GEOMATICS DEPARTMENT
SURVEY OPTION
Oregon Institute of Technology
NWCCU Assessment Report
2023-2024 Academic Year

Table of Contents

1 Program Introduction 2
1.1 Program History 2
1.2 Enrollment Trends (Geomatics - Surveying Option Students) 2
1.3 Recent Number of Graduates 2
1.4 Employment Rates and Salaries 2
2 Program summary. 3
2.1 Geomatics Department Mission, Objectives, and Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) 3
2.1.1 Department Mission 3
2.1.2 Program Educational Objectives 3
2.1.3 Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLO) 3
2.2 Survey Option Student Learning Opportunities 4
3 Summary of Six-Year Assessment Cycle 4
4 Summary of Current Academic Year Assessment Activities 5
4.1 Summaries of individual assessment activities 5
4.1.1 PSLO (1) An ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly-defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline. 5
4.1.2 PSLO (5) An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts. 7
4.1.3 PSLO (6): An ability to function effectively on teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty. 9
5 Evidence of Student Learning 11
6 "Closing the Loop" – Changes Resulting from Assessment 12
6.1 Summary of the Findings 12
6.2 Evaluation of the Success of the Program 12
6.3 Areas for Improvement 12
6.4 Action Plan for Improvement 12
6.5 Closing Statement 13
7 Appendices 13
7.1 Appendix A: Geomatics Department Industrial Advisory Board (IAB) Meeting Minutes– June 5, 2024 13

1 Program Introduction

1.1 Program History

Geomatics education has been offered virtually since the inception of the Oregon Institute of Technology, with an associate degree in Surveying initiated in 1951. The program was accredited by the Engineer's Council on Professional Development (ECPD) in 1953. ECPD is now recognized as ABET. A baccalaureate Surveying Technology degree was offered in 1966 and accredited by TAC-ABET in 1970. The program was one of the first two Bachelor of Science surveying programs nationwide to receive RAC-ABET accreditation in 1984. The geomatics program has enjoyed 71 years of continuous accreditation under ABET or its predecessor, ECPD. Oregon Tech can be proud of having the oldest BS Geomatics program in the nation. The degree title of the program was officially changed from Surveying to Geomatics in 2001, reflecting a global trend recognizing the broadening of the profession and the impact of a revolution in advanced technology. Since 2007, the department has offered the BS Surveying option (former BS Geomatics degree) and the BS GIS option on the Klamath Falls campus.

1.2 Enrollment Trends (Geomatics - Surveying Option Students)

Table 1-1 Geomatics department enrollment trends

Fall Terms	Year (2019-20)	Year (2020-21)	Year (2021-22)	Year (2022-23)	Year (2023-24)
Full-time Students	38	21	29	35	35
Surveying Minors Awarded	0	1	1	3	2

Reported values represent enrollment during the fourth week of the fall quarter as recorded by Oregon Tech Institutional Research.

1.3 Recent Number of Graduates

Table 1.2 shows the number of geomatics degrees (Survey Option) awarded over the last five years.

Table 1-2 Geomatics - Survey Option degrees awarded

Fall Terms	Year (2019-20)	Year (2020-21)	Year (2021-22)	Year (2022-23)	Year (2023-24)
The number of degrees awarded	13	9	2	6	9

Reported values represent graduations as recorded by Oregon Tech Institutional Research for the Geomatics-Survey Option.

1.4 Employment Rates and Salaries

Graduates in 2018 reported an initial starting salary range of $42,000 to $64,000. 67% of students indicated they would receive a signing bonus, and 33% indicated they would receive other guaranteed compensation. However, it did not indicate the value of these bonuses.

2 Program summary.

2.1 Geomatics Department Mission, Objectives, and Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

On June 5, 2024, the Geomatics Department faculty met and reviewed the department mission, program educational objectives (PEOs) and Program Student Learning Objectives (PSLOs) listed below. Faculty affirmed that the department mission, PEOs, and PSLOs still meet the goals of the program.

2.1.1 Department Mission

The mission of the Geomatics Department is to provide students with fundamental knowledge and skills in the geomatics discipline. The Surveying Option prepares students to pass the Fundamentals of Surveying (FS) examination and pursue licensure as a registered Professional Land Surveyor (PLS). The GIS Option prepares students to become certified GIS Professionals. All students learn the professional responsibility of protecting the health, safety and welfare of the public, and become aware of global and cultural issues.

2.1.2 Program Educational Objectives

Program educational objectives are statements that describe the expected accomplishments of graduates during the first few years after graduation, usually 3-5 years. These objectives are consistent with the mission of the program and the institution**.**

Graduates of the Oregon Tech Geomatics Options will:

1. Acquire the ability to obtain professional licensure and/or certifications in the geospatial industry.
2. Advance in the geospatial industry during their career by becoming involved in local, state, national, or international professional organizations.
3. Obtain industry positions requiring increased responsibility.
4. Assume responsibility for lifelong learning in professional and personal development.
5. Demonstrate readiness for graduate education and/or advanced technical education.

2.1.3 Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLO)

(1) An ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.
(2) An ability to formulate or design a system, process, procedure or program to meet desired needs.
(3) An ability to develop and conduct experiments or test hypotheses, analyze and interpret data and use scientific judgment to draw conclusions.
(4) An ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences.
(5) An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.
(6) An ability to function effectively on teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty.

Note: The expected learning outcomes for the survey option are based on ABET/ASAC accreditation criteria.

2.2 Survey Option Student Learning Opportunities

Geomatics student professional learning opportunities include:

1. Geomatics Student Club community service activities. Each year, students in the Geomatics Club are encouraged to take on survey/GIS-related projects that benefit the community. These projects provide the students with exposure to real-world projects, negotiations, and fulfillment of a specific scope of work, as well as the opportunity to work with other disciplines.
2. The National Society of Professional Surveyors (NSPS) National Geomatics Student Competition. If a critical mass of students are committed to participating, a fundraising drive is initiated to supplement funding provided by the department and professional organizations. In 2020, two Geomatics students won the NSPS Student Project of the Year, which involved a surveying/GIS application.
3. Professional Land Surveyors of Oregon (PLSO) annual conference. Students volunteer as runners to assist with conference details, attend technical paper presentations, and staff an Oregon Tech Geomatics department booth.
4. GME 468 Geomatics Practicum. Students are responsible for completing several community service projects for city, county, state, and federal agencies.
5. Industry speakers are invited to present at the PLSO Student Chapter meetings.
6. Students are encouraged to participate in professional organizations, such as becoming a student member of PLSO.

3 Summary of Six-Year Assessment Cycle

Table 3.1 shows the six-year PSLO/ISLO assessment cycle for the geomatics survey option. Table 3.1 indicates the PSLO/ISLO, the academic year, and the course where the learning outcome will be assessed. (ISLO: Oregon Tech's Institutional Student Learning Outcomes).

Table 3-1 Six-Year Assessment Cycle

PSLO	ISLO	AY 18/19	AY 19/20	AY 20/21	AY 21/22	AY 22/23	AY 23/24
(1) An ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.	6	GME175 GIS306			GME175 GIS306		GME175
(2) An ability to formulate or design a system, process, procedure or program to meet desired needs.	4	GIS306 GME468			GIS306 GME468		
(3) An ability to develop and conduct experiments or test hypotheses, analyze and interpret data and use scientific judgment to draw conclusions.	2		GME241 GIS316			GME241 GIS316	
(4) An ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences.	1		GME161 GME468			GME205 GME468	
(5) An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global,	3			GME162 GME454/455			GME162 GME454/455

economic, environmental, and societal contexts.							
(6) An ability to function effectively on teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty.	5			GIS205 GME468			GIS205 GME466
Additional PSLO Assessments							
Review FS Exam Results		X	X	X	X	X	X
Review IAB comments		X	X	X	X	X	X
Alumni Survey			X			X	
Employer Survey				X			X

NOTE: The IAB met on June 5, 2024, from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. via Zoom. The IAB meeting minutes are available in Appendix A.

4 Summary of Current Academic Year Assessment Activities

Table 4.1 summarizes the Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) assessed during the 2023/2024 academic year. The matrix also indicates what course the outcome will be assessed in, the quarter of assessment, the instructor who will perform the assessment, and the method that will be utilized.

Table 4-1 – PSLOs evaluated during the 2023/2024 assessment cycle.

PSLO	Course	Faculty	Term	Method
(1) An ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.	GME175	Puzey	Spring 2024	Homework 3&4
(5) An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.	GME 162	Stevenson	Spring 2024	Final Exam
	GME 454	Walker	Winter 2024	Midterm-Exam
(6) An ability to function effectively in teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty.	GIS 205	Lee	Spring 2024	Final Projects Presentation
	GME 466	Mollett	Winter 2024	Term Paper

4.1 Summaries of individual assessment activities

4.1.1 PSLO (1) An ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly-defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.

Performance Criteria:

GME 175 must demonstrate the ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.

Students are rated based on the following scores:

1) Below 50% of the score
2) Above 50% of the score
3) Above 60% of the score
4) Above 70% of the score
5) Above 80% of the score

4.1.1.1 GME 175

Table 4-2 Rubric For
PSLO 1 "An ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline."
GME 175 – Introduction to Statistics for Surveying

Performance Criteria	**Below 50% of the score (1)**	**Above 50% of the score (2)**	**Above 60% of the score (3)**	**Above 70% of the score (4)**	**Above 80% of the score (5)**
An ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.	Little or no ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.	Some but limited ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.	Some limitations on the ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.	Ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.	Excellent ability to identify, formulate, and solve broadly defined technical or scientific problems by applying knowledge of mathematics and science and/or technical topics to areas relevant to the discipline.

Departmentally Expected Score:

For PSLO (1), the Geomatics Department expects 70% of students to score a 4 or 5 in all categories.

Table 4-3 GME 175: Assessment results

Performance Criteria	**Assessment Method**	**Measurement Scale**	**Minimum Acceptable Performance**	**Results**
Homework 3&4 Questions:	Score	1 to 5 scale	70%	77.8%

Table 4-4 GME 175: The number of students assessed.

Performance Criteria/	Below 50% of the score (1)	Above 50% of the score (2)	Above 60% of the score (3)	Above 70% of the score (4)	Above 80% of the score (5)	Total

Homework 3	1	0	1	0	7	9

Actions to be taken.

The evaluation of Homework 3 for the course GME 175 revealed that the overall performance falls below the departmentally expected standard of 70%. In the 2021-2022 assessment cycle, only 63% of students scored a 4 or higher. The results suggested a potential gap in either the teaching approach or the difficulty and alignment of the homework assignment with the intended learning outcomes. The performance issues identified needed to be addressed promptly to ensure that students could meet and exceed the expected criteria for problem-solving skills in statistical applications for surveying.

The evaluation of Homework 3&4 for GME 175 in the 2023-2024 assessment cycle demonstrates a notable improvement, with 77.8% of students scoring a 4 or 5, exceeding the department's minimum requirement of 70%. This marks a significant advancement compared to the 63% in 2021-2022. The data suggests that recent adjustments or teaching strategies may have positively impacted student performance, indicating progress toward meeting learning objectives.

4.1.2 PSLO (5) An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.

Performance Criteria:

GME 162 and GME 466 students must demonstrate the ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.

Students are rated based on the following scores:

6) Below 50% of the score
7) Above 50% of the score
8) Above 60% of the score
9) Above 70% of the score
10) Above 80% of the score

4.1.2.1 GME 162

Table 4-5 Rubric For

PSLO 5" An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts." GME 162 - Plane Surveying II

Performance Criteria	**Below 50% of the score (1)**	**Above 50% of the score (2)**	**Above 60% of the score (3)**	**Above 70% of the score (4)**	**Above 80% of the score (5)**
An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.	Little or no ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Some, but limited ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Some limitations on the ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Excellent ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions

Departmentally Expected Score:

For PSLO (5), the Geomatics Department expects 70% of students to score a 4 or 5 in all categories.

Table 4-6 GME 162: Assessment results

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable Performance	Results
Final exam Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7	Score	1 to 5 scale	70%	92.3%

Table 4-7 GME 162: The number of students assessed.

Performance Criteria	Below 50% of the score (1)	Above 50% of the score (2)	Above 60% of the score (3)	Above 70% of the score (4)	Above 80% of the score (5)	Total
Final exam Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7	1	0	0	5	7	13

Actions to be taken.

Twelve students exceeded the departmentally established minimum of 70%, except for one who didn't take the final exam. Therefore, no major actions will be taken for PSLO (5) at this time.

4.1.2.2 GME 454

Table 4-8 Rubric For
PSLO 5 An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts." GME 454-GNSS Surveying

Performance Criteria	Below 50% of the score (1)	Above 50% of the score (2)	Above 60% of the score (3)	Above 70% of the score (4)	Above 80% of the score (5)
An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.	Little or no ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Some, but limited ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Some limitations on the ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Excellent ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions

Departmentally Expected Score:

For PSLO (5), the Geomatics Department expects 70% of students to score a 4 or 5 in all categories.

Table 4-9 GME 454: Assessment results

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable Performance	Results
Midterm-Exam Questions 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 21, 32, 36, 37, 49, & 50	Score	1 to 5 scale	70%	86%

Table 4-10 GME 454: The number of students assessed.

Performance Criteria	Below 50% of the score (1)	Above 50% of the score (2)	Above 60% of the score (3)	Above 70% of the score (4)	Above 80% of the score (5)	Total
Midterm-Exam Questions 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 21, 32, 36, 37, 49, & 50	1	0	0	1	5	7

Actions to be taken:

Six students exceeded the departmentally established minimum of 70%. However, one did not submit this midterm exam and failed this course. Therefore, no major actions will be taken for PSLO (5) at this time.

4.1.3 PSLO (6): An ability to function effectively on teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty.

Performance Criteria:

GIS 205 and GME 454/455 students must demonstrate the ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.

Students are rated based on the following scores:

11) Poor work or no contribution at all: below 50% of the score
12) Above 50% of the score
13) Above 60% of the score
14) Above 70% of the score
15) Above 80% of the score

4.1.3.1 GIS 205

Table 4-11Rubric For
PLSO (6): An ability to function effectively in teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty. GIS 205 - Mobile and Web GIS

Performance Criteria	Below 50% of the score (1)	Above 50% of the score (2)	Above 60% of the score (3)	Above 70% of the score (4)	Above 80% of the score (5)

An ability to function effectively on teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty.	Little or no ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Some, but limited ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Some limitations on the ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Excellent ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions

Departmentally Expected Score:

For PSLO (6), the Geomatics Department expects 70% of students to score a 4 or 5 in all categories.

Table 4-12 GIS 205: Assessment results

Performance Criteria	**Assessment Method**	**Measurement Scale**	**Minimum Acceptable Performance**	**Results**
Final Project Presentation Rubric	Score	1 to 5 scale	70%	79%

Table 4-13 GIS 205: The number of students assessed.

Performance Criteria /	**Below 50% of the score (1)**	**Above 50% of the score (2)**	**Above 60% of the score (3)**	**Above 70% of the score (4)**	**Above 80% of the score (5)**	**Total**
Final Project Presentation Rubric	3	0	2	3	16	24

Actions to be taken:

19 students exceeded the departmentally established minimum of 70%. However, three students did not submit and present the final project. Therefore, no major actions will be taken for PSLO (6) at this time.

4.1.3.2 GME 466

Table 4-14 Rubric For
PLSO (6): An ability to function effectively in teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty. GME 466 - Legal Aspects of Surveying II

Performance Criteria	**Below 50% of the score (1)**	**Above 50% of the score (2)**	**Above 60% of the score (3)**	**Above 70% of the score (4)**	**Above 80% of the score (5)**

An ability to function effectively on teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty.	Little or no ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Some, but limited ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Some limitations on the ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions	Excellent ability to understand the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions

Departmentally Expected Score:

For PSLO (6), the Geomatics Department expects 70% of students to score a 4 or 5 in all categories.

Table 4-15 GME 466: Assessment results

Performance Criteria	**Assessment Method**	**Measurement Scale**	**Minimum Acceptable Performance**	**Results**
Term Paper Rubric	Score	1 to 5 scale	70%	88%

Table 4-16 GME 466: The number of students assessed.

Performance Criteria / Number of Students Assessed	**Below 50% of the score (1)**	**Above 50% of the score (2)**	**Above 60% of the score (3)**	**Above 70% of the score (4)**	**Above 80% of the score (5)**	**Total**
Term Paper Rubric	1	0	0	0	7	8

Actions to be taken:

The scores in all categories exceeded the departmentally established minimum of 70% for PLSO (6) at this time.

5 Evidence of Student Learning

For PSLO 5, students in GME 162 were assessed based on their ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions. The assessment was conducted through a final exam, with students rated on a scale from 1 to 5. The department expected 70% of students to score a 4 or 5. The results showed that 92.3% of students met the minimum acceptable performance, and no major actions were needed as most students exceeded expectations.

In GME 454, students were evaluated on the same PSLO using a midterm exam. The expected performance was that 70% of students would score 4 or 5, and the results showed 86% of students met this requirement.

For PSLO 6, GIS 205 assessed students' ability to work in teams, with the final project presentation as the evaluation method. The results showed that 79% of students met the performance threshold, with 19 exceeding the department's expectations.

In GME 466, students were assessed through a term paper. The expected performance was 70% of students scoring 4 or 5, and the results showed 88% of students met or exceeded the standard.

These assessments demonstrate that students consistently performed above the required thresholds for both PSLO 5 and PSLO 6, indicating strong ethical awareness and teamwork skills.

6 "Closing the Loop" – Changes Resulting from Assessment

6.1 Summary of the Findings

Summary of the key takeaways from the assessment:

- PSLO 1: The evaluation of Homework 3&4 for GME 175 in the 2023-2024 assessment cycle demonstrates a notable improvement, with 77.8% of students scoring a 4 or 5, exceeding the department's minimum requirement of 70%.

- PSLO 5: The majority of students in GME 162 and GME 454 demonstrated a strong understanding of ethical and professional responsibilities, with more than 85% of students exceeding the minimum required performance.

- PSLO 6: In GIS 205 and GME 466, students performed well in team-based tasks and project management, with most students exceeding the expectations for teamwork and risk analysis.

6.2 Evaluation of the Success of the Program

Determine if the program is meeting its objectives. Based on the high performance of students in both PSLO 5 and 6, the program effectively teaches ethical responsibility and teamwork skills.

The data indicates that the majority of students meet or exceed the program's expectations for ethical and professional responsibilities, as well as teamwork. This suggests that the current curriculum is successful in developing these competencies.

6.3 Areas for Improvement

- In GME 162, one student did not complete the final exam, affecting their performance in PSLO 5. While this is a small issue, addressing reasons for incomplete submissions could be helpful.

- In GIS 205, three students did not submit or present their final projects, which impacted their performance in PSLO 6. Investigating why this occurred and providing additional support or flexibility might help ensure full participation.

6.4 Action Plan for Improvement

- Although the results have improved, further enhancements could include offering more detailed feedback on Homework 3&4 in GME 175 to help students understand their mistakes and areas of weakness.

- Continue providing supplementary materials like tutorial videos or practice quizzes that align closely with Homework 3&4 in GME 175 concepts, ensuring sustained performance.

- Improve Engagement and Completion Rates: To address the issue of incomplete submissions in GME 162 and GIS 205, we will introduce earlier checkpoints for students to submit drafts or progress reports. This will allow instructors to intervene early if students are falling behind and offer additional support.

- Enhance Ethical Decision-Making in Real-World Contexts: To further strengthen students' understanding of ethical and professional responsibilities, we will integrate more real-world case studies in GME 162 and GME 454, focusing on the global impact of technical solutions.

- To enhance PSLO 5 and 6 performance, we will reassess student progress in these outcomes in three years, focusing on the impact of early interventions and additional support mechanisms on student performance and completion rates.

6.5 Closing Statement

In conclusion, this assessment shows that students are performing well in the areas of ethical responsibility and teamwork. However, we can ensure even greater success by addressing minor areas of concern, such as incomplete submissions. We are committed to implementing the necessary adjustments to further enhance student learning and will reassess these outcomes to measure the effectiveness of our actions."

7 Appendices

7.1 Appendix A: Geomatics Department Industrial Advisory Board (IAB) Meeting Minutes– June 5, 2024

Location

Online: via Zoom

Members Present

- Jack Walker - Department Chair
- Su Jin Lee - Faculty
- Bob Neathamer - PLSO – Industry
- Robert Keene - PLSO – Industry
- Rhonda Dodge - ODOT
- Robert Femling - BLM
- Ryan Richardson - Esri
- Janet Wilkins - USFS

Meeting Start: 03:00 PM, June 5, 2024

Agenda

- Welcome & Introductions
- Original IAC
    - Jack explained the originality of IAC.
- Restructure IAB
    - Jack explained that the current IAC is formed with younger early to mid-career professionals.
- University Restructuring

    - Jack explained how Oregon Tech has been restructured since Dr. Nagi Naganathan joined Oregon Tech as the president.
- Faculty Condition Changes
    - Jack explained the tenure-track faculty condition, which requires a Ph.D. and salary increase based upon annual performance evaluation.
- Moving Forward
    - Jack announced his retirement.
- Department Update
    - Jack mentioned the initiative of the Department of Geomatics and Applied Computing.
    - Jack explained that Geomatics served other programs as a service department.
    - Jack mentioned online GIS and Surveying degrees and current enrollment.
    - Jack introduced funding that we have received from the NCEES Surveying Program Education Awards since 2016.
    - Jack introduced University Giving Day, Equipment funding, and software.

- Surveying Program Update
    - Jack talked about ABET visits and Program Educational Objectives (PEDs). The board members agreed with the current PEDs.
- IAB Comments and Suggestions
    - IAB members discussed how they can support the geomatics program. They agree to support the geomatics program in various ways.
- Adjourn
- **The meeting ends 04:30 PM, June 5, 2024.**