Educational Effectiveness Self-Study
University of Guam

Submitted to
The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

December 2008
THE UNIVERSITY OF GUAM

Educational Effectiveness Self Study Report

Submitted to
the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities
of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

December 11, 2008

Robert A. Underwood, President

In preparing its educational effectiveness review, the University of Guam used its strategic plan, institution proposal, and capacity and preparatory review in the context of the Senior Commission Standards and Core Commitments and therefore submits this Self-Study Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for review and approval.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## I. CONTEXT

ACCREDITATION HISTORY ................................................................. 1
PREPARING THE SELF STUDY ............................................................ 2

## II. RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS ACTION LETTERS AND TEAM REPORTS

ISSUE #1: FINANCES .................................................................... 4
ISSUE #2: ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE ................................... 5
ISSUE #3: ACADEMIC PLANNING ............................................... 5
ISSUE #4: PLANNING STRATEGIES FOR ENROLLMENT, RETENTION, AND GRADUATION .......................................................... 6
ISSUE #5: REGIONAL RELATIONS .................................................. 6

## III. ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: A SET OF ANALYTICAL ESSAYS OF FOUR STRATEGIC INITIATIVE THEMES

### A. ENHANCING ACADEMIC QUALITY

OVERVIEW .................................................................................. 7
DEVELOPING A CULTURE OF EVIDENCE ..................................... 7
EVIDENCE: LEARNING OBJECTIVES, ASSESSMENT PLANS AND SYSTEMS FOR REVIEWING ASSESSMENT RESULTS ................................................................. 7
ESTABLISHED LEARNING OBJECTIVES ...................................... 8
  Institutional Learning Objectives .............................................. 8
  Learning Objectives for Colleges and Schools .......................... 8
  Learning Objectives for Degree Programs ............................... 8
  Learning Objectives for Courses ............................................ 9
ASSESSMENT PLANS .................................................................... 9
  Institutional Reviews .............................................................. 9
  Reviews at the Level of Colleges and Schools ......................... 9
SYSTEMS FOR EVIDENCE-BASED ACTION .................................. 10
  Institutional Systems .............................................................. 10
  Systems by College and School ............................................ 11
ANALYSIS OF THE EVIDENCE .................................................... 11
DO STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE LEARNING AT LEVELS ESTABLISHED BY EXTERNAL STANDARDS? .................................................. 11
  Institutional Policies on External Standards .............................. 11
DO STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE LEARNING AT LEVELS SET BY THE PROGRAM? ............................................................. 12
CLOSING THE LOOP: DATA-BASED DECISIONS THAT STRENGTHEN ACADEMIC QUALITY? .......................................................... 13
  Action Based on Program Reviews ........................................ 13
  Institutional Review of Programs ........................................... 13
  Evidence-based Improvements in Course Syllabi .................... 13
  Examples of Programs Closing the Loop, by College/School ...... 14
SUMMARY .................................................................................. 16

### B. SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

INTRODUCTION .......................................................................... 16
DEFINITION OF STUDENT SUCCESS .......................................... 17
OBTAINING APPROPRIATE AFFILIATIONS ................................. 17
  Improved Recruiting .............................................................. 17
  Enhancing Students’ Essential Skills ....................................... 18
  Academic Programs’ Responses to Island and Regional Needs .... 18
  Assessing the University’s Stature Among Regional Communities 19
SUSTAINING APPROPRIATE AFFILIATIONS ............................... 20
Identifying Factors in Freshman to Sophomore Retention ........................................ 20
Responding to Needs Identified in Surveys of Graduating Seniors ...................... 21
Preparing Students through Research and Scholarly Contributions ............... 22
Student Internships and Service Learning .......................................................... 23
Evidence of Effectiveness .................................................................................. 24
MAINTAINING AN AFFILIATION ........................................................................... 25
The Alumni Relations Office ............................................................................ 25
Feedback from Alumni and Employers ............................................................ 25
Graduate School and Career Placement ............................................................. 26
Professional Certifications ............................................................................... 26
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ......................................................... 27
C. THE LAND GRANT MISSION AND ENGAGEMENT .......................................... 27
INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................. 27
Approach ........................................................................................................... 28
EVIDENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY’S COMMITMENT TO ENGAGEMENT ............ 28
Survey Results .................................................................................................. 28
Dissemination .................................................................................................... 29
Engagement through Scholarship ..................................................................... 29
Community Impacts ......................................................................................... 29
Examples of Programs Meeting Engagement Standards .................................. 32
Distance Education .......................................................................................... 33
NEXT STEPS ...................................................................................................... 33
D. AN ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY ... 34
INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................. 34
MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE IN PRACTICE .................................................. 34
How does the University measure institutional performance in support
of student learning? .......................................................................................... 34
How does the University use its performance measures to improve
effectiveness and efficiency? .......................................................................... 35
What else has the University done to measure and improve
effectiveness and efficiency? ......................................................................... 36
How does the University communicate and share information about
performance? .................................................................................................... 37
MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE: A REPORT OF PROGRESS ON KEY ISSUES ..... 38
What progress has the University made in strengthening institutional
efficiency and effectiveness and addressing WASC issues for
educational effectiveness? .............................................................................. 38
Financial Stability and Sustainability: Evidence and Action ............................ 38
New Revenue Generation: Evidence and Action .............................................. 39
Leveraging the Endowment Foundation and Alumni Association for
Fundraising: Evidence and Action ................................................................. 39
Governance and Administrative Structure: Evidence and Action .................. 40
Sustained Educational Effectiveness using Scarce Resources: Evidence
and Action ......................................................................................................... 41
MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE: ANALYSIS ...................................................... 42
Is the University financially stable? ................................................................. 42
Have new revenues been generated? ............................................................... 42
Are the UOG Endowment Foundation and Alumni Association being
leveraged? ......................................................................................................... 42
Are governance and administrative structures effective? ................................. 43
Can the University sustain educational effectiveness in an environment
of scarce resources? ....................................................................................... 43
CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS .......................................................................... 43
IV. INTEGRATIVE COMPONENT ................................................................. 44
    THEMES ........................................................................................................ 45
    ACHIEVING THE GOALS SPECIFIED IN UOG’S REACCREDITATION PROPOSAL .... 45
V. CONCLUSION .................................................................................................. 49

REFERENCES ...................................................................................................... 51

REQUIRED DATA ELEMENTS ........................................................................ 56

APPENDICES .................................................................................................... 78
## List of Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>WASC Accreditation History for the University of Guam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td>Excerpt UOG FY09 Budget Slides to Legislature Jun08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td>BOR Resolution FY09 Budget Reallocation 2008-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td>2007 Fact Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5</td>
<td>Status of Program Review by Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 6</td>
<td>Freshmen English and Math Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 7</td>
<td>2008 Fall Student Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 8</td>
<td>Service Learning and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 9</td>
<td>List of Participants (EER Steering Committee)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## List of Required Data Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Element 7.1</td>
<td>Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Element 8.1</td>
<td>Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## List of Cited Evidence in the Electronic Evidence File (EEF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EEF</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1</td>
<td>Focus Group Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1</td>
<td>2008 UOG Interim Financial Report to WASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators Among Peer Universities/Institutional Benchmarking Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3</td>
<td>Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Undergraduate Program Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1</td>
<td>Article IV of the RRPM Regarding the University's Commitment to Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.2</td>
<td>Institutional Values and Qualities of the Ideal Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.3</td>
<td>Criteria Manual for General Education Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.4</td>
<td>Nursing Program Evaluation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.5</td>
<td>Summary Table of Course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.6</td>
<td>Closing the Loop Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.7</td>
<td>Information regarding new certificate program and concentration in Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.8</td>
<td>Program Review Handbooks (Undergraduate and Graduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.1</td>
<td>Strategic Enrollment Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.2</td>
<td>2006 Study of English Placement of Recent Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.3</td>
<td>Statistics of Web Traffic Nov 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.4</td>
<td>Freshman Retention Report and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.B.5</td>
<td>Qualitative Analysis Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.1</td>
<td>Land Grant Cumulative Survey Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.2</td>
<td>Land Grant Essay Portfolio of Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.C.3</td>
<td>EER LG Survey Responses and Community Engagement Exemplars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.D.1</td>
<td>Survey of Communication Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Context

The University of Guam is a public, open admissions, four-year land grant institution, located on the island of Guam in the Western Pacific Ocean. It is the southernmost island in the Marianas Island chain. The mission is Ina, Diskubre, Setbe: to Enlighten, to Discover, to Serve. There are 35 (including the Associates Degree in Nursing) degree programs at the undergraduate level and 15 master's level programs. The University is within four hours flying time of all of the major cities of Asia. It is the only U.S.-accredited four-year university located within the Western Pacific region: an area the size of continental U.S. that encompasses, in addition to the U.S. Territory of Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. It was founded as the Territorial College of Guam in 1952 and designated a land grant institution by the United States Congress in 1972. Of the University’s 3,387 students (up 2.7% from Fall 2007 and the highest enrollment since 2000), 91% are of Asian-Pacific Islander ethnicity, and 69% are full-time (Fall 2008 figures.) There are 832 total employees, including 182 full-time faculty and 34 administrators. Consolidated gross revenues totaled $81 million in FY08, excluding investments. Local government appropriations are 39% of consolidated revenue, but 70% of unrestricted general operations revenue. Research grants, contracts, tuition and fees form the other primary sources of revenue.

Guam’s economy is tied to Asian markets. It is driven by tourism and the military, and to a lesser extent, by real estate and construction. As part of a global reallocation of U.S. armed forces, significant military resources will be shifted to Guam (with an expected direct investment of $15 billion over 10 years), which is forecast to create a dramatic boost in Guam’s economic growth over the next 10 years (Economic Forecast, First Hawaiian Bank, 2006-2007).

The people of Guam are multicultural and multilingual. The native inhabitants of Guam are Chamorros, and the two official languages of the island are Chamorro and English. No ethnicity on Guam comprises a majority of the population. The approximately 155,000 residents are 42% Chamorro, 26% Filipino, 8% Micronesian, 7% Caucasian, 13% other Asian ethnicities and 2% other ethnic groups. Guam is an unincorporated territory of the United States, governed by Guam’s Organic Act: an act of the U.S. Congress. There is an elected governor, Felix P. Camacho, and a unicameral legislature of 15 senators elected island-wide. The judiciary is composed of the Guam Supreme Court and the Guam Superior Court. The island’s major employer is the Government of Guam, employing nearly 13,000 workers. The island’s FY 09 budget projects income of $520 million.

Accreditation History

This institution has been continuously accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges since before the Association adopted that name (in 1962), with the first accreditation visit in 1958 and action in 1959 to accredit. Details of each visit and report concerning accreditation are attached as Appendix 1 WASC Accreditation History.

During fifty years of continuous accreditation, there have been two periods during which the University was on probation or show cause. The first period, from 1984-85 (show cause) and 1985-88 (probation), occurred about ten years after the Territorial College restructured to form the University and received Land Grant status. Issues centered on institutional autonomy and the integrity and independence of the Board, as well as a lack of planning and procedures. There were no sanctions following a full review in 1988. A period of economic prosperity followed, as Guam’s economy was influenced by the Japanese and Asian markets. In 2000, the University was placed on probation for failing to meet nine WASC standards and for instilling a “climate of fear” among faculty and staff. Following the formation of a Faculty Senate, the hiring of a new president, and the provision of experienced leadership in the financial and academic areas, the
University was removed from probation, with much praise for the new spirit and commitment to mission. Since 2000 the University hosted four visits (two focused visits, one CPR visit, and a comprehensive review (2000)) and submitted 11 reports (four special reports focused on financial stability and responses to visiting team recommendations, three substantive change requests and four self studies). The University and the island community have thus sustained engagement with the reaccreditation process for quite some time.

In November 2001, the University began a process of self-reflection and dialogue, resulting in consensus on a set of strategic initiatives that defined areas of focus and goals for the University community: a) Enhancing Academic Quality; (b) Supporting Student Success, Institutional Visibility and Enrollment Growth; (c) Promoting the Land Grant Mission of University and Community Engagement; and (d) Strengthening Institutional Effectiveness and Efficiency. These strategic initiatives have endured and guided priorities and the standards for achievement throughout the past seven years.

In May 2008, the University chose its tenth president, Robert A. Underwood, Ed.D., a well-respected former faculty member, Dean and Academic Vice President, who served as Guam’s elected delegate to the U.S. Congress for ten years. Over the past six months President Underwood continued progress on all the strategic initiatives, while guiding the University toward a common set of three overarching themes: UOG Green; UOG, the Natural Choice; and UOG Leading Change. UOG Green is a theme based on the traditional Chamorro respect for the earth and its larger ecosystems: proposing energy sustainability and efficiency, coupled with conservation. The second theme positions the University as the choice for graduating high school seniors, residents who are turning to higher education to improve their quality of life, and the large influx of population (25% increase over the next five years) expected during the military build up. This leads directly into the final theme: Leading Change. As the island undergoes its most dramatic transformation since World War II, economic, societal, technological and political changes are inevitable. The University’s roles in these turbulent times include providing information and research to guide policy decisions; educating the next middle class of professionals who will remain on the island once the dust has settled; and responding to community needs with partnerships and support. This report’s integrative chapter further explores these three themes, and aligns them with the four initiatives represented in the essays.

Preparing the Self Study

Herein the University presents evidence that it is a learning organization; delivers effective educational experiences to its students; bases decisions on its mission, on evidence and on discussion; and utilizes procedures and processes that enable it to move forward as a catalyst for economic prosperity for our island and the region. Throughout this self study, EEF refers to the electronic evidence file found on the thumb drive included with this document. All appendices are attached to this report.

The University has made use of its sustained conversation with WASC, from 2004 as an opportunity to focus on educational effectiveness. Evidence of this exists in the core questions asked of all proposals under consideration: how the proposed activity may enhance effectiveness; how and when to assess its effectiveness; what resources and capacity are available to perform the activity well; how will the activity be funded; and how it will become institutionalized, systematized and part of normal operations. The 2004 Reaccreditation Proposal guided the University’s actions in its Capacity and Preparatory Review, and in its current Educational Effectiveness Self Study. Although not all recommendations in the initial Proposal were implemented, the plan has enabled the University to mature: from a poorly coordinated and inefficient collection of programs whose progress depended on varying levels of attention from individuals, to an
organization that delivers its mission by applying evidence to decisions that support consensus-based priorities.

University leaders at all levels used WASC accreditation procedures and standards to structure their preparations for this report, and worked in their respective areas to build commitment to assessment in its broadest form. First, a task force decided to base this self-study on the four strategic initiatives that have guided the University for many years, as described above. Writing teams assembled in 2007. Each team consisted of seven to 20 people representing different segments of the University community. Within each team, one to two administrators provided support, ensured that administrative tasks were completed, and assisted with writing, while two faculty members (typically, one new writer and one veteran of the CPR self study) performed the actual writing of the essay. The larger task force provided input, support, comments, and feedback from the larger community. The two writers for each essay, the administrators, plus the leaders of the Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and Student Government Association, made up the EER Steering Committee (EER-SC). The Steering Committee met at least twice monthly, and continues to meet as the accreditation cycle continues. Writing commenced after a thorough review of the past eight years: including reviews of the previous self studies (2000, 2002, 2005, 2007), the Proposal, and the responses to recommendations from WASC. Each team developed a chart of the main issues in its area, and the actions and evidence in support of each statement.

Writing teams began by developing outlines and abstracts of their topics. EER-SC meetings supplied a venue for discussions about topics, areas of focus and sources of data. The appointment of an Assessment Officer/Institutional Researcher (in 2008) focused and systematized the work of gathering information. Abstracts and outlines were circulated to the Board of Regents, faculty, students, administration, and staff for comment and input. In spring 2008, revised outlines provided the foundations for commencing work on the essays themselves, and writing continued throughout the summer. First drafts were submitted in early Fall 2008. EER-SC meetings provided lively discussions, as the essays developed. Each writing team conducted a series of focus group sessions over a period of two weeks: one session by invitation only, for nominated specialists whose input was considered essential to accuracy and completeness; a second, open session for all interested parties; and, in some cases, a third open session. Schedules for focus groups and their participants are listed in Electronic Evidence File (EEF) I.1. Using focus groups’ input and continuous feedback from the EER-SC, the writing teams produced final drafts of their respective essays by October 20th, 2008. As expected, these essays were much longer than could be accommodated in a 50-page self study, so the editing process began. The Accreditation Liaison Officer, a faculty editor, and vice-presidents made up the editing team. The faculty editor tightened the essays from 78 pages to 42 pages. The Faculty Senate, the Dean’s Council, the Administrative Council, the President, the student government, and the Board of Regents were apprised of progress monthly. A larger focus group of staff and leaders of the Staff Council convened in November, to promote awareness of the important role of staff in the reaccreditation and renewal process.

In November and December, stakeholders reviewed the self study for relevant evidence and requisite detail concerning the quality of teaching and learning, and the types of evidence collected.

II. Responses to Previous Action Letters and Team Reports

The essays address progress towards or achievement of the objectives set forth in the Reaccreditation Proposal, and respond to the Capacity and Preparatory Review 2007 action letter and team report. The following summarizes WASC’s recommendations and the action(s) taken by the University since 2007, which are detailed and evidenced in the four essays.
Issue #1: Finances. “Clearly overshadowing all other institutional capacity issues...is the ongoing and seemingly never ending issue of finances....the success or failure in addressing (this issue)... will seriously impact UOG’s ability to demonstrate effectiveness in all other areas of institutional endeavor and ongoing compliance with Commission Standards.” An Interim Financial Report (EEF II.1) was provided to WASC in March 2008, as required by the Senior Commission in its 2007 CPR letter. The report addresses the University’s financial condition through FY07 and the steps taken to assure long-term financial stability. Comments were received from WASC reviewers in May 2008. This EER self study does not repeat the actions taken and progress documented in that report, but rather responds to the recommendations of the WASC reviewers and addresses subsequent progress.

Actions:
1. The budget. The University implemented a new system for preparing the budget, and completed one budget cycle using that system. Previously, the budget included all requests and all growth initiatives and asked the legislature to fund the entire package. The FY09 budget, however, was presented in two parts: 1) a no-growth base that sustained academic quality, student learning and infrastructure at current levels, and 2) five growth and investment initiative packages aligned with strategic goals and in support of public policy priorities. A sustained discussion produced consensus on what comprised the University’s base budget, the priority for funding, and the growth initiatives, contingent upon supplemental funding. A short presentation used at Legislative hearings defining the budget initiatives appears in Appendix 2. Facing many competing priorities and unfunded critical government services in health and public safety, the Legislature appropriated only $27.3M for University operations, since supplemented by a promised transfer of $0.7 million from the Office of the Governor. This was $2.1 million (7%) short of the base budget request and contained no funding for growth initiatives. With its new President leading a campus-wide dialogue, the University reordered priorities and established a new balanced base to live within the legislative appropriation and provide for some growth. Revenue generation targets were set, energy conservation and other cost savings measures initiated; critical positions and infrastructure funded; and administrative restructuring and program sustainability discussions begun. A facilities and administrative cost sharing plan was implemented, wherein each revenue stream contributes to the support of the institutional base budget in amounts ranging from a few hundred dollars to $200,000. The revised budget, which the Board of Regents approved on November 20, 2008, appears in Appendix 3.

2. Finding financial balance and preparing for alternative futures. To protect financial stability and long-term viability, deliver the mission and sustain educational effectiveness, several significant steps have been taken since the Interim Financial Report. As noted above, the University has agreed on what constitutes its base budget and the priorities for academic quality and student learning. The Board has approved a policy on reserves, designating different reserve accounts for long term stability and investment. Among these are the University Stability Reserve and capital equipment and facilities reserves. Other recent policy and process improvements address financial stability through entrepreneurial business planning and oversight, reallocation of indirect funds to infrastructure support, endowment spending and fiduciary responsibility, and limits on carry-forward balances for non-appropriated funds. A Faculty Senate-led analysis has made initial recommendations on the long-term sustainability of undergraduate programs. Financial planning processes are being introduced to integrate programs, plans and budgets using strategic assumptions and program needs. The financial planning and collaborations with the government of Guam have led either to payment or financial statement recognition of all outstanding appropriation receivables as well as a better cash position.
3. **Revenue generation.** Substantial progress has been made in generating new, non appropriated revenues. University-generated revenues have grown by an average of 11% over seven years. They now comprise 61% of FY08 consolidated gross revenues, up from 46% in FY01. All auxiliary programs, entrepreneurial enterprises and new ventures have been required to develop a business plan or fiscal notes as part of the budget reallocation. The Professional and International Programs (PIP) unit has been designated to review and monitor plans.

4. **College/school self support.** An increasing number of revenue opportunities, many associated with the military buildup, and new certificate programs are being pursued by the colleges, schools and sponsored program units. Faculty members from across the campus are invited to participate and are compensated for their expertise. The colleges and schools continue to generate funds by revenue-sharing (15%) of tuition money brought in by adjuncts and overload work and through the fees that support the academic programs. Faculty salary buy-out of time is encouraged for grants and contracts. When this occurs, 50% of the amount goes directly to the college/school.

5. **The University of Guam Foundation.** Endowment Foundation giving has increased. 2007 contributions and net revenues were the highest in four years. Three new gifts totaled $1.2 million. $164,000 was raised from 373 new individual donors and $933,000 from 65 new corporate donors. President Underwood and the Foundation are preparing a capital campaign and donor and alumni fundraising activities. The Foundation’s organization and focus are changing with a new Executive Director to be hired and Board members added for their fundraising potential. A financial surplus has been achieved since FY05.

**Issue #2: Administrative Structure.** WASC noted the “potentially cumbersome and problematic three school College of Professional Studies. It also called for the establishment of an assessment and institutional research positions integrally tied to the Academic Affairs area, and for the provision of appropriate institutional attention to and administrative support for graduate education and research. “

**Actions:** After considering the evidence of efficacy, the University disbanded the College of Professional Studies in 2007 and freed the professional schools (Education, Business and Nursing) to report directly to the Senior Vice President. The heads of the Schools of Education and Business were changed to a dean in 2008, while Nursing continued with a Director of Nursing. In 2008, a well-qualified Assessment Officer/Institutional Researcher was hired to monitor and implement assessment activities. A fact book (Appendix 4) and institutional benchmarking studies (EEF II.2) are key results. In addition, a new Assistant Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research and Sponsored Programs has been selected. She will start in January 2009. Her office will be strengthened with a program coordinator, administrative assistant, and the addition of a grant accountant and dedicated information technology (IT) support, offering a team management approach to supporting research and sponsored programs.

**Issue #3: Academic Planning.** The Action letter calls for “a comprehensive plan for providing support for academic assessment and institutional research and [when possible] a budgetary line item for academic assessment…; an examination of the academic programs offered in terms of number of majors, number of faculty, and contribution to the University’s mission and the meeting of community and regional needs; and a review of the quality of the University’s graduate programs.”

**Actions:** The new Office of Assessment and Institutional Research reports to the Senior Vice President and administers a dedicated assessment line item in the budget (2008 and 2009). An analysis of undergraduate programs began in 2007 and served as the basis for recommendations to the Senior Vice President from an ad hoc committee of faculty members (the University Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee and the Senate Committee on Budget and Planning), facilitated by the Faculty Senate.
President. The report is under review by program faculty and the deans of colleges and schools. Details of the assessment appear in the evidence portfolio (EEF II.3). The Graduate Curriculum Review Committee and the Senate Committee on Institutional Excellence are following the same process to conduct the Quality Review of Graduate Programs, which is not yet complete. The evidence portfolio provides more detailed information.

**Issue #4:** A “university-wide enrollment planning strategy and a university-wide focus on retention and graduation (rates)…a plan to develop ongoing relationships with alumni…It cautions, however, against major enrollment growth…not supported by a concomitant increase in financial support.”

**Action:** The Dean of Enrollment Management and Student Services has led the development of an enrollment planning strategy in consultation with the deans. With the publication of a fact book and the selection of peer institutions for benchmarking, the University has focused on retention and graduation rates. Both the analysis of undergraduate programs and the review of graduate programs reflect comparisons with these benchmarks.

**Issue #5: Regional relations.** WASC “encouraged the University to be ‘more collegial and responsive in its collaborative relations with the Micronesian region's community colleges to determine and meet regional needs.’ UOG must attempt to institutionalize its relationships with the Western Pacific's community colleges in ways that all parties find beneficial, including the development of regionally-based technology-mediated instruction.”

**Action:** President Underwood has consistently attended and supported the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council (PPEC), an organization of presidents of all regional colleges and Hawaii institutions as well as Guam. The new undergraduate degree program in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences now offers a major with specializations that is ideal for students transferring from the regional colleges without courses preparing them for a discipline-specific major. The three off-island programs underwent reviews assessing their academic effectiveness and fiscal soundness. The reallocated FY 09 budget pays specific attention to distance education and technology mediated instruction, with the development of a distance education support team—a team leader, two technology specialists, and faculty and computer representatives—to prepare a plan, implement training, conduct needs assessments, and provide ongoing resource support for distance education. There is collaboration with regional colleges on program review, exchanges of faculty, faculty development, financial management, and Board training. The Micronesian Chief Executives Council has designated the University the secretariat for a regional Center for Sustainability.

**III. Analysis of Educational Effectiveness:**
**A Set of Analytical Essays on Four Strategic Initiative Themes**

The themes structuring this self-study's essays are as follows:
- A. Enhancing Academic Quality
- B. Supporting Student Success
- C. The Land Grant mission and Engagement
- D. An Analysis of Institutional Effectiveness and Efficiency
A. ENHANCING ACADEMIC QUALITY

Overview

Administrators and faculty are committed to quality in the academic programs, and to evidence-based decision-making in support of academic quality; a commitment expressed in action as well as in policy. This essay presents evidence that the University has established and effectively assesses student learning outcomes; that the academic programs are effective in educating students, and that both the institution and its programs make appropriate use of data in decisions to enhance pedagogy and curricula. The essay concludes with an analysis of the state of the culture of evidence, and with recommendations. Evidence is provided to support CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 2.1, 2.2 2.3 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10, 2.12, 3.3, 3.11, 4.6 and 4.7.

Developing a Culture of Evidence

The commitment to assessment is articulated in Article IV of the Rules, Regulations and Procedures Manual (EEF III.A.1). With academic quality designated as one of four strategic initiatives, faculty leaders embraced assessment of learning outcomes, provided faculty development opportunities, and established guidelines for academic program review that require ongoing assessment and improvement of instruction. Specific goals included program reviews that documented support for student learning; defined student learning outcomes and assessment methods; and dissemination of information on actions taken to improve pedagogy and curricula, along with the evidence in support of these actions. In 2006, the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Visit team noted both progress and continuing challenges in strengthening academic quality through assessment. The team recommended the hire of an Assessment Coordinator and Institutional Researcher, now completed. This person leads a reconstituted Assessment Committee, which includes the chairs of college and school assessment committees as well as the chair of the General Education Review Committee. The Committee is guided by a five-year plan with an annual $100,000 budget devoted to assessment.

The WASC team made several additional recommendations specific to academic quality. The team required that academic programs "complete the process of developing statements of assessable learning outcomes, linking these to specific courses, assessing students' achievement of these outcomes as graduating seniors, and using assessment results for continuous program improvement." This was determined to mean including program-wide learning outcomes as well as course-specific outcomes in course syllabi; revising program review guidelines to provide clearer and more detailed descriptions of the kinds of assessment and documentation to be provided by departments; examining academic programs in terms of majors, number of faculty, and contributions to the mission, community and regional needs; and reviewing the quality of graduate programs, with special attention to administrative support. While several areas are still developing, continuing efforts to enhance academic quality by systematically acquiring and appropriately responding to assessment data have produced results as documented below.

Evidence: Learning Objectives, Assessment Plans and Systems for Reviewing Assessment Results

The 2006 CPR self-study identified challenges in establishing standards and systems for gathering data on academic quality, and for making these data available to program faculty and administrators. This section documents the degree to which the challenges have been met. Specifically, faculty and administrators have (a) established learning objectives at the level of the institution, and well-aligned learning objectives for the colleges, schools and academic programs; (b) aligned curricula and pedagogy with established learning objectives; (c) collected multiple direct assessments of these learning outcomes; and (d) established regular and systematic procedures for reviewing and improving academic programs, based in part on evaluations of assessment data.
Established Learning Objectives

Institutional Learning Objectives

In 2004, an internal review, Institutional Values and Qualities of the Ideal Student, clarified SLOs and related standards of evidence. A summary of these goals, which include enhancing students’ abilities to master and create global and regional knowledge, and preparing students for service to regional communities, appears in EEF III.A.2. The Assessment Committee updates these goals and determines whether colleges and program SLOs align with the institutional goals.

The General Education (GE) committee developed outcomes, using the institutional values information, and documented them in the Undergraduate Catalog and the Criteria Manual for General Education Categories (EEF III.A.3). The GE program provides students with an understanding of the fundamentals of major fields of knowledge and teaches them to frame questions about purpose in life; historical, geographical, political, and economic contributors to current events and conditions; relationships between individuals and societies, appropriate uses of science and technology, and improvements to self and society. The Criteria Manual for GE Categories lists ten assessable learning outcomes for students, including the ability to interpret and use quantitative information; describe the aesthetic significance of an object or experience; organize, analyze and communicate information using computers; and use appropriate methods for observing and interpreting natural and social phenomena. More detailed statements of category-specific SLOs appear in the Undergraduate Catalog.

Learning Objectives for Colleges and Schools

SLOs have been established for each college or school, and are published in the Undergraduate Catalog.

- The College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences. CLASS includes knowledge of regional cultural traditions, social and economic development, and qualitative and scientific content and methods.
- The College of Natural and Applied Sciences. CNAS includes a culture of partnership and relevant science programs. Each of the College’s undergraduate programs lists learning objectives in the Catalog, which include fostering skills in critical thinking and problem solving, communication, and community engagement.
- The School of Business and Public Administration. SBPA includes critical thinking, social responsibility, strategic thinking, teamwork, and respect for diversity.
- The School of Nursing and Health Sciences. SNHS includes ethical practice, research skills, communication skills, cultural competence and professional growth.
- The School of Education. SOE includes mastery of topic-specific content and of pedagogy.

Learning Objectives for Degree Programs

SLOs for individual degree programs appear in the Undergraduate Catalog, Graduate Bulletin, program review documentation, and the Qualitative Review reports submitted by each program to the Senior Vice-President in 2007. These reports describe how programs’ goals align with the objectives and initiatives identified in the Reaccreditation Proposal.

- CLASS Programs. Eight of the thirteen undergraduate academic programs and all four graduate programs publish SLOs in the Undergraduate Catalog and the Graduate Bulletin, respectively. These objectives vary from general goals involving initiative and content mastery to operationally defined objectives derived from, or aligned with, nationwide standards. The remaining seven programs will submit SLOs during Spring Semester 2009. The CLASS Curriculum Committee
overssees the development and review of SLOs in course outlines, and their alignment with college objectives.

- **CNAS Programs.** All seven programs publish SLOs in the Catalog or Bulletin. The CNAS Assessment Committee supervises the development and regularly reviews SLOs for all course outlines and learner-centered syllabi.

- **SBPA Programs.** The four undergraduate and two graduate programs publish SLOs in the Catalog or Bulletin. An Assurance of Learning Committee reviews all syllabi and assessment data to ensure achievement of stated goals. Outcome assessment is conducted continuously and reported annually to the BBA accreditation body International Association of Collegiate Business Education (IACBE). Finally, SLOs are reviewed annually by the School's faculty and stakeholders for assurance of relevancy and achievement.

- **SNHS Programs.** Both undergraduate programs publish SLOs in the Catalog. The Nursing Program detailed its SLOs in a Program Evaluation Plan (EEF III.A.4) submitted to the National League for Nursing Accreditation Commission.

- **SOE Programs.** Each of the undergraduate and graduate programs publishes SLOs in the Catalog or Bulletin, and submits objectives and assessment results to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). A curriculum committee reviews all courses and programs.

**Learning Objectives for Courses**

Majority of the courses have SLOs and conduct regular assessment of these outcomes. Objectives for individual courses appear in approved course outlines and in course syllabi on file with the college or school. They are distributed to all students. A summary of SLOs in course outlines appears in EEF III.A.5. A subsequent section of this essay provides evidence that the University bases decisions on assessment data, and provides a summary of data on and changes in the syllabi.

**Assessment Plans**

This section summarizes evidence that programs regularly assess their SLOs and use the results to improve learning.

**Institutional Reviews**

Under the Senior Vice-President's supervision, the Assessment Coordinator/Institutional Researcher works with college and school assessment committees to review assessment plans. She supplies individual programs annually with data such as credit hour production, numbers of declared majors and students' academic standing. Mandatory, institution-wide, quinquennial program reviews provide regular opportunities for evaluation of each program's assessment plan. Appendix 5 summarizes completed program reviews.

**Reviews at the Level of Colleges and Schools**

- **CLASS.** Faculty members regularly include multi-year course assessment plans in their annual Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System (CFES) reports and plans. The Dean enforces documentation of assessment of learning outcomes as an integral part of program reviews. The college received a $70,000 sub-grant from Project HÅTSA (US DOE funded to Guam Public School System, addressing the quality of teacher preparation) to conduct a comprehensive assessment of SLOs among students preparing to be secondary education English teachers.

- **CNAS.** The College Assessment Committee and its subcommittees supervise the development of program-specific assessment plans, including summaries of results to date and evidence to be collected in future assessments: reporting each to the Dean. Individual faculty members also present their assessment plans during their annual CFES reviews.
- SBPA. Instructors for all courses conduct pre- and post-course assessments and report the results to the School and to the International Association of Collegiate Business Education (IACBE). In addition, undergraduate programs in Business Administration Criminal Justice and Public Administration, and its Master’s programs in Public Administration and Business Administration, have developed and implemented program-wide assessment plans. The Business Administration undergraduate program has also implemented a nationally standardized comprehensive business examination that is required of all graduating seniors in the program.

- SNHS. The School Curriculum Committee developed the classroom assessment component of Nursing’s Program Evaluation Plan, as submitted to NLNAC: which requires a systematic plan for assessing both required and optional student outcomes. In addition, the Committee supervises annual assessments of learning outcomes, with results disseminated to all faculty members for review and action.

- SOE. The School Assessment Committee developed a six-step assessment plan template that makes use of rubric-based evaluation instruments, LiveText-based assessment portfolios to monitor the developing capabilities of individual students, and clearly designed standards required of students at the initial, midway and final stages of their programs.

Detailed information on specific assessment methods in use within each program, and of results and actions from analysis of assessments, will be provided in the poster session scheduled for the Site Visit team on April 1, 2009.

**Systems for Evidence-based Action**

This section summarizes evidence that assessment data guide decisions on pedagogy and curricula.

**Institutional Systems**

*Program reviews.* Reports on the status of program assessment within each school and college document progress in closing the loop with assessment-enabled improvements to programs. To date, five programs in CLASS, one in CNAS, three in SBPA, one in SNHS, and eight in SOE, have reported assessment-based changes in pedagogy and/or curricula in their most recent program review self-studies. Examples of these actions are cited in this essay.

Based on feedback from the college and school academic affairs committees, the deans, Faculty Senate, and Senior Vice-President proposed a revision of program review guidelines, which require detailed descriptions of the assessments and documentation that programs must provide.

*Analysis of undergraduate programs.* Based on a review and analysis of program-specific qualitative and quantitative data, the University has begun the process of right-sizing academic programs. This was recommended in the 2007 Commission Action Letter. It is critical that recommendations on the future of academic programs be based on current and appropriate data. Accordingly, in 2007, the Senior Vice-President prepared profiles of undergraduate programs that combined quantitative data (e.g., ratios of full-time-equivalent faculty to students; graduation rates for majors) with qualitative data, with each program reporting external recognitions for quality; whether all course outlines reflect both program and course-specific SLOs, and what type of assessment plans are in place; evidence of alignment with the institutional strategic commitment to academic quality (e.g., use of capstone courses and instructional technology); and action on program review-based recommendations for improving pedagogy and curricula. This information was shared with the deans and programs. In Fall 2008, the Faculty Senate President convened an ad hoc committee of faculty, which reviewed the evidence and prepared recommendations. Review of these recommendations by the deans and the colleges/schools will lead to action recommendations to the President. Both the last essay in this section and EEF II.3 contain information on this review and analysis.

*Qualitative review of graduate programs.* The Graduate Curricula Review Committee (GCRC) recommends policies, standards and procedures for the graduate programs, coordinates faculty input on
graduate program reviews, and reviews proposals for substantive changes in existing/new graduate programs and courses to the administration via the Faculty Senate. The graduate program analysis will follow the same pattern as the undergraduate analysis, but with greater emphasis on qualitative data. The GCRC and the Senate Committee on Institutional Excellence are currently conducting this review. In order to include input from the Assistant Vice President, this review will occur in Spring Semester 2009.

**Systems by College and School**

The colleges and schools review assessment evidence in annual CFES evaluation meeting with faculty members. This includes discussions of actions taken to address needs identified in assessment results. Professional accreditation bodies also require assessment plans and actions in response to the results as elements of each review. The Education, Social Work, Business, and Nursing programs have current professional and academic accreditation with their respective bodies. SOE received initial accreditation by NCATE in 2007, with a focused review in March 2009, just before the WASC visit to review assessment plans, results, and actions.

A particular example of the use of data is the development of a Certificate in Entrepreneurship and a new concentration in Entrepreneurship for the Bachelors of Business Administration. Information on these new programs appears in EEF.III.A.7.

**Analysis of the Evidence**

The University has largely achieved the 2004 Proposal's goals of defining SLOs and integrating assessment data with program reviews. Support and review of assessment plans and activities occur at the program, college/school and institutional levels. The colleges, schools and programs report during yearly budget cycles on the alignment of their respective SLOs with those of the institution. The University Assessment Committee then reviews learning objectives at three levels—institutional, college and program—in order to validate the alignment.

The Assessment Committee uses program reviews to gather information about the variety and types of assessments within each program and to determine the degree to which programs have moved beyond student self-reports and pre- and posttests of concept mastery to authentic, performance-based methods. The Committee also provides direction and training opportunities to support faculty work in assessment and works closely with the General Education Review Committee to ensure that appropriate assessments are conducted on GE outcomes, with actions taken in response.

The Assessment Officer / Institutional Researcher has developed a web site to disseminate the results of program reviews and track the progress of reviews. One challenge is to streamline and automate the process via web-based applications, so that faculty use their time and energy in the most productive way possible. The Assessment Committee is currently considering how to respond to this challenge.

**Do Students Demonstrate Learning at Levels Established by External Standards?**

**Institutional Policies on External Standards**

The University encourages all degree programs to link assessments to standards established by appropriate national and international professional organizations. Results have been positive, especially in the professional schools. In addition, the program review system encourages benchmarking with similar programs at other universities, and requires that each program be evaluated by one or more expert external reviewer (Program Review Handbook in EEF III.A.8)

**Examples.** This section presents examples of programs using externally recognized, discipline-specific standards to assess the quality of student learning.
• Business Administration faculty assess students’ global awareness (a program SLO) with pre- and post tests in BA341 International Business Environment. Results revealed substantial improvements in students’ global awareness after taking the course and parity with benchmarks from students in New York and Pennsylvania who completed the same tests at the same level.

• Chemistry faculty assess students’ mastery of learning outcomes using a standardized examination developed and validated by the American Chemical Society, noting that average student scores compare favorably with national averages.

• Nursing faculty assess students’ mastery of content at the end of each clinically based theory course, using tests developed and validated by the NLN. Students typically perform well on these tests, with the majority passing the tests on the first administration, and substantial percentages achieving perfect scores.

• To maintain NCATE accreditation, Education faculty demonstrate that graduates meet national standards of content mastery and proficiency on the Educational Testing Service’s Pre-Professional Skills Tests and content-specific PRAXIS II examinations.

• Programs that offer opportunities for service learning and/or internships frequently rely on evaluations by field work supervisors to assess their students’ performance. Supervisors’ evaluations of students in AG498 Special Projects in Agriculture, PY492a-b Psychology Practicum, and SW385 - 485 Field Instruction I-II have documented the high quality of student performance.

• Admission to graduate programs or to professional study provides another index of program effectiveness. The Student Success essay provides examples.

Do Students Demonstrate Learning at Levels Set by the Program?

Assessments of SLOs make use of standards developed within programs in response to the specific needs of the University’s student population and the region. This section presents representative examples.

• In the Consumer and Family Sciences program (CFS), tests conducted in 2008 compared freshmen and sophomores in CFS courses with graduating seniors, assessing the seniors’ gains in and overall mastery of course material in 16 content areas identified by the CFS faculty. The results demonstrated reliable gains, strong retention and high mean scores in all 16 areas.

• Business Administration faculty developed pre- and post tests in two specific courses in the BBA Economics concentration, BA110 Principles of Economics and BA322 Personal Financial Planning, producing evidence of student improvement in economic and personal finance literacy.

• In BA110 Principles of Economics, a pre-/post-test measures students’ achievements of two program learning goals: to demonstrate critical thinking and analytical skills; and competence in functional areas of economics and finance. Comparisons of 28 students completing BA110 with performance by students in two other studies—a large-scale study of over 1000 students in a comparable course (Markow & Bagnaschi, 2005), and a study of 32 students in a comparable course at Alfred University—indicated a lower mean score, 14.6 (with a standard deviation of 3.45) for the University’s sample, than the researchers observed in their own samples, at 17.28 and 18.06, respectively. Faculty used this information to strengthen course content and include more group discussions in the syllabus.

• While not all results are positive, any negative results are used to guide positive changes in programs. Pre- and post tests conducted in MA165 Pre-calculus indicated that entering students had weak algebra skills, and had not improved these skills by course end. As a result, the prerequisites for this course were improved and a new, accelerated course added to prepare
students for MA 165. Math faculty will repeat the assessment next year, evaluating changes in both pedagogy and curriculum.

Closing the Loop: Data-Based Decisions that Strengthen Academic Quality

This section presents evidence that colleges, programs and faculty respond appropriately and systematically to assessment data. Examples demonstrate that programs regularly revise curricula based on the results of assessments; that assessments of SLOs lead to reflection and deliberation-based revisions of pedagogy; and that formal reviews of academic programs lead to institution-wide and program-specific actions and improvements.

Action Based on Program Reviews

In 2008, the Senior Vice-President released an analysis of responses to all recommendations emerging from the program review process over three years. The analysis indicated that 59% of all recommendations emerging from program reviews were implemented, with a further 31% pending implementation. Of the remaining 10% of program review-based recommendations not implemented or scheduled, 71% were awaiting action by the faculty, while 21% were not implemented due to funding, infrastructure needs or staff/technical support.

College- or school-wide percentages of undergraduate programs making recommendations based on the results of assessment data ranged from a high of 100% for the School of Education to a low of 14% for the College of Natural and Applied Sciences. Implementation rates for recommendations ranged from a high of 76% for the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, to a low of 28% for the College of Natural and Applied Sciences. Although each program has its own story to tell, lack of faculty action was cited most often as reason for not implementing recommendation, with lack of resources listed next, information that supports the need for a program sustainability review. Data from program reviews are also used in the evaluations of deans and in budget preparation.

Institutional Review of Programs

Data from the quantitative and qualitative reviews of undergraduate academic programs guided recommendations by an ad hoc committee composed of the Assessment Coordinator / Institutional Researcher and representatives of the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee, Undergraduate Curricula Review Committee, and Standing Committee on Budget and Planning. The committee was tasked with reviewing program data, validating criteria suggested by the Senior Vice-President, and recommending one of three consequent courses of action, for each program: (1) continue and enhance; (2) combine / collaborate / change; or (3) phase out and/or eliminate. At the time of this report, the committee had submitted a report of its recommendations and findings for review by the college and school deans and academic affairs committees, and the Senior Vice-President (EEF.II.3).

The review of graduate programs now in progress will make use of a similar system for analyses and recommendations.

Evidence-based Improvements in Course Syllabi

A comparison of data gathered from 2005 and 2007 surveys of course syllabi showed quality improvements across the colleges and schools. By 2007, faculty included statements concerning students’ rights under the Americans with Disabilities Act, statements defining and prohibiting plagiarism, and references to how course readings relate to student learning. Areas still requiring improvement include linking the course syllabi to grading rubrics, and linking assessments to specific SLOs.
Examples of Programs Closing the Loop, By College/School

CLASS. Faculty moved from assessing critical thinking skills in GE courses to revising pedagogy and course content based on evidence of student performance in comparison with standards established by the program. Three examples follow.

- Psychology faculty aligned SLOs for individual courses with ten categories of learning outcomes recommended by the American Psychological Association for undergraduate programs. The faculty selected writing skills, critical reasoning, and knowledge of applications of psychology as program-wide priorities, which guided both internal and external assessments, and revisions of pedagogy in multiple courses. Specific skills identified as needing further emphasis include writing for scientific publication, hypothesis testing, and the ability to identify sound applications of psychological principles and data to practical problems: all of which now receive greater emphasis in required and elective courses. Feedback from community-based practicum supervisors has guided program changes in specific content knowledge on psychopathology, ethical issues, and mental health systems on Guam.

- English faculty assessed student learning in three sections of EN100 Fundamentals of College English, using a multiple-choice editing test: identifying specific areas of problems in grammatical constructs, and modifying the choice of text, and instructors’ teaching strategies: to include more supervised in-class exercises. Ongoing assessments will gauge these strategies’ effectiveness.

- Sociology faculty conduct pre- and post tests each semester in SO101 Introduction to Sociology. These tests identified course content requiring—and now receiving—more emphasis during the semester, as well as areas of students’ greatest mastery. Also, external assessments of long-term work in Bali, Indonesia, by students and faculty in SO/AN405 Community Development resulted in improvements in course content and information to guide program planning for field schools in Indonesia for the next several years.

CNAS. The College expanded its evidence-based revisions of courses and curricula from emphasis on Mathematics and Biology to each of its eight degree programs.

- Agriculture faculty assigned to AG101 Introduction to Agriculture, AG102 Plant Biology and AG281 Principles of Horticultural Science altered course content to compensate for students’ pre-test-indicated deficits in basic knowledge of the scientific method: with posttests indicating improvements. Faculty used observations from supervisors of student interns to modify selections of internship sites.

- Biology faculty acted on pre-tests of students enrolling in BI412 Biometrics indicating that students would benefit from a statistics prerequisite specific to biology, rather than a non-specific statistics course offered by the Mathematics program. A successful grant application supported development of a biology-specific statistics course for Spring 2009. Additional assessments focused on anatomy and physiology courses indicated a need to establish uniform structure, content and evaluations across multiple sections. Using a common syllabus, timetable and set of learning objectives, and hiring an adjunct instructor to supervise all six lab sections, achieved the desired standardizations of pedagogy. Faculty are now assessing the efficacy of these changes.

- Faculty assessment of other Biology courses indicated that students lacked important skills in reading and writing scientific material. Faculty secured Federal funds to develop three new required courses in scientific communication.

- Chemistry faculty used pre-tests to familiarize students in CH100 Introduction to Inorganic Chemistry and CH310 Organic Chemistry with category-based standards. Although students’ competence in conducting experiments has improved, post tests indicate continued deficiencies in
solving quantitative problems: leading to more frequent feedback to students from spot quizzes. Similarly increased use of spot quizzes and frequent feedback for students in CH102/103 General Chemistry led to marked improvements in quantitative skills.

- Computer Science and Computer Information Systems faculty designed a business database system to assess students' skills. Results indicated that students needed more practice than coursework then offered in database management and user training skills. CS/CIS courses were redesigned to devote more time to these areas. Results show improvement.

- Consumer and Family Sciences faculty used their programs’ 16 learning objectives to develop a comprehensive assessment of students' skills in each area: determining that coursework had eliminated lower division deficits in knowledge of clothing and textiles by the time of graduation, and that seniors’ skills in each area met program standards.

- After identifying the most challenging problems covered in multiple courses, Mathematics faculty developed cooperative, faculty-supervised workshops modeled on Berkeley’s Uri Triesman’s Emerging Scholars Program. Post tests indicate improved problem-solving abilities.

- On the basis of pre- and post tests and studies of successful completion rates, Mathematics faculty made carefully designed changes in developmental Math course pedagogy, to include more teacher-focused activities such as lectures. To correct clear deficiencies in algebraic problem-solving, faculty developed a course (MA 088, offering intensive practice in intermediate algebra), which has replaced Finite Mathematics as a prerequisite for College Algebra.

- In Social Work, feedback from students in one-day retreats focused on curricula led to systematic changes in program requirements, including the addition of a course in Economics, the deletion of a Political Science requirement and the creation of a new course: Advocacy in Professional Practice. Professional field instructors supply observation-based ratings of students’ specific practice skills in social service settings.

SBPA. On the basis of regular assessments, faculty identified changes in multiple courses with BA110 and BA341 International Business Environments as notable examples. Faculty conduct program assessments using external evaluations, such as a survey of the business community, conducted through the Guam Chamber of Commerce, which indicated a need to change the accounting program from a concentration to a major. This change received administrative approval and is now in place.

SOE. The School’s work to improve pedagogy and curricula benefited greatly from its use of the LiveText Data Management System to compare measures professional dispositions (as assessed using faculty-completed rubric-based ratings)—i.e., pre-service attitudes, behavior, and responses to school climate settings—of students in teacher preparation programs, to national standards. Reviews of individual teacher candidates’ strengths and deficiencies guide the design of interventions to strengthen each candidate’s performance, and revisions of course objectives and course outlines.

SNHS. Based on assessment results that indicated that Nursing majors who completed an elective course on dosages (NU214) were more likely to pass NLN content tests, the elective course was added as a requirement for all students. The same NLN content tests provide diagnostic information on content mastery for each student. Advisors review this information with the student and suggest remedial action.

When clinical skills competency checks conducted in Nursing Practicum identified deficiencies in students’ readiness to provide care to patients in clinical settings, instructors increased lab hours devoted to practicing nursing skills and adjusted schedules so that a clinical instructor would be present. As a result, all students reached competency levels and moved to the next program stage.
Summary

The University has made substantial progress toward achieving the goals for academic quality set in its 2004 Reaccreditation Proposal and in implementing the recommendations of the 2007 WASC Site Visit Team Report and Commission Action Letter. Formal, published learning objectives exist for programs, General Education, each college and school, and the University as documented in course outlines, syllabi and catalogs. Budgets, administrative structures, and faculty development activities support planning, decisions and action to enhance academic quality and decisions are based on reliable evidence, including external reviews. Faculty and administrators have undertaken a quantitative and qualitative data-based analysis of undergraduate academic programs, with the goal of "right sizing" the programs in an environment of scarce resources, and a similar review of graduate programs is underway. The University aligned administrative resources to support graduate programs, and coordinated assessment and institutional research.

The University will continue to support academic programs that have not yet linked their learning objectives to external benchmarks, or to standards identified by professional organizations.

Although the schools and colleges currently use program reviews to develop budgets in support of programs' needs, the University will consider adopting one or more established systems for strengthening the linkage between measures of quality and budgets. Dill's (2007) system for assuring academic quality, which includes the use of national examinations, academic audits and performance-based funding, provides one example.

In the next essay, the focus shifts from the definition and assessment of SLOs to the University's efforts to optimize student development, broadly considered: addressing enhancements in the effective recruitment, remediation, advising, retention, and persistence of students, as well as their training for lifelong learning and service to their communities.

B. SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Introduction

"Regard man as a mine rich in gems of inestimable value. Education can, alone, cause it to reveal its treasures, and enable mankind to benefit therefrom." (Baha'u'llah)

These words capture the essential role that education plays in a world searching for answers. Education uncovers the true potential of the individual, and thus, of local, regional and global communities. This essay evaluates the University's educational effectiveness with particular attention to students' differing needs, and levels of preparation and success across demographic categories and courses of study; evidence of students' satisfaction; evidence of effective advising; faculty members' enacted commitment to developing curricula in response to student needs; linkages between scholarship, teaching, student learning and service; and preparing students for work, effective communication, scientific literacy, lifelong learning and civic responsibility in fulfillment of WASC Criteria For Review 1.7, 1.8, .2.2a, 2.5, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.13, 2.14, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.

In November 2006, the University produced a CPR Self Study that assessed the institution's capacity to realize student success in multiple areas, and made recommendations to extend this capacity in the future. The institution's collective response to these recommendations and evidence of its progress in optimizing three elements of student success are identified below.
Definition of Student Success

The definition of student success that guided the CPR Self Study continues to structure evidence in this essay. Where academic quality focuses on SLOs within specific programs, student success is defined in terms of the student's long-term development: beginning with success in obtaining an affiliation with a university that has programs and resources that are appropriate to the student's goals and capabilities. Student success continues with timely and appropriate advancement from lower- to upper-division courses (sustaining an affiliation), and culminates in learning as a lifestyle, a rewarding career in which the student applies what s/he has learned in college courses, contributes informed opinion and service to his or her community, and maintains a mutually beneficial affiliation with the university (cf. Miller, 2002). The University’s educational effectiveness is evaluated within this framework.

Obtaining Appropriate Affiliations

Demonstrating educational effectiveness requires evidence that the University attracts students likely to achieve their educational goals at this institution; develops students who are at risk; and modifies course offerings and programs in response to community needs. This section presents evidence that the University currently pursues these goals through improved recruiting, cooperation with high schools, enhancements of the developmental programs in mathematics and English, growth in enrollment, assessment of its stature as an institution among regional communities, and through changes in course offerings based on needs assessments.

Improved Recruiting

Reaching potential applicants from the region's high schools and community colleges, and among non-traditional students; conveying the message that higher education is an important next step in their development; and making the case that the University is their very best option, have always presented challenges. Higher education is a relatively recent phenomenon in the Micronesian islands, and many incoming freshmen are first generation college students. This section provides evidence that the University has met these challenges, in fulfillment of WASC's accreditation Standard 1.

The University created and filled the position of Dean of Enrollment Management and Student Services (EMSS). This office developed a Strategic Enrollment Master Plan (EEF III.B.1) that targeted a 3% annual growth rate in enrollment each year for five years. This goal has been achieved and sustained from 2004-2008, in part through focused recruitment efforts.

Representatives of the EMSS Office make twice-annual visits to all public and private high schools on Guam. In 2006, the EMSS Office extended these visits to all high schools in the neighboring islands of Rota, Tinian, Saipan and Palau. Each fall, workshops educate and inform high school counselors about the admissions process and options for financial aid. Each spring, the University hosts multiple College Nights for high school graduating seniors and their parents. Parents on Guam and in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) receive letters of invitation to a College Night, which provides information about the University in general, its admission processes, and options to pay for their children's education. The EMSS Office works closely with the Office of Integrated Marketing and Communication (OIMC) to publicize College Nights in advertisements through radio and print media. The University holds a Graduate Fair each semester during which prospective graduate students may meet and talk with faculty members about their programs.

Individual academic programs use similar recruitment strategies. For example, English and Communication faculty hold annual career days for students interested in these majors. Speakers representing different career areas talk with students about enhancing their college experience, about trends in the field, and about the current job market. Mathematics faculty host a popular Math Day, and
sponsor an island-wide problem-solving contest. As a later section will make clear, such recruitment strategies offer important benefits to students as well the programs, given a demonstrated advantage of declared majors over undeclared students in advancing from freshman to sophomore status.

The Dean of EMSS appears on local radio talks shows, and reaches out to indigenous persons in Chamorro-language broadcasts in the Northern Marianas, encouraging them to consider the University for the future of their children. Additionally, the Director of the OIMC has added to the website a recruitment video often broadcast on local TV, along with links to downloadable admission and financial aid forms.

**Enhancing Students’ Essential Skills**

As the table in Appendix 6 demonstrates, more than half of all students admitted require remedial coursework in mathematics, English, or both. To ensure that these students receive consistent and appropriate remediation, the University developed core course objectives and master syllabi for remedial courses, and increased cooperation with high schools: e.g., in spring 2009, offering courses at the high schools using video conferencing technology currently available in each school.

Other forms of cooperation with high schools in preparing prospective students for college-level work increased substantially in 2007, with a $537,000 Federal grant awarded to the EMSS Office to extend the AmeriCorps program by establishing success centers in five high schools on Guam, and one each in the Department of Corrections and in Guam Community College. Trained students (62 FTE) staff these success centers, mentoring and tutoring potential applicants for success in their current programs, and for possible entry into the University, with remediation in math and English: addressing both recruitment and retention. Since their establishment, these success centers provided tutoring for over 350 students, and outreach to more than 1540.

Mathematics and English faculty defined common learning objectives for developmental courses, as summarized in course syllabi on file with CNAS and CLASS, respectively. Course outlines were revised to formalize these new core objectives, and the student learning outcomes and assessment measures aligned with them, in AY 08-09. The senior management team considered options for administering the developmental programs: from centralized management, to retaining the cost-effective current system, and has left these programs with the colleges based on their strong disciplinary affiliations.

**Academic Programs’ Responses to Island and Regional Needs**

*Program-specific increases in enrollment.* Several degree programs have seen substantial increases in enrollments over the past several years (Appendix 7). Improvements in facilities have attracted increasing numbers of students to programs in Business and Public Administration, which have simultaneously expanded their pools of qualified adjunct faculty. Japan’s economic recovery produced concomitant improvements in Guam’s economy, and steady growth in enrollments at every level of Japanese language courses has accompanied these improvements. Shortages of registered nurses on Guam and in the region have produced significant increases in enrollment in the Nursing program, among both Pre-Nursing and Nursing BSN students. The successful hiring in the Division of English and Acquired Linguistics (DEAL) of three assistant professors contributed to a 26% increase in credit hour production in the program between 2002 and 2007.

A study conducted by Developmental English faculty in 2006 (EEF III.B.2) revealed that over a 1.5 year period, almost 60% of students who graduated with a Bachelor's degree began their studies in Developmental English or another pre-college level English course. During the same period, almost 50% of students graduating with a Master's degree also began at the pre-college English level. These figures suggest that the Developmental English / pre-college level English program meets its primary objective: preparing students for academic success.
Still, not all enrollment increases have been easily accommodated. Class sizes in Nursing have increased, and faculty shortages have reduced the numbers of courses. The program received 80 applications for Spring 2009 enrollment in its BSN Nursing program: which has a capacity of 40.

New academic programs: New programs launched over the past two years in response to demonstrated needs in the Guam community and in the region include an Associate Degree program in Nursing, a Bachelor of Science program in Health Sciences, a Bachelor of Arts program in Sociology, a Master of Arts program in Clinical Psychology, a Master of Arts in English, a Professional Master of Business Administration degree, and a Master's degree in Social Work. The Faculty Senate level has under review a new concentration on Entrepreneurship for the BBA. Each of these programs conducted a community / regional needs assessment, and included that information in its application for a new program.

Three successful substantive change applications have allowed the University to offer new programs in Pohnpei and Saipan. The College of Micronesia-Federated States of Micronesia and the University offer a Partnership Program allowing students to receive a B.Ed. in Elementary Education without leaving their island. In Saipan, new programs offer the Master of Arts degree in School Counseling and a Master of Education in Administration and Supervision. These programs are under evaluation for fiscal soundness, and to ensure that student outcomes match on campus results.

Assessing the University's Stature Among Regional Communities

These responses to the community's needs show every sign of paying off. OIMC tracks news coverage as one means of gauging the community's perceptions of the University. The past several months have shown a marked increase in coverage. Coverage has more than tripled on Guam itself. For example, 115 local news stories appeared during May 2008, with 76 expressing positive perceptions, and 39 neutral. During the same month, OIMC identified 131 University news stories in the mainland United States, as well as 56 international stories, with 96% of stories in each domain expressing positive perceptions. This is evidence of effectiveness in achieving positive visibility. The following excerpt from an editorial in the Pacific Daily News (Guam's primary newspaper) is a case in point.

The University of Guam plays an important role in preparing its students for Guam's work force and helping them become the future leaders of our island and the region. UOG's role in the community becomes even more important as the pending military buildup is expected to change Guam's economic landscape. With a population surge there will be a need for more services, as well as technicians, specialists and professionals to provide for and manage those services.... For years, the university has been able to live within its means. It instituted austerity measures, such as temporary cuts in salaries and work hours, when necessary. It consolidated colleges and divisions. Though the local government shortchanged the university by millions of dollars in allotments for many years, the university was able to continue operations and maintain the quality of its services. It was able to meet the demands of its growing student enrollment with its existing staff, infrastructure and resources....Now, the University is looking ahead to the military buildup, what the needs of our island will be and how UOG can best serve the community during the buildup and beyond. Elected officials must recognize UOG's role in helping prepare our island and its talent for the buildup. More importantly, they must support the university's vision and goals with the necessary funding and resources.

This is but one of many examples where the media recognizes the University's contributions to the region, and its leadership role. Positive local and international coverage in turn contribute to positive perceptions among diverse constituents considering a University affiliation. As evidence, the fact that the 2008 valedictorians from three (of the four) public high schools on Guam, along with two salutatorians and a National Honor Society president, selected the University as their first choice and have now enrolled,
together with the fact that increasing percentages of Guam's public and private high school graduates are attracted—recruiting 23% and 34%, respectively, in Fall 2008—suggests increasingly positive perceptions of the University as the first and best option for graduating high school students.

Comparisons of data on visitors to the University’s new website (www.uog.edu)—launched Jan. 31, 2008—show increases in use from March to August 2008. Sessions quadrupled, and page views increased dramatically over the same period. Visitors spend an average of eight minutes longer on the site. (EEF III.B.3)

**Sustaining Appropriate Affiliations**

As an open enrollment institution, the University faces additional, distinct challenges in providing culturally and academically diverse students every opportunity to succeed. Current initiatives to meet these challenges include: identifying factors in freshman to sophomore retention, and in students’ persistence to degree; responding to needs identified in surveys of graduating seniors and in academic program reviews (cf. Essay A); improving academic advising and work with student organizations; increasing efforts to prepare students as contributors to knowledge; and increasing efforts to prepare students for lifelong service to their communities. This section reviews evidence of each.

**Identifying Factors in Freshman to Sophomore Retention**

In the Spring of 2005, 307 (10%) students were on academic probationary status or suspension. In collaboration with student counselors and the Student Life Office, the Dean of EMSS developed procedures to help students come off of probation. Students on probation were required to meet with a counselor, and to develop and commit to a “road map” leading to a resumption of good academic standing. With the help of tutoring services (including instruction in reading college-level texts) and the development of MA084 (a fundamentals math course based on student-professor contact (as contrasted with MA085, which is self paced and independent study-based)), and focused advising and counseling, the number of students on probation dropped to 291 by the fall of 2006, and again to 149 by Fall Semester 2007: a decrease of over 50%, from 10% of the total student body in 2005 to 4.5% in 2007.

In response to data provided by the Registrar’s Office, indicating many students retake developmental courses several times before passing, the Dean of EMSS initiated an AmeriCorps grant-funded special tutoring program. This program hires students with strong English and math skills to mentor and tutor others in need. Students in this program receive both academic and career counseling. The services are free, and open to students six days a week.

The University this year commissioned a statistical analysis of factors affecting attrition from freshman to sophomore years. A full report of this analysis and its conclusions appears in EEF.III.B.4. Analyses of the pattern of freshmen withdrawals from courses, records of freshmen placed on academic probation, or dismissed, and records of freshmen who advanced to sophomore status and those who left without advancing (stop outs), identified several risk factors among students, and among courses of study.

It is important to note that each of these phenomena—course withdrawals, academic probation, and stop outs—contributes distinct and important information about barriers to student success among freshmen. For example, many freshmen placed on academic probation had not withdrawn from any courses during the prior semester, and many freshmen who did not continue their enrollment had not been placed on probation.

Some highlights of the analysis are summarized below:

**Courses of study.** The analysis identified course subject areas that record reliably higher percentages of withdrawals by freshmen than most other courses. Although the consistent presence of courses in
biology, chemistry and mathematics on this list is consistent with the experiences of peer institutions, courses in philosophy, geography, and anthropology also recorded disproportionately high percentages of freshman withdrawals. Courses in communication, English, fine arts and physical education record reliably lower than average percentages of freshman withdrawals.

Undeclared freshmen are more likely than freshmen with declared majors to be placed on probation or dismissed. (Undeclared freshmen are not, however, more likely to withdraw from courses during a given semester.)

Demographic analyses. Male freshmen are significantly less likely than female freshmen to advance to sophomore status. Thirty-five percent of freshmen in the sample—and 44% of stop outs—are men. The University is not retaining male Chamorro students, in particular, in proportionate numbers. Chamorro men accounted for 14% of all freshmen, but a disproportionate 24% of all stop outs. Similarly, fewer than 1% of freshmen in the sample were men from the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, or the Republic of the Marshall Islands, but these men accounted for 3% of stop outs.

In contrast, Chamorro women and women from elsewhere in Micronesia advanced to sophomore status at rates comparable to the student body as a whole. Also in contrast, the University retains students of Filipino ethnicity, and Filipino women in particular, at disproportionately high rates. Female Filipino students accounted for 27.5% of freshmen in the sample, but for only 13% of stop outs. Students with prior college level work (accounting for 13% of freshmen, but for only 3% of stop outs) also had a reliable advantage.

Male freshmen withdrew from courses at rates comparable with female freshmen, but men were reliably more likely to indicate that their withdrawals were due to work schedule conflicts, or to a lack of interest in the course. Female freshmen were more likely to indicate that their withdrawals are due to personal matters.

Analyses of probationary status and dismissals provided additional information. Male freshmen—and Chamorro men, in particular—were disproportionately likely to be placed on academic probation or dismissed. In contrast, freshmen from elsewhere in Micronesia, though more likely than average to stop out, did not do so because of disproportionately high rates of probation or dismissal. Filipino freshmen were unusually likely to remain on good academic standing.

Each of these findings will encourage additional, qualitative, focus group-based research on freshman to sophomore retention, and on students’ persistence to degree, and will guide the design of interventions for at-risk groups and for freshmen and sophomores in higher-risk courses of study. Pilot interventions will begin in Fall 2009. As subsequent sections of this essay will demonstrate, the University also promotes retention of upper-division students through increased opportunities for student-faculty research partnerships and service learning.

Responding to Needs Identified in Surveys of Graduating Seniors

Annual surveys of graduating seniors identified frequent experiences with closed courses and academic advising as areas for improvement. This section reviews evidence of responses to these needs at institutional and programmatic levels.

Increasing enrollment. Credit hour production across the institution increased over the past four years: 33,643 in the fall of 2004; 35,187 in the fall of 2005; 36,408 in the fall of 2006; and 38,007 in the fall of 2007. For example, English—which is fundamental to the General Education program—increased credit hour production from 4265 during Fall Semester 2005 to 4741 for Fall 2007.

Other specific examples from individual programs include SOE's 14-month teacher certification program. This program is designed for people who already have their baccalaureate degrees and want to become certified as teachers. Forty people earned their certifications as of December 2007, and the
program's third cohort will graduate in December 2008. Another example is the Special Education Fall Institute, which leads teachers to certification in Special Education, and offers a Masters in Special Education as well. The program graduated five students in spring 2008—the first special education Master's program graduates in five years—and will graduate an additional 15 Master's students in Fall 2008.

**Improvements in academic advising and in work with student organizations.** As a part of improving academic advising, the Office of Student Counseling Services provides increased numbers of faculty with training in advising and the use of course registration software, including WebAdvisor. Program-specific initiatives in advising include the use of Individual Degree Plans for majors in Education, and a One Stop Advisement - Registration Pilot Project in Social Work, which allows Social Work faculty to access the computerized registration system, and to retrieve academic evaluations as they advise students and register them for courses. Faculty in Nursing have expanded their advisement to include members of Pre-Nursing and Nursing majors' families, in an annual event that promotes an exchange of information about program activities, and allows students to share their experiences with family members. Faculty in the ROTC Program offer a similar event for cadets' families. Faculty from the School of Business and Public Administration recently completed training on WebAdvisor and are pilot testing use of the web to enter each semester's grades.

Degree programs support student organizations for their majors and minors, and for students interested in their fields. Student organizations in Business Administration (including the Junior Accounting Society, American Marketing Association, Society for Human Resource Management, the Finance Club, and the Tourism Awareness Group), in Communication, in Nursing, and in Sociology, report particularly active collaborations with faculty. As indicated in the following section on service learning, students in the Communication Society and the Triton's Society (in Sociology) are especially active in community service. The Student Nurse's Association of Guam has won awards from the National Student Nurse's Association (NSNA) for the past two years, reflecting increasing membership with NSNA.

Current data support the conclusion that these efforts are succeeding. The Office of Student Counseling Services surveys over the past two years report that graduating seniors provided increasingly favorable ratings of the quality of academic advising.

**Preparing Students through Research and Scholarly Contributions**

In addition to preparing students for contributions to their chosen fields, student-faculty research partnerships contribute to increased student retention (e.g., Gregerman et al, 1998). In this section, we discuss expanded student-faculty research partnerships.

Numerous individual programs provide hands-on training and experience in research and creative productions for undergraduate as well as graduate students. Examples include the following. The Tropical Agricultural Sciences program trains Agriculture students as assistants in faculty research projects, which leads to travel within the region and joint conference presentations. Communication majors contribute papers, poster presentations and organized panels for the CLASS research conference. Communications majors also produce the *Triton's Call*, which publishes eight issues per year. Students in the M.A. program in English in 2007 contributed research presentations to international conferences on terror (at Oxford University) and drama (in California). Education majors are required to join and participate in professional associations and to attend professional conferences. Majors in Nursing present findings from supervised research in a local annual conference. Psychology majors co-authored 21 research-based conference presentations and publications over the past five years; and recent graduates of the Psychology Program co-authored successful grant applications. Since Sociology began offering a Major in 2006, three students traveled to and presented their research at the 4th International Conference on Environmental, Cultural,
Social and Economic Sustainability in Malaysia, while three others co-authored two published articles in international refereed journals. The literary journal, *Storyboard*, is now collaboratively edited by faculty and students. Fine Arts majors perform in the Guam Symphony, the Guam Symphony Chorale, and the Guam Territorial Band. University Music has a strong record of off-island performances in the region. During AY 2006-2007, a student art competition produced artwork for the newly constructed Blue Aster chapel in Tumon. Student artwork now decorates the interior of the chapel.

The University’s National Institute of Health-funded Research Initiative for Scientific Enhancement (RISE) Program has demonstrated particularly strong achievements in preparing students for scholarly contributions and for graduate programs. This program’s goal is to increase the number and preparedness of students from underrepresented minorities in doctoral biomedical research, by strengthening Biology programs’ capacities for training in the responsible conduct of research, and in quantitative, laboratory and communication skills. The grant this cycle supports a core of student activities, the development of a bio-statistics course, and continued development of courses in science communication.

Undergraduate involvement in the past two years included on-island research experiences (six undergraduates and four graduate students each year), plus off-island summer internships, which greatly strengthened students’ capacity for science, motivation for graduate work, and credentials for receiving doctoral fellowships. The off-island partners and the numbers of students supported during the summers of 2007 and 2008 are as follows: University of California, San Diego, STARS program (5); Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, SMART program (1); Rutgers University RISE program (2); University of Delaware, Newark, HHMI program (1); Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, MHIRT program (research in Ghana) (4).

Students working in research labs participate in weekly student and professional development seminars that focus on the responsible conduct of scientific research. Students conducting on-island research also present their work at an annual research conference, and both groups of students are eligible to present papers at national conferences, with support from the grant. Over the past academic year, three students attended the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (Anaheim, Nov. 2007); three students attended the International Coral Reef Symposium (Ft. Lauderdale, July 2008), one student attended the Endocrine Society Conference (San Francisco, June 2008); and one student attended two health conferences in Washington, D.C. (Nov. 2007). In addition, one student received from The Endocrine Society Minority Access Program a scholarship to support her participation in the ENDO conference and the UCSD STARS program. Another student, as a result of his performance in last year’s MHIRT summer program, received a full scholarship to the Florida A&M University College of Pharmacy, to pursue a Ph.D. starting Fall 2008.

The program has a direct impact on graduates, and supports them indirectly through curriculum and infrastructure improvements. Six of eleven Biology graduates in AY 2007-08 participated in the summer internships through NIH RISE, and one also participates in on-campus research.

In addition to promoting student retention and persistence to degree (cf. Gregerman, et al, 1998) academic programs’ successes in involving students in scholarly research, publications and presentations, and in service to the community, serve two further purposes: as ends in themselves, and as preparation for contributions throughout the student’s future career.

**Student Internships and Service Learning**

In addition to preparing students for lifelong contributions to the community, service learning and internships contribute to increased student retention (e.g., Axsom, 1999; Eyler, 2001; Ryken, 2004). This section summarizes examples of increases in the numbers and types service learning and internships as components of undergraduate academic programs.
Increasing numbers of major programs require students to contribute to the community as a part of their education. Two years ago, only two of the 22 nonprofessional undergraduate programs in the colleges offered internships. Today, ten programs have internships as integral components of their curricula. In addition to professional degree programs in the three schools that have traditionally required community service-based internships (e.g., Business Administration, Education, Nursing), many other degree programs, including Computer Science, Computer Information Systems, English and Applied Linguistics, Japanese Studies, Psychology, Sociology, Social Work, Tropical Agriculture, and Communications, offer service learning / internships in core or elective coursework. The goal is to provide such links to the community in each undergraduate program by 2010.

Under supervision from faculty and mentors, student interns complete service learning experiences in areas from Anthropology to Tropical Agriculture. Programs collaborate with government agencies and private businesses to produce formal agreements concerning expectations of interns. Partners include Guam's Historic Preservation Office, media outlets (radio, television and print), Continental Airlines (computer practicum), the public and private schools in Guam and the region, the Pacific Judicial Council, various hotels and retail outlets (e.g., Westin, Hilton, Louis Vutton), the Department of Mental Health and Social Services, local non-profit organizations (Sanctuary, Victims Advocates), the Departments of Agriculture, Federal Fish and Wildlife, the two hospitals and other health care clinics on island, and engineering firms.

In addition, many of these and other programs incorporate other projects involving community service into coursework. Examples over the past year range from planning for a Guam Museum to organizing conferences, training seminars and volunteer work. Some service, such as community forums on controversial social or political topics, addresses immediate community needs. Some projects, such as Head Start and Guam Island Girl Power, address more long-term needs. The disciplines often collaborate; for example, students in Theater and in Clinical Psychology collaborated with the campus suicide prevention grant to produce a play about suicide for discussion and raising public awareness. Cultural activities such as language revitalization, archaeology, and environmental sustainability contribute to the island's development, as well as to that of students. Students develop an awareness of service as a civic responsibility, while experiencing how their discipline addresses needs in the community. Immediate feedback from partners makes learning more relevant, and strengthens links with the community. Appendix 8 contains an inventory of program activities.

The forty or so student clubs, many of them nurtured in degree programs, are regularly involved in community service projects, including: food drives for local charities, public lectures, discussion forums, and a campus-wide safety survey providing baseline data for Campus Safety Awareness Week; fund raising; participating in local forums and conferences; student academic assistance programs; and coordinating campus recycling activities. The Student Government Association supports these activities by providing grants from student activity fees to student organizations for community service projects.

Evidence of Effectiveness

In addition to identifying students' needs and priorities, surveys of graduating seniors capture the overwhelmingly positive experiences reported. Over the past three years, seniors consistently reported that they felt their time at the University had been well worth it. The vast majority (over 92%) reported that they felt prepared for positions in the work force in their fields of study; that they were satisfied with their majors; and that they would recommend the University to others in the community. A majority of students credit the University with helping them to succeed, and an overwhelming majority (over 92%) indicated that faculty and staff are extremely concerned or mostly concerned about the students. Most were optimistic about finding employment in their chosen fields, and a large percentage (over 88%) indicated that they
planned to attend graduate school. with over 55% planning to pursue a Master's degree here. The majority reported positive interactions with faculty, and over 95% indicated that their professors were extremely interested or somewhat interested in helping them. The majority (over 88%) also felt that the overall atmosphere was mostly to extremely concerned and helpful. Overall, these data supply evidence that campus learning experiences have contributed substantially to student success, and that the vast majority of students report a positive experience at this institution. Surveys of employers of graduates are included in program reviews and also consistently report satisfaction with the University of Guam graduate. Graduates from many programs—including Nursing and Accounting—are preferred to other institutions' graduates, based on consistently good experiences. Programs will report details of such surveys as part of the poster session during the site visit.

Maintaining an Affiliation

Student success culminates as the student graduates and enters new phases of life as a university-educated person, as a lifelong learner, as a person with a career, and as a person contributing to the larger society (cf. Miller, 2002). This section summarizes evidence of effectiveness in optimizing outcomes for—and in cultivating mutually beneficial relationships with—its alumni: evidence from activities by the Alumni Relations Office; from individual programs' surveys of alumni and employers; and from data on graduate school and career placements.

The Alumni Relations Office

The Alumni Relations Office updated its web pages to include information, update cards, a photo gallery, and alumni profiles. Regular email information is provided to alumni and presently it has over 1300 alumni on an e-mail list. The office established alumni chapters on Guam and in the region, e.g., in Korea, Palau, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Chuuk. The Alumni Association hosted its first awards banquet this fall, to recognize distinguished alumni. Alumni continue to engage in University activities by recruiting new students, through membership on the Board of Regents, through involvement with various committees and student activities, and by participating in commencement ceremonies and in awards and pinning ceremonies. Increasingly, alumni activities are associated with the college or school. Deans and division chairs are preparing for an annual giving campaign targeting alumni. This campaign awaits reorganization of the support staff of the University's Endowment Foundation.

The University recognizes, however, that it must do more to maintain mutually beneficial relationships with alumni. This is an area of particular concern to President Underwood, and he will report to the team any changes or updates. Recommendations appear in the closing section of this essay.

Feedback from Alumni and Employers

Graduates work in a diverse job market locally and internationally, and those choosing to continue their education now have a choice of 14 graduate options, including specializations in Education Master's programs. Many receive funding for graduate study from local appropriations such as the Yamashita Educator Corps and from external sources such as grants and private scholarships.

Programs conduct formal surveys of their own graduates and/or of employers in cycles ranging from two years to five years for inclusion in the formal program review self study. Every two to three years SBPA surveys its alumni, the general population, and the business community to assess successes among alumni and the school's image in the community. Social Work tracks and updates outcomes for program graduates on an annual basis, using the data to guide decisions on curricula. To date these assessments have provided evidence of strong satisfaction and support for programs. A 2005 survey of Political Science alumni found that participating alumni had found suitable, program-related employment. Surveys of
employers of Nursing graduates and of the graduates themselves at one and five years out from the program report consistent satisfaction with the quality of preparation.

Graduate School and Career Placement

Many programs maintain contact with alumni on an individual basis. The following sample cases of successful alumni were drawn from qualitative review narratives submitted by programs in October 2007 and included in EEF III.B.5 as part of the analysis of undergraduate programs.

- Anthropology graduates work for government agencies in the fields of cultural and historical preservation. Communications program graduates are reporters and anchors for TV and radio news, radio producers and disc jockeys, radio sales and public relations specialists, newspaper editors and reporters, magazine editors and magazine writers, a television program co-host, and human resource managers.

- Many graduates of the Humanities programs (e.g., Art, History, Philosophy) become teachers and administrators in the Guam Public School System, private schools, and the Department of Defense schools. Other positions held by graduates include graphic designers, entrepreneurs, and advertising account executives. Many of the Fine Arts program alumni are active members of a variety of local arts organizations, such as the Guam Symphony Society, Guam Territorial Band, Council of Arts and Humanities Agency, Theatre Guam and KPRG. Japanese Studies faculty report that over the past decade, two of their alumni have received Japanese government (Monbusho) scholarships to study and conduct research in Japan, and a third received a Fulbright scholarship. Other graduates are currently teaching English in Japan or in full-time positions with the Japanese visitor industry in Guam: including one as the president of his own tour company.

- The majority of Psychology graduates obtain employment in psychology related professions, e.g., in careers as mental health counselors, case workers, psychiatric technicians, drug and alcohol treatment specialists, school guidance counselors, and in a variety of other mental health and social service professions.

- Several programs—particularly Nursing and Political Science—report that their graduates currently occupy positions of leadership in the community: e.g., two sitting members of the Guam legislature, one sitting member of the legislature of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the former President of the Association of Pacific Island Legislatures.

- The NIH-funded RISE program monitors the successes of its science graduates, through Master's and Ph.D. or professional programs. That particular program has a 80% success rate in advancing students to further studies in science. Some successes come full circle. The two Programs (RISE and MBRS) celebrated a significant milestone this year with the hiring of two graduates as University of Guam faculty, both with doctorates in science fields (Pharmacology and Toxicology, and Chemical Ecology)

Professional Certifications

Nursing BSN graduates must successfully pass the professional examination, the NCLEX-RN, in order to become licensed to practice nursing within the United States and U.S. territories. The Nursing Program's first-time pass rate has exceeded the national benchmark of 75% since 1992, with several years of over 90%. All Education graduates become certified teachers, with a new requirement of passing the PRAXIS exam included as part of their training, beginning in 2008. Accounting majors go on to positions with the Public Auditors and private firms, but all must pass the CPA examination.
Conclusions and Recommendations

This essay has presented evidence of the three elements of student success. Improved recruiting efforts, including regular visits to high schools on Guam and throughout the region, informational promotions, and centers for mentoring and cultivating potential applicants, as well as new academic programs, expansions of course offerings, and feedback-driven promotion have been accompanied by increases in enrollment in general, and increased enrollments of the region's most promising high school graduates. The University has responded to WASC's recommendations, to data from prospective students, to data on enrollments and students' academic status, and to priorities identified by current students, academic programs, and the community: by identifying specific factors related to student retention and persistence to degree; by strengthening academic advising and work with student organizations; and by enhancing students' opportunities for research, creative production, service learning and internships. Individual programs have taken increased responsibility for optimizing outcomes for, and relationships with, alumni.

The University will continue to monitor these three aspects of student success over the next five years. Work to continue during that period includes the following.

1. The Alumni Relations Office will work to build, continuously update, interpret and make recommendations from, a database on career and other post-graduation outcomes for alumni, and on the needs and experiences of their employers and report regularly to the University community.
2. The University will continue to provide training for faculty in academic advisement and use of Colleague and WebAdvisor.
3. The University will develop and test interventions based on the latest study results to increase freshmen retention through academic and other coping skills. Freshmen in groups that have now been identified as at risk of non-retention will be targeted, and the University will track results, beginning with Pacific Islander freshman in Fall 2009.

Although engaging students in community service is an essential component of the work to promote student success, community engagement in a broader sense is an essential component of the mission of the University as a whole. The following essay explores indicators of the University's effectiveness in this endeavor.

C. THE LAND GRANT MISSION AND ENGAGEMENT

Introduction

Fulfilling the mission as a Land Grant institution requires strong linkages with the communities of Guam, Micronesia and the Asia-Pacific region. These linkages are based on research and on curricular and co-curricular programs that engage faculty and students with community needs in ways that develop stakeholders' skills, and capitalize on the region's cultural and economic diversities.

As the only four-year institution of higher education in the Western Pacific, the University makes unique contributions to positive change in the communities served. This essay provides evidence that the University is an effective partner in off-campus learning, applications of innovative research, and management of regional issues in collaboration with these communities. The engagement agenda calls for learning beyond the campus; applying research results beyond the academic community, and translating them into action; and providing service that directly benefits communities.

A framework developed in 1999 by the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities—as adopted in the 2006 CPR Self Study—applies criteria of responsiveness, respect, academic neutrality, accessibility, integration of scholarship and service, coordination, and resource
partnerships to assess effectiveness. This essay provides evidence of effectiveness in each area. In addition, it applies a second framework to view programmatic information on the relevance and quality of community outcomes. These two frameworks allow the University to assess staff, programs and services devoted to community outreach, and to revise its objectives, agenda and resource allocations accordingly. CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 2.8, 2.9, 2.11, 4.1, and 4.8 are addressed in this essay.

**Approach**

WASC’s 2007 Commission Action Letter encouraged the University to institutionalize its relationships with regional communities and their colleges. Accordingly, the University applied two models of best practice in engagement to assess its community engagement programs and services. The Kellogg Commission’s Holland Matrix measures an institution’s commitment by gauging faculty members’ and students’ involvement with the community with specific attention to the level of engagement through scholarship. The NASULGC model provides criteria for assessing the relevance of programs and activities, outcomes, and commitment to integrating engagement with the traditional academic mission and the regional institutions. The model also provides a foundation for a system of reporting on engagement. Accordingly, this essay provides survey data concerning engagement programs as well as direct evidence of outcomes and impacts of various programs in support of the land grant and engagement mission.

**Evidence of the University’s Commitment to Engagement**

**Survey Results**

To provide additional evidence of the relevance, outcomes and impacts of community engagement programs, the University conducted a survey of deans, directors and others either managing or participating in recently conducted engagement activities, programs, and/or projects (EEF III.C.1). Thirty-one of 54 respondents completed the survey, reporting on 35 activities. To gauge engagement levels by areas, respondents indicated whether projects were regional, local (Guam only), national, international, or combinations. Of the projects reported, 94% were conducted with local partners and collaborators, with 31% of these also reporting collaborations with regional partners. Two projects were strictly regionally focused, serving Palau and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (Saipan), respectively; one project was locally and nationally partnered; and two projects were both local and international in focus.

*Relevance.* Relevant engagement activities—defined as responses to clients’ needs—were identified by surveys, interviews and other research with stakeholders. 94% of programs surveyed reported a variety of such research, including surveys and focus groups, and using client and partner input to assure the relevance of educational programs. Evidence that stakeholder input has guided the design of programs and services is documented in program reviews, minutes of advisory group meetings, and annual plans of Cooperative Extension programs. Community input is requested and used in a variety of ways across the campus. Public hearings assess priority workforce needs. Each of the professional schools and the College of Natural and Applied Sciences have community advisory panels. Across the campus, approvals for new programs and program changes require community input and analyses of community needs.

*Outcomes and Impacts.* This section presents evidence that ongoing evaluations of programs for off-campus learning, applied research and service have identified emerging issues and priorities, and resulted in beneficial changes in the community. 74% of programs surveyed reported formal outcomes evaluations. Further, projects reported evaluation results to external partners such as the Guam Housing and Urban Renewal Authority; the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; the U.S. Department of Agriculture; the National Institute of Health; the U.S. Department of Justice; the U.S. Department of Education and the public school system’s DOE-funded Project HATSA; the U.S. Small Business Administration; the American Association of University Women; the Office of the Taxpayer Advocate; the
Governor’s Council; the National League for Nursing Accreditation Commission Committee; and the Guam Board of Nurse Examiners. Communications with these external partners confirmed that the University's programs have achieved the desired outcomes.

Program evaluations assess the extent of change in knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors attributable to the programs and projects. Survey respondents reported on these impacts for all 35 projects and activities, indicating positive shifts in knowledge, skills and attitudes as the most frequent short-term outcomes. 77% of projects also reported medium-term impacts in behavior, practices and decision-making. Even projects with a strictly regional focus often have beneficial implications for the partnered communities. For example, one of the projects in partnership with the Republic of Palau was designed to meet needs for research on the ecology of global change in island landscapes. It had the additional effect of building scientific capacity in Palau through biodiversity research on ecosystem conservation.

**Dissemination**

The portfolio of evidence supporting this essay (EEF III.C.2) provides documentation of the dissemination of discoveries in applied research to regional communities. This dissemination serves two purposes: 1) directing informational benefits to these communities, using newly produced knowledge to close the loop that began with input-based implementations of services, and 2) providing an opportunity for additional feedback to improve the programs and services that generated the findings.

Formal program evaluations structured feedback on the 35 activities summarized earlier. Respondents confirmed that feedback had helped them to increase the positive impacts of their projects over the medium term, and had led to adjustments in priorities, and to improvements both in services and in the University's stature among stakeholders.

**Engagement through Scholarship**

Implementation of a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System (CFES) coupled with grants and academic initiatives within the schools and colleges facilitates integration of community service with teaching and research. As examples provided in the essays on student success and academic quality make clear, faculty and students are currently engaged in community-focused service learning and in research addressing community issues. This section provides a Holland Matrix-based review of evidence of scholarship as engagement.

Involvement in community engagement was assessed by asking faculty to indicate which level best described their service activities: 1) committee or campus duties; 2) *pro bono* consulting, community volunteerism; 3) tenured/senior faculty pursuing community research; 4) community research and service learning; or 5) none. 85% of the faculty responding reported professional involvement with the community, with most reporting community based research. Respondents indicated which level best described the involvement of students in service activities: 1) extracurricular or student life activities; 2) internships and practicum experiences; 3) volunteerism; 4) service learning; or 5) none. 75% reported organized student involvement as part of a learning activity.

**Community Impacts**

Changes in policies, rules and social action have a substantial impact on the community served. This section provides examples of recent positive changes occurring as a result of the engagement of applied research, outreach and grant activities with the community.

The Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, Education, Research and Service (CEDDERS), a unit supported by Federal grants and local / regional contracts, supplies a particularly strong example of effectiveness in promoting positive social change. CEDDERS increased its funding by
nearly 50% in FY08 ($7M in FY 07 to $10.4M in FY 08) and has succeeded in meeting the community needs for advocacy and policies for individuals with disabilities. CEDDERS works with the CNMI, Pohnpei State, Guam agencies, and FSM on consumer, leadership and systems change. The health, wellness, and prevention programs cover child care, traumatic brain injury, early intervention, and maternal and child health to name a few. CEDDERS leverages resources by extensive collaboration with 23 universities, 25 non-profit organizations, and 37 Guam agencies and NGOs. As a direct result of their collaborative web and research-based interventions and education:

- The Guam Legislature appropriated $750,000 to save /Famagu’on-ta/: a system of care for children with serious mental health needs;
- New criteria for teacher and administrator performance were approved by the Education Board;
- New child care licensure requirements were developed, discussed and approved;
- The Legislature took action to modify taxes for child care providers as an incentive;
- Executive Order 2008-03 established the Guam Early Learning Council to oversee the early childhood comprehensive system, and established professional development plans for early childhood education professionals;
- The Legislature approved the PL 26-109 Vending Act for Individuals with Significant Disabilities, which provides for the development and implementation of policies and procedures for the administration of alternative assessments for students with cognitive disabilities for all six regional entities;
- New procurement policies for Guam, CNMI and American Samoa govern access to instructional materials for students who are blind or have print disabilities.

Another example of such change is the ban on smoking and tobacco use in the island’s bars and restaurants, partially attributable to advocacy by the University’s Cancer Research Center, and its evidence-based arguments at the Legislature. Use of tobacco has now been banned on the campus, at the Governor’s office complex, and at many government agencies as well. Another policy change as a result of the University’s applied research is the recent change making the teacher certification office an independent entity, removing the office from control by the public school system. The University’s influence and outreach is strong in education, economic development, healthcare policy, and environmental issues.

The Micronesian Area Research Center (MARC), the Marine Laboratory (ML) and the Water and Environmental Research Institute (W ERI) similarly are effective at facilitating evidence-based changes in cultural and environmental policies and regulations.

- MARC trained 19 students in basic archaeological field methods, and eight were hired on archaeological field projects. This constituted a fundamental change to the island’s labor pool. Previously, most of the consulting firms brought their own field people to Guam at enormous cost. The Guam Preservation Trust’s master plan in archaeology and oral history / ethnography exists because MARC contributed innovative technology and methodologies, as well as new research results and methods. MARC produced the only record of Latte period cultivations of sweet potato cultivation, early yam cultivation, and cultivation of wax-gourd in this part of the Pacific. Archaeological reports collection methods and procedures for Guam have changed because of MARC’s advocacy. Also, as a result, the number of reports available for policy makers and researchers in the Guam Historic Preservation Office rose from about 200 to nearly 1000. MARC’s intervention changed renewable energy planning from lip service to implementation through solar technology workshops and dialogue on the military buildup. As a direct result, the US Navy
released a pre-solicitation notice for Ocean Thermal Exchange Capacity energy generation to benefit not only the Navy base but also the larger Guam community.

- MARC is emerging as one of the University’s entrepreneurial units, with a major Blanket Purchase Agreement with the U.S. Navy (10 years with no upper limit), to conduct cultural resource management projects resulting from the military build-up. In collaboration with SBPA, MARC secured another subcontract with Parsons Joint Venture, which was awarded the $100 million program management contract from the Navy. This contract will draw on the University to provide basic studies and compliance services for the build-up. In the past two years, MARC has received grants and contracts for over $700,000, and expects to become a multi-million dollar program during the years of the build-up. This money will be used to invest in infrastructure and capacity for future educational and research programs after the flush of consulting opportunities diminishes.

- WERI conducts research and training in the areas of water resources and assessment. Initiatives have produced positive changes in numerous areas, including land cover practice changes, watershed management (Guam, FSM, CNMI), and a major evaluation of the Saipan water distribution system. WERI conducts annual regional and local advisory council meetings to report findings, prioritize areas for research in response to local needs, and target grants in those areas. WERI has a fully developed and functioning cycle of assessment-action-dissemination.

- The ML continues to contribute to policy changes as they affect marine resources in the region. The Herbarium is a unique resource of terrestrial and marine plants, used by researchers and policy makers around the world. The ML leads the quest for Sea Grant status and is actively involved in outreach to local schools for science enrichment; with legislators, to promote environmental laws that will regulate fishing in protected areas; and in coastal economic activities.

There are many examples of effective community engagement led by CNAS:

- The USDA-funded experimental stations and cooperative extension services associated with the University’s land grant status promote healthy living by educational activities for Guam’s manamko’ (Project for Health Aging) and 4H projects.

- A sustainable academic remediation and job skills pilot program led to implementation of the About Face program through a partnership with the National Guard.

- The Guam Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) and the Guam Comprehensive Cancer Coalition depend on support for strategic planning, resulting in grant funding to address areas of need.

- A partnership with DHSS collects health data using the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System: the world’s largest on-going health survey, which applies health and behavioral data to inform decision making.

- A partnership with the Guam Department of Agriculture supports demonstrations of conservation practices, sustainable agriculture, and research-based practical solutions for Guam’s farmers.

- Programs identify and help eradicate invasive species. A faculty-designed plan to control the spread of and eradicate the rhinoceros beetle is currently underway.

- Ongoing workshops, grants, and youth development projects—including Family, 4-H, Food, and Nutrition; Agriculture and Natural Resources; Community and Economic Systems; Aquaculture Development; and the Western Pacific Tropical Research Center—continue under the leadership of CNAS.
Examples of Programs Meeting Engagement Standards

This section provides examples of community engagement with measured positive outcomes. Other examples are provided in EEF III.C.3.

- The Nursing program engages students and faculty with the community to identify and provide solutions for health issues. Nursing standards of practice in Guam have changed as a result of leadership from faculty, and local nurses participate with students and faculty in collaborative research across the island: in maternal outcomes, infection control, and public health. Results of student research are presented each year in radio interviews and a conference for nurses and students. This year senior nursing students conducted a community needs assessment in two low income areas, leading to the provision of a bus stop in the area, built with assistance from the military. Another student research project analyzes the health concerns of the residents near the Ordot dump.

- On the basis of input from focus groups and recent assessment research, the University implemented a project entitled *Capacity Building on the Ecology of Global Change in Island Landscapes of the Republic of Palau*. This project addresses a regional shortfall of scientific expertise in assessing ecosystems, by training Palauan students and scientists in the methods of ecological analysis: enabling studies that will inform policy and efforts to conserve their island ecosystems. This project enhanced the abilities of Palauan students and scientists to collect data, analyze ecologies, and contribute to policy.

- The *History of Guam Service Learning Project* engages students in learning about the island’s past, with the goal of motivating them to take concrete actions to preserve its culture. Outcome assessments included scoring of student-produced essays.

- The *Summer Special Education Institute* addresses the shortage of special education teachers on Guam. Of the approximately 400 educators employed in special education, less than half have the proper special education credentials. In addition, assessments have identified a high rate of annual turn-over as a major problem. In collaboration with the Guam Public School System, the program provides teachers and administrators with accelerated training leading to certification and/or a graduate degree (M.Ed.). Students in the Master's program, all currently employed as teachers, gain knowledge and skills to improve services to students with disabilities.

- The grant-funded AmeriCorps provides tutoring centers in various public high schools, as discussed in the prior essays, and offers students a variety of service learning and community service activities in addition to tuition support.

- In a partnership with the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council (PPEC), the University provides financial resources, office space, and project management services. PPEC is a consortium of presidents and chief executive officers of institutions of higher learning (including community colleges) throughout the Western Pacific, with additional representation from Hawaii. PPEC supports assessment-based regional planning for postsecondary education; serves as a cooperative forum for addressing problems faced by all Pacific peoples; seeks resources dedicated to such areas as communications, alternative energy, and human resource development; and promotes inter-institutional cooperation in joint programs for education, research and service. Because many regional institutions lack the resources to conduct such work on their own, this consortium provides opportunities for these institutions, and for the University, to pool expertise and resources in service to the regional communities.

- The University chairs the subcommittee on Education and serves on the Guam Workforce Investment Board (GWIB) and on the Education, Tourism, Workforce Development and Conservation subcommittees of the Governor's Civilian Military Task Force. Participation in this Task Force allows the University to share expertise in addressing major social, economic, political and environmental issues facing the island and the region as they consider the impact of the impending military buildup. Working with GWIB—the governing board of the Guam Department of Labor and Agency for Human Resource Development—the
University provides support to the Micronesian Chief Executives Summit (MCES). As one outcome, the MCES created a Regional Workforce Development Council to consider regional manpower development and resources.

- An ongoing partnership with the College of Micronesia-FSM provides pre-service teachers with training for skills needed to teach in elementary classrooms, training that is unavailable in the FSM. This partnership allows seamless transfer of students and credits between the institutions, providing students with advisors and the opportunity to earn a B.A. degree in Elementary Education. The partnership is also designed to upgrade regional standards in teacher education.

**Distance Education**

The 2006 CPR Self-Study identified as one priority, “achieving consensus on a distance education plan, with a centralized system for supporting the technology that distance education requires”. The President chartered a University Technology Advisory Committee (UTAC) with administrator, faculty from all schools and colleges, student and computer center representatives. UTAC developed the first IT master plan in 2005 and first IT policy in 2008. The master plan is currently being revised to include an updated IT assessment, infrastructure plan and strategic initiatives related to web based services, business process redesign and distance education. A distance education team developed a conceptual plan for resource support, which is being discussed with the colleges and schools.

Individual programs and projects continue to utilize various distance education technologies to deliver their services. For example, the Telecommunication and Distance Education Operation (TADEO) provides distance education, telehealth, search and rescue, emergency management and disaster relief services to the FSM, Palau, and the Marshall Islands. TADEO provides solar powered computerized communication networks and services to hundreds of outer island medical and educational organizations, which have no other means of communication. TADEO builds capacity by including locals in all aspects of the design, installations, operation, and maintenance of its systems.

A USDA/CSREES grant supports the purchase of infrastructural equipment and software to carry out distance learning initiatives at insular land grant institutions, including the University, the Northern Marianas College, Palau Community College, the College of Micronesia - FSM, the College of the Marshall Islands, the University of Puerto Rico and the University of the Virgin Islands. Through this grant, the University furnished a free standing classroom with video-conferencing capability and state of the art technology. This year’s grant will enable the hire of a faculty member to design and deliver online distance education courses, and to train other faculty in distance education.

**Next Steps**

The 1999 Kellogg Commission report states that it is not enough for a university to produce graduates who will serve their communities. A university must also provide direct service to these communities, through teaching, research and service that address immediate and long-term challenges.

WASC's 2007 Site Visit Report and Commission Action Letter commended the University for its success in serving regional needs, and reiterated the need to "institutionalize its collaborative relations with the Micronesian region's community colleges." This essay has provided assessment- and external criteria-based evidence that the University continues to expand its service to the region, and that, through its work in the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council (PPEC) and partnerships in programs, has furthered its collaboration with the region’s other institutions of higher education.

The continued success of the University’s engagement will depend in part on the efficient use of funds presently available and on developing new sources of revenue for new initiatives. This self-study's final essay examines this and related points in detail.
D. AN ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Introduction

This essay presents an analysis of the University’s institutional efficiency and effectiveness in support of student learning. It updates the 2006 CPR Self-Study, which considered institutional effectiveness and efficiency in the context of the University's mission and WASC standards, and the March 2008 Interim Financial Report. These reports and WASC's 2007 Commission Action Letter and 2008 Interim Financial Report Committee Letter guide the analysis. This essay addresses CFRs 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8.

The essay begins by considering how the University has defined and institutionalized its measures of performance. The second section reviews key issues identified by WASC, and evidence of the progress in resolving them. The third contains a reflective analysis of evidence as it pertains to the University’s effectiveness as an organization devoted to learning. The essay concludes with reflections on relevant commentary from faculty focus groups. The essay demonstrates that in the two years since the CPR Self-Study the University has strengthened its institutional effectiveness and efficiency.

Measures of Performance in Practice

The University uses performance measures to assess and allocate its academic, research, and service resources in support of student learning. This section summarizes how these measures are defined and used, and includes examples.

How does the University measure institutional performance in support of student learning?

The University measures its performance using institutional data, trends, key performance indicators (KPIs), best practice comparisons and benchmarks. Data and information are gathered internally from the Colleague software system, and externally from sources that include the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS); the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO); the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR); the Association of Governing Boards (AGB); and others. Table D1 provides an overview of key performance measures and their sources. The cases that follow demonstrate that the Board, administrators, faculty, staff and students monitor and use institutional, financial and administrative data from the various reports.

Table D1  EXAMPLES OF KEY PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN SUPPORT OF STUDENT LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Where Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional performance related to mission and strategic initiatives</td>
<td>UOG Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of faculty, staff, enrollment, institutional characteristics</td>
<td>UOG Fact Book, IPEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative University performance</td>
<td>KPIs Among Peer Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Grant research and outreach outcomes</td>
<td>WPTRC Impact Report, CES Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Reviews</td>
<td>Faculty Senate reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research, teaching, service allocations and evaluation</td>
<td>CFES reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly, quarterly and annual financial performance</td>
<td>Reports to mgmt. and Legislature, UOG website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial results (including grants/contracts / compliance)</td>
<td>Financial Audit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How does the University use its performance measures to improve effectiveness and efficiency?

The following cases demonstrate the University's data driven, analytical, transparent and comparative approach to assessments and decision making.

• **CASE 1.** The University uses performance measures to anticipate and respond to revenue shortfalls. Learning from its history of allotment holdbacks and payment delays, the University revitalized data collection, improved reporting and monitoring systems, and developed allotment status and cash management reports. Daily cash flow analysis and quarterly forecasts, identified in Table D1 Financial Measures, are a result of this revitalized process. Other benefits include improved financial information sharing with the government, and benchmarking of revenue targets. The Board and administrators use these tools to make resource allocation decisions.

• **CASE 2.** The growth in grants and contracts highlighted the need for attention to the financial management and reports supporting these programs. Using findings from external audits and business policy and process benchmarks, as noted in the financial measures section of Table D1, the University identified and resolved lapses in control and compliance. The Federal government recognized the improvements by designating the University as a low risk auditee for Federal grants for the third consecutive year.

• **CASE 3.** Until recently the University had not identified the most important institutional performance indicators, nor drawn comparisons to peer institutions. As noted in Table D1, the Institutional Researcher recently published a set of institutional KPIs, conducting comparative studies on key criteria: student enrollment, expenditures per student for instruction and student services, the number of full-time tenured and tenure track faculty, and faculty research productivity. (EEF II.2 Peer List Rankings) These data are used to review programs, monitor the effects of interventions for improve student enrollment and retention improvement, and evaluate progress in obtaining grant funding.

• **CASE 4.** The University invited the USDA to review its Land Grant programs. Recommendations included improving administrative efficiency and effectiveness by consolidating two federally funded programs: the Agriculture Experiment Station and the Cooperative Extension Service. The Administration supported this recommendation, the faculty voted in favor, and the two units have
combined into a single faculty unit: the Division of Agriculture and Life Sciences. This has eliminated a division chair position, and provided the potential for better coordination in the Agriculture program: exemplifying the University’s commitment to improving administrative performance in support of student learning.

- CASE 5. The University has had many different committees over the years to address the important issue of IT. With the establishment of the University Technology Advisory Committee (UTAC) in 2003, systematic progress has been made through the use of data, analysis, benchmarking and best practice comparisons. UTAC has used data from academic units, the computer center, academic institutions and the industry to assess the state of IT and to identify program and institutional priorities. The resultant, first IT Master Plan, IT Policy, and institutional IT budget priorities and initiatives have led to a more transparent, effective and collaborative approach to IT. Additional IT resources, while insufficient to cover the needs, have been specifically funded in the general operations budget since FY06.

What else has the University done to measure and improve effectiveness and efficiency?

Academic and administrative units use assessment and analyses to address specific issues and for continuous improvement. Examples follow:

- In order to achieve sustainability within academic programs, the Senior Vice President requested analyses of key quantitative data on student demand and of qualitative information from programs' self-assessments (cf. the essay on academic quality). This review, now underway, demonstrates that data and evidence inform the University's decisions concerning strategic changes.

- The library analyzed online periodical subscriptions to identify overlaps in coverage, as well as in individual print subscriptions. Nearly 200 redundant periodical titles were discovered and eliminated, saving $120,000. This cost reduction allowed for the purchase of additional databases, resulting in an increase in the number of accessible journal titles, from 20,000 to 24,000. This example shows how an analysis of evidence led to reduced costs and an expansion of services.

- The University solicited four external reviews and several internal business process studies of key academic support units: 1) a study of the Human Resources Office (HRO) by HRM faculty and Guam’s SHRM consultant; 2) an administration and finance study by a team from the University of Hawaii System; 3) plant and facilities studies by SODEXO and an energy consultant; and 4) a study of the Financial Aid Office (FAO) by an external reviewer. The findings and reports identify best practices, areas for improvement and recommended actions. The University has implemented recommendations emerging from these studies, and reallocated budgets accordingly.

Table D2 provides examples from other units that measured and analyzed performance to strengthen efficiency and effectiveness and meet WASC standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>RESULTING ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Finance</td>
<td>Fiduciary role of Investment Committee</td>
<td>Land Grant and quasi-endowment spending policies established; Investment Policy aligned with global Fiduciary Standards of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration and Finance planning</td>
<td>Administrative goals and action plans in support of strategic initiatives and educational effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Affairs</td>
<td>Charter, organization</td>
<td>New officers elected; new approach for membership, regional outreach, fundraising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How does the University communicate and share information about performance?

The University shares information among stakeholders for purposes of planning, developing consensus, joint decisions, and image building. EEF III.D.1 provides an inventory of communication resources. This inventory, while thorough, does not exhaust the many fine examples that demonstrate faculty members' efforts to profile and support research, service and teaching. Communication continues to showcase the University's contribution to the island's continued economic development and growth. The redesign of the website has led to more postings and more updates directly by the colleges, schools and administrative units. The increase in usage and visits by students and others has been astounding.
Measures of Performance: A Report of Progress on Key Issues

The prior section provided a summary of what the University measures in order to manage its performance, and how the University uses and communicates the results. This section provides a report of progress on key issues, with a summary of evidence and findings focusing on changes since the 2006 CPR Self Study.

What progress has the University made in strengthening institutional efficiency and effectiveness and addressing WASC issues for educational effectiveness?

Financial Stability and Sustainability: Evidence and Action

- Securing consistent resource appropriations from the government of Guam remains a challenge. The FY09 appropriation is $2.1 million (7%) below what the University requested for continued baseline operations, and 4% less than the FY08 appropriation. The FY09 appropriation did not include funding for growth. As a result of the cutbacks, the President and VPs met with students, faculty, staff and administrators to hear recommendations and discuss options for reapportioning the FY09 budget to live within the legislative appropriation and reallocate the base to support consensus-based priorities. Following these meetings, and following a review by the University Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, the Board approved a reapportioned base budget with reordered priorities, restructured operations, new revenues, cost savings and infrastructure cost sharing. These changes improve long-term financial stability and viability, establishing a new University baseline to sustain educational effectiveness in an environment of scarce resources. Highest priority strategic initiatives were funded, in full or in part, to provide some growth capacity. A number of new policies and processes were developed to support these changes. Nevertheless, the changes will affect program capacity in several high demand areas, availability of course offerings, the time it takes students to graduate, and capacity for additional outreach.

- The cash position has improved. Balances were at two days cash in FY06, have averaged 14 days since the Interim Financial Report, and now stand at nine days. The government of Guam met its prior commitments, as FY05-07 allotments have been paid. At FY08 end, allotment payments were 87% of requests, the second best performance in six years. The government recognized unpaid allotments in its FY08 financial statements and communicated a payment plan. Nevertheless, the cash position remains a continuing challenge given the government’s deficit and obligations.

- Financial management is focused on best practice and living within our means. There have been five consecutive years of net asset surpluses through FY07. However, a FY08 deficit of $3.9 million is projected (preliminary, unaudited), due to $2.8 million of investment losses associated with the impact of the credit market crisis and a $1.4 million (5%) allotment holdback (note: equity losses primarily unrealized, as investments are not drawdown for operational purposes). Other indicators have remained strong over this period: the unrestricted current account has shown a surplus since FY02 and the account balance has been in surplus since FY03; there have been five consecutive years without questioned costs and three consecutive years as a low risk federal auditee; prior to FY08, trends in key financial ratios have been positive or stable; and financial KPIs benchmark well to peer institutions. Given the regularity of allotment holdbacks in five of the last six years, a University Stability Reserve was established by Board policy and funded as a contingency during times of financial crisis. The goal is to maintain an operational reserve of approximately 3% of the most recent general operations appropriation in a segregated cash reserve account. Other reserves were established for capital equipment and facilities. A plan is under development to fund the reserves over a multi-year period.
• Updated policies and processes, and changes now underway, have improved financial stability by addressing fiscal reserves and their funding, business planning and oversight, reallocation of indirect funds and University-generated revenue sharing to infrastructure support, endowment spending and fiduciary responsibility, carry-forward balances, better financial management reporting and budgeting for sustainable base operations and growth. Planning with the government of Guam has become more regular both for the short term (cash planning) and the longer term (Civilian Military Task Force). Processes have been introduced to integrate programs, plans and budgets using strategic assumptions and program needs.

New Revenue Generation: Evidence and Action

• University-generated revenues, excluding investments, have grown an average 11% p.a. from FY01 to FY08 (note: FY08 figures are preliminary, unaudited). They grew from $28 million (46% of gross revenues) in FY01 to $49 million (61%) in FY08, a record level that leverages the local appropriation 1.54 times. Grants and contracts increased an average 15% p.a. to $27 million; tuition and fee revenues increased by an average 10% p.a. to $16 million due to increased enrollment and an annual rate increase. Course fees have been instituted and other fees brought closer to market. Auxiliary and enterprise funds earn surpluses after years of deficit and subsidy.

• Entrepreneurial efforts increased in Professional and International Programs (PIP) and in the colleges, schools and research institutes.
  — PIP has consolidated several entrepreneurial units for administrative efficiency and business planning and oversight and implemented Internet-based professional development and training, corporate English language training, and courses in educational tourism. PIP and SBPA now offer a certificate in entrepreneurship.
  — MARC offers cultural resource management for military and private development projects.
  — SBPA has been particularly innovative and entrepreneurial. Using the University’s status as a minority institution, SBPA teamed with Parsons (a major engineering and construction firm) and MARC to obtain up to 5% of the $100 million U.S. Navy’s facilities project management award. This project draws upon faculty expertise and collaborations across the University. SBPA has tapped into the needs of the Departments of Defense and Commerce for business support of military procurement training and planning for economic development.
  — WERI continues contracting water and energy related projects, utilizing its research niche.
  — CNAS undertook a partnership to market pathogen-free shrimp to Asia, drawing upon their research and hatchery. After setbacks, the College is reassessing its business plan and investment needs.

• The Board and President require that all business ventures have business and financial plans, and PIP provides a centralized resource for these efforts, as well as for oversight. All auxiliary units and entrepreneurial ventures now have business and financial plans, although several are rudimentary. Fiscal notes are now required for new activities. Oversight may include sunset provisions. The Saipan Center venture has been closed, and SOE is reviewing the educational programs in Saipan and elsewhere in Micronesia for sustainability.

Leveraging the Endowment Foundation and Alumni Association for Fundraising: Evidence and Action

• The Endowment Foundation has increased donations, including several large and many small gifts. The Tan Sui-Lin family donated $1 million for the library. The Camacho family and Personal
Finance Center donated $125,000 for the Leon Guerrero School of Business and Public Administration Building. Mobil Oil Guam gave $100,000 for the Leon Guerrero Building and library. The Ji family donated additional scholarships, for a total (with prior donations) of $500,000. In 2007, the Foundation raised $164,000 from 373 new individual donors, and $933,000 from 65 new corporate donors.

- The Foundation’s financial performance improved with clean and timely audits. A surplus has been achieved since FY05. FY07 contributions and net revenues are the highest in four years. The payout ratio is increasing. The Foundation is fulfilling its pledge of $200,000 annually as support for the Leon Guerrero Building’s debt service.

- The Foundation’s organization and focus are changing. A new Executive Director is being recruited for the Foundation. The Foundation Board added new officers and members to its fundraising network. The President and University Regents have identified fundraising as one of the highest priorities. The Foundation and University are jointly preparing a capital campaign. The University submitted its consensus priorities and projected funding needs for capital projects. The Board approved a building naming policy.

- The Alumni Association is restructuring under newly-elected leaders, who met with the President to align goals, priorities and fundraising. The Association implemented a membership drive, which included the formation of new regional chapters, with initial recruiting and fundraising efforts. The first Alumni Week is planned to coincide with spring 2009 graduation ceremonies. Still, Alumni Affairs remains a focus of management attention, and further efforts are underway.

**Governance and Administrative Structure: Evidence and Action**

- Autonomy is well developed. All current regents have been chosen through the Regent Nominating Council. The Board and its committees actively represent the University’s interests in the community, developing policy and providing oversight. The Faculty Senate’s Palulap Award brings recognition to citizens who have acted to preserve the University's autonomy and integrity. An transparent and AGB guidelines-compliant process led to the hire of a widely respected president.

- Institutional governance is well developed. The new President has continued the current strategic initiatives, while building enthusiasm and momentum with additional strategic themes and policies. Updates of strategic plans are underway. The Student Government Association (SGA) is more involved than ever, actively participating in institutional and Board committees. A new, four-year Board-Faculty Union Agreement was negotiated within three days in January 2008.

- The University improved its administrative structure. Acting both on concerns expressed in the WASC Commission's Action Letter and on recommendations of the Institutional Improvement and Sustainability Task Force, the University reorganized and reinvigorated its college structure. The College of Professional Studies was closed and three autonomous professional schools were constituted. SBPA and SOE are led by school deans and SNHS by a Nursing Director. An Assessment Coordinator/ Institutional Researcher and EEO/ ADA Compliance Officer contribute support for academic programs. Board – Faculty Union negotiations restored the positions of division chairs, with newly clarified roles. The newly-formed University Excellence Team and other project teams are working on current issues and three broad themes: UOG as the Natural Choice, UOG Green, and Leading Change. Key councils and a committee structure are in place with clearly identified roles and functions. An Assistant Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research and Sponsored Programs has been hired and her office will be staffed with a dedicated administrative officer, grants accountant and IT support.
• Broadly-based stakeholder committees and task forces are widely convened for consensus building and decision-making advice. Schools and programs have community advisory groups. Institutional committees and task forces address sustainability, planning and budgeting, technology, employee development, institutional safety and entrepreneurial oversight. Committee recommendations have led to policy changes and new program development.

**Sustained Educational Effectiveness Using Scarce Resources: Evidence and Action**

• As noted, the University has stepped up its measuring and monitoring of effectiveness and efficiency through a comprehensive set of performance measures. The administration systematically closes the loop on assessment data-based recommendations emerging from reviews of academic programs (cf. this self-study's essay on academic quality.) An ad hoc committee composed of administrators and the Faculty Senate has addressed the demand for and sustainability of undergraduate programs, and made recommendations to academic administrators.

• A collaborative planning and budgeting approach is used to allocate scarce financial resources based upon consensus-based priorities. Administrators closely monitor financial resources, and manage conservatively, according to specific financial management plans. A strategic financial plan has been developed. Historical data, strategic assumptions and scenarios guide the development of plans and budgets for all areas and funds. Consolidated budgets for IT, capital outlay, deferred maintenance and academic capital have been instituted. The budget process now integrates these needs into the appropriate general operations base budget, growth initiatives, non-appropriated funds budgets, IT budgets and capital budgets, with even greater transparency than before. Priority needs receive funding within the available resources.

• The Board, President and VPs systematically communicate plans and needs to external policy makers and the government of Guam. They meet as needed with the Governor’s office and the legislature. Finance administrators meet on an ongoing basis with the GovGuam finance team. The University chairs the educational sub-committee of the Governor’s Civilian Military Task Force, and participates in others to forecast educational infrastructure needs and investments.

• These approaches have produced results. Two faculty salary scale adjustments totaling 7% were implemented in January 2007 and 2008. Further phased increases are planned, but on hold, subject to funds availability. Resources for infrastructural support of student learning have increased. The 57,000 square foot Leon Guerrero SBPA Building is operational. The Governor has provided over $1.4 million in Federal funds for CIP, ADA compliance, deferred maintenance and the conceptual design for a new Student Center. Another $1 million is pending. A new science and math classroom building with distance education capabilities is complete. Eight aging HVAC systems in classroom and student buildings have been replaced. Renovations and expansions of nursing facilities are funded. IT equipment, technical assistants, wireless networks, student labs and web-based utilities support student learning and faculty. After an at-risk period, IT infrastructure is sounder with a new generator, and FY09 funding for air conditioning, power supply and backup. Still, substantial IT needs remain.

• Support services—including a new website and web-based services for faculty and students—are continually improving. IT policy and master plan efforts have resulted in line items for IT tied to institutional and program needs. The University established and is funding Capital Equipment Reserves for cyclical IT and library purchases; a Capital Facilities Reserve for renovation; and a Campus Maintenance Fund for deferred maintenance. HRO improvement plans are underway or scheduled. Streamlined procurement regulations and procedures include higher small purchase
thresholds (particularly for research materials); automated requisitions; and a purchase card program for procurement of Internet and off-island research materials.

**Measures of Performance: Analysis**

The prior section provides a progress report that tracks actions and outcomes in support of student learning. This section provides an analysis of how these and other accomplishments have strengthened institutional effectiveness and efficiency, and addressed the issues identified by WASC: resulting in enhanced educational effectiveness.

**Is the University financially stable?**

Yes, the University has demonstrated its resilience, and its ability to find revenues and financial balance. The University continues to accomplish its mission—delivering programs of high academic quality—during persistently turbulent times, in an environment of scarce resources. The financial position has improved in five of the last six years. The Board and administrators have established policies, systems, plans, practices and indicators, and utilize them effectively. The University is poised for growth, but requires more capacity to do so. Although the government of Guam’s deficit, revenue shortfalls and allotment holdbacks have continued over many years, constraining progress on plans, systematic consultation and coordination with the government help to mitigate the impact of the government’s financial situation on the University. While there has been sufficient funding for mission delivery and academic quality, important, unmet needs remain in the academic and support units. Once again lacking a fully funded appropriations request in FY09, the University made reallocations for a balanced base budget and to fund priorities. While challenges abound, public feedback provides a measure of the University’s stability and effectiveness:

*In fiscal year (FY) 2007, the University of Guam (UOG) continued to improve its overall financial condition… For the third year, UOG qualified as a low-risk auditee. In addition, there were no current or prior year questioned costs. There were also no current or prior year unresolved audit findings. UOG should be applauded for this achievement.*


*I congratulated the University of Guam. They prepared a budget that they could justify looking at what their present needs are and what their needs are for growth and increasing enrollment. This is how a budget should be presented.…..they have command of their finances.*


**Have new revenues been generated?**

Yes. With the exception of GovGuam appropriations, revenues have substantially increased across the board, and revenue sources are more diversified. The University is competitive in bringing grant funding to bear on community needs. Tuition revenues have increased substantially and affordably: with both enrollment and tuition rates growing over a multi-year period. Auxiliary and enterprise funds are net revenue generators. High-potential, collaborative entrepreneurial ventures associated with the military buildup, University-advantaged niches and partnering opportunities, are underway at institutional and academic unit levels. Business planning and oversight will facilitate the closure of non-performing ventures.

**Are the UOG Endowment Foundation and Alumni Association being leveraged?**

This action is developing. The President has focused on fundraising through the Foundation and Alumni Association. Preparations for a capital campaign and annual giving, major donor and alumni fundraising activities are underway, but these have yet to be organized. The Foundation Board has been
restructured and its capacities increased. A new Executive Director will be hired. The Foundation's fundraising and financial results are revenue positive. The Alumni Association has not yet realized its potential as a financial contributor to the University.

**Are governance and administrative structures effective?**

Yes, the University has delivered its mission and has demonstrated autonomy, shared governance and high priority outcomes. Converting the College of Professional Studies to three professional schools, and hiring the Institutional Researcher and the Assistant Vice President of Graduate Studies and Sponsored Programs and Research filled organizational gaps. Using a consultative process in which administrators and faculty compare outcomes with resources, the University is making optimal use of data and discussion to effect the right-sizing of academic programs. Research units have become increasingly productive in generating grants; and the University has budgeted for greater administrative and infrastructure support. Improved policies and processes assured that transitions in leadership proceeded smoothly, and as the outcomes of merit-based searches. Councils and committees have been broadly representative, active and effective. The new IT policy from UTAC provides one example. Support units such as Business Office, HRO, and Plant and Facilities have shown continuous improvement in their processes, in training sessions with academic units, and in their use of automation. They will require additional skilled staff, and workflow automation that is timelier and more efficient. Overall, IT and deferred maintenance spending is higher, but below what is projected to meet technology changes and campus needs.

**Can the University sustain educational effectiveness in an environment of scarce resources?**

Yes, the University has demonstrated that it can and has. Outcome assessments and decisions based on analysis of data provide evidence of student learning, academic quality, and faculty commitment. Academic and curricular processes are collaborative and exhibit shared governance. Program reviews are qualitatively and quantitatively reflective and are shared at all academic levels. Institutional planning, budgeting and allocations of resources reflect program priorities. Indicators of institutional effectiveness are in place, widely disseminated and utilized. Faculty, students, staff, administrators and the Board are committed to strengthening institutional efficiency, sustaining educational effectiveness and addressing WASC recommendations. They enact this commitment in their policies, practices, priorities and decisions on resource allocations.

**Concluding Reflections**

This essay began in May 2007 with the formation of the WASC IEE Essay Writing Team, and ended with focus groups of continuing participants, and review by the Board. In all, a campus-wide total of approximately forty persons—representing the Board, faculty, staff and administrators—participated in the development of this essay.

Because of their participation, this essay has undergone improvements from its earlier versions, when sections were evolving from idea to draft. The essay has also benefited from the team's study of issues that many colleges and universities face in an era of diminishing public investments in higher education. Asking what the University knows about its effectiveness; how it communicates what it knows; and how it changes and continues to learn, has helped to frame this essay.

A faculty focus group participant summed it up this way, "While we have financial challenges, our team is talented and expert at knowing how to manage in difficult times.” This was a statement of confidence: one tempered by other remarks calling attention to persistent inefficiencies in daily operations. The focus groups served as reminders that while the University has made significant progress in its overall
operational design and management, these gains alone are not enough. It is the not enough which concludes this essay. The focus group and essay team noted several key issues that remain.

- **IT Support of Student Learning.** Baseline resources must be identified for additional investment in IT technology and real time information: especially for IT infrastructure support; more on-line student services; technology-enhanced learning / distance education; and 24x7 access to course and advisement information.

- **Integrating Program Reviews with Resource Allocation Processes.** Many faculty consider the current system for program review burdensome and time-consuming. In 2007, faculty raised questions about whether the reviews lead to timely implementations, and whether they contribute to allocations of resources. The administration has since disseminated more information about how and when the University “closes the loop” on recommendations from program reviews, tying programs' needs to budgetary decisions, and is also beginning an overhaul of the program review process. Both efforts will need time to demonstrate their effectiveness.

- **Sponsored Research in an Era of Greater Accountability.** Research faculty question how well business processes support the development of competitive grants and contracts, and their management. The Office of Research and Graduate Programs, opening in January 2009, and led by an Assistant Vice President with dedicated administrative staff, will be tasked with improving research administration and support.

- **Assurance of Transparency through Improved Communication.** Several in our focus groups asked how they could become better informed. They noted that reports do not always reach them, and that committee representatives may not always report actions and findings. This highlights the fact that participation does not assure transparency. Participants recommended greater use of the website to disseminate budgetary and other administrative reports.

- **Enhanced operational efficiency with better administrative processes and increased staff training.** Business and administrative processes have improved, but fall short of being efficient. To boost efficiency substantially, the University must allocate additional resources to current efforts to train administrative staff in financial, human resource and procurement regulations and best practices; to update personnel and administrative policies and procedures and make them readily accessible and searchable on the website; to invest in workflow automation; and to partner with skilled service providers.

- **Capacity and Growth.** As Guam prepares for the social and economic changes associated with the military buildup, the island has acknowledged the University's potential as a key agent and driver of change. However, publicly voiced concerns contend that public policy-makers’ decisions on funding shortsightedly withheld the means to build the University’s capacity to effect this change. The University must do its part, but must also more effectively engage the support of others.

### IV. INTEGRATIVE COMPONENT

This section synthesizes and integrates the elements of the self study process to address the following questions: What common themes or issues emerged? What did the University learn from the process, and
what major recommendations emerged? Did the University achieve the goals established in its Reaccreditation Proposal? What are the next steps, and how will the University assure sustained momentum?

This self study includes evidence at all levels that the University uses assessment data and analysis to make decisions; and that the University has defined a base budget designed (a) to sustain operations through difficult fiscal times, and also (b) to allow growth in programs and services, as funded by new revenue sources and guided by business plans and needs assessments. Service to students, in the form of academic programs and co-curricular experiences, remains the core of the University’s mission.

Themes
Several common themes emerged from the analysis in preparation for the essays. Briefly, they are:

- More funding is needed in all areas for growth, in conjunction with new and more varied sources of revenue;
- The academic program review process continues to benefit from evaluation and revisions;
- Business and human resource processes remain cumbersome, and could benefit from use of technology and training at all levels;
- Communication of processes, issues, decisions, and feedback is key to employee morale and to support from the community;
- Targeted recruitment efforts, coupled with targeted retention interventions, define the next steps for Fall 2009;
- Budgeting and prioritization processes have proven effective and responsive. Detailed feedback must continue; and
- The University must garner government and legislative support for its base budget and future growth funding.

As the University prepares, along with Guam and the region, for a military build up that will increase the island’s population by over 25% and bring construction and contracts to a level unprecedented in the last fifty years, it does so with an awareness that the concomitant environmental, social, technological and economic changes will transform most aspects of life on Guam. In preparation for these changes, the University has reallocated and balanced its budget to live within the amount authorized by the legislature, while tightening processes for funding new projects.

The tidal wave of change will eventually recede, and, when it does, the island must have a sustainable professional class of teachers, nurses, accountants, entrepreneurs, mental health workers, and managers to continue to prosper. The University will provide for this sustainable class of professionals, by combining and streamlining low enrollment programs, adding concentrations or majors in response to community needs, and targeting recruitment and engagement with the school system to bridge students’ “aspirational gap”: such that currently, only one of every six ninth grade students on Guam aspires to higher education. The University will also become a model of sustainability in energy use, recycling and stewardship of the environment.

Achieving the Goals Specified in the Reaccreditation Proposal
The WASC reaccreditation process has helped the University to remain focused and on course. The University’s 2004 Reaccreditation Proposal defined an ambitious agenda with five goals:

1. To integrate planning, budgeting and assessment in order to demonstrate sound use of finances to support student learning.
2. To become the premier institution of higher learning for Guam and Micronesia by enhancing academic quality, student success, and institutional visibility.
3. To establish assessment and evidence-based decision making across the institution.
4. To strengthen institutional efficiency and effectiveness.
5. To become a University engaged with the community and the region.

Developing plans and actions in support of each goal has contributed to further refinements of purpose. In each case, the University has taken action with flexibility as well as focus, and met its goals. The following table provides a summary of actions in support of the goals, identifying evidence and next steps for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal from Proposal</th>
<th>Proposal Actions Promised</th>
<th>Evidence of Action Taken</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrating planning, budgeting and assessment</td>
<td>i) program reviews will indicate areas of emphasis for enhancement</td>
<td>Closing the loop report; program sustainability recommendations; assessment data</td>
<td>Implement high priority recommendations within available funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) publication of a yearly Fact Book and regular dissemination of data will improve budgeting decisions</td>
<td>IR hired. Completed 2008 Factbook. Budget decisions evidence-based</td>
<td>Continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) key financial indicators agreed upon and tracked</td>
<td>Key indicators and benchmarking report</td>
<td>Publish yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) funding for an outreach agenda prioritized</td>
<td>Budgeting by growth initiative; base budget definition; priorities defined</td>
<td>Continue to assess and reallocate budgets based on priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) internal communications improved with website development and regular feedback to stakeholders</td>
<td>New website with enhanced communication and tracking features</td>
<td>Continue to update and improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) budgeting based on outcomes measurement and continual monitoring of results.</td>
<td>New budget process; business plan required for aux and enterprise activities; entrepreneurial enterprise planning and tracking</td>
<td>Implement decisions and further develop oversight processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality and institutional visibility</td>
<td>(i) college and program goals aligned with strategic initiatives, costed and funded</td>
<td>College goals aligned with University initiatives in budget submissions</td>
<td>Program goals aligned with college/school and university priorities and funded accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and evidence-based decision making across the institution</td>
<td>(ii) program review data reports published each academic year and available on the web site</td>
<td>Sent to all deans/directors in spring of each year since 2005; available on ftp site</td>
<td>Continue, include some analysis for reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) academic program review process will include an external review</td>
<td>External reviewer added and included in all reviews since 2005</td>
<td>Continue, but streamline reviews to make best use of faculty time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) a marketing and enrollment management plan developed and realized</td>
<td>Developed in 2006-07 and implemented in 2007, 2008</td>
<td>Assess plan and make corrections if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) centers of excellence will be defined and marketed; including specific specialized accreditation efforts</td>
<td>CEDDERS generated $10M in 2008, up 50%; MARC and WERI entrepreneurial; NCATE accreditation for Education, CSWE for SW; NLNAC for Nursing; IACBE for Business</td>
<td>New entrepreneurial opportunities with military buildup; consolidate smaller centers and use new AVP office to train grant writers and support specialized accred.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) both institutional and programmatic indicators will be developed and used as part of systematic evaluations of all areas of the University</td>
<td>Assessment committee has taken on institutional indicators; all programs have SLOs</td>
<td>Support Assessment committee’s work ($100K in FY 09 budget)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) the institution as a whole will model the use of evidence by monitoring the committee responsible for budgeting and planning</td>
<td>University Planning and Budgeting Committee has representatives from all constituencies/councils and continues to insist on evidence of effectiveness when budgets are reviewed (see minutes); strategic planning and budget retreats are inclusive and disseminate planning assumptions and guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Fact book publication</td>
<td>Done following IR hire</td>
<td>Continue yearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) key support activities will participate in an external review process, involving a consultant, beginning with the Human Resources Office</td>
<td>HRO, Business Office, Plant Management, and Financial Aid reviewed by external specialist</td>
<td>Continue implementing recommendations; include a cycle of reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) assessment activities will be used as opportunities for engagement</td>
<td>Integrated at college level</td>
<td>Continue to include assessment in CFES plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) institutional decisions will be communicated, along with evidence, to the internal community</td>
<td>Presidential meetings with all constituents; use of electronic updates; web postings; annual/quarterly reports, University magazine and press releases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) a question for each activity proposed will be...“what is the expected outcome and how will we know we get what is expected?”</td>
<td>Has become part of the evaluation of business plans for use of revenue</td>
<td>Assess the entrepreneurial approval process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional efficiency and effectiveness**

<p>| (i) institutional goals will be clear and involve evidence | Four strategic initiatives agreed by consensus and implemented over the last seven years; Three overall themes with goals articulated by President; see presentations | Monitor and assess progress |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(ii) institutional data such as IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Data System) will be disseminated yearly</th>
<th>Published in the Fact book yearly</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(iii) peer institutions for comparison will be chosen for financial benchmarks and CUPA (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources) data used for salary scales</td>
<td>Peer report using indicators published in Fall 2008; admin and faculty salary scales benchmarked to CUPA</td>
<td>Update peer report annually and salary scale data as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) a clear outreach agenda will be developed by consensus and monitored to demonstrate effectiveness</td>
<td>Probably the only goal not yet fully met. Outreach agenda is not yet well coordinated</td>
<td>Clarify outreach agenda and coordinate with colleges, schools and councils; Leading Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) in marketing the institution, student success will be an indicator of effectiveness and communicated to the community</td>
<td>Marketing has been effective using student success stories, enrollment increased</td>
<td>Continue with UOG as the Natural Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) productivity and efficiency will be measured for all areas and assessed as part of an institutional assessment plan</td>
<td>Measured, but not part of an overall institutional plan (current plan completed in 2008)</td>
<td>Currently under development by Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### An engaged University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i) engagement activities will be aligned with academic goals through the budgeting process</th>
<th>Done and funded as prioritized; engagement is a part of CFES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ii) data documenting engagement with the community will be gathered and used to determine needs</td>
<td>Done on a regular basis by CES and grant proposals; see evidence binder under Land Grant</td>
<td>Conduct University-wide community assessment activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) best practices in developing strategic partnerships and engaging the community will be communicated to the university</td>
<td>Done (MOUs, MOAs, contracts), communicated via marketing director announcements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) an outreach agenda will be developed based on a needs assessment</td>
<td>Outline only, Not yet fully developed</td>
<td>Complete the task, implement and monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) outreach and engagement will be a part of individual and unit assessment</td>
<td>Done; included as part of CFES (individual) and budget (college/school/center)</td>
<td>Analyze results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) assessment of community needs will form the basis for the outreach agenda</td>
<td>Always used (program review requirements, grant applications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Conclusion

The University faces complex and serious challenges. The responsibility for social and economic progress for Guam and the region looms even larger given the nature of the military buildup contemplated over the course of the next few years. No other American community will have to cope with such sweeping changes. For Guam, the anticipated developments rival the experience of World War II for the rapidity and scale of dramatic change.

The challenge of maintaining financial balance at a time of rising expectations and increasing demands while ensuring academic quality has not brought the University to a crisis of confidence or to the brink of an uncertain future. Quite to the contrary the University has insisted on academic quality and accountability with even greater intensity in the midst of demands to increase popular programs and sustain less popular ones. We have learned from years of cash flow management about the limits of funding from our primary source, the Government of Guam. We sustained ourselves in lean and difficult times. We have carefully documented our capacity to be efficient resource managers and ensured effectiveness in our academic programs.

Being effective and efficient are not polar opposites and the University of Guam has not viewed these requirements as contradictory. We see them as being necessary to becoming the best University that an island society can rely on for its future well-being. As we envision the even greater demands placed on the University to deal responsibly with the changes of the 2010s, we recognize and accept our need to maintain our financial balance.

However, in order to deal with the changes and move forward, we need to move beyond sustainability by seeking new and more independent sources of funding. We will continue to make the case to increase our share of the Government of Guam budget, but we will not base our future strategy on that approach alone. Instead, we will plan carefully to increase our fundraising, enhance our external funding opportunities and even envision new relationships with other educational agencies to allow us to use our human and property assets to academically and financially benefit all of us. With renewed energy and new leadership in key areas, we will become entrepreneurial in our approach to providing services in the new economy while we maintain academic integrity and effectiveness.

The University of Guam is a learning organization in the fullest sense of the term. It is not only devoted to learning by others, it simultaneously learns about itself. In spite of the label used, a “Self Study Report” is most often seen as an opportunity to highlight activities and accomplishments in order to comply with external requirements. We used the process to meet the original intent. It was an opportunity to learn about ourselves. We learned that we were a good institution even in the midst of a challenging financial environment. We learned that there was a solid commitment to academic quality across campus at all levels.
We also learned that there were a few members of the community who found change difficult and who justified opposition to moving forward by appealing to tradition. Most of all, we learned that we met challenges and created opportunities using external influences as opportunities to engage the Government of Guam and the Guam community. We will engage the future in that spirit.
REFERENCES
REFERENCES


Brigham Young University (2006). “2. Educational Program and Its Effectiveness” (obtain complete website address)

CHEA “Council for Higher Education Accreditation…Accreditation Serving the Public Interest” [www.chea.org](http://www.chea.org)


Enriquez, A.B. (April, 2008). Memorandum to Dr. Roy T. Tsuda, Interim Senior Vice President, RE: Status o Program Assessment at SBPA (as of 4/25/08) with attachments: Status of Program Assessment at SBPA including the following programs: Bachelor of
Business Administration, Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting, Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice, Bachelor of Science in Public Administration, Masters of Public Administration, and Professional Master of Business Administration.


National Survey of Student Engagement at www.nsse.iub.edu

Qualitative Data Report (October 15, 2007). Bachelor of Social Work Program (pgs. 1-5).

Qualitative Data Report (no date). Analysis of Undergraduate Chemistry Program (pgs. 1-4).

Qualitative Data Report (Fall, 2007, Edited by Dr. Fenglien Lee). Qualitative Data for Analysis of Undergraduate CS/CIS Programs (pgs. 1-6)

Qualitative Data Report (Oct. 2007). Terrie O’Brien, Fall, 2007 Analysis of Business Program (pgs. 1-4) with attachment: SBPA Outcomes Assessment Plan: Bachelor of Business Administration Program, Oct. 2006, including Appendices A to D.

Qualitative Data Report (no date). Bachelor of Science in Public Administration, (pgs. 1-12).

Qualitative Data Report (no date). Criminal Justice Program (pgs. 1-7).

Qualitative Data Report (Fall, 2007). Consumer & Family Science Degree Program (pgs. 1-5).

Qualitative Data Report (no date). Tropical Agricultural Science Program (TASP) Assessment-Qualitative Data, (pgs. 1-6).

Salmon, M. (April, 2008), Memorandum to Dr. Roy T. Tsuda, Interim Senior Vice President, RE: Status of Program Assessment at UOG: Health Science Program (with attachments: Status Report for the Health Science Degree Program prepared by Dr. W. Seay and School of Nursing, Social Work and Health Sciences: Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program, Program Evaluation Plan (PEP Plan), Feb. 2002)

Schwab, G. (2004). “University of Guam Assessment Plan (Draft #2)” Contact: Dr. Gerhard Schwab, Assessment Coordinator, 735-2878, gerhards@uog9.uog.edu.

Spencer, M. L. (April, 2008). Memorandum to Dr. Roy T. Tsuda, Interim Senior Vice President, RE: Request for Current Status of Program Assessment of all Degree Programs by Faculty (with attachment: Listing of Program courses assessed by faculty in CLASS).


School of Education (no date). “Assessment System” (Received by SBPA on March 26, 2008).


Teacher Education Accreditation Council at www.teac.org

Twigg, C.A. “Quality Assurance for Whom? Providers and Consumers in Today’s
Distributed Learning Environment” Center for Academic Transformation at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Dean’s Suite, Pittsburgh Bldg. 110 8th St., Troy, NY 12180.

UOG Graduate Bulletin, 2007-2008, University of Guam, UOG Station, Mangilao, Guam 96923.

UOG Undergraduate Catalog, 2007-2008, University of Guam, UOG Station, Mangilao, Guam 96923.

UOG Academic Quality Team (Aug. 1, 2006). “WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review: Outline for Essay on Academic Quality Including Bulleted List of Topics and Lists of Evidence” Submitted to Dr. Helen Whippy, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Guam.”


REQUIRED DATA ELEMENTS
Data Exhibit 7—Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (rev 12/22/08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>College / School</th>
<th>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</th>
<th>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</th>
<th>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</th>
<th>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</th>
<th>(5) How are the findings used?</th>
<th>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>At the institutional level:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For general education if an undergraduate institution:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts and Creative Expression</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No graduates; SLO Assessment of one learning objective</td>
<td>Faculty of GERC, College AAC</td>
<td>To develop the teaching learning outcomes; to guide equipment and faculty acquisition plans and budget development for faculty expansion or other adjustments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Writing Skills</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No graduates; SLO Assessment of one learning objective</td>
<td>Faculty of GERC, College AAC</td>
<td>To develop the teaching learning outcomes; to guide equipment and faculty acquisition plans and budget development for faculty expansion or other adjustments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No graduates; SLO Assessment of one learning objective</td>
<td>Faculty of GERC, College AAC</td>
<td>To develop the teaching learning outcomes; to guide equipment and faculty acquisition plans and budget development for faculty expansion or other adjustments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Studies</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No graduates; SLO Assessment of one learning objective</td>
<td>Faculty of GERC, College AAC</td>
<td>To develop the teaching learning outcomes; to guide equipment and faculty acquisition plans and budget development for faculty expansion or other adjustments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Individual and Society</td>
<td>CLASS/ SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 43)</td>
<td>Course BA110: Nationally standardized Economic Literacy exam given as Pre- and Post-tests, Current events analysis</td>
<td>SBPA Assurance of Learning Committee; University Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Course BA110: To determine teaching and learning effectiveness and identify areas for improvement;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Skills</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Graduates. Standardized Tests for G.E. Courses – 2 semester G.E. requirement.</td>
<td>Faculty of GERC, College AAC</td>
<td>To develop the teaching learning outcomes; to guide equipment and faculty acquisition plans and budget development for faculty expansion or other adjustments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No graduates; SLO Assessment of one learning objective</td>
<td>Faculty of GERC, College AAC</td>
<td>To develop the teaching learning outcomes; to guide equipment and faculty acquisition plans and budget development for faculty expansion or other adjustments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for Meaning</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No graduates; SLO Assessment of one learning objective</td>
<td>Faculty of GERC, College AAC</td>
<td>To develop the teaching learning outcomes; to guide equipment and faculty acquisition plans and budget development for faculty expansion or other adjustments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sciences</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>In progress: 2008-2009 Catalog (GenEd 44) specifies: &quot;Students also learn how to critically interpret quantitative data in mathematics courses.&quot; section, pg , syllabi</td>
<td>In progress: Direct measure of Assessment Plan to assess one learning objective in the biology and chemistry support courses for the Nursing Program and the physics support course for CNAS majors;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Studies</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No graduates; SLO Assessment of one learning objective</td>
<td>Faculty of GERC, College AAC</td>
<td>To develop the teaching learning outcomes; to guide equipment and faculty acquisition plans and budget development for faculty expansion or other adjustments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics /Computer Skills</td>
<td>CNAS/ SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 43)</td>
<td>Course BA130: Pre-test vs. several skill tests given throughout the term</td>
<td>Course BA130: SBPA Assurance of Learning Committee; University Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Course BA130: To determine teaching and learning effectiveness and identify areas for improvement;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting (BBAA)</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg. 81, 83 ); Website, Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Entry into graduate school; BA480 Business and Policy (capstone course); future career success; Certified Public Accountant licensure examination; Pre- and Post-test; One-minute paper</td>
<td>SBPA Assurance of Learning Committee</td>
<td>To determine teaching and learning effectiveness and identify areas for improvement; to make needed changes in curriculum and course offerings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Agriculture (BS)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog, (pg 65), syllabi, Program Review;</td>
<td>In progress: Entry into graduate program, future career success.</td>
<td>In progress: Direct measure of Assessment Plan to assess one learning objective in the Sciences GE and in the AG Degree Program;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003 (for years 1994-2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg. 52); Syllabi, Course outline forms*; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success; Capstone proposed in 2004 Program Review. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To determine teaching-learning effectiveness to improve the program.</td>
<td>2004 (for years 1996-2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology (BA)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 68), NIH RISE Program Review Report;</td>
<td>40-50% went on to grad, med, dental, vet med programs. Lately, most have taken jobs, many in research positions (NIH &amp; private firms, such as Raytheon). The ability to get a job &amp; success in technical, research positions also is a measure of program success. In progress: Direct measure of Assessment Plan to assess one learning objective in the Sciences GE, in the Biology Degree Program and in the support courses for the Nursing Program;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005 (for years 1999-2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration (BBA) Concentrations:</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>2008-2009 UOG Catalog (pg. 81), all BBA Course Outlines and Syllabi</td>
<td>Entry into graduate school; BA480 Business and Policy (capstone course); future career success; Concentration capstone courses; nationally standardized Comprehensive Business Examination; Student Internships; Student Conference Productions and Presentations; Applied Projects for local and national organizations; International Business Simulation Competition, Global Awareness Profile test, Student’s feedback on course materials and teaching method; Student-faculty co-authored peer-reviewed journal publication; Pre- and Post-tests, Internet Review, HR Handbook development and presentation; IR Presentation and evaluation/assessment tool; One-minute paper, current events analysis</td>
<td>SBPA Assurance of Learning Committee; The BBA Program faculty and the BBA international accrediting body: IACBE</td>
<td>To determine teaching and learning effectiveness and identify areas for improvement; to make needed changes in curriculum and course offerings</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Finance &amp; Economics</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 81, 82, 84); Web site, Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Entry into graduate school; BA480 Business and Policy (capstone course); future career success; nationally standardized Comprehensive Business Examination; Student Internships; Student Conference Productions and Presentations; Applied Projects for local and national organizations; Student’s feedback on course materials and teaching method; Student-faculty co-authored peer-reviewed journal publication</td>
<td>The Concentration and BBA Program faculty and the BBA international accrediting body: IACBE</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Human Resources Management</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 81, 82, 84); Web site, Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Entry into graduate school; BA480 Business and Policy (capstone course); future career success; nationally standardized Comprehensive Business Examination; Student Internships; Student Conference Productions and Presentations; Applied Projects for local and national organizations; Pre- and Post-tests, Internet Review, HR Handbook development and presentation; IR Presentation and evaluation/assessment tool</td>
<td>The Concentration and BBA Program faculty and the BBA international accrediting body: IACBE</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. International Tourism &amp; Hospitality Management</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 81, 82, 84); Web site, Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Entry into graduate school; BA480 Business and Policy (capstone course); future career success; nationally standardized Comprehensive Business Examination; Student Internships; Student Conference Productions and Presentations; Applied Projects for local and national organizations</td>
<td>The Concentration and BBA Program faculty and the BBA international accrediting body: IACBE</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Marketing</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg81, 82, 84) Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Entry into graduate school; BA480 Business and Policy (capstone course); BA463 Marketing Management (capstone course); future career success; nationally standardized Comprehensive Business Examination; Student Internships; Student Conference Productions and Presentations; Applied Projects for local and national organizations</td>
<td>The Concentration and BBA Program faculty and the BBA international accrediting body: IACBE</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Custom-Designed</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 81, 82, 84); Web site, Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Entry into graduate school; BA480 Business and Policy (capstone course); future career success; nationally standardized Comprehensive Business Examination; Student Internships; Student Conference Productions and Presentations; Applied Projects for local and national organizations; Global Awareness Profile test</td>
<td>The Concentration and BBA Program faculty and the BBA international accrediting body: IACBE</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry (BA)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2008 Catalog (pg 69), Published in various course outlines for chemistry courses: CH 102-103, 310a-b, 311, 312, 330, 410, 420, 450a-b, 451. Available at the library and natural Sciences Unit Office.</td>
<td>Standard ACS final exams and capstone courses, final exams (Physical Chemistry, Instructional Analysis, organic chemistry course). In progress: Entry into graduate program, future career success.</td>
<td>In progress: Direct measure of Assessment Plan to assess one learning objective in the Sciences GE and, in the Chemistry Degree Program;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004 (for years 1996-2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 52), Syllabi, Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success; Mass Media, Journalism; CO491 Capstone course. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching and learning effectiveness to make improvements.</td>
<td>2004 (for years 1996-2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science/Computer Information System (BA)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 71), syllabi, Program Review; Alumni survey; Guam Business Survey; In progress: Entry into graduate program, future career success. In progress: Direct measure of Assessment Plan to assess one learning objective in the Essential Skills GE (Statistics/Computer Skills) &amp; in the CS/CIS Degree Program; Cap-stone experience – two courses. One course is a project that not only integrates knowledge from previous courses, but also requires students to work together as a team to develop better communication skills and to enhance writing and presentation skills. The other course requires a portfolio of their internship that includes planned activities, work schedule, self-evaluation and sponsor evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008 (for years 1997-2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer &amp; Family Sciences (BA)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 72); Cap-stone experience – two courses. One course is a project that not only integrates knowledge from previous courses, but also requires students to work together as a team to develop better communication skills and to enhance writing and presentation skills. The other course requires a portfolio of their internship that includes planned activities, work schedule, self-evaluation and sponsor evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002 (for years 1993-2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (BS)</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 86) Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>In progress: Direct measure of Assessment Plan to assess one learning objective in the Sciences GE &amp; in the CSF Degree Program; Entry into law school; entry into graduate school; entry into military officer candidate schools; entry into U.S. State Department and United Nations law enforcement security positions.</td>
<td>SBPA Assurance of Learning Committee; PALS program faculty</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Syllabi, Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2005 (for years 1999-2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education - Early Childhood/ Elementary (BAE)</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 92), Syllabi, Course outline; 5 Year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into SOE; ED492 Exit course; Portfolio for ECE courses; Teacher Certification/Praxis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education - Elementary (BAE)</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 92) Course syllabi; SOE Conceptual Framework pamphlets; NCATE Reports</td>
<td>Multiple Assessment measures, portfolio review, student teaching/Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education - Elementary Ed with Chamorro Language &amp; Culture Teaching Specialty (BAE)</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 92) course syllabi</td>
<td>Student teaching/Internship; portfolio review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education - Secondary Education (BAE)</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 92) course syllabi; course outlines, SOE Conceptual Framework pamphlets; NCATE Reports</td>
<td>Student teaching/internship evaluations by classroom &amp; university supervisors, entry &amp; mid-point assessments, follow-up survey of graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education - Special Education (BAE)</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 92), NCATE Program Review (2002), Course syllabi, course outlines</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program, portfolio review, student teaching/Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 54), Syllabi, Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2006 (for years 1999-2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/ Secondary Ed (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Syllabi, Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success as a teacher; Student Teaching Capstone Experience; Teacher Certification. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2006 (for years 1999-2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 55), Syllabi, Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success; Student Exhibit; Portfolio review. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2003 (for years 1998-2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences (BA)</td>
<td>SNHS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 101)</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success; Student Exhibit; Portfolio review. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2003 (for years 1998-2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 57); Syllabi, Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2002 (for years 1995-2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Arts &amp; Sciences (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 58)</td>
<td>Gateway and Capstone Courses (6 credit hours): IAS 101: Gateway to Interdisciplinary Arts &amp; Sciences IAS 497: IAS Capstone Course Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Studies (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 59), Syllabi, Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (BA)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 74), syllabi, Program Review; In progress: Entry into graduate program, future career success, MA421/MA422 as capstone course In progress: Direct measure of Assessment Plan to assess one learning objective in the Mathematics Developmental Program, in for GE in the Essential Skills GE (Mathematics Skills) &amp; in the Mathematics Degree Program;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>December, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (ADN)</td>
<td>SNHS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (BSN)</td>
<td>SNHS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 60); Course outline forms; Program Review; 5 year Academic Master Plan Entry into graduate program; Future career success; PI481 Capstone course. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies. The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999 (for years 1994-1999)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Science (BA)</strong></td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 60); Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>Faculty; Dean data reviewed at AAC and in program review.</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2007 (for years 1999-2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychology (BA)</strong></td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 60); Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Entry into graduate program; Future career success; Senior Thesis. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2005 (for years 1999-2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Administration (BS)</strong></td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 87) Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Entry into law school; entry into graduate school; entry into federal, state, territorial, commonwealth, municipal civil service systems; entry into U.S. state department and United Nations civil service systems; entry into military officer candidate schools; entry into federal and local law enforcement agencies and intelligence services of the United States (CIA, FBI, DEA, Secret Service, etc.), Student-faculty co-authored peer-reviewed journal publication</td>
<td>SBPA Assurance of Learning Committee; PALS Program faculty</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>How are the findings used?</td>
<td>Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work (BSW)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 77); Course Syllabi, Self-Study for Council on Social Work Education</td>
<td>Knowledge, skill, and value indicator assessment projects embedded in courses and field instruction, exit surveys of graduating students, focus groups of graduates, employer surveys, graduation rate of program graduates in graduate programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology (BA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 61); Syllabi, Course outline forms; SO420 &amp; 498 capstone. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 57) Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Language</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 59); Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>No Graduates. Career success and entry into graduate program. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List each minor (no major) program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>College/ School</th>
<th>Have formal learning outcomes been developed?</th>
<th>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</th>
<th>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</th>
<th>Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</th>
<th>How are the findings used?</th>
<th>Date of last program review for this degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Administration</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Future career success in health care industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 57) Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Language</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 59); Course outline forms; Self-Study; 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>No Graduates. Career success and entry into graduate program. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>RFK</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Catalog (pg 103)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal Studies</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Future career success</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2003?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Law Curriculum</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; Gender Studies</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course outline forms; Self-Study 2008-2009 Catalog (pg 62)</td>
<td>No Graduates. Career success and entry into graduate program. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art (MA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course outlines; Syllabi; Graduate Bulletin (pg 33); 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Acceptance to Further Graduate Study; Student Awards; Student exhibition. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology (MS)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin (PMBA)</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Graduate Bulletin (pg 44), Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Capstone course, success in current or future employment, Student’s feedback on course materials and teaching method</td>
<td>PMBA program faculty</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List each graduate degree program:**

- **Art (MA)**
  - Class: **CLASS**
  - Have formal learning outcomes been developed?: Yes
  - Where are these learning outcomes published?: Course outlines; Syllabi; Graduate Bulletin (pg 33); 5 year Academic Master Plan
  - Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree?: Acceptance to Further Graduate Study; Student Awards; Student exhibition. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course-level assessment studies.
  - Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?: The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review
  - How are the findings used?: To evaluate teaching & learning effectiveness to improve program.
  - Date of last program review for this degree program: None

- **Biology (MS)**
  - College: CNAS
  - Have formal learning outcomes been developed?: No
  - Where are these learning outcomes published?: Syllabi
  - Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree?: Syllabi
  - Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?: Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review
  - How are the findings used?: To evaluate teaching & learning effectiveness to improve program.
  - Date of last program review for this degree program: N/A

- **Business Admin (PMBA)**
  - College: SBPA
  - Have formal learning outcomes been developed?: Yes
  - Where are these learning outcomes published?: 2008-2009 Graduate Bulletin (pg 44), Syllabi, Course outline forms*
  - Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree?: Capstone course, success in current or future employment, Student’s feedback on course materials and teaching method
  - Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?: PMBA program faculty
  - How are the findings used?: Same as above
  - Date of last program review for this degree program: 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>College/ School</th>
<th>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</th>
<th>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</th>
<th>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</th>
<th>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</th>
<th>(5) How are the findings used?</th>
<th>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course outlines; 2008-2009 Bulletin (pg 63)</td>
<td>Acceptance to Further Graduate Study; Student Awards; Thesis. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>not yet. First due in Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling (MA)</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Graduate bulletin (pg ); syllabi, course outlines on file in SOE; SOE Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Thesis, special projects, comprehensive exams, practicum and internships, program review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters of Education (MEd)</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Language &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Graduate Bulletin (pg ), Course syllabi; NCATE Program Review, SOE Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>Capstone course, entry; mid-point and exit assessments, portfolio review, comprehensive written examination, thesis or special project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Secondary Education</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Graduate Bulletin (pg ), course syllabi, course outlines</td>
<td>Thesis or special projects, comprehensive written examination, follow-up surveys of graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Special Education</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Graduate Bulletin (pg ), course syllabi</td>
<td>Portfolios; thesis or special project (major paper); comprehensive examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/ School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. TESOL</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Graduate bulletin (pg ); syllabi, course outlines, self-study, 5-year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Thesis or special project (Option A), comprehensive exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Administration &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Graduate bulletin (pg ); syllabi, course outlines on file in SOE; SOE Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Thesis, special projects, comprehensive exams, practicum and internships, program review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (MA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Bulletin (pg. 37) and course outlines</td>
<td>Thesis; acceptance to Ph.D. program, student awards. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course level assessment studies</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>not yet. First due in Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science(MS)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>In progress: UOG Catalog, syllabi, Program Reiview</td>
<td>In progress: Direct measure of Assessment Plan to assess one learning objective in the EV Graduate Degree Program;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin (MPA)</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2008-2009 Graduate Bulletin (pg 57), Syllabi, Course outline forms*</td>
<td>Success in current or future employment, Global Awareness Profile test</td>
<td>MPA program faculty</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>College/School</td>
<td>Have formal Learning outcomes been developed?</td>
<td>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</td>
<td>Other than GPA, what measures/ indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</td>
<td>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td>(5) How are the findings used?</td>
<td>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesian Studies (MA)</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course outlines; Syllabi; SP2000 Program Review; Graduate Bulletin (pg 40); 5 year Academic Master Plan</td>
<td>Acceptance to Further Graduate Study; Student Awards; Thesis. Learning or proficiency demonstrated in course level assessment studies.</td>
<td>The Faculty and Dean. Data reviewed at meetings [AAC] and program review</td>
<td>To evaluate teaching &amp; learning effectiveness to improve program.</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work (MSW)</td>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Element 8—Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Programs: NCATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: April 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation *1) The unit does not regularly and comprehensively collect, aggregate, analyze or report assessment data across all programs within the unit. 2) Assessment tools are not fully developed to identify and monitor candidates in all programs, 3) The Unit has not taken steps to establish procedures that ensure the fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias in its assessments., 4) Faculty has not been systematically involved in the design, development, and implementation of the unit assessment system and its components, 5) Candidates and faculty are not regularly provided with formative and summative feedback based on the unit's performance assessments, 6) Not all programs are included in the collection and reporting of assessment data and 7) The unit makes limited use of data for systematic program improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Performance Indicators: None noted. All standards currently being met. Will need to continue implementation of outcomes assessment plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For at least one indicator for each program, provide up to 3 years of trend data. Institution may wish to link cell to a graph or other format.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Business Admin Programs: IACBE</strong> |
| Date: Summer 2008 2006/2007 IACBE Annual Report accepted for continued accreditation |
| Summary: None noted. All standards currently being met. Will need to continue implementation of outcomes assessment plan. |
| Key Performance Indicators: Student success indicators – acceptance to graduate programs, CPA pass rates, career/employment success, specific discipline certification (HR, Marketing, Finance), positive student/alumni satisfaction survey results, positive stakeholder satisfaction survey results, positive results in nationally standardized comprehensive business examination. |
| For at least one indicator for each program, provide up to 3 years of trend data. Institution may wish to link cell to a graph or other format. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element 8—Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nursing Program:</strong> NLNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of most recent accreditation action by each listed agency: 2002 visit; interim report accepted Nov 2004; reaccreditation to Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary (“bullet points”) of key issues for continuing institutional attention identified in accreditation action letter or report: 2002 Pattern of concern: NCLEX pass rates; workload of administrator (the Dean/Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board, or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.): Graduation rates; NCLEX (licensure) pass rates; employment rates; OUTCOMES: critical thinking abilities, communication abilities, therapeutic nursing interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For at least one indicator for each program, provide up to 3 years of trend data. Institution may wish to link cell to a graph or other format: see attached table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work Program:</strong> CSWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of most recent accreditation action by each listed agency: February 2008: Reaffirmation of accreditation for Bachelor of Social Work Program until 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary (“bullet points”) of key issues for continuing institutional attention identified in accreditation action letter or report: • sufficient autonomy and administrative structure to achieve program goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board, or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.): • maintaining Division of Social Work • Division chair functions as “program director”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For at least one indicator for each program, provide up to 3 years of trend data. Institution may wish to link cell to a graph or other format: • sufficient budget allocations for program operations • participation in budget development and administration • sufficient office-, classroom-, and program spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional remarks: • program assessment • assessment plan with procedures to evaluate assessment outcomes • program development based on utilization of assessment data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NCLEX-RN pass rates for 282 generic BSN graduates

**as of December 06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># took test and passed</th>
<th># took test, not yet passed</th>
<th>Pass rate for all grads who took test</th>
<th>known - not taken</th>
<th>unknown whether taken or not</th>
<th>Total # GBSN grads</th>
<th>Pass rate total (grads we know passed, out of the total # grads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>282</strong></td>
<td><strong>81%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rate is what we report; We also report first pass which is not in this table. Some grads may have taken the test off island and passed. Known pass rate ave. out of total GBSN grads.

#### NOTES

Total BSN grads = 321. Others (39) are Secondstep BSNs who are already RNs or Micronesian nurses.
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