AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

Provider/Program Name:	Hawaii Pacific University
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or “n/a” if not yet accredited):	6/30/2028

© Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation – 2025

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs included in its AAQEP review.

Hawai‘i Pacific University's School of Education develops professional educators and leaders who are reflective practitioners dedicated to the scholarship of teaching, school renewal, and leading positive change. Its degree programs are based on standards-driven, field-based, and inquiry-oriented curricula that employ cutting-edge educational technology to integrate content and pedagogy. Employing an electronic portfolio-based assessment system, university faculty and mentor teachers guide the candidate's progress in achieving professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

The School of Education offers the following degree programs:

Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education (BAEED)

Master of Education in Elementary Education (MEDEE)

Master of Education in Secondary Education (MEDSE)

Licensure only programs

The School of Education degree and licensure programs (Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education, Master of Education in Elementary Education, and Master of Education in Secondary Education) prepare candidates to become competent, caring, and professional educators through classroom discussions and field experiences. Teacher candidates learn in small classes and enjoy individualized attention by university faculty and mentor teachers. Teacher candidates complete core and field experience courses as well as the capstone clinical practice (student teaching) courses in the State of Hawaii. Masters and Licensure Only programs are now offered online as well as in-seat.

Hawaii Pacific University’s School of Education is recognized by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) as a State Approved Teacher Education Program (SATEP). Approved licensure fields are: Elementary Education (K-6), English (6-12), Math (6-12), Social Studies (6-12), Science (6-12), World Languages (6-12), and TESOL (6-12). As required by the HTSB, teacher candidates must demonstrate content knowledge prior to student teaching by either passing the Praxis exam in the content area or satisfying a credit hour requirement in the content area. Student teaching is required to be completed in the

State of Hawaii with 450 hours of clinical practice. Teacher candidates are encouraged to stay and teach within the State of Hawaii, however, the teaching license awarded by the HTSB is transferrable to other states.

Public Posting URL

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members filing this report must post at least Part I):

https://www.hpu.edu/cps/education/index.html

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data, disaggregated by program and license/certificate, for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2024-2025

Degree or Program offered by the institution/organization	**Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential** granted by the state	**Number of Candidates Enrolled** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/25)	**Number of Completers** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/25)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials			
Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education	Elementary Education (K-6)	21	4
Master of Education in Elementary Education	Elementary Education (K-6)	8	2
Master of Education in Secondary Education	English (6-12) Math (6-12) Science (6-12) Social Studies (6-12)	4 3 2 5	3 1 1 1

	World Languages (6-12) TESOL (6-12)	0	0
Licensure Only: Alternative Pathway/Option B	Elementary Education (K-6) Secondary Science (6-12) TESOL (6-12)	0	0
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		0	0
Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators			
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		0	0
Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials			
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials		0	0
Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential			
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials		0	0
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		43	12
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		43	12

Added or Discontinued Programs

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

No changes were made this school year.

3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

A. **Total enrollment** in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.

43

B. **Total number of unique completers** (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.

12

C. **Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.

12

D. **Cohort completion rates** for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe **and** in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.

2024-25 Completer Data				
Program	Initial Cohort		Completion Rate (100% Time)	Completion Rate (150% Time)
Bachelor of Education in Elementary Education (4-year program)	21*		4/21 = 19.04 %	5/21 = 23.8%
Master of Education in Elementary Education (12-month program)	8		2/8 = 25%	7/8 = 87.5%
Master of Education in Secondary Education (12-month program)	14		6/14 = 42.9%	9/14 = 64.3%
Licensure Only Pathways (1 semester to 12 months)	0		N/A	N/A

*Represents a 2-year program, the remaining students will be graduating the following year.

E. **Summary of state license examination results**, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.

Due to the nature of our programs being so small with cohorts typically ranging from 5-20 students, most Title II pass rates are not reported. Additionally, the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) allows for Content Knowledge to be demonstrated by Content Knowledge Exam and/or satisfactory completion of credit hours in the content area. All teacher candidates are required to satisfy the content knowledge requirement prior to beginning student teaching.

For 2024-25, due to the size of our Program, the Title II Pass Rates are not tabulated for less than 10 candidates. We anticipate increasing the number of enrolled students next year, in essence having more accurate data to reflect.

Below is a table that indicates the number of students in each program that complete the content knowledge requirement via content exam and by course credit in the content area for 2024:

Program	# of Completers	Content Area	# Completing Exam	# Completing Coursework
Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Ed.	4	English Math Social Studies Science	2 3 2 4	2 1 2 0
Master of Arts in Elementary Ed.	2	English Math Social Studies Science	1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1
Master of Arts in Secondary Ed.	6	English (6-12) Math (6-12) Social Studies (6-12) Science (6-12) World Languages (6-12) TESOL (6-12)	0 0 0 0 0 0	3 1 1 1 0 0
Licensure Only Pathways	0	Elementary Education (K-6) Science (6-12) TESOL (6-12)	0 0 0	0 0 0

F. Explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

According to data from the 2024-25 Exit Survey data from last year's graduates, completers reported relatively high degrees of self-confidence in preparation of the InTASC standards. The mode of the distribution of responses are at the highest score (4) except for InTASC standard 3: Learning Environments, where the mode was split between the highest two scores (3 and 4). Although the survey is anonymous, the pattern of responses suggests that 2 out of the 8 respondents responded with a score of 2 and, in one instance (InTASC standard 9), a score of 1. These low scores are probably in part due to courses taught by inexperienced adjunct instructors, and part to changing characteristics of younger students that our program did not adequately support. We will examine the courses that had low scores and examine and examine how we can better support students. In one instance, we have already begun to act in this regard. InTASC standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice involves the writing of an action research plan. This course was taught by an adjunct instructor that was not ready to differentiate instruction and provide support for the changing needs of younger students. In response, this year, a more experienced instructor was assigned to teach the course, and students were much better supported in creating the artifact for this standard. We expect the score for this standard to be improved in our report next year.

Summary of Exit Survey

12 completers were requested to complete the survey; six complied. The data below has N = 8.

InTASC Standard	Average	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
1) Learner Development	3.8	4	4	3.8
2) Learning Differences	3.8	4	4	3.8
3) Learning Environments	3.5	3.5	3,4	3.5
4) Content Knowledge	3.6	4	4	3.6
5) Application of Content	3.8	4	4	3.8
6) Assessment	3.4	3.5	4	3.4
7) Planning Instruction	3.5	4	4	3.5
8) Instructional Strategies	3.8	4	4	3.8
9) Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	3.4	4	4	3.4
10) Leadership and Collaboration	3.4	4	4	3.4

G. Explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.
Unfortunately, we do not have Principal Survey data from the 2024-2025 academic year. We are still in the process of working on collecting this data during the current year.
H. Explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.
According to our data, 9 out of the 12 completers in 2024 are currently employed. Unfortunately, we were unable to collect data from some of our completers, so it is likely that this number is an underestimate. As noted below in our action items and in our 2020 QAR, a weakness of our program has been the collection of data from completers and alumni.
I. Explanation of how the **staffing capacity** for program delivery and administration and quality assurance system monitoring have changed during the reporting year, if at all, and how capacity matches the current size of the program.
The staffing capacity did not change for the 2024-25 Academic Year.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures (3 to 5 measures for each standard) of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for performance (criteria for success) and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance

<table>
<tr><th>Provider-selected measures (name and description)</th><th>Criteria for success</th><th>Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation</th></tr>
<tr><td>Student Teaching Evaluations</td><td>One of the core indicators of achievement of program targets is the teaching evaluation. In all of our programs, we perform 4 teaching evaluations for each teacher candidate (2 by the mentor teacher, 2 by the university instructor). We use a rubric based on the Charlotte Danielson Framework that examines the following 5 components of instruction:
2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning
2d: Managing Student Behavior
3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
3c: Engaging Students in Learning
3d: Using Assessment in Instruction
The rubric identifies 4 levels of performance:
Unsatisfactory (1 point)
Basic (2 points)
Proficient (3 points)
Distinguished (4 points)</td><td>Score Distribution for BAEED<table><tr><th>Student ID</th><th>Average Score</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3.3</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>3.2</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>3.0</td></tr><tr><td>Mean</td><td>3.3</td></tr><tr><td>Median</td><td>3.3</td></tr><tr><td>Std. Dev.</td><td>0.18</td></tr></table>Score Distribution for MEDEE<table><tr><th>Student ID</th><th>Average Score</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2.8</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>2.8</td></tr><tr><td>Mean</td><td>2.8</td></tr><tr><td>Median</td><td>2.8</td></tr><tr><td>Std. Dev.</td><td>0.01</td></tr></table>Score Distribution for MEDSE<table><tr><th>Student ID</th><th>Average Score</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>3.2</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3.1</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>3.0</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

	We assigned points to each level of performance (see list above). As a guideline, for a student to pass a teaching evaluation, we require them to get an overall average score of 2.5 or above, which roughly indicates that the student teacher is performing more at the proficient level rather than the basic level. However, depending on contextual factors (e.g. pre-existing problems and/or difficulties the school), a lower score would be acceptable after the examiner establishes that the lower score is more attributable to the context rather than the student's instructional ability and readiness. Generally, the scores by the mentor teachers' evaluations are similar to those by the university instructors.	<table><tr><td>4</td><td>2.9</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>2.7</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>2.4</td></tr><tr><td>Mean</td><td>2.9</td></tr><tr><td>Median</td><td>2.9</td></tr><tr><td>Std. Dev.</td><td>0.26</td></tr></table>

	The data at right are from program completers between August 26, 2024 (beginning of the Fall 2024 term) and August 24, 2025 (end of the Summer 2025 term). They include data from the Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education (BAEED), Master of Education in Elementary Education (MEDEE) and Master of Education in Secondary Education (MEDSE). There was a total of 4 BAEED completers, 2 MEDEE completers, and 6 MEDSE completers. The data show that all but one candidate received a passing score (2.5 or better). The one candidate that was outside of this range had an average score of 2.4, just barely below this guideline. It is our judgement that this low score was caused by the atypical assignment of scores by the mentor teacher. Based on our past experiences, we believe that this candidate would have achieved a score at or above 2.5 had his mentor teacher scored more in line with the typical mentor teacher. The average is in the range of 2.8 – 3.3, which corresponds to a proficient level of teaching, which is considered moderately beyond expectations for student teachers that receive clinical training for 1-2 semesters.	

<table>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Teacher candidates can demonstrate their content knowledge via the following means:
1. Praxis Content Knowledge Test
2. Alternative test accepted by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board (HTSB)
3. College Coursework

BAEED students generally demonstrate their content knowledge by taking the Praxis Content Knowledge tests for Elementary Education (Test 5002 – Reading & Langauge Arts / Test 5003 – Mathematics / Test 5004 – Social Studies / Test 5005 – Science). They do, however, have an option of using college credits to serve as alternative evidence. If a student gets at least 9 college credits in a given subject area, with at least 3 of them upper division, they are eligible to use these credits instead of the subject area test.</td>
<td>BAEED – Evidence of Content Knowledge
<table><tr><th>Student ID</th><th>Average Margin</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>12.5</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>6</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>MEDEE – Evidence of Content Knowledge
<table><tr><th>Student ID</th><th>Evidence Used</th><th>Margin</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Praxis</td><td>30</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>College Credits</td><td>N/A</td></tr></table>MEDSE – Evidence of Content Knowledge
<table><tr><th>Student ID</th><th>Subject</th><th>Credential</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Chemistry (5246)</td><td>Course work</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Mathematics (5165)</td><td>Course work</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>English Language Arts: Content Knowledge (5038)</td><td>Course work</td></tr></table></td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of the 4 completers, 3 used the four subject area tests, while one student used course work for Reading & Language Arts and Social Studies and the test for the remaining two subjects. As a measure of students' test performance, we use the margin beyond the minimum passing score averaged over all subject areas. The result is shown on the right. Two students passed within 10 points of the threshold, while the remaining passed with more than this margin.

For the MEDEE cohort, one student used college credits, while the other took the Praxis test. She passed with an average margin of 30 points.

All 6 MEDSE completers used college credits to satisfy the content knowledge requirement.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Social Studies: Content Knowledge (5081)</td><td>Course work</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>English Language Arts: Content Knowledge (5038)</td><td>Course work</td></tr>
<tr><td>6</td><td>English Language Arts: Content Knowledge (5038)</td><td>Course work</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Teacher candidates can demonstrate their content knowledge via the following means:
4. Praxis Content Knowledge Test
5. Alternative test accepted by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board (HTSB)
6. College Coursework</td>
<td>BAEED – Evidence of Content Knowledge

<table>
<tr><th>Student ID</th><th>Average Margin</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>12.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>12</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

BAEED students generally demonstrate their content knowledge by taking the Praxis Content Knowledge tests for Elementary Education (Test 5002 – Reading & Langauge Arts / Test 5003 – Mathematics / Test 5004 – Social Studies / Test 5005 – Science). They do, however, have an option of using college credits to serve as alternative evidence. If a student gets at least 9 college credits in a given subject area, with at least 3 of them upper division, they are eligible to use these credits instead of the subject area test.
Of the 4 completers, 3 used the four subject area tests, while one student used course work for Reading & Language Arts and Social Studies and the test for the remaining two subjects. As a measure of students' test performance, we use the margin beyond the minimum passing score averaged over all subject areas. The result is shown on the right. Two students passed within 10 points of the threshold, while the remaining passed with more than this margin.

For the MEDEE cohort, one student used college credits, while the other took the Praxis test. She passed with an average margin of 30 points.

3	6
4	5

MEDEE – Evidence of Content Knowledge

Student ID	Evidence Used	Margin
1	Praxis	30
2	College Credits	N/A

MEDSE – Evidence of Content Knowledge

Student ID	Subject	Credential
1	Chemistry (5246)	Course work
2	Mathematics (5165)	Course work
3	English Language Arts: Content Knowledge (5038)	Course work
4	Social Studies: Content Knowledge (5081)	Course work
5	English Language Arts: Content Knowledge (5038)	Course work
6	English Language Arts: Content Knowledge (5038)	Course work

	All 6 MEDSE completers used college credits to satisfy the content knowledge requirement.	
Professionalism Survey	Mentor teachers are surveyed twice during the semester regarding the professionalism of student teachers assigned to them. The areas of professionalism examined are: • Punctuality • Engagement • Preparedness • Collaboration • Communication Mentor teachers are requested to evaluate students on a 10-point scale based on a rubric provided with the survey, with 10 points being very professional, whereas 0 corresponds to unprofessional. The data at right are of program completers between August 26, 2024 (beginning of the Fall 2024 term) and August 24, 2025 (end of the Summer 2025 term). The empty cells shaded in orange are those for which we did not get a response from the mentor teacher. (We urge mentor teachers to complete the evaluations, but some do not.)	

	We define a "successful outcome" using the final criteria: • Both survey scores are perfect (10 out of 10) • The change in score (from first to second) is positive. For the purpose of determining the percentage of successful outcomes, we exclude those cases in which responses are missing. Using this metric, we find the following: • The BAEED program has 100% success rate • The MEDEE program has 100% success rate • The MEDSE program has 60% success rate For the MEDSE program, there were two completers who had a slight decrease in the score (−0.1 points), but both scores were in the 9.0 to 9.9 range. This is consistent with a high performance for this metric.	

	Looking at the cases where only one survey was available, 2 of the 3 had a score in the 9.0-9.9 range, and one was in the 8.0-8.9 range. If we consider the 9.0-9.9 scores as high performance, we get the following assessment of student performance with respect to professionalism: • The BAEED program has 100% success rate • The MEDEE program has 50% success rate • The MEDSE program has 100% success rate The MEDEE rate decreased by 50%, but this is a reflection of the very low statistics ($N = 2$).	

Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
Embedded Assessment for InTASC Standard 2: Culture-Based Sail Plan	The Culture-Based Sail Plan is an assessment that is aligned with AAQEP Standard 2b: Engage in culturally responsive practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts. The score for this assessment is a measure of our completers'	**BAEED** Out of the 4 undergraduate completers 2 received 850 out of 900 (94%) and the remaining 2 received 800 out of 900 (89%). **MEDEE**

	achievement of this standard. The data are shown in the next column. Our interpretation of the results is that, by and large, students demonstrate solid achievement of instructional planning for diverse students using culturally responsive approaches. Those who received less than perfect scores were above 89%, indicating that they missed perfect scores for relatively minor issues.	Out of 2 completers, one received a perfect score and the other scored 810 out of 900 (90%). **MEDSE** Out of 6 completers, 3 scored perfect, and the remaining scored 840, 820, and 800 (93%, 91%, and 89%, respectively).
Embedded Assessment for InTASC Standard 3: Context for Learning / Classroom Community Plan	These assessments are aligned with AAQEP Standard 2a: Understanding and engaging local school and cultural communities and communicate and foster relationships with families / guardians / caregivers in a variety of communities. The assessment "Context for Learning" was performed up to Academic Year 2020-21 and required students to perform research about the demographics of the school and the surrounding community and compile a report on the findings. Starting in Academic year 2021-22, this assessment was changed to the Classroom Community Plan. The purpose of the task is equivalent to the earlier one, but the format of the report	**BAEED** All 4 undergraduate completers received perfect scores. **MEDEE** One completer received a perfect score, and the other received 93%. **MEDSE** Six MEDSE completers submitted this assessment, and five received a perfect score while one received a 93%.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>was changed to include artifacts from the school community and classroom.

The data shown in the next column indicates that most students received perfect or near-perfect scores.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Teaching Evaluation – Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning / Component 2d: Managing Student Behavior / Component 3c: Engaging Students in Learning</td><td>These three components of the teaching evaluation are aligned with AAQEP Standard 2c: Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts.

The data on the right are subcomponents of average teaching evaluation scores. The components are aligned with AAQEP standard 2c. As a measure of achievement, we use 2.75 as a dividing line since this numerical value corresponds to the situation in which a score greater than this indicates more proficient or higher level of performance than basic or below.

Of the 4 BAEED completers, all scored above this cut-off point.

The result for MEDEE and MEDSE completers was somewhat lower. For the most part, the scores were higher</td><td>BAEED
<table><tr><th>2b</th><th>2d</th><th>3c</th></tr><tr><td>3.0</td><td>3.1</td><td>3.1</td></tr><tr><td>3.8</td><td>3.7</td><td>3.4</td></tr><tr><td>3.4</td><td>3.3</td><td>3.3</td></tr><tr><td>3.1</td><td>3.1</td><td>3.4</td></tr></table>MEDEE
<table><tr><th>2b</th><th>2d</th><th>3c</th></tr><tr><td>3.1</td><td>2.5</td><td>2.8</td></tr><tr><td>3.0</td><td>2.6</td><td>3.0</td></tr></table>MEDSE
<table><tr><th>2b</th><th>2d</th><th>3c</th></tr><tr><td>2.7</td><td>2.5</td><td>2.5</td></tr><tr><td>3.3</td><td>3.0</td><td>3.2</td></tr><tr><td>3.1</td><td>3.3</td><td>3.2</td></tr><tr><td>2.9</td><td>3.0</td><td>2.6</td></tr><tr><td>3.2</td><td>3.3</td><td>3.3</td></tr><tr><td>3.1</td><td>2.8</td><td>3.0</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

© Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation – 2025

	than 2.75, but 3 out of 8 of the completers scored below this in the area of "2d: Managing Student Behavior", while 2 out of 8 scored below the threshold in the area of "3c: Engaging Students in Learning". The reasons for these lower performance varies. For example, one of the cases involved a mentor teacher who scored gave lower than typical scores, while another case involved an older teacher candidate who struggled with engaging students in learning compared to the typical teacher candidate. We believe that each case is idiosyncratic and not indicative of systemic issues with our master's programs.	
Embedded Assessment for InTASC Standard 9: Professional Development Plan / Educational Research Project	This assessment is aligned with AAQEP standard 2e: Establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal-setting, and reflection. One of the conditions of the research project is to choose a topic that examines how to improve outcomes from classroom instruction. In the process of performing research, students examine their goals as educators, reflect on their strengths and weaknesses, and (as part of their conclusion) comment on ways to improve their effectiveness as a classroom teacher.	**BAEED** Out of the 4 undergraduate completers, 2 received perfect scores, while the remaining 2 received 78%. **MEDEE** Of the 2 completers, one received a perfect score while the other received 93%. **MEDSE** Of 6 completers, 3 received a perfect score, while the rest received the following: 95%, 85%, and 75%.

	The BAEED cohort's performance was split, with 2 receiving perfect scores and the remaining 2 receiving 78%. This was caused by a first-time adjunct instructor who did not scaffold instruction for the 2 students who scored lower, who were not as familiar with academic research compared to the 2 who received a perfect score. The 2 MEDEE completers performed at a high level, while 2 of the 6 MEDSE completers scored low. The student who scored 85% was experiencing personal challenges, which interfered with the performance of academic tasks. The student who received 75% was a young student who just finished college. It appears that the younger generation of students have greater difficulty with academic writing (like the 2 undergraduate students who scored low). Going forward, we foresee the need to provide greater scaffolding for undergraduate students and students that are just out of college.	
Professionalism Evaluation item 5: Collaboration	This assessment is aligned with AAQEP Standard 2f: Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.	**BAEED** Of the 4 completers, all received mostly 9 out of 10 or above.

	The result is shown in the next column. For the most part, students in all programs score high for collaboration. Out of 12 students in all programs combined, 1 student (MEDSE) had an issue with collaboration. He was an older (in his 50s) retired military candidate whose mentor teacher was younger, which seemed to have created a social dynamic that made it difficult for collaboration. Moreover, the mentor teacher had a student teacher from a different teacher education program, and he was also a military veteran who outranked the completer in question. This resulted in a situation where the completer collaborated more readily with his fellow student teacher rather than with the mentor teacher. This situation led to the lower score for collaboration. In the future, we have had similar issues with older military veterans, and it is an area that we need to continue to work on.	**MEDEE** Of the 2 completers, one received 10 out of 10 in both evaluations, while the second one only got one evaluation (end-of-semester evaluation), in which she scored 9 out of 10. **MEDSE** Five of the 6 MEDSE completers received a perfect score, while one of the completers started with a perfect evaluation, but received an 8 out of 10 in the final evaluation.

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes program accomplishments, efforts, and innovations (strengths and outcomes) to address challenges and priorities over the past year.

We are currently in the process of two new initiatives to help increase our retention and increase enrollment in our Bachelor of Education in Elementary Education program. We are continuing to work on restructuring our current degree plan to move up foundational courses to first year students at HPU. Currently, students do not take Education courses until the 4th semester, which is during their second year at HPU. During this early time, we noticed that we lose several students to other majors (or other retention issues), so we hope that having earlier contact will help us retain students. We are also in the beginning stages of working on a SPED concentration for our Master's students. We are thankful for the support and guidance we have received from the Hawaii Teachers Standards Board for us to pursue this new concentration as we hope this attracts more students.

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

AAQEP does not require public posting of the information in Part II, but programs **may** post it at their discretion.

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard and recent activities related to investigating data quality. Table 5 may focus on an aspect of one or two standards each year, with only brief entries regarding ongoing efforts for those standards that are not the focus in the current year.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Standard 1	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Continue to improve results in the area of Teacher Instructional Observation Rubric Component 3d: Assessment.
Actions	Greater emphasis and focus on the area of Assessment has been provided in the Introduction to Teaching courses where the topic of Assessment is introduced. Also, during the Clinical Practice Seminar, student-teachers engage in greater discourse on the topic of Assessment and the expectations of the Teacher Instructional Observation Rubric in the area of Assessment.
Expected outcomes	We expect the scores in the **2025-2026** cohort to improve in the area of Assessment
Reflections or comments	Although assessment is thoroughly covered in the TEP, often the lessons observed for evaluation do not contain adequate assessment due to the nature of the lesson. We will encourage student-teachers to choose lessons to be observed that will contain the appropriate demonstration of knowledge in assessment so we can better evaluate the student-teacher.
Standard 2	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Continue to support students' growth in international and global perspectives. This will include incorporating and embracing the latest AI technologies to support that growth.
Actions	Create workgroup to focus on integrating international and global perspectives in the curriculum.

Expected outcomes	Workgroup will determine next steps to implement in AY 2025-2026
Reflections or comments	Our program is strong on preparing students in the area of culturally responsive teaching in the context of Hawaiian culture, but our effort at preparing students to teach about international and global perspectives could be more systematic.
Standard 3	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	We have a robust and strong relationship with multiple stakeholders. However, we identified the need for more focused and systematic input from them. We intend to implement an advisory committee formed of select stakeholders in the near future.
Actions	Define the role and purpose of an Advisory Committee with external stakeholders
Expected outcomes	AY 2025-2026, select members of the Advisory Committee with external stakeholders and meet bi-annually.
Reflections or comments	The goal of the Advisory Committee will be to help the TEP be aligned with external stakeholders.
Standard 4	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Implement a consistent process to collect and store alumni information
Actions	Determine the best way to house the alumni data. Coordinate with the University Relations department to gather data that they already have. Systematically send out Alumni surveys.
Expected outcomes	An improved database of completers will allow us to perform longitudinal studies about our completers' performance in the profession and provide the SOE valuable feedback.
Reflections or comments	Due to the nature that many of our completers are from out of state and international, it becomes increasingly difficult to track alumni information, especially teaching information.

Update on Activities to Investigate Data Quality

Data quality investigations are essential to work across the standards. This section documents activities in the 2024-25 reporting year related to ensuring data quality.

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

This section documents how concerns or conditions that were noted in an accreditation decision are being addressed (indicate “n/a” if no concerns or conditions were noted). If a condition has been noted, a more detailed focused report will be needed in addition to the description included here. Please contact staff with any questions regarding this section.

N/A

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

This section summarizes planned improvements, innovations, or anticipated new program developments, including description of any identified potential challenges or barriers.

We are currently in the process of two new initiatives to help increase our retention and also increase enrollment in our Bachelor of Education in Elementary Education program. First, we continue to work on restructuring our current degree plan to move up foundational courses to first year students at HPU. Currently, they do not take Education courses until the 4th semester, which is during their second year at HPU. During this early time, we noticed that we lose several students to other majors (or retention issues if they do not feel a connection to the Ed Program), so we hope that having earlier contact will help us retain students. We anticipate having the new degree plan completed this coming year. Second, we are in the planning stages of potentially creating/ starting a pre-service teacher program, as well as completing a feasibility study/report to see if there is demand for an EdD. We hope this may attract more students in each respective demographic.

9. Regulatory Changes

This section notes new or anticipated regulatory requirements and the provider's response to those changes (indicate "n/a" if no changes have been made or are anticipated).

N/A

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Mani Sehgal, Dean, College of Professional Studies	Mani Sehgal, Dean, College of Professional Studies

Date sent to AAQEP:	12/29/2025