



UNIVERSITY OF GUAM

UNIBETSEDÁT GUAHAN

To: Dr. Anita Borja Enriquez, Senior Vice President

Via: Deborah Leon Guerrero, Assistant Vice President

From: Arline Leon Guerrero, Cheryl Sanguenza, Michelle Santos
(Review Team for Evaluation of Assessment Inventories AY 2016-2017)

Date: 2/21/2018

Subject: Evaluation of Assessment Inventories AY2016-2017

The final report for the Evaluation of Assessment Inventories for the AY2016-2017 is provided. There were 19 undergraduate programs, 1 undergraduate minor, and 11 graduate programs (31 academic programs). Four EMSS programs were reviewed, but only information from one is included in this report. Once again submissions from the academic support units were difficult to assess and the committee would like to work with these units to ensure future submissions look at improvement with student success.

This year, a total of 31 academic programs and 1 support program with a total of 58 PLO's assessed. Last year, there were 26 academic programs (and 4 EMSS programs) submitted and a total of 59 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 AY2016-2017 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 2016-17 PROGRAM DATA (summary of scores for all programs)
6. Suggestions from AAI 16-17 Evaluation Team – AAI Completion and Faculty Training
 - 6a. Suggestions from AAI 16-17 Evaluation Team: Changes in the rubric.
7. Presentation Packet.

One task from last year was to refine the TRAC DAT and UAC templates our recommendations to the templates were used to continue to improve the submissions from the programs. Included in this packet will be our input with regard to the rubric (items #6 and 6a: Suggestions from AAI 16-17 Evaluation Team).

In the 14-15 report, 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. In 2016-2017, Dee Leon Guerrero and Francis Dalisay conducted training regarding capstone assesment. It appears training is payin off as 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 have increased. Of the 29 programs, 12 (41%) scored in the initial stage, 11 (38%) in the developing stage, and 6 (21%) in the highly developed stage. These percentages show an improvement in the academic programs scoring highly developed from 0% in 14-15, to 11% in 15-16 to 21% in 16-17. The Review Team has made some overall statements as to how submission quality can be improved in the future (see supporting documents #6). Please note, these recommendations have come annually and the documents have continued to be refined. So with the refinement of the rubric and a more refined eye, the overall quality is improving, as are the expectations. The program rankings are below:

15-16 Developing	16-17 Developing	16-17 Highly Developed
Nursing	Math (2.61)	UG Secondary Ed UG (3.0)
Political Science	Chemistry (2.58)	MA Teaching (3.0)
Biology	Communication (2.33)	M.Ed Secondary Ed (2.92)
Math	Political Science (2.33)	M.Ed Admin and Sup (2.91)
Masters in Teaching	MPA (2.32)	M.Ed TESOL (2.83)
UG Secondary Education	PMBA (2.28)	Biology (2.76)
M.Ed Reading	Nursing (2.23)	
M.Ed Admin and Sup	Geography (2.14)	
Business Administration	M.Ed. Reading (2.11)	
Anthropology	MA Counseling (2.08)	
15-16 Highly Developed		
Chemistry		
Elementary Education		
M.Ed Secondary Education		

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*.

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. Additionally, EMSS must have specialized training for their programs.

Finally, we would like to thank you 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
Michelle Santos - Committee Chair