

The seal of Eastern Oregon University is a circular emblem. It features an eagle with spread wings at the top, a ship on the left, a plow and sheaf of wheat at the bottom, and a covered wagon pulled by a cow in the center. The words "EASTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY" are written around the top inner edge, and "1929" is at the bottom. A banner across the middle reads "THE UNION".

Focused Interim Report 2010

**Prepared for the
Northwest Commission on
Colleges and Universities**

**Eastern Oregon University
March 26, 2010**

Acknowledgments

The Focused Interim Report was supported by leadership in the Provost's Office and by support staff in Academic Affairs. The Provost, the Deans of the Colleges, the Dean of Enrollment Services, and the Directors of Information Technology and Pierce Library contributed policy and other materials in response to NWCCU's recommendations. The Provost's Office thanks Division Chairs, Discipline Representatives, the Faculty Senate, the University Council, the FPC and EPCC, and the GEC Sampling Teams for their participation in responding to the recommendations. Special thanks to Kris Olson, Angie Adams, Farooq Sultan, and Tim Wilson for their assistance in developing and displaying the evidence that informs the report, and in final preparation of the report for NWCCU.

The President's Cabinet provided thoughtful discussion, approval of policy, and timely feedback of / for the report.

Table of Contents

Acronyms Used in the 2010 Focused Interim Report

Executive Summary and Introduction

Recommendation One	1
Recommendation Two	4
Recommendation Three	7
Recommendation Four	10
Recommendation Five	14
Recommendation Six	18
Recommendation Seven	21
Recommendation Eight	23
Recommendation Nine	26
Recommendation Ten	29
Executive Conclusions	32

Appendices

Appendix R8-A	1
Appendix R8-B	3
Appendix R8-C	10
Appendix R8-D	11
Appendix R9-A	13
Appendix R9-B	15

(Student Samples available in the Exhibit Room)

Acronyms Used in the 2010 Focused Interim Report

EOU	Eastern Oregon University
EPCC	Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee
ETIC	Engineering Technology and Industry Council
FPC	Faculty Personnel Committee
GEC	General Education Core
OSBHE	Oregon State Board of Higher Education
OUS	Oregon University System
ULO	University Learning Outcomes

Executive Summary and Introduction

Eastern Oregon University (EOU) is proud to present the attached Focused Interim Reports in response to Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) recommendations made as a result of the 2008 comprehensive self-study. The entire University community has worked persistently over twelve months to address the concerns of the Commission and to complete the work commenced in academic year 2008-2009. We are confident that progress made will confirm the University's continued high standards and best practices in serving the students of rural Oregon and beyond.

EOU submitted its self-study in September 2008 in preparation for the comprehensive accreditation review. In the report, the University identified a number of institutional needs and was already working on key areas of improvement. In Spring 2008, the University had begun work on university-wide strategic planning and assessment. The development of General Education criteria and assessments and systematic academic program assessment were key to the self-study. To inform all University planning and assessment, Institutional Research was re-evaluated and the University developed a plan to build a fully transparent model for enrollment management, university data gathering, and open access to information. When the Evaluation Team visited campus in October 2008, EOU was addressing these issues. In preparation for the visit, EOU recognized that there was still much to do.

The NWCCU Evaluation Team and Commission agreed that while the institution had made progress in several areas receiving recommendations, these areas needed to reach some conclusion in order to demonstrate analysis and assessment. Many of the things that EOU was commended for were the very things where completion or consistent application was recommended. The Evaluation Team, for example, believed faculty had created an exemplary General Education assessment system—finalized breadth outcome definitions were needed, however, in order to complete the cycle of assessment. The Evaluation Team also commended EOU on its portfolio approach to academic assessment—all programs, however, needed to participate at a sufficient level of consistency and detail to demonstrate a systematic approach to student learning. Strategic planning and institutional research were underway—it was necessary, however, to demonstrate how they had been integrated into the normative planning processes for the University. The Commission placed high value upon completion of these projects and believed recommendations would help the institution progress in these areas.

The NWCCU Evaluation Team was also interested in the Oregon State Board of Higher Education's (OSBHE's) interaction with and oversight of the University. There was consternation that the Board and the Oregon University System office (OUS) had not been attentive in helping the University negotiate leadership and financial difficulties prior to 2008. The Commission cautioned consistency of approach to such difficulties in order to provide confidence that there was adequate fiscal and organizational oversight to ensure the success of the University.

NWCCU's comprehensive visit confirmed and expressed recommendations that substantially aligned with EOU's internal recommendations for the work ahead—particularly in the areas of mission, governance, and assessment. The Evaluation Team's recommendations stimulated immediate response on the part of the administration, faculty, and staff. Beginning in January of 2009, the university community continued in earnest to complete tasks in progress and to

commence action on other recommendations. During 2009, institutional planning around mission was initiated. A University-wide plan connecting mission with action and budget was forged. In addition, General Education Assessment Planning was completed and several cycles of data that inform practice were collected. Academic programs installed regular cycles of assessment, collecting two installments of data that were interpreted and utilized to inform program improvements. Institutional Research was bolstered with both staff time and software to provide better information to all decision makers on campus. In Summer 2009, the OUS Provosts' Council initiated a series of talks with the Chancellor and the OSBHE to ensure governance and fiscal support. As a result of that work, the Board has affirmed a mission-setting process and system analysis of each member University, has developed presidential evaluations keyed to mission accomplishments, has verified specific institutional aspirations with respect to benchmark goals, and has affirmed EOU's progress through positive support for meeting OUS goals.

As a result of work commenced and completed in the past year, the state of the University is now stable. The NWCCU visiting team will find a University transformed in many ways. For the first time at EOU:

- 1) a mission-driven, collaborative, shared governance budget process has set institutional priorities and investments;
- 2) a long range data-driven model of enrollment management portends a positive future of sustained growth;
- 3) a set of planned activities for undergraduates has led to positive retention rate improvement;
- 4) a campus-wide University Learning Outcomes model now drives both General Education and Program Learning Outcomes;
- 5) assessment data is now part of the academic culture of improvement; and
- 6) a commitment to professional development keeps employees attuned to serving the needs of the students EOU enrolls.

EOU welcomes this opportunity to share with the Commission's Evaluation Team the progress the University has made and the positive support that we have received from the Oregon University System to ensure this success. The balance of this report is designed to a) introduce each recommendation, b) offer the University's interpretation of the work that needed to be accomplished, c) explain what process was engaged to address the issues, and d) offer the outcome and analysis of the work. In every case, the University has honestly and thoroughly owned the concerns of the Commission and has expended every effort not only to mitigate shortcomings, but also to develop exemplary practices in their stead.

RECOMMENDATION ONE

The Committee recommends that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE) collaborate with the University to undertake a clearly articulated process to clarify and approve the institution's mission in a timely manner. (Std. 6.B.5 – Governing Board, Std. 1.A – Mission and Goals)

Interpretation

Based on both written and oral communications with the Evaluation Team and the NWCCU, Recommendation One was issued to ensure that the University was supported by the OUS in the approval and affirmation of its mission. Because the OSBHE's (hereafter referred to as the Board's) mission approval processes were informal, and because the record indicated confusion about whether OUS institutional missions had been formally approved through the Board's portfolio review process in early 2007, there was no evidence university missions were approved on a regular cycle and through an iterated process.

Eastern Oregon University's mission statement is as follows:

EOU guides student inquiry through integrated, high-quality liberal arts and professional programs that lead to responsible and reflective action in a diverse and interconnected world.

As an educational, cultural and scholarly center, EOU connects the rural regions of Oregon to a wider world. Our beautiful setting and small size enhance the personal attention our students receive, while partnerships with colleges, universities, agencies and communities add to the educational possibilities of our region and state. (Posted at <http://www.eou.edu/pres/mission.html>)

The University forwarded this mission statement to the Board in June 2007 as part of the portfolio review process. The Board accepted the portfolio, as it had other institutional portfolios. (See http://www.ous.edu/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddoc070608.pdf). Because no further action was required, the University believed the mission was “approved.” A great deal of turnover in Board and OUS staff personnel at the time disrupted the process for tracking university mission statements, and no other process was installed to replace the Board's portfolio review and mission affirmation exercise.

In reviewing a draft of EOU's 2008 self-study—Standard One—the OUS staff determined that there were no official Board minutes specifically citing approval of EOU's mission, although there was documentation that EOU's portfolio had been accepted and reviewed a year earlier. EOU immediately requested Board action to affirm the mission statement above. The Board did so in Fall 2008. (See http://www.ous.edu/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddoc081021.pdf).

The *ad hoc* nature of OUS' and the Board's approval of EOU's mission statement in particular revealed a greater systemic need to articulate an approval process for OUS university mission statements. Although the Board and OUS jointly commenced a portfolio review process in 2007 in order to articulate the differential features of institutional missions, absent a clear cycle of

review or recommended procedure allowing institutions to adjust or change their missions, the process stalled with no final result. The Board's oversight to affirm or approve OUS institutional missions failed to meet the NWCCU's standard required by *I.A.1*: "The institution's mission and goals derive from, or are widely understood by, the campus community, are adopted by the governing board, and are periodically reexamined."

Process

In most instances a university has the ability to directly affect its platform and programs by a change in policy, procedure, or action. The Evaluating Team's recommendation presented a problem beyond EOU's aegis. Because the locus of control for this recommendation is the Board and the OUS Chancellor, EOU's process to address the Evaluation Team's concerns began there.

Subsequent to the Commission's letter and recommendations to the University, EOU's leadership immediately addressed this issue by having conversations with the Chancellor, the Board Chairman, Paul Kelly, OUS staff, and other Board members. In Summer of 2009, EOU's Provost made written requests to the Chancellor, staff, and Chair of the OUS Provosts' Council detailing the specific issues and recommending potential policies.

In response to these requests, the Provosts' Council drafted a mission-setting process that was adopted by the Board's Academic Strategies Committee and ultimately by the entire Board. As a result of this process, the Academic Strategies Committee commenced a system-wide study of university missions and commissioned the Provosts' Council to complete the earlier work of the Board to carefully identify the differential features of each university's mission statement.

Outcomes

As a result of these processes, the Board and OUS now have a formal policy for the review and approval of university mission statements. (See under Planning—OUS Mission Statement Review Policy at <http://www.eou.edu/strategy/>). The process requires that the University propose a mission that considers the following:

- Instructional focus; general education core; intended educational outcomes
- Core themes and signature program areas
- Partnerships
- Role of knowledge creation and application
- Focus of service to the region, state, nation, and/or world, as appropriate
- Connections to state and OUS priorities

The Provosts' Council developed an interactive stage process of approval to guide revision of institutional mission:

Stage 1: Development at the institution

Stage 2: First review by the Chancellor

Stage 3: Review by OUS Inter-Institutional Councils

Stage 4: Second review by the Chancellor

Stage 5: Consideration by the Board's Academic Strategies Committee

Stage 6: Approval by the full Board

In addition to the mission process, the Provosts' Council developed a mission matrix to describe the system portfolio. (See under Planning—OUS Mission Alignment <http://www.eou.edu/strategy/>). Using this information, the Board can better assess an institution's mission to determine the appropriate statewide and regional service, the appropriate programmatic breadth, and the degree to which a university contributes to the economic, cultural, and intellectual capital of the State. This process portends the careful review of each institutional mission and analysis to determine how the system's universities will share in the responsibility to serve all Oregonians.

Analysis

The outcome of the Commission's recommendation to EOU and the OUS has been a good one. The external stimulation to effect a fundamental change within the system has been positive. OUS and the Board have responded, recognized the NWCCU standards, and installed best practices to replace informal policies and processes. EOU is now confident that the robust mission adoption policy will provide a predictable and supportive method for affirming mission.

Given a clear set of steps, EOU can now plan a time frame best suited to reexamine its mission and vision. The campus expects to begin a mission review process as early as Fall 2010.

RECOMMENDATION TWO

The Committee recommends that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE) engage with and appropriately oversee the university to enable the institution to effectively fulfill its mission and goals. (Std. 6.B.7 and Std. 6.B.9 - Governing Board)

Interpretation

This recommendation arises from NWCCU's concern with the consistency of OSBHE's oversight of the institution. Over the past decade, the high turnover of administrative leadership on the Board, within OUS, and within EOU contributed to the Team's conclusion that consistency of Board support was imperative to EOU's future ability to fulfill its mission and goals. EOU had also undergone recent administrative restructuring (2007-2008 *Implementation Plan*) that had yet to mature and that would require consistency of leadership and good communication between EOU, OUS, and the Board in order for EOU to demonstrate the fulfillment of its mission and goals in the years to come.

NWCCU's recommendation focuses on the key elements stated in Standard 6.B.7—Governing Board: *“The board ensures that the institution is organized and staffed to reflect its mission, size, and complexity. It approves an academic and administrative structure or organization to which it delegates the responsibility for effective and efficient management.”* The previous administration was given a great deal of latitude in exploring ways of changing the EOU revenue structure. Due to a lack of proper communication to and from the University and the System (2005-2007), EOU's fund balance was allowed to fall to precariously low levels because it was believed that there was an ultimate plan for gaining new sources of revenue and student enrollment. In the absence of such a plan, OSBHE's subsequent vigilant oversight and enthusiastic approval of EOU's internally developed *Implementation Plan* (2007-2008) resulted in greater efficiencies in and tracking of EOU's fiscal integrity and administrative functions. This plan and oversight, combined with OUS' investment in a consultant to explore resource-sharing potentials system wide that might supplement the infrastructure at regional institutions like EOU, demonstrated awareness of economies of scale within the system and a need to support EOU's special mission to serve rural Oregonians.

In reviewing EOU's situational analysis in Standard Six (2008 Self-Study), NWCCU's Evaluation Team concurred with the view that the Board was not fully attuned to EOU's needs. Although the Board Chair's presence and support for EOU during the 2008 site visit was noted and appreciated, it was singular and perhaps symbolic of the Board's previous lack of attention to EOU's needs and issues. This created a perception by the Team, and subsequently the Commission, that not only was EOU geographically distant from Portland, Salem, and Eugene, but also strategically marginalized by the System.

As with Recommendation One, Board leadership and oversight is beyond the aegis of the institution. Consistent processes and policies that guide oversight and action, however, can be influenced by the University. Because Recommendations One and Two presented similar challenges to the University, leadership used similar processes to effect change.

Process

After the University received the Commission's letter and recommendations, the University administration met with the Chancellor and the Board Chair to discuss the issues. Then President Lund began ongoing conversations with the Chancellor, Board, and NWCCU to better understand what might be done to strengthen and support the fulfillment of EOU's mission within OUS and the State.

When Robert O. Davies became President, he continued Lund's work to solicit support from the OUS. EOU's new president has worked with the Board Chair, the Chancellor, and other Board members to ensure that EOU is an essential element of the OUS portfolio. As the only four-year institution in the eastern part of the State, EOU's role is to serve rural Oregonians. With over 75% of students from high schools in the ten easternmost counties selecting EOU, the critical value of the University to the State is evident to all. Through continued education, the Board is aware of EOU's mission-critical role as part of the OUS.

Outcomes

In late 2007, the Board affirmed EOU's *Implementation Plan* and supported the transition with a one-time allotment of \$1M to stabilize the 2007-2008 budget. The Chancellor also supported EOU with a \$50k sum to bring in outside consultants to help determine how to improve student recruitment. The Board applauded EOU's plans and has noted the success made in the past two years in response to declining enrollment, retention problems, diminished reserves, and turnover in leadership. Most recently, the Chancellor and Board have boasted EOU's success in record-breaking enrollment growth and retention rates.

Paul Kelly, the Board Chair, has pledged unmitigated support for the campus and offered any assistance necessary to address the concerns of the Commission. OUS Finance and Administration has offered technical assistance and support in aligning EOU accounting systems and fiscal reporting. The Chancellor's office has initiated a high degree of communication with presidents and vice presidents for tracking revenues, expenditures, and reserves.

The OUS and the Board monitor the institution through a set of institutional benchmarks where specific parameters are measured and compared to aspirations. These include the following basic parameters and some specific to the institution:

Access & Participation
Student Progress & Completion
Academic Quality & Student Success
Educated Citizenry & Workforce Development
Knowledge Creation & Fiscal Resources
Institutional Mission
(See EOU's Performance-Based Measures at http://www.ous.edu/factreport/mp/board.php)

The benchmarks are set through a collaborative process between the University and the Chancellor's office. Likewise, enrollment modeling is accomplished by personal visits from Chancellor's office staff to compare their data with ours and to arrive at a mutually acceptable funding plan for the following year. In addition, presidential assessments are linked closely to the

management of the campus and to fiscal stability. The presidential evaluation contains the following elements:

- academic leadership
- administrative leadership
- representation of EOU to OUS
- strategic vision and goals
- enrollment
- research and sponsored projects (minor for EOU)
- freshman retention
- graduate satisfaction
- degrees in shortage areas (specifically, math and science teachers)
- philanthropy
- financial management
- diversity
- degrees awarded
- transfer enrollment
- high school graduation yield from rural counties

Because the President is evaluated on these data points, there is a direct relationship to the oversight of the University as a whole.

The Board has recognized the unique role of EOU in the region and will continue to support Rural Access, the small school funding package, and the Health Initiative, and has committed to keeping EOU tuition as low as possible. All of these fiscal incentives demonstrate that the Board is attuned to and supportive of EOU's needs.

The Board has adopted a reward structure to affirm the campus by reimbursing for enrollment and retention gains. In Fall 2009, EOU was awarded \$500k for retention improvement and \$250k for enrollment gains. These funds confirm that EOU's success is of critical interest to the Board and Chancellor.

As part of the mission process iterated in Recommendation One, the Board is considering all OUS universities as a portfolio. EOU plays a critical role in the portfolio by providing regional access and service to eastern Oregon and the coast, a statewide presence through distance education, and liberal arts and professional programs available on campus, online, and on site through partnerships with community colleges across the state.

Analysis

OUS and the Board are keenly interested in EOU and are committed to support and to oversee the overall success of the University. The assurance of this attention is bolstered by the fact that one of EOU's faculty members sits on the Board and is attentive to the needs of all regional universities in the OUS.

The Board plays a central role in the detailed oversight of the universities. The most recent economic downturn has resulted in greater attention to fiscal oversight of all OUS universities. EOU anticipates that these new processes will ensure a higher degree of oversight that will enable greater transparency in mission and goal fulfillment in the years to come.

RECOMMENDATION THREE

The Committee recommends that the University coordinate its planning, budgeting and evaluation processes in a systematic and clearly defined manner that is effectively communicated to all stakeholders to help assure the University's mission fulfillment and the institution's sustainability. (Std. 1.B – Planning and Effectiveness, Std. 7.A – Financial Planning)

Interpretation

The interpretation of this recommendation is that the University needed to connect the mission with an open and iterative process to assign priorities, value, and resources to intended actions. The University needed an overarching plan that moved from mission to goals, from goals to action plans, from action plans to resource requests, and finally from idea to implementation and assessment.

Many of the pieces of this process had been assembled prior to the 2008 accreditation visit, but these pieces had not been connected and the University community had not embraced the overarching plan. For example, in Spring of 2008, Academic Affairs introduced a Strategic Plan outlining goals, aims, and benchmarks for 2008-2010. As an overarching mission plan, Academic Affairs introduced the concept of theme-based mission organization. Similarly, a plan for budget process was also introduced. (See <http://www.eou.edu/strategy/> to view all documents related to planning).

These pieces formed essential elements of a University-wide planning and budgeting process, but had not matured at the time of the visit. Because the previous planning processes had been mandated by the Board (OSBHE) to reduce spending by \$4.1M over three years, the campus community was unfamiliar with more normative ways of planning and thinking. The past seemed very top-down and collaborative planning had not had sufficient time to change that perception.

Process

As part of the self-study, EOU had recommended that the campus community take a series of actions. The following list delineates activities commenced in Spring 2008. These are consistent with Standards 1.B 1-9:

- 1) An overarching method for planning was necessary for individual units and for the University as a whole.
- 2) The University needed to establish the mission as “themes” to better articulate the purposes of the University.
- 3) A set of operational goals and University aims needed to be installed for 2009-10 with the proviso that a long-range policy be established for the setting of goals and aims.
- 4) Each unit needed to develop action plans that followed University goals and aims.
- 5) The University Strategic Plan would contain the critical elements of each unit action plan.

- 6) An assessment system would need to be installed to track progress on each strategic aim.
- 7) A yearly analysis of assessments in comparison to aspirations would be written to apprise the campus community about how the University is meeting its goals.

To affect these processes, a series of campus meetings and discussions ensued. The Provost proposed, in a series of documents and flow charts, options for items 1-7 above. In a series of 12 meetings with every campus constituency,¹ feedback was received and proposals were modified to accommodate feedback. Over six months the campus worked toward solutions to connecting mission with budget.

In Fall 2009, the President and Cabinet took the recommendations and developed a policy and procedure for mission, themes, goals, aims, indicators, action plans, the strategic plan, and budget allocation. The plans were implemented beginning in November 2009, and the first cycle of planning, budgeting and evaluation has concluded. It will begin again in Spring 2010 and annually thereafter on a routine schedule.

Outcomes

The outcomes of the past two years of work on institutional planning are as follows:

- 1) An overarching model for a mission-themes-goals-aims concept for University planning has been forged. (See Planning Template and University Planning Model at <http://www.eou.edu/strategy/>).
- 2) A method for setting budget allocations for new initiatives that arise from strategic planning has been adopted and tested. (See 2009-10 Initiatives and Budget Process at <http://www.eou.edu/strategy/>).
- 3) A University Assessment Plan that collects information about all aspects of campus performance and uses that data to monitor the progress of the University toward its goals and towards fulfilling its mission has been created. (See University Assessment Plan and Matrix at <http://www.eou.edu/strategy/>).
- 4) A first cycle of the initiative process where units developed concept proposals and where shared governance evaluated and tested proposals against the mission and goals of the university has been completed. This is an open and transparent process yielding budget priorities for 2010-11 that was implemented in Winter 2010 (see <http://www.eou.edu/strategy/Initiatives.html>).
- 5) EOU has been in negotiations with a vendor of a comprehensive software system to track institutional assessment that will be implemented in the near future.

¹ These included Faculty Senate, University Council, Budget and Planning Committee, College of Arts and Sciences (three divisions), College of Business, College of Education, Division of Enrollment Services, Administrative Faculty, and Student Affairs

Analysis

One faculty member observed of the collaborative planning process that “I may not like the outcome of the decision that was made about what initiative Eastern had selected, but it was a very good thing to have a systematic and open process to arrive at that point.”

EOU has accomplished a great deal in a short time. The University has emerged from a top-down, private system of budget allocation to an open and collaborative approach. Mission now drives the individual statements of aspiration and action, and assessment provides a feedback loop to determine which practices to keep and which to discard.

RECOMMENDATION FOUR

The Committee recommends that the University increase its institutional research capacity to help define and analyze data necessary for effective and timely decision-making and to disseminate results to all appropriate constituencies. (Std. 6.C.7 – Leadership and Management)

Interpretation

The visiting team observed that the 2008 *Implementation Plan* had impacted staffing of the institutional research area (view plan at <http://www.eou.edu/strategy/>). Their concern arises from their perception that institutional research functions had been compromised at a time when it was vital to assess the progress of the *Implementation Plan*. The evaluation team recommended that EOU increase its institutional research capacity. At the time of the visit, EOU lacked some typical institutional research components—data dashboards, fact books, and tracking programs for university-wide assessment. The team observed that because EOU had not produced these institutional data, institutional research was in deficit.

In response to this recommendation, EOU focused on the phrase “*research capacity to help define and analyze data necessary for effective and timely decision-making.*” While the University recognizes the value of having the institutional research capacity of a large university, the economy of scale forces EOU to concentrate on those areas where data is key to understanding the most essential issues and to focusing attention on data and analyses that support the institution in its decision-making.

In framing a response to this recommendation, EOU leadership determined the key elements of information that the institution must have in order to make timely, informed decisions. The three basic areas of data needs key to assessment of progress are: 1) to report necessary elements of performance standards and OUS requirements in order to make decisions about mission, goals, aims, and benchmarks; 2) to collect information about the students of the University to inform decision-making about enrollment trends, admissions strategies, financial aid, and retention programs; and 3) to inform the campus concerning metrics associated with program effectiveness including productivity measures and assessment summaries. A brief description of each of these needs is given below.

Key to EOU’s sustainability is the ability to carefully track the institutional mission to determine if the institution is fulfilling its aspirations. Recommendation Three details the policies and processes involved in setting mission, themes, goals, aims and indicators. Collecting data about these aims is crucial to giving units and the University as a whole the information necessary to adjust strategies. OUS requires that the University report multiple parameters of performance, including all of the following:

•	Total credit enrollment
•	New undergraduate enrollment
•	Freshman retention at original institution (targeted)
•	Freshman retention within OUS
•	Graduation rate at original institution

•	Graduation rate within OUS
•	Graduate satisfaction (targeted)
•	Graduate success
•	Internships
•	Ratio of students to full-time faculty
•	Total degrees awarded (targeted)
•	Degrees in designated shortage areas (targeted)
•	Sponsored research expenditures (targeted)
•	Philanthropy
•	Faculty compensation
•	Campus Mission-Specific Indicators (2)

The second key to EOU's sustainability is understanding how to track, plan, and predict enrollment and retention. Prior to 2008, few tools were available that could be used to project enrollment for a succeeding year, let alone a longer time frame. The OUS model provided to the University failed to recognize the impact of changes in strategy and as a result, over time, predicted much more conservative values for enrollment growth. At the University level, data was collected in an undifferentiated way where enrollment numbers were reported as sums and not as stratified samples of the major constituents of the student body. EOU is idiosyncratic among OUS institutions in that over half of its students take courses and programs away from campus. Consequently, there are four main groups of students that require very specific tracking: 1) On campus students, 2) Online students, 3) On site students (residential programs at TVCC, BMCC, MHCC, and SWOCC), and 4) graduate students (MBA and MAT hybrid programs). It is critical to understanding the institution and in making decisions for the future that these data are accurately and carefully rendered. Because EOU's fiscal model critically depends on understanding these differentiated revenue streams, short- and long-range statistical methods are essential.

The final key informational need is a detailed understanding of the effectiveness of programs and the behavior of students within programs. Institutional research accounts for several areas of data, including:

- trends in program majors, graduates, and student credit hours;
- outcomes assessment information by general education and by degree program;
- performance of certain identified groups, including online, low-income, first-generation and ethnic/minority students;
- behavior of on-campus students taking online courses;
- financial aid impact;
- retention of specific groups of students;
- attitudes and responses of students and employers to the effectiveness of the institution.

Subsequent to the leadership changes in 2007, all of these areas of need were identified and queued for implementation. There was enough skepticism that the extant data was insufficient and so untrustworthy that the University began anew to reset the data necessary to make good decisions about the future. At the time of the visit only about one-half of the data had been revitalized.

Process

As mentioned above, the parameters of what the University needed to make good decisions had been determined prior to the writing of the self-study and the visit. EOU had articulated what needed to be done and had a longitudinal plan to move in that direction.

Subsequent to the Commission's report and recommendation, university leadership revisited the plan and accelerated its resolve to complete the essential elements necessary to inform the University.

Based upon the key elements required, a University Assessment Plan and Matrix were developed (<http://www.eou.edu/assess/ProgramAssessment.html>). Within the action plan were specific elements of data to collect and process, the identification of the staffing required to accomplish those tasks, the purchase of software that might accelerate the ability for institutional research staff to process information quickly, and the methods by which these data and analyses would be made available to the campus community. Over the past ten months EOU has made a great deal of progress towards meeting these aims.

Outcomes

To date, the institutional research area has completed the following:

Data Reports (<http://www.eou.edu/ir/>)

- Multi-year enrollment forecast model
- Enrollment trends by location
- Retention rates/trends by term, by year
- Retention of specific groups of students
- Admissions reports—current vs historical
- Online/On campus SCH break outs
- Long range cost/revenue projections
- Program graduation numbers and historical
- Program SCH and historical
- Freshmen retention by type
- General Education Core Outcome reports (<http://www.eou.edu/assess/GEC.html>)
- Program Assessment portfolio dashboard (<http://www.eou.edu/assess/ProgramAssessment.html>)

Staffing

- The University has identified a Coordinator of Institutional Research. This individual is responsible for the collection and processing of reports to all units on campus and takes specific direction from the Provost.
- The Coordinator of Institutional Research has engaged in professional development activities and is currently adding to his portfolio the ability to analyze and interpret information through a masters program and through mentoring.
- The University has identified a programmer to provide support to this position so that some code queries will be handled by the support staff rather than programmed by the Coordinator. This permits the Coordinator to have more time to run the actual report and to create the kind of information stream most helpful to the University.
- The University has identified support staff to help in the data entry of assessment information.

- The Provost continues to serve as the primary analyst of enrollment, retention, and programmatic outcomes for the University.

Software

- Multiple platforms of data analysis and display were explored. The University purchased Xcelsius, a tool for graphing, charting, and reporting data. This dashboard software gives the campus community a snapshot of SCH, graduates, and overall enrollment by on site, online and on campus via a web portal.
- The University is also negotiating a vendor to implement a software system that allows all university assessment information to be centralized. This software allows anyone to collect reports and analyze data in order to interpret the degree of success of any particular program, college, or university at large.
- The University has also commissioned several individual pieces of web-entry software tools that allow faculty to enter outcomes assessment information. This method keeps the data in confined parameters so it may be displayed in consistent and parallel methods.

Display Methods

- An IR website has established several elements that are displayed for use by any in the campus community:
 - 1) Current enrollment information by location,
 - 2) program productivity,
 - 3) Retention data,
 - 4) Enrollment modeling,
 - 5) historical trends,
 - 6) special reports, and
 - 7) archived data. (<http://www.eou.edu/ir/>)
- An assessment website displays programmatic information that can be easily accessed by faculty and external agencies. (<http://www.eou.edu/assess/GEC.html> and <http://www.eou.edu/assess/ProgramAssessment.html>)

Analysis

The University made a conscious decision to work incrementally towards acquiring the information necessary in order to make good decisions about resources and future planning. The highest priorities for the University have been to stabilize enrollment and to assess quality. EOU now has adequate data streams that inform our practice. The analysis of admissions data and point of origin has stimulated a shift in the areas where admissions counselors recruit students. As a result, enrollment has grown significantly and student pools have developed earlier than in past years.

As a result of the work to understand enrollment trends and modeling of subsequent years' growth, EOU has been able to prove to the OUS system that its data and model is more reliable than OUS' model, resulting in funding at a higher level. As a result of data collection concerning freshmen retention, strategies were placed specifically to address academic success. The work resulted in an increase from 54% to 72% in freshmen retention (F2008 – F2009). Based on data analysis of the interaction of on-campus and online course distribution, policies and practices were installed that slowed the growth of program hybridization by on-campus freshmen. As a result of EOU's study of low income and ethnic/minority students, new energy is being applied to assure that all students have access to high impact practices and excellent curriculum and instruction.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE

The Committee recommends that the University continue its academic portfolio assessment and ensure uniform application across all academic programs. The Committee further recommends that student learning outcomes be an integral component of portfolio assessment. (Std. 2.B.1 – Educational Program Planning and Assessment, Policy 2.2 – Educational Assessment)

2.B.1—The institution’s processes for assessing its educational programs are clearly defined, encompass all of its offerings, are conducted on a regular basis, and are integrated into the overall planning and evaluation plan. These processes are consistent with the institution’s assessment plan as required by [Policy 2.2 Educational Assessment](#). While key constituents are involved in the process, the faculty have a central role in planning and evaluating the educational programs.

Interpretation

Within the larger context of national and statewide spotlights on excellence in undergraduate student learning, academic portfolio assessment at Eastern Oregon University (EOU) is an integral part of the degree program review process, resulting in a feedback loop designed to improve student learning and program quality. In the decade preceding NWCCU’s ten-year comprehensive evaluation in Fall 2008, EOU installed measures to ensure that learning outcomes for degree programs were published in the biennial academic catalog, were evident to students in existing course syllabi, and were assessed by academic programs. The curriculum approval process continues to ensure that the addition of new courses to the curriculum make learning outcomes explicit in course syllabi. The Evaluation Team noted, however, that faculty engagement in routine assessment varied widely by degree program. EOU has taken steps to systematize the process of academic portfolio assessment and to make assessment of learning outcomes an integral feature of this process.

EOU’s implementation of academic portfolios preceded NWCCU’s 2008 visit and provided the faculty with guidance in a more systemic approach to the assessment process. The academic portfolio process currently serves as a vehicle for annual review of learning outcomes in each degree program. In the 2008 comprehensive self-study, a critical component of degree program portfolios was articulation of key assessment practices used by each program to measure degree program learning outcomes, to monitor the quality of student learning, and to make recommendations for program improvements accordingly. At the recommendation of the NWCCU evaluation team, it is this assessment component of the academic portfolio that has been more clearly defined, consistently applied to all degree programs, and administratively reviewed on an annual basis in keeping with Standard 2.B.1.

Process

EOU recently engaged in a campus-wide process to develop and adopt University Learning Outcomes (ULOs) in order to articulate the curricular goals of the University. The process included an inventory of General Education Core learning outcomes approved in 2006-2007 and Degree Program learning outcomes developed through the portfolio process in 2008. EOU’s University Learning Outcomes map to AAC&U’s LEAP essential learning outcomes (<http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm>), which have provided EOU and other OUS institutions

with a an assessment framework to guide campuses in their assessment work. It is worth underscoring that EOU has been actively engaged in the inter-institutional OUS Learning Outcomes Assessment work group since February 2008. For EOU, OUS' adoption of the LEAP framework has afforded an opportunity for campus-wide discussion of shared student learning outcomes in the curriculum and co-curriculum, funded in part by the Carnegie and Lumina foundations through AAC&U's "Give Students a Compass" initiative (in which EOU participates as a beta site, 2008-2011). By adopting the LEAP essential learning outcomes as an organizer for EOU's University Learning Outcomes, a viable conceptual framework for assessment has taken shape. In essence, EOU's University Learning Outcomes provide 1) a catalyst for joining the various sectors of campus activity and 2) an opportunity for recognizing how the synergistic impacts of the curriculum and traditional co-curriculum result in an integrated university curriculum that may be assessed. The University Learning Outcomes may be viewed at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/universitylearningoutcomes.html>.

Prior to and concurrent with a shared governance process that resulted in finalized language for the University Learning Outcomes (September 2009 – March 2010), the Provost and AVPAA visited with each degree program in Winter and Fall 2009 to discuss clearer development of learning outcomes and the assessment component of academic portfolios. Each program was asked to

- 1) review and revise its learning outcomes, with the goal of finally aligning Program Learning Outcomes with ULOs,
- 2) define a manageable cycle of data collection,
- 3) provide a matrix of methods and tools used by each program, and
- 4) post outcomes data from Spring and Fall 2009.

This process fostered productive conversation about the kinds of student learning valued most by the degree programs and resulted in nesting degree-oriented learning outcomes within the larger ULO framework.

Program faculty members have been both persistent in clarifying their program learning outcomes aligned with the ULOs and diligent in their data collection over the past year. In preparing for their central role in documenting student learning, program representatives in the College of Arts and Sciences participated in a day-long workshop with the Dean and Division Chairs (September 2009) to delineate their responsibilities in implementing a systemic approach to data collection and routine reporting from their respective programs. Preparation for this responsibility has enabled productive conversations between the Provost's office and discipline representatives. It has also resulted in clearer and more predictable expectations with regard to assessment. The academic portfolio not only includes measurable learning outcomes that align both with General Education Outcomes and University Learning Outcomes, but also a manageable assessment cycle sampled on an annual basis, an assessment plan with discipline-appropriate methodologies, tools, and benchmarks to measure student learning, and the collection, analysis, and reflection on the assessment of student learning. Through continued communication with the Provost and staff, and with administrative support for faculty development and "best practices" workshops, faculty will gain greater facility in utilizing data points to inform reflective practice—the kind that leads to insights about teaching and learning on an annual basis. Academic Degree Program Portfolios may be viewed at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/ProgramAssessment.html>.

The assessment processes EOU has installed in the past two years align with and support statewide development of a cohesive assessment framework for OUS institutions that keeps faculty members central to the direct evaluation of student learning.

Outcomes

NWCCU's recommendation has helped EOU move forward using a systemic approach to address documentation of student learning. The University has developed curricular goals through articulation of University Learning Outcomes, has mapped degree program and General Education Core learning outcomes to it, and has begun systematic collection of evidence around these outcomes. Student learning outcomes assessment data is now an integral component of the academic portfolio process and is uniformly applied across all degree programs.

In preparation for implementation of NWCCU's new standards—and apropos of Recommendations One, Two, and Three—EOU has engaged in long-term planning around mission review and has begun to identify those indicators that best exemplify mission fulfillment in serving the region with quality undergraduate and professional programs. EOU's academic portfolio process is identified in the University Assessment Plan and Matrix (<http://www.eou.edu/assess/>) and includes an administrative review on an annual basis (see Program Assessment at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/ProgramAssessment.html>).

Analysis

EOU faculty and administrators have implemented a systemic approach to the academic portfolio process that is both rigorous and manageable. Both constituents recognize, however, that appropriate software is needed to manage data collection for learning outcomes and other indicators of mission fulfillment. To that end the institution has engaged a software vendor to provide a customized demonstration to various units on April 26, 2010, as discussed in Recommendation Four. Discipline representatives and faculty teams who have participated in learning outcomes samplings for the General Education Core program will be invited to attend the demonstration and provide feedback on the utility of such software in managing program data.

In addition, faculty and administrators both recognize that fulfillment of the spirit of learning outcomes assessment lays with faculty. The institution is committed to faculty development that supports reflective practice and engages faculty in meaningful dialogue about teaching and learning. Seeded by the AAC&U Compass initiative, EOU was able to support faculty development in this area in Spring and early Fall of 2009 (see under Faculty Development at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/>). April 15 – 16, EOU will host a guided inter-institutional faculty conversation—also funded by the Compass grant—that addresses best practices in curriculum design and assessment and that results in recommendations to the OUS inter-institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment (LOA) work group on what faculty need most in their professional development as teachers engaged in the learning enterprise. The OUS Compass Conference planned for Fall 2010 will further engage EOU and OUS faculty in sharing best practices across institutions that foster and sustain a culture of assessment within the institutions.

Finally, as administration considers the policies and procedures installed to ensure evaluation of program majors, the stages in the development of meaningful assessment are recognizable. At first, faculty colleagues responded dutifully, filling in forms and completing assignments. They recognized the high stakes of accreditation and were highly compliant. The first stage of development was simply that—compliance. As faculty leaders were challenged to make sense of the data, they struggled. The data became burdensome as fuel for their reflection. Dissonance resulted as they began to use data to interpret the efficacy of their programs. From this they began to realize that their stated goals and outcomes may not have been what they really wanted and

that the assessments they had planned were not as helpful in providing discriminating data. A third stage of development occurred when programs modified their learning outcomes and finally created assessments that would work to better inform program improvements. The University is now at a formative stage of development where the ULOs are informing the majors and pushing faculty to think more broadly about outcomes. Programs have adjusted learning outcomes language to address the wider purposes of student learning (currently available in the Academic Program Portfolios at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/>, to be published in the 2010-2012 academic catalog). There are more stages ahead as degree program faculty continue to chart the course of programmatic review and assessment. For now, however, faculty are engaged in the process—a process of continuing examination of outcomes that inform practice. The University has built a sound framework for academic assessment and is prepared to continue with support of faculty development in this area.

RECOMMENDATION SIX

The Committee recommends that the University fully implement the General Education Curriculum (GEC) revision undertaken in 2006-07, including the finalizing of the GEC Breadth Outcomes. The Committee further recommends that the GEC be systematically and regularly assessed. (Policy 2.1 – General Education/Related Instruction Requirements, Policy 2.2 – Educational Assessment)

Interpretation

Through conversation between EOU's Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee (EPCC) and the NWCCU Team member assigned to evaluate EOU's General Education Core (GEC) program, the intent of Recommendation Six is clear—to finalize the Breadth Outcomes language so as to enable systematic assessment of the GEC outcomes. EOU appreciates the perspective that several revisions of the General Education program within the past decade has resulted in confusion about the objectives and requirements of GE—both for the students and for the NWCCU Team member. In Fall 2009, EPCC finalized the operational language of the GEC Breadth Outcomes and the Core Learning Outcomes, which were discussed and approved by Faculty Senate in November 2009 (<http://www.eou.edu/senate/agendas.html>). EOU also appreciates NWCCU's position that the effectiveness of EOU's current GEC program can best be determined through systematic assessment of its learning outcomes.

Process

In Winter 2008, the Provost charged EPCC to operationalize the objectives of the General Education Core program approved by the Assembly in June 2006—this so that an assessment plan could be developed and GEC learning outcomes could be assessed on a cyclic basis. EPCC, through the expert guidance of Carol Lauritzen as Associate Dean of the College of Education, accomplished its charge by developing learning outcomes and rubrics that were aligned with approved GEC program objectives (2006).

Donald Wolff, Professor of English/Writing, also assisted EPCC members by designing an assessment reporting template, a methodology, and a protocol for systematic assessment of GEC learning outcomes. Led by Donald Wolff in its pilot phase, systematic assessment of EOU's GEC began with Critical Thinking in Spring 2008. A manageable Assessment Cycle for the remaining GEC Learning Outcomes was developed by the AVPAA and shared with EPCC in late Spring 2008. In Fall 2008, the Critical Thinking pilot team reported the results of the pilot. The results of the 2008 Critical Thinking pilot are available at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/GEC.html>.

Professors Donald Wolff, Carol Lauritzen, and Jeff Johnson led pilot assessments in Communication, Content Knowledge, and Inquiry during 2008-2009. The results of these pilots were communicated both to EPCC and to the faculty in Fall 2009 (results of the 2008-2009 Communication, Content Knowledge, and Inquiry pilots are also available at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/GEC.html>). In addition to recommendations to refine the language of EPCC-developed rubrics per the GEC Assessment Plan protocol, these pilots resulted in professional development workshops in Communication and Inquiry for all teaching faculty prior to the beginning of Fall 2009 classes (<http://www.eou.edu/assess/>).

A salient recommendation from one pilot group indicated that faculty members themselves had insufficient authority to mandate faculty participation in GEC assessment and that administrative leadership was therefore recommended. The pilot phase has concluded and the *sampling phase* began in Fall 2009, when the AVPAA stepped in to provide administrative oversight for convening and debriefing the GEC Sampling Teams during 2009-2010.

GEC Sampling teams for Communication and Civic Engagement met in Fall 2009 to discuss the rubrics and their application to selected assignments. Since a web portal had been designed in summer to facilitate data collection, there was also discussion about use of the portal (<http://chinook.eou.edu/environ/assess/>). In Winter 2010 (January 12 and March 9) each team participated in two debriefing sessions focused on the results of the 2009-2010 GEC Sampling preliminary to making recommendations to EPCC and the faculty-at-large in Spring 2010. Members of both teams have indicated their willingness to share their results in a workshop format designed to promote faculty discussion of the learning outcomes and use of the rubric performance criteria to guide closing the loop statements (how assignments and course sequences can contribute to students' achievement of the learning outcome, for example). The Composite Reports for the 2009-2010 Communication and Civic Engagement Samplings are available at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/GEC.html>.

At this point in time, one full assessment cycle (2008-2010) of all five GEC learning outcomes has been completed on an abbreviated schedule and all are available to view through the General Education Core Assessment Plan, Cycle, Methods and Tools link at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/GEC.html>. In Fall 2010 the GEC assessment cycle will begin again with greater participation and at the manageable pace of one GEC program learning outcome per year for the next four years, plus the Content Knowledge (breadth) outcome every year for the next four years depending on Degree Program assessment cycles for Content Knowledge.

In Summer 2010, the AVPAA plans to use assessment results from 2008 - 2010 to generate a summative report about the effectiveness of the GEC Program. This report, along with recommendations for next steps, will be submitted to the Provost and to EPCC for their consideration. Such periodic summative reports will contribute significantly to a strategic rather than incremental approach to GEC Program effectiveness.

Outcomes

Since the 2008 visit, EPCC's work to finalize the GEC Breadth Outcomes has been accomplished. EPCC and general faculty discussion of GEC outcomes has clarified that EOU's GEC program is a hybrid model that seeks to integrate content-oriented traditional distribution curricula and requirements (Aesthetics and Humanities; Science, Math, and Informational Technology; Social Sciences; and Artistic Processes and Creativity) with General Education Core Learning Outcomes (Civic Engagement, Communication, Critical Thinking, and Inquiry). Such a hybrid model is typical nationally as universities shift their thinking about general education from a distribution to a learning outcomes perspective. EOU's hybrid model reflects this shift towards outcomes in the final language for GEC breadth outcomes. The outcomes were approved by the Faculty Senate in November 2009 and may be viewed through the GEC Program Objectives (Learning Outcomes) link at <http://www.eou.edu/assess/GEC.html>. Instead of nine discrete GEC learning outcomes (content knowledge plus four distribution outcomes plus four program outcomes), GEC now has five learning outcomes that subsume the breadth categories under the Content Knowledge learning outcome:

- 1. Content Knowledge**
 - a. Science, Mathematics, and Computer Information Sciences
 - b. Aesthetics and Humanities
 - c. Artistic Process and Creation
 - d. Social Sciences
- 2. Inquiry**
- 3. Communication**
- 4. Critical Thinking**
- 5. Further Learning and Civic Engagement**

The GEC pilot on Content Knowledge was particularly instrumental in moving faculty to an outcomes-based perspective for breadth requirements, and this was supported in subsequent discussions between the Provost, program faculty, and EPCC. Since the efficacy of the GEC Content rubric was questionable as an inter-disciplinary tool, the recommendation from the Content Knowledge pilot relegated assessment of GEC Content Knowledge to Degree Programs using discipline-appropriate assessment instruments. This approach is conceptually sound, and although the institution has not yet purchased and implemented a common software platform that enables Degree Program outcomes data on Content Knowledge to port to the GEC outcomes database, this software should be implemented by Winter 2010.

Analysis

EOU has benefitted from the evaluation team's recommendation to finalize the breadth outcome language and to undertake a complete review of the GEC learning outcomes. A clear example of the power of the new assessment system is results gleaned from the latest evaluation of general education courses that focus on Communication as a GEC/ULO outcome. The results show that EOU students develop a degree of competency that appears to align with the level of course. Students at the 100 level tend to score "Developing" in comparison to the adopted rubric. Students at the sophomore level of general education tend to score at the "Adequate" level, and those at the upper-division level at the "Proficient" level of competency. These data may seem obvious, but are essential to help drive the conversation towards next steps. The assessment information will fuel a conversation around how EOU transforms GEC to pre-plan the development of skills so that students move from one level to the next, and where the collective instructional community scaffolds and advances learning in a systematic way. The work of assessing, collecting, and interpreting data has stimulated this conversation. Faculty and administrators recognize, most of all, that the assessment cycle for GEC, major programs, and the University at large requires a continuing conversation about improvement.

RECOMMENDATION SEVEN

The Committee recommends that student records be secured in a fire-proof safe and that the University systematically ensure confidentiality of on-line student records. (Std. 3.C.5 – Academic Credit and Records)

3.C.5—The institution makes provision for the security of student records of admission and progress. Student records, including transcripts, are private, accurate, complete, and permanent. They are protected by fire-proof and otherwise safe storage and are backed by duplicate files. Data and records maintained in computing systems have adequate security and provision for recovery in the event of disaster. The information-release policy respects the right of individual privacy and ensures the confidentiality of records and files.

Interpretation

EOU appreciates the Evaluation Team's concern about compliance issues related to the safety and security of student records. The institution has taken steps to ensure such safety and security and has developed a policy to delimit and monitor online access.

Process

EOU has historically maintained records in hard copy, with a routine process of microfilm backup. In Summer 2009, investigation of a digitization process was initiated and equipment was purchased and in place by January 2010. The process for converting hard copy records to digital files is underway, and a process of digital records management for current students will commence in Spring of 2010.

Outcomes

Records Storage. Records are currently stored in lateral file cabinets, with a total of twenty three (23) five (5)-drawer cabinets containing a total of approximately 74,650 records. Conversion of these hard-copy records to a digital format began in January 2010 and will proceed on a full-time basis for approximately one calendar year. During this time, the Registrar's Office will retain a temporary, full-time employee whose sole task will be conversion of these records. It is estimated that approximately half of these records can be digitized in this timeframe. In the following year, this role will be reduced to half-time; it is anticipated that the remaining records can be digitized in approximately 15 months.

Once records are digitized, they will be copied to micro-fiche for long-term, permanent storage. Records will be stored in the Oregon State Archives as directed by state law. The Oregon State Archives Building is designed and equipped to meet fireproof records storage requirements.¹ Digital records are maintained on secure servers with a router-based Access Control List for controlling access. Servers are backed up on a routine basis using disk technology. EOU has purchased new hardware and is in the process of expanding its Storage Area Network to a mirrored system so that servers will be backed up to a secondary location on campus. This strategy will also provide redundant server capabilities through server virtualization.

Security of Online Record Access. EOU ensures access to online records to only those individuals with a need for access. Each year, at the close of the academic year, Human Resources generates a list of those faculty/staff who have been inactive for the previous four terms. This list goes to the appropriate Director/Dean/Vice President for verification, then to Information Technology for appropriate action, then to Finance and Administration for confirmation of such action, and is then returned to Human Resources for records storage (see Policy Statement for Security of Online Record Access under Section 700 Human Resources at <http://www.eou.edu/academic/handbook/>). This process will be initiated in a hard-copy format, and will eventually be migrated to electronic processing.

Digital Records Management. Concurrent with the process described above, EOU will initiate a process of digital records management for student records. From the point of admission to the university, student records will be converted to and maintained in digital format. Records may be a compilation of entries from the Admissions Office and Financial Aid Office, as well as of ongoing academic progress. Since the Registrar is the official repository of student records, the process described above will determine the format and flow of these records into the compiled official student record. Records will be converted to micro-fiche on a monthly basis and filed in accordance with the aforementioned storage procedure.

Analysis

EOU has demonstrated both commitment to and significant progress in meeting the threshold for compliance in the safety and security of student records. The Policy Statement for Security of Online Record Access will be implemented in June 2010 and thereafter on an annual basis. The conversion software is in place and operational and the expected completion date for the conversion project is early 2012.

-
1. An official description of the Oregon State Archives Building is as follows:

Fire: The Archives Building is protected from fire by several means. The stacks are constructed of reinforced concrete and the entry doors are designed to withstand fire from outside sources for long periods. The records are boxed and placed tightly on shelves to discourage the spread of fire. Finally, the stacks employ a sophisticated fire suppression system. This "intelligent head dry pipe system" deploys sprinklers with small charges of water behind each head that are activated only where needed. No water is stored in the pipes but is brought in once a sprinkler head discharges. Each sprinkler head is outfitted with a heat and smoke detector. Only those sprinkler heads that detect heat or smoke will deploy, thus avoiding unnecessary water damage to the records.

Water: Water damage can come from something as small as a slowly leaking pipe or as devastating as a flood. Well designed stack areas minimize the passage of water pipes in or near the area so that the threats of leaks or breakages are reduced. The placement of the Archives Building above the likely flood zone minimizes the risk of catastrophic flood damage. A disaster preparedness plan is designed to further mitigate damage.

RECOMMENDATION EIGHT

The Committee recommends that the post-tenure review process outlined in the current Faculty Handbook (September 12, 2008) be implemented consistently across the university. (Std. 4.A.5 – Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare, and Development, Policy 4.1 – Faculty Evaluation)

4.A.5—The institution provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities. The institution’s policies, regulations, and procedures provide for the evaluation of all faculty on a continuing basis consistent with Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation.

Interpretation

EOU recognizes the importance of applying a consistent process in the ongoing review of tenured faculty, since the post-tenure review is used to document accomplishments and to help faculty in ongoing development of instruction, scholarship, and service that ensures a quality learning environment for students. The Deans of the Colleges have responded to the Evaluation Team’s concern about consistent application of the *Faculty/Staff Handbook* process.

Process

In response to the Evaluation Team’s recommendation, the Deans of the respective colleges convened in Spring and Summer 2009 to come to a mutual understanding about the application of the Post-Tenure Review language in the *Faculty/Staff Handbook* (<http://www.eou.edu/academic/handbook/>). The Deans agreed on the following process: Faculty members are notified in writing during the Fall term that they are responsible for a written professional development plan that is reviewed with the unit leader during Winter and Spring terms. See Appendix R8-A for an example of the notification letter and Appendix R8-B for an example of a professional development plan.

After the submission of the plan, the faculty member meets with the unit leader for an in-depth discussion. The unit leader follows up with a report of the meeting that is filed in the College office. See Appendix R8-C for an example of the report. Finally, the Provost receives from the Dean a list of those who have completed the post-tenure review process.

Outcomes

Over the past year, post-tenure reviews have been conducted in a consistent and systematic manner at EOU. The post-tenure reviews are done in a routine manner on a two-year cycle with records being kept at the College regarding faculty to be reviewed on odd and even numbered years (see Appendix R8-D). The purpose of the post tenure review is to address the concerns of four specific audiences with differing goals: 1) the faculty member, as an opportunity for self-reflection and continued growth; 2) the University, as an opportunity to affirm achievement and locate areas for improvement; 3) the higher education community, as an opportunity to fulfill

requirements for accreditation through on-going review of faculty; and 4) the citizens of the State of Oregon, as an affirmation of continued faculty professionalism in a public university setting.

Analysis

The Deans of the Colleges have worked effectively to implement a consistent process for the review of post-tenure faculty. They have articulated a process, shared best practices, and developed the necessary materials to implement the process in an equitable and consistent manner across colleges.

Appendices for Recommendation 8

R8-A Sample Post-Tenure Review Notification Letter

R8-B Sample Post-Tenure Review Professional Development Plan

R8-C Sample Post-Tenure Review Follow-Up Report

R8-D Post-Tenure Review Handbook Policy

RECOMMENDATION NINE

The Committee recommends that due to the changes in governance and operations for distance education, the University develop a policy and appropriate procedures to effectively evaluate on-line adjunct faculty. (Std. 4.A.5 – Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare, and Development, Policy 4.1 – Faculty Evaluation)

4.A.5—The institution provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities. The institution’s policies, regulations, and procedures provide for the evaluation of all faculty on a continuing basis consistent with Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation.

Interpretation

The Evaluation Team’s recommendation that EOU develop a policy for the effective evaluation of online adjunct faculty is clear. EOU agrees that appropriate policy and procedures for peer and administrative evaluation of online faculty is necessary and that such a provision was not evident at the time of the 2008 visit. EOU administration and faculty have been responsive to NWCCU’s recommendation by developing a policy that extends the peer-evaluation process to all faculty and enables the institution to demonstrate EOU’s core mission to provide quality instruction in on-campus, on site, and online modalities.

Prior to 2008, a separate division was assigned all responsibilities associated with online courses. The Division of Distance Education managed the courses, faculty, and oversight of the program. The Division had developed a wide range of activities that ensured quality instruction. Several specialized administrative faculty members were charged with the responsibility of curricular oversight, student complaints and course evaluations, and overall online faculty recruitment, retention, and relations. The success of the online program was made from a reputation of careful and attentive advising, the access to full degree programs, and the attentiveness of instructors. Evaluation of online adjuncts was well-designed, maintained, and reported.

In January 2008, the University restructured its distance education program and collapsed all functions into the three standing colleges. The accommodation of the numerous practices associated with online oversight had not thoroughly been embedded by October of that year. Most of the efforts had been to determine how to manage and plan for online instruction. Work towards developing a college division evaluation of instruction had just begun at the time of the visit.

Process

In response to the recommendation made by the Evaluation Team, the Provost met with the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) in Winter 2009, charging them to develop *Faculty/Staff Handbook* language that focused on the peer- and administrative-evaluation process for online adjunct faculty. In order to seed FPC discussion and prompt action, in Spring 2009, prior to the end of the academic year, the Provost shared with FPC the underlying principles of evaluation most appropriate to the duties and responsibilities of EOU’s online adjunct faculty members.

The most salient aspects of these principles were to assure 1) that the curriculum standards were parallel with that of the on-campus faculty members, 2) that the pedagogical style of instruction utilized the appropriate technology employing interactive teaching, and 3) that the outcomes of instruction were on par with students who took courses from on campus faculty members. An additional important principle was also established in this communication. Since the Division of Distance Education was now integrated into the campus processes, the ownership of the online faculty was now shifted to the on campus faculty. Their role would become one of not only oversight of these faculty, but to bring these individuals into the colleges as virtual colleagues.

From January 2008 through December 2009 faculty in each college division began to incorporate the idea that they had an “expanded” roster of faculty members. Each discipline adopted their distance faculty members and developed personal ties to establish them as part of the community. It is this reorganization that has led to a new focus on student success and has resulted in a revitalized campus.

In June, these principles and developing relationships became the basis for a Draft Framework for Online Adjunct Faculty Evaluation circulated to the Deans and AVPAA (see Appendix R9-A), who were asked to provide support to FPC in a summer project to reorganize the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion section of the *Faculty/Staff Handbook*. In the process of reorganizing that section of the handbook, the framework for online adjunct faculty evaluation was added for FPC’s consideration, revision, and action in Fall 2009.

FPC plays a critical role in the academic personnel calendar, and their Fall schedule was such that review of all aspects of the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion language was not feasible. However, the FPC Chair and members were quite responsive to the time constraints posed by NWCCU on the matter of online adjunct faculty evaluation, and they agreed to implement an Online Teaching Faculty Evaluation Policy on an Interim basis (see alphabetical listing under Teaching Faculty category at <http://www.eou.edu/academic/handbook/>).

Outcomes

Deans and Division Chairs have created a cycle of evaluation for online adjunct faculty and continue to work through the faculty evaluation schedule. See Appendix R9-B for the cycles currently underway. Completed evaluations will be available on site in the evidence room.

As a result of the work of the deans using formal methods of evaluation and the work of faculty leaders to incorporate online adjuncts into university review processes, a more uniform system of assurance of quality instruction is now in place. Faculty are now the key drivers monitoring the program to ensure that students have access to the same content, level, and expectations that they would have in courses taught by on-campus instructors.

Analysis

EOU has made substantial progress in engaging faculty in the issues and process of online adjunct faculty peer review. Faculty have responded favorably to the need to ensconce a process of peer review of online colleagues that is founded on sound principles of online faculty evaluation. EOU’s Interim Policy is in place and the implementation of the policy is underway.

Appendices for Recommendation 9

R9-A Draft Framework for Online Adjunct Faculty Evaluation

R9-B Online Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Cycles—2009-10

RECOMMENDATION TEN

The Committee recommends that the University develop and implement a plan for ensuring the adequacy of Pierce Library's core collections and facilities to meet the needs of the educational programs, ensure accessibility to services and collections for library users with disabilities, provide adequate space for collections, and provide sufficient quality space for library users. (Std. 5.C.1 and Std. 5.C.2 – Facilities and Access)

Interpretation

The Evaluation Team's recommendation that EOU develop a plan that ensures the adequacy of its core collections and accessibility to its services and collections corresponds with the institution's own internal assessment. As EOU's 2008 Self-Study makes clear, past funding has been limited in these areas, resulting in deficiencies in the core collection and deferred capital upgrades to Pierce Library. Administration and OUS have responded positively to this recommendation. EOU has identified increased funds to immediately enhance the core collection through a one-time allotment as well as through ongoing state funded initiatives (Engineering and Technology Industry Council [ETIC], Health Initiatives, and Rural Access). The OUS has also secured funding for capital projects from the State and is assigning \$8 million for upgrades to Pierce Library.

Process

Core Collection. In their report, the NWCCU Evaluation Team acknowledged Pierce Library's efforts to enhance the materials collection by creative and inexpensive means. These include careful and focused selection processes, taking advantage of group purchase offers whenever possible, using consortial memberships to enhance the available collection, simplifying and expediting inter-library loan processes to make that an attractive option for students, and encouraging and making full use of gift books.

In part as a result of these measures, the library journal collection is adequate. Unfortunately, this comes at the expense of the book collection, which is "not remaining current, not developing depth, and is of poor quality overall." The only remaining option for collection enhancement is to increase the budget for books and other one-time collections purchases (firm orders). During a time of nationwide budget uncertainty and cutbacks, decreases in funding are expected. While most EOU supply budgets have been trimmed in response to diminished resources, however, the library supply budget has remained stable. The University administration is committed to address the collection problem with both short-term and long-term solutions. In the short term, the University will invest one-time dollars to assist in building the collection. The President has authorized that \$21,400 be distributed to the library for the express purpose of filling identified gaps in the collection this fiscal year, and he has additionally asked the Library Director to do a user/program analysis, because of capital investment received from the state, to determine what is needed and where gaps in service exist.

Facilities and Access. As acknowledged by the Evaluation Team, the library staff has made noticeable efforts to make Pierce Library inviting and useful to students and faculty. Areas of strength for the facility include the open and well-lit reading room and the themed room housing the youth collection. Efforts to increase the available collection space through planning, weeding

and shifting, and through purchasing electronic resources when available, were also commended by the committee—these efforts continue.

Overall, however, the facility is not adequate. Specific concerns enumerated by the accreditation committee include:

- Poor lighting and crowding in the second floor study area
- The lack of an automatic door opener at the wheelchair accessible entrance.
- No accessible bathrooms on the main floor
- No wheelchair access to the government documents collection
- Insufficient growth space for collections

The first two of these concerns have already been addressed either in full or in part. Due to the fortuitous allocation of capital from the Oregon State government, plans are in place to address all of the facilities concerns.

The second floor study area, which was crowded and poorly lit, has been opened up by removing the heavy, cramped study carrels and replacing them with a few couches. For quiet study purposes, several small tables have been placed along the first and second floor south-facing windows in spaces that are well-lit, but remote from the central area, and students are encouraged to use these. Lighting remains a problem, but rather than replace all of the lighting, quiet study spaces in well-lit areas have been created.

In addition, the following specific facilities improvements have been made:

- The ground floor carpet has been replaced (March 2009)
- An automatic door opener has been installed at the wheelchair accessible entrance (August 2009)
- Some staff offices have been rewired (September 2009)
- Doors have been added in strategic areas to increase security where necessary for staff, and to increase privacy in designated study areas (November 2009)
- The highly visible wall above the computer research area has been repainted and the Pierce Library logo updated (December 2009)

Library staff has continued with efforts to make positive, inexpensive facilities improvements. Improvements in key areas include bulletin boards added at the front entrances, Library art revitalized with new pieces from the EOU gallery collection, and closer communication with janitorial staff. These short-term small improvements all have high impact.

Outcomes

Core Collection. A long-term approach to an enhanced library materials budget has been worked-out and is being implemented as of the current fiscal year. Pierce Library will receive additional funding for collections as EOU initiates new programs. New library funding will be indexed as a fixed, ongoing cost to the institution in any new curricular proposals. This approach will have a positive effect above and beyond simply increasing the money available for library materials. In new curricular proposals, faculty will be required to identify the cost of library materials to support the program adequately. Over the long run, the need for library materials to support programs will become more inculcated into the faculty culture, which in turn will

- EOU has discretionary money from the ETIC initiative, which is used to enhance student retention in engineering and technology related fields. Pierce Library will obtain \$1,500 in additional funding to purchase library materials in support of this initiative.
- EOU has rural access funding, used recruit, retain, and serve the support needs of students from areas in rural Oregon. Pierce Library will be allocated \$1,500 from this initiative.
- EOU has Health Initiative funding, used to support students in pre-professional health related programs. Pierce Library has been allocated \$5,000 from this initiative.
- EOU will be starting an MBA program on-site in Gresham, OR. Pierce Library will be allocated \$5,000 from this new program.

For upcoming new initiatives, the amount allocated for library materials will vary depending on the degree of depth that already exists in the collection of the subject area. The general rubric will be a minimum allocation of \$1,000, with higher allocations for those programs where the library collection is weakest and most in need of enhancement, as well as for graduate-level or research-intensive programs that rely more heavily on library resources. In the absence of a detailed collection assessment (such as the RLG Conspectus), the condition of the Pierce Library collection for particular disciplines will be gauged by counting the number of choice outstanding academic titles held in that particular subject area.

This approach will not only strengthen the library core collection, but also focus the collection in the program areas where EOU is growing. The funding obtained this fiscal year alone (\$13,000) will purchase an additional 130 books, which is a 10% increase over the number of books purchased in FY 2007, when the comprehensive Standard Five report was written. Provided the initiative is sustained, the concerns of the accreditation committee in this area should be fully addressed.

Facilities and Access. Long term, Pierce Library has been allocated funding to address the more entrenched facilities issues. The OUS has secured funding for capital projects from the State and is assigning \$8 million for upgrades to Pierce Library. The money will become available towards the end of the current biennium (2010-2011). Planning efforts have commenced to develop a realistic plan, with accurate cost estimates, that incorporates input from all stakeholders. The advance planning will also help ensure that the facilities upgrades meet basic library facilities needs while incorporating state of the art academic library upgrades.

Analysis

EOU has been responsive to the Evaluation Team's recommendation to enhance Pierce Library's core collections and to ensure that the facility and its library materials are accessible. The academic integrity of the institution has been shored up through the institution's attention to these areas of concern. Intentional resource planning for new and growing curricular programs and secured capital funding for library facilities upgrades has enabled the institution to implement short- and long-term plans that contribute to and enhance students' learning environment.

Conclusions

The ten recommendations EOU received from the Evaluation Team were framed to help strengthen the institution in targeted areas. The institution has engaged appropriate governance bodies, faculty, staff, and/or administrators in responding to each recommendation. Processes and policies that inform EOU's practice in several key areas have been clarified—most notably in governance and leadership, in information management, in assessment, and in faculty review. EOU emerges from focused work in these areas with a more systemic approach to its operational infrastructure and with strategies for implementing normative functions.

Recommendations One, Two, and Three involved EOU's mission at several levels: 1) clearer articulation and understanding of the mission approval process between the institution, the OUS, and the OSBHE; 2) greater oversight by OSBHE to enable EOU to effectively fulfill its mission and goals, and 3) clearer institutional processes for planning, budgeting, and evaluation to ensure mission fulfillment. OUS and OSBHE have been strengthened as a result of EOU's work with OSBHE and the OUS Provosts' Council to articulate an interactive mission review process. Detailed processes and policies that guide Board oversight of EOU's successful mission fulfillment have strengthened communication to and from the University and the Board, and EOU's current success as a result of this oversight will enable greater transparency in mission and goal fulfillment in the years to come. Clarification of these important shared governance and leadership functions has enabled the University to establish a rational framework and process for planning, budgeting, and evaluation that informs effective mission fulfillment. This framework has been tested and is scheduled for normative implementation beginning in Spring 2010.

Recommendations Four, Five, and Six involve data collection and reflective practices that enable decision making at several levels: 1) development of data warehouses that permit timely and informed decisions in mission-critical areas like enrollment management, retention, and graduation; 2) development of predictive models that inform funding; and 3) development of an assessment framework for GEC and a portfolio system for degree programs that enable data collection, analysis, and reflection on fulfillment of clear curricular learning outcomes. EOU has made significant progress in these areas and is committed to software enhancements that optimize efficiencies in institutional research and assessment and that make data available for informed analysis and reflective action.

In Recommendation Seven, EOU has demonstrated both commitment to and significant progress in meeting the threshold for compliance in the safety and security of student records. Conversion software is in place and operational for converting hard copy records to digital files, records storage issues are being appropriately managed, and a policy is now in place that regulates the security of online record access. In Recommendation Eight and Nine, the College Deans have implemented consistent processes for review of post-tenure faculty and the Faculty Personnel Committee has approved an interim policy for the review of online adjunct faculty that is currently underway. Recommendation Ten, which focuses on core collection and facilities deficiencies, has been addressed through an immediate infusion of funds to shore up the core collection in need areas, longer-term consistent funding through state funding initiatives, and capital funding (\$8M) to address short- and long-term facilities issues in Pierce Library.

EOU has accomplished much in a short amount of time and is appreciative of the opportunity to make substantial progress in areas that help demonstrate the integrity of our mission and its fulfillment.

Appendices

R8-A Sample Post-Tenure Review Notification Letter

November 11, 2008

Dear :

In accordance with the Promotion and Tenure Handbook (pages 17-18) you will be engaged in a post-tenure review this year. To find the Promotion and Tenure Handbook, go to <http://www.eou.edu/academic/handbook/> and scroll down the right column to Teaching Faculty until you locate the Promotion and Tenure Handbook.

You should submit a written professional development plan by the beginning of winter quarter 2009. The plan should be organized to address the four areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service and outreach). You should state what has been accomplished in the past two years of service and what you expect to accomplish in the next two years. The plan should be in a narrative form that provides the context for a conversation between you and me. It should be succinct, appropriately two single-spaced typed pages.

During winter term, please schedule an appointment for a conversation about your professional development plan. The outcome of the review will be communicated according to the processes required in the Handbook.

This review allows the University to meet the obligations of accreditation and Oregon Administrative Rules. More importantly, the post-tenure review is intended to be a positive process giving you an opportunity for self-reflection and continued growth as well as providing an opportunity to affirm achievement and locate areas for improvement.

I look forward to receiving your professional development plan and having a conversation with you.

Sincerely yours,



28 October 2005

Dr. Karen Antell
304 Washington Avenue
La Grande, Oregon 97850

Dear Karen,

You are scheduled for a Post-Tenure Review with your Division Chair during AY 2005-2006.

Please review the criteria relevant to the Post-Tenure Review in the *Faculty/Staff Handbook* at the following link:

<http://www.eou.edu/academics/handbook/SECTIONS/7BPOST.HTM>

Your “Biennial Development Plan” (about two pages) should be submitted to the Dean’s office no later than 13 January 2006. The review of your Development Plan with your Division Chair should be completed and the Dean’s offices so informed no later than the end of March 2006.

Thank you for your diligence in observing this aspect of the university’s ongoing faculty review process.

Sincerely,

Marilyn A. Levine
Dean, College of Arts and Science

cc: Provost John Miller

R8-B Sample Post-Tenure Review Professional Development Plan

To: Donald Wolff, Division Chair
From: Nancy Knowles, Associate Professor of English/Writing
Re: Post-Tenure Review
Date: 19 Sept. 2008

To follow is a list of my accomplishments from 2006-08 and plans for the next two years in the review categories. I look forward to discussing this work with you.

Instruction

Accomplishments 2006-08:

- Taught support courses, including Writing 115 and 121 linked with CORE 101 and SOC 204 respectively.
- Taught the following courses in my areas of expertise: English 239 Genres: World War I Literature, English/Gender 395 Gender in Literature/Film: Women's Science Fiction, English 410 Women Writers, English 410 C. S. Lewis, English 448 K. A. Porter
- Continued to serve pre-professional nursing and dental hygiene programs by offering WR 320; enhanced the rigor in regular WR 320 to emphasize research, report-writing, and grantwriting
- Began offering WR 330 Electronic Word because no one else wanted it
- Began offering WR 310/329 Grantwriting to develop student professional experience
- Supervised 5 practica, including teaching practica
- Supervised 15 capstones
- Served on one master's thesis committee for Education
- Advised approximately 25 majors and signed forms for many minors

Plans:

- Revise WR 115 to serve students with a greater variety of learning styles, to make college expectations explicit, and to hold students accountable for scaffolding assignments
- Revise WR 330 to blend theory and application more effectively
- Develop stacked and hybrid courses to ensure upper-division literature can be offered

Commitment to Subject Discipline

Accomplishments 2006-08:

Publications

- "The Voyage Home: Peter Walsh and the Trauma of Empire in Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway*," forthcoming in the *Selected Papers from Eleventh Annual Virginia Woolf Conference*
- "Teacher Energy Promotes Student Energy." With Cori Brewster. [*Northwest Education* 13.3](#) (Spring-Summer 2008): 12-17.
- "Imperial Attitudes in Mary Elizabeth Braddon's *Lady Audley's Secret*." With student Katherine Race. Accepted for inclusion in Braddon collection awaiting publisher approval.

Completed Screenplay: *The Shape-Changer's Wife* (adaptation)

International Presentations

- "War Planes and Body Bags: Feminist Pacifism in Woolf and Morrison," 17th Annual International Conference on Virginia Woolf, Oxford, Ohio, 10 June 2007.

National Presentations

- "La Frontera: Teaching in the Borderlands," National Writing Project Urban Sites Network Conference with Neva Sanders, 25 April 2008, Denver, Colorado.
- "Writing across the Range in the Oregon Outback," National Writing Project Rural Sites Network Conference with Tom Wallis, 9-10 March 2007, Albuquerque, New Mexico

Regional Conference Coordination: 15th Annual Oregon Conference on Rhetoric and Composition, 5-6 Oct. 2007

Regional Presentations

- "The Eastern Oregon Writing Project's Greatest Hits!" Oregon Council of Teachers of English English Language Arts & Reading Conference with Norma Barber, Karen Lawrence, Shannon McClellan, John Scanlan, and Mary Thouvenel, 5 April 2008, Pendleton, OR.
- "Grammar," workshop for UMESD Small Schools Inservice, 12 Oct. 2007
- Presentations to OWP Teaching Ideas Institutes

Campus Presentations

- "Standing on the Table: Student Engagement in Classroom Learning," EOU Colloquium, 22 May 2008, La Grande, Oregon.
- Presentations to courses, colleges, panels, and community groups

Plans:

- Continue to reduce committee work to focus on scholarship in preparation for promotion
- Complete draft of Maslow article with Gerry Ramey and Shari Carpenter
- Publish the following:
 - "The Voyage Home: Peter Walsh and the Trauma of Empire in Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway*." Conference paper to be lengthened into journal article. One abstract submitted and rejected thus far.

- “Irony, Austen, and Empire in Stella Gibbons’s *Cold Comfort Farm*”. Revising for submission.
- “The Notebooks as Pacifist Technique in Doris Lessing’s *The Golden Notebook*.” Revising for submission.
- Article on Sheri S. Tepper’s *Gate to Women’s Country* from dissertation
- Article on Woolf and Morrison from dissertation and Woolf conference presentation
- Send letter to participants in this now outdated project from 2000: *The Flash of Some Terrible Reality Leaping: New Explorations of Virginia Woolf and the Real*. With Carmine Esposito (manuscript for edited book)
- Revise and publish 2000 dissertation *From Protest to Process: Pacifism and Post-1970 Women’s Novels Written in English*. Manuscript in proposal stage.
- Seek representation for screenplay
- Try to get a partial stipend for summer 2009
- Include teacher research in promotion portfolio
- Write more poetry. Finish novel. Write another screenplay.

Institutional Service

Accomplishments 2006-08:

- Served as English/Writing Discipline Representative (2006-07)
 - Drafted program accreditation documents
 - Collaborated on successful resource-faculty searches
 - Initiated major redesign
- Served as Writing Coordinator
 - Supervised University Writing Requirement implementation
 - Presented faculty workshops and discussions regarding teaching writing
 - Represented EOU on the Oregon Writing and English Advisory Committee
 - Participated in statewide dialogues regarding writing outcomes and dual credit
- Chaired the Standards 2 and 4 Accreditation Subcommittee
- Served on the College Personnel Committee
- Served on the Education Policy and Curriculum Committee
- Served on the Assessment Task Force/University Assessment Committee
- Served as Secretary of Associated Academic Professionals
- Mentored resource faculty
- Facilitated successful EOU Phi Kappa Phi graduate fellowship five years in a row
- Maintained English/Writing web page

Plans:

- Analyze UWR survey data and make recommendations
- Transfer English/Writing web design to Zachary Walter
- Shepherd revised English/Writing major through approval process
- Draft proposal for MA English Literature
- Draft proposal for Graduate Certificate in Teaching Writing

- Consider NEH grant to enhance relevance of first-year literature offerings
- Improve supervision and assessment of dual-credit offerings
- Continue to say no to additional committee work

Outreach

Accomplishments 2006-08:

- Directed the Oregon Writing Project
 - Supervised Co-Directors and Teacher Consultants in three Teaching Ideas Institutes in Bend, Ontario, and Pendleton, achieving enrollment objectives
 - Supervised WR 131 “lab school”
 - Supervised Summer Writers’ Retreat
 - Supervised Student Writers’ Workshop, including 2008 integration of CUESTE students as presenters
 - Wrote successful federal renewal grant and event grants totaling \$57,600
 - Developed Co-Director Handbook
 - Attended national convention
 - Participated in Project Outreach work, including national meetings
 - Resolved dispute regarding overages in grant accounts by learning to print and read FIS reports and presenting history of grant account balances to 2007
 - Balanced multiple accounts and drafted budgets
 - Coordinated year-long inservice for Milton-Freewater Unified School District
 - Proposed professional development model for EOU
 - Created and coordinated distribution of all publicity
 - Coordinated Blue Mountain Writers, including monthly critique group and open mic meetings, regional networking, participation in Crossing the Blues, and inauguration of the Union County Poetry Contest
 - Networked with Education Consortium and Union County Literacy Alliance
 - Collaborated with OWP State Network and Northern Lights Regional Network
- Supervised over 80 student community service projects through Writing 320 Professional Writing (almost double the previous two years)
- Supervised one student-written grant in WR 310 for the Wallowa County Libraries

Plans:

- Grantwriting, including OWP priorities and Literacy Alliance partnership with ODS
- Systematize OWP inservice marketing, including Outreach Coordinator positions
- Move the host summer institute back to La Grande (from Pendleton) on regular rotation
- Coordinate the La Grande summer institute with Susan Whitelock’s WR 131
- Draft proposal for Graduate Certificate in Teaching Writing (OWP SI embedded)

- Develop Hermiston inservice 2008-09
- Continue contact with Milton-Freewater inservice teachers
- Hire a work study student to handle university paperwork
- Offer online book discussions to serve the Northern Lights Regional Network
- Plan coordinated writers' retreat and NLRN retreat for summer 2009
- Figure out how to get paid for OWP summer work besides summer institutes
- Write Wildhorse renewal grant
- Attend national convention
- Attend Rural Sites Meeting
- Assist with recruitment efforts in Bend and Ontario
- Develop quarterly weekend programming
- Update OWP web page
- Develop offerings for Pendleton Art Center
- Revise Co-Director Handbook
- Revise OWP brochure

TO: **Donald Wolff**
Division Chair of Art and Letters, Eastern Oregon University

From: April Curtis/ Professor of Theatre and Speech

RE: **Post-Tenure Review**
February 2009

Reflection:

The last time I wrote a Post-Tenure Review, I sought to be deeply reflective about the 15 years I had worked as a theatre and speech professor. I wanted, in the writing of that Review, to understand the profound effect being at EOU had had on me as an educator and artist. It was a good undertaking because it made me realize that I was in the exact place I needed and indeed wanted to be.

This time is a bit different than the last; it is as if I am a bit uncomfortable and want to put on another mask or costume to see if it fits better than the one I am dressed in. Although I can and do celebrate every day the wonderful and passionate students I work with, I am a bit unsettled about my particular role in “the Academy” at this point in my working life. I am a shy person by nature (no one believes this but it is true) and am often unclear and even squeamish about the expectations of me outside of my classes and my “arena” of safety. Therefore, I see my work here almost like a spy movie where I am underground working on the “guts” of what is happening above. I feel comfortable doing this for the most part but I wonder if it is helping EOU? I want to do more than be a member of a Committee. This is something I am thinking about.

Teaching:

Currently, my half-time status in Theatre and Speech is really satisfying for me. I really enjoy teaching a cross-section of students in the communication area and I adore my Media Arts colleagues. I can't believe how much I like going to meetings with them! Surprisingly, however, although I thought I would be interested in moving over to the communication area ¾ time, I find I am enjoying both programs thoroughly this year. Perhaps half and half is a good place to be as long as it serves the students.

What Has Happened or Good Things in the Past Two years for April Curtis

Teaching:

- ❖ Developed 2 creative arts classes for the Ed Program's MTEs
- ❖ Have begun teaching creative arts techniques classes in the area high schools – John Day will be the first on March 13th
- ❖ Re-tooled the curriculum for the High School Institute – Acting 1 Class
- ❖ Re-tooled the curriculum for the Arts Institute Class for online students
- ❖ Took ten theatre students to New York – spring break
- ❖ Taught a lot of classes. I love to teach in class, online, onsite, in-space...

Discipline:

- ❖ Received a Fulbright Grant/ Council of International Exchange to Croatia
- ❖ Received a Kennedy Center Award for *Pippin* (Fall 07 show)
- ❖ Received a EOU Faculty Scholars Grant to write *Strange Gift*, a play about early Ireland and the Stages of a Woman's Life
- ❖ Created masks for *Macbeth* and wigs for *She Stoops to Conquer*
- ❖ Am currently working with Kevin Cahill and a wonderful cast in one of the lead roles in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*
- ❖ Sponsoring a new theatre honorary fraternity - Alpha Psi Omega

On-Campus

- ❖ With a great Committee, created the Communication Minor at EOU
- ❖ College Personnel Committee/Assembly Personnel Committee
- ❖ Communication Facilitation for RA's, Student Affairs and Business Classes

Outreach

- ❖ Communication Facilitation for Shelter From the Storm
- ❖ *A Year with Frog and Toad* – school tour to 9 area schools
- ❖ March 1st – A new version of *Coyote Tales* for Fish Trap's "Big Read"

Personal

- ❖ Woman of Courage and Vision Award from the PCSW
- ❖ Traveling to Italy, Croatia, Czech Republic

Thoughts about the Future:

I have been hired as a consultant five times this past year for both Organizational Interpersonal Facilitations and Creative Arts in the Schools. I guess I am old enough now to be an "expert"! Ha-ha! I like it! I really enjoy working with teachers to integrate the

arts into their classrooms and I like to work with employers to create a positive and productive working atmosphere. Perhaps this a small wave in the ocean of my future.

I hope to go to Croatia and learn a great deal more about masks, puppets and playwriting. I am interested in developing plays that incorporate “artifactual” elements as a way to investigate the de-humanization of human beings on our planet. Often, puppets are mirrors for us because we manipulate them and they tell our deepest stories. Puppets are political, powerful tools for self-expression. I also want to bring Croatian theatre students to EOU since education there is incredibly expensive for them.

Last summer, I added writing and painting studio in my basement and I have been completing a set of masks for *Strange Gift*, the play I wrote last year. I believe it will be produced in 010-011.

I want to continue to teach and create at EOU for as long as I may.

Finally, I want to retire in 9-10 years and begin a Stage Career. And a Puppetry and Mask Studio. And a Consultancy. And an eccentric yet fabulous dotage.

R8-C Sample Post-Tenure Review Follow-Up Report

February 2, 2009

The post-tenure review for Dr. Kerri Wenger has been conducted and the development plan approved.

Comments:

Name
--- Professor

Name
Dean, College of ---

Comments:

R8-D

Post-Tenure Review Handbook Policy

POST-TENURE REVIEW

Post tenure review will take place biennially (through the development plan outline below) as a supplement to the yearly Faculty Information Reports ("green sheets"). The following processes are meant to address the concerns of four specific audiences, with differing goals: (1) the faculty member, as an opportunity for self-reflection and continued growth, (2) the University, as an opportunity to affirm achievement and locate areas for improvement, (3) the higher education community, as an opportunity to fulfill requirements for accreditation through on-going review of faculty, (4) and the citizens of the State of Oregon, as an affirmation of continued faculty professionalism in a public university setting.

1. Biennial Development Plan

A written professional development plan will be submitted by the faculty member by the beginning of winter quarter of a review year. The plan should be organized to address the four areas of evaluation (for tenure and promotion) and should be both reflective (what has been accomplished in the past two years of service) and predictive (what will be accomplished in the next two years). The plan should be in a narrative form that provides the context for faculty work and leads the writer into a dialog with the reader (the Dean or Division Chair). The plan should be succinct. ["Two pages" was a frequently mentioned expectation in the course of Assembly debate on the policy.]

Upon receipt of the plan, the Dean or Division Chair will meet with the faculty member during winter or spring term for discussion of the document. (In Arts and Sciences, the document will then be passed from the Division Chair to the Dean for review.) If the Dean notes significant areas of concern in performance, these will be fully articulated in writing and become part of the faculty member's personnel file. The Dean and the faculty member will then jointly develop a one-year plan of improvement that will, if successfully completed, return the faculty member to the biennial development plan review schedule. Any irreconcilable disagreement between the faculty member and the Dean about formation of the plan of improvement or about whether or not it has been successfully completed will initiate the formal post-tenure portfolio process (#2 below) to be completed in the second year.

2. Formal Post-Tenure Portfolio Review

The formal review process is that identified in the Faculty/Staff Handbook under Promotion, Tenure, and Other Reviews (Chapter VI [B]). After the formal post-tenure portfolio review, the faculty member will rejoin the cycle for biennial development planning until a formal post-tenure portfolio review may become necessary again.

3. Oregon Administrative Rules and personnel procedure currently in place offer means as well to address unsatisfactory performance. When unsatisfactory performance is noted, these means can be procedurally enacted.

4. Implementation

The policy will be implemented over a two-year period. Approximately half the tenured faculty in each School will prepare the professional development plan during each of the two years of

implementation. The half of the tenured faculty for whom post-tenure (or tenure) review has been most recent will participate during the second year of the implementation of the new approach. For faculty not currently tenured, the first such review will occur two years after the year in which a faculty member is successfully considered for the award of tenure. Schools will notify affected faculty of their involvement in the process early in the academic year. Schools will maintain records pertinent to the implementation and conduct of this policy. Schools will, on an annual basis, inform the Provost's Office of those faculty for whom the process of biennial plan development and review has been completed, any cases involving preparation of a plan of improvement, and any situations that will result in the step of initiating the formal post-tenure review process. In cases where a plan of improvement has been developed, a copy of that plan will be forwarded to the Provost's Office. The Provost will annually include, as a part of the schedule of academic personnel procedures, dates for completion of the various steps of the biennial post-tenure review process.

Oregon Administrative Rules on Post-Tenure Review (580-021-0140) require that institutional post tenure review procedures "clearly link the level of remuneration to faculty performance"; OUS IMD 4.002 Post Tenure Review further specifies that institutional post-tenure review approaches must include: "a description of the institutional plan for relating post-tenure reviews to the faculty reward system, so that annual salary-adjustment decisions (i.e., increase, no increase, decrease) will reflect the results of performance evaluations."

Eastern Oregon University, in its implementation of the EOU policy on Post-Tenure Review, meets these OUS requirements as follows:

- * all "across the board" salary adjustments require satisfactory service; where service is not satisfactory, no salary increase is given,
- * exceptional service results in merit awards, using processes and procedures described elsewhere in this Handbook,
- * whenever service is not, satisfactory - as determined at any of the stages of post-tenure review - the school Dean will, after consulting with the School Personnel Committee, make a recommendation to the Provost on the question of a reduction in salary; the Provost will present a recommendation on salary reduction to the President after consultation with the Assembly Personnel Committee.

[Responsible for Accuracy: John S. Miller, Provost - Last Verified: 7/28/00]
From Faculty/Staff Handbook

Appendices

R9-A Draft Framework for Online Faculty Evaluation **6/24/09**

1. *Framing Statement* -- Faculty provide a "framing statement" indicating the individual's teaching roles and responsibilities along with a reflective statement focusing on teaching philosophy, the use of technology to maximize student-teacher interaction, instructional strategies and use of a wide array of tools to help students achieve important educational outcomes at a distance, activities engaged in to improve teaching, and future goals. This statement creates the conceptual framework that will help members of personnel committees to understand diverse faculty intentions, goals and teaching practices. Faculty diversity in approaches to the instructional mission will be respected; but this can only be done to the extent that the Framing Statement provides an internally coherent and complete articulation of the faculty member's pedagogical assumptions and approaches. The intent is to evaluate faculty effectiveness within the context of online delivery and their unique approach taken to teaching and goals pursued, which can vary widely depending on individual temperament and the demands of their discipline.
2. *Student Evaluations* – An online student evaluations form developed by the Faculty Personnel Committee will be used for all online courses taught with enrollments of more than three in the most recent two years. Faculty may elect to supplement these evaluations with approaches of their own design.
3. *Course Syllabi* – The adjunct faculty member will include three representative course syllabi from those taught in the past two years, including lower and upper division or graduate courses. Syllabi will be evaluated by the Dean or designee for the following criteria:
 - Is the syllabus consistent with the standards required by EOU and program faculty? Does the syllabus maintain the intent of the master course syllabus?
 - Does the syllabus compare in scope and depth with similar courses in the discipline?
 - Does the syllabus articulate the appropriate standards and outcomes consistent with GEC and / or programmatic outcomes?
 - Are the range of activities, strategies, resources, and assessments commensurate with other similar courses in the discipline?
4. *Sample Assessments* – The adjunct faculty member will submit a set of assessments used in each course. The Dean or designee will examine the assessments to determine the following:
 - Do the assessments match the learning outcomes of the course?
 - Do the assessments compare in depth of expectation to those of similar courses in the discipline?
5. *Sample Faculty-Student Interaction* – The adjunct faculty member will submit a representative sampling of email logs, Discussion Board interaction, and feedback on

assignments as well as documentation of other means of interaction with students, when appropriate. The Dean or designee will examine the Faculty-Student Interaction to determine the following:

- Is the instructor timely in response to student needs and inquiries?
- Does the instructor provide adequate feedback on assessments and assignments?
- Does the instructor engage in regular and substantive interaction with students?

R9-B Online Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Cycle—2009-10

College of Arts and Sciences					
Division of Arts and Letters					
Last Name	First Name	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer
Henry	Elizabeth		x		
Morgan	Ben			x	
Ottem	Eric			x	
Schumacher	Matt			x	
Wolff	Donald	x			
Division of Social Sciences and Modern Languages					
Dense	Jeffrey		x		
Humphrey	Paula		x		
Johnson	Jeff		x		
Maille	Peter	x			
Wetherill	Jeffrey		x		
Division of Science, Math, Technology					
Cain	Shaun	x			
Huntoon	Alishia		x		
Ettinger	Chip		x		
Antell	Karen		x		
College of Education					
Babcock	Ronald				x
Brog	Molly			x	
Doebler-Irvine	Elisa	x			
Furman	Courtney			x	
Grant	Peggy				x
Hofmann	Phillip				x
Lazareva-Stanishcheva	Victoria	x			
Mack	Margo			x	
Oja	Kristen		x		
Schnitker	Donna			x	
Snook	Sandra		x		
Snyder	Lisa				x
Warren	Lynne	x			
Zorn	Anna		x		