
Report: Evaluation of Assessment Inventories AY2014-2015

February 8, 2016

Review Team:
Dr. Celine Cabading, SNHS
Dr. Cheryl Sanguenza, SOE
Prof. Martha Suez-Sales, SBPA





MEMORANDUM

To: Deans

From: Anita Borja Enriquez
Senior Vice President, Academic & Student Affairs

Subject: *Evaluation of Assessment Inventories; AY2014-2015*

Date: March 9, 2016

Background. To institutionalize reporting of assessment of student learning outcomes at the program level and to annually track the status of assessment activities to improve student success in the academic programs and EMSS units, an annual reporting cycle was established in 2010¹ known as “Annual Assessment Inventory”. Due each October 1st, the inventories are a snapshot of assessment plans, data collection efforts and analysis, and closing the loop activities. Over the past iterations, the University Assessment Committee (UAC) has presented statistics on several occasions regarding how many programs submitted inventories, what types of assessment instruments were used, what stage in the assessment cycle a program was at, and other information. However, feedback on the substance and quality of the assessment efforts as reported had yet to be provided. Therefore, for the AY2013-2014 submissions and again for the AY2014-2015 submissions, I authorized the formation of an ad hoc review team² to review the assessment inventory submissions with the following objectives: (i) evaluate the inventories using an objective tool, such as a rubric, (ii) provide feedback for the programs that submitted an inventory, (iii) provide recommendations for improvement of the inventory submission process, and (iv) identify exemplars. The members of the ad hoc review team are members of the faculty as well as members of the UAC and possess extensive knowledge of assessment of student learning outcomes and our inventory submission requirements. Beginning October 2015, the team conducted the review and delivered the attached evaluation report on February 8, 2016.

Evaluation Process. It is important to recognize that the evaluation report is **not** an evaluation of the programs; it is feedback and review of the inventory submissions pertaining to their documented quality and substance of assessment efforts; it is a matter of providing clarity in our reporting as well as assessing the effectiveness of the templates and tools provided to the programs to facilitate this clarity.

¹ UAC memo to Deans/Directors via SVP, “Institutionalizing Assessment”, March 3, 2009

² The members of this review team are Dr. Celine Cabading (SNHS), Dr. Cheryl Sanguenza (SOE), and Prof. Martha Suez-Sales (SBPA)

The review team evaluated all assessment inventories submitted for the AY2014-2015 reporting period, evaluated each section in the assessment inventory template, evaluated program assessment plans as expressed through the alignment and flow between each section in the assessment inventory template, drafted feedback for the programs, identified exemplars; and adopted the lens of an outside reviewer to complete these tasks.

Last year, the review team created an evaluation rubric and scoring template based on (i) reviews of other rubrics, (ii) using WASC as a lens, (iii) consideration of UOG goals, (iv) consideration of rubric and assessment language, (v) consideration of ultimately what would an assessor want to know from reviewing a submission, (vi) consideration of how can programs use feedback to improve, and finally, (vii) using the TracDat template and the UAC template (revised March 2015) as their frame.

Follow ups on last year's recommendations on AY2013-2014 submissions. The review team provided the following follow-ups on the approved recommendations from the AY2013-2014 evaluation report.

- 1.a) Recommendation: Adopt the TracDat as the template for all future submissions or revise the UAC template to be consistent with the TracDat submission.
- 1.b) Follow up: The revised UAC template is consistent with TracDat submissions. If the UAC template is acceptable, change the rubric so programs are not penalized for using that template.

- 2.a) Recommendation: While a plan may be inferred from the overall assessment report, it would be advantageous to include a section on assessment plan in the TracDat system. This brief would contextualize the elements in the template.
- 2.b) Follow up: This issue continues. The assessment plan is currently challenging to identify. Support recommendation.

- 3.a) Recommendation: Professional development on writing PLOs. A clear PLO statement was fundamental in this review exercise. A meaningful evaluation could only be achieved when elements aligned to a well written PLO. Otherwise, the evaluation was simply a review of each element independent of its relationship to the PLO. .
- 3.b) Follow up: Continue to support this recommendation.

- 4.a) Recommendation: The inclusion of an alignment between PLO and ILO in the future submissions. Missing in the TracDat template is the opportunity to articulate the alignment of PLO to ILO.
- 4.b) Follow up: This was available and easy to assess in the revised UAC template, but still missing in TracDat template.

AY2014-2015 Recommendations. This year's evaluation team divided evaluation/recommendations into three categories: 1) The Rubric, 2) The Assessment Inventory Template and 3) Faculty Training. These recommendations are **approved** with some action items specified as needed to support these recommendations:

THE RUBRIC

- Rubric Issue 1.a. *Finding: Difficulty in assessing quality of COMPLETION vs quality of CONTENT.*
Rubric Issue 1.b. Recommendation: Develop an Assessment Inventory Evaluation Team Mission Statement and refine language in the rubric.
Rubric Issue 1.c. Action: The UAC will recommend a mission statement and refined language in the rubric.
- Rubric Issue 2. a. *Finding: Cannot easily evaluate Assessment Plan based on current submission requirements.*
Rubric Issue 2. b. Recommendation: If an Assessment Plan is deemed important, keep it in rubric and add a column for Assessment Plan in the assessment inventory templates. Otherwise remove it from rubric.
- Rubric Issue 3.a. *Finding: Difficult to assess "Justification of Benchmark." There is no prompt for this in the template.*
Rubric Issue 3.b. Recommendation: For now, remove "Justification of Benchmark" from rubric.
- Rubric Issue 4.a. *Finding: Difficult to assess "summarize and analyze data." Adequate summary of data but inadequate analysis.*
Rubric Issue 4.b. Recommendation: Provide explicit descriptors in the template and the rubric.
- Rubric Issue 5.a. *Finding: Difficult to assess "evidence of improvement in program." There is no prompt for this in the template.*
Rubric Issue 5.b. Recommendation: For now, "evidence of improvement in program" will be removed from the rubric.

UAC Template

- Recommend for UAC Template: 1. Programs using the UAC template should attach supporting documents.
Recommend for UAC Template: 2. Relocate the last three questions at the top of the template into the column chart. (Reason: The first three questions asks for an overview of program whereas the last three questions will yield answers unique to the PLO's in the template)

TracDat Submissions

- Recommend for TracDat Subm. 1. The assessment tool description should describe how the tool assesses the PLO.
Recommend for TracDat Subm. 2. The Assessment Plan should be articulated.
Recommend for TracDat Subm. 3. The generated report needs a place for demonstrating links to the ILO(s).

Faculty Training

- Recommend Faculty Training 1. Training on "How to write PLO's."
Recommend Faculty Training 2. Training on the purpose of the Annual Assessment Inventory - to understand the "why" behind each column.
Recommend Faculty Training 3. Training on the expectations for each column in the templates

Overall Evaluation. The review team has offered recommendations for improvement in each category in the “Overall Feedback Summary” section of the report. Also, i) It is imperative that programs receive and understand their feedback to recognize strengths and to critically evaluate and address areas of weakness; ii) It is vital that report authors understand how to explicitly express evaluation of program learning outcomes vs course outcomes. A shift in language will help the report read like a program assessment and not a course course assessment; iii) Faculty training is essential to maintaining the intent and integrity of the Annual Assessment Inventory; and iv) It is necessary to standardized how many PLOs to *formally* report (i.e., 1 to 3).

It is imperative for each program to critically evaluate their respective feedback and address areas of weakness.

Exemplars. The report specified that a number of programs have shown initiative through a well-developed assessment plan and the engagement of multiple program faculty.

Although no program achieved Highly Developed in the Final Ranking, the following programs have shown a strong standing in the Developing stage:

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Nursing | 6. Clinical Psychology |
| 2. Math | 7. Masters in Teaching |
| 3. Political Science | 8. EMSS Residential |
| 4. Chemistry | 9. EMSS Counseling |
| 5. Biology | 10. EMSS Student Life |

I commend Dr. Sanguenza, Dr. Cabading, and Prof. Suez-Sales for their fine work, diligence, and service towards the improvement of student learning and student success. As schedules permit, they have agreed to be available to meet with the AACs or other appropriate groups at the college level to present these findings.

The UAC will oversee the continuation of this evaluation effort each year, including proposing revisions to the evaluation rubric as deemed necessary.

The evaluation report is attached along with the individual program feedback for your respective programs.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Attachments

Cc: Director for Academic Assessment and Institutional Research
University Assessment Committee
Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee



UNIVERSITY OF GUAM

UNIBETSEDÁT GUAHAN

To: Dr. Anita Borja Enriquez, Senior Vice President

Via: Dee Leon Guerrero, Director of Assessment

From: Celine Cabading, Cheryl Sangueza, Martha Suez-Sales
(Review Team for Evaluation of Assessment Inventories AY 2014-2015)

Date: 2/08/2016

Subject: Evaluation of Assessment Inventories AY2014-2015

The final report for the Evaluation of Assessment Inventories for the AY2014-2015 is provided. There were 25 undergraduate programs, 1 undergraduate minor, 7 graduate programs, (30 programs), and 4 programs in EMSS assessed. From these 37 programs, a total of 34 programs and 88 PLO's were assessed. Three programs (CLASS CIS and CS, and SOE SPED GRAD) submitted antiquated information or information in a format not assessable by the rubric. Last year, there were 33 programs that submitted and a total of 67 PLO's were assessed.

The Review Team continued to adopt the lens of an outside reviewer to address their task to:

1. Provide a review and feedback for all AY2014-2015 assessment inventories submitted by programs.
2. Identify some exemplars of well-developed assessment reports and methods.

Completed products submitted to you are:

1. The rubric to assess each PLO.
2. Evaluation sheet used to assess each PLO
3. The feedback for each program provided for each PLO that was assessed.
4. Overall Feedback Summary based upon all the inventories that were reviewed. The summary highlights the general area of weaknesses and the possible improvements to strengthen the assessment of PLOs in the future.
5. AAI AY 2014-15 PROGRAM DATA (summary of scores)
6. Notes to refine rubric.
7. Presentation Packet.

One of our tasks this year was to comment on the use of the rubric to further refine it. Included in this packet will be our suggestions for change in the rubric (item #6: Notes to refine rubric).

Continuing from last year, we made notes to ensure “the rubric [would] be simple and easy to use.” The final rubric still has 6 categories: Submission Status, PLOs, Means of Assessment or Goals of Assessment Method, Benchmark, Results, Actions and Follow Up. Under the six categories there are 2-4 subcategories that address specific areas.

This year, the UAC template was used by 47% (down from last year’s 57%) of the programs for their submission. Last year, the Review Team felt that “the template does not adequately address all the assessment components that are necessary to critically evaluate learning outcomes.” However, this year the Review Team feels that the revised UAC template has the components necessary to critically evaluate program outcomes.

A clear statement on the PLO was fundamental in this review exercise since a meaningful assessment could only be achieved when properly aligned to the PLO. The alignment of PLO to ILO was also deemed necessary by the Review Team to provide a clear link from SLO to PLO then to ILO. Since most of the TRacDat submissions used the four column report, the ILO statement was therefore excluded. We are proposing the inclusion of ILO statement in the future submissions, meaning generating a five column report through TracDat.

A complete articulation of this year’s evaluation and recommendation can be found in the Presentation PPT.

The rubric utilizes a numeric score. This score provides an overall ranking of the PLO assessed. The total points gained under each category are normalized by dividing by the number of subcategories. The total from all categories was also treated in the same way but here it was normalized by the total number of categories, i.e. six. These numbers are clearly stated under the score section in the table together with the overall score as the Final Rating.

Overall the evaluation of assessment results at UOG is still at the ranking of **Initial** stage. The Review Team has made some overall statements as to how these could be improved in the future (see presentation packet).

A number of programs have clearly shown great initiative through a well-developed assessment plan and the engagement of most of the program faculty. These should serve as a model for UOG and these programs should be recognized. Although no

program achieved the **Highly Developed** in the Final Ranking, the following programs have shown a strong standing in the **Developing** stage:

1. Nursing
2. Math
3. Political Science
4. Chemistry
5. Biology
6. Clinical Psychology
7. Masters in Teaching
8. EMSS Residential Hall
9. EMSS Counseling
10. EMSS Student Life

Last year 5 out of 33 programs (15%) scored in 2.00 or higher and placed in the Developing stage. This year, 10 out of 34 programs (29%) scored 2.00 or higher and placed in the Developing stage.

This year's Evaluation Team strongly believes that a refined rubric will yield assessment inventory submissions clearly capable of earning a Highly Developed.

One notable observation from this review exercise is the number of programs that did not submit any inventory at all. We propose that programs be given "no submission status" for the particular year concerned. This should to be reflected in the UAC input for that particular program's Self Study report. However, UAC may wish to provide some measures to improve the compliance rate.

Evaluations and recommendations are shared in the Presentation Packet. Additionally, the evaluation team strongly believes:

1] It is imperative that programs receive and understand their feedback *to critically evaluate and address areas of weakness*.

We anticipate programs to be given their individual feed back (in item #3 above) plus copies of items # 1, 2 and 4)

2] It is vital that report authors understand how to explicitly express evaluation of program learning outcomes vs course outcomes. Many submissions read as report for courses and not programs.

3] Faculty training is essential to maintaining the intent and integrity of the Annual Assessment Inventory.

4] It is necessary to standardized how many PLOs to formally report (1-3).

Finally, we would like to thank you and the SVP for providing us the opportunity to undertake such a review exercise. We all learned and gained tremendously.

Should there be any questions pertaining to this report, we will be happy to assist.

Sincerely,

Celine Cabading
Cheryl Sanguenza – Committee Chair
Martha Suez-Sales

The slide features a light gray background with a white rectangular area in the center. Inside this white area, the title "EVALUATION OF ASSESSMENT INVENTORIES" is written in a large, dark, serif font. Below the title, the authors' names "DRS CELINE CABADING, CHERYL SANGUEZA AND MARTHA SUEZ-SALES" are listed in a smaller, dark, sans-serif font. To the right of the text is a vertical rectangular graphic with a gold-colored grid pattern.

The slide has a light gray background. At the top, the title "OUR TASK" is centered in a large, dark, serif font, with the subtitle "(SEE ASSESSMENT INVENTORY RUBRIC)" centered below it in a smaller, dark, sans-serif font. Below the subtitle is a list of four bullet points, each starting with a dark gray dot. The first three bullet points describe the evaluation process, and the fourth describes providing feedback. At the bottom, there is a note starting with an asterisk and italicized text.

- Evaluate all assessment inventories for one academic year (AY 14-15)
- Evaluate each section in the assessment inventory template
- Evaluate program assessment plan as expressed through the alignment and flow between each section in the assessment inventory template
- Provide feedback to programs
- Identify exemplars

* *We used the rubric created by last year's review team.*

SUBMISSION SUMMARY

13-14	14-15
33 programs submitted	37 programs submitted, 3 were not assessed Two programs submitted outdated info. One program submitted info but not in a format we could assess
67 PLO's reviewed	88 PLO's reviewed
57% of those submitted used the UAC template	47% of those submitted used the UAC template
5 out of 33 programs (15%) scored in Developing	10 out of 34 programs (29%) scored in Developing

OUR PROCESS IN A NUTSHELL

- ASSESSED 6 Batches of Programs
 - Blind **evaluation** of each program (in batches)
 - Individual evaluations were submitted to one committee member to **compile** inputs
 - A meeting to **calibrate** inputs.
 - Discussion about input that differed to agree where on the rubric that item should be marked.
 - Calibrated inputs were submitted to one committee member to **score** each program.
- Constant interaction with evaluation and calibration allowed us to make suggestions for improvement with rubric, assessment inventory template, and training for faculty.

SCORING SCALE

SCALE	Initial 1	Developing 2	Highly Developed 3
Range	0-1.99	2 – 2.99	3 and up

Final rubric scores lie primarily in the Initial stage. 10 out of 34 programs (29%) scored in the Developing stage.

ALL PROGRAM TRENDS

	PROGRAMS ASSESSED		PLO		ASSESSMENT SCORE		HIGHLY DEVELOPED	
	13-14	14-15	13-14	14-15	13-14	14-15	13-14	14-15
CLASS	9U 1G	*7 of 11U 1 of 3 G	29	23	2.18	1.92	4	2
CNAS	3U 0U	**4 of 7U 0 of 2U	9	7	1.65	2.13	1	3
SBPA	3U 2G	4 of 4U 1 of 2 G	5	18	1.25	1.64	0	0
SOE	5U 6G	7 of 7U 5 of 7G	11	30	1.17	1.67	0	1
SNHS	2 U	1 of 3 U	7	2	1.41	2.56	0	1
EMSS	2 of 9	4 of 9	7	6	1.53	2.03	0	3

* One other program submitted, but it is not in a format that can be assessed

**They submitted 6, but two were last year's data

NEXT...

- 1] [Follow up on the 2013-14 \[4\] recommendations](#)
- 2] [Evaluation/Recommendation 2014-15](#)
- 3] [Exemplars](#)
- 4] [General Comments for each unit](#) (1st year-2nd year)
- 5] [End.](#)

FOLLOW UP ON THE 2013-14
FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS

-1-

UAC TEMPLATE VS TRACDAT

Recommendation:

Adopt the TracDat as the template for all future submissions or revise the UAC template to be consistent with the TracDat submission.

Follow up:

The revised UAC template is consistent with TracDat submissions.

If the UAC template is acceptable, change the rubric so programs are not penalized for using that template

-2-

WHAT TRACDAT DOES NOT CAPTURE

Recommendation:

While a plan may be inferred from the overall assessment report, it would be advantageous to include a section on assessment plan in the TracDat system. This brief would contextualize the elements in the template.

Follow up: Issue continues. The assessment plan is currently challenging to identify. Support recommendation.

-3-

WRITTEN PLO'S

Recommendation:

Professional development on writing PLOs.

A clear PLO statement was fundamental in this review exercise. A meaningful evaluation could only be achieved when elements aligned to a well written PLO. Otherwise, the evaluation was simply a review of each element independent of its relationship to the PLO.

Follow up: Support recommendation.

-4-

ALIGNMENT BETWEEN PLO AND ILO

Recommendation:

The inclusion of an alignment between PLO and ILO in the future submissions.

Missing in the TracDat template is the opportunity to articulate the alignment of PLO to ILO.

Follow up: This was available and easy to assess in the revised UAC template, but still missing in TracDat.

[*Back.*](#)

EVALUATION/RECOMMENDATION 2014-15

This year's evaluation team divided evaluation/recommendations into 3 categories:

- 1] The Rubric
- 2] The Assessment Inventory Template
- 3] Faculty Training

EVALUATION/RECOMMENDATION 2014-15

1] THE RUBRIC

1] EVALUATION: Difficulty in assessing quality of COMPLETION vs quality of CONTENT.

RECOMMENDATION: *Develop Assessment Inventory Evaluation Team Mission Statement and refine language in rubric.*

2] EVALUATION: Cannot easily evaluate Assessment Plan based on current submission requirements.

RECOMMENDATION: *If an Assessment Plan is deemed important, keep it in rubric and add a column for Assessment Plan in the assessment inventory templates. Otherwise remove from rubric.*

EVALUATION/RECOMMENDATION 2014-15

1 RUBRIC continued

3] EVALUATION: Difficult to assess "Justification of Benchmark." Not asked for in template.

RECOMMENDATION: For now, remove from rubric.

4] EVALUATION: Difficult to assess "summarize and analyze data." Adequate summary of data but inadequate analysis.

RECOMMENDATION: Explicit descriptors in template and rubric.

5] EVALUATION: Difficult to assess "evidence of improvement *in program.*" Not asked for in template.

RECOMMENDATION: For now, remove from rubric

EVALUATION/RECOMMENDATION 2014-15

2] RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ASSESSMENT INVENTORY TEMPLATE

UAC:

- 1] Ask to include raw data.
- 2] The last 3 questions at the top of the template need to go in the chart below.
 - Reason: The first 3 questions asks for an overview of program whereas the last 3 questions will yield answers unique to the PLO's in the template.

TracDat:

- 1] Assessment tool description should describe how tool assesses PLO.
- 2] Assessment Plan should be articulated.
- 3] Template needs a place for ILO.

EVALUATION/RECOMMENDATION 2014-15

3] RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACULTY TRAINING

- 1] Training on "How to write PLO's."
- 2] Training on the purpose of the Annual Assessment Inventory - to understand the "why" behind each column.
- 3] Training on the expectations for each column in the templates
 - Issues to improve:
 - random data and often volumes of it were submitted
 - insufficient or incoherent information written in columns
 - surface information in report

RECOMMENDATION 2014-15

Complete the Annual Assessment Inventory so someone *outside* your program clearly understands:

- 1] How your PLO aligns to your program statement and ILO.
- 2] How the assessment tool assesses PLO *throughout the program*.
- 3] How faculty have designed/made changes that align with the analysis of the data.

LASTLY, THE 14-15 EVALUATION TEAM ASSERTS:

1] It is imperative that programs receive and understand their feedback *to critically evaluate and address areas of weakness*.

2] It is vital that report authors understand how to explicitly express evaluation of *program learning outcomes* vs course outcomes. A shift in language will help the report read like a program assessment and not a course course assessment.

3] Faculty training is essential to maintaining the intent and integrity of the Annual Assessment Inventory.

4] It is necessary to standardized how many PLOs to formally report (1-3).

[BACK](#)

EXEMPLARS

A number of programs have shown initiative through a well developed assessment plan and the engagement of multiple program faculty.

Although no program achieved **Highly Developed** in the Final Ranking, the following programs have shown a strong standing in the **Developing** stage:

13-14	14-15
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clinical Psychology 2. Anthropology 3. Chemistry 4. Psychology 5. Political Sciences 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nursing 2. Math 3. Political Science 4. Chemistry 5. Biology 6. Clinical Psychology 7. Masters in Teaching 8. EMSS Residential 9. EMSS Counseling 10. EMSS Student Life

THANK YOU!!

A sincere thank you to SVP Dr. Anita Borja-Enriquez and Deborah Leon Guerrero for providing us the opportunity to undertake such a review exercise. This was an amazing learning experience!

GENERAL COMMENTS FOR UNITS

GENERAL COMMENTS: CLASS

AY 13-14	AY 14-15
9 undergraduate and 1 graduate program submitted All submissions were in TracDat	8/11 undergraduate and 1/3 graduate program submitted 7 undergraduate assessed
One program listed seven PLOs which was a bit too many	All submissions in TracDat
Assessment method not clearly stated	One program listed 6 PLOs and 2 listed 4.
Faculty participation needs to be clearly stated	Program statement missing in some
Raw data and data analysis were weak	Actions and follow up was weak or missing in many submissions
Follow up action was weak	There are 2 exemplars from CLASS.
AVG Assessment Score = 2.18	AVG Assessment Score 1.92

GENERAL COMMENTS: CNAS

AY 13-14	AY 14-15
Only 3 programs submitted No Graduate program submitted	6/7 programs submitted but 2 had last year's information.
Weak evidence of Action and Follow Up	Neither of the 2 graduate programs submitted
1 used TracDat and 2 used UAC template	3 of the 4 programs assessed used TracDat
One program listed 6 PLOs, which is a bit too many	3 was the highest number PLO assessed in a program
Faculty participation was weak	3 exemplars are found in this unit
Lack of raw data and data analysis	
AVG Assessment Score 1.65	AVG Assessment Score 2.13

GENERAL COMMENTS: SOE

AY 13-14	AY 14-15
5 under graduate and 6 graduate programs submitted	7/7 undergraduate and 5/7 graduate submitted
All used UAC template	All used UAC template
Most use the professional exam (**) as evidence for achievement but this was not clearly linked to assessment plan and PLO	Of the 12 that submitted, 2 programs had 5-6 PLO, 1 had 3, and the rest had 1-2 PLO assessed
Lack of raw data and data analysis Weak Action and Follow Up	Lack of raw data and data analysis
Incomplete assessment reporting is evident	Weak Action and Follow Up 1 exemplar is in this program
AVG Assessment Score 1.17	AVG Assessment Score 1.67

GENERAL COMMENTS: SBPA

AY 13-14	AY 14-15
3 undergraduate and 2 graduate submitted	4 out of 4 undergraduate and 1 out of 2 graduate programs submitted
All used the UAC template	3 used TracDat and 2 used UAC
All followed a lengthy table of PLOs with all courses and what assessment activity. Table has too many PLO's and Assessment method, but very limited results	2 of the 4 programs assessed 6 PLO's. Submissions included PLO's that were not assessed by the unit.
Lack of raw data and data analysis	Weak action and follow up
Weak Action and Follow Up AVG Assessment Score = 1.25	Some assessment tools does not seem to address PLO. AVG Assessment Score = 1.64

GENERAL COMMENTS: SNHS

AY 13-14	AY 14-15
2 undergraduate programs submitted	1 out of 3 undergraduate programs submitted
All used the UAC template	UAC template was used
Some used the professional exam results as evidence but this was not clearly linked to PLOs	Faculty participation evident
Evidence of good assessment activities were stated but was not well captured in the UAC template	The only scores in "initial" were in Document template and Assessment Plan – both of which we identified as areas to fix in in each document
Faculty participation evident	Clear action and follow up.
Lack of Action and Follow Up AVG Assessment Score 1.41	AVG Assessment Score: 2.59 (the highest)

GENERAL COMMENTS: EMSS

AY 13-14	AY 14-15
2 programs submitted: Residence Hall and Trio	4 out of 9 programs submitted
Both used a 4 column that mirror TracDat	TracDat was used for all submissions
	*3 of the 4 submissions scored 2.0 or higher (developing stage)
	<i>The team used the current rubric, but modified the interpretation of rubric to account for a non-academic unit report.</i>
	Back

THANK YOU!!

A sincere thank you to SVP Dr. Anita Borja-Enriquez and Deborah Leon Guerrero for providing us the opportunity to undertake such a review exercise. This was an amazing learning experience!

Assessment Inventory Rubric

Program: _____

Year assessed:

PLO ____/____

Reviewer:

	Initial (1)	Developing (2)	Highly Developed (3)	Notes
<p>Submission Status</p> <p>A. Timeliness B. Quality of completion C. Document template</p>	<p>A. Document submitted late. B. Document is incomplete OR completed with non-cohesive information C. Document completed in the UAC template.</p>	<p>A. Document submitted on time. B. Document may be missing minor information elements, but is otherwise complete. C. Document completed in TracDat.</p>	<p>A. Document consistently submitted on time (at least 2 times in a row) B. Document is complete. C. Document completed using most updated TracDat format with related links.</p>	
<p>PLO</p> <p>A. PLO identified B. Alignment of PLO to Program Statement C. Alignment of PLO to ILO.</p>	<p>A. PLO not identified or is identified, but are too broad and lacks clarity. PLO's language resembles a course learning outcome. B. No evident alignment between PLO and Program Mission Statement. (ex: no Program Mission statement to align to) C. No evident alignment between PLO and ILO.</p>	<p>A. PLO identified and articulates competencies with an action verb that clearly demonstrates the skill or behavior to be observed and measured. B. Implied or loose alignment to Program Mission Statement. C. Implied or loose alignment to ILO.</p>	<p>A. 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. B. Clear alignment between PLO and Program Mission Statement. C. Clear alignment between PLO and ILO.</p>	

	Initial (1)	Developing (2)	Highly Developed (3)	Notes
<p>Means of Assessment or Goals of Assessment</p> <p>A. Assessment tool.</p> <p>B. Description/Quality of assessment tool (appropriateness of data tool, variability of tool)</p> <p>C. Assessment Plan (ex: alignment with PLO, multiple tools at different times in program) [BEFORE IMPLEMENTING ASSESSMENT]</p> <p>D. Faculty participation/collaboration/engagement</p>	<p>A. Assessment tool not identified</p> <p>B. No clear description of assessment tool and/or does not assess PLO.</p> <p>C. No clear assessment plan or assessment plan does not align with PLO. The assessment plan is stated but not complete or realistic.</p> <p>D. One faculty or one course assessing the PLO.</p>	<p>A. Assessment tool is identified.</p> <p>B. Assessment tool assess PLO at some level.</p> <p>C. Assessment plan aligns with PLO, but plan missing some details. Assessment plan is articulated with some details.</p> <p>D. Evidence of faculty collaboration are present.</p>	<p>A. More than 1 assessment tool identified.</p> <p>B. Assessment tool assess PLO comprehensively.</p> <p>C. Assessment plan deliberately aligns with PLO and goals for program assessment conveys insightful plans to improve quality of student learning, retention, program efficiency.</p> <p>D. Faculty collaboration is strongly evident (ex: multiple faculty across different time points in program).</p>	
<p>Benchmarks</p> <p>A. Clearly stated</p> <p>B. Justification of benchmark met or not met</p>	<p>A. No benchmark</p> <p>B. The assessment just reported data without any criteria identified.</p>	<p>A. Benchmark is present, but needs refining (clarity, level)</p> <p>B. Some justification for Benchmark present (ex: benchmarks not met repeatedly with no explanation, or met and no explanation of what will do next).</p>	<p>A. Benchmark is clearly stated and appropriate.</p> <p>B. Justification clearly articulates purpose and description is explicitly offered on how the results of assessment activities will be used to modify and improve learning outcomes.</p>	

	Initial (1)	Developing (2)	Highly Developed (3)	
Results A. Raw data reported B. Summarizes the results (related links) C. Analysis of data	A. Few to no raw data are reported. B. Summary of findings are not reported C. No analysis of data OR analysis are not supported by the data	A. Raw data are generally reported from most assessment activities B. Summary of findings are reported on some outcomes. C. Some analysis of data is provided.	A. Raw data are reported on all assessment activities B. Summary of findings on all outcomes are reported with comparing/ contrasting of findings from multiple measures. C. Clearly developed and well thought out analyses are reported and supported by the data.	
Actions and Follow up A. Actions identified B. Alignment with the analysis and quality of follow up C. Evidence of improvement <i>in program</i>	A. No action to change or maintain program outcomes is identified. B. No clear follow up action from the analysis of data. C. No evidence of improvement is reported.	A. Action/s to maintain or change the majority of outcomes is reported. B. Present data have influenced some actions to change or maintain program outcomes. C. Evidence of improvement is reported on some learning outcomes.	A. Action/s to maintain or change the majority of outcomes is extensively described. All actions reflect the thoughtful use of the analyses. B. Strong evidence that present data have influenced detail, meaningful, programmatic changes. C. Strong evidence of improvement is reported in all learning outcomes.	

Assessment Inventory Rubric

Program:

Year assessed: 2014-2015

PLO ___ of ____

Reviewer:

Highlighted – remove?

	Initial (1)	Developing (2)	Highly Developed (3)	Notes	Score	Category
Submission Status						
a. Timeliness						
b. Quality of completion						
c. Document template						
PLO						
a. PLO identified						
b. Alignment of PLO to Program Statement						
c. Alignment of PLO to ILO.						
Means of Assessment or Goals of Assessment						
a. Assessment tool.						
b. Description/Quality of assessment tool (appropriateness of data tool, variability of tool)						
c. Assessment Plan (ex: alignment with PLO, multiple tools at different times in program)						
d. Faculty participation/ collaboration/engagement						
Benchmarks						
a. Clearly stated						
b. Justification						
Results						
a. Raw data reported						
b. Summarizes the results						
c. Analysis of data						
Actions and Follow up						
a. Actions identified						
b. Alignment with the analysis and quality of follow up						
c. Evidence of improvement						
Final Rating:						

Assessment Inventory Rubric
Anecdotal Common Findings

Year assessed: 2014-15

Submission Status	Common Strengths	Common Weaknesses	How to Improve
a. a. Timeliness	13-14	13-14	13-14:
b. Quality of completion	Many completed of all four columns in a clear and cohesive manner and on time.	If information given was not grounded in a PLO, quality was low. The most common incomplete document was having results but no action.	Clear alignment between PLO and rest of template information.
c. Document template	14-15 Same as above	UAC format does not capture needed data. All attachments should be easily accessed. Links to websites should not be included.	Fill out all relevant sections of the TracDat table Complete TracDat 5 column with relative links.
		14-15 The most common incomplete document was having results but no action. Programs who used UAC could only score a 1.	14-15: Faculty training. Fill out each column succinctly. Do not ding those who use UAC template.
PLO	Common Strengths	Common Weaknesses	How to Improve
a. PLO identified	13-14	13-14	Write brief and properly articulated PLO's that overtly align to your program statement.
b. Alignment of PLO to Program Statement	Many PLOs were developed and clearly stated.	PLOs were too general Program statement missing to align with PLO or no clear alignment	Reference which ILO the PLO addresses.
c. Alignment of PLO to ILO.	Some very clear connection between PLO and Program Statement. Related links provided additional descriptions	Lack of alignment of PLO to ILO Too many PLO's identified, but only one/few truly assessed.	Report ONLY the PLO that is assessed. Number of PLO assessed must be realistic.
	14-15 Increased number of articulated PLO Overt alignment between ILO and PLO possible in UAC template	14-15 Same as above	14-15 Faculty training

Means of Assessment or Goals of Assessment	Common Strengths	Common Weaknesses	How to Improve
a. Assessment tool.	13-14	13-14	13-14
b. Description/Quality of assessment tool (appropriateness of data tool, variability of tool)	Assessment tools were listed. Some level of description was often written. Some units were overt about multiple faculty participation.	Description of tool (to assess how it aligns with PLO) was sparse. Assessment Plan had to be inferred vs overt.	Write brief description of how assessment tool assess PLO in tool description. Make assessment plan overt.
c. Assessment Plan (ex: alignment with PLO, multiple tools at different times in program)	Units clearly assessed PLO at multiple course and time points throughout the program.	Often a PLO was only assessed by one faculty member and/or one course. Several PLO's assessed with only one tool.	Articulate how multiple faculty across different time points in program are involved with assessing any individual PLO.
d. Faculty participation/collaboration/engagement	14-15 Same as above	UAC template does not clearly ask for a PLO. 14-15: Same as above with the last one being addressed by the revised form	13-14 Revise assessment template for clarity in input Faculty training
Benchmarks	Common Strengths	Common Weaknesses	How to Improve
a. Clearly stated	13-14	13-14	13-14
b. Justification of benchmark met or not met	Benchmarks were offered by all units who submitted via TracDat Some units offered a justification of benchmarks met or not met. Some units gave a clear report in related links. 14-15 Benchmarks were given in majority of the submissions Benchmarks are now captured in the UAC template	Many benchmarks were not clear with percentage reference (ex: 80% of class will improve vs 80% of class will earn an 85% or above...) Justification of benchmark itself was grossly missing. Lack of specificity in benchmark. In the UAC template, benchmarks are not captured. 14-15 Some benchmarks were not clear with percentage reference (ex: 80% of class will improve vs 80% of class will earn an 85% or above...) Justification grossly missing	Write a benchmark that describes what is your scale for improvement and justify why you chose your scale. Explanation as to why benchmark was met or not met should be evidence based and stem from reflections about course and program design. 14-15 Give example of a proper benchmark in template Remove/reword "justification" in rubric

Results	Common Strengths	Common Weaknesses	How to Improve
a. Raw data reported	13-14	13-14	13-14
b. Summarizes the results	In template, many units gave a summary of the data.	Raw data were rarely reported.	Give raw data, and a summary and analysis of that data that brings out information relative to improvements you need to make to address PLO.
c. Analysis of data	Clear reports were added in related links.	Many summaries and analysis were superficial.	
	14-15	Some results were present but not aligned with identified tools.	14-15
	In template, many units gave some raw data and summary of results	Some have too many results in progress.	Attach ONLY current data relative to current assessment tool
	Some reports offered valuable summaries of data	14-15	Clearly distinguish between expectations for summary and analysis
		Many programs attached volumes of unrelated data.	
		Some summaries and analysis were superficial.	
Actions and Follow up	Common Strengths	Common Weaknesses	How to Improve
a. Actions identified	13-14	13-14	13-14
b. Alignment with the analysis and quality of follow up	Actions were often shared.	Actions sometimes did not align with improving PLO benchmark.	Write clear actions with data to support that action.
c. Evidence of improvement IN PROGRAM	There was some alignment between analysis and follow up.	Actions had nothing to do with data or PLO.	Even if PLO is met, identify and explain what are your next steps.
	14-15	Actions were missing if PLO were met.	Articulate evidence of improvement in PROGRAM.
	Some programs demonstrated changes in program (curriculum and in delivery method) based on data summaries.	Evidence of improvement <u>in program</u> was rarely addressed.	
		Some proposed improvement were too board and missing specific actions.	14-15
		14-15	Same as above with the exception of the last entry.
		Actions sometimes did not align with improving PLO benchmark.	Suggest to remove "evidence of improvement in program" in rubric
		Actions were missing if PLO were met.	
		Evidence of improvement <u>in program</u> was rarely addressed.	
		Some proposed improvement were too board and missing specific actions.	
		Many actions were to "maintain" course of current action	

Overall Suggestion:

To programs:

- After completing the template, ONLY link data pertinent to current assessment tool.
- Make sure your PLO is an appropriately written PLO (not too vague, is a learning outcome indicative a PROGRAM learning outcome).

Fill out template so someone outside your program clearly understands:

- 1] How your PLO aligns to your program statement and ILO.
- 2] How your assessment tool assesses progress in the PLO (via brief but descriptive tool description and benchmark) throughout your program.
- 3] How you have designed/made changes that align with the analysis of your data.

Template changes:

Consider another section where the assessment plan can be cleared assessed.

UNIT	PROGRAM	13-14 PLO	13-14 Score	Highly Developed	14-15PLO	14-15 SCORE	UAC-TRACDAT	Highly Developed
CLASS	Anthropology	2	2.19	3	1	1.97	TRAC DAT	
CLASS	Communcation	2	1.76		4	1.68	TRAC DAT	
CLASS	Fine Arts	7	1.59		3	1.73	TRAC DAT	
CLASS	history	1	1.72		1	1.83	TRAC DAT	
CLASS	Poli Sci	4	2.01	4	6	2.42	TRAC DAT	3
CLASS	Psychology	2	2.12	5	NONE	NONE		
CLASS	Sociology	3	1.67		3	1.9	TRAC DAT	
CLASS	English	3	1.79		NONE	NONE		
CLASS	Micronesian Studies	2	1.64					
CNAS	Bio	NONE			1	2.17	TRAC DAT	5
CNAS	Chem	1	2.27	2	2	2.41	TRAC DAT	4
CNAS	Consumer Science	6	1.36		3	1.47	TRAC DAT	
CNAS	Math	2	1.33		1	2.48	UAC	2
SBPA	SB Accounting	1	0.83		6	1.77	TRAC DAT	
SBPA	BSPA	NONE			3	1.63	UAC	
SBPA	Criminal Justice	1	1.48		3	1.72	UAC	
SBPA	BA SBPA Public Admin	1	1.53		6	1.62	TRAC DAT	
SNHS	Nursing	2	1.28		2	2.59	UAC	1
SNHS	Health Science	5	1.53		NONE	NONE		
SOE	SOE ELEM	1	1.14		5	1.84	UAC	
SOE	SOE ECE	NONE			2	1.61	UAC	
SOE	SOE PE	1	1.06		2	1.63	UAC	
SOE	SOE Elem Cham	NONE			2	1.34	UAC	
SOE	SOE SPED	1	1.18		2	1.56	UAC	
SOE	SOE ESL Elem	NONE			2	1.26	UAC	

Assessment Inventory Rubric

	Initial (1)	Developing (2)	Highly Developed (3)	Notes 2013-2014	Notes 2014-2015
<p>Submission Status</p> <p>A. Timeliness B. Quality of completion C. Document template</p>	<p>A. Document submitted late. B. Document is incomplete OR completed with non-cohesive information C. Document completed in the UAC template.</p>	<p>A. Document submitted on time. B. Document may be missing minor information elements, but is otherwise complete. C. Document completed in TracDat.</p>	<p>A. Document consistently submitted on time (at least 2 times in a row) B. Document is complete. C. Document completed using most updated TracDat format with related links.</p>		
<p>PLO</p> <p>A. PLO identified B. Alignment of PLO to Program Statement C. Alignment of PLO to ILO.</p>	<p>A. PLO not identified or is identified, but is too broad and lacks clarity. PLO's language resembles a course learning outcome. B. No evident alignment between PLO and Program Mission Statement. (ex: no Program Mission statement to align to) C. No evident alignment between PLO and ILO.</p>	<p>A. PLO identified and articulates competencies with an action verb that clearly demonstrates the skill or behavior to be observed and measured. B. Implied or loose alignment to Program Mission Statement. C. Implied or loose alignment to ILO.</p>	<p>A. 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. B. Clear alignment between PLO and Program Mission Statement. C. Clear alignment between PLO and ILO.</p>	<p>C – is there a place in TracDat?</p>	<p>C – still no place in TRAC DAT.</p>

	Initial (1)	Developing (2)	Highly Developed (3)	Notes 2013-2014	Notes 2014-2015
<p>Means of Assessment or Goals of Assessment</p> <p>A. Assessment tool.</p> <p>B. Description/Quality of assessment tool (appropriateness of data tool, variability of tool)</p> <p>C. Assessment Plan (ex: alignment with PLO, multiple tools at different times in program)</p> <p>D. Faculty participation/collaboration/engagement</p>	<p>A. Assessment tool not identified</p> <p>B. No clear description of assessment tool and/or does not assess PLO.</p> <p>C. No clear assessment plan or assessment plan does not align with PLO. The assessment plan is stated but not complete or realistic.</p> <p>D. One faculty or one course assessing the PLO.</p>	<p>A. Assessment tool is identified.</p> <p>B. Assessment tool assess PLO at some level.</p> <p>C. Assessment plan aligns with PLO, but plan missing some details. Assessment plan is articulated with some details.</p> <p>D. Evidence of faculty collaboration are present.</p>	<p>A. More than 1 assessment tool identified.</p> <p>B. Assessment tool assess PLO comprehensively.</p> <p>C. Assessment plan deliberately aligns with PLO and goals for program assessment conveys insightful plans to improve quality of student learning, retention, program efficiency.</p> <p>D. Faculty collaboration is strongly evident (ex: multiple faculty across different time points in program).</p>	<p>B – hardly anyone is describing tool – do we need to prompt them to get this info?</p> <p>C – template asks for a one word answer – will not get a plan from that question</p>	<p>How do we establish that there are multiple faculty across different time points in the program?</p> <p>B – more are describing tool</p> <p>C – Rarely present: do we want to ask to explain why they selected the PLO and accept that as a “plan”</p>
<p>Benchmarks</p> <p>A. Clearly stated</p> <p>B. Justification of benchmark met or not met</p>	<p>A. No benchmark</p> <p>B. The assessment just reported data without any criteria identified.</p>	<p>A. Benchmark is present, but needs refining (clarity, level)</p> <p>B. Some justification for Benchmark present (ex: benchmarks not met repeatedly with no explanation, or met and no explanation of what will do next).</p>	<p>A. Benchmark is clearly stated and appropriate.</p> <p>B. Justification clearly articulates purpose and description is explicitly offered on how the results of assessment activities will be used to modify and improve learning outcomes.</p>	<p>B - having a hard time finding this – is it found in the last question in the new template?</p>	<p>B- remove justification or change what this means – this is most difficult part of rubric</p>

	Initial (1)	Developing (2)	Highly Developed (3)	Notes 2013-2014	Notes 2014-2015
Results A. Raw data reported B. Summarizes the results (related links) C. Analysis of data	A. Few to no raw data are reported. B. Summary of findings are not reported C. No analysis of data OR analysis are not supported by the data	A. Raw data are generally reported from most assessment activities B. Summary of findings are reported on some outcomes. C. Some analysis of data is provided.	A. Raw data are reported on all assessment activities B. Summary of findings on all outcomes are reported with comparing/ contrasting of findings from multiple measures. C. Clearly developed and well thought out analyses are reported and supported by the data.		Most programs give a summary, but hardly anyone gives analysis
Actions and Follow up A. Actions identified B. Alignment with the analysis and quality of follow up C. Evidence of improvement in program	A. No action to change or maintain program outcomes is identified. B. No clear follow up action from the analysis of data. C. No evidence of improvement is reported.	A. Action/s to maintain or change the majority of outcomes is reported. B. Present data have influenced some actions to change or maintain program outcomes. C. Evidence of improvement is reported on some learning outcomes.	A. Action/s to maintain or change the majority of outcomes is extensively described. All actions reflect the thoughtful use of the analyses. B. Strong evidence that present data have influenced detail, meaningful, programmatic changes. C. Strong evidence of improvement is reported in all learning outcomes.	C – not improvement – just meeting benchmark. Need to change this? OR ask in template to report the year before for the same data.	C – remove evidence of improvement in program – cannot asses. Question about action and follow up – if this is WHY we do assessment, should we put heavy focus on this? Most programs say “continue assessment” or

					don't offer a follow up if they met benchmark. Many actions are in form to improve teaching strategies and not program changes... what do we do about that? Do we expect programmatic changes every year?
--	--	--	--	--	---

Issues:

Too many PLO's listed

Random data shared in links.

Actions and Follow inputs are surface.