



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