# Academic Program Review Rubric

**Program Name**   Masters of Public Health (SOM, Public Health Preventive Medicine)

**Review Date:**   2/11/2014

**APR Committee Reviewers:**   David Covell, Joanne Noone, Sean Molloy

## 1. INTRODUCTION

☐ **1. Early Development:**

Process is incomplete, omitted dates of meetings or voting record; self-study compiled primarily by program head or a senior faculty member; little faculty and staff input; no input from students or other stakeholders.

☑ **2. Developing:**

Process is complete, with dates of meetings and record of faculty vote; but engagement of stakeholders is narrow.

☐ **3. Highly Developed:**

Process is complete, with dates of meetings and voting record; engagement of faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders is broad and collaborative.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

**Commendation**: Participation in the self-evaluation process seems broad; programs answered key questions.

**Recommendation**: Though there was reference to faculty engagement in the CEPH report, it was difficult to tell how involved faculty were in the compilation of this report; provide more specific information about the program's overall feedback process.

## 2. OVERVIEW

☐ **1. Early Development:**

Overview is incomplete; program has not created MPGs or MPGs are not aligned with university MPGs.

☐ **2. Developing:**

Program has established its own set of MPGs unique to the program, but MPGs are not aligned with university MPGs.

☑ **3. Highly Developed:**

Program has established its own set of MPGs unique to the program, AND are aligned with university MPGs and stated clearly and concisely.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

**Commendation**: Excellent work demonstrating alignment between the program and the university mission; positive overlap between program and OHSU.

**Recommendation**: Program mission statement could you some revision and strengthening.

## 3. FACULTY AND STAFF RESOURCES

☐ **1. Early Development:**

No discussion of faculty trends that affect program development and faculty diversity; no succession planning

(recruitment, retention, retirement, needs) is evident. Temporary/adjunct faculty teach majority of the courses in the curriculum. Program does not avail itself of academic and student services.

### ☑ 2. Developing:

Discussion of faculty trends; preliminary planning for program development, faculty diversity recruitment and retention. All courses are taught by highly qualified faculty. Program uses academic program services to a limited extent.

### ☐ 3. Highly Developed:

Explicit planning for program development based on faculty diversity and recruitment/retention needs. Supporting data used in planning. All courses taught by high quality faculty current in the field. Program draws upon relevant academic and student services to increase program effectiveness.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

**Commendation**: Provided a good amount of information; did a good job setting goals.

**Recommendation**: Provide more information about efforts to recruit URM faculty; describe the follow-through on goals. Retain goals for next review.

## 4. ENROLLMENT/DEGREE PRODUCTION

### ☐ 1. Early Development:

No analysis of program enrollment and degree production in the context of program development, capacity and sustainability. No discussion of student diversity and plans to increase student diversity to achieve core theme objectives. Static curriculum unreflective of changes in the field. Courses are not integrated into a coherent whole and do not reflect student needs. No discussion of curriculum to reflect current practice in the field, changing student needs or changing employment conditions.

### ☑ 2. Developing:

Curriculum appears to reflect current practice in the discipline. Uses some rudimentary analysis of trends in enrollment and degree production in the context of program quality and sustainability. No discussion of employment projections or prospects for program graduates. Some discussion about student diversity and planning for recruitment.

### ☐ 3. Highly Developed:

Innovative, dynamic curriculum; program development based on data about student performance and developmental needs. Well-developed and successful plans for student diversity recruitment, retention and success. Data analysis reflects trends and understanding of both internal and external forces. Informed by comparison to peer universities.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

**Commendation**: This section illustrates a lot of consistency in the program's quality of students, enrollment and degree production.

**Recommendation**: Provide more analysis of the long-term implications of lower applicant numbers, drop-out rate, ratio of full- to part- time students; demonstrate that data is being collected and that these issues have been acknowledged as part of the process.

## 5. OTHER RESOURCES

### ☐ 1. Early Development:

No discussion about resource adequacy. No 5-year planning for resources. Does not identify needs or priorities. Does not identify important contextual factors or extenuating circumstances related to resource planning.

### ☑ 2. Developing:

Preliminary discussion of the adequacy of resources; no resource planning for or identification of potential new revenue streams for the next 5 years. Identifies needs or sets priorities, but not linked to data. Limited discussion of context and extenuating circumstances affecting resource planning.

☐ **3. Highly Developed:**
Detailed analysis of resource adequacy for the 5-year period; uses data to identify program needs and priorities. Developed understanding of unique program circumstances affecting resource needs. Informed by comparison to peer universities.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

**Commendation**: Peer university comparison was thorough.

**Recommendation**: Demonstrate more planning for revenue in the next five years; include adjustments/alignment with PSU. In the future, be more analytical and less descriptive in this section; utilize section as a place to creatively examine financial options and gain stronger financial footing.

## 6. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

☐ **1. Early Development:** Program-level student learning outcomes vague and not measureable; courses or experiences required for the degree/certificate are listed but not linked to the SLOs; assessment methods are not identified; no evidence of faculty engagement in the discussion of assessment results to improve curriculum, academic support services, faculty development and the like.

☑ **2. Developing:**
Program-level student learning outcomes clear and measureable, reflecting three learning domains (Bloom's taxonomy) indirect and direct measures of learning are used; faculty committee discusses assessment results and uses results to improve curriculum and results; evidence of administrative support for assessment and resources for regular data collection. Some students are aware of the findings.

☐ **3. Highly Developed:**
Program-level student learning outcomes are clear and measureable; uses direct measures of learning; courses listed and linked to SLOs (curriculum mapping); defined levels of learning; assessment results regularly discussed by faculty committee; evidence of administrative support, use of technology and regular data collection to support assessment. Most students are aware of the findings.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

**Commendation**: Comprehensive assessment of student learning outcomes.

**Recommendation**: Provide more discussion of how results and feedback are used to improve curriculum; provide more detail of alumni outcomes.

## 7. OTHER INFORMATION (OPTIONAL FOR PROGRAMS)

☐ **1. Early Development:**
Additional information provided about the program did not contribute to the reviewers' understanding of the program and its effectiveness.

☑ **2. Developing:**
Additional information was relevant, but did not contribute significantly to the reviewers' evaluation of program effectiveness.

☐ **3. Highly Developed:**
Additional information enhanced the discussion of specific actions or changes to be taken in the next 5 years.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

**Commendation**: Providing context of upcoming program changes, and the expanding partnership with the School of Public Health Development.

**Recommendation**: Discuss, analyze how the program will be impacted by the described changes.

## 8. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

☐ **1. Early Development:**

Discussion of strengths, accomplishments and improvements needed are superficial and not likely to lead to needed improvements over the next 5 years. Neither selected indicators for improvement, nor set targets; plan does not address curricular or program challenges ahead.

☑ **2. Developing:**

Reflects spirit of continuous improvement; directions for next 5 years are reasonably developed; selected one indicator for improvement and set a realistic target; Core Themes considered.

☐ **3. Highly Developed:**

Reflects spirit of continuous improvement and self-reflection; selected more than one indicator for improvement, but no more than three. Set reasonable 5-year targets for each; specific program/curricular changes are discussed and based on evidence and trends; Core Themes are directly addressed.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

**Commendation**: Identification of areas that need strengthening, including additional resources required.

**Recommendation**: Be more analytical, and more clearly contrast needs identified by the program (internal) versus CEPH requirements/identified needs (external).

## 9. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PROGRAM REVIEWS

☐ **1. Early Development:**

Program did not address or implement recommendations, nor give an explanation for not doing so.

☐ **2. Developing:**

Program implemented some recommendations. Provides explanation for not addressing all.

☐ **3. Highly Developed:**

Program effectively addressed most, if not all, recommendations or incorporated them into its current 5-year plan.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

N/A

## 10. OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

*Total Score (the sum of each section, totaling 9 - 27):*

17

*Does the sub-committee believe the program meets OHSU academic standards?*

◉ Yes     ◯ No

*Additional comments for Faculty Senate consideration.*

Overall the committee thought this was a strong program that was probably doing more than was demonstrated in the report. The committee also recognized that with the upcoming changes and the development of a School of Public Health, this program will likely be very different in another five years. Below are more specific recommendations for future program analysis and reporting:

- identify some targets and areas for change based on findings; describe what's happening to address issues and how those action plans

- close the loop: ongoing evaluations from students and faculty perspective and are those evaluations resulting in program change
- alter mindset and/or approach to long-term planning at the program level for matriculation, drop-out rate, financial analysis, etc.