

Academic Program Review Rubric

Program Name

Radiation Therapy

Review Date:

11/5/2013

APR Committee Reviewers:

Joanne Noone, Margaret Scharf, Karla Kent

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: The program engages in a self-evaluation process annually.

Recommendation: Provide more detail about stakeholder engagement and the 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: The Program of Study provides a strong sense of what students will accomplish over the course of the program.

Recommendation: Demonstrate more specific alignment with OHSU's Mission, Purpose and Goals; the JRCERT goals are very generic and the committee wanted the program to have more specific goals in addition to these.

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: There appear to be lots of opportunities for faculty development and to ensure that faculty remain current with industry standards.

Recommendation: Provide more faculty credentialing information to give reviewers a more complete picture of the program's faculty resources; provide information about faculty trends to better evaluate the sustainability of the program from a faculty perspective.

Overall the review committee thought this section was too sparse.

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: Good presentation of data and information; graduation rate is excellent; pass rates following 2009 demonstrate commitment to improve student outcomes

Recommendation: The section needed more information/analysis regarding student attrition, diversity (beyond race/ethnicity), and curriculum alignment with current practices in the discipline.

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: Program appears to be small and self-sufficient

Recommendation: Committee suggests program conduct a 5-year financial plan and identify potential revenue streams; analyze faculty salary and size needs; program growth potential; and demand. Program security was difficult for the committee to assess.

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: Good action plan and outcomes; tables were easy to read and provided a lot of relevant data; clear demonstration of work toward program improvement.

Recommendation: Outcomes could be more measureable, for example how will the program measure, 'develop critical thinking skills and values'?

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:

N/A

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 not 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: Evidence of strong curriculum based on students being accepted into advanced programs following graduation.

Recommendation: This section was vague, and mentioned things that were not addressed earlier in the report and raised concerns: stability of instructors with patient care or physics; a need to strengthen the basic science curriculum; and building a relationship with the Radiation Medicine department.

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):

13

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

Yes No

Additional comments for Faculty Senate consideration.

Overall, the committee believes the program is high quality and doing more than was demonstrated in the APR. There needed to be more information summarizing the program to help inform/educate the committee about what the program does, for example, where is the program situated in the university, what kinds of issues have they faced (if

any), etc. The report needed to be more analytical.

The benchmarking and student section was the strongest section in the report and provided the most information for the committee about the program. The sections on faculty and alignment with the university mission, purpose and goals needed the most work.
