

Guidelines for the Preparation of Year One Self-Evaluation Reports

(Revised 4/10/14)

Structure and Contents

1. Title page to include:
 - a) Title of Self-Evaluation Report
 - b) Name of Institution
 - c) Date Submitted
2. Table of Contents
3. Institutional Overview [Two (2) pages maximum]
4. Preface
 - a) Brief update on institutional changes since the institution's last report
 - b) Response to topics previously requested by the Commission (i.e., Addenda)
5. Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations
 - a) Executive Summary of Eligibility Requirements 2 and 3
 - b) Standard 1.A *Mission* to include [Three (3) pages maximum]:
 - Institution's mission statement
 - Interpretation of mission fulfillment
 - Articulation of an acceptable threshold, extent, or degree of mission fulfillment
 - c) Standard 1.B *Core Themes* to include:
One Section for each Core Theme [Three (3) pages maximum per Core Theme]:
 - Title of the Core Theme
 - Brief description of the Core Theme
 - Objectives to be achieved via the Core Theme
 - Indicators of achievement of the respective Core Theme objectives
 - Rationale for the selection of the respective indicators of achievement—why they are assessable and meaningful measures of achievement of the associated Core Theme objectives.
6. Conclusion [One (1) page maximum]

Report Layout

1. Use letter size portrait orientation (8½" wide by 11" high) with 1" margins on all sides.
2. Use 11- or 12-point type face for the body of the report. Larger fonts may be used for major headings which should be in bold print face and double spaced from the text. Do not use script or italic as the primary font.
3. Number all pages (except Title page and Table of Contents page).
4. Single space text in the body of the report.

Print Version

1. Except for the front and back covers of bound reports, use **WHITE** 20 pound paper.
2. Other than the Title Page and Table of Contents page, print on **BOTH SIDES** of the paper.
3. Staple the report in the upper left corner

Submitted to Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Western Oregon University

February 28, 2017

TITLE PAGE HERE

DRAFT 1-16-2017

Table of Contents

Title Page.....

Table of Contents.....

Institutional Overview.....

Preface.....

Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations.....

 Executive Summary of Eligibility Requirements 2 and 3.....

 Standard 1.A Mission.....

Standard 1.B Core Themes.....

 Core Theme 1.....

 Core Theme 2.....

 Core Theme 3.....

Conclusion.....

Appendices.....(Numbering to be adjusted).....

 A. Board of Trustees (use photo chart).....

 B. University Organizational Chart.....(9-2016 version)

 C. Higher Education Coordinating Commission, 2016 University Evaluation.....

 D. 2017-2023 WOU Strategic Plan [Title of Plan to be added].....

 E. Rubric for Planning Assessment.....

DRAFT 1-16-2017

DRAFT 1-16-2017

Institutional Overview

Western Oregon University (WOU) is an Oregon public, liberal arts institution located approximately 15 miles from the state capitol of Salem, Oregon. The University is governed by a 15-member [Board of Trustees](#)¹ (Appendix A) which includes the President of the University, Dr. Rex Fuller, as an ex officio, non-voting member. For an overview of all senior leadership, please see the university [organizational chart](#)² (Appendix B).

The Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) articulates these key objectives for Oregon's public universities. State appropriations funding is then tied to performance levels, as described in the 2016 University Evaluation for Western Oregon University (Appendix C):

“...student success as measured by degree completion; access and affordability as measured by equity across socioeconomic, racial/ethnic and regional (urban/rural) groups; academic quality and research; financial sustainability, and continued collaboration across universities in support of the State's mission for higher education” (Page 3).

Programs and Degrees

WOU offers undergraduate and graduate [degree programs](#)³ in addition to graduate certificates and the associate degree linked to specific transfer degree completion programs in collaboration with several international university partners. At the undergraduate level, WOU offers the Bachelor of Art, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Science, and Applied Baccalaureate degrees. There are 37 majors, with an additional 30 'concentration' programs of study within those majors. Most majors also have an associated minor option. Additionally, the Education major has 7 major areas for teaching or professional preparation, and 21 subject specializations for teacher preparation at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

Graduate degree [programs](#)⁴ include the Master of Music in Contemporary Music, Master of Arts in Teaching, Master of Arts in Criminal Justice, Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies, Master of Science in Rehabilitation and Mental Health Counseling, Master of Science in Management and Information Systems, Master of Science in Deaf and Hard of Hearing Education and the Master of Science in Education. This last degree also allows students to more intensely specialize in information technology or special education.

Individual programs at WOU are accredited by the following organizations:

- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (to migrate to Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
- Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE)
- Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education (CCIE)
- National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)

¹ Board of Trustees: <http://www.wou.edu/board/>

² Organizational Chart: http://www.wou.edu/president/files/2016/09/WOU_Organizational_Chart-1.pdf

³ Degree programs: <http://www.wou.edu/resources/student-resources/academics/>

⁴ Graduate degree programs: <http://www.wou.edu/graduate/>

In addition, the University is in compliance with the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), which holds authority to approve teacher preparation programs offered by Oregon higher education institutions.

Students

WOU's students are primarily Oregonians (78.2%), enrolled fulltime, with nearly 44% receiving Pell Grants. Additionally, HECC reports that WOU's fall 2016 number of enrolled underrepresented minority students is the largest percentage of any Oregon public university (2016, HECC, pg. 10). In that term, WOU's students included 705 Hispanic undergraduate students and 145 Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islanders, an increase of 25% and 20.8% respectively from the prior year. WOU's four-year graduation rate for the 2009 first-time, full-time freshman cohort was 25.6% and the six-year graduation rate for that same cohort was 50.4%.

Faculty

WOU has 400 instructional faculty; 164 tenured or tenure-track faculty, 127 full-time and 109 part-time non-tenure track faculty positions⁵. Within the full-time⁶ instructional faculty, 69.8% hold a terminal degree (doctorate or terminal masters), 27.1% hold a master's degree that is not a terminal degree and 3% hold a bachelor's degree. Within the part-time instructional faculty, 14.7% hold a terminal degree, 79% hold a master's degree that is not a terminal degree and 6.3% hold a bachelor's degree. Additionally, there are 53 full-time and 7 part-time research faculty.

The 2015-2017 [collective bargaining agreement](#)⁷ with WOUFT, the faculty union, requires a terminal degree for rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor; a master's degree is required for the position of a non-tenure track instructor. The rank of lecturer is the only instructional role for which a bachelor's degree is adequate.

Women comprise 56% of faculty across all ranks; 17.3% of faculty identify as members of minority groups. *For fall 2015, the student-to-faculty ratio⁸ is 15 to 1, based on 4,703 students. [CHECK # and source for 2016]*

⁵ IPEDS 2016-17 (SPECIFY REPORT)

⁶ Full time is defined as working at equal to or over .5 full-time equivalent (FTE); part time is less than .5 FTE.

⁷ Agreement: http://www.wou.edu/hr/files/2016/03/WOUFT_CBA_2015-2017.pdf

⁸ Ratio is calculated as the total full-time students plus one-third of part-time students to full-time faculty plus one-third part-time faculty.

PREFACE

Update since Year 7 Report in April 2016

Effective September 2016, Dr. Sue Monahan, former dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences moved to the position of Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness. In this new role, Dr. Monahan builds on her work with the Assessment Facilitation Steering Committee and university faculty to create and nurture a university-wide system of alignment and assessment for curriculum. This change will enable WOU to meet NWCCU-mandated benchmarks for student learning outcomes and to support academic programs as they develop processes to ensure ongoing adaptation to the evolving needs of our students.

The addition of the position of Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness is planned and the national search opened late December, 2016. **(UPDATE CLOSER TO DUE DATE.)** This position will add critically-needed capacity for deeper analyses of institutional data for better decision-making, and contribute to creating a more-informed process for setting targets for mission fulfillment.

Finally, the institutional strategic planning process that commenced April 2016 (as reported in the 2016 Year Seven Report) concluded mid-January, one month before this report was to be submitted. The [2017-2023 Strategic Plan⁹](#) (Appendix D) established a new mission, as well as statement of vision, values, purpose, and institutional priorities for the university. This plan was developed through the work of a 25-member committee composed of faculty, staff, students, Board of Trustee members and community representatives co-chaired by President Rex Fuller and immediate-past Faculty Senate President Dr. Laurie Burton. It was approved by the Board of Trustees on January 25, 2017.

Response to Topics requested by the Commission

a. Response to Spring 2016, Year Seven- Recommendation 1

The newly approved 2017-2023 Strategic Plan conveys a new mission statement that explicitly articulates WOU's intent to provide for "transformative education" and "student success". A transformative education requires academic excellence, and student success requires that students complete their degree programs. Consequently, the institution's leadership has also identified the first two Institutional Priorities as its Core Themes (Academic Excellence and Student Success) for NWCCU accreditation. The last three Institutional Priorities are operational imperatives (Community Engagement, Accountability, Sustainability and Stewardship) in that they help define how WOU and its members will conduct the institution's affairs. This moves components that were less central to WOU's purpose in WOU's last mission statement to a subordinate position and allows for greater emphasis on components of WOU's academic purpose. Altogether, these changes clarify the mission and provide better direction to assess mission fulfillment.

b. Response to Spring 2016, Year Seven- Recommendations 2 and 3

There have been substantial efforts and improved outcomes related to mission fulfillment and expectations as defined in the first objective under the new Core Theme 2: Academic Excellence. First, it is now an institutional priority to build campus-wide commitment to the premise that design of WOU's degree programs are integral to student success, and that there must be alignment between

⁹ Strategic Plan: <http://www.wou.edu/planning/>

stated program outcomes and program curriculum to ensure that students have the opportunity to gain the knowledge and skills expected of graduates. Consequently, academic effectiveness must be grounded in assessing student learning across all courses, programs, and degrees.

As described earlier, Dr. Sue Monahan as Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness is leading the charge to build WOU faculty capacity to effectively set meaningful, assessable and verifiable learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional level. Additionally, she is leading efforts to define and establish policies, enable an online, centralized repository and ensure effective intra-institutional communication of assessment plans and results.

Review, revision and/or confirmation of program learning outcomes for all programs was completed in December 2016. The target date for submission of all undergraduate general education course goals and alignment was December 31, 2016 with [85% submitted](#)¹⁰ by mid-January. (*Finalize % in Feb*). By March 31, 2017 faculty are expected to provide information on course goals and their alignments with program outcomes and university learning outcomes for all courses at WOU. By June 2017, this information will be available for use in five distinct ways: (1) it will populate the university's curricular review system, strengthening collective faculty ownership of curriculum, (2) it will be used to organize university-wide assessment of undergraduate and graduate learning outcomes, (3) it will be used to inform curricular maps for all programs including undergraduate general education, (4) it will be published on a website, strengthening the transparency of our courses and curriculum, and (5) it will be used annually to update and/or generate template electronic syllabi for distribution to programs, to ensure consistency in core course elements (i.e., course goals) across instructors and/or terms.

Work accomplished to date can be seen at the [academic effectiveness website](#)¹¹. A detailed report on this work will be included in the fall 2017 Ad Hoc Report as requested by the Commission in its letter of June 14, 2016.

Progress on defining mission fulfillment on objectives under Core Theme 1 and remainder of the objectives under Core Theme 2 has been modest, but meaningful. Preparation for this Year 1 Report was constrained by uncertainty arising from changing details in the strategic plan. The simultaneous timeline of the strategic plan and the Year 1 Report complicated efforts to closely link the latter to the former, and efforts to vet details related to mission fulfillment with campus-wide constituents would have been challenged by that disconnect. (For example, the Board of Trustees reviewed and approved the final version of the strategic plan at the same January meeting at which it first reviewed and commented on this report to NWCCU.)

Consequently, in an effort to maintain momentum toward improving institutional systems and meeting reporting requirements for NWCCU, the Academic Affairs leadership team made several strategic decisions:

- 1) To prioritize and begin action on the needed curriculum assessment structures, described at the start of this section.
- 2) To prioritize and emphasize attributes of *student success* and *academic excellence* (as they came to be named as core themes) within the Year 1 Report, based on the strong identification of campus members to those as core values, the articulation of those as central to WOU's purpose for many years, and validation from members of the strategic planning committee.

¹⁰ Find chart at <http://www.wou.edu/cai/files/2017/01/How-is-my-program-doing-Gen-Ed-Goals.pdf>

¹¹ Academic Effectiveness website: <http://www.wou.edu/cai/initiatives/assessment/>

- 3) To establish an initial mission fulfillment matrix that articulated objectives, indicators, and evidence related to basic academic and co-curricular indicators and measures.

At this point, the strategic planning committee intends *(rewrite after Feb 3 Strategic Planning Committee meeting)* to define implementation strategies and next steps in key areas (i.e., budget and resource planning, technology) at its February 3, 2017 meeting. Building upon those decisions, academic leadership expects to engage with key parties as well as shared governance bodies (i.e., Faculty Senate, Staff Senate and the Associated Students of WOU) for discussion of the initial mission fulfillment matrix with a goal of adding needed indicators or measures, defining evidence, clarifying target goals and possibly expanding coverage, including a potential third core theme. Thus, a comprehensive matrix, although delayed, will be thoroughly vetted with campus constituents and submitted as part of the Fall 2017 Ad Hoc Report to enable WOU to meet the spirit and letter of Recommendations 2 and 3, and meet the two-year deadline as required U.S. Department of Education 34 CFR 602.20.

Finally, discussions have already begun on the requirements outlined in Recommendations 4, 6, and 7 of the Commission's findings and progress will be reported in detail in the fall 2017 Ad Hoc Report as requested in the Commission's letter of June 14, 2016. For example, the strategic planning committee's agenda for its February 3, 2017 meeting, intended to initiate implementation strategies in critical areas (i.e., budget and resource planning, technology) and the inclusion herein of assessment of planning as a measure of mission fulfillment (described in detail in Appendix E) are critical first steps to meeting requirements under Recommendations 5, 6, and 7.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS 2 and 3

Eligibility Requirement 2. Authority

The institution is authorized to operate and award degrees as a higher education institution by the appropriate governmental organization, agency, or governing board as required by the jurisdiction in which it operates.

Western Oregon University was originally authorized to offer associate, baccalaureate and masters degrees by Oregon Revised Statute 352.355; until June 30, 2015, oversight authority was held by Oregon State Board of Higher Education and the Oregon University System. This changed with the enactment of Senate Bill 80; changes are summarized in the Oregon State Bar's [summary of 2015 legislation](#)¹²:

"SB 80 abolished the Oregon University System and the State Board of Higher Education. The board's duties, powers, functions, and lawfully incurred rights and obligations pertaining to a university with a governing board are transferred to and vested in the university's governing board. Any administrative rules and policies adopted by the board continue in effect until superseded or repealed by the standards or policies of a university or its governing board."

Oregon State Bar, 2015 Oregon Legislation Highlights, pages 1-19.

Subsequently, the Board of Trustees of Western Oregon University was formed. [Bylaws](#)¹³ establish the Board's authority to govern the university and the [Board Statement on Delegation of Authority](#)¹⁴ (Section 1.7 Academic Affairs) provides information concerning the academic authority held by the Board:

1.7.1 The Board has the authority to establish, eliminate, control or substantially reorganize academic programs and units of operation. Any significant change in the University's academic programs as defined by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission must be approved by the Board prior to submission to the Commission. The Board confers academic degrees, certificates and other forms of recognition upon the recommendation of the faculty. Such academic degrees, certificates and other forms of recognition are granted in the name of the Board of Trustees of Western Oregon University and are executed by the Board Chair and the University President. The Board shall have the exclusive authority to approve honorary degrees.

1.7.2 The Board delegates to the President and the professors ("the faculty" as defined in ORS 352.146) authority relating to: (a) academic standards relating to admission to study at the University; (b) curriculum, curricular materials, method of instruction, grading, credits, and academic standards of the University; and (c) standards of student competence in a discipline.

¹² Summary of 2015 legislation: https://www.osbar.org/_docs/lawimprove/2015LegislationHighlights.pdf

¹³ WOU Board of Trustees Bylaws: http://www.wou.edu/board/files/2014/10/WOU_Bylaws1.pdf

¹⁴ http://www.wou.edu/board/files/2014/10/Board_Statement_on_Delegation_of_Authority.pdf

Eligibility Requirement 3. Mission and Core Themes

The institution's mission and core themes are clearly defined and adopted by its governing board(s) consistent with its legal authorization, and are appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education. The institution's purpose is to serve the educational interests of its students and its principal programs lead to recognized degrees. The institution devotes all, or substantially all, of its resources to support its educational mission and core themes.

The institutional strategic planning process that commenced in April 2016 (and was first reported in the 2016 Year Seven Report) concluded in January 2017 with its adoption by the Board of Trustees at its January 25, 2017 Board meeting. The newly-adopted mission and core themes have been forwarded to the Higher Education Coordinating Commission for formal recognition at the state level. After receiving that approval, the university will communicate this change throughout the campus community, alumni and local community.

Substantially all of the University's resources support its educational mission, as demonstrated by the percentage of total 2015-2016 general fund expenditures used for instruction, research and public service (Eric to insert %; Use data ending 12/31/2016?) and academic or student support services and financial aid (need %). Together, these expenditures account for nearly XX% of the total. The balance of expenditures includes administration, expenses for shared services among the public universities and physical plant. Detailed financial report can be found on the [Office of Finance and Administration website](#)¹⁵.

¹⁵ Office of Finance and Administration: <http://www.wou.edu/financeandadministration/documents/>

STANDARD 1.A MISSION

1.A.1. Mission: *The institution has a widely published mission statement—approved by its governing board—that articulates a purpose appropriate for an institution of higher learning, gives direction for its efforts, and derives from, and is generally understood by, its community.*

Western Oregon University's 25-member Strategic Planning Committee defined the institution's mission with discussion and input from the campus and local community over a 10-month planning process. This mission statement (below) was subsequently approved by the WOU Board of Trustees at its January 25, 2017 board meeting. In accordance with state statutes, the mission was then submitted to the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission for review; approval is expected in spring 2017. *(REX/ RYAN: any further detail on next steps with HECC?)*

Western Oregon University creates lasting opportunities for student success through transformative education and personalized support. (version 1-10-2017)

The mission articulates a purpose appropriate for an institution of higher learning, particularly for a public, teaching-oriented institution in Oregon. The mission gives direction for WOU's efforts to advance student success, aspire to standards of academic excellence in all programs, and through community engagement, enhance access to and support for experiential learning and co-curricular activities.

1.A.2. Mission: *The institution defines mission fulfillment in the context of its purpose, characteristics, and expectations. Guided by that definition, it articulates institutional accomplishments or outcomes that represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.*

Mission fulfillment is defined appropriately for WOU's purpose as a public, liberal arts institution of higher education. WOU prioritizes teaching and being student-centered; accordingly, it is characterized by smaller class sizes, courses taught by faculty rather than teaching assistants, and a student to faculty ratio less than 20 to 1, that enables frequent and meaningful faculty-student interactions. WOU's expectations of its programs are that students complete their degree programs in a timely manner. Altogether, WOU's purpose, characteristics and expectations give rise to its definition of mission fulfillment.

Performance on institutional objectives are evaluated based on two parts: outcomes along stated measures under Core Theme objectives, and an assessment of the *planning processes* that are enacted to achieve those outcomes. Thus, mission fulfillment is also tied to the institution's development of organizational capacity to effectively plan, implement, evaluate, communicate results, and integrate those results into subsequent decision-making, planning, and budgeting. (Details are included under Appendix E: Rubric for Planning Assessment)

WOU intends that a 'minimally acceptable' outcome for Objectives' measures for year two (and subsequent years) of the seven-year accreditation cycle is an outcome which maintains performance on par with the prior year's performance, assuming the measure is quantitatively based. For an assessment of 'satisfactory performance', performance must make progress toward the stipulated target goal. A 'minimally acceptable' outcome for assessment of planning processes for year two is achieving any level above Level I. For 'satisfactory performance', planning processes must be assessed at Level III or IV.

For those Objectives' measures that are not quantitative, but instead, dependent on provision of an internal report, or other documentation, WOU intends that a 'minimally acceptable' outcome for Objectives' measures for year two (and subsequent years) of the seven-year accreditation cycle is one in which the President's Cabinet reviews the documentation and by a majority vote, rates it as minimally acceptable. If the majority vote is not achieved, then performance is designated as less than acceptable. If performance is perceived to be stronger, than the rating of 'satisfactory performance', may be assigned based on the Cabinet's unanimous vote that substantial progress has been made toward the stated goal. Therefore, WOU has defined mission fulfillment and articulated a structure for core themes and outcomes that enables assessment of achievement relative to mission fulfillment.

Additionally, it is intended that the President's Cabinet will receive, minimally, an annual update on plans and institutional progress toward stated goals. Communication of progress reports through multiple channels will convey updates to the campus constituency.

STANDARD 1.B CORE THEMES

1.B.1 Core Themes: The institution identifies core themes that individually manifest essential elements of its mission and collectively encompass its mission.

Five institutional priorities were articulated within the 2017-2023 Strategic Plan; the first two are explicitly stated in the mission statement and therefore have been identified as the core themes by which to focus efforts on mission fulfillment. The remaining three priorities (Community Engagement; Accountability; Sustainability and Stewardship) will help to guide operational practices. The two core themes are:

1. Student Success: To promote student success, learning, and graduation through personalized support in a student-centered learning community.

2. Academic Excellence: To promote academic excellence in an engaged student-centered learning community.

Individually, these are specifically stated in the mission statement; this implicitly defines them as essential elements. Collectively, they illuminate the mission's intent that WOU is first and foremost focused on academic program quality, student learning and students' successful graduation. Although WOU, as a public university, may also be expected to serve the public good (e.g., community outreach or partnerships), those activities are not represented in core themes since they are not essential to mission, not part of performance evaluations by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission and not considered critical for determining state appropriations funding.

1.B.2. Core Themes: The institution establishes objectives for each of its core themes and identifies meaningful, assessable, and verifiable indicators of achievement that form the basis for evaluating accomplishment of the objectives of its core themes.

CORE THEME 1: Student Success

Promote student success, learning, and graduation through personalized support in a student-centered learning community.

To promote student success, curriculum must be accessible to the full range of potential students in our region, which will require delivery modes beyond the traditional on-campus, 8am-5pm course offerings. Furthermore, time to degree is a critical variable for accessibility since extended time leads to increased cost to student. Thus, the curriculum should be attainable in 180 credits/four years which requires that degree programs (including majors, general education, and other university requirements) are designed so that students may have a reasonable expectation of completing their degree in a timely manner.

WOU must also improve factors that impact student progress, including transfer articulations with community colleges, program design and required total credits, university requirements, and students' timely completion of critical foundational coursework. Working to improve the quality and efficiency of these inputs is intended to lead to improvements in goals critical to mission fulfillment: students graduate at a higher rate, with fewer excess credits in a shorter time frame, controlling for other student characteristics.

Finally, WOU must prioritize supportive structures and personalized service and do so in a way that *anticipates* obstacles our students may face in navigating unfamiliar institutional systems. Many of our students and potential students, are 'New Majority' (i.e., first-generation, low-income or immigrant students). Such students bring strengths and value to the institution, but they may not have the social and cultural capital (e.g., knowledge of institutional systems, mentorship from friends and family with familiarity with the complexities of higher education) needed to navigate our specific programs, processes and structures. To fulfill our mission of student success, it is incumbent upon our university to design transparent and student-friendly systems, and foster relationships with students that allow us to proactively guide them towards important services (e.g., advising services) and opportunities (e.g., internships, co-curricular programs, leadership opportunities).

Altogether then, the indicators are meaningful, the stipulated measures (direct and indirect) are assessable, and all evidence is able to be verifiable by internal and external reviewers.

The following chart ([CHART XX](#)) conveys the objectives, measures, and evidence that will be used to assess achievement and progress toward mission fulfillment. The chart also articulates goal target, along with the minimum performance threshold that is acceptable, as well as what would qualify as satisfactory level of performance relative to the target goal. In addition, for each measure, the chart includes the two columns that indicate the current and targeted goal levels for Planning Assessment. This allows the institution to convey not only the performance on the outcomes for the specific core theme measure (e.g., graduation rate), but the planning processes that are intended to support performance on the measure.

CORE THEME 1: Student Success

Objective	Indicator	Measure	Evidence *FTFTFR = first time, fulltime freshman	Minimum Threshold performance	Satisfactory performance	Target Goal	Planning Assessment Current	Planning Assessment - Goal
A. Empowers students to succeed academically through its <i>accessible curriculum</i> and <i>attainable programs</i> .	1. Curriculum is offered across multiple delivery pathways.	Flexible format course offerings (i.e., online, hybrid, evenings or weekends)	Percentage of programs which are able to be served by flexible LACC curriculum (Gen Ed).			Positive slope over 7 years using annual average	Level I	Level III
		Percentage of fully enrolled students, by term	% of UG enrolled in 15 credits; % of Grad students enrolled in 9 credits			Positive slope over 7 years using annual average	Level I	Level III
	2. Programs are offered which can be completed in a timely and efficient manner.	Graduation Rates	5 year graduation rate for students: UG, Grad, First-time freshmen, Transfer	Increase by 2%	Continued 2% increase/yr	Slope to 110% comparator group* average	Level I	Level III
		Total Credits at Graduation	Average total credits for students: UG, First-time freshmen, transfer	Not higher than 2016 average number	% graduating under 200 units	Negative Slope to 180	Level I	Level III
		Community College Articulation and/ or Degree Pathways	% of programs with articulated "90+90" pathways with 5 targeted community colleges	Add 2 community college articulations/yr	Increase in number of programs articulated with each CC	Positive slope relative to targeted CC list	Level I	Level III
		Number of Program Credits Required (Undergraduate)	% of Undergraduate programs that can be met within 180 credits			Slope to 100%	Level I	Level III
		Timely completion of requisite general education Math and Writing requirements (UG)	% of FTFTFR completing math and writing requirements by end of sophomore year		90% of students complete	100% of students complete	Level I	Level III

* The comparator group are 10 universities matched to WOU's characteristics using IPEDS data.

CORE THEME 1: Student Success (Continued from prior page.)

Objective	Indicator	Measure	Evidence	Minimum Threshold performance	Satisfactory performance	Target Goals Completion by	Planning Assessment-Current	Planning Assessment-Goal
B. WOU's supportive structures and personalized service support students in their educational endeavors.	1. WOU's supportive environment facilitates student persistence and success.	Retention Rate	5 Year Average: UG, Grad, Transfer, FTFTFR*			Slope to 110% of comparator group**	Level I	Level III
		NSSE – Advising Component	Responses on NSSE advising scale			Slope to 110% of comparator group**	Level I	Level III
		Graduation rate of underrepresented students (HECC priorities)	Graduation Rate of under-represented minority, veterans, rural, or economically disadvantaged			Positive 5yr trend		Level III
	2. WOU provides personalized service to its students.	NSSE: Engagement	Responses to NSSE engagement scale (Q 3, 13, 14).	Performance at current NSSE rating	Improvement over past measure	Slope to 110% of comparator group**	Level I	Level III
Student –Faculty Ratio		Student-Faculty ratio, using IPEDS definition			Maintain ratio no higher than 25:1	Level IV	Level IV	

* FTFTFR: First-time, full-time freshmen

** The comparator group are 10 universities matched to WOU's characteristics using IPEDS data.

CORE THEME 2:

Promote academic excellence in an engaged, student-centered learning community.

WOU's degree programs are integral to providing an educational experience leading to student success. Academic effectiveness focuses on assessing student learning in across all courses, programs, and university requirements. Achieving alignment between stated program outcomes and program curriculum ensures that students have the opportunity to gain the knowledge and skills expected of graduates.

The simple graphic below communicates the meaning and value of alignment:



These components are defined as:

Align: We coordinate our teaching efforts

Assess: We study learning as a community of scholars

Evolve: We use what we learn to improve

Shine: We celebrate our successes

Core Theme 2's objectives focus on the outcomes of the process: the demonstration of alignment as well as a reiterative regular review process. The first ensures a "purposeful learning experience" and the second enables "programs that are responsive to the evolving needs of students".

All indicators related to the first objective are dichotomous; the assessment task has been completed or it has not and action is designed to be tracked with progress noted on the Academic Effectiveness [website](#). Therefore, the indicators are meaningful, the stipulated measures (direct and indirect) are assessable, and all evidence is able to be verifiable by internal and external reviewers.

The remainder of the objectives speak to WOU's emphasis on "transformative education", the creation of which is possible through opportunities for students to participate in high-impact practices within courses or in co-curricular opportunities. Additionally, faculty excellence is linked to the student educational experience, and thus, measures that demonstrate outstanding teaching and scholarship are meaningful to assess institutional mission fulfillment. They are assessable, using direct and indirect means, and able to be verifiable by internal or external reviewers.

The following chart (**CHART XX**) conveys the objectives, measures, evidence and goal target that will be used to assess progress toward mission fulfillment. In addition, for each measure, the chart includes the two columns that indicate the current and targeted goal levels for Planning Assessment. This allows the institution to convey not only the performance on the outcomes for the specific core theme measure (e.g., graduation rate), but the planning processes that are intended to support performance on the measure.

CORE THEME 2: Academic Excellence								
Objective	Indicator	Measure	Evidence	Minimum Threshold performance	Satisfactory performance	Target Goals	Planning Assessment- Current 1/ 17	Planning Assessment - Goal Jan 2018
C. Aligned and responsive academic practices provide a purposeful learning experience for students.	1. Alignment is demonstrated across course learning outcomes (goals), program learning outcomes, and university learning outcomes.	Verification of curricular and co-curricular alignment plan, process, schedule and demonstrated alignment.	Process for academic program and co-curricular alignment, published online		Alignments with program outcomes and university learning outcomes for all course goals for 100% courses published online	Full alignment X% of alignment reviewed annually	Level I	Level III
	2. Academic and co-curricular programs are responsive to the evolving needs of our students	Verification of data-driven curricular change	Documentation of practices and professional development to enable valid, data-driven curricula evaluations		Inventory of curricular changes (and explanation of data & analyses) resulting from assessment efforts; accessible online	Full alignment X% of curriculum reviewed annually, based on rotating schedule	Level I	Level III
		Evidence of ongoing undergraduate, graduate, program and co-curricular assessment.	Schedule of expected assessments published online		Completion of timely assessment according to schedule; at least X % of academic units participate	X% of curriculum reviewed annually, based on rotating schedule	Level 1	Level III

CORE THEME 2: Academic Excellence (Continued from prior page)

Objective	Indicator	Measure	Evidence	Minimum Threshold performance	Satisfactory performance	Target Goals	Planning Assessment-Current	Planning Assessment-Goal
D. WOU fosters a culture and climate of curiosity, critical inquiry, and scholarship.	1. Championing outstanding teaching, research, and scholarship	NSSE Engagement Survey	Comparison of student responses to peer group	Maintain current level		Trend comparison to peers over X time Vs. Slope to 110% of Peers	Level I	Level III
		Grants received for Instruction or Scholarship	Number and value of grants received	Maintain current level of grant activity		To be decided	Level I	Level III
		Faculty and Staff Research and Publication	Inventory of faculty/staff peer-reviewed publications, creative work, and products from professional development fund, and sabbatical accomplishments	Maintain current level of professional activity		Updated Report	Level I	Level III
		Graduate or professional school matriculation of students	Numbers of WOU graduates in postgraduate programs	Maintain current level of post-graduate enrollment		To be decided	Level I	Level III
	2. Student engagement in high impact-learning	Prevalence of student-faculty research collaborations	Student responses to NSSE question related to student/faculty research	Maintain current % level of engagement		Slope to 110% of comparator group	Level I	Level III
		Student engagement in high impact practices	Student Responses to NSSE HIP survey (Q11 and 12)	Maintain current % level of engagement		Slope to 110% of comparator group	Level I	Level III
		Availability of high impact opportunities	Inventory by program of practices, & percent of participants	Maintain current level of opportunities	Opportunities available in all programs	Updated Report	Level I	Level III

Objective	Indicator	Measure	Evidence	Minimum Threshold performance	Satisfactory performance on Mission Fulfillment	Target Goals:	Planning Assessment-Current	Planning Assessment-Goal
	3. Students engage with peers from a diversity of cultures, worldviews, or thought.	NSSE Question/Scale: Interactions with others unlike self.	Responses to NSSE questions.	Performance maintained at most recent level		Positive trend	Level I	Level III

DRAFT 1-16-2017

Conclusion

Since the Year-7 report was filed with the NWCCU in March 2017, the Western Oregon University community has undergone a focused, intensive engagement in examining the University mission through the strategic planning process. Significant public discussion among multiple constituencies has taken place on setting the course for the University's future mission and the strategic and tactical means by which that mission is pursued. We believe the mission and core themes adopted by the University's Board of Trustees in January 2017 best focus the University for the future. Further, the institution's response to the Commission's recommendations from the Year 7 review demonstrates that the institution's leadership is committing significant resources to give concerted attention to the processes for tracking mission fulfillment that will ensure our accountability and responsiveness to our constituencies. More in-depth update on the various steps taken since our Year 7 review will be forthcoming in our fall 2017 Ad Hoc Report.

APPENDICES PLACED HERE...

Placeholder: APPENDIX D: Rubric for assessing planning processes

In addition to assessment of core theme-related success, WOU must also establish a means to assess planning activities, in addition to assessing key indicators. This leads to a rubric that enables institutional members to evaluate performance of the internal assessment planning progress, and ensures that WOU is more systematic in its planning processes. For example, it will be clearer how WOU is progressing on achieving better planning processes under an ‘objective’ as well as achieving the target ‘indicator’ under that objective (e.g., graduation rate).

Planning Rubric

The rubric is dependent upon four incrementally-higher levels of performance on planning as described in Chart 1. The levels are meant as a heuristic guide to a holistic evaluation of mission fulfillment rather than as standards to be strictly defined. The levels and content were developed based on insights from a similar rubric intended to evaluate plan progress for assessing academic outcomes, proposed by NWCCU at its Mid-Cycle Evaluation workshop (Seattle, 2016) and include reference to stages of planning, implementation, evidence-based evaluation of outcomes, integration of evaluation into subsequent plan, and communication.

CHART 1: LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE

LEVEL	Characterized by:
I - Initial	No formal plan; no feedback on plan from other constituents; non-specific outcomes; data/evidence not defined specifically, not collected, not reviewed for appropriateness, or not reviewed by others for validity check. No schedule to review data/evidence.
II - Emerging	Relies on intermittent or non-integrated planning; planning not communicated outside department; data/evidence (on outcomes or relevant factors) is appropriately defined and intermittently collected; no evidence of review or discussion for changes needed to planning or budgeting; some attempts at alignment between planning and budgeting
III – Developed	Clear written plan, communicated and adopted by relevant decision-making authority; Intended actions are defined, coordinated, and in progress; Data/evidence (on outcomes or relevant factors) is defined and available to assess outcomes with at least annual feedback to functional department or relevant parties. Alignment between budget and planning occurs informally or intermittently.
IV – Highly Developed	Clear use of planning for multiple years; Data/evidence (on outcomes or relevant factors) is collected and used to inform subsequent planning for achieving targeted goals; performance is communicated to appropriate campus constituents including senior executives and Board of Trustees as appropriate; Evidence of collaborative efforts to improve next cycle performance

The intent is that the levels under the rubric would then serve to assess the implementation of planning functions, which in turn supports mission fulfillment. Chart 2 displays how functional units might translate the score on the rubric to a rating for mission fulfillment.

CHART 2: Translating level of planning assessment to rating on mission fulfillment.

Level of Planning Assessment	Initial Level I	Emerging Level II	Developed Level III	Highly Developed Level IV
Rating for Mission Fulfillment	Unsatisfactory	Year 1- 2 : Somewhat Unsatisfactory Year 3 forward Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent

Two scenarios help illustrate how this may be holistically applied to a specific Core Theme and Objective (see Chart 3, below), based on the difficulty of the indicators and the level assigned for planning. In Scenario 1, staff have decided that the majority of ratings will determine the mission fulfillment of planning for that Objective. Results in the chart show that over half of the items rate only at Level 1; therefore, Objective 1.2 receives a Level 1, Unsatisfactory, rating for its overall planning efforts. In Scenario 2, the ratings are equally split between Level II and III. However, since the two items with the higher ratings are complex planning situations involving multiple parties, the staff might rate Objective 1.2 as either Level II or III.

In practice, planning is expected to be ongoing; therefore, the Year 7 Report (2023) is expected to be able to demonstrate progress over the next seven years from this Year 1 Report.

CHART 3: EXAMPLE SCENARIOS

CORE THEME: STUDENT SUCCESS		
Objective 1.2: WOU offers programs that can be completed in a timely and efficient manner.		
Key Indicators	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
Graduation Rate	Level I – Initial	Level II –Emerging
Time to Completion	Level I – Initial	Level II –Emerging
Total Credits at Graduation	Level I – Initial	Level III -Developed
Degree Pathways for CC transfer sources	Level II –Emerging	Level III-Developed