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# 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 Oregon Tech 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>

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 set 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.

The University Assessment Commission revised and approved its own mission in alignment with both the Oregon Tech Mission and Academic Master Plan mission on Dec 1, 2022. It reads as follows:

The assessment commission will foster a community of learning and teaching excellence at Oregon Tech using assessment data to make continuous process improvements. As part of the university’s continual monitoring of student and graduate success, the commission will promote assessment skills and knowledge in all faculty through implementation of an Institutional Assessment Plan and the preparation of an Annual Report on institutional progress.

Work in 2023-24 academic year on Strategic Mission continued to focus on making progress on measurable academic outcomes. Charge 2 initiative 1.5 of the academic master plan 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 for Program Review of Fall 2023 and the responsible party as Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. **The process was not written** because the position of Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs was filled July 2024.

The Program Assessment process in 2023-24 academic year was not used for program review, though it required documentation of many of the items required for programmatic review. Many programs at this institution participated in external audits responsible for programmatic review. Those programs and their anticipated external audit dates are documented in this report.

The Academic Program Review Process will be developed during 2024-25 academic year. In preparation for this, the Program Assessment Report Template has been updated to include a summary that may be used by senior administrators responsible for this process.

# 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 Process

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 in all bachelor’s level programs, 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 Process** was adopted by the Assessment Executive Committee in 2022-23 academic year as appointed and charged by the Provost’s Office. It is located on the academic assessment website at [Institutional Assessment | Oregon Tech (oit.edu)](https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence/institutional-assessment). Annually the process is reviewed by the committee and updated considering feedback from faculty, evaluation of the contents of the submitted reports, and updated state and accreditation standards.

The process, as written, requires that the assessment commission make updates to both the Academic **Program Assessment Report Template** and the collection process for **Institutional Learning Outcomes** (ISLO) annually. Both items are posted to the Office of Academic Assessment Website at <https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence> by the start of fall term.

Updates and other valuable assessment process data were presented to all programmatic faculty at Convocation in Fall on September 19, 2023.

During 2023-24 academic year, all programs were required to nominate an individual faculty member by email to enroll in an Assessment Canvas Shell. These individuals participated in submission of the Program Assessment Reports for their programs by October 31st 2023 and the peer review process that provides feedback to these reports and the overall institutional process. Peer reviews were complete by May 1, 2024. All program reports were posted on the program’s individual assessment webpages operated by the Office of Academic Excellence by May 7 2024.

For 2024-25 academic year, nominations will come to the office of academic excellence by a survey sent to department chairs during 2024-25 Convocation. The same due dates will apply of reports submitted by October 31st, Peer Review completed by end of Winter term, and posting of reports to occur during Spring term.

At the conclusion of the academic year, the **Program Assessment Report Template** was updated for use in preparation of the program reports due next October. The updated templates both for Graduate Program Assessment and Undergraduate Program Assessment were presented to Program Chairs and designees in a Basic Program Coordinator’s training on April 24, 2024.

Institutional Level Outcomes Assessment Process was adopted May 2022 and is posted on the academic webpage at [Institutional Student Learning Outcomes | Oregon Tech (oit.edu)](https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence/GEAC/essential-studies/Institutional-student-learning-outcome). The process is a collaborative process that charges **ISLO committees** with updating rubrics that define the individual outcomes, individual programs with determining how their curriculum measures the outcomes, and the Commission on College Teaching (CCT) with providing support to faculty teaching to the outcomes.

ISLO committees participated with the Assessment commission planning and evaluation of assessment data during 2023-24 academic year as they worked toward their individual committee charges. Diverse Perspectives (DP) ISLO committee reviewed submitted reports for gaps in Diverse Perspectives curriculum delivery. Quantitative Literacy and Inquiry and Analysis (QLIA) ISLO Committee loaded rubrics into Canvas for streamlined collection of outcomes data across programs. Ethical Reasoning, Teamwork and Communications (ETC) ISLO committee collaborated with subject matter experts to update outcomes rubrics and expectations and determined that Ethical Reasoning was a better fit for the DP committee than theirs.

During 2024-25 academic year ISLO committees will coordinate with General Education Council by defining criteria for entry level competence on the institutional outcomes.

Assessment Process Actions and Plans

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2023- 24 Actions | 2024- 25 Plans |
| * Canvas Course Shell built to guide and house Program Assessment Report submission and Peer Review
* AVPAE position filled
* Peer reviews performed by program nominated faculty members instead of chairs or assessment committee members
* Graduate Program Assessment Template created
* Canvas Assessment tools built for ISLO data collection
* 28/36 reports submitted
 | * Program Review Process developed.
* Program Assessment Report Template to contain summary statement used for Program Review.
* ISLO committees to define criteria for entry level competence in General education coursework on Institutional Outcomes.
* Ethical Reasoning to be paired with DP for outcomes collection.
 |

The Continuous Assessment Cycle

Measurement of programmatic and institutional outcomes are split among 3 parts of the cycle of assessment (Plan, Collect 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.



Participation and Inclusion

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.

Programmatic Faculty are responsible for adhering to the processes laid out by assessment leadership and providing feedback to faculty representatives on the committees regarding process improvements.

Collaboration 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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2023-24 Commission RosterVice Provost – Abdy Afjeh Co-Chair HAS – Rachelle Barrett Co- Chair KF -Christy VanRooyen ETM – Cecily Heiner Portland Metro – Gary Lomprey Online/Graduate – Cristina Crespo GEAC – Andria Fultz ISLO CTER (GEAC) – Krista Beaty ISLO DP (GEAC) – Jennifer Wilson ISLO QLIA (GEAC)/CCT – David Jonston(CPC) - Vacant AVPAE – VacantPLT – Carrie DicksonExecutive Assistant- Vacant | 2024-25 Commission RosterVice Provost – Abdy Afjeh  Co-Chair HAS – Rachelle Barrett  Co- Chair KF -Christy VanRooyen  ETM – Cecily Heiner  Portland Metro – Gary Lomprey  Online/Graduate – Cristina Crespo GEAC – Andria Fultz  ISLO CTER (GEAC) – Krista Beaty  ISLO DP (GEAC) –   Sophie NathensonISLO QLIA (GEAC)/CCT – David Jonston (CPC) - Caroline Doty  AVPAE – Dr. Linus YuPLT – Carrie Dickson Executive Assistant- Vacant |

Communication of Assessment Matters

Systematic and broad communication on assessment matters is important to the assessment process. The Office of Academic Excellence maintains and updates webpages publishing widely and externally Programmatic Assessment Processes, Institutional Assessment Processes, Annual Institutional Reports and Annual Programmatic Reports. Programmatic Assessment reports include student learning outcomes, curriculum maps, and graduation statistics among the data published.

These webpages are reviewed and updated annually during the summer term and as needed during the academic year. Additionally, the Assessment Committee meets bi-weekly during the academic year and maintains Minutes and Agendas from the meetings both on the webpage and in a Teams shared file. Communication from the academic community is maintained by an Office of Academic Excellence email established in 2022-23 as oae@oit.edu.

Campus wide trainings were held to communicate assessment matters with the academic community. At all campus-wide trainings, Programs are encouraged to contact the email to set up a department specific training should it be desired.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2023-24 Trainings | 2023-24 Meetings |
| Convocation 9/19/23Program Assessment Report Training 10/19/23Academic Council 4/9/24Basic Assessment Coordinators Training 4/24/24Peer Review training 2/1/24 & 2/15/24 | 10/4/2310/27/2311/17/2312/8/231/19/242/2/243/1/243/15/244/10/245/8/245/22/246/5/24 |

# 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.

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.

Data Sources

Student Perspective

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). Faculty Senate workgroup considered several different vendors for administration of more meaningful evaluations of teaching during academic year 2023-24. A recommendation from this workgroup is still forthcoming.

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 senior and freshman responses to The **National Survey of Student Engagement** (NSSE). Oregon Tech has participated in this survey in 2015, 2018, 2021 and 2024. Data from this survey will be available during academic year 2024-25. Office of Academic Excellence will present the data to faculty in collaboration with Student Affairs office during Convocation 2024.

The Office of Academic Excellence administers to all graduating seniors a **Student Exit Survey** on behalf of every program. Questions asked of these students cover student perspective on their education’s impact on their performance on Programmatic Outcomes, Institutional Level Outcomes, their perspective of Institutional resources and their post-graduation plans. This data is provided to programs for use in writing their program assessment reports. In 2023-24 academic year, programs were asked to review questions on their programmatic surveys to consolidate standardized institutional questions with program questions. Students that graduated from programs without an exit survey designated would receive a survey with the standard institutional questions only. All programs were asked to find a capstone or end of program course to encourage student participation in the survey.

Office of Academic Excellence and Student Affairs are collaborating on survey consolidation that will reduce survey fatigue for graduating seniors and increase student participation. For academic year 2024-25 the Senior Exit Survey will have a new name: **Senior Institutional Evaluation Survey**, that differentiates it from the financial aid survey administered at the same time and so it will be included in the graduation checklist assigned by the registrar’s office.

Indicators of Student Achievement

The Office of Institutional Research Provides head count data on **graduation, attrition, and retention rates** by term, department, and college to all academic programs. This data is publicly available on the OIR website at <https://www.oit.edu/institutional-research>

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.

Since these dashboards were implemented, trainings on how to use them have been widely advertised to all faculty. Access to the data within the dashboards has varying levels. Faculty may see their individual courses, Chairs may view their program level data, Deans have access to College specific data and Administration may view the University as a whole. For 2024-25 academic year, program level data access will be granted to designees appointed by department chairs who are preparing assessment reports and leading assessment conversations.

Learning Outcomes

Student achievement on learning outcomes set by faculty may be recorded and tracked by two different methods. The first method developed by the Office of Academic Assessment is a worksheet available to all faculty via TechWeb log-in called Course Learning Outcomes (CLO) Worksheet. These worksheets have been in use since 2019. During academic year 2023-24 the assessment committee began development of Canvas Outcomes tracking for Institutional Learning Outcomes. This new tool may one day replace the CLO worksheet, but currently both are still in use.

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.

**Canvas Outcomes** tools have been explored because they may be integrated into work that faculty are already completing in the LMS and eventually reduce work associated with Assessment. Canvas has a variety of data integrations that faculty may implement. For individual courses, outcomes may be set and monitored through the Learning Mastery Gradebook feature. Standardized Institutional outcomes may be imported to a particular course and used to compare student performance on a particular outcome in multiple courses or modalities. This feature may also be created to measure outcomes across the programmatic level.

During 2023-24 ISLO committees updated rubric grading guidelines for performance on these outcomes for import to Canvas. A training in spring term was held for faculty on this topic in spring so that faculty may begin using them in 2024-25 academic year.

External Perspective

External evaluation of programs is conducted by participation with Professional Advisory Boards and by Program Accreditation Practices. The Academic master plan goal 2.2 aimed to implement Advisory boards for each academic department by spring 2023.

As of 2023-24, 70% of academic programs participated in external accreditation audits. The other programs would have gained this valuable information through advisory boards until an internal Program Review process can be implemented.

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 due October 2024 | Allied Health |
| EMS  | Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) undergoing accreditation in 2023  | Mathematics |
| Diagnostic Medical Sonography EchocardiographyVascular Technology | Joint Review in Diagnostic Medical Sonography (JRCDMS) over seen by The Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) - Due March 2025 | 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 interim in Fall 2024   | 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 Fall 2024 |  |
| Renewable Energy Engineering  | Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET interim scheduled for Fall 2024   |  |
| Computer SET  | Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET visit in 2021  |  |
| Mechanical Engineering (ME)  | Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET interim Fall 2024  |  |
| Manufacturing Engineering Technology  | Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET interim in Fall 2024   |  |
| Management  | International Accreditation Council for Business Education (IACBE) Certificate earned in 2022 Interim report due 2025 |  |

\*Accreditation process on hold due to low faculty.

Publication of Assessment Activities

All programs are required to submit an **Annual Programmatic Assessment** report to the Office of Academic Assessment by October the academic year after the collection year. In winter, faculty peers review the contents of the program assessment reports according to a standardized rubric and provide feedback to each program. Reports are posted on the external facing website for each program by Spring term. **Peer review** has allowed a broader audience of faculty members to become familiar with assessment processes and tools and has produced more streamlined comprehensive reporting of assessment activities. Peer reviewers are nominated by program chair to submit a report for the program and to read 2 reports that they did not write. Trainings are provided to peer reviewers for rubric norming, then each report is review by two different reviewers. The process is managed within the Canvas Assessment course shell named for the academic year.

For 2023-24 academic year submission, the office expected to receive 27 Bachelor’s level reports and 8 Graduate level reports. Of these expected reports, 19 Bachelor’s program reports were submitted and 6 Graduate level reports were submitted. This was fewer than the previous year for bachelor’s programs and more than previous for graduate programs. Programs that did not submit reports were contacted and could not spare faculty from teaching duties to prepare reports. The entire mechanical engineering department failed to submit reports for any of its 5 programs due to the unexpected vacancy of their department chair. The communications department, similarly, suffered from faculty vacancies and could not submit their reports until spring term when faculty positions were filled.

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 of 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. The template is posted on the Academic Assessment website and within the Canvas course shell by the beginning of fall each year.

Based on reports submitted and peer reviewed from academic year 2022-23 and feedback from peer reviewers, very few changes were made to the template for use in publishing data from 2023-24 that will be submitted October 2024. Wording was added to guidance on curriculum maps to include an expected completion time for gaining graduation. This was added to fit academic master plan Charge 3 to provide a path to graduation within 4 years. An example table for writing action plans was added in order to assist programs with linking **resource requests** to assessment data. Finally, an executive summary was added to the end of the document that covers common questions about program health and accomplishments that are asked by administration. This summary statement is meant to consolidate the report and encourage administrators to read the reports.

A comparison between report grades from the previous year to current year indicate that the programs have continued to improve reporting on assessment activities. Program reports continue to provide excellent plans for assessment and justifications for missions, objectives and external comparators for data. Less often, assessment data was compared to previous years’ data when making interpretations. Action plans reported from 2022-23 were often made around retention and enrollment but were often found lacking in specifics of accountability, timelines, and links to resource requests.

Assessment Tools Actions and Plans

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2023- 24 Actions | 2024- 25 Plans |
| * Canvas Outcomes built for measuring Institutional Learning Outcomes (ISLO)
* Dashboards data used by 68% of programs in assessment activities
* Senior Exit survey implemented that measured post-graduation success and contained standardized questions about institutional effectiveness.
* Program Report Templates separated for Graduate and Undergraduate program assessment.
* 28/36 reports submitted for peer review.
 | * Canvas Outcomes to be used by faculty to measure student performance on ISLOs teamwork and communication.
* Program designees given access to dashboard data for the entire program even if they are not acting as Department chair.
* Senior Exit survey re-named to “Senior Institutional Evaluation Survey” and added to registrar checklist for graduation.
* Program Report Template updated to include example table for resource requests, research tracking , executive summary, and focus on program completion date.
 |

# 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  | 2023-24 | 2022-23  | 2021-22  | External Comparator  |
| Enrollment  | 5111 | 4913  | 4910  |  \* |
| 6-year Freshman Graduation Rate  |  58.7% |  57.2%  |  56.8%   | 49.83% Oregon Avg |
| Freshman 1 year Retention  | 72.9% | 72.2%  | 67.9%  | 72.5% Oregon Avg |
| Post-Graduation Success  | 97% | Not Reported  | 96% employed  | #12 in best value schools |
| DFWI  |  8.5% | 8.8%  | 12%  | 9-22% (world news report) |

\*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 published by the office of institutional research as six-year graduation rate. The Academic master plan aims to focus programs on a 4-year graduation track. When dashboard data is filtered for Full-time Bachelor’s program students, 71% have graduated by 4-years. Demographics of graduates have varied very little from previous years. This institution continues to maintain a level 32% students of color and have a higher enrollment in senior courses than freshman courses. Due to the nature of programming offered, Oregon Tech attracts students looking for specific programs who are willing to transfer to gain these valuable degrees. Actions taken by the entire campus to improve **retention** have barely budged it above Oregon average. On the other hand, identification and focus on closing **equity gaps** and DFWI has seen some major improvement. In 2024-25 academic year, focus on identifying gate keeper general education courses with high DFWI, like what was accomplished by the Management Department, may help improve retention.

Major recruitment is necessary to gain students from varied backgrounds and to support them through their academics here. Graduates continue to have very high **post- graduation success**  with a reported 97% of students employed or continuing schooling in their major within 6-months of graduation. With such a high success-rate for employment, industry should also be very focused on recruiting underrepresented populations into these very successful programs.

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 2023-24 academic year and what was actually accomplished.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| GoalStrategic 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**.  | 2023-24 AccomplishmentDeans charged programs with developing program level Retention strategies. Retention actions were reported in 1/3 of Program assessment reports. 2/3 programs reported retention as same or increased.Only 1 program reported path to graduation in 4 years. Timeline to graduation added to template.68% of reports included examination and interpretation of Equity data. 41% of Programs that reported equity data included actions taken on equity gaps. 77% of programs reported success or no change on reducing DFWI.36% of reports included resources requests in the report. Lowest performing report category.1/3 requests were for filling faculty vacancies. 1/3 of requests were for marketing support of programs to increase enrollment especially in underserved populations. Table added to template.Two surveys administered. 183 respondents by May 2024. | 2024-25 GoalFaculty vacancies filled and predictive scheduling implemented.75% of bachelor’s programs report paths to graduation in 4-years or less.Student testing and tutoring centers on specific subjects (grammar, mathematics) implemented to support first gen and English as second language learners.Gate keeper courses identified for assessment in 2025-26.Deans and Chairs read assessment reports and use them in resource and budget allocation process.Collaboration between student services and Office of academic excellence to increase student participation in surveys.  |

# 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 Outcomes (PSLO)

Programmatic and Instructional faculty are given the autonomy to create CLO and PSLO based on the specific needs of their programs and the program 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. Programs reported on 83 measured program specific learning outcomes during academic year 2022-23, 86% of those were interpreted as met by student work product. This was an even higher performance rate than reported in previous years. Interestingly, most of the outcomes missed were related in some way to taking directions from a customer and implementing them into the final product.

Actions taken by programs were often providing students with additional instructors from different backgrounds from inviting industry partners into the classroom to collaborating with the tutoring center on early interventions to provide students with instructional materials from multiple teaching styles and perspectives.

Programs continued to report being plagued by low faculty requiring some courses to be cancelled, leading to student dissatisfaction. This low faculty presence can impact the student experience by reducing variability in teaching styles desperately needed for the varied needs of learners. The faculty vacancy problem is cyclical. 1/3 of programs reported requests for enrollment help from marketing and couldn’t report DFWI data because of low enrollment numbers. It is not financially responsible to hire more faculty for programs with low enrollment, however, we cannot increase enrollment without faculty to teach the additional students.

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. Current rubrics may be found on the assessment webpage at <https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence/GEAC/essential-studies/Institutional-student-learning-outcome>

During 2022-23 academic year, programmatic curriculum around Diverse Perspectives was assessed for the first time in the University’s history. With no past data on this outcome the goals for assessment were to gain baseline data to determine who can assess this outcome and how it could be assessed. Much faculty support was provided on the topic of cultural competency during the academic year. Of Reports submitted, 14 out of 26 reports submitted assessments of student work on this outcome and all but two of those programs measured their student performance as met for this outcome. One program made an action plan to include this outcome in future assessment cycles.

The DP- ISLO committee was tasked during 2023-24 academic year to look over what was submitted by programs on this outcome and develop a plan to support faculty in providing education on this topic. It is anticipated that this will involve collaborations from multiple subject matter experts. A rubric that may be used to measure the global aspect of this outcome should also be a focus for this committee in coming years. The outcome will be re-assessed again in 2026-27.

This academic year 2023-24 Quantitative Literacy and Inquiry and Analysis was the ISLO that programs were directed to collect student work product on. Historically students have performed very well on these outcomes at the program level. The QLIA -ISLO committee updated the rubrics for these outcomes and had them uploaded into Canvas so that individual faculty members could pull these standardized outcomes into their courses. Since this was the first time Canvas Outcomes tools are being used, this data will be looked at in 2024-25 for process improvements and useability of these tools.

ISLO subcommittees have been active participants in development and improvement of processes, review of assessment reports, and spreading assessment information to more faculty campus-wide. They will again be charged by the Provosts’ office for academic year 2024-25 to continue this good work.

1. Communication, Teamwork, (CT) charged with:

* Providing instructional guidance on teaching these outcomes.
* Provide guidance on collection of ISLO during 2024-25 academic year in programs and in General Education.

2.Diverse Perspectives & Global Awareness & Ethical Reasoning (DPE) charged with:

* Recommending Resources to be allocated to institutional improvement efforts on these outcomes.
* Identify General Education courses where Foundational education of this outcome can be taken.
* Improve the rubrics for Global Awareness & Ethical Reasoning

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

* Reviewing outcomes reporting at the program level on these outcomes for common themes.
* Reviewing Canvas data collection tools for process improvement.
* Developing institutional actions to be taken on these outcomes.

Assessment Data & Outcomes Actions and Plans

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2023- 24 Actions | 2024- 25 Plans |
| * Post-Graduation Success data collected in 2 ways: Senior Exit Survey & Career Services survey
* ISLO data collection on QLIA using Canvas outcomes tools
* DP data reported for the first time by 14/26 reports as 85% met
* 86% student work products met expectations for the 83 PSLO assessed by programs.
 | * Post-Graduation Success data collected from the survey that has the highest participation rate.
* ISLO data collected from Canvas formatted for programs to view at program and institutional levels.
* 100% of programs submit program assessment reports.
 |

# 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.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | 2022-23 Action Indicated | Success Indicator |
| 5 programs noted missed outcomes on groups producing products for specific customer needs | Providing students examples of different customer perspectives and needs by partnering with industry. | Teamwork ISLO measurement in 2024-25 is increased over previous. |
| 8 programs noted low retention. 5 linked it to low faculty.  | Predictive Scheduling. Hiring of faculty to fill courses.Investigate gatekeeper courses using DFWI | Retention Increases for 2024-25.Critical open positions are filled by fulltime faculty. |
| 2 programs did not meet on assessment of DP and over half didn’t assess this outcome in programming | Add DP into program level work. | 80% of programs assess this outcome in 2026-27 |
| 5 programs noted equity gaps in graduates | Marketing and recruitment of underserved populations.Language center and tutoring supports for English as second language learners. | Diversity in programs is equal to general population by 2026-27 |

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.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | 2021-22 Action | Success Indicator | Interpretation |
| 8 programs noted action plans meant to improve student ability to communicate technical knowledge. | 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.  | Progressing. This outcome set for data collection 2024-25 and interpretation 2025-26 |
| 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.   | 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.  | Progressing.Retention did not change.  |
| 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. | 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.  | Success. Program coordinators have access to Canvas shell and trainings.  |
| 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.  | Unknown.Enrollment is unchanged.  |
| Programs have not assessed Diverse Perspectives in curriculum.  | 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. | Success. DP Reported by 53% of programs. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | Action | Success Indicator | Interpretation |
| 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 WrittenProcesses Implemented | Fail. No process.  |
| 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.  | Progressing. |
| 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. | Success.  |
| 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. | Success. |
| 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.  | Progressing.Teamwork and Communications to be collected 24-25Ethics moved to DP for 26-27 |
| 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. | Progressing.Data collected.Action pending. |
| 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. | Progressing. Tools built. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Driver | Action | Success Indicator | Interpretation |
| Gender enrollment equity gap noted in allied health and engineering.  | Marketing to underserved populations.  | Higher enrollment. | Not looked at. |
| 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.  | Actions implemented not measured |
| 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.  | Actions implemented not measured |
| LGBTQ students not considered in equity gaps analysis.  | Preliminary data collected to identify potential gaps.  | Potential gaps identified. Action plans made.  | Not looked at. |

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 2023 academic assessment reports and their status.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2021-22 Needs Requests | 2021-22 Needs Fulfilled |
| * 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
 | AVPAE hiredAdded to the template and Basic Training in AprilCareer Services Director hiredStudent Involvement and Belonging and Center for Wellbeing programs begun. Intro to Allied health Interprofessional curriculum  |

In reports submitted to the Office of Academic Excellence in 2023-24 identifying resources needed based on assessment data collected in 2022-23 the following resource needs were indicated:

* Faculty positions filled
* Support for Math tutoring Center
* Advising and Retention support
* OER investment
* Scheduling and Admissions focus on predictive scheduling
* Construction on clinics
* New hospital beds
* Marketing to underserved populations to increase enrollment
* Collaboration in Interprofessional Practice
* Construction on lab to make them handicap accessible

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 2023-24 academic year.