevant information, examining the data, and then producing results. The question they have asked might be framed this way: If our assumption is that successfully completing the EIL program prepares non-native English speakers to enter a rigorous undergraduate program alongside native speakers, how can we test that assumption?

The EIL faculty have tried to answer this question by collecting a variety of kinds of data. One is the students’ own sense of their English-language preparation. Every assessment plan since 2002
has included the following outcome: “Students will recognize that the EIL program was beneficial in assisting them with the English language proficiencies necessary for success at the University.” Using the University Graduation Survey as the means of assessment, the objective has been that 70% of EIL students will rate the preparation they received in EIL as between “good” and “excellent.” Though the data have fluctuated to some degree from year to year, in no year have the results fallen below the 70% threshold. In the last reporting cycle (2005-2006), 79% of students rated their overall experience in EIL as good, very good, or excellent; 81% gave the same ratings to the quality of EIL teaching; and 79% felt the level of preparation provided by the EIL program was good or better.

Other sources of information helpful in answering the question about the value of EIL training beyond the exit data are measurable competencies displayed in the post-EIL undergraduate curriculum. English 101 (“Communicating in Writing, Speaking, and Reading”) is the first course in the English composition sequence, and is required of all students. The catalog description gives a good indication of the course’s content: “Strengthening critical awareness through the development of effective writing, speaking, and literary reading skills. Focus on composition, speech, and literature. Beginning research.” Data since 2000 show that pass rates for EIL graduates have been 90% or above every semester except Fall 2000.

Similarly promising results have come from analyzing the GPA data of EIL-specific courses linked to General Education courses. One of the innovative measures adopted by the EIL program to help students make a successful transition into the general undergraduate curriculum is what the program refers to as “adjunct” sections of GE courses. Under this arrangement, an EIL advanced reading course is linked to a GE course, with the EIL instructor helping students understand the specific material in the GE course while also working toward program goals in English reading. GPA data accumulated over the ten-year period from 1996 to 2006 indicate that for most GE areas, EIL students perform at a level comparable to native speakers of English.

Areas of discrepancy in performance have provided occasions for EIL faculty to explore the relationship between course content, cultural background, and language acquisition, thus further tightening the feedback loop. Native English-speaking students in Political Science courses, for example, most of whom are from the United States, benefit from background knowledge of American history, culture, and politics. The GE Psychology course requires a high level of proficiency in English reading and writing, even though it is an introductory-level course. One way in which faculty are using such data is to identify further subject areas for EIL adjunct courses in order to provide EIL students with the greatest level of support possible.

In these and other ways, the EIL program attempts to track the progress of every student who enters and exits the program. This practice of following every student over the course of several years might
be likened to a CT scan, which views its object from multiple angles in order to get a comprehensive picture. Through a continuous process of measuring students’ reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills, and then using the results of that testing to adjust both teaching methods and expected test scores, the EIL program has firmly grounded its decision-making in the generation and analysis of data.

**Case Study #3 - Gaining Cultural Competence in International Cultural Studies**

Created in 1998, the department of International Cultural Studies and World Languages is one of the university’s youngest departments. It houses an interdisciplinary faculty offering a major (International Cultural Studies, or ICS) that combines “tracks” in cultural anthropology, communications and culture, and world humanities and cultures. While sometimes competing for personnel resources, and with full recognition that each discipline within the major has its own history and methodologies, the ICS department has succeeded in creating a major that consciously and purposefully challenges disciplinary boundaries and encourages its students (as well as its faculty) to make new and creative connections among diverse ideas, and between ideas and practice.

The major’s mission is to “prepare students to serve, work and lead in a global and multicultural environment in a manner that will contribute to the establishment of peace in and among nations, communities, and homes.” This mission is directly linked to the overall university mission of “preparing men and women with the intercultural and leadership skills necessary to promote world peace and intercultural brotherhood, [and] to address world problems.” Goals of the major include not only becoming oriented to world cultural systems and their interaction, but also such qualities as the competency to “think clearly about cultural and global social forces, and through effective dialogue, develop solutions to real world problems.” The department explicitly hopes that its students will not only develop these qualities, but will also put them to use in getting jobs or moving on to graduate school.

The department has five major outcomes, with a multi-year assessment plan that calls for two or three of the outcomes to be assessed each year between 2005 and 2010. ISC graduates should:

1. Possess a high degree of cultural literacy in at least two world areas.
2. Effectively manage cultural difference and conflicts, and will be prepared to develop solutions to real world problems.
3. Think critically.
4. Articulate and sustain their views through verbal and written discourse.
5. Be well prepared to enter graduate school or employment.

Though the major is young, it has experienced rapid growth. From 2000 to 2006, the number of majors has increased 68% to 129, making it one of the largest majors at the university. Students come to the major for a variety of reasons, but most seem to be drawn at least in part by the opportunity to engage with questions of global significance; they tend to be students with restless minds, and often with a sense of mission. From an assessment standpoint, however, qualities like the ability to “manage cultural difference” are notoriously difficult to pin down, so the department has expended considerable thought and effort on coming up with appropriate means of assessment that will tell them something meaningful about student learning and its application.

Department faculty, already comfortable with looking at the world as a series of questions for exploration, approached the assessment of ICS student outcomes as both an intellectual and a practical problem. Up through 2006, when the department made some adjustments based on data gathered to that point, they utilized two primary assessment means: the Intercultural Development Inventory, and the essays and presentations from the senior seminar.
The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) was developed in 1998 by Mitchell Hammer and Milton Bennett as a way of measuring the stages in Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, a widely-accepted theoretical model. The profile generated by the 50-item IDI can be used to assess a person’s ability or willingness both to engage with new ideas and perspectives, and to critically assess one’s own beliefs, behaviors, and values.

The department initially gathered IDI data on graduating seniors with results suggesting that ICS majors had acquired the sort of sensitivity and world view toward which the major’s outcomes pointed. Faculty quickly realized, however, that the problem with their data was that there was no comparison group, and therefore no way to ascertain whether or not the IDI measurements reflected the work done in the ICS major, since they could simply be the result of the general, multicultural BYU-Hawaii experience. For 2004-2005, therefore, the faculty decided to change their means of assessment to include comparison data with graduating seniors from several other programs. Data from five majors provided enough information for valid comparisons (International Business Management, Psychology, Accounting, Information Systems, and Hospitality and Tourism Management). After analyzing the data, departmental faculty concluded that ICS students tend to have developed a greater degree of intercultural sensitivity than students graduating from other majors, and that these levels cannot therefore be attributed only to the fact that students are at BYU-Hawaii. This tendency was particularly strong in three areas: ICS students were less inclined to see the world in terms of “us” versus “them” categories or to see their culture as superior to others; they reported being less inclined to minimize cultural differences or to assume that people everywhere have the same needs, interests, and goals; and they were less inclined to emphasize universal concepts as a way of avoiding cultural differences or to see the application of a universal belief as creating the same culture everywhere. As encouraging as these comparative findings were, faculty realized that there was another problem with their approach to assessing something as slippery as intercultural sensitivity: How did they know that the comparative data did not simply reflect self-selection on the part of ICS majors? That is, if a student who selected ICS as a major was already more sensitive to cultural differences than other students, then comparative data may only confirm the major’s ability to attract a certain type of student, rather than assessing the degree to which the major had added competencies to its students as specified in its desired outcomes.

To control for this possibility, in 2005-2006 the department decided to compare the IDI scores of graduating students with those of students just entering the major. Their assumption was that a significant difference in the sensitivity profile generated by such a comparison would confirm that the major was indeed succeeding in enhancing the intercultural competency of its students, regardless of whether or not they were already predisposed to be more interculturally sensitive than other students. The data generated during that assessment cycle did indeed indicate that ICS students leave their major course of study with qualities of intercultural sensitivity that are substantially enhanced over their time in the major.

The second primary means of assessing students’ achievement of major outcomes in ICS is the senior seminar, which requires both a written paper and an oral presentation, designed to assess whether or not graduating students have the ability to “sustain their views through verbal and written discourse.” Early assessment plans had targeted a grade of B or better for all students. Of the 52 seniors who participated in the senior seminar between 2003 and 2004, 87% achieved at least a B on their paper (up from 61% in 2002), as determined by two members of the ICS faculty, and 100% achieved at least a B grade on their oral presentation (up from 68% in 2002), as determined by the entire ICS faculty. The department became concerned, however, about the possibility of grade inflation with the setting of a 100% benchmark. They worked on restating the goal, while continu-
ing to encourage increasing quality in student work and appropriate rigor in grading. The percentage of students receiving a grade of B or better on written and oral presentations fell in 2005—a decline that could be only partially accounted for by increased standards and expectations.

In response to this, ICS faculty revised their assessment plan to include the development and deployment of rubrics to evaluate both written and oral presentations. This, they felt, would help them clarify their expectations to students and would also facilitate consistent grading in line with departmental objectives. Beginning with the 2005–2006 academic year, departmental assessment plans have included both the use of a rubric and the achievement of a B score or better by 80% of senior students.

This revision in assessment plan was part of an overall reconsideration of assessment means following the successful use of the IDI as a comparative tool and the adjustment of the written/ oral presentation outcome. In its 2006–2007 assessment plan, the department affirmed its decision to focus its assessment efforts on outcomes 1, 4, and 5 (see list above), including employment or further training after graduation.

The concern with productivity after graduation has coincided with a greater university-wide push to help prepare students for employment, as discussed in a later essay. As the department tracks its students beyond the first year after graduation, the data become more useful. The department’s information indicates that, at least up to a certain point, as the number of years since leaving BYU-Hawaii increases, so does the number of students who enroll in graduate studies. At last count, roughly one-third (32%) of ICS graduates had gone on to graduate school. Employment data is still far from complete, but preliminary results indicate that approximately half of ICS students have secured employment at graduation. The survey of December 2006 graduates conducted by Career Services showed that 80% of the ICS graduates who were seeking employment had found jobs, though one-third of the graduates did not respond to the survey. Particularly encouraging to ICS faculty, however, is the trend for more students to find employment directly related to their ICS undergraduate training.

Finally, it is worth noting that ICS is the first program to closely link its ongoing annual assessment to the five-year cycle of comprehensive program reviews. Under the direction of then-Chair Chad Compton, the department prepared a 51-page self-assessment report in November 2004 in preparation for the review of the program by a four-person team (two external, two internal) in 2005. The department’s report included extensive reporting on assessment activities through 2004. This has become a pattern for subsequent self-studies as the round of program reviews continues.

Program Reviews

In addition to departmental assessment plans submitted and updated annually, a schedule of program reviews will ensure that by 2010, every school or department is thoroughly reviewed by a team of external and internal reviewers. Perhaps the most important part of the review process is the internal self-study, giving the faculty an occasion to examine their history, their objectives, their capacity, and their challenges. With this review, departments can consider how they fit into the university’s mission, and consider any changes in curriculum, staffing, or goals might help them better serve the students of BYU-Hawaii.

To date, 12 of 22 departments have completed the review process: Hawaiian Studies, International Cultural Studies and World Languages, Exercise and Sport Science, School of Education (including programs in Elementary Education, Special Education, and Secondary Education), English Language Teaching and Learning (with programs in both English as an International Language and TESOL), and English, Political Science, Social work, and Math. All documents related to these program onsite visits, including both the program’s self-assessment and the review team’s report, are on the
Thus enabling easier circulation of people and ideas. The third major to undergo external review, Exercise and Sport Science, has been reexamining their curriculum as well. The review determined, among other things, that over time the program had experienced difficulty keeping a sharp focus as it tried to simultaneously maintain an intercollegiate coaching program, an exercise science major designed to prepare students to be trainers or to attend graduate or medical school, and a health and wellness program. After the reviewers issued their report, the department has reviewed its curriculum to try to create greater coherence and to decide on a direction that is suitable for all involved. We anticipate that as recent departments to be reviewed—reflect on the process of program review, they will similarly be presented with opportunities for improvement. If nothing else, certainly the preparation of the departmental self-assessment, such as the 154-page document produced for English Language Teaching and Learning, is a healthy exercise in data collection, reflection, and discipline.

Support Services

Since all units of the university share the same overarching mission, it makes good sense for all to be engaged in the process of continual assessment, reflection on data, and data-based improvement. In addition to the assessment and review efforts of academic departments, it is important to note that university service and support units, even administrative services, have been involved in the collection and use of data. Departments as diverse as Admissions, Security, the Bookstore, and IT Services have all used focus groups, tracking of use, and other methods to assess their department’s performance and find ways to make their services more useful and efficient. These departments use assessment to improve academic support and reduce distractions to the learning environment.

Some of the support assessment addresses our ability as a university to meet our primary goals. For example, Admissions tracks the numbers of applications it receives from Hawaii, Asia, and the...
Pacific, the key target areas for student recruitment, thus enabling us to analyze our effectiveness in meeting the university’s fundamental mission of “extending the blessings of learning to members of the Church, particularly in Asia and the Pacific.” Career Services tracks the average number of jobs posted and the number of on-campus employer presentations, in order to determine what efforts are needed to connect students with employers, and the number of students registered on the “YCareers” network in order to make sure those students are able to take advantage of the opportunities the center provides.

This sort of assessment of broad university goals often happens at the university-wide level. Assessments such as the Graduating Student Survey and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) have also yielded information that can be used by many departments and support services in evaluating and planning their programs. In June 2007, Planning, Institutional Research, Assessment and Testing (PIRAT) published the results of a survey of BYU-Hawaii graduates from 2003, administered in Spring 2007. The detailed data in this report are extremely valuable in assessing the degree to which students have fulfilled personal and institutional objectives four years after graduation. Among the encouraging findings is the fact that 85% of the graduates who responded were either employed full-time, or were full-time homemakers or graduate students. Nine out of ten felt that BYU-Hawaii prepared them either effectively or very effectively for graduate school, while 70% felt they were either “quite” or “extremely” well prepared for their current job. Of particular relevance to the university’s international mission, over two-thirds of the international students reported that they either had returned or planned to return to live in their homeland. A large amount of qualitative data adds to the usefulness of this report. As this process of alumni surveys continues, we will develop a solid base of input on which to build improvements in the student experience at BYU-Hawaii.

Other departments are directly assessing factors contributing to the academic progress of students. Counseling Services, for instance, administers both a pre- and post-test evaluation of GPAs for students receiving special-needs services. This helps them to assess whether their current programs are assisting students in meeting their academic goals or if new programs are needed. The Academic Advisors have examined the correlation between students’ self-reported understanding and their actual performance on a short test administered after the Academic Realities orientation program. This has helped them to assure that students have understood key elements of the university experience that will help them to stay on the track towards earning a degree.

Finally, services directly affecting classroom instruction and access to learning resources are involved in evaluating whether students have the tools they need for learning. The Center for Instructional Technology and Outreach (CITO) regularly tracks faculty attendance at training sessions for using classroom technology and developing course outcomes and assessment measures. Such data helps to give them a picture of the usefulness of their training programs and both plan and advertise future efforts. They also track faculty use of technology such as Blackboard course management software in order to find out how useful such software is to faculty and how it can be made more useful through training or other efforts to encourage technology in the classroom. Academic Computing records computer lab usage, and has used their data to adjust placement and capacity at on-campus computing labs. This has allowed students greater access to the technology they need when and where they need it. (PIRAT) monitors completion of online faculty profiles. This is part of the review process for our faculty and ensures that faculty development is effectively monitored and supported so that students will have access to highly qualified faculty.

One of the best examples of how service departments have used assessment to improve the learning environment is Library and Information Ser-
Prior to this, assessment of library users using the ARL LibQual instrument was conducted in 2003-2004. The study has since lead to the formation of other assessment goals in areas such as the library web site, collection development, and space usage. This most resent shift in personnel has helped the library more closely align its strategic planning goals and objectives with that of the University. Through the strategic planning process, the library team is thinking assessment. The new library strategic plan will contain several assessment related goals that focus on the interests and needs of the student and faculty members. Currently, an information literacy assessment tool called Project SAILS is being used to evaluate History 201 students' information literacy skills. This course was selected because of its rigorous information literacy component. This is also the course in which all the Reference Librarians teach for several weeks as part of the course structure. Results will be available at the end of the semester.

Assessment as a Catalyst for Change

While most departments have not yet assessed all of the outcomes for their programs, we already see evidence that data are being used as a catalyst for improvement. Some departments have used the results of assessment to change the curriculum. In other cases, assessment evidence is being used to adjust the material covered in classes, or to modify teaching approaches. (See the online Assessment Dashboard for a summary of department assessment efforts).

The Music Department, for example, has used the results from assessment to make significant pedagogical and curricular changes. Following assessment of a music theory course, the department restructured the course in order to provide more appropriate coverage and better meet course objectives. As part of the process of carefully examining best practices, the department sent a faculty member to a conference to learn about teaching world music in a traditional theory curriculum—an issue with particular relevance to our highly-diverse student body. Because they found that student instrumentalists did not have the sight-reading skills the faculty hoped for, they strengthened their sight-reading component and added sight-reading to the instrumental jury process. In addition, partly as a result of examining data on the graduation rate of students in the various majors within the department, the faculty ended up eliminating the music education major.

The Math Department has also used assessment to drive changes. Several years ago, the department began using the Major Field Test in Mathematics (MFT) as an assessment tool. Based on the results, the department added a seminar course to help students synthesize previous learning. Faculty also felt that exam results indicated a need to revise the detailed outcomes for their lower-level service courses—a process that meant a fundamental revision of the curriculum. Determined to see the process through, and using the funds allocated from the assessment budget, the department scheduled a bed-and-breakfast for a weekend and spent the time in retreat, considering the curriculum in light of their findings. They are now discussing curriculum changes with the departments that they service in order to continue to fine tune their approach in light of their data.

Some changes have preceded the assessment that has justified them. For example, just as assessment was in the early stages of being formalized in their department, History faculty decided that they were unsatisfied with their students' research skills. As a result, they created a new course, History 200, to teach the “craft” of the historian. To assess the value of this course, the department used library personnel to evaluate student performance. The findings from this process have confirmed the value of this course in raising the research competency of history students. The creation of this course then opened another avenue for assessment: comparison of students upon entering and exiting the major. This was initially attempted using
a multiple-choice world history test administered to students in History 200 and in History 490, the senior research seminar (and normally the last course taken by majors). The data from these comparisons were neither useful nor significant. The department then shifted to more qualitative comparisons, achieved through interviews. For a portion of the History 200 final exam, the instructor spoke with each of the students enrolled, asking them questions about their developing knowledge of history and their approaches to learning history, and inviting them to rate themselves as learners on a scale of 1 to 10. The average was quite low (below 5). But when the same questions were asked of History 490 students, the comparison was stark and encouraging. Nearly all students now gave themselves a 9 or 10 rating as “learners of history”—even those whose average grades hover around the C+ or B- range. Interviews suggest that, as compared with students just beginning in the major, graduates understand how to use the library (and like using it), want to read more books, and know that reading one book or other source about a historical subject is only the beginning of learning. More data will need to be collected, of course, but the initial evidence is very telling with regard to how history students progress as researchers and learners.

On the other hand, assessment has also invalidated some changes, and those changes have been discarded. The ICS Department at one point had successfully petitioned to have their students exempted from the requirement of taking English 315, the advanced writing course, because they felt that their own capstone course was sufficiently writing-intensive to satisfy the university’s advanced writing requirement. Assessment of student writing, however, indicated that students’ abilities were not as high as the faculty expected, and they subsequently reinstated the English 315 requirement.

Other changes have been less sweeping, but valuable on the level of instructional emphases. The Information Systems Department uses a national curriculum and assessment test. The results of this test indicate that students do not adequately understand the vocabulary used in the exam, so faculty are now teaching vocabulary which they once took for granted. The Accounting faculty recognized that many students did not adequately understand the comprehensive concepts in their international capstone course. As a result, they decided that students would benefit from more practice in order to fully integrate the new material in the course with corresponding material learned in earlier courses.

Not all departments, of course, are implementing major changes at this point. Some departments have been seriously assessing for a limited period of time and so are still in the stage of discovery before significant changes can be made. For some smaller programs, data over a relatively limited period of time may not be adequate to determine how successful the program is in meeting outcomes. There is understandably some uneasiness about instituting major changes until a sufficient set of data has been collected and analyzed. Nevertheless, the influence of assessment on our academic programs increases noticeably each year.

**Where We Are Going: Continual Review and Improvement**

A schedule is in place that will take us through two rounds of thorough reviews for each academic program, up through the year 2015. For programs seeking accreditation or other professional certification, the program review is timed to coincide with certification deadlines, thus allowing us to gain maximum benefit from the intensive internal effort involved in these reviews.

One program at the university recently completed the process of accreditation necessary for its degree to be recognized within Hawaii, and three other units of the university are currently at various stages in the process of accreditation by relevant professional organizations. The School of Education was notified in March that it had been granted
which observations and interviews are completed by a team of experts in the academic and professional standards of the field under review.

There are many benefits, at the level of Department, School, and University, in seeking both comprehensive accreditation from WASC and program-level accreditation from relevant agencies. The quality and efficiency of assessment plans is increased by the accreditation process, and this process helps drive decision-making as units make plans for improving delivery of their programs. In some cases (the School of Education and the Department of Social Work, for example), the process of accreditation by their respective professional organizations has meant that their assessment efforts have been even more rigorous than the university normally asks of its academic departments. While most departments assess a subset of their learning outcomes annually on a 5-year rotation, these programs assess all of their learning outcomes every year.

Conclusion

Brigham Young University Hawaii still faces many challenges in assessment. We sometimes struggle to find the resources to assess all of our learning objectives and keep the level of enthusiasm high. In many cases, we are only now beginning to see mature assessment measures being implemented, and assessment being used to drive meaningful change in departments. These challenges are certainly not unique to our institution. Nevertheless, we are beginning to see the results of assessment and program review. More importantly, we are beginning to see departments use those results, and we expect that this trend will continue. What is most encouraging is that we are seeing fewer and fewer departments interested in simply fulfilling the requirements of assessment in a pro forma way, and more and more that are interested in good data that can fuel change. More of our faculty and staff seem genuinely committed to building a culture of evidence. The influence of assessment on program decisions in the future should only increase, as we are determined not only to gather data, but to learn from it.
THEME THREE: MEANINGFUL EMPLOYMENT

Where We Have Been: Focusing on the Issue

The twin themes of employment and home-country return have been part of the thinking of BYU-Hawaii from its beginnings as the Church College of Hawaii. When ground was broken for the new school in February 1955, the school’s founder, David O. McKay, then President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and regarded by Church members as a prophet, proclaimed that “from this school . . . will go men and women whose influence will be felt for good towards the establishment of peace internationally.” Since that time, everyone involved with BYU-Hawaii has worked to try to make that vision a reality, in part by creating the conditions under which students educated here will return to their home regions and spread their beneficial influence from there as they build strong families, societies, economies, and nations, while also strengthening the church that has sponsored them (and of which most are members). Eighteen years later, during a speech at the dedication of the Aloha Center (one of the major campus buildings), another Church leader, Marion G. Romney, was explicit in linking the mission of the school to its graduates’ willingness and ability to return home: “This college cannot fulfill its purpose if it is simply a way station used by the students on their way to the mainland.”

Since our last accreditation there has been a great deal of renewed emphasis on the challenge of what we have come to call “returnability” and its connection with employment. In August 2001, an eight-member “BYU-Hawaii Future Committee,” consisting of faculty and administrators from BYU-Hawaii and the BYU campus in Provo, Utah, issued their final report. One of the five questions the committee was asked to consider was, “How do we improve job placement for BYU-Hawaii graduates in their home countries?” As the report noted, “the educational services provided by universities represent a value chain that is not completed until students are placed in the kinds of jobs that will facilitate life-long learning. We cannot expect international students to go home unless we can help them find something to go home to.”

The need for action was reiterated in two documents from 2002. One was a set of recommendations submitted to the president of the university by Amos Jordan (retired US Army brigadier general, West Point department head, and president of the Council on Strategic and International Studies) and his wife Mardeane. The Jordans spent a year as volunteers at BYU-Hawaii, specifically working on the issue of post-graduation placement. In their 29-page report they urged that “a far reaching change of culture at BYU Hawaii is required if the University is to fulfill the mandate of helping students find employment in their home countries.”

The second key document from 2002 was the final report of a 13-member university-wide Returnability Committee, tasked in 2001 by President Shumway with the responsibility to “candidly and proactively address institutions within the institution—policies, programs and traditions—that seem to cater to getting students through to graduation and then send them on their way with no regard to where they go.” The committee spent most of a year carefully studying issues surrounding employment and returnability, issuing its comprehensive findings and recommendations in September 2002. The extraordinary difficulty of the challenge was clearly identified by the committee, which noted that changes in policies and procedures, while important, were not enough. “No policy changes will ever sustain significant improvement in student return rates. We must change the culture.” Arguing for an incremental approach as the best model for sustainable change, the committee recommended that the university focus its attention on measurable steps: market our message, collect good data, improve job placement,
Where We Are Now: Emphasizing “Returnability”

The renewed emphasis on employment and return has begun to yield results that we can document. Documentation and data collection are themselves key targets of our efforts, as outlined in our Capacity and Preparatory Review. Over the past four years, therefore, we have emphasized two processes: encouraging all students to plan “exit strategies” early in their university careers, while especially encouraging international students to return to their home regions after graduation; and becoming more intentional and diligent in our collection of data that can tell us whether or not our efforts are achieving our goals.

It should be pointed out that home-region return is not the sole focus of our placement work. We are equally concerned about the career and graduate school opportunities available to our U.S. students as we are about our international students. We chose, however, to use the reaccreditation process to sharpen our thinking and our actions on employment for our international students largely because that issue is a more difficult one than the issue of employment for our American students. At the same time, it is so closely linked to our institutional purpose that our success in this area can be taken as one measure of our seriousness about our overall mission for all of our students, regardless of their origin.

As we described our interest in focusing on employment in our Institutional Proposal, we outlined several areas in which we planned to take action: 1) establishing an organizational structure, physical setting, and resources necessary to manage effective career development programs, placement services, and evaluation systems; 2) educating the university community regarding awareness of career development as a concept linking academic preparation and post-collegiate employment; 3) increasing student awareness of, and involvement in, career development and placement programs, from first year to graduation; 4) increasing intern-

involve the faculty, develop leadership curriculum, focus recruiting and admissions efforts, and seek ecclesiastical support (since discussions with ecclesiastical leaders are part of the BYU-Hawaii application process). This report became the basis for the university’s thinking and actions over the last five years.

While the emphasis on returning students to their home regions has been a constant concern of the university, implementing plans and procedures to monitor our success and improve on our results has been a challenge. There are many reasons for this, ranging from greater job opportunities elsewhere, to international marriages that create different sets of imperatives, to fluctuating commitment on the part of students and employees, to discussions about the question of when a graduate must return to his or her home country in order to be thought of as fulfilling the university’s objectives. Nevertheless, despite the complexity of the problem and the absence of an easy solution, the issue of employment and home-country return is important enough to us that we made it one of the four central themes in our 2003 Institutional Proposal for reaccreditation. In that document we spelled out part of what we hoped to do. “Over the next three years, BYU-Hawaii will centralize relevant existing data collected from admissions, registration, alumni surveys, and departmental surveys, and establish a common framework for departmental analysis, placement efforts (career services), and student tracking.”

A key recommendation in all reports on the issue was to enhance the visibility, resources, and professionalism of placement services. To this end, the university’s placement office was reorganized in the summer of 2003 and a new Director of Career Services was hired. It became both the clearinghouse and the motivator for employment and returnability efforts across the university.
Several things have happened in the last few years to help us strengthen the focus on returnability. One was to define more precisely what we mean by “returnability.” The 2002 committee report proposed the following definition: “BYU-Hawaii is helping to fulfill its Asia/Pacific leadership mission when its alumni take up residence in international regions of Asia and the Pacific to live for a period of years at least equivalent to the duration of study at BYU-Hawaii,” with alumni defined as anyone who has completed 24 credits or more. While this definition has not been formalized in official university documents, and discussion continues about precisely when a student must return to his or her home region in order to be considered to have met university objectives, it nevertheless serves as a useful guide to institutional thinking about the issue.

An important part of focusing the message about returnability has been to involve the university faculty and staff, so that a consistent set of messages reaches students from all sectors of the university. In 2005, the Returnability Committee conducted a survey of the BYU-Hawaii community in order to measure the effectiveness of the renewed focus on returning to one’s home region. Nearly 900 students, faculty, staff, and administrators responded to the survey, providing a valuable snapshot of the degree to which there was any campus consensus on the meaning and importance of returnability. Two-thirds of respondents felt confident that they knew what returnability means, though deeper analysis of the data suggests that there are in fact multiple understandings of the concept’s origins and meaning, and of who has responsibility for seeing that it is put into practice. As an example, though the majority of respondents agreed that returnability is the personal responsibility of each student and a matter of honesty and integrity, a similar percentage also felt that faculty and alumni should personally promote returnability and that they therefore bore some responsibility if the message was not conveyed.

While roughly eighty percent of respondents believed that graduates were expected to return to their home country (19.2%) or to either their home

Focusing the Message

One of the recommendations contained in the 2002 report from the Returnability Committee was that we must communicate more clearly and more broadly the importance of returnability. According to the report, “BYU Hawaii has not been clear or consistent when presenting its position on returnability.” The committee recommended that we “establish a clear position on returnability as it relates to an Asia/Pacific leadership focus and communicate it broadly.”

ship and practicum opportunities in students’ home countries which can serve as stepping stones to employment and/or graduate education.” This report summarizes some of the actions we have taken in those areas over the last several years.

The raw data on employment and return rates show substantial success in achieving our goals. Notable “snapshots” of the larger picture include the following comparisons between 2003 (when we submitted our Institutional Proposal) and 2006 (the latest year for which complete data are available):

- The international return-to-country rate rose from 18% to 56.5%, according to data collected at the time of graduation.
- The rate of acceptance to graduate school (also considered a “placement”) rose from 41% to 75%.
- According to “next destination” survey responses, the overall placement rate went from 18.1% to 63.2%. This compares with a national average in 2006 of 49.8%, as reported by the National Association of Colleges and Employers.

These data, though gratifying, mask the real reasons behind the change in campus culture that they represent. A concerted effort on the part of faculty, staff, administrators, and even students to focus the message of employment and returnability, and then to create and take advantage of opportunities, is the real story behind the numbers.
country or home region (61.8%), over fifteen percent felt that “returnability” meant that a graduate is expected to return “anywhere” or “anywhere but the US.” While the university has tried hard not to simply become the channel via which overseas students stay in the United States, it has also tried to convey its message in such a way that students understand the larger purpose behind its policies. It is not just a matter of leaving the US upon graduation, but of using a BYU-Hawaii education as a platform for a life of service to one’s own region. While the data indicate that this message has been conveyed quite successfully, we may still need to find ways to reach those whose understanding of the policy is incorrect.

Similarly, some members of the university community think that the expectation to return applies only to students whose education has been funded by the International Work Experience Scholarship (IWES). This misimpression perhaps stems from the fact (as reported elsewhere in this document) that the IWES application procedure explicitly commits students to return after graduation. Still, the broader expectation of return applies to all international students, regardless of the source of their funding. And although misperceptions about the audience for the returnability message, or the location to which they are expected to return, were decidedly in the minority, there was no consensus among survey respondents regarding the time that a graduate was obligated to remain in their home region following graduation. Overall, however, the survey does suggest that the university community broadly pays attention to the message of returnability and that there is a consensus on its importance as well as on some of the details of its implementation.

Perhaps the most important practices that have been instituted to better focus the message about returnability (and about employment in general) have been, first, those that encourage students to think about exit strategies even as they are preparing to enter the university, and, second, those that facilitate career planning throughout the undergraduate experience. Through intentional inter-
ventions into the student’s planning processes, we hope to create moments during which a student is required to think carefully about the connection between what he or she is doing now (whether applying for admission or registering for the next semester’s classes), and what his or her plans are after graduation. And if there are no such plans, these moments are the time to start making them.

The first direct contact that most international students have with BYU-Hawaii is through the Admissions Office, which handles the recruitment of international students and the processing of their applications for financial support. Many students from our “target area” of Asia and the Pacific do not have the personal or family financial means to pay for a university education overseas. Since the university’s mission includes “extending the blessings of learning to members of the Church, particularly in Asia and the Pacific,” creative ways have been found to assist needy students. Chief among them is the IWES (International Work Experience Scholarship) program.

Under the terms of the IWES program, financially disadvantaged students from outside the United States are given the opportunity to have most of their university costs (tuition fees, room and board, books and supplies) paid for them. In exchange, the student agrees to work at the Polynesian Cultural Center (PCC). The PCC, adjacent to the BYU-Hawaii campus, is the number-one paid visitor attraction in the state of Hawaii, with approximately one million visitors per year. Though the PCC and BYU-Hawaii are administratively separate, they work closely together in many areas. The IWES program is one of the most creative and mutually beneficial of those areas. The availability of jobs at the PCC is a crucial element in the success of the IWES program. At the same time, the PCC could not operate without a large, capable work force. Approximately 700 BYU-Hawaii students work at the PCC, many of them under IWES sponsorship. IWES students agree to work part-time (19 hours per week) during the fall and winter semesters and the spring term, and full-time (38-40 hours per week) during the summer term.
A portion of each paycheck is withheld to repay part of the cost of the scholarship.

All international students at BYU-Hawaii are encouraged to return to their home regions to live, work, and serve after graduation, but IWES students are under a special obligation. Recruiters from the BYU-Hawaii Admissions Office make the obligation to return a feature of all the presentations they make during overseas recruiting trips. The IWES application includes, as one of its requirements, student acknowledgment of this statement: “You have made a promise to return to your country or region after you graduate. You have a moral obligation to honor this promise. You understand that if you do not honor this promise, BYU-Hawaii may elect to place a hold on your transcripts. . . . If you complete your bachelor’s degree within four years and return to live and serve your country or region, BYU-Hawaii will provide your return fare ticket home. Keep this commitment in mind as you choose your major and schedule your classes.” Applicants and their parents also sign a formal “Promise to Return.” Beginning in 2004, in an attempt to further strengthen the focus on returnability, an essay section was added to the IWES application. In this essay, students are asked to write about their plans after graduation. By including a reflective essay in addition to the student’s explicit assurance that he or she plans to return, admissions and financial aid officers hope to be able to assess with some confidence the student’s commitment to return to his or her home region after graduation. This multi-layered commitment is not in itself a guarantee that a student will return. Indeed, it could be argued that at best, the student is making a moral and not a legal commitment. But at a church-sponsored university that takes moral commitments seriously, such overt promises on the part of students do have persuasive power.

It is not enough, of course, simply to encourage students to commit at the front end of their university experience. Students’ lives and interests change, and an early focus on the importance of returning can easily fade. In addition, it will do little good for a student to maintain a commitment to return home to work, only to find that no suitable work is available. This is where greater attention to career planning has been important. We want students to be thinking about exit strategies throughout their time at BYU-Hawaii, even as they immerse themselves in the exciting here-and-now experiences of university life. We have enhanced our career development and placement efforts both internally and externally, and have tried to bring those two streams together whenever possible.

Internally, a reorganized Career Center has helped focus the message of returnability and quality job placements in a variety of ways. The first step was simply to make the Career Center a more visible part of the university. It was moved to a new location with a new, full-time Director and a mandate to help generate awareness of the importance of exit strategies oriented toward achieving the university’s priorities of post-graduation employment for all students, and strengthening communities in our target area. Activities promoted by the Center or other university offices have included the following:

- Hosting international guest speakers for talks, firesides, seminars, or workshops designed to raise awareness of employment possibilities in specific countries, and to support the message of the desirability of returning home.
- Strengthening relationships with in-country liaison councils designed to help students plug into employment networks as they prepare to return to their home regions.
- Enhancing the resources available for students to assess their skills and explore possible career options.
- Regularly distributing an electronic “career bulletin” to notify students of job postings and on-campus events and interviews.
- Revising and tightening the policies for OPT (Optional Practical Training) so that it encourage students to return home at an appropriate time.
- Holding frequent workshops on campus related
to job searching and interviewing skills.
• Creating of a new Career Services website http://apps.BYU-Hawaii.edu/career/, full of information, advice, and links on a wide range of topics, from career management to graduate

In addition, the Career Center has been diligent in networking with alumni, chambers of commerce, professional associations, and employment resource centers sponsored by the LDS Church.

These efforts have been complemented by a campus-wide effort to include activities and messages relevant to employment and returnability. As an example, the number of faculty members who help raise awareness through class activities has clearly increased. Several faculty members are encouraged to intentionally focus attention on job skills, home-region opportunities, or both. These efforts complement the work being done by the university’s Academic Internship Office to not only increase the number of international internships, but also to direct students toward internships that show greater promise of leading to employment opportunities. The Mark and Laura Willes Center for International Entrepreneurship was created with a specific goal to “educate and mentor budding entrepreneurs and to provide a structure that will encourage the creation of businesses started in BYU-Hawaii target areas.” The annual business plan competition sponsored by the Center provides start-up money as an incentive for students to think creatively about how they can translate their academic training into jobs, particularly in their home regions.

For years, all BYU-Hawaii students have been required to file a Major Academic Plan (MAP). This document helps students organize their university years in the way that will most effectively lead them to graduation in a timely manner. Beginning in Fall 2006, all students have been required to also file, and regularly update, a Career Advancement Plan (CAP). The CAP is divided into four sections. The first section contains tasks the student should complete within his or her first 45 semester hours of university work. Subsequent sections track the student’s progress in career planning at the 60, 90, and 120 credit hour marks. Just as academic advisors are available to assist students with the MAP, career advisors in the Career Center provide CAP assistance. By the time a student graduates, he or she will have taken at least the following planning steps:

• Completed a self-assessment.
• Registered with BYU-Hawaii’s online job search network (which also facilitates interviews and internships searches).
• Attended a resume workshop and created a resume.
• Recorded a practice interview.
• Completed a mid-point inventory of interests and abilities.
• Met with a career advisor.
• Completed the Myers Briggs Type Indicator.
• Documented evidence of employment competencies.
• Created a stock personal introduction.
• Developed a job search strategy.
• Created an electronic career portfolio.
• Completed a graduation survey and reported their next destination.

By creating a series of timely interventions and planning structures, the CAP provides a powerful framework within which students and career counselors can work together to generate exit strategies beginning very early in a student’s time at the university. This relieves some of the stress that can come with the sudden realization, near graduation time, that the student has no post-graduation plans. It also gives the university another way to clearly focus the message of returnability and employability, and to link that message to a student’s academic progress.

The university’s Returnability Committee, organized as part of a concerted effort to sharpen the focus on home-region return, refashioned itself the “Return-Ability” Committee, emphasizing the importance not only of returning home after graduation, but of returning home equipped with
Since the acceptance of our Institutional Proposal, which highlighted employment and returnability as one of our key themes, BYU-Hawaii has continuously implemented more effective ways of both focusing the message and assessing our efforts. The employment and returnability data gathered to date through student surveys indicate that the work we have done is showing positive results. We know there is still work to be done, but we believe that the history of our endeavor and the results available to date show a clear commitment. Especially important is the fact that this commitment has been institutionalized, through the creation of new standing committees, new university centers, new policies, and new requirements for students. Weaving this commitment into the fabric of university structures and student life is what will give it long-term sustainability.

**Creating Opportunities**

In both our Institutional Proposal and our Capacity and Preparatory Review, we declared our intention to ground our reaccreditation work in the kind of solid data that would not only report results to WASC, but would also help point the way to improved institutional performance in pursuit of our own goals. When we began to focus efforts on employment and returnability, we realized that one of our enabling goals would itself have to be the collecting of data. We are certainly doing a better job of this than ever before, and are confident that we are on the path toward having the kind of data that will help us make informed analysis of our strengths and weaknesses in the area of helping our students make the next steps after graduation. Several types of data are of immediate relevance in reporting and analyzing where we are now.

Since the time of our Capacity and Preparatory Review, we have implemented procedures to ensure that good data on employment and returnability are compiled and made available to decision makers. At the time of graduation, the university now collects data on employment, graduate school placement, and return plans. This information is correlated with institutional research data and departmental exit surveys in order to get the most accurate data possible. These data are made available to deans and to others who can utilize them in their own planning and decisions. We now measure our placement performance against national norms. Because our data collection systems in the past were inconsistent, we have little historical data to use as benchmarks. But with the regular use of graduation surveys and alumni follow-up surveys, we are now in a position to collect and analyze longitudinal data on into the future.

An ongoing concern of university administrators prior to 2005 had been the potential for the Optional Practical Training (OPT) opportunity to subvert the larger goals of home-region return. Under OPT provisions approved by the U.S. government, students on an F-1 student visa are allowed (with university certification and backing) to work in the United States for one year after graduation. The idea behind the program is to allow recent graduates to obtain hands-on experience directly in a field related to their undergraduate major, thus enhancing their immediate job prospects. Following the terrorist incidents of 11 September 2001, however, the U.S. government drastically reduced the number of H1-B work visas available. If there is little to no opportunity for the employer to convert the person on the OPT into a longer-term employee, then it is not financially expedient for the employer to hire someone for only a one-year period. The average cost of a new hire (including training) is approximately $7,000 per hire. This factor, combined with concerns that too many students’ OPT experiences were not linked to their majors and were therefore unlikely to enhance their job prospects, led the university to...
announce a change in OPT policy effective August 2005. One of the primary changes in the new policy is that a student must now demonstrate that the job for which he or she wishes to stay in the U.S. is in a field directly related to his or her major field of university study, requires a bachelor’s degree as a condition of employment, and provides experience not readily available in the student’s home country.

This new policy has reduced the number of BYU-Hawaii international graduates utilizing the OPT option. In the five years from 2000 to 2004, the average number of international graduates on OPT was 109, with a high of 133 in 2004. With the policy change in 2005, that number shrank in one year to 68. It stayed nearly the same (70) in 2006. But the change in OPT policy has not reduced job placements, as it has been accompanied by an emphasis on high-quality internships instead—preferably in the student’s home country—as a more effective way of connecting international students to professional opportunities in their region.

A major focus of our placement efforts over the last few years has been to encourage students to seek high-quality internships. There is no question that internships are among the best job-search opportunities available. Particularly for international students who have been away from their home region during most of their time as students, an internship is a powerful strategy for establishing links between future graduates and potential employers.

The emphasis on internships has been facilitated by generous grants which allow the university to pay the airfare for international students to return to their home country for an internship opportunity once prior to graduation. Particularly for IWES-sponsored students, who may not have personal funds available to pay travel costs and who are normally under obligation to spend their entire time as students in residence at the university, this opportunity has opened doors that would otherwise be closed. Seven major programs now require an internship for graduation, with the rest of the programs now offering it for elective credit. It is expected that more will move in to mandating it as a requirement. As mentioned above, internships are the preferred method for providing job-related experiences linked to the student’s major.

The data on internships for the past several years clearly demonstrate our commitment to linking our undergraduate academic programs to internships as a way of creating pathways to employment. As the table below indicates, the total number of students doing internships rose by over 400% in the four-year period from 2003 to 2006. Especially dramatic, however, has been the increase in the number of international students engaging in international internships. That number rose from 11 in 2003 to 131 in 2006. While the number of American students doing internships roughly doubled during that period, the number of international students increased more than tenfold.

- Creating a campus culture that is committed to improving the quantity and quality of internships has been facilitated by many factors and the participation of many people:
- The creation of an Internship Office, closely linked to the Career Center, to coordinate all internship activity and follow up on placements.
- Donations from university supporters to pay for the cost of transportation to and from international internship sites.
- The appointment of internship coordinators in each academic department to advise students on major-related internship possibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summaries</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International students doing internships internationally</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students doing internships in the United States (including Hawaii)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American students doing internships internationally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American students doing internships in the United States (including Hawaii)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total students doing internships</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Some departments such as political science and social work, were not included in 2003.)
• Regular publicity through articles in the student newspaper, workshops, email, and other means.
• The work of the Career Center in promoting internship planning as part of each student’s career plan.

One of the most important factors in making internships central to both our educational and placement efforts has been the deep engagement of faculty. Many faculty members have actively sought ways to create more internship opportunities. Some have combined professional development travel with visits to potential internship sites and networking with potential sponsors. Others have traveled with groups of interns in order to supervise their work on site while also linking it with the academic work the students will do when they return to campus. In these and other ways, faculty have shown a commitment to helping create opportunities for students to return to their home countries, find good jobs, and become leaders in their communities and careers. As a result of the combined efforts of staff, faculty, administrators, and students, the number of countries in which we were able to place interns increased from three in 2003 to 28 in 2006. More important than any of the numbers reported here, however, is the fact that the majority of international students who complete internships return home and find jobs after graduation. Thus, the internship experience play a key role in opening the door to their return and eventual employment in their hom areas.

We recognize that some BYU-Hawaii graduates from developing nations in our target area in Asia and the Pacific may have severe difficulty finding employment that actually utilizes their education. Yet there are financially rewarding opportunities waiting to be discovered by well-trained and modestly funded entrepreneurs. One promising new program at BYU-Hawaii to aid in the returnability of our graduates through development of employment opportunities is the Mark and Laura Willes Center for International Entrepreneurship (CIE). The CIE is a non-profit organization supported by BYU-Hawaii and the School of Business to create entrepreneurial vision and cultivate “entrepreneurial intent” in BYU-Hawaii graduates. The CIE empowers graduates with tools necessary to envision life as successful business owners in their own societies. The School of Business in conjunction with CIE offers business majors and other students the opportunity to develop practical entrepreneurial skills through classes taught in the integrated business core practicum, business plan writing workshops, business plan competitions, the entrepreneur lecture series, and an annual entrepreneur conference. CIE is developing an annual and multi-year assessment plan to help track participation in these programs over the next several years and the impact of these programs on our graduates, especially in the University’s target areas.

Where We Are Going:
No Room for Complacency

We will continue to work on the seven key areas that the Returnability Committee recommended for attention in its 2002 report:

• Market our message. This will require the sustained attention of all members of the university community so that messages are both consistent and appropriate.
• Collect useful data. As we have attempted to build a data-rich reaccreditation profile, and use good data in making all university decisions, one of our biggest challenges has been the lack of good historical data. We have spent a considerable of time, effort, and money over the last few years to develop much better university-wide data collection systems that will help us see where we have been and where we are now, so that we can make informed decisions about where we want to be in the future. Clearly these efforts are bearing fruit, but we must make sure that appropriate data are always available for decision makers.
• Improve job placement. Few things are more central to our mission than this. The Career Center, with the cooperation of other offices and individuals, will continue to create new
pathways by working with in-country placement councils, networks of employers, alumni, and internship sponsors. We will need to find ways to add resources to the Career Center, however, so that it can do its job more effectively.

- Involve the faculty. We will continue to encourage faculty to make internships a focal point of their work with students.
- Develop curriculum. We will encourage more faculty to include job-related thinking or assignments in classes where appropriate, and will include employability considerations in discussions of new academic programs.
- Focus recruiting and admissions efforts. Anyone, whether Admissions Office personnel or faculty, who participates in the recruitment of students, should be made fully aware of the university’s policies on returnability. Since the first contact many students have with the university comes through recruiters, their role in affecting potential students’ understanding of the university’s expectations is crucial.
- Seek ecclesiastical support. Most BYU-Hawaii students are members of the LDS Church, and all of them, whether LDS members or not, must receive an endorsement from an ecclesiastical leader before their application for admission can be considered. We must make sure that they are aware of BYU-Hawaii’s expectations with regard to placement and return, as they are potentially powerful allies in delivering the message and focusing students’ thinking at the time they enter the university.

Central to our efforts in the future will be the further strengthening of the links between three key returnability components: IWES, internships, and career planning. The scholarship program is not simply a way for a student to receive an education; an internship is not simply a part of one’s major; career planning is not simply a requirement imposed by the university. The key is the strategic relationship among the three, and their ability to combine to create exit strategies for students who, before they came, were likely to have been thinking almost solely in terms of entrance strategies. The university must continue to find creative ways to channel the important shift in thinking from admission to graduation along lines that help students find meaningful careers—and, for international students, careers in their home regions if at all possible.

**Conclusion**

We feel good about where our efforts have taken us so far, but we also realize the substantial challenges that face us if we are to continue improving our placement and return efforts. Sustainability is everything, and in order to make our progress sustainable in the long term we must continue to make each gain reported here—and those still to come—part of the institution, and not just the achievements of one person or office.

For all of our students, whether American or international, our goal remains the same. We want a BYU-Hawaii education to be the key that unlocks a world of opportunities to work and serve in ways that are meaningful and satisfying.

---


3 [http://apps.byuh.edu/apps/pirat/Planning/docs/futures_report.doc](http://apps.byuh.edu/apps/pirat/Planning/docs/futures_report.doc)
THEME FOUR: EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH

The importance for BYU-Hawaii of sustained attention to the development of English-language skills cannot be overstated. It is the language of instruction at the university, but beyond that, it is the *lingua franca* for many of the commercial, cultural, legal, and intellectual exchanges that characterize the interconnected world in which our students will live and work. Yet it is the first language for only approximately half of our students, with the other half embarking on their university careers at various stages of English-language competence. Given this reality, it is imperative that everyone at BYU-Hawaii—faculty, staff, and administration—commit themselves to the task of producing graduates with the ability to speak English in social and professional environments. This recognition led us to designate effective communication in English for second-language students as one of our institutional themes for the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Where We Have Been: Determining Informed Goals

Beginning in 2001, the university, at the direction of its Board of Trustees, undertook a series of initiatives to increase the enrollment of students from the university’s target area, and specifically from Asia. An influx of non-native English speaking students presented the prospect that many students could easily spend much of their day immersed in their native language rather than developing the proficiency in English necessary to perform well academically. Once the strategic decision had been made to move in the direction of enrolling more students from non-English speaking backgrounds, however, BYU-Hawaii faculty and officials recognized that they would need to ensure high standards of English competence and to create an environment in which English language skills would be actively developed and supported, with mechanisms in place to assess progress—both the progress of individual students and the progress of the institution as a whole.

Our goal, as articulated in 2002 in our Institutional Proposal, was to develop a language plan that would maximize the language-learning opportunities of non-native speakers of English, that would involve all members of the campus community, that would be institutionalized and therefore sustainable, and that would be subject to assessment and data-driven feedback and improvements.

We immediately began taking steps to realize this goal. In the Winter semester of 2003, Dr. William Eggington, an internationally-known ESL scholar and consultant, and a professor at the BYU campus in Utah, spent the semester in residence at BYU-Hawaii studying the state of English-language teaching and learning on campus. He surveyed hundreds of students, examined the language curriculum, consulted with faculty, and produced an extensive report on the possibilities of developing a language plan at BYU-Hawaii. Determined to build our language efforts into university processes, a standing Second Language Committee which will be referred to as L2 in this document with broad representation from across the university was formed in May 2004. Its mission is to “ensure that the entire campus works together to make BYU-Hawaii a place where non-native speakers of English develop clear competence in the English language.” In order to accomplish that mission, the committee was asked to consider how the university “can coordinate campus-wide efforts to support the development of English language competence among our second-language students.”

Historically at BYU-Hawaii, the development of English-language competency by L2 students was seen almost exclusively as the responsibility of the English as an International Language (EIL) program, which would provide students for the baccalaureate program who had the skills necessary for success. This tended to marginalize the activities of EIL within the university and to obstruct the flow of useful information on language learning. With
the formation of the L2 Committee, however, the campus began moving toward a new model, focusing not on any set “arrival point.” but on the development of English proficiency throughout a student’s time at the university. This new direction has meant that improving the English proficiency of non-native speakers has become the responsibility of everyone on campus, not just those involved directly in the EIL program. This message was reinforced through a series of presentations on L2 issues at university faculty meetings beginning in October 2004.

The committee recognized that the ability to create a campus culture that was more conducive to broad agreement on the importance of English proficiency would require the articulation of a clear set of objectives relevant to the work of the entire university community. With this in mind, one of the first endeavors the L2 Committee undertook was to write a comprehensive mission statement that would form the basis both for work within the university and communication to interested parties outside the university. It is worth quoting here, as it establishes a direction for the work discussed in this report:

“The mission of the Second Language (L2) Committee is to ensure that the entire campus works together to make BYU Hawaii a place where non-native speakers of English develop clear competence in the English language. We will accomplish this goal by developing and implementing a comprehensive language plan which:

- Demonstrates an understanding of English language behavior, (including language use, language proficiency, and language acquisition), and attitudes towards the English language as based on data collected from stakeholders.
- Establishes an ongoing system for collecting and analyzing data related to English language behavior and attitudes towards the English language.
- Endorses the highest standards of learning and teaching the English language on campus.
- Promotes extensive English language development opportunities in all areas of student life including academic, residential, employment, social, and ecclesiastical, yet respects the rich diversity of the students’ first languages.
- Is subject to continuing evaluation and refinement.”

Outlining the L2 mission in this way focused the Committee’s efforts on (a) collecting and analyzing data related to English language behaviors and attitudes, and (b) developing and implementing a language plan to ensure that the campus moves forward in a unified way to help students become clearly competent in English, while also recognizing the importance of students’ continued identification with their first language. The Committee has taken several steps toward accomplishing its goals. In terms of the map of objectives outlined in our Institutional Proposal and further discussed in our Capacity and Preparatory Review, and particularly our determination to institute data-rich decision-making practices, the most important of these steps has been a sustained process of data collection. Although we have been testing L2 students for years, we have coupled our broader, university-wide L2 emphasis with an effort to gather relevant data that would contribute to a university-wide English language plan. For example, we have collected data to determine student and faculty attitudes toward English language learning and teaching, as well as students’ actual abilities in English (both during and after their time at BYU-Hawaii).

Data Collection

The data collected to date exist in a multitude of forms, from the results of standardized tests to responses to questionnaires. Analysis of the data continues, and will be used both in the refinement of our language plan and as feedback to help us improve the data collection instruments themselves. The data in Appendix K summarizes the findings of the data collected so far.

Limitations

These data have given us much information to
work with and analyze, but the picture they present is still a limited one. One of the most important limitations stems from the fact that most of the data are self-reported (though even this is a vast improvement in areas for which most of our previous data was anecdotal and therefore of very little value for decision making or planning purposes). The only actual measure of students' English ability is the institutional TOEFL. This test itself provides a limited view of English proficiency, as it is a multiple-choice test of reading, listening, and grammar. The test does not give any indication of a student's ability to write or speak, as those sections are not included on the institutional version of the exam. In addition, not all students have TOEFL scores on admission (some students take the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency [MTELP], while others are excused from testing), so conclusions must be drawn on the basis of incomplete information about the proficiency levels of incoming students. It should also be noted that during the process of data collection the number of seniors tested varied, from 28% to 56% of the total pool of international students who are non-native speakers of English.

Despite these limitations, however, two points should be highlighted. First, the data we have collected give us a much richer understanding of where we have been with regard to English language teaching and learning than we have ever had before, and therefore provide us with a usable baseline for establishing a plan and improving our efforts. Second, the process of data collection itself has been valuable, arising from and reinforcing our determination to use data at all critical decision points. It is only by collecting data that we can know whether or not the data needed for sound planning are available.

Where We Are Now: Working With the Data

Having collected a substantial amount of data, our next step is to determine how the data can inform the creation of a language plan and specific initiatives to support faculty and students in the teaching and learning of English. This is where the real work of planning begins, as we build a structure of knowledge and a course of action based on sound data, and directed toward goals that are in line with the university's overall mission, demographic profile, and resources.

Four key conclusions emerge from an analysis of the data collected so far:

- **Our students do make progress in their English ability.** Most of this progress seems to occur early in their university careers, and this progress may not be as substantial as we would like. Students' TOEFL scores increase by an average of 70 points during their time at BYU-Hawaii. Furthermore, half of that increase occurs between the time of admission and the completion of EIL requirements, meaning that from then until graduation the average L2 student's score increases by only an additional 35 points. It is important to note that a TOEFL score represents a range of proficiency rather than a precise pinpointing of skills, and is limited in what it measures. Students may be much stronger in language skills that are not susceptible to TOEFL measurement (speaking and writing), or on more authentic language tasks (for example, the actual use of English in real-life academic or social contexts), rather than the skills measured by standardized, multiple-choice English proficiency tests. Anecdotal information abounds about students who, by the reckoning of their professors or their peers, have English skill levels above or below their officially tested levels. Nevertheless, a seventy-point increase (from 489 to 559) is not substantial. Universities commonly require a score of 550 (only slightly below the average score that BYU-Hawaii students have achieved upon graduation) for undergraduate admission (600 is a common requirement for graduate programs)

- **Students generally feel quite strongly that their English skills are adequate to the demands that the BYU-Hawaii academic experience places on them.** Students rate their abilities and efforts quite high when asked how well and how much they use English. Alumni looking back after a number of years
Case Study #1 - Surveying the Scene: The 2003 Eggington Study

The study carried out by Dr. William Eggington in 2003 provided a valuable qualitative snapshot of the L2 situation at BYU-Hawaii. In addition to examining the state of language planning at BYU-Hawaii, Dr. Eggington surveyed over 400 international students in order to explore the strengths and weaknesses of the current L2 environment. His findings include the following:

Prior Training and Experience
- The majority of respondents had training and experience with English before coming to BYU-Hawaii (for example, full-time church missions or extensive formal language study). A large majority (81%) studied English in their home countries for 5 or more years; 22% studied in the U.S. prior to coming to BYU-Hawaii.
- The majority of respondents spent a modest amount of time (two semesters or less) in the EIL program, or were not in EIL at all.

Academic Usage
- Use of English in academic situations is generally high. Over 90% of respondents report using English most or all of the time in academic contexts.

Social Usage
- The majority of respondents (80%) live in situations in which they are likely to need to use English at least some of the time.
- The use of English with friends is moderate. Generally, about 40-50% of respondents indicate that they use English most or all of the time to visit with friends (close friends in the U.S. and at BYU-Hawaii) or to email friends.
- In social situations, such as visiting with neighbors, a large majority of respondents (83%) indicate using English most or all of the time.
- Respondents report fairly low use of English in social situations in the cafeteria, the Seaside snack bar, and when exercising or relaxing.

The findings of the data reported above are under consideration as we move purposefully ahead in further university-wide discussions regarding the establishment of a language plan for BYU-Hawaii. These efforts have faced certain key challenges affecting the work of the L2 Committee. The committee chair left the university for employment elsewhere, as did another key committee member, an expert in English language assessment. Other committee members have been unable to participate for a variety of reasons, leaving only three active members. We are currently engaged in identifying and appointing new committee members, and it will undoubtedly take some time to familiarize these members with the past efforts of the committee. The newly-inaugurated president of BYU-Hawaii may also wish to offer advice and direction in this area as he works to shape the future direction of the university.
Case Study #2 -
Engaging the Faculty: The 2005 Survey

One of the important lessons we have learned as we have pushed for greater effectiveness in developing our students’ English language ability is that accomplishing this goal is not simply a matter of convincing students to immerse themselves in English, or of hiring more and better-trained faculty to teach them. Rather, the entire campus must be involved in the effort. In particular, non-EIL faculty can play a key role in setting the tone and creating the opportunities that will make BYU-Hawaii an environment that is simultaneously English-rich and linguistically diverse.

The first step in more fully engaging faculty in this task was to assess the attitudes and expectations of BYU-Hawaii faculty members regarding our large L2 student population. To do this, the L2 Committee conducted a survey of the entire faculty in the Fall of 2005, with a response rate of 51% (93 out of 183 full- and part-time faculty). The findings were reported at the 2006 annual seminar of the Regional Language Centre in Singapore by the study’s authors, Dr. Maureen Andrade (currently Chair of the Department of English Language Teaching and Learning at BYU-Hawaii) and Dr. Norman Evans (on the BYU-Hawaii faculty at the time of the survey, and now at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah). The key findings are summarized below, but several points are worth highlighting.

As Andrade and Evans reported, “generally speaking, the faculty think that their ESL students have adequate language skills for the academic tasks that are required of them.” At the same time, faculty were clearly not satisfied with this level of English attainment. In other words, there appears to be broad acknowledgment that English for university success is not the same thing as comprehensive linguistic fluency. While at first glance this appears to present an incongruous conclusion, coming as it does from people who value the rich use of language in a university setting, it is probably better seen as a recognition that even the most robust
The 2005 survey represents a major milestone in our understanding of the interplay among faculty expectations, EIL training, academic success, and institutional responsibility. This raises two important questions: Does the level of student attainment in English language competence need to be raised? And whose responsibility is it to raise that level? The survey data reveal that most faculty members believe the primary responsibility lies with the students themselves. But creating an environment filled with appropriate pathways to progress will clearly involve campus-wide efforts. Andrade and Evans mention several possibilities, including “study groups, tutoring, supplemental materials, technology-based tools . . . learning center support . . . the reconceptualization of ESL course work, peer support programs, learning support services, and student life initiatives.”

As this essay indicates, we have a substantial amount of both quantitative and qualitative data. The real question for us as we move forward is: What do we do with this information? We have demonstrated the ability to gather good data about a range of issues relating to our goal of improving the English ability of L2 students. We have also analyzed and, in some cases, reported much of the data. The next step is to subject the findings from these analyses to university-wide discussion and to incorporate them into a comprehensive language plan that recognizes current reality, draws on current strengths, and creates momentum for continuous improvement.

**Where We Are Going: An Institutional Language Plan**

The L2 Committee has now identified a number of strategic initiatives that will have to be part of any language plan, and has envisioned future possibilities for the implementation of such a plan. A crucial next step will be to generate wide discussion of these initiatives and possibilities across campus. We propose the adoption of a framework grounded in what we know about student development and language acquisition theory, which will provide the basic principles on which we will build our plan.

Reduced to its essence, with details of conceptualization, implementation, and justification removed, the philosophy behind BYU Hawaii’s future language plan can be summarized in one sentence: We challenge our students to have excellent English language skills, and we offer the necessary support for their success. In short, the institution must focus its initiatives on properly challenging students to excel. It must also ensure that the necessary support is available to every student, and that the entire university is engaged in offering that support. This challenge, and the support systems it implies, can be achieved in many ways. Only a few of the possibilities can be mentioned here, but they suggest some of the directions of our thinking.

**The Challenge of Excellence**

- The university must stop apologizing for its language requirement. Instead, it should start promoting it, emphasizing the value it adds to a BYU-Hawaii education.
- Faculty in all departments and disciplines need to raise their expectations of students’ English ability.
- Departments need to take responsibility for defining acceptable English standards in their disciplines, and for identifying ways by which they can hold students to those standards.
- Care must be taken never to allow challenges to be seen as threats. Rather, students must be helped to see these challenges for what they are—academic expectations. University life is full of academic expectations and challenges. Excellence in English should be seen as one of them.
- Opportunities for students to develop English language skills must be incorporated into all aspects of a student’s life. Those responsible for residential and student life should find appro-
The Obligation of Support

- BYU-Hawaii must continue to support the EIL program. As long as students with limited access to English language instruction in their homelands are part of the university’s target population, a vigorous, semi-intensive language program will be indispensable. Such a program is integral to the fundamental mission of the university. Developing students’ language skills to the level needed for university work will require expert language instruction.

- We should consider creating a high-visibility English Development Center with a full-time, professional director. The purpose of such a center would be to provide professional, reliable English language resources for students and faculty. Ideally, such a Center would involve a consolidation and reconceptualization of existing language-support centers on campus (Reading/Writing Center, Language Lab, Speech Lab). This redeployment in support of a focused language plan could result in more efficient use of existing resources as well as clearer channels for the utilization of any additional resources that may be directed toward accomplishment of the university’s language objectives in the future. The Center would be much more than simply a new administrative home in which the three existing centers would continue to operate as they do now. The magnitude of the challenge will require a higher level of support and a greater degree of guidance than are available now. It will also require greater ownership and involvement by all the disciplines on campus. Faculty must see the Language Development Center as their center—that is, as a center that cooperates in accomplishing objectives that the faculty members have accepted as their own. The Center’s director, reporting to the Vice President for Academics, should be a member of the faculty who will oversee operations, work with other faculty, and chair a steering committee consisting of opinion leaders from the various departments and schools.

- Finally, we must recognize that a state-of-the-art language plan will require the allocation of financial resources. BYU-Hawaii has been generous in providing funds to programs that meet university priorities. For a language plan to succeed, it must be well funded.

All of our thinking about the development of a language plan has been based on the collection and analysis of data about English language abilities and attitudes. As the plan is implemented, we recognize that the continued collection of data will be critical so that we can measure how well we are achieving institutional language development objectives, and be in a position to make informed decisions about changes or improvements we will need to make.

Conclusion

Nearly fifty percent of the BYU Hawaii’s student body comes from outside the United States, representing over 70 different countries. This extremely diversified international population presents both opportunities and challenges. Certainly one of the greatest challenges is linguistic. Because the growth in our population of non-native speakers occurred earlier and more rapidly than our thinking about how to integrate English competence into the total student experience, it is fair to say that we have been operating under several important but untested language development assumptions for nearly four decades. Foremost among these is the assumption that international students...
immersed in the English-language environment on campus will naturally develop strong English-language skills throughout their time at BYU-Hawaii. The data suggest that this is not entirely correct. Learning from the data we have gathered, we intend to take a much more intentional approach as we move forward. Students must be challenged, and made aware of the university’s high expectations, in order to achieve stronger competence in English. The existence of a large percentage of students who speak English as a second (or later additional) language creates an environment that potentially limits English language development opportunities. Without intervention, innovation, and involvement by the entire campus, the current English language “comfort zone” could easily persist, but with proper attention and resources, we believe substantial improvements can be made. BYU-Hawaii has an opportunity few other universities have: the possibility of truly becoming a living language laboratory, thereby contributing to the understanding of second language development while also fulfilling its international mission to provide educational opportunities to students from throughout Asia and the Pacific. This mission has not changed, nor has our determination to accomplish the task we set for ourselves in 2002. We may not have fully appreciated at the time that the task involved fundamental changes in institutional attitude and energies, and that the creation and implementation of a language plan would be quite as complicated as it has proven to be. The future direction of the new president will undoubtedly impact several aspect of the language plan. He has proposed a strategy to implement English-language courses through distance learning to increase student English proficiency prior arriving on campus. Still, the launching of the L2 Committee, its status as a university standing committee, and its work to date on analyzing large amounts of data about attitudes and accomplishments, gives us strong reasons to believe that we have both the will and the intellectual resources to accomplish our goal.

---

4 A preliminary version of the report is available at BYU-Hawaii institutional ePortfolio site: http://apps.byuh.edu/apps/pirat/ePortfolio/2nd_Language_Learning.php

5 The entire paper, title “University Instructors’ Views of ESL Students: Implications for Training,” is part of the BYU-Hawaii institutional ePortfolio, and can be read at http://apps.byuh.edu/apps/pirat/ePortfolio/2nd_Language_Learning.php
CONCLUSION:
INTEGRATING THEMES, GOALS, STANDARDS, AND STRUCTURES

From the beginning of our campus-wide work on reaccreditation, we were determined that we would not be driven simply by the need to meet standards established by WASC and to demonstrate compliance with those standards by the presentation and explanation of evidence. As important as those standards are, and as much as we consider WASC to be a valuable partner in our desire to achieve and sustain academic excellence, we knew that an externally-motivated process would never generate the kind of engagement, enthusiasm, and commitment that we wanted. The way to make the process of reaccreditation as meaningful as possible was to identify internally our defining goals and values, and then generate discussion and effort in the service of achieving those goals as informed by our values. Only a fraction of that sustained process, occurring over several years and involving in some way nearly all of the faculty, staff, and administrators (not to mention many students), can be distilled into this Educational Effectiveness Report. We have focused our report on the ways in which we have built a culture of evidence while carrying out positive changes in our educational programs. In general, we have presented our report in the form of connected historical narratives, outlining the current state of our efforts in the context of where we have been and the direction in which we are moving. In this way, we have tried to capture some of the dynamism that has animated our reaccreditation work, and that will continue to sustain us as we build on the discussions, data, and decisions that have emerged since the submission of our Institutional Proposal five years ago.

What this means is that in addition to charting certain important institutional developments related to reaccreditation, this report is a description of the changing fabric of university life. As we wrote in our Capacity and Preparatory Review, our concerted effort of the last several years has been focused on two essential questions: “What can we learn? Can we apply what we learn?” Learning and application necessarily imply an openness to change and improvement. “BYU-Hawaii is determined,” we wrote, “to be an institution that learns from its work and from its history of confronting challenges.” No one would suggest that the challenges have ended. Indeed, as we welcome a new president this academic year and embark on a course that both honors our past and shapes our future, we know that new challenges will arise. This is why it has been so important for us to explore our ability to focus on our mission, identify key issues, generate lively discussion, and marshal the data that will lead to sensible policies. It is still true, as we said in 2005, that “the future we envision is one in which all university stakeholders understand the institution’s mission, and are provided with the data they need to make informed decisions directed toward that mission.” This report highlights some of the key decisions that have been made and the data that have supported them.

The report also suggests some important challenges that lie ahead—for some of which clear recommendations can be made. One immediate challenge will be for the new president to articulate his vision for the university’s future in light of the university’s history. This is the type of challenge, however, that we see as an opportunity, since the need for any new leader to chart a course is also a chance to raise awareness of key issues for the university as a whole. A second (and greater) challenge will be to ensure the sustainability and institutionalization of the improvements of the last several years. We must continue to develop institutional habits of using data in decision making, maintain momentum and increase commitment in assessment and program review, and take a long, hard look at the very complex issues surrounding English-language development for our increasingly international student body. If the number of students at BYU-Hawaii increases, both the number and the percentage of non-native English speakers will also increase, requiring redoubled efforts to create the kind of campus-wide commitment to language training that will improve our results in this area. Finally, as we emphasize to students the importance of thinking about exit strategies.
All of these essays also highlight the need to sustain and institutionalize change. In each of the major areas selected for review, we have created structures to facilitate this. The General Education committee, the University Assessment Committee, an enhanced Career Services office, a standing L2 Committee—all of these structures have been created since our last accreditation, and all will continue to drive university-wide engagement with the process of improvement. By linking continued progress to institutional structures rather than to the hope that key individuals will drive the process, we will be able to continue to move forward despite inevitable personnel changes.

Beyond the details of specific initiatives outlined in this report, the overarching goals of the entire reaccreditation process that were articulated in our 2003 Institutional Proposal have remained firmly in our sight. Those goals were: 1) to incorporate critical data into decision-making processes; 2) to implement a departmental review process for each program area; 3) to implement meaningful, positive changes in the teaching-learning process at BYU-Hawaii by building on assessment of student learning outcomes; 4) to develop outcomes and means of assessment for selected General Education areas; and 5) to educate faculty on the processes and purposes of a culture of evidence. Each of the major focus areas identified by one of our Educational Effectiveness themes, was designed to build our capacity to achieve one or more of these goals. This report tells the story of how we have done that.

We recognize, however, that although this report is a formal endpoint in one process, in the longer term it is only a way station—an intermediate point on a much longer journey toward the future of excellence we envision. We also recognize that we cannot afford to pause and enjoy the view from this way station for very long. It is our hope that the way we have conducted our reaccreditation work will generate momentum that will carry us through a process of sustained improvement long after many in the BYU-Hawaii community have forgotten the immediate impetus that started the process.
As we move forward, then, three steps will be important for sustaining improvement. First, having become much better at gathering and using data, we must now find ways to make the data collected from one area usable in multiple areas. Second, we must synthesize the vision of the new university president with the developments generated and reported to WASC since 2003. And third, we must ensure that we can maintain the momentum that has been generated during the process of reaccreditation. In addition to adopting strategies for publicizing new initiatives and socializing new faculty, staff, and administrators into the “culture of evidence” we have been trying to establish, we will do this by identifying key stakeholders and key opinion leaders, and then enlisting their support in helping us seize key opportunities.

We have learned a great deal, as individuals and as an institution, over the last several years. To conclude this report, it would be worth briefly summarizing some of the key lessons we have learned since beginning our reaccreditation work. Simply put, they are as follows:

- Sustainability is everything.
- The best way to make progress sustainable at a university is to make it relevant to the kinds of work that faculty value.
- Connecting goals and initiatives to the university’s mission is crucial.
- Faculty and staff work quite hard, and it is difficult to generate wide buy-in for initiatives that are seen simply as top-down administrative impositions. Therefore, creating opportunities for meaningful discussion and participation—and demonstrating that such participation has an impact—is of fundamental importance.
- We have the will to accomplish our objectives, we have the ability to collect and assess necessary data, and we have the necessary resource support from the church that sponsors BYU-Hawaii.

This is an important set of lessons. If we take these lessons seriously, we can move forward with optimism about the future stemming from a sense that our efforts will not be wasted.
APPENDIX A

Response to Recommendations by the Capacity and Preparatory Review Team
Response to Recommendations by the Capacity and Preparatory Review Team

In its report on its Capacity and Preparatory Review visit to BYUH in March 2006, the WASC visiting team made four major recommendations. A response to each of those recommendations follows.

1. The team recommends that the institution continue to pursue solutions to the housing issue in order to support the recruitment and retention of quality faculty and staff.

The cost of housing in Hawaii is extraordinarily high. This fact has a potential impact on academic quality at BYUH, since it can be a disincentive for faculty to remain at the university—or to come in the first place. Realizing the importance of this issue, the university administration, in consultation with faculty, staff, and consultants, has been working for several years to come up with a workable solution.

We are pleased to report that the Board of Trustees has appropriated a loan of $12,000,000 for the start-up and implementation of a housing initiative that will result in the demolition of 25 homes built in the early 1960s. Each of these homes was built on a lot zoned for two homes. The existing structures will be replaced by 50 new homes that will be available for purchase by faculty and staff at a price well below prevailing market rates in Hawaii. In order to make this new housing initiative sustainable over the long term, conditions of home ownership will be structured in such a way that the home owner will be required to sell the unit back to the university if he or she leaves the university or purchases another home in Hawaii.

This initiative was the result of the work of a Housing Task Force that led to a proposal from UniDev Group, an institutional housing developer that has worked with other universities to find solutions to similar housing problems. The proposal is now being implemented by the university administration, with guidance and input from a faculty-led housing committee. An additional aspect of the proposal is for much of the university’s existing housing stock that is not slated for destruction to be made available for sale under the same conditions as the new units. The sale of existing homes is included in the plan in order to offset the high cost of construction of the new units so that they can be kept as affordable as possible without continued university subsidies.

The timing for this project is good because of the slowdown in the housing market and the corresponding decline in construction in other parts of the island. In the past, builders and subcontractors were reluctant to bid on construction projects in Laie because of its distance from Honolulu, but we are now in a position to benefit from changing market conditions.

There will undoubtedly be many “bumps in the road” as we move ahead, but we are currently closer to high-volume home ownership than we have been at any time in the past fifteen years.

2. The team recommends that the institution formally restructure teaching loads to bring itself into alignment with institutions that require scholarly activity of its faculty. More normative for research-active faculty at universities that have a primary commitment to teaching would be a nine-hour load with a three-hour release for research.

Although the university respects the recommendation of the visiting team regarding teaching loads, and fully understands the reasons for it, the university’s funding scheme does not at present allow for the substantial additional costs that a normative 9-9 load (with an additional 6 hours in Spring/Summer) would require. Upon reviewing the team’s recommendations, the Vice President for Academics committed to a goal of making three hours available for scholarly and creative activity each year to faculty who had documented, results-oriented scholarly projects. The Academic Planning Council is in the process of setting parameters for the kinds of scholarly activity for which released time can be appropriately considered at a university, such as ours, that has a primary commitment to teaching. The replacement of part-time faculty with visiting faculty in non-continuing-status positions is also intended to build a stronger teaching
Our strategy will be to continue to actively recruit a diverse faculty and to create ways to support academic couples. In support of this strategy, we have developed the position of Adjunct Associate Professor, a new part-time position that can become a permanent part-time assignment after a review that is similar to review for Continuing Faculty Status (similar to tenure). Currently we have identified four faculty spouses who have been teaching successfully since their wives or husbands joined the full-time faculty, and who have the appropriate degrees and experience that would normally qualify them for full-time faculty consideration. These four are the initial candidates for Adjunct Assistant Professor positions. Strategic use of this opportunity can aid in both recruitment and retention of academic couples.

In response to the suggestions of the WASC visiting team, a group of female faculty and administrative staff formed an “Academic Women’s Network” that meets informally and makes recommendations to the Vice President for Academics. As a result of these activities, two female faculty members were sent to the conference of the American Association of University Women in Phoenix in June 2007, and one female faculty member was nominated for and accepted to attend the HERS (Higher Education Resource Services) Summer Institute at Bryn Mawr College in 2007. Additionally, an effort has been made to assure continued female participation at the annual WASC conference and on WASC committees.

3. The team recommends that the institution cultivate leadership skills and aspirations among their women faculty, and find more productive means of recruiting and retaining qualified women and persons from underrepresented groups for full-time faculty positions.

The university sees this recommendation as three interrelated challenges: recruitment, retention, and promotion. The recruitment and retention challenges are clearly the most directly interconnected. Since 2000, the university has proactively worked to ensure that recruitment pools are diverse by gender and ethnicity. The preference for qualified candidates who are members of the sponsoring church has become less of an inhibitor, as educated people from throughout the world are now represented among church members. In the time since the Capacity and Preparatory Review visit we have been able to add female faculty members from the United States, Italy, Finland, and China, and male faculty from Fiji and China. With regard to the retention of female faculty, our dilemma has been the lack of job opportunities for spouses of married faculty and the lack of a vibrant social life for single faculty. This is further complicated by the high value the church places on family, and the number of female faculty who choose to leave full-time employment to fulfill family responsibilities. A further complication (though one we take positively) is that experience teaching in an intensely multicultural environment such as the one found at BYU Hawaii is considered very positively when it appears on a faculty CV; our female and minority faculty are therefore in high demand if they choose to look for jobs elsewhere.

4. The team recommends that the institution make periodic reports to the campus community on the objectives of the strategic plan to affirm the progress that has been made. Given that the plan is due to expire in 2007, it would be timely to begin discussion of the next five-year plan for 2007-2012.

As noted above, since the team’s visit the university has undergone a change in leadership. Since the Capacity Review visit, the university has had a change in leadership. President Eric Shumway has been replaced by President Steven Wheelwright. President Wheelwright has eliminated the Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committee and replaced it with a President’s Advisory Council which consists of the President’s Council plus nine additional
members, most of whom were on the Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committee. This Council is intended to make the day to day decisions regarding university policies and also to act as the strategic decision making body of the university. The minutes of this Council will be posted on a web site accessible to all university employees to assure transparency and improve communication.

President Wheelwright’s mandate from the Board of Trustees has been to improve instruction and reduce costs. As a result, he has enlisted the services of a consultant to develop a university redesign team to design an organization that provides improved education in a more cost effective manner. The team was established in November and reports to a Steering Committee made up of the President’s Council. It should have some preliminary results available when the WASC team visits in March.
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### 7.1 Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Have formal learning outcomes been developed?</th>
<th>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</th>
<th>Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</th>
<th>Who interprets the evidence?</th>
<th>How are the findings used?</th>
<th>Date of last program review for this degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Department exam</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art 2-Dimensional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Student art show</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art 3-Dimensional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Student art show</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior seminar</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior seminar</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Winter 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS (licensure)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol Sciences-Pre Pr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>ACAT and Unifying Principles of Biology exams</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Required Course(s)</td>
<td>Evaluation Method</td>
<td>Review Process</td>
<td>Implementation Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Teacher Education</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS (licensure)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>MFAT in CS</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS (licensure)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Capstone research project, MFAT in English</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Education</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS (licensure)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXS - Exercise Science</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior project</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Winter 2006 (sched. 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXS - Physical Education</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS (licensure)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Winter 2006 (sched. 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i Studies</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior seminar, department exam</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Winter 2004 (sched. 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior seminar</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and Tourism Mgt</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Comprehensive portfolio; internship</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Winter 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS - Anthropology</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior seminar</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Winter 2005 (sched. 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS - Communications</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior seminar</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>Winter 2005 (sched. 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS - Humanities</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior seminar</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>National IC/Exam and Industry licensing exams</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>CAS dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Tools/Steps</td>
<td>Review Method</td>
<td>Purpose of Review</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern. Bus. Mgmt.</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Integrated business core; department exit exam</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>MFAT in Math; embedded course questions and rubrics</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Educ</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS (licensure)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS (licensure)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island Stud.</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>TBD (Combine w/ HIS)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>TBD (Combine w/ HIS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science Edu.</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS (licensure)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Pedagogy</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Student performance</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Internship evaluation; student papers</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior seminar</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Edu.</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS (licensure)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Senior Research Project, Field Practicum Assessment, BEAP Surveys</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>PRAXIS TESL exam; TESOL 480</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>Winter 2007 (w/ EIL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>TBO (AA degree)</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Studies</td>
<td>BYUH General Catalog, Dept. ePortfolio and several course syllabi</td>
<td>Student performance</td>
<td>Reviewed by department faculty and dean</td>
<td>To improve student learning and instruction</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators
## 8.1 Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of accredited or certificated program</th>
<th>Professional, special, state, or programmatic accreditation agency for this program</th>
<th>Date of most recent accreditation action by agency</th>
<th>Summary (&quot;bullet points&quot;) of key issues for continuing institutional attention identified in agency action letter or report</th>
<th>One performance indicator accepted by the agency; selected by program</th>
<th>For one indicator, provide 3 years' trend data, link to cell for graph if desired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (ELED, SCED, &amp; SPED)</td>
<td>Hawaii Teacher Standards Board (SATE Review)</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>See SATE Final Report of 2006 (School of Education report link)</td>
<td>Praxis II (Content Knowledge) for ELED see p. 34 of <a href="http://soe.byuh.edu/sate%20accreditation/Elementary%20Education.pdf">http://soe.byuh.edu/sate%20accreditation/Elementary%20Education.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>CSWE</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Requires more than minimum hours for field practicum; assess overall student performance relating to each objective; flow chart for assessment process</td>
<td>ACAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>Applying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business (ACCT, HTM &amp; IBM)</td>
<td>AACSB</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>Applying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Writing Assessment Rubric for GE Capstone Writing and Research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANALYSIS</strong></td>
<td>Inadequate. Writing does no more than list, report, or summarize information.</td>
<td>Weak. Writing uses information incorrectly or ineffectively evaluates that information.</td>
<td>Adequate. Writing offers some effective interpretation of the significance of the information.</td>
<td>Proficient. Writing analyzes and integrates information to provide insightful meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COHERENCE</strong></td>
<td>Inadequate. Writing has no apparent organization.</td>
<td>Weak. The thesis is not followed, or organization exists without an explicit thesis.</td>
<td>Adequate. Writing explicitly incorporates a thesis and structure.</td>
<td>Coherent. Writing flows from thesis to conclusion in properly constructed and logically sequenced paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE</strong></td>
<td>Inadequate. Serious problems in language.</td>
<td>Deficient. Problems in language which interfere with understanding.</td>
<td>Adequate. Minor Problems in language but which do not interfere with understanding</td>
<td>Proficient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>EMERGING (1)</th>
<th>COMPETENT (2)</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERY</td>
<td>Presenters seem uninvolved. Indifferent. Work is flat, stiff. All tell, no</td>
<td>Personality, flavor, style of presenters show sometimes. Pleasant, acceptable,</td>
<td>Confident, honest style gives viewer a clear sense of presenters' convictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>show. Anyone could have done it.</td>
<td>earnest, cautious, routine.</td>
<td>Natural language engages audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>Presenters take an unreflective and routine approach to the subject.</td>
<td>Presenters take a successful but ordinary approach to the subject.</td>
<td>Presenters analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and apply new knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little evidence of gaining new understandings.</td>
<td>Remain at knowledge level thinking.</td>
<td>They offer fresh and original insights. Evidence and examples keep viewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictable</td>
<td>involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>Order is confusing. The beginning and end are vague and undefined.</td>
<td>Order of presentation makes sense.</td>
<td>Clear direction moves audience through the presentation. Beginning gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning, middle, and end are obvious. Most details are in the right place.</td>
<td>attention. Details fit and build to main point. End provokes thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>Problems in grammar, word choice, pronunciation, or tone strongly distract</td>
<td>Presented in generally effective language. Only minor problems in grammar,</td>
<td>Presented in natural, smooth language. No distracting problems in grammar,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from or confuse presentation.</td>
<td>word choice, pronunciation, or tone.</td>
<td>word choice, pronunciation, or tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem Solving Rubric (PHSY 100).
Each of the outcomes was evaluated on a pass/fail basis. Each outcome area was given a 1 for a pass and a 0 for a fail. The following scoring system was adopted to simplify the assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT OUTCOMES</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student adequately identifies the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student states or implicitly understands the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background of the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student develops a plan to solve the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student outlines, clearly shows or develops a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model to solve the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student analyzes relevant information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student collects relevant information where</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possible and analyzes relevant information given in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interprets data and findings and uses them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to adequately solve the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student is able to use data and findings to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>create a logical solution to the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale:**
5 = All four major outcomes demonstrated satisfactorily with the student demonstrating a clear ability to use data and apply findings to present a logical solution to the problem.
4 = All four outcomes demonstrate adequately.
3 = Three major outcomes demonstrated.
2 = Two major outcomes demonstrated.
1 = One major outcome demonstrated.
APPENDIX G
Information System Department Assessment Report, 2005-2006
## Information Systems Department Assessment Report, 2005-2006

### Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will demonstrate a broad background in all facets of information systems. (IS 110)</td>
<td>• 50% of students in IS 110 will double their score or reduce their error rate by 50% on knowledge of information systems concepts (pretest to posttest).</td>
<td>FA 32/49 did, WI 33/34 did, SP 17/23 did, YR 82/118 did = 69% success</td>
<td>Raise the bar: Expect 75% who pass IS 110 will cut their error rate in half. Expect 30% of graduating students to score 50% or above on the ISA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20% of all graduating IS students will score at or above the 50th percentile on the national ISA exam.</td>
<td>FA 5/20 did, WI 3/11 did, SP 4/15 did, SU 0/3 did, YR 12/49 did = 24% Note: 50thile is about 47.7% score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student will demonstrate proficiency with modern personal computer hardware and operating systems (IS 250)</td>
<td>• 25% of the IS 250L class will take the A+ HW test and 50% of them will pass the test at a certification level.</td>
<td>YR 4/63 tested, 3/4 passed Too few tested.</td>
<td>Restructure the way in which top students are tested so that more top students get involved. Goal: 25% of students who pass IS 250L will score 90 on TestOut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To pass IS 250L each student will participate in a Service Learning Project, successfully diagnosing and repairing a computer that was brought in for repair.</td>
<td>YES (all)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students will set up and operate a local area network and network services. (IS 386/389)</td>
<td>• To pass IS 389 each student will correctly use unassembled network pieces to make a working network.</td>
<td>In teams, students successfully built working networks many times during the semester using Cisco switches and routers.</td>
<td>Remove the focus from this outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To pass IS 386 each student will correctly create user accounts and assign network resources for a typical network.</td>
<td>YES (all)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students will demonstrate proficiency in at least one modern, computer programming language. (CS 201)</td>
<td>• 90% of the IS majors in CS 201 will complete the simplified “shopping cart” project (manager) to published specifications.</td>
<td>FA 7/16 did (across all majors) WI 22/36 did, SP 19/32 did, YR 48/84 did = 57% success</td>
<td>Count IS majors only, not all majors; findings at left don’t separate majors. Restrict assessment to those earning a C- or better in the class. Reduce (manager) goal to 80% Reduce (shopcart) goal to 25% Continue to focus on this outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 50% of the IS majors in CS 201 will complete the full “shopping cart” project (shopcart) to published specifications.</td>
<td>FA 4/16 did, WI 11/36 did, SP 3/32 did, YR 18/84 did = 21% success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will demonstrate a broad background in all facets of information systems.</td>
<td>1.1 75% of students who pass IS 110 will cut their error rate in half (pretest to posttest) on knowledge of information systems concepts.</td>
<td>Overall, 77% (51/66) met this goal: Fall 2006, 71% (27/38); and Winter 2007, 86% (24/28).</td>
<td>Continue to assess;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 30% of all graduating IS students will pass the national ISA exam (score 50% or above).</td>
<td>28% of the graduating IS students (17 of 60) passed the national ISA exam with a score of 50% or above.</td>
<td>Continue to assess IS 110 Students using pretest and posttest. Provide students with additional test preparation resources, such as vocabulary lists, to assist in preparation for the ISA exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student will demonstrate proficiency with modern personal computer hardware and operating systems (IS 250L)</td>
<td>2.1 25% of students who earn C- or more in the IS 250L class will score 90% or above on TestOut ExamSim.</td>
<td>Overall, 44% (21/48) students met this goal, as follows: Fall 2006, 38% (11/29), and for Winter 2007, 53% (10/19).</td>
<td>The assessment is now part of IS 254 and will continue in the next academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 100% of the students who pass IS 250L will participate in a Service Learning Project, successfully diagnosing and repairing a computer that was brought in for repair.</td>
<td>All IS 250L students participated in a Service Learning project to diagnose and repair personal computers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students will demonstrate proficiency in at least one modern, computer programming language. (CS 201)</td>
<td>3.1 80% of majors who earn C- or more in CS 201 will complete the inventory control project to simplified “manager” specifications.</td>
<td>32% (8/25) in 2006-2007; 51% (19/37) in 2005-2006; 70% (26/37) in 2004-2005. The trend is going in the wrong direction.</td>
<td>Review who taught and what was taught in CS 101 the previous term. Review the data for accuracy; work with the tutoring staff to improve the completion rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 25% of majors who earn C- or more in CS 201 will complete the inventory control project to more difficult “shopcart” specifications.</td>
<td>4% (1/25) in 2006-2007; 22% (8/37) in 2005-2006; 32% (12/37) in 2004-2005.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Set up and operate local area networks and network services.</td>
<td>4.1 100% of IS 250L students will set up and operate a local area network (LAN).</td>
<td>This activity did not get integrated into the curriculum for the IS 250L course.</td>
<td>The IS 250L assessment was moved to IS 280 and will be reassessed in 2007-2008. The IS 386 assessment will continue as we move toward the goal of 100%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 100% of students who elect to take IS 386 will complete all 138 tasks that have been identified as necessary to setup and manage a network server environment.</td>
<td>The goal was achieved by 70% (26/39) of the students as follows: Fall 2006, 50% (8/16); Winter 2007, 92% (12/13); Spring 2007, 75% (6/8). The remainder of the students completed most of the tasks (&gt;90%), but not all of them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I
Multi-year Assessment Plan - Information Systems Major
# Multi-Year Assessment Plan

## Information Systems Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate a broad background in all facets of information systems.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National ISA exam. Is 410 (Dept. exam to be developed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate proficiency with modern personal computer hardware and operating systems.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS 307 assignment. Is 307 project (rubric).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Set up and operate local area networks and network services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS 280 assignment. Is practicum W / IT services (rubric).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrate proficiency in at least one modern, computer programming language.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS 201 assignment. Capstone assignment (IS410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Design normalized database structures to match organizational realities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>IS 350 assignment (rubric). Capstone assignment (IS410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Understand the fundamentals of business or another target environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Track environment GPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work effectively with others to solve problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Team assignment in IS409 (rubric). Student Group Evaluation (rubric).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Communicate proficiently both orally and in writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ENGL315 paper. Oral presentation and documentation (IS410).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Obtain appropriate industry certifications such as A+, MSCE, CCNA, and RHCT.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>At least 50% of graduating IS students will pass a certification exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments/Reflection:** Department will review the course syllabi to determine the alignment of course objectives with department outcomes and to determine assessments imbedded in key IS courses.
APPENDIX J
2001-2006 Summary of EIL Annual Assessment Plans
## 2001-2006 Summary of EIL Annual Assessment Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Means of Assessment</th>
<th>Results Summary 2001-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Demonstrate understanding of the essential points and most details in an academic reading passage.</strong></td>
<td>70% of the students who complete the reading component of the EIL program will obtain a score of 70% or higher on a locally produced reading test.</td>
<td>Moved from 32% to 86% of students reaching the 70%-90% goal; tests were not the same for all administrations; tests continually analyzed and improved; instruction now aligned more closely to objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their level of preparation in reading as good, very good, or excellent.</td>
<td>Survey questions modified when online version created; 78% of students '03-'05 rated reading preparation as described; '02 results extremely positive: 90% felt EIL prepared them well or very well overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Demonstrate the appropriate level of competence in academic writing on both the rhetorical and syntactic levels.</strong></td>
<td>70% of the students who complete the writing component of the EIL program will obtain a score of 5/6 or higher on the EIL Program writing exam OR will receive a 70% or higher on their writing course final exam.</td>
<td>Program writing exam results moved from 44% to 80% meeting the goal; then down to 58% when course finals were introduced and students had to pass only one or the other; close to 100% passing writing final, so pass rate moved to 80%; instruction focused more on objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their level of preparation in writing as good, very good, or excellent.</td>
<td>76% of students '03-'05 rated writing preparation as described; '02 results extremely positive: 90% felt EIL prepared them well or very well overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Successfully handle most communicative tasks in academic situations.</strong></td>
<td>70% of the students who complete the listening/speaking component of the EIL program will obtain a score of 70% or higher on the speaking task test.</td>
<td>33% initially achieved goal on SPEAK assessment; increased to 66%; nearly 100% reached goal when group discussion test used; modified to iBT type test and 84% reached goal '05-'06; instruction now aligned more with course objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their level of preparation in speaking as good, very good, or excellent.</td>
<td>74% of students '03-'05 rated speaking preparation as described; '02 results extremely positive: 90% felt EIL prepared them well or very well overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Comprehend the main ideas and most details of extended academic oral discourse.</strong></td>
<td>70% of the students who complete the listening/speaking component of the EIL program will achieve a score of 70% or higher on a locally produced listening test based on an academic lecture from which students take notes and answer questions.</td>
<td>Listening test results have been low overall – 36%-63% achieving the goal; test analyzed and revised; passing score lowered to 65%; 85% of students achieved 65% in '05-'06; instruction becoming more focused on course objectives and desired outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their level of preparation in listening as good, very good, or excellent.</td>
<td>75% of students '03-'05 rated listening preparation as described; '02 results extremely positive: 90% felt EIL prepared them well or very well overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Recognize the value of the EIL program in assisting them with the English language proficiencies necessary for success at the University.</strong></td>
<td>70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their overall experience in EIL, the quality of teaching in EIL, and the level of preparation provided by the EIL program as good, very good, or excellent. 70% will slightly agree, agree, or strongly agree that the length of time spent in the program was appropriate. Students who took EIL classes and are now in their senior year will indicate that they have largely positive views towards the EIL program and the level of preparation they received. This will be determined through focus groups.</td>
<td>From '01-'02: 86.5% felt EIL prepared them well or very well; 81.5% felt prepared or very prepared; 78% felt EIL contributed to success; 76% rated overall EIL experience positively; ('01-'02 survey different format and questions) From '03-'05: 76% rated overall experience as indicated to the left; 75% rated quality of teaching as indicated; 75% rated level of preparation as indicated; 75% rated length of time as indicated. Focus groups '04 and '05: positive comments related to value of program, quality of teaching; complaints related to placement and advancement criteria, quality of teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K
Summary of Data Collection and Key Findings for L2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>Online survey asking L2 students about their English usage on and off campus, estimation of their English skills, and their response to proposed support programming. Domestic students were asked about social interactions with L2 students, academic standards, views towards L2 students, and future directions.</td>
<td>449 second language students (46.5% response rate)</td>
<td>1. L2 students perceive that they use English in academic and social situations to a greater extent than anecdotal data suggests; however, they perceive their use of English to be more extensive in academic situations than social. 2. L2 students perceive that their English is adequate and meets their needs; they feel their English has improved over the course of their studies at the university. 3. L2 students feel comfortable using English with domestic students, and report that their English skills have improved through employment, social interactions, EIL courses, other course work, and religious activities; they report some difficulty making close friends with native speakers. 4. L2 students support initiatives related to receiving additional English help with GE classes, increased use of English at work, and having native speaker study partners; less popular ideas are required English language tests (post-EIL) and additional EIL requirements. 5. Domestic student responses show some ignorance about language acquisition. Those who are more informed tend to be returned missionaries with language learning experience. A strongly held view is that L2 students need to associate more with native speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>112 domestic students (31.3% response rate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Focus Groups</td>
<td>Students were asked about their goals for learning English, English development on campus, and future goals. Conducted by an L2 student from Asia.</td>
<td>36 second language students in their senior year (20% response rate); 27 Asian; 6 Pacific Island; 3 Other</td>
<td>1. Few have goals related to English language learning upon coming to campus; their goal is to obtain a degree. 2. Students recognize their weaknesses with English but are generally satisfied. 3. Most feel that associating with peers of similar language backgrounds inhibit their English development. They recommend associating outside of their L2 groups but sometimes find this uncomfortable. 4. Most see the value of English and expect to use it in their futures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey</td>
<td>Online survey focused on alumni satisfaction with various aspects of their experience at the university and how it has contributed to their careers and personal lives.</td>
<td>773 (31.9% response rate); of these, 190 or 24.7% were second language speakers</td>
<td>Most L2 alumni feel their English skills were adequate (i.e., had some weaknesses but managed to get along) when they entered the university; a large majority felt their English skills were very strong when they left the university (i.e., no problems communicating in English).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collected</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Survey</td>
<td>The survey covered the following areas: estimation of L2 students' language abilities, impact of having L2 students in classes, faculty efforts to help L2 students improve, future possibilities for faculty training, institutional efforts to help L2 students improve, and future institutional possibilities.</td>
<td>93 full and part-time faculty (51% response rate)</td>
<td>1. Faculty feel L2 students are generally competitive with native English speakers in their classes. 2. They feel the English skills of the majority of L2 students is adequate, but there is always room for improvement. 3. They do not perceive that they are compromising the rigor of their course work to accommodate L2 students. 4. They demonstrate sensitivity to L2 students in that they adjust their pedagogy and provide needed support in and outside of the classroom. 5. Faculty are generally not interested in training to learn more about language acquisition or pedagogical methods for L2 students; they strongly support outside services where they can send their students for needed help. These could include discipline-specific language aids and general support to strengthen specific skills such as writing, reading, and speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2005</td>
<td>Three faculty focus groups were held. Purpose was to provide a verbal and written overview of findings and invite discussion related to issues such as: 1) Based on the findings, is there a problem with English language proficiency/intercultural learning at the university? 2) Who is responsible for addressing these issues (i.e., faculty, students)? 3) What should be done to support English language learning goals and how?</td>
<td>Focus group one = 36 participants; focus group two = 28 participants; focus group three was a faculty meeting = 60 (23-51% response rate)</td>
<td>1. Faculty feel that a language plan is needed and that faculty buy-in is critical to its success. 2. They see the need to communicate the vision of improved English skills to all on campus, especially students. 3. Faculty do not have sufficient time to focus on students' English skills but feel improved skills are needed. The language plan should include strengthened support services on campus, some of which could include discipline-specific support materials and tutoring; students should be supported through their regular course work as much as possible rather than in separate classes. 4. Cultural issues affecting success must be addressed. 5. No students should be excused from testing for admission. 6. The language plan must be generously funded; it must be state of the art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Focus Groups</td>
<td>Four separate groups have been tested with the Institutional TOEFL at varying times. The Institutional TOEFL is a measure of overall language proficiency.</td>
<td>L2 administrations to seniors: 2004 Dec '04 &amp; April/June '05 grads. = 26 (28% response rate) 2005 April/June '05 grads. = 32 (40% response rate) 2005 Dec. '05 &amp; April/June '06 grads. = 61 (56% response rate) Total n = 119</td>
<td>EIL records demonstrate that on average, students enter the university with a mean TOEFL score of 489. The three EIL test administrations of the TOEFL indicate that students complete EIL with a mean score of 523. The L2 administrations to seniors indicate that students graduate from the university with a mean score of 559. (2005 = 551; 2005 = 565; 2006 = 554)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L
Key Findings Summary from the 2005 Survey
Future Possibilities for Faculty
- Show more interest in knowing about their students’ cultural backgrounds than they do about their languages or language learning in general
- Show very strong interest in outside of class help being made available for their students such as tutoring and study groups
- Somewhat support technology assisted learning materials for student use outside of class

Institutional Efforts to Help
- Somewhat agree that the institution should raise the admissions requirement on the TOEFL
- Somewhat disagree that the EIL exit requirement should be lowered
- Somewhat agree that the EIL exit requirement should be raised
- Implementing an English only policy is somewhat disagreeable to faculty
- Focusing on motivational strategies to get students to improve on their own accord is an agreeable concept

Future Institutional Possibilities
- Show support for institutional efforts outside of class that will improve students’ English skills:
  - Organize mixed languages work teams to encourage use of English
  - Offer additional English help for students while enrolled in GE/major classes
  - Pair ESL and native speakers as study partners

Estimation of Skills
- Students’ English skills are adequate
- Somewhat disagree that the University should not be satisfied with the students’ level of English
- It is the students’ responsibility to improve their English
- Very few – some ESL students have difficulty expressing themselves clearly in class.
- By the time ESL students reach upper division courses their English skills are generally quite strong

Impact of ESL Students in Class
- Somewhat agree that English skills should be raised before enrolling in GE classes
- Not enough time to do much about the quality of ESL students’ English in their GE and major classes
- Somewhat agree that English language teaching is primarily the responsibility of the EIL and English teachers
- Tend to think that having many ESL students in their classes does not affect the way they teach
- Seldom adjust the depth and difficulty of their content to accommodate ESL students

Faculty Efforts to Help
- Seldom if ever select easier reading assignments because there may be many ESL students in class
- Sometimes intentionally create assignments or create small groups to help ESL students improve English
- Use a variety of good teaching practices such as using visual aids to help ESL students improve

Key Findings Summary