



**2021-2022 Academic Assessment Report and 2022-2023 Academic Assessment Plan**

Prepared by

Rachelle Barrett, Chair, Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission

*10/31/2022*

## Contents

1. Institutional Mission	2
2. Institutional Assessment Process	3
a. Assessment Cycle	4
b. Leadership	4
c. Liaison with Other Campus Bodies	5
d. Actions on Institutional Process	6
3. Communication of Process	7
a. Website	7
b. Meetings	8
c. Trainings	8
4. Institutional Resources for Assessment	9
a. Sources of Data	9
b. Tools	10
c. Report Contents	11
d. Actions on Program Assessment Process	12
5. Institutional Indicators of Success	13
a. Data & Interpretations	13
b. Institutional Goals	14
6. Student Learning Outcomes Definitions and Data	14
a. Programmatic	14
b. Institutional	15
c. Plan for 22-23 Collection	18
7. Actions Summary	20
a. Programmatic	20
b. Institutional	21
c. Equity	21
8. Closing the Loop	22
a. Success of 2019-20 Actions	22
b. Needs Assessment	23

## Institutional Mission

The Mission statement approved in 2019 was reviewed and updated in 2022 final approval to take place during the 2022-23 academic year. The approved Mission for academic year 2021-22 is as follows:

“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.”

Workgroups met during 2020-21 academic year to develop metrics for measuring the progress of activities supporting the strategic plan. Those metrics were approved and presented to faculty during 2022 Convocation and are listed on the University website at <https://www.oit.edu/about/strategic-plan>

From this mission statement, an academic master plan and academic mission was written by faculty supported work groups. This mission statement is the first one adopted by this Provost’s office. It is also pending approval for academic year 2022-23 and 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.”

## Institutional Assessment Process

The institution is continually assessed for effectiveness according to the **Institutional Assessment Plan** adopted by the Assessment Executive Committee as appointed and charged by the Provost’s Office. The Plan is updated annually by the committee and rolled out to programmatic faculty at Convocation in Fall before classes begin. The plan encompasses a Template for Programmatic Assessment and a Process for Assessment of broad Institutional Outcomes. 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>.

### 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

ISLO Three Year Academic Assessment Cycle (Student Success)		
Year 1 ISLO 2020-2021	Year 2 ISLO 2021-2022	Year 3 ISLO 2022-2023
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Plan</b> Communication, Teamwork, Ethical Reasoning</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Plan</b> Diverse Perspectives including Cultural Sensitivity &amp; Global Awareness</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Plan</b> Inquiry &amp; Analysis includes problem solving &amp; Info literacy, critical analysis &amp; logical thinking Quantitative Literacy &amp; Reasoning</p>
<p>PLAN: Course Selections, Assignment Design, Rubric Design. (Program Planning report due start of winter quarter, feedback given by spring term).</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assess</b> Inquiry &amp; Analysis includes problem solving &amp; Info literacy, critical analysis &amp; logical thinking Quantitative Literacy &amp; Reasoning <b>Collect</b> (FALL &amp; WINTER) <b>Analyze</b> (SPRING)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assess</b> Communication, Teamwork, Ethical Reasoning <b>Collect</b> (FALL &amp; WINTER) <b>Analyze</b> (SPRING)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assess</b> Diverse Perspectives including Cultural Sensitivity &amp; Global Awareness <b>Collect</b> (FALL &amp; WINTER) <b>Analyze</b> (SPRING)</p>
<p>ASSESS: Direct Measures- (circle) Faculty Grades (Rubric), Standardized Tests, Exams, Pre and Post Test Designs, Competency-Based Demonstrations, Portfolios Indirect Measures-(circle) Faculty Grades-DFW, Surveys &amp; Reflections, Course Evaluations, Graduation Rates, Retention Rates. Program Collect and Analyze Report due at the end of spring term and feedback given by fall term.</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Act</b> Diverse Perspectives including Cultural Sensitivity &amp; Global Awareness</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Act</b> Inquiry &amp; Analysis includes problem solving &amp; Info literacy, critical analysis &amp; logical thinking Quantitative Literacy &amp; Reasoning</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Act</b> Communication, Teamwork, Ethical Reasoning</p>
<p>Act: Close loops, make improvements and re-measure Engage campus (professional development)</p>		

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 (AVP) 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. Beginning in academic year 2022-23 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 last updated in 2016.

#### 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 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. Additions to Commission Roster to Represent the entire Institution

<u>2021-22 Commission Roster</u>	<u>2022-23 Commission Roster</u>
AVP – Dina Battaglia	AVP – Vacant
Vice Provost – Abdy Afjeh	Vice Provost – Abdy Afjeh
Chair- Rachelle Barrett	Chair – Rachelle Barrett
Online – Cristina Crespo	Online (ETM) – Cristina Crespo
Klamath Falls – Christy VanRooyen	Klamath Falls -Christy VanRooyen
Portland Metro – Gary Lompfrey	Portland Metro (HAS) – Gary Lompfrey
	Salem (GEAC) – Andria Fultz
	ISLO CTER (GEAC) – Krista Beaty
	ISLO DP (GEAC) - Trevor Petersen
	ISLO QLIA (GEAC) – Joe Reid
	ISLO QLIA (CCT) – Cecily Heiner

Table 2. Actions for the Institutional Assessment Process

Sources of data identifying gaps in the Institutional Assessment process came from communications with the Assessment Committee, accreditation reports, Program Academic Assessment Reports and tools stored in Assessment committee files.

<b>Gap Identified</b>	<b>Change made in 2021-22</b>	<b>Change to be made in 22-23</b>
Faculty noted confusion on the expected contents of program assessment reports.	Assessment report components image posted to program website.  Training for chairs held at academic council.  Rubric for assessing academic report components updated.	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.
Accreditors noted actions from ISLO assessed taking too long to be meaningful use.	Implemented 3-year Assessment cycle as adopted and approved in 2020-21.  Provided training for programs to align 3-year cycle of institutional outcomes assessment with program specific learning outcomes.	ISLO subcommittees combined into 3-year cycle categories to better associate charges with activities within cycle.  ISLO subcommittees activated and given charges by the provost office.
Assessment data on institutional outcomes not provided by 50% of programs reported in 2019-20	ISLO assessed within programs by coursework that supports programmatic outcomes.  Data collected on CLO worksheets instead of by student artifact graded by external grader by standard rubric.	Standard rubrics to be updated for assessment of institutional outcomes by Assessment Commission.  Faculty to be trained on incorporating institutional outcomes into programmatic coursework by CCT.
No published Assessment Process	A university-wide ISLO Process written.  2021-22 Annual report specifies the plan.	Write Institutional Assessment Process encompassing program and institutional activities by Assessment Commission in conjunction with Provost's office.

## 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. Below is a summary of actions taken on communication both in Academic year 2021-22 and planned for Academic year 2022-23.

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.

The Assessment Executive committee 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 will be posted on the webpage in 2022-23 academic year.

Table 3. Meetings of Assessment Committee During 2021-22 Academic Year

14 Meetings were held during Academic year 2021-22:	10/22/21
	11/02/21
	11/16/21
	12/14/21
	2/03/22
	2/24/22
	3/10/22
	3/30/22
	4/13/22
	5/04/22
	5/11/22
	5/25/22
	6/08/22

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** has been posted to the website in order to facilitate quick communication from any faculty member across the university.

**Trainings** during academic year 2021-22 mainly focused on transitioning chairs into their new roles as program assessment coordinators. Assessment commission attended Academic Council to facilitate these trainings and then in some cases were invited to department meetings by individual chairs to disseminate information.

Table 4. Assessment Trainings During 2021-22Academic Year



<p>All department trainings:                  Convocation Training 9/22/21                  Academic Council Training 3/8/22                  Workshop on CLO Worksheets 4/14/22                  Academic Council Training 5/24/22</p>	<p>Individual department trainings:                  MMET                  Dental Hygiene                  Psychology                  Data Science                  Management</p>
---	---

For academic year 2022-23 much focus and coordination will be placed on training all faculty not just Department Chairs. Chairs are reminded that they have assessment experts in faculty that served as **Program Assessment Coordinators** in previous years. The change from program coordinators to chairs completing the assessment report occurred for academic year 2021-22. The change was meant to improve communication about assessment among department faculty instead of allowing the information to be siloed to a single individual. The downside of this change has been commented upon at multiple levels. Chairs have expressed frustration at the additional burden this task places on them both in training and coordination. For academic year 2022-23 Chairs are still the main point of contact for assessment work but they are not required to serve as Program Assessment report graders. Chairs are instead encouraged to nominate one person from each program that submitted a report to be included in communications from the Assessment Committee. All faculty are invited to participate in assessment trainings, as they are expected to participate actively in the assessment of and planning for their program’s student learning and achievement. The trainings that take place in 2022-23 will be advertised before the training takes place and recorded and posted on the webpage afterward for campus wide consumption.

## Resources for Assessment

### 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). Training on how to access and interpret this data is conducted by CCT during their annual OTET Workshop.

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 Learning Outcomes and their post graduation success. This data is provided to programs for use in writing their program assessment reports.

Historically the Office of Career Services conducted a survey on post-graduation success but that practice was abolished in 2020. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides a report of 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>. Additionally, OIR data dashboards that report student achievement data are readily available to faculty online through faculty resources page on the universe's intranet TECHweb.

External evaluation of programs is conducted by participation of Professional Advisory Boards and Accreditation for individual programs.

Table 5. Accredited programs and their most recent Accreditations

<b>Program</b>	<b>Accrediting Body and Date</b>
Dental Hygiene	Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) visit in 2017 due in 2024
EMS	Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) undergoing accreditation in 2023
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	Commission of Accreditation for Respiratory Care (COARC) awarded in 2021
Polysomnographic Technology	Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) awarded in 2022
MLS	National Accrediting Agency for CLS 10 year Certificate earned in 2021
Civil Engineering	Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET visit in 2022
Electrical Engineering	Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET visit scheduled for 2022-23
Electronics Engineering Technology	Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET visit in 2021
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
------------	--

### Tools

The institution has created dashboards for each faculty member to review their courses. The OIR data dashboards report student achievement data and are readily available to faculty online through faculty resources webpage on the universe's intranet TECHweb with faculty log-in credentials. Dashboards are maintained by the Office of Institutional Research also contain data **disaggregated** data by race, gender, first generation college attendance, Pell Grant recipient status, and full or part time status. Such data included in the dashboards is 6-Year Graduation data, Retention for one year, and Dropped Failed Withdrew or Incomplete (DFWI) by term. Faculty report review of this data in program assessment reports and in Course Learning Outcomes (CLO) **Worksheets** due at the end of each term.

The CLO Worksheets were created by the Office of Academic Assessment and allow faculty a place to enter assessment data based on course work performance that can then be summarized by the chair of the department. Using the CLO worksheets, faculty determine which programmatic and institutional outcomes their specific coursework pertains to. Faculty enter performance targets for assignments and course work. The program determines a **standard of success** to mean the number of students performing acceptably on the outcome that indicates the outcome is met for the course. Faculty determine **student success** to be the student's work product compared to the rubric for the outcome on the assignment. The **Program Assessment Handbook** expected to be published in 2022-23 academic year clarifies definitions for faculty on each of these measures of success.

**Portfolio** is an electronic database available for assessment reports to be uploaded and graded by rubric. In past years, the Office of Academic Excellence would receive program assessment reports and student artifacts for ISLO grading and upload them to portfolio. Within portfolio the workproduct would be assigned a rubric and a grader. Graders would then grade the product to generate feedback for the product. Student work Artifacts were not uploaded to portfolio during 2021-22 academic year. 35 Program Assessment Reports were uploaded and graded by 6 graders on the Assessment Committee. The assessment committee will consider whether or not to phase out Portfolio as a tool in coming years.

### Report Contents

All associate and bachelor's level programs are required to submit a programmatic assessment report. Within the program report should be listed the 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 or planned because of this data.

The reports are submitted and stored with the Office of Academic Excellence and published to the program’s webpage. If contents of the report were missing, programs were given the opportunity to correct and resubmit the necessary information.

Table 6. Program Reports Submitted During 2021-22 Academic Year

<p>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</p>
---

Table 7. Program Assessment Process Actions Planned for 2022-23 Academic Year

<b>Gap Identified</b>	<b>Action taken in 2021-22</b>	<b>Action to be taken in 2022-23</b>
<p>Assessment report graders noted that Portfolium grades do not generate reports that can be disseminated easily to submitters. Submission and grading is a manual process.</p>	<p>Submission of reports was to a particular person who has since discontinued employment with Office of Academic Excellence.</p>	<p>Portfolium submission is discontinued. Grading by Canvas assigned rubric by 2 graders nominated by department chairs.</p> <p>Assessment vendors explored by Office of Academic Excellence.</p> <p>Submission of reports by automated process linked to the website.</p>
<p>Program Chairs reported that Disaggregated data is difficult to draw conclusions from with the dashboards set up with absolute numbers.</p>	<p>Training by Office of Institutional Research conducted for both Chairs and Assessment committee. Feedback requested from all parties.</p>	<p>A representative from Assessment Executive Committee will work with Office of Institutional Research to adapt these dashboards to use % and comparators that can be easily used.</p>

		A request has been made to OIR to include more recent data in graduation dashboards.
Department faculty noted that data could not be reviewed after submission to CLO worksheets.	Department chair button was added to worksheets that gave Chairs access to all data submitted. The ability to edit previously submitted data was added.	Summary reports will be developed by IT to make data more useable.  Canvas tools for collecting assessment data will be explored by workgroup.  Canvas trainings planned for late 2023 by Director of online operations.
Faculty didn't know what tools were available or how to use them.	Trainings conducted specific to using the developed tools.	Program Report Handbook being written for publication to website by Assessment Executive Committee.
Student exit survey data was missed for 2020-21	Student exit surveys were sent for 2021-22.	Possibility of Student exit surveys to be administered automatically in partnership with Office of Institutional Research being explored by a representative from Assessment Commission.
End of Course Surveys do not include CLO and PSLO.		Workgroup approved by faculty senate to update questions.

## Institutional Indicators of Success

Table 8. Summarized Institutional Data

Indicator	2021-22	2020-21	Ranking among Regional West*
6-year Freshman Graduation Rate	56.8%	50.9%	#6
Freshman 1 year Retention	67.9%	75.8%	#8

Post-Graduation Success	96% employed	96% employed	#2
DFWI		12%	NA

\*Source from US World News Report

### Interpretations

More comparators needed for DFWI data to be useful.

Students are highly successful once they graduate from the programs offered here. Most are employed and most earn higher wages than regional comparators.

Retention should be a focus for the university. Identifying the groups of students leaving the university and where they leave to can help identify tools to be used to improve retention of freshman. The largest exodus for freshman occurs between Freshman and Sophomore year when 30% stop out. Thereafter 8% leave after Sophomore year and 4% after Junior year.

### Goals for 22-23

- 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.

## Student Learning Outcomes Data

Student learning outcomes are categorized as follows:

- Course Student Learning Outcomes (CLO)** – Student learning outcomes limited to the course subject only. Students achieve them by specifically attaining a faculty member’s success criteria for each learning outcome (not completing a course.)
- Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLO)** – Learning outcomes students achieve by completing requirement of the degree program. Program learning outcomes are defined by program faculty and or program accreditation agencies, if any. Achievement of the program learning outcomes are typically demonstrated by what students can do.
- 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 consistently integrated and assessed in program courses university wide throughout a student's learning experience at the institution.

They are assessed at three levels as follows:

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

### Programmatic

Instructional faculty are given the autonomy to create CLO based on the specific needs of their courses. Instructional faculty meet within programmatic committees to develop PSLO that meet the 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. Most programs reported assessing outcomes only in summative assignments.

Programs reported 90% of performance targets were met by PSLO assessments occurring during 2020-21 academic year. In total, 187 outcomes were assessed by the University's 45 program reports. Three programs did not assess any programmatic outcomes during the academic year. Universally, programs assessed students familiarity with technical terms and hands-on applications specific to the degrees sought. During this assessment cycle, many programs noted the difficulty in maintaining rigor in the curriculum without the ability to be with students in person. In many reports, programs noted the idea of 2020-21 academic year being a rebuilding year and one of innovation in the realm of online education. Comparing programs that reported students not meeting expectations, two general themes emerged: 1) Teamwork faltered from a lack of face-to-face interaction even after students were allowed back onto campus, 2) Student motivated problem solving and analysis were impacted.

### Institutional

The ISLO are defined based on the mission of the institution. Formerly referred to as ESLO (Essential Student Learning Outcomes) the new wording was adopted for academic year 2021-22. ISLO are incorporated with programmatic curriculum maps to ensure that students graduating from the University have achieved at least once on each of these outcomes. The ISLO process is published on Office of Academic Assessment webpage at <https://www.oit.edu/academic-excellence/GEAC/essential-studies/Institutional-student-learning-outcome> . This process has changed vastly since its inception and will continue evolve in coming years due to emerging student needs and state, continuous improvements based on assessment of ISLO data, alignment with the institution's mission, and accreditor recommendations.

Oregon Tech's Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) support Oregon Tech's institutional mission and strategic goals. The outcomes and associated criteria reflect the rigorous applied nature of Oregon Tech's degree programs.

*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.

#### Past data and processes

Previous to academic year 2019-20, ISLO were assessed using a standard rubric to grade student artifacts submitted to Portfolium. Each program was tasked with identifying a course to submit artifacts from to gain Practice level measures of the outcome. The committee would then coordinate with a general studies course to submit artifacts for a Foundational level measure. All submissions were graded by volunteer faculty according to the standard outcome rubric, regardless of assignment. Results of the artifact grading were used to identify gaps in the outcome.

The results were summarized by the ISLO sub committee and actions to be taken planned by these individual committees of 5-7 faculty volunteers. Programs were not involved in action planning or rubric development on these institutional outcomes. Data were reported in annual summative reports by the ISLO sub committees and shared with faculty at Convocation and finally published to the assessment website.

Feedback regarding this process was mixed. Programs felt disconnected from the institutional outcomes measurement process as evidenced by the lack of Institutional outcomes mentioned in annual assessment reports, only 44% in 2019-20 academic year. Faculty have mentioned that this process attempts to measure student performance consistently and thus to produce more meaningful data and that it would be better if all students across disciplines were measured by the same assignment. Accreditors felt this process took too long to produce meaningful results. The assessment commission expressed difficulty in getting faculty volunteers to grade artifacts to



produce meaningful data. Thirteen programs reported low sample sizes in production of data points during 2019-20 academic year.

Table 9. Summary of Past 6-years ISLO Data

ISLO	Date of Assessment Collection	Data Source	Gaps Identified	Actions Taken
Communication	2016-2017	Communications artifact	Student Technical Writing Skills	2017 Symposium with Industry members defining expectations for communication  2017 Communications department instructor work group to consider Discipline specific technical writing courses development
Ethics	2018-2019	Ethics artifact	Instructor knowledge of ethical theories.	2020 update of rubric
Teamwork	2019-2020	Qualtrics Survey	Student ability to set group roles/responsibilities.	
Quantitative Literacy	2020-2021	Student survey and student artifact	Student financial literacy.  Understanding reputable sources and significance in statistics.	2021 Journal club to focus on students as consumers of statistics rather than producers.
Inquiry and Analysis	2017-2018	Inquiry and Analysis artifact	Assessment at multiple levels of curriculum	2019 Workshop on Scaffolding curriculum from CCT.  2019 Book discussion "factfulness".  2020 Development of Assignment library to share resources on inquiry and analysis.
Diverse Perspectives	2015-2016	none	Instructor ability to assess this item	2016 Integrating diverse perspectives - CCT convocation session.

				2018 Faculty training workshops on the Rubric and course design.
				2019 Dashboard development

During 2020-21 academic year, the ISLO subcommittees were not activated or given charges, and no directive was given to programs regarding artifact submission. This academic year was the year for collection of data on Inquiry and Analysis and Quantitative Literacy. This was the first year during which the three-year cycle of assessment was active and these two topics were combined. 52% of program reports during this cycle included assessment of ISLO data.

The Quantitative Literacy ISLO committee continued implementing a plan developed during the 2019-20 academic year which involved a financial literacy survey administered to all students, measurement of foundational QL coursework and a survey to all programmatic faculty regarding perceptions of student proficiency on this topic. The topic was split further into Calculation, Interpretation, Application and Communication of quantitative data. The QL report submitted to the Office of Academic Assessment summarized that most topic areas rated foundational student deficiencies to be corrected by the time of graduation. Universally, financial literacy and student ability to understand the difference between reputable and non-reputable sources were items to be worked on in coming years. The 2021-22 report generated by this group expressed the need to close the loop on these identified gaps.

Actions taken on outcomes in the past were driven based largely on the results produced by the general education course standard assignment. During 2022-23 academic year, general education course work will be undergoing tremendous change due to implementation of state standards. This emphasizes the need for more faculty involvement in ISLO assessment. The work of the Quantitative literacy group in updating their assessment to include multiple data points from programs and general education is a model for how institutional assessment can be broadened going forward.

### Data 2021-22 Academic Year

With the subcommittees also not active during 2021-22 academic year, ISLO alignment to PSLO was pushed out to faculty as a viable more meaningful alternative of collecting data that would be directly impactful to faculty. With programmatic coursework less engaged in the measurement of institutional learning outcomes in the past, it left the University's large number of transfer and post baccalaureate students without a means of assessment of Institutional Outcomes.

Academic year 2021-22 assessed data on Communication, Ethical Reasoning and Teamwork outcomes within programmatic courses. Artifacts during this year weren't submitted for external grading as they had been in the past. Faculty reported student performance based on criteria expected to be met for specific coursework using the newly revamped CLO Worksheets.

Data from programmatic reports will be summarized in an ad hoc addendum by the ISLO CTER subcommittee.

Programs find some outcomes more challenging to incorporate naturally within the curriculum than others. Across the board, Inquiry and Analysis, Quantitative Literacy, and Communication seem to be adapted to most programmatic offerings. Ethical Reasoning and Global and Diverse Perspectives have in the past been assessed rarely within programmatic courses. The challenge with this method of collecting the data is the lack of summation for trends to take University-wide actions.

#### Plan for 2022-23 Academic Year

For academic year 2022-23 Diverse Perspectives and Cultural Competency will be assessed for the first time within student coursework. To support this work, faculty are encouraged to attend a series of training sessions relating to closing equity gaps and teaching and assessing diverse perspectives and cultural competency.

ISLO committees have been reorganized and reactivated with charges from the Provost's office. The committees are as follows:

#### 1. Communication, Teamwork, Ethical Reasoning (CTER) charged with:

- Reviewing programmatic data collected during 2021-22 year for trends and gaps
- Developing a plan to implement University wide actions suggested by faculty and staff
- Documenting actions taken by programs at the University level

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

- Working with CCT and DICE to provide guidance on curriculum and classroom design for individual programs to collect assessment data
- Documenting participation in training on this subject
- Updating University Definitions of ISLO to incorporate cultural competency elements and publish to the ISLO website

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

- Aiming to better represent students across all degree programs through data collection in general education curriculum
- Developing a method for comparing previous ISLO data to data that will be collected in 2023-24 academic year
- Closing the Loop on QLIA data

Table 10. ISLO Driven Action Plans for 2022-23 Academic Year

Gap Identified	Action Taken in 2021-22	Action to be taken in 2022-23
Not all faculty participating in the assessment process for Institutional Outcomes.	Incorporated alignment of ISLO with PSLO into all programs.	Actions to be recorded and taken at the programmatic and curriculum level using CLO worksheets.  ISLO committees activated and given charges.
Faculty expressed concern regarding the standardization and comparability of expectations on outcomes.	Standard rubrics are published.	CCT and DICE to collaborate on a series of trainings regarding expectations on Cultural Competency and Diverse perspectives outcomes.
Summation of ISLO data to make reasonable actions university wide.	Resource allocation a required section for Assessment reports.	Programmatic actions will inform the needs for University-wide actions as summarized in the annual ISLO reports and reported to the University Accreditation committee for resource allocation.

## Actions Summary

Reports submitted during 2021-22 academic year examined assessment data from 2020-21, 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 2022-23 academic year.

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

<u>Assessment-Informed Driver</u>	<u>2020-21 Action</u>	<u>Success Indicator</u>
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.
Courses that collect assessments in 4 departments not run.	Fill critical faculty positions in engineering and general education.	Courses run.
4 programs noted lack of interdepartmental/interprofessional group skills. The need for collaboration	Simulation practices were begun in MIT and MLS. New course for allied health interprofessionalism being explored	Assessments on interprofessional skills documented.

opportunities was noted by communication, geomatics, dental hygiene, and environmental sciences, biohealth sciences, and population health.	by College of Health, Arts and Sciences.	
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.
3 programs reported students adversely impacted by stress	Positions open in mental health services for multiple locations.	Filled positions.

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

<u>Assessment-Informed Driver</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Success Indicator</u>
Inconsistent implementation of Assessment process.	Filled positions: Director of Office of Academic Excellence, Director of DICE, Student Support Services Director	Processes are written, published and followed.
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.
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
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.
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.
ISLO planned: Diversity and Cultural Sensitivity	Programs will identify courses and assignments that can be utilized for assessment of this topic.	Data will be collected from multiple programs on this topic.

	Trainings are planned for standardized expectations on this topic	Cultural competency standards will be adopted by departments.
--	---	---

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

<u>Assessment-Informed Driver</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Success Indicator</u>
2020 Accreditation requirement to identify equity gaps	Tools generated for collection and disaggregation of institutional outcomes	# gaps identified are reported
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
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

## Closing the Loop

Though the University was operating in a continually changing landscape brought on by global pandemic, programs continued to meet, teach courses, assess students and make programmatic changes. Below is a summary of action plans from 2019-20 assessment reports and summarized responses from 2020-21 reports. Of particular note is that 19 action plans were reported as successful and 10 were reported as ongoing in the 2020-21 reports.

Table 14. Success of 2019-20 Assessment Actions

<u>2019 Actions Recommended</u>	<u>Implemented successfully?</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13 programs reported low sample sizes and the need to change assessment practices to increase this number.</li> <li>10 programs reported the need for curriculum redesign to better serve student success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 programs reported that enrollment was a worsening problem. 16 programs reported focused efforts on enrollment as a department goal.</li> <li>7 programs reported successful indicators from curricular changes made</li> <li>3 programs reported that they couldn't add additional courses due to faculty</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 programs reported the need to add additional courses from the curriculum to the assessment process</li> <li>• 4 programs reported the need to fill faculty vacancies in order to teach classes where assessments would be taking place</li> <li>• 5 programs mentioned gaps noted in student ability to communicate within interprofessional teams</li> <li>• Non academic resource requests included: academic advising assistance, articulation agreement approvals, the need to maintain software agreements and technology replacement schedules</li> </ul>	<p>shortages. 1 program went on hiatus. 1 program reported a successful course addition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 faculty vacancy was reported as filled</li> <li>• New course for allied health interprofessionalism being explored by College of Arts and Sciences.</li> <li>• Non academic resources filled: position for academic advising director, technology replacement schedules/contracts maintained</li> </ul>
--	---

### 2020-21 Needs Requests

These reported facility needs are sent to University Accreditation Committee (UAC) on \_\_\_\_\_. UAC should respond to Office of Academic Excellence with plans to meet the needs based on these assessment data.

- 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.