



UNIVERSITY OF GUAM

UNIBETSEDÁT GUAHAN

To: Dr. Anita Borja Enriquez, Senior Vice President

Via: Dee Leon Guerrero, Director of Assessment

From: Arline Leon Guerrero, Cheryl Sanguenza, Michelle Santos
(Review Team for Evaluation of Assessment Inventories AY 2015-2016)

Date: 2/02/2017

Subject: **Evaluation of Assessment Inventories AY2015-2016**

The final report for the Evaluation of Assessment Inventories for the AY2015-2016 is provided. There were 15 undergraduate programs, 1 undergraduate minor, and 10 graduate programs (26 academic programs). Nine EMSS programs were assessed, but that information is not included in this report. Submissions from the non-instructional units were difficult to assess and the committee would like to work with these units to insure future submissions look at improvement with student success.

This year, a total of 26 academic programs and 59 PLO's were assessed. Last year, there were 30 academic programs (and 4 EMSS programs) submitted and a total of 88 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 AY2015-2016 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 2015-16 PROGRAM DATA (summary of scores for all programs)
6. Suggestions from AAI 15-16 Evaluation Team: TRACDAT and UAC templates, and for submissions.
- 6a. Suggestions from AAI 15-16 Evaluation Team: Changes in the rubric.
7. Presentation Packet.

One task from last year was to refine the TRAC DAT and UAC templates and rubric. Included in this packet will be our input with regard to the most updated templates and rubric (item #6 and 6a: Suggestions from AAI 15-16 Evaluation Team).

Last year, it was stated that 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. Additionally, the alignment of PLO to ILO was also deemed necessary. The result of these two suggestions were that: Faculty training for writing PLO's was completed on September 16, 2016 by Dee Leon Guerrero and Arum Swamy. Also the TRAC DAT template was modified to include a link between ILO and PLO. The overall average score for the PLO category was a 2.5 (Developing) and 14 of the 26 (53%) academic programs scored Highly Developed in the PLO category of the rubric.

A complete articulation of this year's evaluation and recommendation can be found in the supporting documents and 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 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 years 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:

14-15 Developing	15-16 Developing	15-16 Highly Developed
Nursing	Nursing	Chemistry
Political Science	Political Science	Elementary Education
Biology	Biology	M.Ed Secondary Education
Math	Math	
Masters in Teaching	Masters in Teaching	
Chemistry		
Clinical Psychology	UG Secondary Education	
	M.Ed Reading	
	M.Ed Administration and Sup	
	Business Administration	
	Anthropology	

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.

Evaluations and recommendations are shared in the supporting documents. 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 feedback along with the rubric. Last year CLASS and SOE invited the evaluation team to discuss the process of evaluation, the rubric, and individual program feedback.

- 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.

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] 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.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Arline Leon Guerrero
Cheryl Sanguenza – Committee Chair
Michelle Santos