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I. Introduction

In September 2012, Portland State University (PSU) submitted its Year Three Self-Evaluation Report for reaffirmation of accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. The evaluation team that reviewed the report made three recommendations and four commendations.

**Recommendation 1:** While the University has identified core themes, objectives, and indicators of achievement, the evaluation committee found that levels of mission fulfillment have not been defined for all indicators. In other instances, the level of mission fulfillment has been defined, but the threshold level of mission fulfillment does not appear to lead to meaningful improvement. The committee recommends that indicators of achievement need to be better aligned with clearly defined and meaningful levels of mission fulfillment (l.A.1, l.B.2).

**Recommendation 2:** While the review of tenure-track faculty is conducted through a well-defined process, the review of faculty who have attained tenure is uneven. The committee recommends that policies and practices regarding post-tenure review be strengthened to make certain that all faculty are evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner at least once within every five-year period of service (2.B.6).

**Recommendation 3:** The committee found that, while under development, PSU does not have a fully-functioning program review cycle that includes all academic programs. It is recommended that the University act to implement an effective system for the review of academic programs to make certain that the expected program learning outcomes for all programs are communicated, that undergraduate programs demonstrate a coherent design with appropriate breadth, depth, and sequencing and that graduate programs demonstrate greater depth of study and increased demands (2.C.2; 2.C.4, 2.C.12).

The evaluation team concluded that both Recommendations 1 and 2 were “substantially in compliance with Commission criteria for accreditation” but Recommendation 3 did not meet the Commission’s standards for accreditation. In its letter of February 8, 2013, (appendix 1) the Commission requested PSU prepare an ad hoc report to address the concerns expressed in Recommendations 1 and 3. Recommendation 2 will be addressed in the Fall 2015 Year Seven Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability Self-Evaluation Report.

II. Response to Recommendation 1

While the University has identified core themes, objectives and indicators of achievement, the evaluation committee found that levels of mission fulfillment have not been defined for all indicators. In other instances, the level of mission fulfillment has been defined, but the threshold level of mission fulfillment does not appear to lead to meaningful improvement. The committee recommends that indicators of achievement need to be better aligned with clearly defined and meaningful levels of mission fulfillment (l.A.1, l.B.2).

In its Year One and Year Three Self-Evaluation reports, PSU presented objectives and indicators for each of four core themes, which also serve as the foundation for the University’s strategic plan: Community Engagement and Civic Leadership, Student Success, Innovative Research and Scholarship, and Educational Opportunity. The four Core Themes provide a means for organizing “achievements, outcomes and expectations” in fulfillment of the University’s mission as an engaged, urban-
serving institution. In order to monitor progress toward mission fulfillment and to ensure accountability and improvement, specific objectives and indicators have been articulated under each theme to “…represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.” The Year Three Self-Evaluation Report refined this work presented in the Year One Self-Evaluation Report, and included data for measurable indicators and a rubric that could be used to assess progress toward mission fulfillment.

In February 2013, Provost Andrews formed a small committee, consisting of the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), the Vice Provost for Academic Innovation and Student Success/Dean of Undergraduate Students, and the Director of Institutional Research to begin work on realignment of the indicators with the core theme objectives. Beginning in March 2013, the team worked collaboratively with an ad hoc committee comprised of faculty and administrators from across the institution (membership is listed on the contributor’s page).

The first recommendation from the ad hoc committee was that a clearer connection among the Core Themes, objectives, and indicators of achievement be articulated. A second recommendation was to eliminate the qualitative indicators of mission fulfillment that had been included in the Year Three Self-Evaluation Report. While these measures included specific examples linked to objectives, they could not be tracked consistently over time, and therefore did not represent meaningful levels of mission fulfillment. A third recommendation of the committee was to keep the objectives as consistent as possible with those presented in the Year Three Self-Evaluation Report. It also suggested including narratives that would describe the connection between objectives and indicators and provide more clarity as to why specific indicators were selected.

This work resulted in a modified set of indicators and a method for evaluating threshold levels for mission fulfillment that better aligned with the core themes, as well as with changes in governance and accountability demands at the statewide and university level (appendix 2). The method for evaluating thresholds of mission fulfillment follows that described in the Year One Report. For each indicator that is measured by three or more years of data, a rolling three-year average performance will be computed. Performance on the measure will be expected to remain within a 5% range from the mean to meet the threshold for mission fulfillment. Performance measures 5% below the mean will be flagged for review. This interval was selected to allow for variations in the data that may result from internal initiatives or external influences and still allow for meaningful improvement.

Institutional experts were consulted for input on mission fulfillment threshold levels. The process was iterative, with the ALO presenting revisions to the ad hoc committee, the Provost, and the President’s Executive Committee for review and approval. In President Wiewel’s strategic plan, *Opportunity and Competitiveness for the Region*, a number of units were identified as leads for oversight of each of the areas examined in the plan. To determine mission fulfillment, the responsible units were also asked to review indicators identified by the ad hoc committee and to provide data and set performance levels. Each Core Theme, objective, and indicator has now been linked directly to metrics with expected levels of performance for an “acceptable threshold.”

Some indicators were taken directly from accountability reports prepared by statewide or system-level governance bodies, such as the Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB). Under the leadership of Governor Kitzhaber, the OEIB has developed Achievement Compacts for Oregon’s seven public universities that set metrics which inform and guide progress toward meeting statewide goals for Completion, Quality, and Connections for Oregonians. PSU is validating these
threshold levels by comparing them with national accountability standards such as the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) and the Student Achievement Measure (SAM).

An annual cycle of review, appropriate actions, and feedback will ensure accountability and meaningful improvement. Thus, each year in early May, the ALO will send a reminder to the individuals or units responsible for monitoring thresholds for each of the indicators to update their data for the current year and indicate whether or not an indicator is meeting or failing to meet threshold levels. Also in May, the ALO will convene a small committee to conduct an objective evaluation of the data reported in the matrix. This group will be chaired by the Director of Institutional Research and include a faculty member appointed by the Faculty Senate Presiding Officer, an appointee from Research and Strategic Partnerships, and an Associate Dean. **If a majority of the indicators for each theme meets threshold levels, the committee will find that the University’s mission is being fulfilled for that theme.** A downward trend or failure to meet the threshold for any indicator, however, will signal a need to address performance. This review and evaluation should be completed by the end of May.

Following its review, the committee will report the findings to the ALO, who in turn will prepare a final report for the Provost. After reviewing the report, the Provost will share it with the Academic Leadership Team (Deans) and the President’s Executive Committee, which will make the final determination of mission fulfillment or the need for appropriate actions. The Provost and ALO will take any concerns to the appropriate groups, and those responsible units will prepare action plans to address the concerns. Upon completion, President Wiewel will share a summary of the report with the PSU Board of Trustees, which was established by Senate Bill 270 and assumes authority July 1, 2014. This annual compilation and review will provide the campus and the Board of Trustees with detailed information on the status of the mission fulfillment indicators. This information can then be used to inform the University’s annual strategic planning process.

Annual reports will be shared with the campus and external community through the Office of Academic Affairs’ accreditation web site. The document monitoring threshold levels will be maintained by the ALO and revised, as needed, to address changes in PSU’s priorities. This final set of objectives, indicators and methods for determining mission fulfillment was agreed upon in March 2014, along with a process for annual updating, review, and reporting.

### III. Discussion of Core Themes, Objectives, and Indicators

#### Core Theme 1: Community Engagement and Civic Leadership

PSU’s identity is defined generally by its urban location and specifically by its location in Portland. Community engagement is central to PSU’s approach to teaching, learning, and research. Located in the core of Oregon’s largest metropolitan area, PSU takes advantage of a wide variety of opportunities for community engagement by integrating these opportunities into both the undergraduate and graduate curriculum.

PSU is actively engaged with the community through a wide array of civic partnerships and economic relationships and provides a strong leadership role in addressing issues important to the city and the region. Members of the campus community actively participate in civic life, serving in organizations and on boards, task forces or commissions focused on improving the quality of life in the region and on developing strategies to promote sustainable urban futures.
Objectives
One of the major ways that community engagement occurs at PSU is through its community-based learning (CBL) courses and chiefly, the Senior Capstone. The Senior Capstone is an interdisciplinary experience utilizing a student’s educational and life experience in a group project agreed upon by the faculty member and community partner. This culminating general education requirement demonstrates the strong connection between the institution and the community in which it resides. Establishing strategic partnerships and collaborations is a fundamental way that PSU advances its civic leadership goals. PSU is also a key economic driver in the Portland Metropolitan area and through its mission strives to enhance the cultural awareness of the city by hosting and producing public events.

Indicators
The Senior Capstone was selected as an indicator because of the interdisciplinary nature of the program. All undergraduates are required to complete a Senior Capstone, which is assessed through an exit survey that asks students about the perceived impact on the community of their work in the course, and the value of community engagement, generally (Indicators 1.1.3 and 1.1.4). PSU provides enough Capstones to allow students to successfully complete their educational experience and fulfill the Capstone requirement (Indicators 1.1.1 and 1.1.2).

Impact on the community is a vital component of Civic Leadership. PSU measures impact both economically (Indicator 1.2.1) and also by the number of service hours provided by the University to the community (Indicator 1.2.2). Additionally, the impact of partnerships is an important measure of the University’s community engagement and leadership. Enriching partnerships that take multiple years to develop and establish are rewarding both to PSU and the community. The Office of Strategic Partnerships works to leverage a spirit of collaboration by identifying and cultivating public and private partnerships that simultaneously address pressing metropolitan problems while enhancing PSU’s reputation (Indicator 1.2.3). PSU’s mission statement also obligates it to enhance the cultural quality of urban life. The institution achieves this by sponsoring, hosting, and offering a number of cultural events and public presentations to the community (Indicator 1.2.4).

Mission Fulfillment Thresholds
Development of the acceptable mission fulfillment levels for the Core Theme of Community Engagement and Civic Leadership involved multiple people across the university in consultation with the Provost and the ALO. Setting appropriate Objective 1.1 threshold levels involved meetings between the ALO, the Vice Provost for Academic Innovation and Student Success, the Capstone Program Director, and the Director of Assessment and Upper Division Clusters. These levels were determined by examining Capstone program data and University Studies programmatic assessment materials. The finalized threshold levels take into account these changing Capstone trends with the 5% tolerance. The threshold levels for Objective 1.2 were set by representatives from the Office of Research and Strategic Partnerships and the President’s Office, including the Vice President for Research, Associate Vice President for Strategic Partnerships, and the Senior Policy Analyst. An improved multiplier and a more accurate methodology implemented in 2010-11 for Objective 1.2 will enable these numbers to be more accurate and provide a clearer indication of PSU’s economic and community service impact on the Portland region. These threshold levels demonstrate both the economic and social impact PSU has in the urban area. These threshold levels were selected to assist PSU in monitoring its diverse educational, social, and economic impacts on the community and the urban region.
Core Theme 2: Student Success
As an urban-serving institution, PSU serves a diverse population of learners, including large numbers of first-generation college students, transfer and part-time students, older or returning students, students of color and low-income students, as well as graduate students and those seeking career advancement. This diversity challenges traditional measures of undergraduate student success and calls for innovative strategies to ensure that access and opportunities result in the achievement of educational goals. PSU’s growing commitment to student success includes two important dimensions: offering and assessing high quality academic programs and increasing student retention throughout the academic experience, with degree completion as the goal.

Objectives
To ensure student success both academically and post-graduation, PSU offers a rigorous academic portfolio of high quality programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. In evaluating its portfolio of programs, PSU utilizes both external and internal evaluations. External review of programs, through programmatic accreditation (Indicator 2.1.1) places those programs within a national framework of specialized standards and review. PSU has also recently revised and implemented its internal review mechanism through the Academic Program Review process (Indicator 2.1.2). This review includes an in-depth assessment of student learning and an external reviewer to evaluate the program. Complimentary to offering quality programs, is monitoring student academic progress through retention and graduation rates.

Indicators
Retention indicators (Indicator 2.2.1 and 2.2.3) and graduation rate indicators (Indicator 2.2.2 and 2.2.4) were selected as measures of successful student progress. Indicators 2.2.5, 2.2.6, and 2.2.7 were based on student success measures included in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) and the Student Achievement Measure (SAM). Both are new indicators of student success for the University, representing PSU’s participation in national efforts to identify appropriate measures of student success and to ensure degree completion for its students.

Mission Fulfillment Thresholds
The determination of mission fulfillment thresholds for program review involved multiple people across the University in consultation with the Provost, the ALO (who tracks programmatic accreditation), and the Curriculum Coordinator (who tracks Academic Program Review). The threshold levels of continual review - within a seven year timeframe - were selected to ensure that program quality is maintained over time. It is anticipated that both the Academic Program Reviews and specialized accreditation reviews will reveal areas for improvement while also noting areas of excellence. PSU is committed to an ongoing review of its array of programs to ensure the institution is meeting its commitment to the community and the needs of its students. It will address areas of concern within the timeframe proscribed by review. Retention and graduation threshold levels were reviewed by the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, and have been communicated to the campus community through enrollment management reports. The OEIB has also set institutional targets for PSU for those threshold levels noted. Since PSU recently joined the VSA and the SAM, threshold levels have not been determined because only one set of data points are available at this time for Indicators 2.2.5, 2.2.6, and 2.2.7. These threshold levels will be established and monitored for the 2015 Year Seven NWCCU Self-Evaluation Report.

Core Theme 3: Innovative Research and Scholarship
Research and scholarship at PSU involve faculty and students working in close collaboration with community partners or in multidisciplinary teams to address “locally relevant” questions and issues. One important aspect of the growing research agenda, and of many of the institution’s graduate programs, is active engagement with the urban environment. A wide range of topics, such as transportation, urban planning, social work, nano-materials and fabrication, health and life sciences and K-12 pathways, reflects both PSU’s urban character and the social, cultural and economic development needs of the region and the state. A major thrust of research and scholarship activities is sustainability, which takes a multidisciplinary approach including the sciences, social sciences, humanities, the arts and an array of professional programs. Faculty experts on solar cells, pollution, climate change, healthy living, biotechnology, and public policy making are enhancing PSU’s reputation as a research institution focused on developing sustainable practices.

Partnerships with other higher education institutions in the state, such as those with the Oregon Health & Sciences University (OHSU) help develop programs that meet regional needs and foster interactions between industry and Oregon’s research universities. These relationships also provide opportunities for faculty and students to conduct collaborative, multidisciplinary research and to bring this work to bear in the curriculum.

**Objectives**
PSU’s research agenda has improved with the establishment of the Office of Research and Strategic Partnerships in 2010 and demonstrated the institution’s commitment to research and scholarship. There is an expectation to use faculty expertise to improve the economic and cultural developments of the region through research and improve the community partnerships in the industrial, government and non-government sectors. This expectation of the research mission establishes the framework for the objectives in Core Theme 3, which are tied to interdisciplinary research and how PSU’s research addresses community needs (Objective 3.1), and student participation in research at the undergraduate and graduate levels (Objective 3.2). As with the Senior Capstone, PSU values interdisciplinary teams of faculty and students working on research projects relevant to the metropolitan area.

**Indicators**
The measures for Objective 3.1: Increase interdisciplinary funded research activity, focus on the number of awards received, faculty with external funding, and the number of interdisciplinary awards (Indicators 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4). They were established by the Office of Research and Strategic Partnerships in consultation with the Provost and the ALO. Additionally, total research expenditures (Indicator 3.1.1) also demonstrate the development in sponsored research activities at the University. Objective 3.2 tracks student participation in research at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Undergraduate research activities are detailed in the Ronald E. McNair program (Indicator 3.2.3) while graduate research is measured by the number of graduate research assistantships on sponsored projects (Indicator 3.2.1) and doctoral degrees awarded (Indicator 3.2.2). The Dean of Graduate Studies provided input on the threshold levels for the number of doctoral degrees awarded. Research projects that are funded by industry demonstrate the institution’s connection to the community and how the University assists external partners in their research activities. Strategic Partnerships reports research expenditures for sponsored research annually and is developing methods for identifying sustainability research.

**Mission Fulfillment Thresholds**
The mission fulfillment threshold levels for Core Theme 3: Innovative Research and Scholarship were determined by the Associate Vice President for Research in consultation with the Provost and the ALO. These levels attest to the investment in research activities that have become a priority at the institution. Recently, the effect of the recession has challenged the trend of continual growth for these indicators and has caused PSU to curtail some of its more ambitious levels for growth. The mission fulfillment threshold, however, demonstrates the institution’s commitment to supporting research activities. The Office of Academic Affairs and the Associate Director of the McNair Scholars Program provided threshold levels for Indicator 3.2.3 and the Dean of Graduate Studies offered suggestions for Indicator 3.2.2. This indicator anticipates modest growth in the number of doctoral degrees awarded by the institution through the next accreditation cycle.

Core Theme 4: Educational Opportunity
The University’s commitment to opportunity entails providing students with a range of choices in their educational careers, as well as flexibility in academic scheduling and mode of delivery. The variety of educational programs for undergraduate and graduate students ranges from degrees in the traditional humanities, social science and science disciplines to an array of professional programs particularly suited to the needs of the metropolitan region. The richness of academic programs in the schools and colleges demonstrates PSU’s commitment to serving the needs of the metro region. A key piece of PSU’s urban-serving mission is to provide educational opportunities to metropolitan, regional and international communities.

As the most diverse university in Oregon, PSU creates a welcoming climate for students from all backgrounds. Multiple constituencies look to the University to provide opportunity and leadership: first-generation and returning students, the Latino/a community, veterans, people with disabilities, career professionals seeking advancement, and many others. This includes a commitment to diversity and the provision of opportunities to all populations in the urban area and as such this Core Theme has two distinct components – “Providing Access to Programs” and “Opportunities for Diverse Populations.”

Objectives
The objectives for Educational Opportunity overlap with some of those described under “other Core Themes.” Access for students to academic programs through non-traditional means and partnering with other educational institutions - particularly community colleges to meet the needs of Oregon’s populous are two key objectives that also are reflected under Student Success. Addressing the needs of Oregon’s diverse population is also a major component of the University’s mission. The University seeks to increase efforts to integrate its student body, support historically underrepresented groups, and provide international learning experiences.

Indicators
Through online course enrollments (Indicator 4a.1.1) and online credit sections (Indicator 4a.1.2), PSU is providing access to programs at different times and locations helping a diverse student body to meet its educational goals. The University also offers a range of professional degree programs relevant to the Portland metro area (Indicator 4a.1.3) and is in the process of redefining and expanding the possibilities for credit for prior learning (CPL) to meet the needs of urban, adult and returning students(Indicator 4a.1.4). Students transferring into PSU are a key aspect of the student demographic. Thus, collaborative work with other regional educational institutions to assists students navigating between multiple institutions such as transfer students from Oregon community colleges (Indicator 4a.2.1) or freshman with dual or early college credit (Indicator 4a.2.2) are
important indicators to monitor. Furthermore, detailed articulation agreements (Indicator 4a.2.3) assist students in making the transition from community college to PSU easier and may lead to higher degree completion. Diversity enrollment indicators (Indicator 4b.1.1) and bachelor degrees awarded to Pell Grant Eligible Oregonians (Indicator 4b.1.2) demonstrate the institution’s commitment to increasing the diversity of its student body. Providing student support services (Indicators 4b.1.3 and 4b.1.4) illustrates the relationship between student access and the institution’s commitment to student success. Internationalization is also an important part of the student experience. Preparing students for an international experience through study abroad (Indicator 4b.2.1) and providing access to the international educational community here in Portland, exhibit a strong institutional commitment to a rich student experience with a global perspective.

**Mission Fulfillment Thresholds**

Determination of mission fulfillment thresholds for this theme also involved the participation of various individuals across campus in consultation with the Provost and the ALO. The online enrollment and course section thresholds (Indicator 4a.1.1 and 4a.1.2) were suggested by the Director of Pedagogy and Platform in the Office of Academic Innovation. The Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management offered suggestions for the threshold levels involving enrollment data (Indicators 4a.2.1, 4a.2.2, 4b.1.1 and 4b.2.2) using specific enrollment and retention goals based on enrollment management reports. Targets have also been established for the university by the OEIB (Indicator 4a.2.2 - Newly admitted Oregon Freshman entering with high school dual or other early college credit and 4b.1.2 – Number of bachelor’s degrees awarded to Pell Eligible Oregonians). Some threshold levels still need to be determined because the indicators (4a.1.4 – Number of credits earned by Credit for Prior Learning and 4a.2.3 – Program specific Articulation Agreements) are in the developmental stages. These threshold levels will be established by the Year 7 NWCCU Institutional Self-Evaluation Report. The mission fulfillment threshold levels for International learning opportunities (Objective 4b.2) were submitted by the Executive Director, International Affairs/ Director, Education Abroad. Threshold levels were also set by the Office of Academic Affairs (Indicators 4a.1.3 and 4a.2.3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme 1: Community Engagement and Civic Leadership</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objective 1.2:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an undergraduate student experience that connects and engages students with the community</td>
<td>Provide leadership in areas vital to the urban and metropolitan area and contribute to social and economic vitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Portland State University offers an array of Community-Based learning opportunities for students; the Capstone was selected because it is interdisciplinary in design and is a requirement for graduation.)</em></td>
<td><em>(Portland State University is actively connected with the community through strategic partnerships and other economic relationships and provides a strong leadership role in addressing issues important to the city and the region.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Capstone courses offered annually are sufficient to meet student demand</td>
<td>1.2.1 Portland State University’s economic impact on the region in dollars(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Number of students enrolled in Capstone courses</td>
<td>1.2.2 Service hours completed(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Students will leave Portland State University prepared to make a difference in the community</td>
<td>1.2.3 Number of strategic partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Community engagement helped the student better understand the course content in the Capstone course</td>
<td>1.2.4 Contribution to the cultural richness of the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Fulfillment - Acceptable Threshold</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mission Fulfillment - Acceptable Threshold</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 234 Capstone courses offered annually</td>
<td>1.2.1 Portland State’s value of economic impact in dollars (To be established with a more accurate formula with one year of data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 3820 students enrolled in Capstone courses</td>
<td>1.2.2 Hours of service to the community (To be established with a more accurate formula with one year of data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 78% of Capstone students will agree or strongly agree that they have a better understanding of how to make a difference in the community in an end of course survey</td>
<td>1.2.3 5 institutional strategic partnerships by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 84% of Capstone students will agree or strongly agree that the community work helped them to better</td>
<td>1.2.4 Portland State University offers an array of public events for the Portland Metropolitan area where attendance will exceed 71,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) Information found at Portland State [Profile](#)
understand the course content of the Capstone course in an end of course survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Responsibility:</th>
<th>Institutional Responsibility:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Office of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Research and Strategic Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core Theme 2: Student Success

#### Objective 2.1:
Provide quality educational programs and evidence of the student learning experience

*Portland State is committed to ongoing internal and external review of its academic programs including the assessment of student learning outcomes to ensure high quality academic programs are available to its students.*

#### Objective 2.2:
Improve retention and completion rates

*Portland State’s growing commitment to student success includes two important dimensions demonstrated through student retention and degree completion efforts.*

#### Indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2.1</th>
<th>Objective 2.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Programs with Specialized Accreditation</td>
<td>2.2.1 Retention rate of first-time, full-time freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Programs, scheduled each year, have undergone academic program review with a comprehensive program assessment</td>
<td>2.2.2 Graduation rate (within Oregon Public Universities) of first-time, full-time freshmen within six years (this indicator will change with the transition of OUS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3 Retention of Oregon Community College transfer students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.4 Bachelor degrees awarded to transfer students from Oregon Community Colleges²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.5 Percentage of first-time, full-time freshman who have graduated either from reporting institution or a subsequent institution *(VSA/SAM measure)*³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.6 Percentage of first-time, full-time freshman who are still enrolled at PSU or subsequent institution *(VSA/SAM measure)*³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Achievement compact measure
³ Portland State University recently agreed to participate in the VSA and SAM and thresholds for this indicator will be monitored by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
### Mission Fulfillment - Acceptable Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Programs with Specialized Accreditation are renewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Programs, scheduled each year, have completed academic program review on institutional cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mission Fulfillment - Acceptable Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Portland State retention rate for first-time, full-time freshman will be 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Portland State six-year graduation rate (within Oregon Public Universities) for first-time, full-time freshmen will be 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>Retention of Oregon Community College transfer students will be 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>Number of bachelor degrees awarded to transfer students from Oregon Community Colleges will meet OEIB target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institutional Responsibility:

| Office of Academic Affairs | Enrollment Management and Student Affairs |

### Core Theme 3: Innovative Research and Scholarship

#### Objective 3.1:

Increase interdisciplinary funded research activity that reflects the University’s urban character and addresses the needs of urban communities.

*(As a Carnegie High Research institution, Portland State promotes and supports research and scholarship that involves students and faculty in knowledge creation that addresses the needs of urban communities, locally and globally.)*

#### Objective 3.2:

Provide opportunities for student participation in research at undergraduate and graduate levels

*(Students are engaged in research at the undergraduate and graduate levels establishing a solid foundation in disciplinary knowledge and preparing them for collaborative research.)*

#### Indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Total expenditures for sponsored project activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>Number of awards received annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>Number of faculty with externally funded projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Number of graduate research assistantships on sponsored projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Number of doctoral degrees awarded¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3</td>
<td>Number of undergraduates enrolled in the Ronald E. McNair Scholars Program³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Ronald E. McNair [alumni productivity page](#)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme 4: Educational Opportunity: Providing Access to Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4a.1:</strong> Provide access to a wide range of programs, offered through traditional and non-traditional means that support Portland State University’s mission and meet the needs of a diverse student population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Part of Portland State University’s commitment to opportunity is to provide students with a range of choices in their educational careers, as well as flexibility in scheduling and mode of delivery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Portland State University emphasizes improving college readiness and community college pathways for students to attend university. Partnerships have helped to engage different communities and to enable students to envision themselves as learners with the expectation that they will attend university)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4a.1.1 Number of students enrolled in online courses
4a.1.2 Number of credit sections offered in an online format
4a.1.3 Number of professional degrees
4a.1.4 Number of credits earned by Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)²

4a.2.1 Enrollment of transfer students from community colleges
4a.2.2 Newly admitted Oregon Freshman entering with high school dual or other early college credit²
4a.2.3 Program specific Articulation Agreements³

**Mission Fulfillment - Acceptable Threshold**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mission Fulfillment - Acceptable Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a.1.1</td>
<td>6,000 students enrolled in online courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.1.2</td>
<td>1,475 credit sections in an online format offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.1.3</td>
<td>15 professional degrees offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.1.4</td>
<td>Number of Credit for Prior Learning earned meets HECC’s target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.2.1</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for 1,739 transfer students from community colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.2.2</td>
<td>Number of newly admitted Oregon Freshman entering with high school dual or other early college credit will meet OEIB target²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.2.3</td>
<td>Number of Articulation Agreements will reach 25 by 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Responsibility:**

Office of Academic Affairs

---

Core Theme 4: Educational Opportunity: Opportunities for Diverse Populations

**Objective 4b.1:**

Increase efforts to enroll a diverse student body and provide support services for students from historically under-represented groups

*(As the most diverse university in Oregon, Portland State University provides opportunities for students from all backgrounds)*

**Indicators:**

4b.1.1 Enrollment of diverse (appendix 2, pg. 26) students as a percentage of total enrollment
4b.1.2 Number of bachelor's degrees awarded to Pell Eligible Oregonians²
4b.1.3 Number of students served by

**Objective 4b.2:**

Provide international learning opportunities

*(Portland State University is committed to providing international experiences for all students, as well as hosting experiences for students from abroad whose presence on campus and in the classroom enhances the experience of domestic students)*

**Indicators:**

4b.2.1 Number of students successfully completing study abroad offerings (including short-term faculty-led study abroad)
4b.2.2 International students enrolled at Portland State University in degree programs

---

² This indicator is still in the developmental stages and will change to the number of students successfully graduating under articulation agreements

³ This indicator is in development with threshold levels to be established
support services designed for under-represented students
4b.1.4 Completion rates of students served by TRiO-Student Support Services program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Fulfillment -Acceptable Threshold</th>
<th>Mission Fulfillment -Acceptable Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4b.1.1 Enrollment of diverse students as a percentage of total enrollment is 23%</td>
<td>4b.2.1 Number of students successfully completing study abroad offerings is 500 a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.1.2 Number of bachelor’s degrees awarded to Pell Eligible Oregonians meets OEIB achievement compact target</td>
<td>4b.2.2 Increase international student enrollment by 100 students a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.1.3 479 students served by support services designed for under-represented groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.1.4 Graduation rates of students served by TRiO program will be equal to institutional graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Responsibility:
Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion
Enrollment Management and Student Affairs

Institutional Responsibility:
Office of International Affairs

IV.  Recommendation 3

The committee found that, while under development, Portland State University does not have a fully-functioning program review cycle that includes all academic programs. It is recommended that the University act to implement an effective system for the review of academic programs to make certain that the expected program learning outcomes for all programs are communicated, that undergraduate programs demonstrate a coherent design with appropriate breadth, depth, and sequencing and that graduate programs demonstrate greater depth of study and increased demands (2.C.2; 2.C.4, 2.C.12).

Since the fall 2013 site evaluation, Portland State University (PSU) has improved its academic program review process which has become more established across the institution. The process has incorporated the feedback of administrators and faculty to enhance the value of the review process to the institution. In February 2013, Provost Andrew’s appointed the Vice Provost for Academic Fiscal Strategies and Planning, the Curriculum Coordinator, the Director of Institutional Research, and the ALO to a committee to review the Guidelines for Academic Program Review at Portland State University that were in a draft format during the site visit in 2013 and prepare it for PSU Faculty Senate approval. After consultation with the presiding officer of the PSU Faculty Senate, the committee proposed a more reflective and introspective approach to program review than previously required by the Oregon University System (OUS).
A policy (appendix 3) was drafted consisting of a policy statement, a reason for policy/purpose, applicability, definitions, policy/procedure, links to related forms, links to related policies, procedures and information, contacts, policy adoption, and history/revision dates. This policy was submitted to the Educational Policy Committee, a Faculty Senate Constitutional Committee in November 2013 for review. The Educational Policy Committee provided input to the guidelines and presented information about the policy and guidelines during the January and February 2014 Faculty Senate Meetings. The Educational Policy Committee formally submitted the policy with accompanying guidelines to the PSU Faculty Senate for recommendation by the faculty at the March 3, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting. The Faculty Senate has recommended that the policy be approved and the Provost has concurred. This policy dictates a rigorous review (appendix 4) and approval process for all new programs and certificates, as well as a systematic 5-7 year cycle review (appendix 5) of all existing programs carried out at the college/school level. The Academic Program Review materials are publicly available on the Office of Academic Affairs webpage.

The Guidelines for Academic Program Review at Portland State University in draft form was used by the Environmental Sciences and Management program in 2012-2013 to complete that program’s review at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in a pilot phase. The Environmental Sciences and Management program also incorporated the centers and institutes they oversee in the review process. This pilot review, under these draft guidelines, was very informative for the review process and detailed difficulties and idiosyncrasies that may be unique to various departments.

The Deans, the Office of Academic Affairs Executive Committee (OAA Excom), and the Administrative Leadership Team (ALT), agreed that a comprehensive schedule of graduate programs, undergraduate programs, and centers and institutes would be generated for a 5-7 year review cycle. The academic deans have proposed a complete and on-going schedule for program review through the 2020-2021 academic year for each discipline to demonstrate that the system is fully integrated across the institution. The Guidelines for Academic Program Review at Portland State University will serve as the basis for these reviews and will include comparative data at an institutional level and enable the programs to evaluate themselves with other programs on a national level.

To aid in the communication of a coherent design of all undergraduate and graduate programs, PSU has implemented a Degree Mapping website. This website, available to students, perspective students, parents, advisors, and the community, provides information about advising, careers, degrees and certificates, learning outcomes, and links to departmental webpages. This single location has made access to various forms of information readily available and has provided the public with clearer course and learning expectations of PSU’s programs.

V. Conclusion

PSU has carried out an extensive process to discuss, evaluate, and reflect upon the 2012 NWCCU site evaluation team’s Recommendations 1 and 3. An administrative team, working with an ad hoc committee has made stronger connections between the core themes, the objectives, and the indicators of achievement. Threshold levels for each indicator have been defined and changed to ensure that they are meaningful and will lead to institutional improvement. The ALO has developed a process for compiling indicator data and ensuring annual data review. This process will result in an annual report to the Provost who will bring this report to the President’s Executive Committee for review and an opportunity to address circumstances that may threaten mission fulfillment thresholds.
PSU has also established a policy, recommended guidelines, a schedule, and a reporting library for academic program review. These actions will enable a functioning review cycle that includes all academic programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as centers and institutes. The academic program review process in conjunction with the degree mapping website demonstrates that expected learning outcomes are being communicated and that there is a coherent design to the curriculum. External review during the academic program review process will provide an outside perspective to ensure that academic rigor, assessment of student learning, and program design is appropriate. This ad hoc report demonstrates the steps Portland State University has taken to ensure that Recommendations 1 and 3 from the 2012 NWCCU site evaluation have been addressed and that PSU is in compliance with NWCCU standards.
February 8, 2013

Dr. Wim Wiewel  
President  
Portland State University  
P. O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207-0751

Dear President Wiewel:

On behalf of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to report that the accreditation of Portland State University has been reaffirmed on the basis of the Fall 2012 Year Three Resources and Capacity Evaluation which was expanded to address Recommendation 1 of the Fall 2011 Year One Mission and Core Themes Peer-Evaluation Report.

In reaffirming accreditation, the Commission requests that the University address Recommendation 2 of the Fall 2012 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report in its Fall 2015 Year Seven Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability Self-Evaluation Report. The Commission further requests that the University address Recommendations 1 and 3 of the Fall 2012 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report in an Ad Hoc Report with a visit in Spring 2014. A copy of the Recommendations is enclosed for your reference.

In taking these actions, the Commission finds that Recommendations 1 and 2 of the Fall 2012 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report are areas where Portland State University is substantially in compliance with Commission criteria for accreditation, but in need of improvement. However, the Commission determined that Recommendation 3 of the Fall 2012 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report is an area where the University does not meet the Commission’s criteria for accreditation. According to U.S. Department of Education Regulation 34 CFR 602.20 and Commission Policy A-18, Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period (enclosed), the Commission requires that Portland State University take appropriate action to ensure that Recommendation 3 is addressed and resolved within the prescribed two-year period.

If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes for a rewarding new year.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sandra E. Flmand  
President

SEE:rb  
Enclosure:  Recommendations  
Policy A-18  

cc:  Mr. Robert Halstead, Coordinator for Accreditation and Special Programs
1. While the University has identified core themes, objectives, and indicators of achievement, the evaluation committee found that levels of mission fulfillment have not been defined for all indicators. In other instances, the level of mission fulfillment has been defined, but the threshold level of mission fulfillment does not appear to lead to meaningful improvement. The committee recommends that indicators of achievement need to be better aligned with clearly defined and meaningful levels of mission fulfillment (1.A.1, 1.B.2).

2. While the review of tenure-track faculty is conducted through a well-defined process, the review of faculty who have attained tenure is uneven. The committee recommends that policies and practices regarding post-tenure review be strengthened to make certain that all faculty are evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner at least once within every five-year period of service (2.B.6).

3. The committee found that, while under development, Portland State University does not have a fully-functioning program review cycle that includes all academic programs. It is recommended that the University act to implement an effective system for the review of academic programs to make certain that the expected program learning outcomes for all programs are communicated, that undergraduate programs demonstrate a coherent design with appropriate breadth, depth, and sequencing and that graduate programs demonstrate greater depth of study and increased demands (2.C.2; 2.C.4, 2.C.12).
Policy A-18 Commission Action Regarding
Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period

If the Commission determines that an institution it accredits is not in compliance with a Commission standard for accreditation, the Commission will immediately initiate adverse action against the institution or require the institution to take appropriate action to bring itself into compliance within a time period that shall not exceed: 1) twelve months, if the longest program offered by the institution, is less than one year in length; 2) eighteen months, if the longest program offered by the institution, is at least one year, but less than two years, in length; or 3) two years, if the longest program offered by the institution, is at least two years in length.

The Commission may extend the period for compliance noted above should it reasonably expect that, based upon the institution’s progress toward meeting the Commission’s standard for accreditation, the institution will come into full compliance within a reasonable timeframe. Should an institution deem that as a result of mitigating circumstances it is not able to comply with the standard for accreditation within the specified period of time, the institution may submit a written request to the Commission for additional time to come into compliance with the standard for accreditation. The request is to be submitted prior to the time limit for corrective action set forth by the Commission, provide a detailed explanation of the reasons why the institution cannot comply with the standard for accreditation within the designated time period, and demonstrate that the institution is making good progress in meeting the standard for accreditation. Following a review of the request, the Commission will make a determination as to whether the institution has based its request on valid reasons. If the Commission determines that the institution has substantiated good cause for not complying within the specified time period and is making good progress to come into compliance, the Commission will extend the period for achieving compliance and stipulate requirements for continuing oversight of the institution’s accreditation during the extension.

Adopted 1997/Revised 2002
### Portland State University Mission:

The mission of Portland State University is to enhance the intellectual, social, cultural and economic qualities of urban life by providing access throughout the life span to a quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to metropolitan areas. The University conducts research and community service that support a high quality educational environment and reflect issues important to the region. It actively promotes the development of a network of educational institutions to serve the community.

### Outcome Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13 Projected</th>
<th>2013-14 Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Oregonians</td>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>All Oregonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>URM</td>
<td>Pell Eligible</td>
<td>URM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to Oregonians</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to rural Oregonians</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of advanced degrees awarded to Oregonians</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge in employee’s field of study or major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% very or extremely satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% at least somewhat satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of engineering, computer science, and technology employers reporting they were “Very or Extremely Satisfied” and they were at least “Somewhat Satisfied” with recent graduates’ knowledge or abilities in the following areas:***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very or Extremely Satisfied</th>
<th>Very or Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/78 (31%)</td>
<td>65/78 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32/78 (41%)</td>
<td>68/78 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39/78 (50%)</td>
<td>72/78 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49/78 (63%)</td>
<td>74/78 (95%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engineering, computer science, and technology employer satisfaction with the general knowledge and skills of the majority of recent college graduates (overall)***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% very or extremely satisfied</th>
<th>% at least somewhat satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53/96 (55%)</td>
<td>92/96 (96%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alumni Satisfaction

Data Available 2014
#### Outcome Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connections</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13 Projected</th>
<th>2013-14 Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># and % of newly admitted Oregon freshmen entering with HS dual credit or other early college credit</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to transfer students from Oregon community colleges</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Local Priorities (optional for each institution)

**A student is defined as being disadvantaged per OEIB 705-0010-0040 by being either a member of an under-represented racial or ethnic group and/or eligible to receive a Pell Grant. The Federal Pell Grant is a need-based grant from the federal government intended for undergraduate students who have not earned a bachelor’s degree; eligibility is subject to change by criteria set forth by the federal government. For this report, only Pell recipients are counted. Students self-identify both race and ethnicity. Inclusion in the multi-racial category is determined by identification with more than one race and inclusion of one or more of the underrepresented groups. A student may be a member of both an underrepresented minority group (URM) and be Pell eligible.**

**To protect confidentiality of individual students, data is not reported for cells containing fewer than 6 students or when small cell sizes can be deduced from either OUS or institutional totals.**

**Employer survey administered during 2012-13 to Oregon engineering and technology employers; targets for 2013-14 are not available for these employers. Employers were not asked to rate their satisfaction of OUS alumni’s performance in terms of race/ethnicity, thus race/ethnicity data is not available.**

#### Investment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education and General</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>$ 68,630,709</td>
<td>$ 70,656,270</td>
<td>$ 54,295,004</td>
<td>$ 55,264,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disadvantaged Students 2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures Actuals for 2011-12</th>
<th>Disadvantaged Students*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to Oregonians</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to rural Oregonians</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of advanced degrees awarded to Oregonians</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># and % of newly admitted Oregon freshmen entering with HS dual credit or other early college credit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to transfer students from Oregon community colleges</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Priorities (optional for each institution)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A student is defined as being disadvantaged per OEIB 705-0010-0040 by being either a member of an under-represented racial or ethnic group and/or eligible to receive a Pell Grant. The Federal Pell Grant is a need-based grant from the federal government intended for undergraduate students who have not earned a bachelor’s degree; eligibility is subject to change by criteria set forth by the federal government. For this report, only Pell recipients are counted. Students self-identify both race and ethnicity. Inclusion in the multi-racial category is determined by identification with more than one race and inclusion of one or more of the underrepresented groups. A student may be a member of both an underrepresented minority group (URM) and be Pell eligible.

**To protect confidentiality of individual students, data is not reported for cells containing fewer than 6 students or when small cell sizes can be deduced from either OUS or institutional totals.
Disadvantaged Students 2012-13 Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcome Measures 2012-13 Projections</strong></th>
<th>Disadvantaged Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to Oregonians</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to rural Oregonians</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of advanced degrees awarded to Oregonians</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># and % of newly admitted Oregon freshmen entering with HS dual credit or other early college credit</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to transfer students from Oregon community colleges</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Priorities (optional for each institution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A student is defined as being disadvantaged per OEIB 705-0010-0040 by being either a member of an under-represented racial or ethnic group and/or eligible to receive a Pell Grant. The Federal Pell Grant is a need-based grant from the federal government intended for undergraduate students who have not earned a bachelor’s degree; eligibility is subject to change by criteria set forth by the federal government. For this report, only Pell recipients are counted. Students self-identify both race and ethnicity. Inclusion in the multi-racial category is determined by identification with more than one race and inclusion of one or more of the underrepresented groups. A student may be a member of both an underrepresented minority group (URM) and be Pell eligible.

**To protect confidentiality of individual students, data is not reported for cells containing fewer than 6 students or when small cell sizes can be deduced from either OUS or institutional totals.
# Disadvantaged Students 2013-14 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcome Measures 2013-14 Targets</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disadvantaged Students</strong>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to Oregonians</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to rural Oregonians</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of advanced degrees awarded to Oregonians</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Available 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># and % of newly admitted Oregon freshmen entering with HS dual credit or other early college credit</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to transfer students from Oregon community colleges</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Priorities (optional for each institution)

*A student is defined as being disadvantaged per OEIB 705-0010-0040 by being either a member of an under-represented racial or ethnic group and/or eligible to receive a Pell Grant. The Federal Pell Grant is a need-based grant from the federal government intended for undergraduate students who have not earned a bachelor’s degree; eligibility is subject to change by criteria set forth by the federal government. For this report, only Pell recipients are counted. Students self-identify both race and ethnicity. Inclusion in the multi-racial category is determined by identification with more than one race and inclusion of one or more of the underrepresented groups. A student may be a member of both an underrepresented minority group (URM) and be Pell eligible.*

**To protect confidentiality of individual students, data is not reported for cells containing fewer than 6 students or when small cell sizes can be deduced from either OUS or institutional totals.
### OUS ACHIEVEMENT COMPACT 2013-14
### DATA DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Achievement Compact Metrics (continued)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Definition</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of engineering, computer science, and technology employers reporting they were “very or extremely satisfied” with recent graduates’ knowledge or abilities in the following areas:</td>
<td><strong>OUS Employer Survey 2012-13</strong></td>
<td>OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>Survey conducted in 2012-13 by OUS reflecting responses of employers hiring recent OUS graduates with engineering, computer science, and materials science degrees. Four (4) digit NAICS industry codes were used to obtain industries that would potentially hire engineering and technology graduates. A study conducted by Carnegie Mellon University was used as a baseline for these industry codes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Communication</td>
<td>In order to help ensure that respondents were directly dealing and had familiarity with OUS graduates, 3 separate employer contact lists were used for a total number of 286 respondents out of a total list of 3350 contacts for a 8.5% response rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>The first contact list was executives and hiring managers from ETIC members and OUS engineering contractors comprised 29% of the total sample (84 responses out of 175 total, and a 48% response rate); a list of ‘C-level’ executives and hiring managers from a DMX mailing list for 26 of the entire sample (14 respondents out of 1027 records for a 7% response rate); and a list from the Oregon Employment Department comprising of primarily of accounting, payroll, and HR managers for engineering and technology industries for 45% of the entire sample (128 respondents out of 2148 records for a 6% response rate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge in employee’s field of study or major</td>
<td>For those respondents who reported being at least ‘somewhat familiar’ with graduates from the Oregon University System, skills were assessed for an institution if it was among the top 3 institutions from which the company hires recent graduates. Employers were not asked to rate OUS alumni’s skills or knowledge in terms of race or ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages are also reported for those employers who reported being “extremely, very, or somewhat” satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Employer satisfaction</strong></th>
<th><strong>OUS Employer Survey 2012-13</strong></th>
<th>OUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For those respondents who reported being at least ‘somewhat familiar’ with graduates from the Oregon University System, employer satisfaction is measured by the percent response of “Extremely” or “Very satisfied” to the following question: “Overall, how satisfied are you with the general skills of the majority of recent graduates of (institution name) as they relate to the requirements of the job(s) for which they are hired?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data is also shown for the percent responding “Extremely” “Very” and “Somewhat” satisfied. Employers were not asked to rate OUS alumni’s skills or knowledge in terms of race or ethnicity. Employers were not asked to rate their satisfaction levels in terms of student race/ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Achievement Compact Metrics (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni satisfaction</td>
<td>The Status of OUS Baccalaureate Graduates: One Year Later Survey. Bachelor’s degree recipients awarded a degree in any term of a given academic year (summer through the following spring) are surveyed nine to twelve months following graduation. Graduates will be asked to rate the overall quality of their educational experience on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 is “excellent” and 1 is “poor”). Data reflect the percentage of survey respondents rating the overall quality of the experience a 4 or 5. This field will have a blank placeholder in the 2013 submission to OEIB, as this data is not yet available. The survey will be administered in summer 2013 on the graduating class of 2012.</td>
<td>OUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># and % of newly admitted Oregon freshmen entering with HS dual credit or other early college credit</td>
<td>SCARF Fall 4th Week, Enrollment of New Freshmen from Oregon High Schools. Dual college credit includes any course that is offered to high school students and awarded college credit. Early college credit for Oregonians also includes credit earned through Advanced Placement (AP) testing.</td>
<td>OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of bachelor’s degrees awarded to transfer students from Oregon community colleges</td>
<td>SCARF Annual Degrees, Academic Year, Summer through Spring, using the most recent college source information for transfer students from Oregon community colleges</td>
<td>OUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Priorities (optional for each institution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Oregon residents and youth participants in activities sponsored by the OSU Extension Service per million dollars invested</td>
<td>OSU Extension Service reports, Oregon resident and youth (like youth participating in 4-H) activities per million dollars of state support invested in OSU Extension Service</td>
<td>Campus OSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Academic Program Review Policy

I. POLICY STATEMENT

It is the policy of the Office of Academic Affairs that all PSU academic programs, as required by Northwest Commission on Colleges and University (NWCCU) standard 2c Educational Resources, and any associated centers or institutes go through a periodic Academic program review in order to improve the effectiveness and quality of the academic programs offered by PSU.

II. REASON FOR POLICY/PURPOSE

The academic program review process at PSU is designed to provide continuous improvement of academic quality within academic units through self-study, external review, and internal action plans. For the purposes of this document, “program review” refers to a department or division’s holistic appraisal over five years of its curricular offerings (certificates, majors, minors, and graduate programs), and where applicable, its centers/institutes. Center and institute review should follow Guidelines for Center/Institute Review at Portland State University. Program review provides academic units the opportunity for reflection and discussion of their programs on a regular cycle, and is explicitly designed to be collaborative in nature, and inclusive of student, faculty, community, and administrative input as well as external evaluation, as determined by the dean. The overall goal of program review is to assist academic units in:

- articulating their goals and objectives in relation to the University's priorities, and initiatives,
- instituting a regular process of internal and external review of qualitative and quantitative information about program activities and impact,
- demonstrating progress toward achievement of department goals,
- using outcomes for program improvement and goal-setting,
- provide deans and the provost with more thorough and reflective evidence of program progress.

The academic program review process is accomplished through a recurring minimum 7 year cycle of goal setting, data gathering and analysis, and reporting. Through the college’s planning process, the academic department:

- establishes its goals and objectives related to teaching, scholarship and service for its respective programs;
- provides analysis of data received and/or collected to demonstrate progress toward the stated goals and objectives;
- reports on its progress toward meeting its goals and objectives within the unit’s and the University’s mission.
Academic units may consult the **Criteria for Program Review**, attached here, for program review questions.

### III. APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to all academic units, programs (undergraduate and graduate), schools and colleges under the purview of the Office of Academic Affairs.

### IV. DEFINITIONS

- **Academic Program.** Academic units offering academic courses under the direct supervision of a Dean or Vice Provost.

- **Action Plan.** A document outlining the Academic Program’s and dean’s strategies for addressing issues found during the Academic Program Review.

- **Review Schedule.** An annual timeline for program review listing all academic programs designating the academic year in which the academic program will go through the Academic Program Review process. The Review Schedule is recommended by the deans of the schools and colleges in cooperation with department chairs and/or divisional directors and approved by the Office of Academic Affairs which will also maintain and publish the review schedule.

- **Self-Study.** A systematic and thorough examination of all of an academic program’s components in light of its stated mission.

### V. POLICY / PROCEDURE

1. **Review Schedule**
   
   1.1. An annual timeline for program review and a master schedule of departmental rotation will be published on the OAA website.

   1.2. Deans, with approval of OAA, are responsible for setting review schedules for their units on a 7 year cycle (unless otherwise influenced by the specialized accreditation agency).

2. **Preparation**

   2.1. At the beginning of each academic year, the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) sends a reminder to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) and to the deans listing the programs or departments he or she has indicated will be subject to review during the academic year.

   2.2. Reviews will begin in Fall term and must be concluded by the end of Spring term.
2.3. The dean meets with the programs or departments to develop a process for the reviews and to finalize any decisions about information that will be required beyond what is typically provided by OIRP.

2.4. The program or department prepares review materials according to the Academic Program Review Guidelines (see link below), using the Criteria for Program Review in the Guidelines and any additional materials as required by the dean.

2.5. Core data elements will be available through Cognos reports at www.datamaster.pdx.edu, or directly from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. (Those departments subject to specialized accreditation should also use these data, but may prepare other materials as required by their accrediting agencies.)

3. Review Process

3.1. The dean is responsible for initiating the process for a review of the program or department, including coordinating external reviews, and where relevant, community members input.

3.2. Department/program creates a self-study using the established standards/criteria listed below,

3.3. Self-study and list of potential external reviewers submitted to the dean for review and comment,

3.4. Self-study and program materials submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies, when applicable, for review and comment.

3.5. Self-study and dean’s response submitted to external reviewers, Depending on the program and at the discretion of the dean the review by external reviewers can either be through a site visit or done virtually,

3.6. External reviewers prepare a team report and submit it to the department chair or the review committee,

3.7. The dean and/or the department chair prepares a final report and action plan for the department/program based on the self-study and the external reviewers’ report,

3.8. The department/program prepares a response to the final report and action plan,

3.9. Departments/programs with institutes and centers will simultaneously initiate a review of those centers and institutes following the “Guidelines for Center/Institute Review at Portland State University”,

3.10. The complete review packet (self-study, dean’s response, external review report, final report and action plan, and department/program response) submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs.

4. Implementation

4.1. Following the review of the self-study report, the dean’s response, the external review report, the final report and the action plan, the Office of Academic Affairs
will meet with the college/school dean and the department chair or divisional director to discuss the recommendations made in the program’s Action Plan.

4.2. This Action Plan must be agreed upon by the Office of Academic Affairs, the college dean, and the departmental administrator. It becomes a part of the review record and should be used to guide any follow-up activities.

5. Follow-Up

5.1. The Office of Academic Affairs will call a meeting with OAA, the dean and department chair or director three years following the initial meeting to review the progress that has been made (or not made) with regard to the implementation of the Action Plan.

6. External Reviewers

6.1. Academic programs undergoing program review are expected to include 2-3 external reviewers in the process.

6.2. The selection of external reviewers shall be determined by the deans, in consultation with the program chairs/directors, from a list of candidates provided by the departments/programs.

6.3. Two to three external reviewers should receive and review the self-study written by the department, as well as the dean’s response to the report in advance of their visit to campus.

6.4. Deans may determine whether one or more reviewers make a site visit, or if a virtual visit is adequate for review purposes.

6.5. Deans or departments are expected to cover expenses related to these site visits.

7. Specialized Accreditation and Academic Review

7.1. To the extent possible, attempts will be made to coordinate the APR so that it occurs at a time most convenient to the accreditation cycle, as requested by the school/college undergoing specialized accreditation review.

7.2. Reviews of programs with specialized accreditation will be scheduled, whenever possible, to coincide with their accrediting agencies’ visit.

7.3. In addition, to minimize the duplication of effort and maximize the value of all review processes, documentation prepared as part of the department/programs accreditation and/or external review processes may be submitted or included in the materials submitted for APR.

7.4. These reports will be reviewed for completeness and alignment with the university’s APR guidelines. Requests for additional information will be made if necessary.

8. Guidelines for Selection of External Reviewers

8.1. External Reviewers should be scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field.

8.2. It is desirable for external reviewers to hold a terminal degree in the appropriate discipline.
8.3. It is desirable for external reviewers to have experience with program administration and/or significant leadership role in higher education.

8.4. It is desirable for external reviewers to have experience with student learning assessment, regional accreditation, and/or professional accreditation.

8.5. It is desirable for external reviewers to have prior experience conducting reviews or are or have been officers in related professional organizations.

8.6. It is desirable for external reviewers to be currently employed at a peer institution with a similar degree program.

8.7. External Reviewers must have no conflict of interest such as recent employment or consultation with Portland State University.

VI. LINKS TO RELATED FORMS

Link to APR “Action Plan” template.

Link to APR Guidelines.

VII. LINKS TO RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND INFORMATION

Link to APR process webpage.

Link to “Centers and Institutes” Review policy and process.

Link to “Principles for Effective Assessment of Student Achievement”.

VIII. CONTACTS

Questions regarding this Policy should be directed to the Office of Academic Affairs at (503) 725-4596 or can be e-mailed to harmons@pdx.edu.

IX. POLICY ADOPTION

Recommended: __________________________ Date: ________

Faculty Senate Presiding Officer

Approved: __________________________ Date: ________

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

X. HISTORY/REVISION DATES

Revised: 2/19/14
Adoption Date: To be added.

Next Review Date: To be added.
Academic Program Review Guidelines

Office of Academic Affairs
February 18, 2014
Purpose of Program Review at PSU

The program review process at Portland State University (PSU) is designed to provide continuous improvement of academic quality within academic units through self study and external review. For the purposes of this document, “program review” refers to a department or division’s holistic appraisal over five years of its curricular offerings (certificates, majors, minors, and graduate programs), and where applicable, its centers/institutes. Center and institute review should follow Guidelines for Center/Institute Review at Portland State University. Program review provides academic units the opportunity for reflection and discussion of their programs on a regular cycle, and is explicitly designed to be collaborative in nature, and inclusive of student, faculty, community, and administrative input as well as external evaluation, as determined by the dean. The overall goal of program review is to assist academic units in:

- articulating their goals and objectives in relation to the University's themes, priorities, and initiatives,
- instituting a regular process of internal and external review of qualitative and quantitative information about program activities,
- demonstrating progress toward achievement of department goals,
- using outcomes for program improvement and goal-setting,
- provide departments with support during transition, and
- provide deans with more thorough and reflective evidence of program progress.

The program review process is accomplished through a recurring schedule of goal setting, data gathering and analysis, and reporting. Through the college’s planning process, the academic department:

- establishes its goals and objectives related to teaching, scholarship and service for its respective programs;
- provides analysis of data received and/or collected to demonstrate progress toward the stated goals and objectives;
- reports on its progress toward meeting its goals and objectives within the unit’s and the University’s mission.

Academic units may consult the Criteria for Program Review, attached here, for program review questions.

Units whose programs are subject to specialized accreditation review are excluded from Academic Program Review. In cases where a department has some programs that carry specialized accreditations and others that do not, faculty should consult their deans to determine a reasonable process of review that does not duplicate efforts.

Review Schedule

An annual timeline for program review, and a master schedule of departmental rotation will be published on the OAA website. Deans, in collaboration with OAA, are responsible for setting review schedules for their units on a 5-7 year cycle (unless
otherwise dictated by the specialized accreditation agency). Those units with specialized accreditation may complete their accreditation body’s program review process and submit it to OAA in lieu of the PSU process and format described here. Submission to OAA is required in either case.

**Procedures**

Program review procedures are outlined below. In consultation with the Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Instruction, deans and department chairs may modify these procedures to accommodate particular circumstances.

**Preparation**

At the beginning of each academic year, the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) sends a reminder to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) and to the dean listing the programs or departments he or she has indicated will be subject to review during the academic year. OIRP will provide the department/program being reviewed with the requisite data indicated in the Criteria for Program Review below. Reviews will begin in Fall term and must be concluded by the end of Spring term.

The dean meets with the programs or departments to develop a process for the reviews and to finalize any decisions about information that will be required beyond what is typically provided by OIRP.

The program or department prepares review materials according to the Program Review Criteria, and any additional materials as required by the dean. Core data elements will be pre-populated by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. (Those departments subject to specialized accreditation should also use these data, but may prepare other materials as required by their accrediting agencies.)

**Review Process and Timeline**

The following represents a standard chronology of steps and recommended deadlines for each step in the process. If submission of a completed APR to OAA is not possible by the final June 1st deadline, a request detailing the reasoning must be made by the appropriate Dean.

**Spring Term**

- OAA alerts deans of the pending reviews scheduled for the next academic year,

**Fall term.**

- Review process begins,
- The responsible dean meets with the units scheduled for review to develop the process for the reviews and to finalize any decisions affecting the information that will be required beyond what is provided by OIRP,
- Department/program begins drafting its self-study,

**Winter term**

- Department/program completes self-study using the established standards/criteria listed below,
• March 15\textsuperscript{th} Self-study and list of potential external reviewers submitted to the dean for review and comment,

• April 1\textsuperscript{st} Reviewers approved and confirmed

Spring

• April 23\textsuperscript{rd} Self-study and dean’s response submitted to external reviewers,

• May 7\textsuperscript{th} External reviewers brought to campus to conduct review (other arrangements may be made at the discretion of the dean, i.e., virtual reviews are possible),

• May 15\textsuperscript{th} External reviewers prepare a report and submit it to the dean,

• May 23\textsuperscript{rd} The dean prepares a final report for the department/program based on the self-study and the external reviewers’ report,

• May 23\textsuperscript{rd} The department/program prepares a response to the reports of the external reviewers and the dean,

• Departments/programs with institutes and centers will simultaneously initiate a review of those centers and institutes following the “Guidelines for Center/Institute Review at Portland State University”,

• June 1\textsuperscript{st}. The complete review packet (self-study, dean’s response, external review report, dean’s report and department/program response) submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs,

• June 1\textsuperscript{st} The complete centers/institutes review packet submitted to the Associate Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships who provides a final report to the Provost,

• June 15\textsuperscript{th} The Provost reviews and signs off on the department/program report and the centers/institutes report or recommends additional steps in consultation with the dean and VPAPI and/or VPRSP.

The cycle begins again with the new academic year.

\textbf{Use of External Reviewers}

Academic programs undergoing program review are expected to include 2-3 external reviewers in the process. Departments identified for review need to submit names of potential reviewers to their deans, who may add additional names to the list. Two to three external reviewers should receive and review the self assessment written by the department, as well as the dean’s response to the report in advance of their visit to campus. Deans may determine whether one or more reviewers make a site visit, and whether meetings via skype or other means are adequate for review purposes. Deans are expected to cover expenses related to these site visits.

\textbf{Committee Considerations}

As part of the department/program review, the department/program review committee should consider consultation with, as appropriate, the following:
Students (program majors), staff, associated faculty, community partners, disciplinary librarian(s), as well as representatives from OIT, Facilities, Center for Online Learning, and Student Support Services.

**Guidelines for Academic Program Review**

The following reports will be available in the *Program Review* folder contained within the *PSU Fact Book* folder in Data Master at [www.datamaster.pdx.edu](http://www.datamaster.pdx.edu).

- Declared Majors
- SCH generation
- Degrees Granted
- Faculty Load
- Student Mix
- Classes with high DFW rates

The **Office of Institutional Research and Planning** (OIRP) will provide a report of faculty characteristics.

The **Office of Research and Strategic Partnerships** (RSP) will provide yearly research expenditures.

The **Campus Planning Office** (CPO) will provide a current assessment of departmental space and a breakdown by usage.

The **PSU Revenue and Cost Attribution Tool** (RCAT) (FY 2013 onwards) can be accessed by each dean’s office to provide an aggregate and a departmental breakdown of the revenue generation that is attributed to the department, the department’s direct costs (yearly Education and General Fund budget) and the department’s attributed indirect costs.
Criteria for Program Review

Common Criteria

1. Centrality to the PSU mission

How does your program/department advance the University’s mission, themes, and priorities?

- Clearly articulate the goals and objectives of your program/department.
- Efficiently identify strengths and weaknesses of your program/department.
- Provide a narrative statement that addresses program/departmental goals and objectives in relation to the overall university mission, themes, and priorities and reflected in the mission/values within the college/departments. This statement can address the cumulative findings of any preceding plans, and should be created by the program/department and reviewed and approved by the dean’s office.
- Where do you find opportunities to further enhance the unit’s connection to the University’s mission, themes, and priorities, and how do you intend to fulfill those opportunities?

2. Quality of Instruction and Curriculum

Does the program have adequate and experienced personnel?

Are there areas where your faculty is particularly strong?

How does your particular faculty mix support the program’s objectives?

Describe the strengths of the curriculum and its quality and rigor.

What are the emerging trends in your field? How is your unit poised to address those trends?

What is the role and function of online learning in your programs?

How does your program support the institutional diversity and international initiatives?

Common data elements (required):
- Faculty Load (Datamaster Report)
- Faculty Characteristics (contact OIRP)
- Faculty Service

Potential data elements:
- Number of faculty by tenure status.
- Number/proportion of diverse faculty.
- Faculty by full-time/part-time status.
- Number of faculty with terminal degrees.
- Number and percentage of tenure-related faculty.
- Number and type of graduate assistants.
- Number and FTE of staff.
- Degree programs offered.
- Online programs offered.
- Number of Community Based Learning, Sustainability, Capstone, or other community-based courses offered.
- Number of diversity-related courses offered.
- Number of online courses offered.

3. Quality of Scholarly and Creative Work

What are your department/program’s current areas of strength? Where is there growth potential?

How does the department/program’s scholarly activity advance the curriculum?

What are your department/program’s formative and summative assessment measures?

To what degree are undergraduate and graduate students involved in scholarly work?

How does your particular faculty mix support the program’s research and partnership objectives?

Describe the strengths of the scholarly work and its quality and rigor.

What are the emerging scholarly trends in your field? How is your unit poised to address those trends?

How does the department/program connect through community engagement and service?

*Common data elements (required):*
  - Yearly research expenditures (contact RSP)

*Potential data elements:*
  - Number of proposals and awards for sponsored research grants and contracts.
  - Proportion of faculty involved in research (whether funded or not).
  - Publications, presentations.
  - Citations of published works.
  - Faculty Development Fund awards, number and award amounts.
  - External faculty honors and awards.

4. Program Efficiency and Effectiveness

What is your department’s approach to undergraduate advising? Does your department advise students on all requirements for graduation, including general education requirements?
What are the barriers to student success in your department (for example bottleneck courses or courses with significant D, W, F rates), and what is the department/program doing to alleviate those barriers?

How do you evaluate the effectiveness of your advising plan?

(Common data elements (required):
- Degrees Granted (Datamaster Report).
- Classes with high DFW rates

(Potential data elements:
- Advising plans.
- Degree maps.
- Enrollment by major.
- Number of undergraduate degrees awarded (include minors and certificates).
- Number of graduate degrees awarded (include graduate certificates).
- Number/proportion of diverse students.
- Number of doctoral students.
- Support available to graduate students.
- Gainful employment information (certificates).

5. Assessment of Student Achievement

What is the evidence of the student learning experience?
- Programs should be able to define and evaluate how well their students are learning through clearly defined learning outcomes and objectives: more specifically, programs should be able to describe the kinds of experiences that they expect students to have inside and outside the classroom.
- Relevant evidence may pertain to targets for the kinds of reading and writing assignments that students should complete; levels of personal interaction with faculty members; residential and/or co-curricular components of the learning experience, and other learning experiences that the program deems relevant to its mission.

How is the program evaluating student academic performance?
- Programs should be able to define meaningful curricular goals and they must have defensible standards for evaluating whether students are achieving those goals.
- Appropriate methods for the assessment of student work may include, among other approaches, meaningful and rigorous faculty evaluation and grading or external benchmarking.

What are the post-graduate outcomes for the program?
- Program should be able to articulate how they prepare students consistently with their mission for successful careers, meaningful lives, and where appropriate, further education.
- They should collect and provide data about whether they are meeting these goals.
Relevant kinds of data may include completion rates, job placement rates, levels of post-graduation civic participation, kinds of jobs and vocations chose, surveys pertaining to alumni satisfaction and success, and data on other post-graduation goals relevant to the programs mission.

*Potential data elements:*
- Program’s long-term assessment strategy.
- Measures and indicators used to assess student learning.
- Metrics used for comparison of performance at the beginning and end of term.
- Outcomes in alignment with workforce or post-graduate goals.
- Metrics used to determine students’ long-term outcomes of student’s experiences.
- Baseline and trend information.
- Responsible person(s) for assessment.

6. **Cost Effectiveness, Program Productivity, and Level of Institutional Support.**

Discuss budgetary trends/productivity over the last five years.

*Common data elements (required):*
- Assessment of departmental space and a breakdown by usage (contact CPO).
- RCAT breakdown (contact dean’s office)

*Potential budgetary data elements:*
- Proportion of budget from grants and contracts.
- External funding generated.
- Number and identity of funding sources, i.e., number of public, private, internal and external sources.
- Proportion of budget from E&G, (fees, tuition, state appropriations).
- Ratio of revenues to expenditures.

7. **Summary Narrative.**

Programs and departments should include a summary narrative that addresses issues that have emerged from the analysis of data included under the five common categories.
- Where has the unit excelled in providing quality education, and what assisted the department in this achievement?
- Where does the department identify challenges, and what might alleviate those barriers to academic quality?
Criteria for Graduate Program Review

Graduate programs may use these criteria in addition to the common criteria for program reviews.

In Relation to Educational Objectives:

Student application and process through a program:
- Number of applications.
- Number of admissions.
- Number of students matriculating.
- Number of students continuing from previous year.
- Number of graduates (Masters and Doctoral level separate) per year since last program review.

Curriculum design and delivery:
- Percentage of total credit hours required for a program that must be from courses that are graduate only (e.g., not 400/500 level).
- Typical ratio of graduate versus undergraduate enrollment in mixed U/G courses.
- What percentage of core courses and regularly offered electives are taught by tenure track faculty?
- For programs with both a thesis and non-thesis option, what proportion of graduates utilize each option, what proportion switch from thesis to non-thesis?
- What proportion of student credits are taught in approved versus experimental courses (510, 610, etc.)?
- Does the program have formally documented processes and associated criteria for admission and graduation, aside from the general University standards?
- Does the program have a Graduate Program Handbook or other written materials that clearly define student and faculty responsibilities, expected rate of progress, conditions and procedures for removal from the program, etc.?

Information that would provide perspective on mentoring and the ability of the faculty to foster immersion into the field.
- Ratio of graduate-level SCH generated to the number of faculty (FTE).
- Number of students actively preparing theses or dissertations, compared to total number of students and to faculty FTE.

In Relation to Research:

Comment on the availability of potential national and/or local research funding sources. What trends or emphases are evident and to what extent does the program align with those trends?

In Relation to Scale:
What number of tenured positions and fixed term FTE are utilized in the delivery of the graduate program?

What number of ‘strands’ or areas of emphasis are offered in the program? How many faculty are associated with each?

**In Relation to Resources:**

Does the program have necessary amounts and quality of space (labs, offices for GAs, studio space, library, student meeting areas, etc.)?

Does the program have (or have access to) the necessary equipment and related materials (e.g., computer hardware and software, scientific equipment, etc.)?

Does the program have (or access to) community engagement, service and community support?
### Academic Program Review Schedule, 2012-13 through 2020-21

All programs -- departments, divisions, schools, areas of study, etc. -- must be scheduled for an academic program review at least every seven years. A review of a program should include all associated degrees (graduate and undergraduate), certificates, minors, and any associated centers and institutes under the purview of the “program”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Environmental Science and Management</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCECS</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technology Management</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTA</td>
<td>Art and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>Undergraduate BS/BA, Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>Masters Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>Centers for Real Estate and Retail Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>Urban Studies and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNST</td>
<td>University Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Chicano/Latino Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>MCECS</td>
<td>Civil and Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>MCECS</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MCECS</td>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>Child &amp; Family Studies</td>
<td>SSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTA</td>
<td>Theatre &amp; Film</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>Criminology &amp; Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>Community Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Minimum Threshold Levels (-5%)</th>
<th>Are we currently meeting threshold level? Rational for meets.</th>
<th>Location (include hyperlink or add note on how data will be collected)</th>
<th>Primary responsibility for tracking this measure</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013 data</th>
<th>2013-2014 data</th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Theme 1: Community Engagement and Civic Leadership</td>
<td>Objective 1.1: Provide an undergraduate student experience that connects and engages students with the community</td>
<td>Indicator 1.1.1: # Capstone courses offered annually</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3 year average with a 5% deviation provides a level for meeting threshold level. Based on Senior Capstone Course evaluation data, we know that our UNST 421 seminar-style courses result in strong reported measures of student community engagement and learning related to civic leadership. Data from larger courses shows statistically significantly lower scores in those areas. Offering this number of Capstone courses allows us to maintain the seminar teaching approach which will best meet this objective. Indicator 1.1.2: # of students enrolled in Capstone courses</td>
<td>3820</td>
<td>DIRP/UNST</td>
<td></td>
<td>297</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1.1.3: % of Capstone students will agree or strongly agree that they have a better understanding of how to make a difference in the community in an end of course survey</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Downward trend. This course evaluation instrument was developed internally at PSU to reflect the practices and goals of the UNST Capstone program. We don’t have external comparator data. These thresholds are used to ensure quality within the program. When individual courses fall below the &quot;meets&quot; threshold, we ask faculty to engage in course redesign and faculty development. When courses exceed this level, we identify them as exemplars and investigate best practices. This consistency between our external accreditation practices and our internal quality assurance practices gives integrity to this approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNST</td>
<td></td>
<td>4051</td>
<td>4066</td>
<td>4021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Accreditation Monitoring Thresholds

| Indicator 1.1.4: % of Capstone students will agree or strongly agree that the community work helped them to better understand the course content of the Capstone course in an end of course survey | 84% | This course evaluation instrument was developed internally at PSU to reflect the practices and goals of the UNST Capstone program. We don’t have external comparator data. These thresholds are used to ensure quality within the program. When individual courses fall below the “meets” threshold, we ask faculty to engage in course redesign and faculty development. When courses exceed this level, we identify them as exemplars and investigate best practices. This consistency between our external accreditation practices and our internal quality assurance practices gives integrity to this approach. | UNST |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| Indicator 1.2.1: Portland State’s value of economic impact on the region (in dollars) | $1.44 billion | First data point using a more accurate multiplier. Need to follow and determine with more data. | RSP |
| Indicator 1.2.2: Hours of service to the community each year | 1.02 million hours | First data point using a more accurate counting methodology based on banner queries and interviews. Need to follow and determine with more data. | RSP |
| Indicator 1.2.3: Number of institutional strategic partnerships | 5 | 5 | 5 | RSP |
| Indicator 1.2.4: Portland State University offers an array of athletic and cultural events for the Portland Metropolitan area | 73,182 | Ticket event sales through the box office for athletic and non athletic events. | cognos |
| | | PSU Box office | 69,594 | 73,573 | 81,617 | 74,928 | 74,928 |

### Core Theme 2: Student Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2.1: Provide leadership in areas vital to the urban and metropolitan area and contribute to social and economic vitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.1.1: Programs with Specialized Accreditation are renewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.1.2: Programs scheduled each year have successfully completed academic program review with a comprehensive program assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2.2: Improve retention and completion rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2.1: Retention rate of first-time, full-time freshmen entering Portland State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010 cohort: 72.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator 2.2.2: Graduation rate (within Oregon Public Universities) of first-time, full-time freshmen within six years
- **Goal**: 42.5% by 2013 (not met).
- The new initiative of 4-year degree guarantee will be monitored as it is implemented in 2014.
- Need to be reviewed as PSU established Board of Trustees.

### Indicator 2.2.3: Retention of Oregon Community College transfer students
- **Goal**: 40%
- Fall 2005 cohort: 35.8%
- Fall 2006 cohort: 39.5%
- Fall 2007 cohort: 38%

### Indicator 2.2.4: Number of Bachelor degrees awarded to transfer students from Oregon Community Colleges
- **Goal**: Meet OEIB target of 1,709.
- Need to have the targets available.
- 1,654 (projected) for 2013-14.

### Indicator 2.2.5: Percentage of first-time freshman who have graduated either from reporting institution or a subsequent institution
- **Goal**: IN Progress, one data point will need to set threshold.
- 51%

### Indicator 2.2.6: Percentage of first-time freshman who are still enrolled at PSU or subsequent institution as of 2012-13
- **Goal**: IN Progress, one data point will need to set threshold.
- 22%

### Core Theme 3:
#### Objective 3.1: Increase interdisciplinary funded research activity that reflects the University's urban character and addresses the needs of urban communities
- **Goal**: $55 million in sponsored project expenditures each year.

- **Indicators**:
  - Indicator 3.1.1: Total sponsored project expenditures each year
  - Indicator 3.1.2: Number of awards funded each year
  - Indicator 3.1.3: Number of faculty with externally funded projects each year
  - Indicator 3.1.4: Number of awards with multiple investigators and involving multiple departments or colleges each year
  - Indicator 3.1.5: Number of sponsored projects funded by industry each year

#### Objective 3.2: Provide opportunities for student participation in research at undergraduate and graduate levels
- **Goal**: 255 graduate research assistantships on sponsored projects.

- **Indicators**:
  - Indicator 3.2.1: Number of graduate research assistantships on sponsored projects
  - Indicator 3.2.2: Number of doctoral degrees awarded
  - Indicator 3.2.3: % of Ronald E. McNair students that presented research

#### Objective 4a.1: Provide
- **Goal**: 6027 students enrolled in online courses.

- **Indicators**:
  - Indicator 4a.1.1: Number of students enrolled in online courses
  - Indicator 4a.1.2: Number of credit section for online courses
  - Indicator 4a.1.3: Number of Professional Degrees offered

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Data 2013-14</th>
<th>Data 2014-15</th>
<th>Data 2015-16</th>
<th>Data 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2.2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2.3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2.4</td>
<td>Meet OIRP target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2.5</td>
<td>IN Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2.6</td>
<td>IN Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Core Theme 4: Educational Opportunity: Providing Access to Programs**

- **Objective 4a.1: Provide**
  - **Goal**: 6027 students enrolled in online courses.
  - **Indicators**:
    - Indicator 4a.1.1: Number of students enrolled in online courses
    - Indicator 4a.1.2: Number of credit section for online courses
    - Indicator 4a.1.3: Number of Professional Degrees offered

- **Core Theme 4: Educational Opportunity: Providing Access to Programs**

- **Objective 4a.1: Provide**
  - **Goal**: 6027 students enrolled in online courses.
  - **Indicators**:
    - Indicator 4a.1.1: Number of students enrolled in online courses
    - Indicator 4a.1.2: Number of credit section for online courses
    - Indicator 4a.1.3: Number of Professional Degrees offered
| Indicator 4a.1.4: Number of students enrolled in Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) | NEED to Set for 2017 - HECC - Higher Ed Coordinating Commission is setting requirements | OIRP | 800 | 840 | 609 | (incomplete) |

**Objective 4a.2: Partner with other educational institutions to create a seamless and more effective system to support opportunities for students from preschool to graduate school**

| Indicator 4a.2.1: Enrollment of transfer students from Oregon community colleges | OIRP | 1730 |
| Indicator 4a.2.2: Number of newly admitted Oregon Freshman entering with high school dual or other early college credits | Meets OIB target |
| Indicator 4a.2.3: Number of Articulation Agreements | 25 | Agreements are being tracked and expected to meet 25. |

| Objective 4b.1: Increase efforts to enroll a diverse student body and provide support services for students from historically under-represented groups |

| Indicator 4b.1.1: Enrollment of diverse students as a percentage of total enrollment | 23% | An improving indicator, which will need to be monitored. [http://www.oirp.pdx.edu/StatsNFact.html](http://www.oirp.pdx.edu/StatsNFact.html) | OIRP | 20% | 23% | 24% | 25% | 24% |
| Indicator 4b.1.2: Number of bachelor’s degrees awarded to Pell Eligible Oregonians | Meets OIB target |
| Indicator 4b.1.3: Number of students served by support services designed for under-represented students | 479 | Min students in TRIO is 265. This is TRIO + Diversity and Multicultural Student Services (DMSS) | EMSA | TRIO 298 | 497 (TRIO 308 + DMSS 99) | 511 (TRIO 320 + DMSS 91) | 54 (TRIO 305 + DMSS 39) | 504 |
| Indicator 4b.1.4: Completion rates of students served by TRIO-SSS program | Graduation rate equal to institutional rate. 6 year rates | Place students within the institutional graduation rate. | EMSA | TRIO 298 | 79% |

**Core Theme 4: Educational Opportunity: Opportunities for Diverse Populations**

| Objective 4b.2: Provide international learning opportunities |

| Indicator 4b.2.1: Number of students successfully completing study abroad offerings (including short-term faculty led study abroad) | 510 | Expectation is 500 a year | OIA | 510 | 513 | approx 450 not finalized | 536 |

| Indicator 4b.2.3: Number of International students enrolled at Portland State University in degree programs | Increased by 160 | From SEM short-term enrollment goals to increase INTL new student enrollment by 100 new students a year. Our trends demonstrate that we have been able to meet and exceed the 100 new students per year. The addition of international partnerships benefit PSU's international enrollments. The goal is to enroll 10 percent of our population from international enrollment. | OIA | Fall 2010 1859 | Fall 2011 1923 | Fall 2012 2006 | Fall 2013 2186 |