



Academic Program Review

2023-24 Handbook & Guidelines

Office of the Provost

Table of Contents

Purpose and Intent.....	3
Committee Structure and Review Teams.....	4
Academic Program Review Schedule	4
<i>Notification of Review</i>	4
Timeline, Process and Responsibilities	5
Program Self-Study Outline.....	5
<i>Introduction</i>	5
<i>Response to Previous Recommendations</i>	5
<i>Program Description</i>	5
<i>Program Reflection & Analysis</i>	6
<i>Supporting Documentation</i>	6
Committee Evaluation Process and Recommendations.....	6
Development of Program Action Plan	7
Frequently Asked Questions	8
Appendices	10
<i>Appendix A. Flowchart and Responsibilities</i>	11
<i>Appendix B. APR Self-study Template</i>	12
<i>Appendix C. APR Supplemental Data</i>	18
<i>Appendix D. Program Self-Study Evaluation</i>	20
<i>Appendix E. Five-year Academic Program Review Rubric</i>	22
<i>Appendix F. Action Plan</i>	25
<i>Appendix G. Important Definitions</i>	26

Purpose and Intent

The five-year Academic Program Review (APR) process is an essential part of OHSU's ongoing efforts to ensure the educational mission is being met through the delivery of academic programs. Consistent with [OHSU Policy 02-50-005](#), Academic Program Review, primary goal of the APR is to evaluate the quality of OHSU's undergraduate and graduate educational programs, and provide faculty and staff the opportunity to reflect upon the content of their programs, curricular delivery and research through an evaluation of academic program planning and effectiveness.

The APR is intended to:

- Assess the quality and effectiveness of academic programs, while maintaining an equity lens;
- Identify program strength and opportunities for improvement;
- Encourage both short-term and long-term goals and objectives;
- Establish program action plans and strategies for continuous improvement;
- Ensure that current and proposed degree and certificate programs are aligned with OHSU strategic priorities and Mission, Purpose and Goals;
- Utilize the information collected through the program review process to inform planning and priorities at the university level.

APR is linked to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) accreditation cycle, and specifically addresses course, program, and review of academic degree/certificate programs in Standard One (1.B.1, 1.C.1, 1.C.5, and 1.C.9).

APR is also linked to OHSU's strategic plan through program level analysis and planning that demonstrates alignment with OHSU's Mission, Purpose and Goals, metrics and indicators. Overall, APR is an important mechanism by which the institution can measure alignment with institutional metrics and strategic planning. In addition, it is essential that the self-study is driven by faculty in order to ensure an authentic representation of program planning. Academic programs are empowered to determine their goals in collaboration with school level planning, and are expected to describe their academic program with respect to both regional and national peers and discipline trends. Information about academic programs should be presented in an outcomes based format to ensure measurability of goals and quality of programming.

The review cycle is initiated by the APR Committee and Office of the Provost, who maintains the program review schedule for each school or college.

Committee Structure and Review Teams

The APR Committee is comprised of nine members with representation from each school or college or affiliated units at OHSU. APR members are nominated by their colleagues to a three year term. The appointment is endorsed by the APR Committee Chair and Office of the Provost. All nominations are confirmed OHSU Faculty Senate.

Each year, the Office of the Provost works with the APR Committee on review assignments, and designates a Review Team for the purposes of evaluating academic program self-studies. APR Committee members have the primary responsibility of ensuring the authentic evaluation of programs and services, and to determine if goals and outcomes are being achieved. Review Teams are responsible for developing an evaluative report within four weeks of the review meeting, which is submitted to the academic program and appropriate associate dean for the purposes of developing a response and/or correcting factual errors.

The APR Committee meets as a group no less than twice per academic year to discuss Review Team findings, identify trends, and consider school and institutional level recommendations for inclusion in the APR annual report.

Academic Program Review Schedule

The APR Committee establishes a schedule that strives for a balanced distribution of reviews across each school or college at OHSU and appropriate alignment with specialized accreditation obligations. On average, six to eight self-studies are reviewed annually. Each school or college is given the opportunity to review the schedule and may provide input on the need for flexibility or special scheduling considerations.

Factors that may influence the APR review schedule include:

- Timing with NWCCU or specialized accreditation reviews and site visits
- Substantive program changes
- Program suspension or closure
- Special circumstances relating to a combined or multi-program review

Notification of Review

As early in the process as possible, the Office of the Provost will notify the academic program of its scheduled review.

Timeline, Process and Responsibilities

OHSU conducts a systematic internal review of programs and/or departments once every five years, which takes roughly 12-18 months to complete. Stages of the APR process include:

1. Planning and data collection
2. Unit self-study
3. Evaluation by APR Review Team
4. Development of Action Plan
5. Report to Faculty Senate and Office of the Provost

For a complete flow chart of the APR process and responsibilities, see Appendix A.

Program Self-Study Outline

The self-study process and report offer a high-level summary of the academic program, reflecting ongoing self-examination by program faculty, staff and students. *The program director is responsible for selecting a team to write the self-study report, and making it available to appropriate stakeholders within the academic program and school or college, as well as external stakeholders.* This team needs to be identified in the self-study, with name and title. It is recommended that the team developing the self-study use simple and natural language, with the understanding that the Review Team may not be familiar with the discipline. The self-study should demonstrate the program engages in ongoing systematic collection of meaningful, accessible and verifiable data—quantitative and/or qualitative, as appropriate indicators of achievement. The team charged with developing the self-study will need to use an equity lens as they complete the APR requirements. See Appendix B for a copy of the self-study template.

Components of the self-study include:

Introduction

The Introduction may include information about any previous reviews and discuss the academic program's response to recommendations emerging from the last review. If there have been any significant changes in the curriculum, budget, staffing, etc. they may be discussed in this section or elaborated on in the body of the report.

Response to Previous Recommendations

Academic programs that completed a self-study in a previous cycle will provide a description of its response to recommendations in the last five-year review.

Program Description

This section is designed to be descriptive, rather than analytical. This section communicates the current mission, purpose and goals (MPGs) of the program. The

descriptive sections convey a sense for the size, quality and scope of program activities. In addition, this section examines the quality and effectiveness of the academic program, student support, faculty development and evaluations (professional review and course evaluations), as well as budget and planning efforts.

Program Reflection & Analysis

This section of the report includes clear and specific recommendation or action the academic program could take to capitalize on its strengths and minimize weaknesses. By providing academic programs with an opportunity to use the information gathered for the analysis section, the program is able to think about goals, including but not limited to reallocation of resources to meet objectives, adjustment for student recruitment, etc. Areas for additional consideration may include:

- Strategies used to respond to possible challenges/opportunities in their field;
- Identify benchmarks that can be used to gauge performance, effectiveness;
- Sources of external funding to pursue;
- Shifts in program faculty (ex: retirements).

Supporting Documentation

Programs are not required to document all data in the self-study. However, it is expected that programs will append (at a minimum) the following supporting documentation:

- APR Supplemental Data Sheet;
- Program curriculum and summary of changes over the last five years;
- Letter from OHSU Assessment Council-Program Rubric Scores & Feedback.
- Program Action Plan from Previous 5-Year APR (if applicable).

Committee Evaluation Process and Recommendations

The self-study report is submitted to the Office of the Provost for review by the assigned APR Committee Review Team. The Review Team writes a summative APR Program Report on the findings for each section of the self-study and provides both commendations and recommendations. See Appendix D for the APR Self-Study Evaluation and Appendix E for the Evaluation Rubric.

The APR Self-Study Evaluation is submitted to the academic program, leadership within the school or college, and Chair of the APR Committee. Academic programs may develop a response to the report and submit any revisions to correct factual errors. In addition, academic programs draft an Action Plan, which helps the program to respond to the recommendations of the Review Team.

Each academic program will present the Self-Study, Review Team findings and the Action Plan at the appropriate school level faculty committee. This will allow other academic programs to observe the role of APR in program evaluation and effectiveness and allow for additional faculty involvement and school-level oversight of the Action Plan. Upon endorsement at the school-level, the Action Plan shall be submitted to the Office of the Provost (APR committee) no later than 3 months after receiving APR recommendations in preliminary response for documentation purposes. For more information about the Action Plan, see the section on Development of Program Action Plan.

The full APR Committee will meet (twice annually) to discuss Review Team recommendations, and identify areas for consideration and improvement across the university. Following the APR Committee meeting, the report is forwarded to Faculty Senate for its consideration. Upon approval, a recommendation and report is sent to the Office of the Provost.

Development of Program Action Plan

The purpose of the Action Plan is to use the information outlined in the Self-Reflection section of the self-study and the APR Review Team recommendations, and translate these ideas into actions with achievable outcomes. This planning process should also take into account any school level or institutional planning currently under way. The program chair/director is responsible for drafting the action plan, in consultation with faculty. All plans must be approved by the school level faculty, and the academic dean.

The Action Plan will:

- Be based on the informed, evidence-based inquiry of the program review;
- Recognize the limited availability of new resources and will strive to make program improvements considering current and future resources;
- Reflect findings/recommendations of the APR final report;
- Compliment the mission, purpose and goals of OHSU;
- Remain active until goals are achieved, a reevaluation of goals is put-forth as determined by school leadership, or the next program review is initiated.

NOTE this process is conducted once every five years and is endorsed by the academic program and academic dean. The Action Plan will be submitted to the APR Committee within 3 months after receiving APR recommendations in preliminary response. For a suggested approach to Action Planning see Appendix F.

Frequently Asked Questions

What is the purpose of the Academic Program Review?

The APR process provides OHSU with an ongoing process for systematic review, assessment and planning and continuous improvement. The review process formalizes opportunities for program, school/college, and university level reflective practice.

How is Academic Program Review different from Assessment Planning?

The APR process is designed to provide a broader scope review of program quality and effectiveness. The OHSU Assessment Council is a standing committee charged with promoting campus-wide assessment activities to improve learning outcomes that align with university mission and strategic goals. In an effort to support a positive culture of assessment as a collaborative effort, the OHSU Assessment Council will provide feedback to programs in their yearly assessment. The feedback from the Assessment Council will be collected during the APR process.

How are programs selected for review and how long will it take?

The Office of the Provost and APR Committee works with leadership in each school or college to set a schedule. The process is cyclical, with each program undergoing review/evaluation one every five years. Every effort is made to properly align the APR review with obligations for specialized accreditation. Each review takes roughly 12-18 months to complete.

How is the self-study conducted?

Each program will review the guidelines in preparation for the APR self-study. Programs are expected to adhere to program review timelines and general framework, but each program (based on its articulated needs and goals) may approach the self-study in its own way. In light of these unique characteristics, programs should meet with their dean and the Office of the Provost prior to beginning the self-study process.

What is the structure for the final self-study report?

Questions on the self-study template are designed to prompt reflection and discussion among the program team members writing the self-study. Not all of the questions will be relevant to each program. A section has been provided for programs to discuss why certain sections may not be relevant to the discipline, etc. Furthermore, the APR largely examines the program as it currently exists. The sections on Recommendations and Action Planning will give programs the opportunity to communicate goals and next steps for the future.

Who sits on the APR Committee/Review Team?

The APR Committee is comprised of nine members with representation from each school or college and affiliated units at OHSU. APR members are nominated by their school or college to a three year term. The appointment is endorsed by the APR Committee Chair and Office of the Provost. All nominations are confirmed by the OHSU Faculty Senate.

What happens with the self-study once the review is complete?

After the self-study has been submitted to the Office of the Provost, the APR Review Team convenes to discuss the report. Within four weeks of the review meeting, a report will be submitted to the program for response and revisions to correct factual errors. After the response has been received, the full APR Committee will meet (twice annually) to discuss Review Team recommendations, and identify areas for consideration and improvement across the university. Following the APR Committee meeting, the report is forwarded to Faculty Senate for its consideration. Upon approval, a recommendation and report is sent to the Provost.

Appendices

Appendix A. Flowchart and Responsibilities

Appendix B. APR Self-Study Template

Appendix C. APR Supplemental Data

Appendix D. APR Self-study Evaluation

Appendix E. Five-year Academic Program Review Rubric

Appendix F. Action Plan


Appendix G. Important Definitions

Appendix A. Flowchart and Responsibilities



Five-Year Academic Program Review

Color Key: **Provost**, **Programs**, **School**, **APR**, **Faculty Senate**



Appendix B. APR Self-study Template

I. INTRODUCTION

The Introduction may include information about the history of the program, any previous reviews and discussion of the program's response to recommendations emerging from the last review. If there have been any significant changes in the curriculum, budget, staffing, etc. they may be discussed in this section or elaborated on in the body of the report. It is expected that programs will complete the self-study in consultation with faculty, students, appropriate staff, and in some cases alumni. Please, make certain to maintain an equity lens as you complete this self-study.

PROGRAM NAME:

A. DEGREES/CERTIFICATES REVIEWED UNDER THE SELF-STUDY:

B. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. *Identify the participants in the self-evaluation process. Please select all that apply.*
 - Faculty Alumni
 - Students Employers
 - Staff Others, please specify
2. *When were meetings held to complete this self-evaluation process?*
3. *Who prepared the document?*
4. *Who reviewed the report? Describe how the program elicited feedback from faculty, students and other stakeholders.*
5. *Provide a brief history of the program. Describe any major changes or emerging trends that have surfaced in the last 5 years.*

II. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Please provide a narrative that discusses the program's response to recommendations emerging from the last five-year review process (if applicable).*

III. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION & ANALYSIS

This section is designed to be descriptive, and communicates the current mission, purpose and goals (MPGs) of the program. The descriptive sections convey a sense of the size, quality and scope of program activities. This section also provides an assessment of the quality and effectiveness of the programs, with examination of equitable student learning outcomes, learning environment, faculty and student development, budget obligations and resource utilization. In this form, you will be asked to reflect on the diversity of your program (students and faculty). We encourage programs to use the diversity definition as it is defined by individual programs, but OHSU'S definition as provided by AAEO is also available as guidance in the following link:

<https://www.ohsu.edu/affirmative-action-and-equal-opportunity/what-we-do>

PROGRAM MISSION, PURPOSE AND GOALS

1. *How does the program define its mission (i.e., what is the area of focus, area of excellence, who is served, who benefits from program research and activities)?*
2. *In practice, how does the mission influence program structure and decision making?*
3. *Describe how the Program's mission statement reflects the program's purpose, primary activities and stakeholders.*
4. *How are the program's purpose and goals communicated to faculty, students and stakeholders?*
5. *What are the current, relevant critical issues (e.g. equity issues), interprofessional competency development, and approaches in the field, and how are they reflected in the mission statement?*

A. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

1. *Summarize the student learning outcomes assessment plan. How do you assess student learning outcomes for degree/certificate programs? What are you doing with the findings to implement change and to assess overall program improvement? Please also describe how assessment plans are aligned with equity as a part of the annual assessment process*

B. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Learning environment refers to the diverse physical locations, contexts and cultures in which students learn. Learning environments have both a direct and indirect influence on student learning, including student engagement in what is taught, motivation to learn, sense of well-being, belonging, and personal safety, as well as how individuals interact with one another. Students may learn in a variety of settings, such as off campus locations, labs, clinical sites, etc.

1. *Describe the program's learning environment. Do your students learn in classrooms, laboratories, community settings, and/or virtually? Describe how the program creates safe and engaging physical learning environments.*
2. *What strategies does the program engage in to promote a positive and safe learning environment to promote student sense of well-being, belonging, and personal safety, as well as positive interpersonal interactions?*
3. *What sort of student feedback is collected by the program about the learning environment? What did the program learn from it, and what has been done with this information?*
4. *OHSU provides equal opportunities to all individuals without regard to race, color, religion, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity or expression, military service, or any other status protected by law. Per OHSU Policy 03-05-032, OHSU Members are responsible for maintaining an environment for work, study and the provision of services that is free from harassment.*
 - *What process does the program use to respond to allegation(s) of misconduct or mistreatment of students and/or faculty within the learning environment?*

C. FACULTY

1. *Discuss the program’s faculty. Provide an overview and analysis of trends in the recruitment, retention and departure/retirement of faculty over the last five years.*
2. *How does the program interpret and define faculty diversity? Over the last five years, what percentage of your faculty is diverse? How have you utilized university resources to increase diversity and inclusion efforts?*
3. *What efforts have been made to retain and diversify the faculty? What types of challenges does the program face related to faculty diversity and recruitments in attracting a wide breadth of expertise?*

D. TEACHING EVALUATIONS AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Please keep equity as a lens when reflecting on this section, in addition to other teaching evaluation and faculty development aspects that may be relevant.

1. *How have teaching evaluations been used for program improvement?*
2. *What internal and external faculty development opportunities do faculty take advantage of?*
3. *Are there gaps in faculty development opportunities? What is needed?*
4. *For research focused education programs, how many faculty members are funded and what is the average number of grants per faculty member? In addition, please complete with table below with aggregate program information for each of the last five years.*

Faculty Accomplishments

Year	# of Faculty Awards	# of Peer Reviewed Faculty Publications	# of Grants Awarded
2018-19			
2019-20			
2020-21			
2021-21			
2022-23			

E. STUDENTS

Please analyze the data provided by the Office of the Provost to address the questions in Section II E, Students. NOTE: The data provided is collected and reported centrally and given to programs in order to improve the consistency of data used by programs for APR. The data may be slightly different from data collected at the school and/or program level. Please keep equity as a lens when reflecting on this section.

1. *Describe the program’s admissions/selection criteria and how it has impacted matriculates. How does the program ensure high quality student are admitted and matriculate?*

2. *Has the number and/or quality of matriculates changed in the last five years? If so, how?*
3. *Discuss the 5-year enrollment trend. Is it appropriate to the program's capacity? What is the program's plan to maintain or adjust capacity?*
4. *How does the program interpret and define student diversity? Over the last five years, what percent of your student population is diverse? How has the program utilized university resources to increase diversity and inclusion efforts?*
5. *Discuss the 5-year completion rate and average time to degree. What activities or strategies does the program utilize to support on-time degree completion?*

F. STUDENT SERVICES AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Please analyze the data provided by the Office of the Provost to address the questions in Section II F, Student Services and Career Development. NOTE: The data provided is collected and reported centrally and given to programs in order to improve the consistency of data used by programs for APR. The data may be slightly different from data collected at the school and/or program level. *Please keep equity as a lens when reflecting on this section.*

Discuss how students utilize support services, and whether or not the current level is adequate for the number of students in the program.

1. *Aside from learning outcomes, what are the critical benchmarks for your program? How have your students met these benchmarks over the last five years?*
3. *How does the program support the career development of its students?*
4. *Cultural responsiveness is the ability to learn from and relate respectfully with people of your own culture as well as those from other cultures. How does the program prepare students to be culturally responsive professionals?*
5. *How do you define scholarly output? What is the scholarly output per student? Are students receiving awards and grants? Please complete the table below.*

Student Publications and Grants/Awards

Year	Number of Student Publications	Number of Student Grants/Awards	Number of Conferences/Posters/Presentations	Other*
2018-19				
2019-20				
2020-21				
2021-22				
2022-23				

**If self-reporting in the "other" category, please describe the nature of the scholarly output and*

the benefit to the professional development of students in the program.

H. BUDGET/OBLIGATIONS, TUITION AND RESOURCE UTILIZATION

Please contact your school or college for assistance in reporting this information.

1. *How is the program funded and what does it cost to run the program? Provide a clear description of all revenue sources (for example: tuition revenue, Provost’s Office and/or Dean’s Office support, training grants, state appropriations, etc.).*
2. *What does it cost to run the program? Complete the table below and provide the programs total expenditure for the provided categories.*

Fiscal Year 2022-2023

Expenditure	Amount in dollars
<i>Payroll (Total Salary & OPE)</i>	
<i>S&S</i>	
<i>Travel Costs & Professional Development</i>	
<i>Tuition and/or Stipends Paid on Behalf of Students</i>	
<i>Other</i>	

3. *How does tuition compare to similar programs at other institutions? How many students are self-funded (pay tuition and do not receive scholarships or stipends)? If applicable, describe how the Provost’s Office and/or Dean’s Office invests in tuition for students in the program.*
4. *Describe the types of scholarships and tuition support that are available to students. How many students are on scholarships or receive tuition support? Please, provide examples on how funding provides equitable opportunities for diverse faculty and students.*
5. *If applicable, how do graduate stipends compare to similar programs at other institutions?*

Please enter the number of students who receive stipend support from the options below. NOTE: only report the primary source of funding.

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
<i>Internal Funds (university/dept/institute etc)</i>					
<i>Federal Grants</i>					
<i>Foundation Grants/Gifts</i>					
<i>Industry Grants</i>					
<i>Non-Federal or other Government Grants</i>					
<i>Does not receive a stipend</i>					

Of those primarily supported by external grant funds, please enter the number of your students supported by the following types of grants.

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
<i>Student Fellowship/Grant</i>					
<i>Faculty Grant</i>					
<i>Institutional Training Grant</i>					

6. *What resources is the program utilizing to fulfill its mission (e.g. library holdings, computer equipment, facilities, research labs, core facilities, clinical placements)? What resources, if any, is the program sharing with other programs?*
7. *How are program resources (equipment, space, staff support, etc.) allocated? How could they be reallocated to increase effectiveness and target priorities?*

IV. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Please provide a narrative that addresses any additional information or feedback you may have about the Self-Study process, as well as any justification for omitted sections (optional).

V. PROGRAM REFLECTION

Provide a brief narrative that addresses at least three things you learned about your program as a result of engaging in the reflective self-study. What goals would you set and/or changes you would make to the program based on what you have learned through this process? Examples may include: reallocation of resources to meet objectives, adjustment for students recruitment, strategies used to respond to possible challenges/opportunities in the field, the identification of benchmarks that can gauge performance and effectiveness, sources of external funding to pursue, shifts in program faculty. Reflect on your program's overall equity efforts. What are your program's strengths and areas for improvement? What resources does your program need to improve? How did equity inform your review and preparation of the self-study?

VI. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

This section is designed to capture additional information requested in the self-study. In addition, programs are also requested to provide key pieces of documentation related to Student Learning Outcomes Assessment and curricular modifications that have occurred over the last five years.

- A. *APR Supplemental Data Sheet*
- B. *Letter from OHSU Assessment Council- Program Rubric Scores & Feedback*
- C. *Current Program Curriculum and Summary of Changes over Last Five Years*
- D. *Program Action Plan from Previous 5-Year Academic Program Review (if applicable)*

Appendix C. APR Supplemental Data

Table 1: The purpose of this section is to provide the Academic Program Review Committee with supplemental information about program admissions. Please complete the tables below for each of degree or certificate offered by your program. To do so, the following guidance is provided:

- Total application means: the total sum of applications received for each degree or certificate program.
- Total offers made means: the total sum of all admissions offers made by the program.
- Total number of matriculated students with advanced degrees: if a student has earned more than one advanced degree only count the student once.

Please note: the Office of the Provost has provided data for each degree or certificate program related to total matriculation and enrolment, withdrawal, completion, and other demographic information. This data should be used to prepare narrative responses in the self-study.

Year	Total Applications	Total Offers Made	Total # of Matics. with Advanced Degrees		Average GPA of Matriculated Students
			N	%	
2018-19					
2019-20					
2020-21					
2021-22					
2022-23					

Table 2: The purpose of this section is to provide the Academic Program Review Committee with supplemental information about program faculty rank/series and workload. To do so, the following guidance is provided:

- *FTE Dedicated toward program means: The current faculty members FTE that is dedicated to the program.*
- *Number of courses taught means: the number of courses taught by the faculty member as the course instructor over the last five years.*
- *Number students mentored means: if the total number of students mentored by the faculty member over the last five years.*
- *Other roles/functions means: any other activities that make up the total workload for the faculty member such as, service activities.*

Faculty Name, include credential	Rank and Series	FTE Dedicated Toward Program	# of Courses Taught*	# of Students Mentored	Other Roles/Functions
e.g. Janet Smith, PhD	Professor, Biomedical Engineering				

Appendix D. Program Self-Study Evaluation

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

PROGRAM INFORMATION	
Program Name:	
Review Date:	
APR Committee Reviewers:	
PART I- INTRODUCTION <input type="checkbox"/> EARLY DEVELOPMENT <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPED	
GENERAL INFORMATION:	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
PART II- RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS <input type="checkbox"/> EARLY DEVELOPMENT <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPED	
RESPONSE AND IMPLEMENTATION:	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
PART III- PROGRAM DESCRIPTION <input type="checkbox"/> EARLY DEVELOPMENT <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPED	
A. PROGRAM MISSION PURPOSE AND GOALS (MPG)	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
B. EVALUATION AND PROGRAM PLANNING	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
C. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
D. FACULTY	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
E. TEACHING EVALUATIONS AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
F. STUDENTS	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
G. STUDENT SERVICES AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:

H. BUDGET/OBLIGATIONS, TUITION AND RESOURCE UTILIZATION	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
PART IV- SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION <input type="checkbox"/> EARLY DEVELOPMENT <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPED	
OTHER INFORMATION: OPTIONAL FOR PROGRAMS	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
PART V- PROGRAM REFLECTION & ANALYSIS <input type="checkbox"/> EARLY DEVELOPMENT <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPED	
PROGRAM REFLECTION	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
PART VI- SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION	
EVIDENCE OF EQUITY EFFORTS	Reviewer's Comments: Commendation: Recommendation:
OVERALL RECOMMENDATION	Does the subcommittee believe the program meets OHSU academic standards: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Additional comments:	

Appendix E. Five-year Academic Program Review Rubric

Report Sections	In Early Development	Developing	Developed
PART I- Introduction			
General Information	Process is incomplete, no evidence of meetings; self-study compiled primarily by program head or a senior faculty member; little faculty and staff input; no input from students or other stakeholders; no indication of a process for faculty participation. Limited history of the program is provided.	Process is emerging, with evidence of meetings and narrow stakeholder engagement. A history of the program is complete but lacking detail.	Process is complete, with clear evidence of meetings; engagement of faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders is broad and collaborative. A complete history of the program is provided.
PART II- Response to Previous Recommendations (N/A if appropriate)			
Response & Implementation	No description of previous APR or recommendations. Program did not address or implement recommendations, nor provide an explanation for not doing so.	Limited description of previous APR and recommendations. Program implemented some recommendations and provides explanations for not addressing all.	A clear description of previous APR recommendations and program level response. Program effectively addressed most, if not all, recommendations or incorporated them into its current 5-year plan.
PART III- Program Description & Analysis			
A. Program Mission Purpose & Goals (MPG)	Overview of program MPG's is incomplete; little or no discussion of mission influence on program structure and decision making and stakeholder activities. Little or no discussion of how program MPG's are communicated to faculty, students and stakeholders. Discussion of relevant current issues is incomplete.	Overview of program MPG's is emerging. Indicators of mission influence on program structure, decision making and stakeholder activities. Limited articulation of MPG's to program faculty, students or stakeholders. Limited discussion of relevant current issues and impact to program.	Program has established its own set of MPGs unique to the program. Evidence of MPG's influencing program design, decision making and stakeholder. Clear articulation of MPG's to program faculty, students and stakeholders. Clear articulation of relevant current issues and impact to program's mission.
B. Evaluation of the Program	Summary and analysis of Assessment Plan incomplete. Limited discussion of how findings are used to implement change and program improvement.	Summary and analysis of Assessment Plan is complete. Developing discussion of how findings are used to implement change and program improvement.	Summary and analysis of Assessment Plan is complete with clear indicators for measuring program quality/effectiveness. Uses findings to implement change/program improvement.
C. Learning Environment	Little or no description of the learning environment and/or how feedback is collected or used about the learning environment. Little or no discussion of how the program responds to allegations of misconduct or mistreatment of students and/or faculty.	Emerging description of the learning environment and/or how feedback is collected or used by the program. Developing discussion of how the program promotes a positive learning environment and the process used to respond to allegations of misconduct or mistreatment of students and/or faculty.	Explicit description of the learning environment and how feedback is collected and used by the program. Program provides evidence of activities used to promote a positive learning environment and a clear process for responding to allegations of misconduct or mistreatment of students and/or faculty.

D. Faculty	Little or no discussion of faculty trends that affect program development and faculty diversity; no succession planning (recruitment, retention, retirement) is evident.	Emerging discussion of faculty trends; preliminary planning for program development, faculty diversity recruitment and retention.	Explicit planning for program development based on faculty diversity and recruitment/retention needs. Supporting data used in planning.
E. Teaching Evaluations & Faculty Development	Little or no discussion of how teaching evaluations are used for program improvement. Limited discussion of faculty development opportunities/gap analysis. cursory information about faculty grants.	Moderate discussion of use of teaching evaluations for program improvement. Emerging discussion of faculty development opportunities/gap analysis. Provides information related to faculty grants/awards.	Provides analysis of use of teaching evaluations for program improvement. Provides examples and relevant data related to faculty development opportunities/gap analysis. Reports complete information related to faculty grants/awards.
F. Students	Little or no analysis of program admissions, enrollment and degree production in the context of program development, capacity and sustainability. No discussion of student diversity and plans to increase student diversity.	Curriculum appears to reflect current practice in the discipline. Uses rudimentary analysis of trends in admissions, enrollment and degree production to support program quality and sustainability. Some discussion about student diversity and recruitment planning.	Provides strong analysis of program admissions, enrollment and degree production and demonstrates how the data is used to maintain program quality and sustainability. Well-developed and successful plans for student diversity recruitment, retention and success.
G. Student Services & Career Development	Limited discussion of student support services; little analysis on adequacy of services. Initial discussion of program support and student career development. Incomplete information about scholarly output and student grants/awards. cursory analysis of student feedback processes.	Emerging discussion of student support services; initial analysis on adequacy of services. Preliminary discussion of program support and career development. General information about scholarly output and student grants/awards. Preliminary analysis of student feedback processes.	Provides strong analysis of student support services and program goals for student career development. Provides complete information about scholarly output and student awards/grants. Thorough analysis of how student feedback is collected and utilized for program improvement.
H. Budget/Obligations, Tuition and Resource Utilization	Initial data on revenue sources and annual financial obligations related to program operations. Does not identify important contextual factors or extenuating circumstances related to resource planning. Preliminary evaluation of tuition and comparators. Limited discussion of students on faculty grants. Little to no discussion of resources utilized for mission fulfillment.	Preliminary discussion of resources; emerging resource planning or potential new revenue streams. Identifies needs or sets priorities, but not linked to data. Limited discussion of factors affecting resource planning. Evaluation of tuition and comparator programs. Provides data linked to students on faculty grants. Emerging discussion of resources utilized for mission fulfillment.	Detailed analysis of resource adequacy for the 5-year period; uses data to identify program needs, priorities and students on faculty grants. Developed understanding of unique program circumstances affecting resource needs. Informed by comparison and analysis of program tuition to peer universities. Full analysis of resources utilized for mission fulfillment.
PART IV- Supplemental Information (optional)			
	Information provided about the program did not contribute to the reviewers' understanding of the program quality and effectiveness.	Information was relevant, but did not contribute significantly to the reviewers' evaluation of program effectiveness.	Additional information enhanced the discussion of specific actions or changes to be taken in the next 5 years.

PART V- Program Reflection & Analysis			
	Provided limited narrative that addresses what was learned through the self-study.	Emerging narrative about what was learned through the process. Identified key areas for reflection and evaluation.	Strong reflection about self-study and integrated feedback into planning process. Articulates plan for future assessment of program needs and outcomes.
PART VI- Supporting Documentation			
	Some but not all of required supporting documents were provided. Information is limited and somewhat supports the program level goals.	Required supporting documents were provided. Documentation is sufficient and provides relevant information to support program level goals.	All supporting documents were provided and complete. Documentation is well thought out and provides context for program level goals.
Evidence of Equity Efforts			
	Evidence of equity efforts are missing or non-existent throughout the self-study report; no clear identification of strengths or areas for improvement; no plan to improve equity efforts in the next APR cycle is present	Evidence of emerging equity efforts are present throughout the self-study; identification of strengths, areas for improvement, and plans to improve equity efforts in the next APR cycle are limited	Evidence of equity efforts are successfully noted throughout the self-study report, identifying strengths and areas for improvement, with a clear, well-articulated plan to improve equity efforts in the next APR cycle

Appendix F. Action Plan

Action Plan

The programs will use this action plan template to respond to the recommendations provided by the APR Committee and return it to APR within 3 months of receiving this evaluation and feedback from the APR Review Group. Your response to this action plan should identify actions and existing or needed resources taken to address these recommendations, and how the program plans to measure or assess progress. This Action Plan needs to be reviewed and endorsed at School level. Completing this table is **required within the current review cycle**, and these recommendations, actions, and metrics together with results will need to be presented in the next academic program review. This and any other responses by the program will be submitted to Faculty Senate with the program's self-study and this evaluation form (please, see flowchart).

Recommendations	Actions and Resources to Address Recommendations	How Will Progress be Measured or Assessed?
#1		
#2		
#3		
#4		

Appendix G. Important Definitions

Academic Program Review: The APR is designed to evaluate the quality of OHSU's undergraduate and graduate educational programs, and provide faculty and academic units the opportunity to reflect upon the content of their programs, curricular delivery and research through an evaluation of program planning and effectiveness.

Academic Program Review Committee: The APR Committee is comprised of no fewer than nine members with representation from each school or college and affiliated units at OHSU. It is the responsibility of the Committee to establish the schedule for program review, conduct a review and analysis of scheduled programs, provide feedback to programs and school level leadership on general commendations and areas for improvement, as well as generate an annual report that documents common themes and recommendations to university level leadership.

Program Review Team: The Review Team is comprised of no less than three members (unless only two members can be identified for a specific review) from the APR Committee. The responsibility of the Review Team is to evaluate individual programs and to bring reflections and recommendations to the APR Committee for consideration.

Program Self-Study: The self-study is developed by the program in preparation for the APR. Components of the self-study include: introduction; description and analysis; program recommendations and supporting documentation. For detailed information, see the section related to the self-study outline on page 5.

Program Action Plan: The program action plan is developed after the self-study has been reviewed by the APR Committee. The action plan is drafted by the programs as a way to reflect and respond to Review Team recommendations and set goals that will be evaluated in the next program review cycle, and will be assessed as a component of section 1. The Action Plan is developed by the program with the support of school level leadership and needs to be submitted to the APR Committee within the same review cycle.

APR Program Report: the Program Report is developed by the Review Team and reflects the program level feedback generated by the committee. The commendations and recommendations in this report should be used as a guide when developing the Program Action Plan.

APR Annual Report: The Annual Report is generated by the APR Committee and documents the work that has occurred over the academic year. The report is verbally presented to the Faculty Senate, and then formalized in a shared memorandum that is

submitted to the Provost on behalf of the APR Committee and Faculty Senate. This report documents the programs reviewed, commendations and recommendations, and offers broader institutional level recommendations for university consideration.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan: OHSU Academic Programs engage in an annual Assessment Planning Process to engage in meaningful data-driven program improvement while meeting standards set forth by NWCCU.

To ensure the highest levels of quality, all academic programs create and implement assessment plans that articulate student learning outcomes and assessment activities for determining student achievement of outcomes. Additionally, all academic programs reflect on student assessment and program statistical data as part of the annual reflection and review process.

Underrepresented Minority (URM): Any ethnic or racial group whose representation is disproportionately less in a given context relative to their numbers in the general population constitutes an underrepresented minority.

For students, OHSU defines underrepresented minorities based on minorities underrepresented in medicine, dentistry and nursing professions. The following students are considered an underrepresented minority when self-identifying race or ethnicity as follows:

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Underrepresented Asian (Korean, Vietnamese)
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Two or more races (with at least one race classified as URM)
- Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity