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Directions:

The Annual Institutional Assessment Report evaluates the success of the processes utilized for assessment and highlights necessary changes. The Assessment Plan, summarized in the **Annual Institutional Assessment Report,** is updated annually by the Assessment Committee and rolled out to programmatic faculty at the Fall Convocation before classes begin. Changes to the Plan resulting from faculty feedback are documented within the Annual Institutional Assessment Report as well.

Items **on process** recorded in the Report for the year include changes to the structure or reporting of the Assessment Committee, actions taken to change the process, improvements to the tools used in assessment, and trainings provided to the campus community that support assessment work. Items recorded **on quality of reports** may change from year to year, depending on the quality of the reports submitted; however, at minimum, the number of programs that submitted reports during the academic year should be reported. Other program report items included would be the percentage of reports that submitted a particular piece of data that indicates a gap, such as the percentage of programs identifying equity gaps or the percentage of programs reporting action plans. Summarized **University Trends** data is recorded in the Annual Assessment report, items such as University-level averages and trends in institutional-level indicators of success (retention, graduation, DFWI) over time and compared with external sources, trends in program assessment reported gaps and actions, faculty interpretations of student performance on ISLOs, and programmatic requests for University **resources**. Needs identified through the assessment processes are submitted to the **University Accreditation Committee (UAC),** where non-academic Department Vice Presidents use this data to allocate resources to the academic departments. The following year’s program assessment reports summarize the success of actions taken in the previous year and whether resources were provided in the Close the Loops section of the Program Reports.

# PLAN

# Institutional Mission

Applicable Regulation:

1.A.1 The institution’s **mission** statement defines its broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement.

The mission statement was approved by the Oregon Tech Board of Trustees on May 30, 2019, and reviewed by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission on August 8, 2019. It is published on our outward facing University website at: <https://www.oit.edu/about/mission-statement>. It reads:

Oregon Institute of Technology (Oregon Tech), Oregon’s public polytechnic university, offers innovative, professionally-focused undergraduate and graduate degree programs in the areas of engineering, health, business, technology, and applied arts and sciences. To foster student and graduate success, the university provides a hands-on, project-based learning environment and emphasizes innovation, scholarship, and applied research. With a commitment to diversity and leadership development, Oregon Tech offers statewide educational opportunities and technical expertise to meet current and emerging needs of Oregonians as well as other national and international constituents.

The mission statement informs the Strategic Plan. Oregon Tech’s Five-Year Strategic Action Plan was created in 2020. It documents goals, objectives and actions, built collectively by university stakeholders. It is published on the University outward facing webpage at <https://www.oit.edu/about/strategic-plan> Workgroups formed in 2020-21 academic year to develop measurable outcomes for progress on the Strategic Plan met again in 2022-23 academic year in order to make the first measure of progress or recommend edits to the outcomes after one year of work. Those results were presented to the board of trustees and to a 7-year site visit accreditation team.

The Academic Master Plan was approved in November 2022 and is now viewable on the outward facing webpage at <https://www.oit.edu/provost>. The Academic Master plan is meant to sets the goals and objectives to accomplish the vision and mission of Academic Affairs as it builds toward the future. The plan is not operational, but visionary and forward-thinking. It concentrates on program and curriculum innovation, accountability, and quality. The plan provides focus to the work of all members of Academic Affairs at the University. It was written by a committee of faculty, students and administrators from across the academic community. The Academic mission reads as follows:

Through a sense of community, collaboration, and innovative degree programs, Oregon Tech Academic Affairs provides applied hands-on learning from teacher-scholars who develop life-long learners and tomorrow’s leaders.

Of particular note from the academic master plan is Charge 2 initiative 1.5 which reads “Establish a regular process for program review with a focus on relevance, marketability, student interest, return on investment, student outcomes, resource availability, and alignment with Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities accreditation assessment requirements. Each program will be reviewed at least every seven years, including a self-study and one or more outside reviewer site visits.” This planned initiative lists a due date for a written process of Fall 2023 and the responsible party as Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, a position which has remained vacant during this academic year. The Program Assessment process is not currently used for program review, though it requires documentation of many of the items required for programmatic review. Many programs have external auditors responsible for programmatic review, but not all. An action that may be taken in 2023-24 academic year to support this activity then would be to streamline this data gathering with College Deans so that only data not already collected during Programmatic Assessment process is asked for during programmatic Review.

# Institutional Assessment Process

Applicable Regulation:

1.B.1 The institution demonstrates a **continuous** process to assess institutional effectiveness, including student learning and achievement and support services. The institution uses an ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning process to inform and refine its effectiveness, assign resources, and improve student learning and achievement.

1.B.3 The institution provides evidence that its planning process is inclusive and offers opportunities for **comment** by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

1.C.3 The institution identifies and **publishes** expected program and degree learning outcomes for all degrees, certificates, and credentials. Information on expected student learning outcomes for all courses is provided to enrolled students.

1.C.4 The institution’s admission and completion or graduation requirements are clearly defined, widely **published**, and easily accessible to students and the public.

# Institutional Assessment Plan

The assessment of institutional effectiveness at Oregon Tech is an inclusive process that involves the entire campus community. It is informed by Oregon Tech's strategic mission to foster student and graduate success, by providing a hands-on, project-based learning environment that emphasizes innovation, scholarship, and applied research. As such, assessment processes include the submission of programmatic assessment reports from all academic programs, the assessment of student performance on Institutional Student Learning Outcomes, evaluation of the student perspective on their learning, and coordination between academic programs and non-academic departments in the allocation of university resources that support student success.

The **Institutional Assessment Plan** adopted by the Assessment Executive Committee as appointed and charged by the Provost’s Office, is updated annually by the committee and rolled out to programmatic faculty at Convocation in Fall before classes begin. As a part of the plan, an updated Template which lists out all required elements of Programmatic Assessment and a Method for Assessment of broad Institutional Outcomes is outlined. At the conclusion of the academic year, the **Program Assessment Report Template** and **ISLO Process** are adjusted considering feedback from faculty, evaluation of the contents of the submitted reports and updated state and accreditation standards. The current Template and Process documents are posted on the Office of Academic Assessment Website at <https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence>.

During 2022-23 Academic year ISLO Assessment Process was performed within Academic programs on student outcomes related to Diverse perspectives. Much of the focus for this ISLO collection year was on identifying where education on this outcome is occurring within the university and identifying tools to improve faculty delivery of this content. The process for grading was also adjusted to be more inclusive and spread the responsibility of Assessment review to faculty members of all programs as peer reviewers. The Program Assessment Report Rubric was redesigned based on feedback during the grading cycle to include a “Developing” grade between Meets or Does not Meet criteria.

The Continuous Assessment Cycle

Measurement of programmatic and institutional outcomes are split among 3 parts of the cycle of assessment (Plan, Assess and Act). Each year all faculty are involved in **planning** for assessment of a particular outcome, **collecting** and analyzing data for assessment of a different outcome, and carrying out **actions** based on assessment of the rest of the outcomes. In this way the curriculum and the institution are continually adapting and changing to the needs of their students.

Fig 1. 3-Year Assessment Cycle
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Leadership of Academic Assessment Efforts

It is imperative that the assessment of institutional effectiveness is an inclusive process that involves the entire campus community. The **Assessment Committee** is responsible for developing, reviewing, and implementing the institutional assessment plan. Standards laid down by NWCCU, particularly their rubrics for assessment processes (<http://www.nwccu.org/tools-resources/evaluators/forms-guidelines/>) help guide all involved with assessment to fulfill increasing state and federal mandates, which hold institutions of higher education accountable for student learning and continuous improvement.

The committee reports to the Provost. The Assessment Committee is comprised of the Chair; Vice Provost (ex officio); Associate Vice Provost of Academic Excellence; at least one faculty member from each **college** and **campus**; and at least one faculty member from **Online Learning**. The Provost appoints one faculty member to serve as Chair of the Assessment Committee for a three-year term. Other membership includes the **ISLO subcommittees** divided by assessment cycle (plan, assess, act), department chairs, and/or faculty designated by each academic department for a specified term to assist with assessment.

ISLO Sub committees are charged with either planning for assessment of their particular assigned outcome, analyzing the data collected on their particular outcome, or facilitating university-wide actions on their particular outcomes. Additional information on the Assessment Committee can be found in the **Mission Statement and Charter** which was updated in Fall 2022.

Liaison with Other Campus Bodies

A representative from the Assessment Committee is a member of the **Curriculum Planning Commission (CPC).** In this role, the representative reads all curriculum proposals, attends CPC meetings, and provides an assessment perspective to the work of CPC. The representative ensures that appropriate assessment questions are included in all coursework proposals.

At least one representative from the Assessment Committee serves on the **General Education Advisory Council (GEAC)**. Communication between the Assessment committee and this committee must be bi-directional. Representatives from the assessment committee ensure that assessment in general education is prioritized within processes and that ISLO definitions are consistent with state mandated standards for general education.

A representative from the Assessment Committee serves on the **Commission on College Teaching (CCT)**. The representative provides assessment results and recommended actions for continuous improvement as they pertain to faculty professional development.

A representative from the Diverse Perspectives ISLO subcommittee should be in close contact

with or on the **Diversity, Inclusion, and Cultural Engagement (DICE)** steering committee. DICE work guides assessment work related to standards of equitable curriculum delivery and measurements on the Diverse Perspectives ISLO. Assessment work provides data to the DICE office identifying equity gaps and actions related to the closure of those gaps.

The online representative member should be in contact with **Online Learning Advisory Council (OLAC)** to ensure that best practices for online education are being assessed similarly to in person programs.

The Associate Vice Provost (AVP) of Academic Excellence or a representative serves as a member of the **Institutional Accreditation Team**, ensuring that academic assessment efforts are aligned in support of institutional accreditation reporting activity. This member ensures that the year end Assessment report is distributed to this team and that University resource allocation is guided by assessment needs.

Table 1. Commission Roster that Ensures Representation from the Entire Academic Institution

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2022-23 Commission Roster  AVP – Vacant  Vice Provost – Abdy Afjeh  Chair – Rachelle Barrett  Online (ETM) – Cristina Crespo  Klamath Falls -Christy VanRooyen  Portland Metro (HAS) – Gary Lomprey  Salem (GEAC) – Andria Fultz  ISLO CTER (GEAC) – Krista Beaty  ISLO DP (GEAC) - Trevor Petersen  ISLO QLIA (GEAC) – Joe Reid  ISLO QLIA (CCT) – Cecily Heiner | 2023-24 Commission Roster  Vice Provost – Abdy Afjeh  Co-Chair HAS – Rachelle Barrett  Co- Chair KF -Christy VanRooyen  ETM – Cristina Crespo  Portland Metro – Gary Lomprey  Online – Rachel Hanan  GEAC – Andria Fultz  ISLO CTER (GEAC) – Krista Beaty  ISLO DP (GEAC) - Trevor Petersen  ISLO QLIA (GEAC) – David Hammond  ISLO QLIA (CCT) – Cecily Heiner  (CPC) - Vacant  AVP – Vacant  PLT – Carrie Dickson  Executive Assistant- Vacant |

Table 2. Actions Taken and Planned for Improvement of Institutional Assessment Process

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gap Identified** | **Change made in 22-23** | **Plan for 23-24** |
| Faculty noted confusion on the expected contents of program assessment reports. | Template shortened from 30 pages to 6 pages.  Example tables added to Template.  Assessment report components image updated.  All faculty training on assessment at Convocation at beginning of academic year.  Website updated. | Canvas Course Shell with writing guides for Template completion roll out expected Fall 2023.  Clarifying language added to template. |
| Accreditors noted actions from ISLO assessed taking too long to be meaningful use. | ISLO subcommittees combined into 3-year cycle categories to better associate charges with activities within cycle.  ISLO subcommittees activated and completed charges by the provost office reported at end of year. | ISLO sub committees given new charges specific to the part of the cycle they are in. |
| Assessment data on institutional outcomes not provided by 50% of programs reported in 2019-20 | ISLO alignment made a part of Assessment Report Rubric.  Assessment data aligned for 89% of programs in 2021-22 academic reports. | Institutional Outcomes to be assessed in General Education courses at Foundational level across multiple divisions of the same course. Programmatic courses will continue data collection processes already developed for Practice and Capstone levels. |
| No published Assessment Process | Institutional Assessment Process written and approved by Provost’s office. | Institutional Assessment Process to be taken to faculty senate.  Other processes to be written: General Education Assessment process, Resource allocation process |
| Academic Master Plan charge for Programmatic Review process to be developed |  | Fill open AVP position.  Work with Provost to determine how Programmatic Assessment fits in with Programmatic Review. |
| General Education Committee noted that no assessments have been done in Gen Ed Courses |  | Collaboration between GEAC and Assessment Exec to develop reporting process for assessment data from Gen Ed courses to programs.  Gen Ed courses that fullfill ISLO foundational assessment to be identified by ISLO committee. |

Communication of Assessment Matters

Systematic and broad communication on assessment matters is important to the assessment process. As such, communication avenues should be continually improved upon. The Office of Academic Excellence maintains a **webpage** with current information and assessment practices and annual summary assessment reports at <https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence> The webpage was updated during the summer of 2022. Accompanying pages where departmental outcomes and program assessment reports are published for public consumption were also updated at this time. A review of departmental pages was conducted during fall 2022 to determine which department reports were missing from external webpage publication. Office of Academic Excellence webpage was also linked to data from Office of Institutional Research that publishes global institutional indicators of success and to National Student Survey.

The Assessment Executive team and ISLO sub committees meet regularly and contain members that also serve on the CPC , CCT, and GEAC committees in order to facilitate broad communication on academic matters. Agendas and Minutes are stored on a shared **Teams drive** that all members were given access to. Minutes for these meetings were posted to the webpage once approved by a majority of members.

Table 3. Meetings of Assessment Committee During 2022-23 Academic Year

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meetings were held consistently on a bi-weekly basis during Academic year 2022-23: | 10.13.22  10.27.22  11.10.22  12.01.22  01.19.23  01.31.23  02.14.23  02.28.23  03.14.23  04.11.23  05.02.23  05.09.23  05.23.23  06.06.23 |

The Assessment Committee Chair regularly communicates with program assessment coordinators and department chairs through email, formal meetings, trainings on assessment topics, and regular consultations and work sessions. In 2022-23 a **team email** was posted to the website in order to facilitate quick communication from any faculty member across the university.

**Trainings** during academic year 2022-23 mainly focused on programmatic assessment report review of new peer reviewers put forth by program chairs and preparation for an accreditation visit that focused on assessment processes. It was a particular goal of the assessment executive committee to share out results of assessments that had been performed in previous years and to ensure that faculty developed the ability to use assessment data to improve programs. A tracking tool for trainings that had been delivered was developed.

Table 4. Assessment Trainings During 2022-23 Academic Year

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| All department trainings:  Convocation Template Training 9/21/22  Academic Council Template Reminder Training 10/11/22  Close the Loop Training 10/20/22  Program Assessment Report Grading 1/19/23, 1/24/23, 2/19/23  Accreditation prep faculty forum 4/13/23  Equity Gaps Dashboards Training 4/4/23, 4/5/23, 4/6/23, | Individual department feedback and trainings:  EERE  Management  Math  Hummanities  Dental  MIT  Communications  MMET  MLS |

For academic year 2023-24 Chairs are still the main point of contact for assessment feedback but they are not required to serve as Program Assessment report graders. They are required to nominate a member of their faculty that they feel would benefit from the extra training involved in being a program assessment report peer reviewers. All faculty are invited to view the modules in the Canvas course shell to assist in understanding of Assessment processes at the University. The trainings that take place in 23-24 will be advertised before the training takes place and recorded and posted on the webpage afterward for campus wide consumption and coordinated with other members of the academic community such as CCT or DICE or IR when their expertise is needed.

# Resources for Assessment

Applicable Regulation:

1.D.4 The institution’s processes and **methodologies** for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.

Sources of Data

Student perspective is utilized broadly across the institution. Every course is assigned an **end of course survey** administered by **IDEA**. Faculty have direct access to the results of these surveys for all of their courses. Faculty report these data in their Annual Performance Evaluations (APE). The questions asked on this survey were examined by faculty work group in Faculty Senate during 2022-23 academic year. The group made recommendations for improvements and uses of these questions for improvement in 2023-24 academic year, those suggestions have sent to administration for approval. Training on how to access and interpret this data was conducted by CCT during their annual OTET Workshop before Convocation in fall 2022.

In accordance with Oregon Tech's strategic goal of prioritizing student and graduate success in every decision or action at every level of the university, the student experience is evaluated in part by The National Survey of Student Engagement (**NSSE**). Oregon Tech has participated in this survey in 2015, 2018, and 2021 and is planning to participate again in 2024. Student Services has read through and made plans for improvements based on the survey results gathered in 2022. Results of this survey are being widely distributed to faculty for action planning during assessment training at the beginning of 2023-24 academic year.

The Office of Academic Excellence conducts a **Student Exit Survey** for every department on their graduating seniors through **Qualtrics**. Questions asked of these students cover student perspective on their education’s impact on their performance of Programmatic Outcomes and their post-graduation success. This data is provided to programs for use in writing their program assessment reports. Each student exit survey has been designed by the programs with no collaboration or common questions. Common questions are planned to be added to these surveys in order to gain information from alumni regarding the university resources students found useful while in school and to gather information about **post-graduation success** indicators such as employment or continued education.

The Office of Institutional Research Provides head count data on **graduation, attrition, and retention** rates by term, department, and college. This data is shared with programs and available on the OIR website at <https://www.oit.edu/institutional-research> Post graduation employment and starting salary data is accrued through Oregon Department of Employment and published on program information websites by Career Services.

External evaluation of programs is conducted by participation of Professional Advisory Boards and Accreditation for individual programs. As of 2022-23, 70% of academic programs participate in external accreditation, the other programs will be subject to internal program review processes beginning in 2023-24 academic year.

Table 5. Accredited programs and their most recent Accreditations and Programs not Accredited

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Accrediting Body and Date** | **Not Accredited Program** |
| Dental Hygiene | Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) visit in 2017 due in 2024 | Allied Health |
| EMS | Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) undergoing accreditation in 2023 | Mathematics |
| Diagnostic Medical Sonography | Commission of Accreditation for Respiratory Care (COARC) awarded in 2021 | Communications |
| Polysomnographic Technology | Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) awarded in 2022 | Biology |
| MLS | National Accrediting Agency for CLS 10 year Certificate earned in 2021 | Data Science |
| Civil Engineering | Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET visit in 2022 | Environmental Science |
| Electrical Engineering | Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET visit scheduled for 2022-23 | Population Health Management |
| Electronics Engineering Technology | Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET visit in 2021 | Psychology\* |
| Geomatics | Applied and Natural Sciences Accreditation Commission of ABET visit scheduled for 2024-25 |  |
| Renewable Energy Engineering | Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET visit scheduled for 2022-23 |  |
| Computer SET | Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET visit in 2021 |  |
| Mechanical Engineering (ME) | Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET visit in 2022 |  |
| MET | Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET visit in 2021 |  |
| Manufacturing Engineering Technology | Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET visit in 2021 |  |
| Management | International Accreditation Council for Business Education (IACBE) Certificate earned in 2022 |  |

\*Accreditation process on hold due to low faculty.

Tools

The institution has created dashboards for each faculty member to review their course specific data. **Dashboards** are available on TechWeb with faculty log-in beneath the heading of faculty resources. Dashboards created and maintained by the Office of Institutional Research contain data that may be **disaggregated** by race, gender, fist generation college attendance, Pell Grant recipient status, and full or part time status. Such data included in the dashboards is Graduation from the past 6 years, Retention for one year, and Dropped, Failed, Withdrew, or Incomplete (DFWI) status by term. Faculty report review of this data both at the end of each term in Course Learning Outcomes (CLO) Worksheets and then annually in the Program Assessment Reports.

The **CLO Worksheets** were created by the Office of Academic Assessment as a tool to help faculty enter assessment data based on course work performance each term that a course is taught. Access to this data is granted based on level of responsibility. Faculty members only access data for their individual courses. Department Chairs have access to all course data within their department. Only administrators have access to all course data University wide.

Using the CLO worksheets, faculty determine which programmatic and institutional outcomes their specific coursework pertains to. Faculty define **performance targets** for acceptable student outcomes on assignments. The program determines the **standard of success** for the course, that is the number of students performing acceptably on the outcome that indicates the outcome is met for the course. After all outcomes are reported for the course, faculty are guided to look at the dashboards to determine if the disaggregated data for DFWI in the course indicate an equity gap for the course. There is also a text box for faculty to record any actions planned that pertain to that particular course.

At program meetings, department chairs and/or individual faculty are expected to look at this entered data for all courses taught within the academic year and make interpretations on trends or patterns within the data for the entire program. This information is reported on the **Program Annual Assessment Report**. Guidance for doing this work has been provided through individual department trainings during 2022-23 academic year and will be written and accessible to faculty through an Assessment Canvas Course shell in 2023-24 academic year.

Program Assessment Reports

All programs are required to submit an **Annual Programmatic Assessment** report to the Office of Academic Assessment. For 2022-23 academic year submission, the office expected to receive 38 Bachelor’s level reports and 8 Graduate level reports; the 8 Certificate and Associates programs were not expected to submit reports. Of these expected reports, 32 Bachelor’s program reports were submitted and 4 Graduate level reports were submitted. Programs that didn’t submit academic assessment reports were either new programs or programs that had critically low enrollment, in both types of circumstance, no data was generated for the report. All operation programs are expected to submit reports in the coming academic year.

Contents of the program assessment reports include program mission and how it aligns with the mission of the institution, program specific learning outcomes (PSLO) and how they are justified by accrediting bodies or requirements from industry, a scaffolded curriculum map, the process the program used to collect data used for assessment including direct (student work product) and indirect (perspective) sources of data, and faculty interpretations and actions taken because of this data.  These expectations are widely distributed to faculty within a Program Assessment Report Template updated annually by the Assessment Executive Committee and on the Academic Assessment website updated during 2022-23 academic year. During 2023-24 academic year, faculty will have access to a Canvas course shell that guides them through writing of the Annual Assessment Report.

The reports are submitted during fall term and stored with the Office of Academic Excellence and published to the program’s assessment webpage after review in winter term. During 2022-23 academic year, program reports were randomly assigned for peer review. Programs submitting a report were also requested to submit the name of an individual to participate in **peer review process**. Peer reviewers were assigned two reports (not their own) to review according to a standardized rubric. Items on the standardized rubric emphasized that all contents were present in the report and that the program adhered to assessment processes, not the quality of the program itself. Training was provided to all peer reviewers. The rubric grading for peer review was conducted in a Canvas course shell for this purpose. Peer reviewers could then view the results of peer review on their report within this Canvas course shell. Twenty peer reviewers participated in the process, none of them were department chairs. Summary of the peer reviews were forwarded to department chair at the end of Winter term. Department chairs reviewed the peer review then were asked to either submit changes to the reports or approve the reports for publication on the external facing assessment websites, 75% were approved for external publication by spring term.

A comparison between report grades from previous year to current year indicate that the programs have improved adherence to process especially when it comes to reporting data and developing action plans. Still more work needs to be done to help departments make better use of assessment data for improvements and in evaluation of past actions. The largest growth was seen in faculty use of the dashboards to assess equity gaps in their programs.

Table 6. Annual Program Assessment Report Comparative Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program Reports Submitted During 2021-22 Academic Year  45 reports graded with feedback given  Highest rubric scores on Mission statements and Program Outcomes  Lowest rubric scores on use of resources and closing the loop.  58% presented aligned maps​  87% presented a 3 year assessment cycle​  52% presented ISLOs​  10% mentioned equity  90% performance targets met by department | Program Reports Submitted During 2022-23 Academic Year  53 reports graded with feedback given  Highest rubric scores on Action Drivers from assessment data and Performance targets specified  Lowest rubric scores on using assessment data for resources and look back as past data or comparators.  88% presented aligned maps  94% presented a 3 year cycle  94% presented ISLO data  55% mentioned equity  84% performance targets met by department |

Table 7. Assessment Tools Actions Planned for 2023-24 Academic Year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gap Identified** | **Action taken in 2022-23** | **Action planned for 2023-24** |
| Submission, grading and feedback is an arduous manual process. | Portfolium submission was discontinued. Peer review grading implemented within Canvas Course shell.  Submission of reports by email to Teams file for Office of Academic Assessment. | Canvas Course shell created specific for report submission for each academic year. Different levels of access for peer review, chair, and faculty. |
| Program Chairs reported that Disaggregated data is difficult to draw conclusions from with the dashboards set up with absolute numbers. | A representative from Assessment Committee collaborated with OIR to adapt these dashboards. Additions added to disaggregate “stopped out” individuals. Use percentages where meaningful.  Dashboards training conducted during spring term. | Programs to work directly with OIR for individualized dashboards that produce meaningful data.  Cohort programs to request different graduation start date data. |
| Preparers of program assessment reports had difficulty accessing specific course work data through CLO worksheets. | Edit button was added to faculty level CLO worksheets.  Summary access was granted to Department chairs. | General education reporting process to be developed.  Programs to include communication regarding general education data in planning for assessment. |
| Faculty didn’t know what tools were available or how to use them. | Department trainings provided to all faculty.  Peer review trainings provided to report preparers.  Dashboards trainings provided to all faculty.  Websites updated. | Canvas course shell go-live Fall 2023.  Convocation trainings specific to peer reviewers, all faculty, and graduate departments separately. |
| Student exit survey data was missed for 2020-21 | Student Exit surveys administered by Office of Online learning. | Student exit surveys reviewed for common questions by Office of Online learning and Assessment Executive Committee. New template for departments available fall 2023. |
| End of Course Surveys do not provide useful data for assessment. | Workgroup approved by faculty senate to update questions made recommendations on use of qualitative data vs quantitative data. | Utility of this data updated in Report Template rubric and canvas course shell. |
| Low program assessment rubric scores for graduate level programs. | Graduate level programs submitted reports for the first time.  Ad-Hoc Graduate program group met to make suggestions on graduate specific template and rubric that matches NWCCU standards. | Graduate Level program assessment module developed within Canvas shell.  Separate rubrics and templates developed for graduate programs implemented. |
| Program use of assessment data in resource and budget alignment is lowest performing data point. | Wording change from “budget decision” to “resource needs” on template and rubric.  Trainings developed on this topic. | Process for resource requests of non-academic departments based on assessment data to be developed. |

# DATA

# Institutional Indicators of Success

Applicable Regulation:

1.B.2 The institution sets and articulates meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators of its goals to define mission fulfillment and to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions.

1.D.2 Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of **indicators** for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

Contents:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Current Year | Previous Year | External Comparator |
| Enrollment | 4913 | 4910 | #4 in peer group\* |
| 6-year Freshman Graduation Rate | 57.2% | 56.8% | #2 in peer group\* |
| Freshman 1 year Retention | 72.2% | 67.9% | #4 in peer group\* |
| Post-Graduation Success | Not Reported | 96% employed |  |
| DFWI | 8.8% | 12% | 9-22%\*\* |

\*Board of Directors’ approved peer group of Universities of similar size and composition.

\*\*McGuire, Robert. A Selection of DFWI rates Disaggregated by Race and Ethnicity. Course Gateway. March 2023. Accessed from:https://www.coursegateway.org/resources/selection-dfwi-rates-disaggregated-race-and-ethnicity

Interpretations

Graduation rate is defined as six-year graduation rate of first-time, full time freshmen. 150% Grad rates look back 6 years; therefore Fall 2016 cohort is the most current grad rate available. When disaggregated by full time status and part time status, the graduation rate for part time students is 35% compared with 67% for full time students. First generation students are recorded as 48% compared with 56% for full time students. If disaggregated by race, not surprisingly African American students graduated at lower rates than their peers at 41.7%, the group that ranked lower was American Indian at 38.5% compared with their White and Asian peers that both graduated at rates of 53%. When looking at trends in these groups over time, enrollment of African American students is increasing while enrollment of American Indian students remains steady. With low enrollment, these numbers are prone to fluctuate greatly.

Retention may be where investigations of this graduation data can provide some guidance. For part time students 37% of students stopped out after the first term whereas 92% of full time students continued on into the next term. For African American students 33% stopped out after the first term and 100% of those that stopped out were part-time students. This indicates a need for support and tracking of part time students of all backgrounds. Given trends annually for overall retention, it appears that efforts by Oregon Tech in retention are working. There was a blip during 2020-21 retention due to the global pandemic, but the University appears to have recovered.

In looking at DFWI globally, the university overall has good DFWI compared with the few available comparators. DFWI rates are not widely reported so locating comparators is a challenge. Of available data, it appears that a rate of 22% is typical for a General Education gate keeper course, and a rate of 8 or 9 is typical for an upper level course. Faculty can use this data to look at their own course work and disaggregate the data by student groups to see if a particular student group is performing vastly differently. Identification of this information could improve retention efforts by focusing on supporting students that need it extra support.

In past years, Oregon Tech outperformed comparators with employment data for graduates. This data was not collected in the past year. This is a gap that needs to be rectified. This point of pride for the University is an excellent recruitment tool for the university. With enrollment numbers in the past two years down from the pre COVID rate, the University could benefit from marketing the success of their graduates in very specific ways.

Goal Setting

As the University continues to work on implementing academic master plan and strategic plan, it is important to look back at what was intended for 2022-23 academic year and what was actually accomplished.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Goal  Strategic Plan Goal 1 Objective 1.3: Implement collaborative university-wide **retention** strategies.  Academic master plan Charge 3 Objective 1.2: Increase in four-year **graduation** rates by 10% collectively by spring 2025  Academic master plan Charge 3 Objective 1.9: All programs have a path for **completion** in four years.  Academic master plan Charge 3 Objective 1.3: Program assessment reports submitted include data and plans to address any concerns with the following: student enrollment, retention, graduation rates, pell grant status, DFWI, and equity concerns.  Academic master plan Charge 3 Objective 1.6: Department reports include resources needed for improved student support.  Employment reported for post-graduation success. | 2022-23 Accomplishment  Deans charged programs with developing program level Retention strategies. Retention was an action plan recorded in 1/3 of Program assessment reports. Retention improved by 4%.  4-year Graduation rate unchanged over past year. Improved by 2% for full time students only.  55% of reports included equity data. 33% of reports included actions taken on retention.  44% of reports attempted to include resources in the report. Lowest performing report category.  None reported. | 2023-24 Goal  Record **collaborative** efforts taken to impact retention of first year students and part-time students.  Take Initiatives to support paths to graduation within 4 years. Focus on resources for **academic advising** and **general education courses.**  80% of reports include examination and interpretation of **equity data**. 50% of reports take action to close equity gaps.  Process developed and implemented for identification of **resource needs** with assessment data. Rubric updates made and training provided on this topic to faculty. 80% reports include this data.  Include **post graduation employment data** as part of Student Exit survey update with common questions. |

# Student Learning Outcomes Data

Applicable regulations:

1.C.1 The institution offers programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission, culminate in achievement of clearly identified **student learning outcomes** that lead to collegiate-level degrees, certificates, or credentials and include designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

1.C.2 The institution awards credit, degrees, certificates, or credentials for programs that are based upon student learning and learning outcomes that offer an appropriate breadth, depth, **sequencing**, and synthesis of learning.

1.C.5 The institution engages in an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs. The institution recognizes the **central role of faculty** to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs.

1.C.6 Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, **institutional learning outcomes** and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy.

Student learning outcomes are categorized as follows:

1. **Course Student Learning Outcomes** (CLO) – Student learning outcomes limited to the course subject only. Students achieve them by attaining a faculty member’s success criteria for each learning outcome (not completing a course.)
2. **Program Student Learning Outcomes** (PSLO) – Learning outcomes students achieve by completing requirement of the program. Program learning outcomes are defined by program faculty and or program accreditation agencies, if any. The program learning outcomes are typically demonstrated by what students can do.
3. **Institutional Student Learning Outcomes** (ISLO) – Student learning outcomes students achieve by completing degree requirements. Institutional Student Learning Outcomes are broad learning outcomes; they are not major specific but are integrated and assessed in program courses throughout a student’s experience at the institution.

They are assessed at three levels as follows:

1. **Foundational** – introduction to the concept
2. **Practice** -  performance within programmatic coursework that builds on foundational knowledge
3. **Capstone** – synthesis of knowledge from multiple areas in coursework in application of professional level practice

Programmatic

Programmatic and Instructional faculty are given the autonomy to create CLO and PSLO based on the specific needs of their programs and the programs accrediting bodies. Programs adopt anywhere between 3 and 10 outcomes for assessment. PSLO are scaffolded across curriculum and should be measured using at minimum two direct assessments and one indirect assessment each time they are measured. Many programs reported assessment of outcomes throughout the program and by multiple means including direct assessment of student work product and the student experience of their learning indirectly.

Programs reported 84% of performance targets were met by PSLO assessments occurring during 2021-22 academic year.  In total, 213 outcomes were assessed by the University’s 53 program reports. 35% of outcomes missed were related in some way to communication of major specific technical information to a client or non-professional audience. Many action plans focused on providing communication scaffolds and ethical definitions scaffolds at more points within the curriculum and aligning these communication and ethics expectations with industry standards. Interestingly, those actions that didn’t focus on helping students to improve their communication were meant to improve communication of expectations on the assignments used for assessment from faculty. Past actions that were successful indicated that clarified expectations and teaching tools that were hands on and applications based had larger impacts on student outcomes. Assessment data demonstrated that students performed well on assessments related to Teamwork and Problem Identification. Communication of the impacts of the problem and/or solution may be areas in need of improvement. Some hands-on actions that have been implemented include TILT, Supplemental Instruction (math center and writing center), flipped classroom, open ended problems, capstone projects, and the introduction of professionally used technology to the classroom.

Programs inconsistently reported post-graduation success. Career services in past years has conducted a survey of employment post-graduation which has not been done since 2019. Those programs that retained contact with students and reported employment reported 97%-100% employment rates. This number should be celebrated and widely collected by all programs for marketing purposes.

Universally students tended to thrive when provided flexibility in course offerings, access to education and when provided different career tracks within curriculum. While many programs noted that flexibility with offering course work online, in hybrid format and at a variety of times improved the student experience or was requested by students to improve the experience, nearly 40% of program reports also noted that faculty workload constraints put into place with the CBA and through faculty attrition were limiting their ability to supply these courses and make adjustments to curriculum needed. During this assessment cycle, many programs noted low enrollment and low staffing levels as detrimentally impacting curriculum delivery. Students were feeling the impacts of the missing faculty in their review of advising availability in the Engineering Department and Medical Imaging Department, two programs that have historically been large draws to this University and are now reporting low enrollment. Marriage and Family Therapy Program had to put their application for accreditation on hold due to low staff and Dental Hygiene Online Degree completion m.

entioned the limited online course offerings due to workload restrictions, both programs have in past produced highly competent students and are concerned that low staff may impact these outcomes.

DFWI

Impressively, programs are utilizing equity gaps dashboards at a significantly higher rate of 55% compared with the previous years reporting of 10% use. Equity gaps are being identified at the program level and this access to the data allows programs to drill down to the course level to determine which groups are adversely impacted. An enrollment gap of low female to male ratio was noted in the majority of Engineering majors, while an opposite gap of low male to female enrollment was noted in allied health programs such as vascular technology and medical laboratory science. Communications department noted a gap in performance in students of International origin, most likely due to the need for additional supports for students whose first language is not English. As expected, many programs noted low enrollment for people of color and low performance for enrolled African American students which are trends both for the state of Oregon and Nationally in Higher Education. Those that noted low enrollment will be depending on robust marketing strategies to attract these students and income related supports for those students once they are enrolled. The MS in Applied Behavior Analysis Program demonstrated that once supports are put into place for a particular population that is identified as having a high DFWI rate, then that rate can improve as they did with part-time students. This program supported a population of students that were part-time by providing additional advising check ins and flexible schedules to improve retention of these students. Similarly, the management department identified a high DFWI rate for non-traditional students in the entry level accounting course. Once students were identified and encouraged to seek supplemental instruction (SI) those students were better retained within the program and DFWI improved.

A group currently not being counted in DFWI data are those that identify as LGBTQ. Much turnover in the title 9 office and changes in other supports for this population of students including lack of leadership for their student club may have impacted this student population, but without tracking of this information, the exact impact is unknown.

Institutional Outcomes

While CLO are set by faculty, and PSLO are set by programs, Oregon Tech's Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) are set by the Office of Academic Excellence to ensure that they support Oregon Tech's institutional mission and core themes. The outcomes and associated criteria reflect the rigorous applied nature of Oregon Tech's degree programs. In depth definitions on acceptable performance on these outcomes are published at <https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence/GEAC/essential-studies/Institutional-student-learning-outcome>

*Oregon Tech students will:*

* ***communicate*** effectively orally and in writing;
* engage in a process of ***inquiry and analysis***; including problem- solving & information literacy, critical analysis & logical thinking
* make and defend reasonable ***ethical*** judgments;
* collaborate effectively in ***teams*** or groups;
* demonstrate ***quantitative literacy & reasoning***;
* explore ***diverse perspectives, including cultural sensitivity & global awareness***.

Outcomes are assessed on a rotating 3-year cycle. Each outcome has published standardized rubrics meant to guide faculty in creating assignments, teaching, and assessing these outcomes in course work. These rubrics were written by content level experts in committee and approved by the Provost’s office. Training on these rubrics occurred during the assess year before each outcome was assessed.  The rubrics were all posted to the Academic Assessment webpage for ISLO accessed at <https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence/GEAC/essential-studies/Institutional-student-learning-outcome>

Past data and processes

During 2021-22 programs were tasked with identifying coursework normally in their curriculum that would assess the outcome during the assessment year in this case Ethical Reasoning, Teamwork, and Communication. Program faculty were charged to review the rubric provided by the Institution but then to also use criteria expected of professionals that graduated from their program to assess student performance on these outcomes. For example, an Engineering professional will have different standards for written communication ability than a Journalism professional. This process enabled many programs during 2021-22 academic year to align their pre-existing accreditation and program specific standards to these institutional standards and to examine their course offerings for inclusion of Institutional outcomes that were lacking. Many programs through this process, found gaps in course offerings for Diverse Perspectives and Cultural Sensitivity and began to explore professional expectations on those topics in preparation for the collection year 2022-23. Institutional Outcomes Data was reported both in Program Assessment Reports at the program level and in CLO worksheets at the course level.

Table 9. Past Data on CTE

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ISLO | Past Assessment Date | Gap Identified | Current Gap Identified | Interpretation |
| Communication | 2016-17 | Student Technical Writing | Communication of profession level concepts to clients. | Still progressing.  Previous measure focused on actions related to professional expectations. Focused work in discipline specific technical writing course development. New actions relate to verbal and written communication incorporated throughout programmatic curriculum. |
| Ethics | 2018-19 | Instructor Knowledge of theories | Instructor alignment with rubric. | Improving. More clarity on ethics expectations from advisory boards and external industry partners as well have been implemented. Flexibility and assignment clarity have improved student outcomes in 8 programs. |
| Teamwork | 2019-20 | Student ability to set group roles/responsibilities | Communication within team of various structures. | Success. 4 different programs mentioned teamwork successes in close the loop analysis. Plans to build upon the success include hybrid team skills and interprofessional applications. |

Past data was provided by a single course in each program. Action plans were created by the ISLO committees and dictated to the programs. This resulted in less than 50 data points for evaluation and the generation of three or four action plans on each outcome that may or may not have been applicable to the programs. This new process allows for multiple data points to be provided within all programs >50 data points, and the generation of an action plan by every program that needs an action plan. The action plans are aligned with industry standards for each degree program. With the entire University aligned on the same outcome, resources are easier to allocate because multiple programs can benefit from the resources if they are all asking for the same thing.

Nearly every program reported assessment data that included Communications, Ethical Reasoning or Teamwork in some fashion. 13 Action plans based on these outcomes were examined by the ISLO sub committed on Ethics, Teamwork, and Communication. They submitted a report summarizing actions taken by programs in 2021-22 and developed an Institutional level action plan from this information.

“Multiple departments expressed a desire to improve their assessment data collection, analysis, and reporting, but do not have the staffing to do this thoroughly. This was a common theme in both colleges and in many departments. The departure of many experienced faculty members from the University have left departments lacking in the manpower and knowledge to effectively carry out effective assessment procedures. Based upon this committee’s review of assessment reports and action plans, we give the following recommendations:

* 1. The Executive Committee is thanked for supplying a template and training this year to support assessment procedures. We recommend they supply specific examples each year of how to report action plans in section 7 of the assessment report template. The action plans should be detailed and specific to be measurable and better facilitate closing the loop.
  2. We recommend rubric training, and action plan suggestions for ethical reasoning since this was the area of greatest deficiency. Any assessment training should occur during spring term, as assessment reports are due at the beginning of fall term, and many faculty may not be available to work on this during summer months.
  3. CTER subcommittee should review ethical reasoning rubrics during the next academic year to determine the need for any changes. It may be helpful to reach out to departments who identified deficiencies and get feedback on the rubric.”

During 2022-23 Academic year this same process was followed. The diverse perspectives sub committee was tasked with update of the Rubric on this outcome most especially on providing guidance for the Global Awareness portion of the rubric. They were also tasked with making contact with CCT and DICE office to ensure faculty were supported during academic delivery on these topics. DICE office offered a series of training on Inclusive Syllabus and Cultural Sensitivity actions. Programs were encouraged to seek out faculty enrichment on this topic through professional organization or accreditors related to their majors. Programs were to collect data on student outcomes in curriculum related to Diverse Perspectives, Cultural Sensitivity and Global Awareness delivered during this academic year. This data will be summarized in the reports submitted in October of 2023 and will include actions programs plan to take in 2023-24 on this topic.

Plan for 2023-24 Academic Year

For academic year 2023-24 Inquiry and Analysis and Quantitative Literacy will be the student Outcomes programs must assess student work on. Directions for this process are being uploaded into the Canvas Course shell for 2023-24 to enable an easier repository for summary of this data. General Education will also be tapped to provide ISLO data where last academic year, they weren’t involved in the process. By including General Education courses in their own reporting, it is the goal of this process, that student performance on Institutional Outcomes can be scaffolded from entry level to graduation. This scaffolding should help identify where in the curriculum students can best be supported on performance of these outcomes.

ISLO subcommittees have been active participants in development of processes, review of assessment reports, and preparation for the Accreditation site visit during 2022-23. They will again be charged by the Provosts’ office for academic year 2023-24 to continue this work.

Communication, Teamwork, Ethical Reasoning (CTER) charged with:

* Recommending Resources to be allocated to institutional improvement efforts on these outcomes.
* Taking action on faculty education needs for these outcomes
* Identifying other actions that need to be taken on these outcomes
* Identify General Education course where Foundational measure of this outcome can be taken.

2.Diverse Perspectives/Cultural Sensitivity & Global Awareness (DP) charged with:

* Reviewing outcomes reporting at the program level on these outcomes for common themes.
* Developing institutional actions to be taken on these outcomes
* Improve the rubric for Global Awareness and Cultural Sensitivity
* Identify General Education course where Foundational measure of this outcome can be taken.

3.Quantitative Literacy, Inquiry & Analysis (QLIA) charged with

* Provide guidance on collection of this data during 2023-24 academic year in programs and in General Education
* Identify General Education course where Foundational measure of this outcome can be taken.

Table 10. Success of ISLO Process Driven Action Plans

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gap Identified | Action taken in 2022-23 | Action to be taken in 2023-24 |
| Not all faculty participating in the assessment process for Institutional Outcomes. | Actions recorded in Program Assessment reports. 88% programs participated/aligned.    ISLO committees activated and given charges.  13 programs developed action plans on the outcomes. | Canvas incorporated outcomes tool researched for application in 2024-25 academic year. |
| Faculty expressed concern regarding the standardization and comparability of expectations on outcomes. | DICE office did not review Institutional rubrics but did provide training on cultural sensitivity standards. Not much crossover between ISLO sub committee and DICE office. | Faculty need training on the difference between assessment data and research data. New AVP should bring this experience. |
| Summation of ISLO data to make reasonable actions university wide. | Programmatic actions summarized in the annual Institutional Assessment Report (here). and | ISLO data reported to all faculty during Convocation and to ISLO committee for action planning. |

# ACTIONS

# Actions Summary

Applicable Regulations:

1.C.7 The institution **uses the results of its assessment** efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes.

1.D.3 The institution’s **disaggregated indicators** of student achievement should be widely published and available on the institution’s website. Such disaggregated indicators should be aligned with meaningful, institutionally identified indicators benchmarked against indicators for peer institutions at the regional and national levels and be **used for continuous improvement** to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources.

Reports submitted during 2022-23 academic year examined assessment data from 2021-22, identified gaps and developed actions to be taken within the programs or at the university level to close gaps identified. Some commonalities within reports are summarized in the table below.  Successes on these actions will be evaluated within the reports submitted during 2023-24 academic year.

Table 11. Programmatic Action Plans Made During 2022-23 Academic Year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | 2021-22 Action | Success Indicator |
| 8 programs noted action plans meant to improve student ability to communicate technical knowledge.  NSSE score on “connected your learning to societal problems or issues” -11 compared to BOT | Active teaching techniques implemented: TILT, Flipped Classroom, Simulations on interprofessional communication, Simulated professional documents, Case Study reviews, Video projects. | Close the loop analysis of programs reporting improvement.  NSSE score increase. |
| 7 programs noted that student stop out may be related to lack of accessible course offerings or a confusing road to graduation. More flexibility needed.  NSSE score of “I feel valued by this institution” -19 compared to BOT | Full time faculty hired for Applied Behavior Analysis, Communications and Professional Writing, Biohealth Sciences, Renewable Energy. Still open for Engineering and Data science.  Scaffolding support added to different graduation tracks added to Mathematics, Civil Engineering, Environmental Sciences, Communication, Electronics engineering.  Hybrid offerings to be increased in Dental Hygiene, Medical Laboratory science, Vascular Technology, Electronics Engineering, Population Health, Renewable Energy | Retention increase.  NSSE score increase. |
| 7 programs noted assessment processes, course availability and in one case accreditation, were impacted by large faculty turnover and filled positions with adjuncts and visiting professors. Student interactions were also impacted.  NSSE score of “Talked about career plans with a faculty member” – 16 compared to BOT | Online training to be built for adjunct and visiting professions by Medical Laboratory Science, Dental Hygiene, Applied Psychology, Biohealth Sciences, Renewable Energy.  Professional Advisors hired for both Portland Metro and Klamath falls campus.  Career advising to be a focus for advisor or faculty training for Renewable Energy, Mathematics, Communications, Environmental Science | Assessment process, accreditation and other Department duties fulfilled by competent faculty members.  NSSE score increase. |
| Overall enrollment is down in 9 programs. Engineering noted female enrollment is far below that of male. Allied health noted the opposite.  Respiratory therapy had course offerings impacted by low enrollment. | 4 programs mentioned getting help from marketing to boost overall enrollment and targeted enrollment. | Marketing plans implemented. |
| Programs have not assessed Diverse Perspectives in curriculum.  NSSE score on “Included Diverse Perspectives on course discussions or assignments” -17 compared to BOT | The following programs are working to develop and/or align outcomes on Ethics and Diverse Perspectives with professional standards:  Applied psychology, Behavior Analysis, Mathematics, Civil Engineering, Data Science, Electronics engineering, management department, Population health, Radiation Science, Vascular Technology, Renewable Energy. | # programs assessing Diverse Perspectives in 2022-23 is counted.  NSSE score increases. |

Table 12. Institutional Action Plans Made During 2022-23 Academic Year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | Action | Success Indicator |
| General Education courses are not assessed for outcomes. | Develop Process for General Education course Assessment.  Develop Process for communication of Programs with General Education courses that provide assessment data.  General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) develops a process for approving courses in General Education and for ISLO. | Processes Written  Processes Implemented |
| Not enough faculty workload available for assessment activities. | Develop Canvas Course shell for ease of process.  Explore Canvas tools to collect assessment data.  Provide designated times for faculty to meet to discuss assessment data. | Work required to accomplish assessment tasks decreases in 2023-24. |
| Student Exit Surveys do not provide Institutional Level data on the Student Experience post-graduation. | Existing surveys examined for common questions to add to survey template. | New survey template implemented Sept 2023. |
| University not reporting Employment as Post-Graduation Success. | Add Post-graduation employment as one of several standard questions added to Senior Exit Survey. | Post-Graduation employment used as a marketing tool for the University. |
| ISLO measured: Ethical Reasoning, Teamwork, Communication | Rubric Review for Ethical Reasoning, Professional Communication collaboration opportunities developed | Student outcomes on these topics will be measured and increased. Resources will be identified to help improve student performance on these outcomes. |
| ISLO collected: Diverse Perspectives, Cultural Sensitivity, and Global Awareness | ISLO committee reviews data that is collected. Begins to develop action plans. | An evaluation of student performance will be made based on data collected.  An action plan will be developed. |
| ISLO planned: Quantitative Literacy and Inquiry and Analysis | Canvas Course Shell developed collection tool.  Communication to programs regarding this process. | Data will be collected from multiple programs on this topic. |

Table 13. Equity Related Action Plans Made During 2022-23 Academic Year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | Action | Success Indicator |
| Gender enrollment equity gap noted in allied health and engineering. | Marketing to underserved populations. | Higher enrollment. |
| International students written communication skills. | SI supports including tutoring and the opening of a Writing Center to support language skills. | Gap closed in communications courses. |
| Part-time students have higher stop out rate and DFWI than Full-time students. | More flexibility in course offerings and degree completions over multiple programs. The hiring of an Online AVP. More advising touch points with these students. | Retention gap closed. |
| LGBTQ students not considered in equity gaps analysis. | Preliminary data collected to identify potential gaps. | Potential gaps identified. Action plans made. |

Closing the Loop

Applicable Regulation:

1.B.4 The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it considers such findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, planning, intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement of its goals.

During academic year 2022-23 the University was preparing for a Site visit from the North West Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) the entity responsible for accreditation. The year 7 visit focused on assessment processes. Many of the faculty involved in peer review, members of the ISLO committees and the Assessment Executive Committee were present to speak directly to the accreditors about the process. The standard process was published and the year was more a business as usual year post-pandemic. Faculty were also beginning to take on tasks post Unionization. The reports submitted were a result of the hard work developing and implementing processes in 2021-22 academic year and they demonstrate a better understanding of data collection and using of assessment data than in past years. The institutional assessment report written last year made several action plans with far reaching goals for Institutional assessment. Successes on these actions is evaluated below.

Table 11. Programmatic Action Plans Made During 2021-22 Academic Year

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | 2020-21 Action | Success Indicator | Interpretation |
| 16 departments noted enrollment and retention as a gap. | Management department developed advisor communication tool.  Dean driven department plans focusing on retention gaps. | Increased enrollment and retention. | Progressing.  Retention +4%.  Enrollment Unchanged. |
| Courses that collect assessments in 4 departments not run. | Fill critical faculty positions in engineering and general education. | Courses run. | Mixed.  Communications department hired 3 full-time faculty. Engineering still not full and Applied Behavior Analysis and Psychology and Data Analysis departments need faculty in order to operate fully. |
| 4 programs noted lack of interdepartmental/interprofessional group skills. The need for collaboration opportunities was noted by communication, geomatics, dental hygiene, and environmental sciences, biohealth sciences, and population health. | Simulation practices were begun in MIT and MLS.  New course for allied health interprofessionalism being explored by College of Arts and Sciences. | Assessments on interprofessional skills documented. | Fail.  No movement on these initiatives due to other faculty focuses. |
| 10 programs reported curricular changes needing to be made to better serve student outcomes. | 7 curricular redesigns were reported to be changed and gave positive measures. | Student performance on outcomes increased after curriculum redesign put into place. | Progressing.  Curricular changes approved by CPC awaiting new outcomes measurement. Many outcomes reported positive results. |
| 3 programs reported students adversely impacted by stress | Positions open in mental health services for multiple locations. | Filled positions. | Success.  Mental Health positions filled. New organization within Student support includes Student Involvement and Belonging (SIB) includes helping students with basic needs. |

Table 12. Institutional Action Plans Made During 2021-22 Academic Year

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | Action | Success Indicator | Interpretation |
| Inconsistent implementation of Assessment process. | Filled positions: AVP of Office of Academic Excellence, Director of DICE, Student Support Services Director | Processes are written, published and followed. | Success.  Process Published at https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence/institutional-assessment |
| Lack of faculty engagement | Changed responsibility for assessment activities from assessment commission with specific assessment coordinators to department chairs | Evidence of multiple faculty within department participating in assessment activities. | Success.  Faculty participation in assessment increased from 9 to 29 faculty members. |
| University Outcomes indicators lowest in Retention | Programs looking at specific populations that are not retained to develop tools for supporting students. | Retention rates increase on average | Progressing.  Populations identified as African American, American Indian, International and Part-time. Action plans to be implemented. |
| ISLO measured: Quantitative Literacy and Inquiry and Analysis | Develop additional resources for Financial Literacy for students  Utilize library resources for evaluating source materials | Student outcomes on these two topics will be measured and increased. | Progressing.  Library resources have been evaluated. Financial literacy website updated at https://www.oit.edu/college-costs |
| ISLO collected:  Ethical Reasoning, Teamwork, Communication | ESLO committees were activated with charges. | An evaluation of student performance will be made based on data collected.  An action plan will be developed. | Success.  Evaluation made here and at the programmatic level. Actions to be taken in 2023-24 academic year. |
| ISLO planned:  Diversity and Cultural Sensitivity | Programs will identify courses and assignments that can be utilized for assessment of this topic.  Trainings are planned for standardized expectations on this topic | Data will be collected from multiple programs on this topic.  Cultural competency standards will be adopted by departments. | Progressing.  Programs were informed of plan for collection. Faculty were encouraged to seek out and record continuing education on these topics. Education on these topics was provided by DICE office. |

Table 13. Equity Related Action Plans Made During 2021-22 Academic Year

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | Action | Success Indicator | Interpretation |
| 2020 Accreditation requirement to identify equity gaps | Tools generated for collection and disaggregation of institutional outcomes | # gaps identified are reported | Success.  11 gaps identified. |
| 10% of 2020-21 reports mentioned equity | Faculty trained on tools available for identifying equity gaps  2 programs adopted cultural competency standards within assessment practices. | # reports using equity gaps data in assessment increases    # programs adopting cultural competency standards increases | Progressing.  55% used the dashboards.  No mention of adoption of cultural competency standards. |
| Admitted student population does not match 2020 Census data in the State of Oregon | Marketing plan for recruitment in underserved populations.  Seek a Vendor to Contract with for translation services for marketing materials. | Admitted students in underserved populations increases | Mixed.  African American and Hispanic admissions are up. Native American population is steady. Asian is down.  No vendor has been identified for translations. |

Evaluation of Needs Allocation due to assessment processes confirmed that the process of communicating these needs was unsuccessful. A new process is needed. Some needs were fulfilled, while others were not. Very little communication between non-academic department and academic assessment information is occurring. The following is an evaluation of the needs indicated from 2021 academic assessment reports and their status.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2020-21 Needs Requests | 2020-21 Needs fulfilled? |
| • Allocated time for all faculty to meet within programs and departments to make interpretations from data collected and action plans.  •Faculty continuing education on identifying and closing equity gaps.  •Critical positions filled to teach courses required for programmatic assessment in engineering, communication and general education.  •Library support for student education in research source evaluation.  •Finances department support for student education in personal finance.  •Marketing support in underserved populations recruitment.  •Marketing support for translated materials for ELD students.  •Support for Office of Institutional Research to make usability updates to data gathering tools.  •Support for Office of Academic Excellence to continue operations. | 4 hours at Convocation. 1-2 hours at Department meetings throughout the year. 1-2 hours of training. None was compensated.  Dashboards training in April.  Communication filled. Others not.  Located on Library website.  Located on Student Financial Aid website.  Unknown.  Unknown.  Updates begun and shared in April with Accreditation visit. Implementation 2023-24  AVP search failed. Executive Assistant not posted. Acting Deirdre Harlan, Carrie Dickson, Rachelle Barrett, Abdy Afjeh. |

In reports submitted to the Office of Academic Excellence in 2022-23 identifying resources needed based on assessment data collected in 2021-22 the following resource needs were indicated:

* Marketing support in underserved populations recruitment.
* Marketing support for translated materials for ELD students.
* Support for Office of Academic Excellence to continue operations
* Faculty continuing education on using assessment data for resource allocation
* Career Advising
* Technology support contracts review and implementation
* Cultural Competency faculty training
* Workload for assessment activities
* Institutional Process Approval Process
* Student Writing Center
* Support for Online Education as more flexible course offerings become available
* Training warehouse for adjunct faculty and new faculty on assessment, career advising and other institutional tools available.
* Collaboration opportunities for interprofessional practice

These reported facility needs are sent to University Accreditation Committee (UAC). UAC should respond to Office of Academic Excellence with plans to meet the needs based on these assessment data or how they have been met by activities in 2022-23 academic year.