MEMORANDUM

To: Deans

From: Dr. Anita Borja Enriquez
Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs

Subject *Evaluation of Assessment Inventories; AY2015-2016*

Date: April 26, 2017

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 2010[1] identified as the Annual Assessment Inventory ("AAI"). Due each October 1st, the inventories are a snapshot of assessment plans, data collection and analysis, and closing the loop activities. Comprised of faculty members on the University Assessment Committee (UAC), an ad hoc evaluation team[2] compiled evaluations and statistics of the submissions such as:

- Number of programs that submitted inventories
- Types of direct and indirect assessment instruments used
- Stage in the assessment cycle a program was at
- Feedback on the substance and quality of the assessment efforts using a rubric

Utilizing knowledge of assessment of student learning outcome processes and practices, and the AAI submission requirements, the evaluation team was tasked to (i) evaluate the inventories using an objective 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. Beginning October 2016, the team conducted the review and delivered a presentation of the attached evaluation report on February 27, 2017 to the Academic Officers Council (AOC).

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

---

[1] *UAC memo to Deans/Directors via SVP, "Institutionalizing Assessment", March 3, 2009*

[2] *The members of the review team for the AY2015-2016 AAI submissions were Arline Leon Guerrero (EMSS) Dr. Cheryl Sangueza (SOE), and Dr. Michelle Santos (SOE)*

UOG Station, Mangilao, Guam 92923 Tel. (671) 735.2994 Fax. (671) 734.3636
A U.S. Land Grant Institution accredited by the Western Association of Schools & Colleges
The University is an Equal Opportunity Employer and Service Provider
The University is a Tobacco-Free Campus

reporting as well as assessing the effectiveness of the templates and tools provided to the programs to facilitate this clarity.

The team evaluated all assessment inventories submitted for the AY2015-2016 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.

The team continued to utilized an evaluation rubric and scoring template as it has in the past two years which was crafted 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 as their frame.

One notable observation from last year's review exercise was the number of programs that did not submit an Annual Assessment Inventory and that the submission rate was lower this year than last. UAC may wish to provide some measures to improve the compliance rate.

Follow ups on last year's recommendations on AY2014-2015 submissions. The review team provided the following follow-ups on the approved recommendations from the AY2014-2015 evaluation report.

Recommendation#1: Update the evaluation rubric to provide more clarity. Broadly distribute the rubric to the programs.
Action Taken: Changes were made to the language and format of the rubric and AAI template. The rubric was attached to the AAI template.

Recommendation#2: 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. .
Action Taken: AAI Feedback and faculty training for PLO occurred.

Recommendation#3: 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.
Action Taken: The TracDat 5-column Report was utilized which demonstrated ILO-PLO alignment, however it resulted in 15+ page reports which became more cumbersome for the review team to use.

AY2015-2016 Recommendations This year's evaluation team divided evaluation/ recommendations into three categories: 1) The Rubric, 2) The Assessment Inventory Template

and 3) AAI Completion Process/Faculty Training. These recommendations are **approved** with some action items specified as needed to support these recommendations:

THE RUBRIC

Rubric Issue#1. *Challenging to score non-academic submissions with the current rubric.*

Recommendation: Consider another Assessment tool that can assess all submissions

Action: Academic submissions will continue to be evaluated using the current rubric. Non-academic submissions that can be closely assessed to institutional student learning outcomes (ILOs) (e.g., Student Life Office/Student Organizations, Counseling services) will be evaluated using the current rubric. A new assessment tool will be developed for use with non-academic submissions that are primarily focused on support services (e.g., Financial Aid Office, Admissions & Records Office).

Rubric Issue#2. *Some language read as a checklist for completion and not an assessment of quality.*

Recommendation: See supporting document 6A Suggested Changes in AAI Rubric.

Action: Implement 6A Suggested Changes in AAI Rubric

Assessment Inventory Template

Template Issue#1. *Cumbersome to evaluate PLO – ILO alignment with TRACDAT submissions.*

Recommendation: Redesign how to link the two in TRACDAT.

Action: ILOs/PLOs alignment will be included in the PLO description fields which will allow the use of the 4-colunn report for AAI submission rather than the 5-column report for easier review.

Template Issue#2. *Language in both templates needs clarity*

Recommendation: See supporting document 6] Suggestions from AAI 2014-2015 Evaluation Team Report.

AAI Completion/Faculty Training

Fac Training Issue# 1. *Some programs submitted data in TRACDAT and UAC*

Recommendation: Make instructions clear.

Fac Training Issue# 2. *Many programs submitted data not addressed in AAI*

Recommendation: Only submit supporting documents for the PLO's reviewed in that AAI.

Fac Training Issue# 3. *Programs still evaluating too many PLO's in one cycle*

Recommendation:	Limit AAI reporting to one to three PLO's
Fac Training Issue# 4.	*Some programs reported from GE courses. Need to strengthen understanding of Program Learning Outcomes*
Recommendation:	Discussion with UAC re: what are pertinent data to evaluate PROGRAM learning outcomes. Faculty training needed.
Acton:	Submit assessment of capstone courses or capstone experiences or at the very least assessment conducted in upper division major courses.
Fac Training Issue# 5.	*Frequent transcription issues (Ex: cutting and pasting info from faculty reports and placing them in the wrong column).*
Recommendation:	Continue to provide training
Fac Training Issue# 6.	*Some information was not found in TRACDAT or UAC, but buried in supporting documents.*
Recommendation:	Report data ONLY on PLO's assessed for that year.
Fac Training Issue# 7.	*Concept of closing the loop (in follow up column) is weak.*
Recommendation:	Provide training

Overall Evaluation. It is imperative that programs receive and understand their feedback *to critically evaluate and address areas of weakness.* The evaluation team anticipates programs to be given their individual feedback along with the rubric. Last year CLASS and SOE invited the evaluation team to discuss the process of evaluation of the inventories, the rubric, and individual program feedback. The team found that CLASS had an average increase from 1.92 (Initial) in AY 14-15 to 2.07 (Developing) this year. SOE had an average increase from 1.67 (Initial) in AY14-15 to 2.40 (Developing) this year.

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

There were inconsistencies between data in TRAC DAT and data in supplementary documents. There is a question about possible transcription issues between author of documents and data input into TRAC DAT.

Faculty training is essential to maintaining the intent and integrity of the Annual Assessment Inventory. Additionally, EMSS must have specialized training for their programs.

Exemplars. 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 has increased from last year's Initial to the ranking of Developing. Of the 26 programs, 6 (23%) scored in the initial stage, 17 (65%) in the developing stage, and 3 (11%) in the highly developed stage. These percentages show an improvement from last year's academic program (EMSS scores not included) scores of 62% scoring initial, 38% scoring developing, and 0% scoring highly developed. The Review Team has made some overall statements as to how submission quality can be improved in the future (see supporting documents #6).

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. Last year no programs achieved the Highly Developed in the Final Ranking and 7 academic programs who scored in the Developing Stage. This year, there were 3 programs that scored in the Highly Developed stage and 10 that finished strong in Developing:

AY2014-2015 Developing	AY2015-2016 Developing	AY2015-2016 Highly Developed
Nursing	Nursing	Chemistry
Political Science	Political Science	BAE Elementary Education
Biology	Biology	M.Ed Secondary Education
Math	Math	
Masters in Teaching	Masters in Teaching	
Chemistry	BAE Secondary Education	
Clinical Psychology	M.Ed Reading	
	M.Ed Admin and Supervision	
	Business Administration	
	Anthropology	

I commend Dr. Sangueza, Dr. Santos, and Prof. Leon Guerrero 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: Office of Institutional Effectiveness
       University Assessment Committee
       AY2015-2016 Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee