## Minutes 04/16/25 10am

Attendees: Krista Beaty, Jeannie Bopp, Rachelle Barrett, Cristina Crespo, Christy VanRooyen, Carrie Dickson, Cecily Heiner

## Past business:

- 1. Results of Peer Review of Assessment report process.
  - All peer review are done. Tracked data can be reviewed here:
     https://oregontech.sharepoint.com/:x:/s/AcademicAssessment2/EVnRCX-gcsZDl7tQqEtCwXEBwSjSmPuYJsrl56UyGDy2Cg?e=fEbM46
  - b. Takeaways: Very few faculty participated in this process. Fewer reports were submitted this year than in past years. 15 out of 29 bachelor's programs, 5 out of 9 Graduate programs. Reports were thorough in sections 1-5 and lacking in action specifics. #1 resource needed for program success is fulltime faculty.
  - c. Discussed barriers to this process: faculty time, overlap of reports, lack of consistency of reporting procedures, access to needed data, lack of actions taken by administration.
  - d. Discussed mitigations: survey faculty about barriers, create a Dean report that is filled out by Deans to demonstrate to programs actions that are taken by the deans (this may be a program review step), reduce redundancies and changes to the process.
  - e. Discussed that in theory peer review process is good for faculty who participate in it to get to know what other programs are doing and how they do it. Should continue to do this process.
  - f. Question: Should each chair receive an individual email with peer review feedback and request for external posting?

## 2. Program Review discussion

- a. Good place for faculty/student ratios to be discussed in a meaningful way such as faculty to program course ratio, enrollment in courses, other administrative issues with course offerings.
- b. For Programs that are already accredited, it may suffice to have a self-reflection submitted after external site visit.
- c. For Programs entering accreditation for first time, they may benefit from selfsurvey process and submit as program review.
- d. For Programs without external accreditation, they will require guidance and need to understand what actions will be taken as a result of reporting before

moving forward with the process. (This may be the place for the Dean's report)

- Deans report Goals: Deans have information to work across programs, Deans use information in bargaining for resources for programs, Deans share progress on projects on behalf of programs with programs
- 3. <u>Draft Template completed updates.</u> Major updates: Clarified at top that this is an external document and who the audience is. Allow self-study report to be submitted in lieu of this report. Removed DFWI to chair's internal report. Keep section 5 as a snapshot in time of assessment processes. Keep Grad, Retention, Post-grad success reporting. Remove external comparator requirement for learning outcomes performance. Added full curriculum map example to section 3. Replaced ISLO for coming year in examples. Added verbiage clarifying that not just majors need to be assessed in program report but that all participants in major offered courses should be assessed (this is reflected in individual peer review feedback) Left in executive Summary even though it is redundant to chairs report because it could be cut and pasted from this report into department-wide report for chairs.
  - a. Discussion of whether the report should indicate where student data listed in the report is kept. Some programs must maintain evidence of student work used for 5 years etc. Decided that program directors should be discussing this with faculty but not necessary to report.
  - b. Task: Look at Template changes. Will be approved at next meeting for general use.

## New business:

- 1. Ad-Hoc Accreditation site visit 4/24/25. Assessment meeting is at 9am on Klamath Falls Campus. Site inspectors will be looking at evidence of improvements from their 2023 visit and asking about the ad-hoc report submitted this year.
  - a. Additional resource for you to consider especially regarding our participation in accreditation are the 2020 NWCCU standards.