



---

# Degree Qualifications Profile in Oregon

## Year One Progress Report

Submitted by

Sandra Bailey  
Director of Assessment

*March 2013*

## Table of Contents

Summary of Institutional Characteristics .....	1
Statement of Year One DQP Work Plan Goals and Objectives.....	1
Progress to Date.....	1
Reflections.....	2
Lumina Grant Deliverables.....	2
Concluding Thoughts .....	3
Appendix .....	4

## **I. Summary of Institutional Characteristics**

Founded in Klamath Falls in 1947, Oregon Institute of Technology (Oregon Tech) is one of the seven public universities that make up the Oregon University System. Oregon Tech serves the state with programs in engineering, technology, management, health technologies, arts and sciences as well as cooperative programs in dental hygiene and nursing. Oregon Tech has a full-service, residential campus in Klamath Falls and an urban, industry-focused campus in Wilsonville. Oregon Tech also has a distance education program which delivers a variety of degrees and offerings online. A total enrollment of about 4000 allows for an intimate campus environment distinguished by small classes and a student-to-faculty ratio of 20:1.

## **II. Statement of Year One DQP Work Plan Goals and Objectives**

The focus of Oregon Tech's year one work plan involved work in institutional engagement and horizontal alignment. Specific goals for institutional engagement included the creation of a DQP campus team, informing relevant stakeholders, and exploring the efficacy of the DQP in conjunction with a review of general education requirements and outcomes. Creation of a profile for a sample of degree programs was planned for horizontal alignment work with the DQP.

## **III. Progress to Date**

The Provost appointed the DQP campus team and the initial meeting was held in June 2012. The team includes faculty from a variety of disciplines and is led by the Provost, Director of Assessment and Chair of the Assessment Commission. This group met several times throughout the year to discuss potential uses of the DQP framework to further the assessment work already well developed at Oregon Tech, inform the strategic planning process, develop the work plan, and discuss progress toward objectives. Several members of the campus team attended the DQP conference in October 2012 and reported back to the Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission and the General Education Advisory Council.

In January 2013 the Provost issued a charge to review Oregon Tech's general education requirements using the DQP as a framework (see Appendix). A general education review committee has been formed including members from the DQP campus team. The committee is co-chaired by a faculty member and the Director of Assessment. It is anticipated the work of this committee will span three academic years.

To represent a sample of programs from Oregon Tech, one technical degree (Management, Entrepreneurship option) and one allied health degree (Nuclear Medicine Technology) were selected for horizontal alignment. Program faculty used the spider web tool to descriptively create a profile for the baccalaureate degrees. Faculty found this exercise fairly shallow without input from all program faculty as well as input from general education faculty. Assigning weights to each area was reported problematic given the subjective language of the DQP. Rather than map program level outcomes, faculty felt it may be more effective to map course outcomes. The mapping did confirm what we already know about our programs—high in applied, specialized and intellectual and low in civic learning. Overall

faculty did not see the value in the spider web application. The committee plans to structure horizontal alignment activities in more useful format in year two.

The initial lack of clarity of the Oregon DQP objectives made it difficult to define the nature of work to be completed at the institutional level. Once deliverables were clearly defined, time was limited to complete any substantial work. It is anticipated that the work planned for year two will allow for greater engagement by faculty within the areas of learning defined by the DQP.

#### **IV. Reflections**

The initial response from faculty who used the DQP to map current program outcomes was unenthusiastic. The language of the DQP is very subjective and therefore cumbersome to map to existing student learning outcomes. Program outcomes tend to be at a high level, the DQP would likely map better to course outcomes or specific performance criteria. Thus work in the coming year will focus on this more in depth analysis. Largest gaps appear to be in the area of civic learning. Oregon Tech institutional student learning outcomes in the areas of teamwork and lifelong learning did not seem to map well to the DQP outcomes.

#### **V. Lumina Grant Deliverables**

##### **Degrees, programs, or learning outcomes under review as part of the DQP project**

Oregon Tech is reviewing general education requirements as part of the DQP project. In addition, the DQP will be used to review learning outcomes for the Applied Psychology degree beginning fall 2013.

##### **Engagement of faculty in the DQP project**

So far there has been little engagement of Oregon Tech faculty in the DQP work. A handful of faculty are familiar with the profile, but few have engaged in any substantive work using the outcomes defined by the DQP. Oregon Tech has an advanced academic assessment process with high faculty engagement across the institution. It is difficult to get faculty excited about work with yet another model of student learning outcomes that is somewhat cumbersome when trying to compare to current program and institutional student learning outcomes.

##### **Use of spider web maps**

Two degree programs have been mapped using the spider web application. End results were deemed of little use. Oregon Tech will not use the spider web application to map other programs.

##### **Involvement by students and advisory committees in the DQP work**

Current students, alumni and advisory committees provide substantial feedback in regards to both program and institutional assessment at Oregon Tech. At this point, there has been no involvement of students or advisory committees in our DQP work.

## **VI. Concluding Thoughts**

Oregon Tech is just in beginning stages of work with the DQP. Future plans include the use of the DQP as a framework to review general education requirements and as tool for review of program student learning outcomes and potential revision of those outcomes and/or curriculum. More faculty engagement will be necessary for the outcome of the mapping exercise to influence program outcomes and assessment of student learning.

## Appendix

### Sandra Bailey

---

**From:** Bradley Burda  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 29, 2013 1:56 PM  
**To:** Tanya McVay  
**Cc:** Sandra Bailey; Charlie Jones; Lawrence Powers; Mateo Aboy; Cheryl Meyers  
**Subject:** GEAC Gen Ed charge

Tanya,

GEAC's review of the Management Department's request for an exemption to 36 credits in mathematics or 45 credits in mathematics, science, and social science has illustrated a need for us to review/reevaluate our overall general education requirements.

We are not alone in this undertaking. OSU recently completed their review. Also, much work has been done in recent years with the AAC&U LEAP vision through a statewide group formed by the Chancellor's office, the development of our own ISLOs, and now a grant incorporating community colleges and public universities in an attempt to define what the broad outcomes should be for all associate and baccalaureate degrees independent of discipline (DQP). All of which can be used as a resource for the work that needs to be done.

I understand that this will be a multi year process and suggest the following timeline:

- **Year 1** - Define the process, including how to dovetail DQP
- **Year 2** - Engage in a campus wide dialogue with the goal of defining Gen Ed outcomes. Compare those outcomes with LEAP, ISLOs, and DQP
- **Year 3**
  - Review our current Gen Ed requirements and recommend changes.
  - Begin the process of submitting changes to CPC

I propose forming a GEAC subcommittee to guide the process. I've met with you, Sandra Bailey, and Maria Lynn to discuss possible membership and will be contacting prospective members in the near future.

Thank you,  
Brad