



Oregon Institute of Technology

Mid-Cycle Self-Evaluation Report



**Prepared for the
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)**

Submitted March 12, 2019

Contents

Part I: Overview of Institutional Assessment Plan	1
Defining Mission Fulfillment	1
Assessing Mission Fulfillment	2
Roles and Responsibilities in the Assessment Cycle	3
Validity of Core Themes and Objectives	4
Sufficiency of Evidence to Assess Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability	4
Part II: Examples of Learning Outcomes Assessment	7
Applied Math program: Creation of a Mathematical Structures Course	7
Background: Program Assessment Structures	7
From Mission to Measures: Applied Mathematics Outcomes and their Origins	8
Making Indicators Meaningful: Repeated Assessment of Applied Mathematics PSLO #6	8
Closing the Loop: Curriculum Revision and a New Course	9
Communication ESLO: Launch of new structures for institutional outcomes assessment	10
Background: Revision of Institutional Outcomes	10
From Mission to Measures: Development of the Communication ESLO and Rubric	10
Making Indicators Meaningful: Faculty Discussion on Data	11
Closing The Loop: Improving both Processes and Courses	12
Part III: Next Steps for Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness	13
Next Steps for Institutional Effectiveness Assessment	13
Responsibility and Leadership	13
Execute Plan and Engage Stakeholders	14
Revision of Core Theme Indicators	14
Integration into Institution-Level Decision-Making Processes	15
Integration into Lower-Level Decision-Making Processes	15
Next Steps for Other Assessment Processes	16
Further Improvements in Learning Outcomes Assessment	16
Further Improvements in Unit/Program-Level Assessment	17
Conclusion	17
Appendix A: Core Themes Assessment Plan	18
Appendix B: Core Theme Indicators Reflection Template	25

Part I: Overview of Institutional Assessment Plan

Oregon Tech aspires to be a university where key decisions at every level, from resource allocation to program development to curriculum changes, are informed by data that reflects institutional priorities and values. Although university leadership emphasizes this ethos for decision-making, it is more challenging to consistently implement the processes required to realize this goal. Oregon Tech therefore concurs with the critiques delivered by NWCCU in its Year Seven Peer Evaluation in Spring 2016, that improvement is needed in processes that “utilize planning and assessment effectively to guide [...] decision-making [and] resource allocation,” “engage in a regular, systematic, participatory, self-reflective, and evidence-based assessment of [our] accomplishments,” and “regularly review [our] assessment processes to ensure they [...] yield meaningful results that lead to improvement.”

In response to these recommendations, Oregon Tech’s Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) engaged with university leadership, faculty, and staff to launch a new Core Themes Assessment Plan (Appendix A). Although Oregon Tech has been conducting institutional assessment in broad accordance with the spirit of NWCCU guidelines for some time, the absence of a university-level structure to guide this work has limited its effectiveness and impact.

Additionally, with new leadership at the helm, including a new President (April 2017), Provost (July 2017), and Vice President for Finance & Administration (June 2016), significant work is underway to improve Oregon Tech’s processes at all levels, and to incorporate formal structures that emphasize data-driven decision-making into university operations. Although work remains to be done to fully integrate all of these processes, as Oregon Tech develops in this direction, we will be able to fully link assessment findings and key performance measures to institutional planning and resource allocation.

Defining Mission Fulfillment

Any assessment process begins with agreement on core values—those things worth routinely measuring and allocating resources to. Oregon Tech’s Mission Statement and Core Themes reflect the university’s core values and the way that the university meets its commitments to its students and the state.

As the Northwest’s only public polytechnic university, Oregon Tech’s mission is uniquely focused on providing students with a hands-on, applied education that prepares them to excel in their chosen career. This mission is achieved through the delivery of high-quality programs and is embodied in all of the University’s major functional units: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Strategic Enrollment Management, and Finance & Administration. As described by President Naganathan, Oregon Tech aspires to be “industry’s university,” producing career-ready professionals by emphasizing hands-on, workforce-responsive undergraduate and graduate education and applied research activity.

With this goal in mind, Oregon Tech has formally defined mission fulfillment as evidence of, or identified improvements in support of, all of the identified institutional indicators that instantiate Oregon Tech’s Core Themes:

- **Applied Degree Programs**
- **Student and Graduate Success**
- **Statewide Educational Opportunities**
- **Public Service**

Assessing Mission Fulfillment

To be part of a meaningful assessment and decision-making process, agreed-upon broad themes and values must be translated into a form that can be measured and examined regularly. From the four broad Core Themes listed above, the Core Themes Assessment Plan specifies these in the form of objectives, outcomes, and quantifiable indicators. Benchmarks for each indicator specify target levels of achievement. Oregon Tech's current set of objectives, outcomes, indicators, and benchmarks are formally articulated in Oregon Tech's 2017 Year One Self-Evaluation, which were revised from those used in Oregon Tech's 2016 Year Seven Comprehensive Self-Evaluation.

In the past, examination of key indicators has taken place most extensively in preparation for NWCCU accreditation visits. However, since the submission of Oregon Tech's 2017 Year One Self-Evaluation, Oregon Tech's Accreditation Steering Committee has put a Core Themes Assessment Plan (Appendix A) into place to systematically ensure examination of, and response to, key indicators, and formal reflection on their usefulness to the university in the context of Core Themes and mission fulfillment.

The structure for examining Core Theme indicators explicitly parallels the structure of Oregon Tech's student learning outcomes assessment framework. This structure includes six (6) steps:

- **Define/Design** measurable indicators and benchmarks that reflect Core Theme objectives and outcomes.
- **Collect** meaningful data that reflects performance on these indicators.
- **Analyze** this data within the context of core theme achievement and mission fulfillment.
- **Engage** stakeholders to inform planning and drive action.
- **Evaluate** improvement activities and their impact on these indicators.
- **Reflect** on both the process and the results within the context of core theme achievement and mission fulfillment.

This Core Themes Assessment Plan ensures that data are systematically analyzed, that they are communicated by the appropriate stakeholders to the university community, and that the data are used to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources within and across functional units.

In the first year of the Core Themes Assessment Plan implementation (2018-2019), the ALO and designees are leading the ASC through an initial review of Oregon Tech's core theme indicators. The results of this review will be presented by to the Board of Trustees in Summer 2019.

As data are collected in accordance with the Core Themes Assessment Plan (Appendix A), Oregon Tech hopes to be better able to evaluate accomplishments, identify areas for improvement, and allocate resources to address critical needs. As areas of below-threshold performance are identified, the university will prioritize these for intervention; areas of consistent above-threshold performance should provoke opportunity to gradually increase standards in support of long-term continuous improvement.

Within this plan, there exists the opportunity for critique, reassessment, and improvement on the measures themselves, as well as on assessment processes. This reflection will help to ensure that the plan generates data that reflect are meaningful, verifiable, and actionable indicators of core theme achievement and mission fulfillment.

Although not launched until late 2018, the goal is for the Core Themes Assessment Plan to become the primary tool by which university leadership communicates mission fulfillment. This plan will inform the development of division- and program-level plans university-wide. Finally, we intend for both the indicators and the plan through which they are examined to evolve with time to provide a framework for broad engagement with Oregon Tech’s strategic planning process. This will ensure long-term continuity for our strategic planning efforts.

Roles and Responsibilities in the Assessment Cycle

Led by Oregon Tech’s Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Oregon Tech’s Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) oversees the execution of the Core Themes Assessment Plan. This group drives execution of the Core Themes Assessment Plan in concert with a number of other groups. Each group’s role is described in greater detail within Appendix A, but is summarized in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Schematic Representation of Information and Decision Flows in Oregon Tech’s Core Themes Assessment Plan.

Validity of Core Themes and Objectives

Oregon Tech's current set of Core Themes were approved by the State Board of Higher Education in 2011, and were explicitly reaffirmed and adopted by the newly-formed Oregon Tech Board of Trustees on July 9, 2015, in accordance with Oregon Revised Statute 352.089(2). Oregon Tech serves the higher education needs of students from Oregon and the region through the delivery of degree programs that support statewide workforce needs. Our Core Themes—applied degree programs, student and graduate success, statewide educational opportunities, and public service—remain meaningful and relevant given this commitment.

Oregon Tech's Core Themes are also validated through implementation in the form of meaningful indicators. The discussions that are scaffolded by the Core Themes Assessment Plan ensure that many eyes examine the data and responses and that stakeholders are invited to the table during the improvement process. These discussions improve validity and reliability of the measures; examples of the lessons being learned from this process of data collection and discussion are outlined below. As noted in Part III, Oregon Tech looks forward to the opportunity to thoroughly reevaluate our indicators, objectives, and the Core Themes that underlie them both in the context of a new strategic planning process and in light of the emphasis on student achievement within the new NWCCU draft standards.

Sufficiency of Evidence to Assess Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability

With the implementation of our new Core Themes Assessment Plan, Oregon Tech will possess a systematic and ongoing mechanism to evaluate whether the data we have collected are sufficient to assess mission fulfillment and sustainability. As part of this process, the ASC solicits feedback from the Core Theme Administrative Champions (each of whom has responsibility for one of Oregon Tech's four core themes) on indicators using a formally defined template (Appendix B).

This template asks for data, a description of the data's origin, and the replicable processes for obtaining the data. It then asks for description of, and reflection on, the processes by which the data is shared and how it prompts improvement activities (when needed). This process is intended to gather feedback about the effectiveness of the institutional assessment process while also evaluating Oregon Tech achievements in the context of mission fulfillment.

As the Core Themes Assessment Plan is being implemented for the first time during the 2018–2019 academic year, the ASC has found that many of the submissions provided by Action Owners (those delegated to complete these submissions) contain center on reflection on the quality of the indicators as written; initial action items often include clarification or improvement of indicators. In cases where indicators are already well-defined and obtainable, discussion has centered around identification and justification of appropriate performance benchmarks, or improvement activities for indicators that fall below the target benchmarks. The Core Themes Assessment Plan, even in its early implementation, has already begun to impact communication and decision-making processes surrounding key indicators.

Examples of action items identified via this process are described in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Action items identified during 2018–2019 Core Themes Assessment Plan implementation

Indicator and Benchmark Prompting Improvement (and Action Owner)	Actions Planned	Goals
<p>Indicator: Library services support hands-on, real-world learning. Better defined measure to yield meaningful results that reflect performance; Analyze data with emphasis on patterns, trends, and insights.</p> <p>(Action Owner: Library Director)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify specific ACRL metrics most relevant to the core theme indicator. • Revise library process for collecting and reporting data to ACRL. Document changes. • Engage library staff in analysis of data. • Report and document results of analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrics better reflect hands-on, real-world learning, support library’s goal to optimize faculty/student satisfaction. • Built-in redundancies ensure broader integration of stakeholders. • Meaningful plans for action are developed and implemented internally within library.
<p>Benchmark: 90% of program assessment reports indicate improvement based on actions implemented. Performance falls below benchmark; Review benchmark for relevance and attainability; Stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>(Action Owner: Director, Office of Academic Excellence)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to expand program assessment guides and professional development for program assessment coordinators. • Review benchmark with Assessment Executive Committee. Consider revising benchmark to measure whether programs are documenting and implementing changes rather than proving improvement based on re-assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved performance relative to benchmark. • A realistic, attainable benchmark is identified that is meaningful and reflects performance. • Assessment Executive Committee and Assessment Coordinators are better aligned with respect to the goals of program assessment processes.
<p>Benchmark: 98% of students have found employment, pursue further education, or are not seeking. Benchmark rationale is unclear; Revisit benchmark for relevance and actionability; Stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>(Action Owner: Director of Career Services)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More broadly disseminate data across the university, including to all faculty. • Engage with senior leadership to identify appropriate university targets. • Consider developing program-specific targets based on national or regional disciplinary benchmarks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment data are relevant to all stakeholders from senior leadership to program faculty. • Targets are identified and meaningfully integrated at the program-level.

<p>Benchmark: Student and Enrollment Services FTE maintained at CAS-specified levels. CAS data has changed, no longer supports outcome; Revise measure and benchmark with focus on quality of interactions.</p> <p>(Action Owner: Vice President for Student Affairs)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operationalize “satisfaction” and “quality of interactions” with respect to supporting students’ academic and personal development. Define/Design measurable indicators and benchmarks that are meaningful to Student and Enrollment Services staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasis shifts from number of staff to quality of interactions. Meaningful improvement plans are implemented and supported by leadership.
<p>Benchmark: 75% of transfer students are retained fall-to-fall. 80% of new freshman are retained fall-to-fall. Better collection, understanding, and dissemination of qualitative data regarding stop-outs; Improve follow-through on action plans.</p> <p>(Action Owner: Associate Vice President for Strategic Enrollment Management)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design processes to systematically collect and disseminate qualitative data. Integrate quantitative data with qualitative data to broaden understanding of transfer and first-year student populations. Use communication touchpoints to monitor and support completion of, and reflection on, improvement actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transfer and first-year student populations are better understood. Improvement actions are integrated into the ongoing cycle of data analysis within the Strategic Enrollment Management unit and are used to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources and capacity.

This regular, systematic review of processes and outcomes, objectives, and indicators, ensures that the evidence the university is collecting to assess mission fulfillment and sustainability is relevant and actionable. Next steps include identification of concrete annual deadlines for revisiting each indicator as each is reviewed, with these deadlines timed to align with annual availability of new data. Future work to evolve these nascent processes into formal dashboards and reports is outlined in Part III of this report.

Part II: Examples of Learning Outcomes Assessment

In contrast with Core Themes assessment, described in the section above, Oregon Tech’s engagement with learning outcomes assessment has been broader and more systematic. Early institutional efforts in outcomes assessment began around 2000 and were more thoroughly and formally systematized around 2007. Currently, learning outcomes assessment at Oregon Tech is conducted at two levels:

- academic program level, through assessment of program student learning outcomes (PSLOs)
- institutional level, through assessment of institution-wide essential student learning outcomes (ESLOs) common to all bachelor’s degrees.

Since that time, Oregon Tech’s processes and culture surrounding learning outcomes have continued to evolve, including refinements implemented since the 2016 NWCCU Peer Evaluation.

In this section, we describe both the context of our programmatic and institution-level learning outcomes assessment processes and provide examples of each of these processes in action, drawn from recent activity at Oregon Tech—for the academic program level, assessment of one programmatic outcome within the Applied Mathematics major; for the institutional learning outcome level, assessment of the Communication outcome.

For each process, we detail how learning outcomes ultimately derive from institutional mission (“From mission to measures”), how we have developed measures for each that are meaningful, actionable, and broadly shared (“Making measures meaningful”), and how each process has resulted in action, both within courses and curriculum and within the assessment process itself (“Closing the loop”).

Applied Math program: Creation of a Mathematical Structures Course

Background: Program Assessment Structures

Every degree program at Oregon Tech identifies a set of learning outcomes (typically three to eight), and assesses those outcomes within that program on a cycle defined by the program faculty (typically three years, but ranging from one to four years). This program assessment cycle includes collection of direct evidence stemming from faculty analysis of student work, and indirect evidence, most often through the Student Exit Survey administered to all graduates during their final term. These both inform a program’s determinations on whether and what improvement activities are called for.

Under the guidance of the department chair and program director, program-level assessment work is led and documented by a program assessment coordinator. Each year, academic programs document this work in a program assessment report, which outlines how the program outcomes stem from program and institutional mission, the programs’ cycle for outcomes assessment, the approach taken for collecting data on that year’s outcomes (including summary statistics), and programs’ action plans in response to that data. Where possible and appropriate, this extends to reassessment of outcomes where improvement activity has taken place. Program assessment reports are archived on Oregon Tech’s assessment website.

An example of how this process supports program improvements within a particular major (Applied Mathematics) is provided below.

From Mission to Measures: Applied Mathematics Outcomes and their Origins

Oregon Tech's B.S. in Applied Mathematics was launched in 2006 and currently enrolls approximately 40 majors. Common pathways for graduates from this program include both direct employment in technical fields and as secondary educators, as well as pursuit of graduate work in mathematics.

Oregon Tech's mission to provide industry-relevant programs with workforce-ready graduates is realized, in many cases, with the support of industry advisory boards. These boards advocate externally for a program and advise program faculty on relevant outcomes and emerging market trends. The Applied Mathematics program's industry advisory board, convened at the program's inception, emphasized the importance of courses with strong theoretical grounding (such as Real Analysis) in order to ensure that students were prepared for graduate coursework. This motivated Applied Mathematics PSLO #6, which states that students will demonstrate the ability to "perform abstract mathematical reasoning." Although this outcome may superficially be less relevant for immediate employment post-graduation, the mathematics faculty embrace this outcome as supporting the more broadly transferrable skills of precise critical and analytical thinking and precise mathematical communication.

Making Indicators Meaningful: Repeated Assessment of Applied Mathematics PSLO #6

Applied Mathematics PSLO #6 came up for assessment within the program's usual cycle in the 2014–2015 academic year, and was assessed during the Winter term of that year. The program faculty specified this outcome with three criteria, centered on construction of several fundamental proofs within Introduction to Real Analysis (MATH 311). Per the usual process, work was collected and scored by the course instructor using a simple rubric developed by the mathematics faculty.

However, given the low number of students (only 2 in the 2014–2015 assessment), the mathematics faculty felt that firm conclusions could not be drawn, and chose to extend assessment of this outcome into the next academic year. The 2015–2016 report documents this reassessment, now with a total of 8 students.

In this report, documentation of departmental discussion is included; for instance, the 2015–2016 program assessment report notes:

The Winter 2016 instructor for Math 311 (Jim Fischer) feels that students are reluctant to work at learning how to write proofs. There is too much information available online that allows students to avoid thinking about proofs and instead copy proofs or main ideas from internet resources.

We decided to bring the discussion to the department during convocation 2016. We will likely request that faculty assess writing mathematics in more courses (such as Math 111, 112, 25X). We are also thinking about adding some introduction to writing proofs to the Math 253 course."

This documentation indicates that these discussions helped to crystallize and focus departmental reflection, and the repetition of this over a period of time helped to expand these conversations to the math department as a whole and contribute to a consensus that action was needed. Improvement activities discussed included both possible modifications to courses, and extensions of assessment activity.

The indicators for this outcome, therefore, although simple in structure, proved to be both straightforward to apply consistently across multiple years, and were of sufficient quality and detail to provide a compelling basis for departmental discussion. This work strikes an appropriate balance between practicality, quantity, and meaningfulness for this program's faculty.

The type of data proved to be sufficient and meaningful; however, the quantity of evidence was not yet compelling, even after two years, and assessment was extended into a third year, with parallel methods.

Closing the Loop: Curriculum Revision and a New Course

By the third successive year of assessment, the mathematics faculty noted:

"The department has been assessing this PSLO for three consecutive years, Winter terms, Math 311 (Instructors Deb, Fischer, Paul). [...] We also had general discussion about our opinions on the performance overall concerning abstract reasoning. Our students seem to perform satisfactorily when asked to make a [routine] statement of logic. [...] However, we feel that too many of our students are not able to construct complete proofs. This is despite given many opportunities to practice prior to exams. [...] Students stumble with both the syntax as well as making logical connections."

This reflects evidence of further analysis of students' particular strengths and weaknesses, conducted in a broad-based manner, with the engagement of multiple faculty. As related by the program assessment coordinator, examination of this data occurred during both departmental meetings and smaller group discussions; analysis of this outcome extended beyond mere description of the results and began to unpack possible underlying explanations for students' lower-than-desired performance. After repeated discussion, the 2016–2017 assessment report describes the consensus for action within the Applied Mathematics program:

"While the prerequisite Math 327 has some learning outcomes related to abstract reasoning, we decided our applied math students need more. We met several times during the 2016–17 year and concluded that a new course needed to be created. We created a new course "Mathematical Structures"; [curriculum committee] submission will occur Fall term 2017."

Although faculty have indicated that there is a good possibility that the major would have created and incorporated the Mathematical Structures course without formal assessment process, the assessment structures, carried out simply but authentically, yielded broad-based discussion with the program, a consensus for action, and the execution of that action, and continue to provide a framework for the evaluation of this action.

This curriculum change has been approved, and the course was taught as a required element of the Applied Math major for the first time in Fall 2018. Reassessment is currently underway in the MATH 311 course in Winter 2019 and will be documented in the Applied Math program's 2018–2019 program assessment report; however, the instructor for that course has already reported his personal impression that this curriculum change has markedly enhanced students' abilities in this area. He anticipates a high degree of likelihood that the quantitative assessment data will bear this out.

Communication ESLO: Launch of new structures for institutional outcomes assessment

Background: Revision of Institutional Outcomes

Systematic examination of institution-wide learning outcomes began in earnest at Oregon Tech in the early 2000s. The most recent comprehensive revision of institution-level outcomes occurred in 2015, as a byproduct of the comprehensive general education reform process begun in 2013. General education reform processes coalesced around a model specifically structured around key learning outcomes: outcomes that could readily be embedded and advanced both by traditional general education courses and within the context of programs.

Informed by Oregon Tech's mission to produce workforce-ready graduates with in-demand skills, the revision of eight institutional student learning outcomes down to six drew upon internal faculty, alumni, and employer surveys; external resources such as national AAC&U employer surveys; and internal experiences with assessing the previous set of institutional outcomes (outcomes such as "lifelong learning" had proven extraordinarily challenging to assess meaningfully).

Ultimately, the general education reform work coalesced on six outcomes: Communication, Inquiry & Analysis, Teamwork, Ethical Reasoning, Quantitative Literacy, and Diverse Perspectives.

From Mission to Measures: Development of the Communication ESLO and Rubric

During the general education reform process, faculty subcommittees were formed to advance collaborative and broad-based discussion of the outcomes' definitions. During Fall 2014 and Winter 2015, these committees proposed definitions and criteria for each outcome, which were formally adopted in February 2015 as Oregon Tech's new Essential Student Learning Outcomes (ESLOs). In subsequent terms, these committees both proposed general education pathways to support these outcomes (which were used to inform development of the broader general education proposal), but also drafted institutional rubrics for each outcome, which have been employed in subsequent assessment work.

Concurrent with the launch of new ESLOs was the launch of a new six-year ESLO assessment cycle. One of the critiques of the previous assessment processes was that, by focusing on one outcome per year, faculty had to design an assessment strategy, implement it, collect and analyze data, and plan and begin improvement activity within the space of about a year (or, generously, a year and a half) before moving on to the next outcome. With the creation of faculty ESLO committees as bodies of expertise and learning communities invested and knowledgeable about a particular outcome, a more distributed assessment cycle was launched in which the above process was spread out across a longer period of time and structurally involved participation beyond assessment leadership.

The Communication ESLO outcome is one of the first to "fully" go through this cycle (after the "pilot" outcome, Diverse Perspectives, which was also the last outcome to be assessed from the previous ISLO's), and this cycle has both helped to drive institutional change surrounding the communication outcome and informed the further evolution of Oregon Tech's assessment processes.

Table 2. ESLO Outcomes Cycle.

	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21
Communication		Design	Collect	Analyze	Engage	Evaluate	Reflect
Inquiry & Analysis			Design	Collect	Analyze	Engage	Evaluate
Ethical Reasoning				Design	Collect	Analyze	Engage
Teamwork					Design	Collect	Analyze
Quantitative Literacy						Design	Collect
Diverse Perspectives	Design	Collect	Analyze	Engage	Evaluate	Reflect	Design

The ESLO assessment cycle for Communication began with the “Design” year (2015–2016) academic year), during which the Communication ESLO committee and Assessment Executive Committee developed a protocol to identify both general education courses and upper-division disciplinary courses for assessment of this outcome. This included both general education courses from the Communication department (WRI 122, Argumentative Writing, and WRI227, Technical Report Writing) and disciplinary courses—each bachelor’s degree program identified a course in which students produced a significant written work that could be scored using the Communication ESLO rubric. During the “Analyze” year, the faculty responsible for these courses scored their students’ work individually and submitted those scores using Oregon Tech’s assessment software. The Communication ESLO committee organized training and rubric norming sessions for faculty to familiarize them with the rubric; however, not all faculty who scored student work attended these sessions.

Making Indicators Meaningful: Faculty Discussion on Data

In alignment with this new cycle, the Assessment Executive Committee (faculty leadership in academic assessment) and Office of Academic Excellence (staff/administrative support of academic assessment) have re-envisioned the all-faculty session on assessment at Oregon Tech’s fall convocation. In previous years, this session had consisted primarily of presentation by assessment leadership on summary data and plans for action; beginning with the “Analyze” year for the Communication ESLO, this session was reconfigured to be participatory for faculty. Under this new structure, data was not interpreted for faculty, but provided to them, and faculty were paired in interdisciplinary tables and asked to make meaning of it—to identify key trends, to posit explanations for the origins of those trends, and to identify practices that might help improve both how they are supported in the curriculum and how they are assessed.

One of the key insights gained from the collaborative discussion of Communication ESLO data was that faculty had little confidence that data scored in isolation by individual faculty was reliable, and that

unreliable data is a poor foundation for action. NWCCU's assessment rubrics, placing an increased emphasis on inter-rater reliability of scores, came to Oregon Tech at the same time and reinforced this theme for our assessment leadership.

The "Design" year for the Ethical Reasoning ESLO was able to react to this insight by putting into place a new structure for faculty scoring of work. Drawing upon best practices from other institutions and NWCCU rubrics, the Assessment Executive Committee and Ethical Reasoning ESLO committee have structured scoring of student work within Assessment Days, the first of which have been held during the Winter 2019 term. At these events, faculty from diverse departments come together to both receive norming training on the rubric and to score work together.

Although this will result in less work in total being scored, we anticipate that the scores themselves will be more valid measure for performance. Even more importantly, we will have fostered cross-disciplinary discussions between faculty surrounding the outcome, the assignments in which is manifested, and the pedagogical approaches that support it. These discussions themselves (from which we are recording reflections) will help generate both ideas for future action, create a broader, participatory understanding of the outcome, and build buy-in for eventual improvement activities in later years of the cycle.

Closing The Loop: Improving both Processes and Courses

The disparity in scores between the sophomore-level technical communication course and both the foundational writing courses and the junior-level disciplinary courses revealed a clear difference in perspective taken by these differing groups of faculty.

Concurrent with this work, the technical communication group, having recently experienced significant faculty turnover, has eagerly entered into discussion about revision of existing technical communication courses and development of new, more discipline-specific technical communication courses (e.g. Writing for the Health Professions, Science Writing, etc.). The Communication ESLO committee, in collaboration with the technical communication group, has begun to engage in deliberate conversations with departments regarding faculty's expectations surrounding technical communication, in order to inform the development of these courses.

This process of moving from data to action has revealed ways in which the assessment process can be better structured to prompt action. During the "Analyze" year for the Communication ESLO outcome, analysis of reflections and planning for action took place primarily only within the Assessment Executive Committee. This has led to difficulty in developing agreement on how to move forward with engaging faculty in improvement actions; this year, reflection on feedback from convocation (on the Inquiry & Analysis ESLO outcome) is being more deliberately shared with and analyzed by the Inquiry & Analysis ESLO committee and with the Commission on College Teaching (which supports faculty development) in order to foster broader buy-in for a plan of action. Next steps in evolving this process will involve greater engagement with academic leadership (Deans, etc.) to make decision-makers with the authority to allocate resources to address issues of broader and cross-cutting concern.

Part III: Next Steps for Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness

As noted in previous sections, Oregon Tech is in a time of transition regarding our assessment and institutional effectiveness processes. We recognize a number of next steps that are needed to further these efforts in preparation for our Year Seven report, but, most importantly, to ensure that Oregon Tech meets its obligations to its students and to the taxpaying public. Below, we outline the broad steps that Oregon Tech will need to undertake in particular over the remainder of this academic year, as we move into the 2019-2020 year under the leadership of Oregon Tech's next provost, and on an ongoing basis over the next several years as we move towards sustainable structures for continuous improvement and institutional effectiveness.

Next Steps for Institutional Effectiveness Assessment

Oregon Tech's activity to date to launch our Core Themes Assessment Plan over the current academic year is largely documented in Part I of this report. This work is well-timed in the current institutional landscape: we have identified a number of opportunities to align Core Themes Assessment activity with other efforts, including a university strategic planning process that is currently getting underway, responses to emphases within the new NWCCU standards, etc. This work is still beginning for us as institution; many of the items below relate to formalization of processes for Core Themes Assessment.

Responsibility and Leadership

- Formalize the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) as a standing university Institutional Effectiveness Committee rather than an *ad hoc* group, with administrative membership linked to institutional positions, and with faculty and staff inclusion.
 - Responsibility: Provost/ALO (with input from President and Executive Staff)
 - Timeline: Summer 2019, alongside annual committee appointment cycle, or earlier.
- Clearly assign day-to-day ownership and operation of the Core Themes Assessment Plan to an Accreditation Lead with both the background and bandwidth to lead this work out effectively, whether that person is the formal ALO or not. Define formal linkages with Office of Academic Excellence, Office of Institutional Research, and strategic plan implementation, and update job descriptions as needed. Identify whether (and on what timeline) Oregon Tech may proceed with a possible hire of Assistant/Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, for which a position description has already been developed.
 - Responsibility: ALO/Provost
 - Timeline: Spring–Summer 2019. Revisit Assistant/Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness with new Provost coming on board Fall 2019.
- Support professional development in institutional effectiveness for key leadership (Provost, Associate Provost, Institutional Research, Academic Excellence). Possible conferences/trainings to which Oregon Tech could send teams include the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Annual Conference, particularly to begin to develop measures which are aligned with those of other institutions, per draft NWCCU guidelines; Association for Institutional Research (AIR) courses, Network for Change and Continuous Improvement (NCCI) workshops, etc. This work can also be supplemented by in-person visits to peer institutions to learn from best practices.
 - Responsibility: ALO/Provost, members of Accreditation Steering Committee
 - Timeline: Beginning Summer 2019.

Execute Plan and Engage Stakeholders

Over the coming months, the initial review of Core Themes indicators will provide substantial reflection on the quality and usefulness of these indicators, as well as prompting action and broader conversation surrounding the following:

- Accreditation Steering Committee, with input and engagement from across the university, must complete initial review of indicators under Core Themes Assessment Plan and report to Executive Staff/Board of Trustees for the first time, meeting at minimum monthly and more often as needed. Offer initial input on possible changes to indicators, with an awareness that the continued evolution of indicators will be informed by strategic planning efforts and new NWCCU standards (see next section).
 - Responsibility: ALO & Accreditation Steering Committee, with engagement from units connected with Core Theme Indicators.
Timeline: Spring–Summer 2019, for possible presentation at July 25–26 Board Retreat.
- Develop a robust information tracking and communication system with dashboard for the Core Themes Assessment Plan, with a website and regular expectations for reporting to Executive Staff, President, and Board of Trustees.
 - Responsibility: ALO, Institutional Research, Accreditation Steering Committee
 - Timeline: Spring–Summer 2019, for rollout at Board Retreat in July.
- Broaden awareness and engagement with Core Themes Assessment Plan. Report out and solicit input from faculty/staff at Fall 2019 convocation, students in Fall 2019, in alignment with strategic planning efforts. Gather institution-wide feedback on validity and meaningfulness of indicators, and, where performance falls below benchmarks, institution-wide input on and suggestions of potential actions.
 - Responsibility: ALO, Accreditation Steering Committee, Strategic Planning leadership
 - Timeline: Fall 2019

Revision of Core Theme Indicators

This initial review of indicators should provide substantial information that can be fed into the strategic planning process. However, this information flow will not be one way. We intend to use the broadly-engaged strategic planning process as a major tool to widen discussion across all stakeholders about appropriate measures. We seek to develop institution-wide buy-in for new indicators as authentic and widely valued measures of institutional performance, likely reduced in number substantially from Oregon Tech's current 27 Core Themes Indicators.

- Provide information on initial review of indicators as input to strategic planning process. Review Core Themes Indicators in light of institutional priorities identified in a broadly participatory strategic planning process.
 - Responsibility: Accreditation Steering Committee, Strategic Planning leadership
 - Timeline: Alongside Strategic Planning process, beginning Spring 2019

- Review Core Themes indicators specifically in light of new NWCCU standards, particularly NWCCU’s increased emphasis on measures of student achievement. Ensure alignment of indicators with indicators from peer institutions, per new NWCCU draft standards. Consider devolving some Core Themes indicators to unit-level assessment processes, and/or introducing new indicators relevant to student achievement.
 - Responsibility: Accreditation Steering Committee, ALO
 - Timeline: Fall 2019 and afterwards, after new NWCCU standards are officially approved
- Carry out Core Themes Assessment process with revised indicators on the timelines for each indicator identified during the 2018–2019 initial review. Explicitly compare indicators for which actions have been identified to evaluate whether action, if it occurred, has resulted in improvement.
 - Responsibility: Accreditation Steering Committee, ALO
 - Timeline: 2019–2020 academic year

Integration into Institution-Level Decision-Making Processes

As we have begun to document in Table 1 within Part 1, the mere process of examining indicators systematically has begun to help prompt action informally, through bending the activities of units and individuals. However, the processes will be most meaningful and authentically valued if they are linked to Oregon Tech’s ongoing and formal systems for decision making and resource allocation.

- Revise Core Themes Assessment Plan to be fully integrated with rollout and execution of university strategic plan (and eventual academic strategic planning efforts).
 - Responsibility: Senior Staff, Strategic Planning leadership
 - Timeline: Alongside Strategic Planning process, beginning Spring 2019
- Formally integrate responding to Core Theme indicators as an element of institutional budget builds. As described in Oregon Tech’s *ad hoc* report responding to the Year Seven Peer Evaluation, new budgeting processes implemented by the Finance & Administration unit have included explicit elements where the allocation of funds was specifically targeted towards execution of strategic initiatives identified in the Board-approved Presidential Short-Term Action Plan. As this short-term plan approaches its conclusion, Oregon Tech will replace reference to the short-term plan in this process with reference to the Core Themes indicators.
 - Responsibility: Accreditation Steering Committee, VP for Finance and Administration
 - Timeline: Fall 2019, for 2020–2021 budget build (which occurs in Winter 2020).

Integration into Lower-Level Decision-Making Processes

Once Oregon Tech has reached a point of confidence in major institutional indicators, particularly those associated with student achievement, we will need to extend these indicators to enable prioritization of resources and action at the program and department level. While some indicators may have institution-level actions, many may also help drive additional or complementary program-specific actions:

- Development of department-level indicators (stemming from Core Themes Indicators), and integration into departmental assessment and/or program review processes. Creation of dashboards to facilitate easy and broad access to departmental indicator data. Development of processes to ensure that improvement actions are identified and implemented, where needed.
 - Responsibility: Accreditation Steering Committee, Provost’s Leadership Team, Academic Council (department chairs), Institutional Research
 - Timeline: 2020–2021 academic year
- Build reference to addressing departmental indicators as an integral and highly-weighted element of departmental requests, particularly budget builds, position requests, and equipment requests (for which existing processes already exist).
 - Responsibility: Provost, VP for Finance and Administration, etc.
 - Timeline: Likely rollout in 2020–2021 processes, beginning with incorporation in academic position prioritization in Spring 2019, and equipment request processes in Fall/Winter 2020

Next Steps for Other Assessment Processes

Beyond the large-scale work needed to reach a point of a meaningful, broadly-engaged, and effective Core Themes Assessment Plan that informs institutional decision-making, Oregon Tech recognizes continuing improvements needed in assessment processes at other levels, including learning outcomes assessment, academic program review, and unit-level assessment.

Further Improvements in Learning Outcomes Assessment

- Continuation and refinement of program assessment, primarily through program assessment report review processes that emphasize broad discussion of assessment results amongst program faculty and concrete plans for action and reassessment, as well as improved feedback to academic programs on how they can improve their own assessment activity (see *Ad Hoc* report response to Recommendation 4 for more detail). Strengthening connections and reporting to senior academic leadership (Deans, Provost, etc.)
 - Responsibility: Office of Academic Excellence, Assessment Executive Committee, Provost’s Leadership Team
 - Timeline: Ongoing, into 2019–2020 academic year
- Continuous improvement of ESLO assessment processes, with emphasis on within six-year ESLO cycle (see Part II above, and *Ad Hoc* report responses to Recommendation 3 and 4 for more detail) and ensuring continuity of activity between the various groups connected with the six-year cycle (ESLO committees, Commission on College Teaching, etc.) and strengthening connections to academic leadership (Deans, Provost, etc.)
 - Responsibility: Office of Academic Excellence, Assessment Executive Committee, Provost’s Leadership Team
 - Timeline: Ongoing, into 2019–2020 academic year

Further Improvements in Unit/Program-Level Assessment

Alongside and following further development and execution of the Core Themes Assessment Plan, willingness exists to extend formal assessment activity to the unit level. Such work has begun in places, but has not been highly formalized. However, rather than merely proliferating assessment processes, extension of assessment activity into new areas should be done in a way that originates from well-functioning high-level practices. Further movement in this direction should be done thoughtfully and deliberately, should be informed by best practices external to Oregon Tech, and, most importantly, should align with and not interfere with meaningful implementation of the Core Themes Assessment Plan.

- Academic program review. During the 2018–2019 academic year, a program review process has been drafted by academic leadership (described in more detail in Oregon Tech’s *Ad Hoc* Report responses to Recommendation 3). This process stands ready to be refined and rolled out in alignment with academic master planning, Core Themes Assessment, and existing academic assessment processes.
 - Responsibility: Provost, Provost’s Leadership Team
 - Timeline: TBD, driven by new Provost
- Student affairs/student services assessment. As described in Oregon Tech’s *Ad Hoc* Report responses to Recommendation 3, Student Affairs units already engage in some assessment activities. Student affairs leadership is currently participating in professional development activities relating to assessment best practices in student affairs in preparation for possible increased formalization of assessment work in these areas.
 - Responsibility: VP for Student Affairs/AVP for Strategic Enrollment Management
 - Timeline: TBD, driven by relevant VP/AVP
- Administrative unit assessment. Similarly, administrative units housed under the Vice President for Finance (Information Technology Services, Facilities, etc.) currently engage in internal assessment activities, including benchmarking to peers and periodic dashboard reporting which can be further strengthened and formalized along similar lines to student affairs/student services assessment.
 - Responsibility: VP for Finance and Administration
 - Timeline: TBD, driven by relevant VP/AVP

Conclusion

Although the next steps ahead for Oregon Tech are substantial, we believe we are on solid footing with leadership that articulates the values of data-driven decision-making in support of student success, and now with the emergence and improvement of institutional structures that will help us realize this goal. With this work as a priority for new leadership, a new institutional strategic planning process, and NWCCU’s new standards all emerging simultaneously, we anticipate that the coming years will be ones of rapid growth for Oregon Tech in structures that drive institutional effectiveness, support robust processes for making and communicating decisions within a shared governance structure, raise our institutional profile, and, most importantly, drive our students’ successes to even greater heights.

Appendix A: Core Themes Assessment Plan

Development of Core Themes to Indicators

Oregon Tech's Core Themes are instantiated and developed into measurable performance indicators through the following hierarchical structure:

- **Core Theme:** Each core theme identifies a mission-critical and defining element of Oregon Tech's activity and identity.
- **Objective:** Each core theme is specified by one or more objectives, specifying broad ways in which that core theme is advanced.
- **Outcome:** Each objective is further specified by one or more outcomes, specifying behaviors or activities that manifest achievement of that objective.
- **Indicator:** Each outcome is tied to one or more **quantifiable** measures of behavior.
- **Measure:** Each indicator has one or more or reliable and persistent sources of quantitative data.
- **Benchmark:** Each measure has a single benchmark; this describes the performance level sought by the university.

On July 9, 2015, the Oregon Tech Board of Trustees adopted Oregon Tech's Mission Statement and Core Themes, per Oregon Revised Statute 352.089(2). Upon adoption of the Mission Statement and Core Themes, the NWCCU Accreditation Steering Committee was charged with identifying Core Themes objectives, outcomes, indicators, measures, and benchmarks, as defined above. The committee began their work by adopting the below guiding principles based on NWCCU guidelines:

- "Structure, resources, and programs support and result in substantial accomplishment of the Institution's stated purpose."
- "Meaningful, assessable, and verifiable indicators of achievement form the basis for evaluating accomplishment of the objectives of its core themes."

This plan outlines a systematic process for collection and use of the data pointed to in this plan and for continuous improvement of the set of indicators and process itself.

Roles and Responsibilities within Core Themes Assessment Plan

The Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) drives execution of the Core Themes Assessment Plan in concert with a number of other groups:

Executive Staff & Trustees

Regularly review and reaffirm the university's Mission, Core Themes, metrics, and associated data during the Board of Trustees' annual retreat. Signifies the start of a new cycle.

Executive Staff

Determine priorities and identify and direct resources. Administrative Champions are members of the President's Executive Staff and are positioned to drive action in support of performance on Core Theme Indicators.

Administrative Champions¹

Support and provide accountability to leaders within their functional units. Manage planning, assessment, and improvement processes that support mission fulfillment.

Institutional Research and Action Owners²

Collect, analyze, and evaluate assessment data. Implement improvement actions. Document findings and create dashboards to monitor and share information. Evaluate processes. Engage stakeholders. Recommend improvement actions.

Administrative Champions

Engage and reflect with Action Owners & Leaders on documented findings and processes. Evaluate core theme attainment and mission fulfillment. Champion improvement actions and resource allocation in support of them. Propose revisions to processes, where needed.

Executive Staff

Collectively review and prioritize assessment findings and proposed improvement actions. Integrate findings and actions into the institutional planning process.

Accreditation Steering Committee & ALO

Monitor and support annual progress on the Core Themes Assessment Plan through regular interactions with Executive Staff, Administrative Champions, Action Owners & Leaders. Revise Core Themes Assessment Plan as needed.

¹ Administrative Champions - Four ASC members on the President's Executive Staff, who are also members of the Accreditation Steering Committee, identified with primary responsibility for one of Oregon Tech's four Core Themes.

² Action Owner – a staff member whose professional responsibility is closely linked with an indicator, who is delegated by an Administrative Champion to carry forward work related to an indicator, particularly when activity is best handled below the Vice-President level.

Information flows between these groups, as coordinated by the Accreditation Steering Committee, are summarized here:



Figure 2. Schematic Representation of Information and Decision Flows in Oregon Tech's Core Themes Assessment Plan.

Responsibility for Reflection on Core Theme Indicators

Formal responsibility for providing data and reflections on each Core Theme indicator using the Core Themes indicator template (Appendix B) rests with the Administrative Champion associated with that core theme:

Core Themes and Administrative Champions:

Core Theme 1: Applied Degree Programs	Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Core Theme 2: Student and Graduate Success	Vice President for Student Affairs
Core Theme 3: Statewide Educational Opportunities	Associate Vice President for Strategic Enrollment Management
Core Theme 4: Public Service	Associate Provost for Research and Academic Affairs

It is not expected that these individuals necessarily will provide data or complete the template personally (although they may in some cases); in many cases, an indicator may be assigned an “Action Owner” and “Data Owner,” by the relevant Administrative Champion, with these roles tied to the positions within the institution who are delegated with this responsibility; these may be different individuals, but the ownership resides with the position, not the individual.

Indicator Template

Administrative Champions or their designated “Action Owners” have the responsibility to either personally complete or delegate the completion of the Indicator Template (see Appendix B). Within this template, the action owner is asked to describe how they and others have, within the context of mission fulfillment

- **Defined/Designed** the indicator to be reliably and meaningfully measured
- **Collected** meaningful data that reflects performance
- **Analyzed** that data to reveal patterns, trends, and insights, particularly if performance is below benchmark level.
- **Engaged** with stakeholders to develop and implement plans for action
- **Evaluated** the effectiveness of actions taken and whether they have yielded improvement
- **Reflected** on the results of this work, the meaningfulness of the indicator and outcomes itself, and the process that supported them.

The Administrative Champion or designated Action Owner will submit this report to the Accreditation Liaison Officer or their designee.

Review of Indicator Template and Identification of Improvement Actions:

At minimum, the Accreditation Steering Committee (ACS) will meet monthly to oversee the process of collection and reflection on Core Themes Indicators. Upon receipt of each report, the ACS will review the submission in collaborative discussion with the submitter and determine whether formal Improvement Action is needed. These Improvement Actions may be (but are not limited to):

- Actions within or below the ASC, such as:
 - Minimal revision of the outcome, indicator, measure, or benchmark.
 - Once revised, an indicator should generally stay fixed for a period of at least three years.
 - Upon three years of consistent attainment of a benchmark, action should be initiated to consider whether a higher benchmark level is appropriate.
 - Action within a unit to yield improvements.
- Upward referrals—activities which require the input or action of Executive Staff or the Board of Trustees, such as:
 - Recommendation to re-evaluate a Core Theme (must go through Executive Staff to the Board of Trustees)
 - Recommendation of allocation of resources beyond the internal capabilities of a unit.
 - Recommendation for broader discussion on the revision of an outcome, indicator, measure, or benchmark.

Improvement Actions ***must*** be initiated under the following circumstances (but may also be initiated under other circumstances):

- Data was not reliably available or meaningful.
- Performance falls below benchmark level.
- Performance has declined for three consecutive years.

Upon continuous attainment of a benchmark for three consecutive years, the Accreditation Team, in consultation with the Action Owner, shall propose an appropriate, higher benchmark or alternative measure in order to foster continuous improvement.

Schedule

For the 2018–2019 academic year (Oregon Tech’s first implementing this plan), the following outcomes are have been reviewed:

- January 2019:
 - Program Assessment
 - Library Usage
 - Graduate Success Rate
 - Graduate Starting Salary
- February
 - New Freshman Retention
 - Transfer Student Retention
 - Student Affairs Support
- March–June 2019:
 - All remaining outcomes

As initial review of each outcome is completed, the proper timing in an annual cycle, based on availability of data, will be assigned.

Reporting on Core Themes Assessment Activity

Throughout the year, Executive Staff will receive updates on a bimonthly basis, on the implementation of this plan, including the status of attainment of indicators and any needed revision of indicators, and action items identified under the processes above. As noted above, some items to act in response to indicator data or to revise indicators may be referred upward from the ASC to Executive Staff for their engagement.

This data will be summarized in an annual *Core Themes Assessment Report* prepared by the Accreditation Steering Committee during each summer, distributed to the university community, and posted on the Oregon Tech web site. It will be presented to the Board of Trustees and to Executive Staff at their annual retreats.

An interactive session(s) at or near Fall Convocation will also share information on this process with the **entire** university community (administration, faculty, and staff), including collaborative discussion of meaningful indicators, potential new indicators that reflect the continuing evolution of the institution, and actions in response to weak indicators. Similar conversations shall occur with engagement with students, if they are not already folded into the above session.

Input from these participatory sessions will be reviewed and analyzed by the Accreditation Team, who will make available a summary of the provided input and, over the course of its work, may recommend revisions to outcomes, indicators, etc., or refer larger matters upwards for consideration.

Each year, the Accreditation Team will also explicitly consider whether changes should be made to this Core Themes Assessment Plan, including associated schedules and the Indicator Template.

Review and Reaffirmation or Modification of Core Themes

During the years following to the submission of Mid-Cycle Self-Evaluation and Year Seven-Self Evaluation (years one and four in the seven-year NWCCU accreditation cycle) the Core Themes and Objectives will be reviewed by Executive Staff and the Board of Trustees at their annual retreat(s) and either positively reaffirmed or a process begun to modify them. This places the formally next scheduled Core Themes review in 2019–2020, in concert with the strategic planning process to be rolled out by President Naganathan beginning in 2019.

Such processes that might result in modification of core themes should be directed by senior university leadership and broadly participatory, with opportunity for input from administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

Appendix B: Core Theme Indicators Reflection Template

NWCCU Core Theme Indicators: Template for Process and Results Review

Core Theme:	
Objective:	
Outcome:	
Indicator:	
Measure:	
Benchmark:	
Data Owner:	
Relevant VP/AVP:	
Action Champion:	
Team Members:	

Define/Design: (Is the measure well-defined?)	
Process Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a documented process in place to systematically collect this data? If yes, please describe. Is additional information needed to support this metric? 	
Results Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a process is in place, how well did it work? Are changes needed to improve the process? 	
Collect: (How are we performing?)	
Process Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the data readily available? What is the (at least annual) cycle for obtaining this data, including optimal timing? 	
Results Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was data collected? If yes, where do the data live? What is the “banner headline” statistic for this measure (for the past three years, if possible)? 	

Analyze: (What does the data mean?)	
<p>Process Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a documented process in place to systematically analyze the data? If yes, please describe. Who is reviewing/analyzing the data? Where are the results of the analysis documented? • Are results communicated to appropriate stakeholders? If yes, please describe who and how. • Are the data analyzed within the context of core theme achievement? 	
<p>Results Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do the data tell you? Are we meeting institutional benchmark for this outcome? Is performance slipping, gaining, or steady? • Are you able to use the data to make determinations of quality, effectiveness, and core theme achievement? If not, what other data might be of value? Are benchmarks appropriately set and their levels clearly justified? • If communicated, did stakeholders engage in idea generation around continuous improvement? 	
Engage: (What should we do in response to the data?)	
<p>Process Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are results considered within the context of continuous improvement? Are results used to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources and capacity? If yes, please describe. 	
<p>Results Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is action needed to improve this metric (or has recent action been taken to improve this metric)? If so, what? What resources are needed? 	

Evaluate: (Are our improvement activities working?)	
<p>Process Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a documented process in place to systematically evaluate the actions taken to improve this metric? If yes, please describe. 	
<p>Results Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well do the outcomes/objectives indicate success of our actions? • Have identified actions resulted in improvement? 	
Reflect: (Did the process serve us well?)	
<p>Process Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have all stakeholders been given an opportunity to reflect on the results? If yes, please describe. • Where are reflections documented? 	
<p>Results Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the outcome/objective a meaningful and verifiable indicator of core theme/mission achievement? • Do the outcomes/objectives support the Core Themes? Do they need to be reconsidered? 	