|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Criteria** | **Initial (1)**  | **Developing (2)** | **Highly Developed (3)**  |
| **Submission status** | 1. Timeliness
2. Quality of completion
 | 1. Document submitted late.
2. Document is incomplete OR completed with non-cohesive information
 | 1. Document submitted on time.
2. Document missing minor elements, but we can still assess inventory and/or is completed in a later template format.
 | 1. Document consistently submitted on time (at least 2 times in a row)
2. Document is complete (with related links) using the most updated format.
 |
| **Program Learning Outcome (PLO)** | 1. PLO identified
2. Alignment of PLO to Program Statement
3. Alignment of PLO to ILO.
 | 1. PLO not identified or is identified, but are too broad and lacks clarity. PLO’s language resembles a course learning outcome.
2. No evident alignment between PLO and Program Mission Statement. (ex: no Program Mission statement to align to)
3. No evident alignment between PLO and ILO.
 | 1. PLO identified and articulates competencies with an action verb that clearly demonstrates the skill or behavior to be observed and measured.
2. Implied or loose alignment to Program Mission Statement.
3. Implied or loose alignment to ILO.
 | 1. PLO identified and articulates competencies with an action verb that clearly demonstrates the skill or behavior to be observed and measured AND PLO’s language is indicative of an end of program learning outcome.
2. Clear alignment between PLO and Program Mission Statement.
3. Clear alignment between PLO and ILO.
 |
| **Means of Assessment or****Goals of Assessment** | 1. Assessment tool.
2. Description/Quality of assessment tool (appropriateness of data tool, variability of tool)
3. Assessment Plan (ex: alignment with PLO, multiple tools at different times in program)

[BEFORE IMPLEMENTING ASSESSMENT]1. Faculty participation/ collaboration/engagement
 | 1. Assessment tool not identified
2. No clear description of assessment tool and/or does not assess PLO.
3. No clear assessment plan, or assessment plan does not align with PLO. The assessment plan is stated but not complete or realistic.
4. One faculty or one course assessing the PLO.
 | 1. Assessment tool is identified
2. Assessment tool assess PLO at some level.

C. Assessment plan aligns with PLO, but plan missing some details. Assessment plan is articulated with some details.D. Evidence of faculty collaboration is present. | 1. More than 1 assessment tool identified.
2. Assessment tool assess PLO comprehensively.
3. Assessment plan deliberately aligns with PLO and goals for program assessment convey insightful plans to improve quality of student learning, retention, and program efficiency.
4. Faculty collaboration is strongly evident (ex: multiple faculty across different time points in program).
 |
| **Bench-marks** | A. Clearly stated | 1. No benchmark
 | 1. Benchmark is present, but needs refining (clarity, level)
 | 1. Benchmark is clearly stated and justified.
 |
| **Results** | 1. Raw data reported
2. Summarizes the results (related links)
3. Analysis of data
 | 1. Few to no raw data are reported.
2. Summary of findings are not reported
3. No analysis of data OR analysis are not supported by the data
 | 1. Raw data are generally reported from most assessment activities
2. Summary of findings are reported on some outcomes.
3. Some analysis of data is provided.
 | 1. Raw data are reported on all assessment activities
2. Summary of findings on all outcomes are reported with comparing/ contrasting of findings from multiple measures.
3. Clearly developed and well thought out analyses are reported and supported by the data.
 |
| **Actions and****Follow up**(Closing the loop) | 1. Follow up actions identified
2. Follow up actions alignment with the analysis
 | 1. No follow up action identified, or only an action to maintain status quo is identified
2. Follow up action does not align with the analysis of data.
 | 1. Follow up action/s is identified.
2. Follow up action/s have influenced some actions to change or maintain program outcomes and is grounded in the analysis of appropriate data.
 | 1. Follow up action/s for all assessment tools are extensively described.
2. All follow up actions reflect the thoughtful use of the analyses with overt evidence that present data have influenced meaningful, programmatic changes (learning experiences, course map, test design, etc).
 |

University of Guam

Annual Assessment Inventory (5-Column Report[[1]](#footnote-1))

Reporting Period: AY\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Program Title:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mission Statement or Program Description: |  |
| Assessment Plan created or revised?*(Note: attach Plan to this submission)* |  |
| Where are the PLOs published? *(e.g., catalog, web, TracDat)* |  |
| ILO[[2]](#footnote-2) | PLO[[3]](#footnote-3) | Means of Assessment and Benchmarks*What type of evidence is used to determine achievement?* | Results*Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?**(attach supporting docs)* | Action & Follow-Up (Closing the Loop)*How are the assessment findings used?* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Questions? Contact the Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research at 735-2585 or* deborah@triton.uog.edu

1. *Do not use this template if you are already using TracDat to specify the assessment plan and to report assessment results, analysis, and closing the loop*. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *List the ILOs that are linked or correspond to the PLOs being assessed in this reporting period.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *List only the PLOs that are being assessed in this reporting period.*

*Template version August 2016* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)