ASSESSMENT REPORTING TEMPLATE

Complete this template if your program already has results from a program assessment activity.

Name:
Program Name: Aerospace Studies (Air Force ROTC)
Unit:
UH User Name: afrotc@hawaii.edu
Phone: 956-7762

1. List the program’s student learning outcomes.

   Department’s learning outcomes consist of two major components, academics and leadership training, with fitness training and conditioning as adjunct areas.

   The learning outcomes and their assessment are externally controlled. Air Force Holm Center Accessions and Citizen Development dictates specific learning outcomes to ensure that 144 Aerospace Studies Departments at different universities across the country have a common academic and leadership approach.

2. Where are your program’s student learning outcomes published?

   (Mark all that apply and include URLs when appropriate)
   [X ] Website. URL: http://www.hawaii.edu/aerospace/curriculum.html
   [ ] Student Handbook. URL, if available online:
   [X] Information Sheet, Flyer, or Brochure. URL, if available online:
   [ ] UHM Catalog. Page Number:
   [ ] Other:
   [ ] Other:

3. Provide the program’s activity map or other graphic that illustrates how program activities/services align with program student learning outcomes.

   The activity map below shows two routes (4-year and 3-year) for completion the leadership courses required, successful completion of officer field training and the star at the end denotes successful completion of our program, which equates to becoming a commission Air Force Officer
To make the annual reports more meaningful and useful, please base your responses to questions 4-13 on assessment activities that took place between June 2009 and September 2010.

4. **State the assessment question(s) and/or goals of the assessment activity. Include the student learning outcomes that were targeted, if applicable.**

   **What did the program want to find out?**

   Ultimate assessment of success/goal in meeting learning outcomes is the qualification of students to become commissioned Air Force officers.

5. **State the type(s) of evidence gathered**

   To assess the student learning outcome(s) or answer the assessment question, what evidence was collected?

   **Quantitative:** There are multiple leadership positions, practical exercises, field training, academics and fitness requirements a student must complete throughout the program to ensure the desired outcomes are achieved (i.e. what we expect of a Lieutenant in the US Air Force). If they do not meet these requirements/desired outcomes they will not become commissioned officers.

   **Qualitative:** The department also uses end-of-term surveys and the UHM CAFÉ surveys to assess student perspectives and Holm Center instructor surveys to determine the effectiveness of curriculum on meeting learning outcomes.

6. **List the person/people who interpreted or analyzed the evidence that was collected.**

   Examples: program staff; faculty committee; advisory board; graduate students; external organization/evaluators

   Department Chair along with the Aerospace Studies Assistant Professors within the program, analyze the data and methodically evaluate each student based on factors/outcomes addressed but not totally encompassed in question 5.
Ultimately, as these Lieutenants step into the US Air Force, both ranks above and below will provide feedback on the ability of these new leaders.

7. How did he/she/they evaluate, analyze, or interpret the evidence?

   *What method was used to evaluate, analyze, or interpret the evidence?*

   Examples: Compiled survey results; used qualitative methods to compile interview, focus group, or other open-ended response data; used a rubric or scoring criteria; used a scoring key on exams; used their professional judgment (no rubric or scoring key used); external organization/person analyzed data.

   *Quantitative data was collected through student performance; in the form of academic grades, physical fitness scores, Aerospace Studies class performance and Commander’s ranking. With that said, most of the data is quantitative which equates to the highest scores being optimal.*

   *Additionally, the department is subjected to external inspection by various levels of headquarters staffs to ensure compliance with the learning outcomes. The results of these external inspections supplement internal department reviews.*

8. State how many persons (e.g., students, clients) submitted evidence that was evaluated (e.g., state the sample size).

   *If applicable, please include the sampling technique used.*

   The average size of the Cadet Wing during the given period was approximately 100 cadets. *Quantitative and Qualitative data was collected through feedback and student performance; in the form of academic grades, physical fitness scores, Aerospace Studies class performance and Commander’s ranking.*

9. Summarize the actual results.

   *Results of the learning outcomes, during the specified time period, produced 15 Air Force Second Lieutenants.*

10. What was learned from the results?

    *That the commission rate (goal) can be increased with focusing more attention on attracting highly qualified (high SAT/ACT scores, physical training scores, and motivation to serve the country) candidates.*
11. Use of results/program modifications:
   State how the program used the results
   --or--
   Explain planned use of results
   Please be specific.

Assessment data is used in a continuous improvement process. Data is fed back to the Holm Center to improve curriculum, evaluation techniques and data. The review board at the Holm Center convenes annually for adjustments to the nation-wide AFROTC program. These adjustments are based off of a bottom up approach along with feedback from first line supervisors in the Air Force on what we are expecting from Lieutenants as young leaders. The feedback loop is essential in improving both the program at the University of Hawaii and other programs around the nation.

12. Reflect on the assessment process.

   Is there anything related to assessment procedures your program would do differently next time? What went well?

   All facets of the assessment went well and the department will conduct the assessment in the same matter next year unless a new progressive process is revealed.

13. Other important information

   None