

# Academic Program Review Rubric

Program Name

Undergraduate Nursing Program

Review Date:

5/29/2014

APR Committee Reviewers:

Paul Gorman, Owen McCarty

## 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:** Description of stakeholder input is impressive.

**Recommendation:** Given the nature of the program, it might be helpful to describe how the program fits into the overall Oregon climate.

## 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:** Clear understanding of the program's mission and goals and how that fits within the context of the University

**Recommendation:** None at this time.

## 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:** Program is clearly thinking about qualified faculty and clinical instructors, program needs, and salary balance, all within the context of resource constraints and a shortage/lack of access to doctorally prepared faculty.

**Recommendation:** School wide emphasis on research in order to be more attractive to PhD trained faculty.

#### 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:** Enrollment, degree pathways (OCNE, RNBS), degree production and job placement illustrate responsiveness to community needs and program strength.

**Recommendation:** None at this time.

#### 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:** Clear understanding of program's resource needs and what is available.

**Recommendation:** None at this time.

[Separately, the reviewers wanted to know if there was a plan to increase funding in the future?]

## 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:** The curriculum mapping efforts and curriculum development are impressive.

**Recommendation:** None at this time.

## 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:** Program demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness to incoming student needs.

**Recommendation:** Look at other areas to develop funding streams and expand the grant portfolio. Suggestion to investigate rural network as a potential funding source for development. Strong leadership has been inconsistent for the last several years in the school and could pose challenges to the program. Currently, the program seems to be thriving regardless.

## 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):

21

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

Yes  No

*Additional comments for Faculty Senate consideration.*

Overall the committee was very impressed with the program and report. They described it as well organized, analytic, and well-presented. The report is very data driven, and the survey/feedback improvement CQI is very impressive across the school. Innovations at the program and course level were well articulated. The program has clearly been responding to challenges--financial, distance, educational, leadership. The committee recognized that due to workforce needs, the program is in high demand.

There was a query about whether or not the report was too polished, and the committee found it difficult to get a sense of what is happening on the ground. They did note that several important details regarding leadership challenges

were missing, and given that it is a known issue, they felt it would be more effective to address these challenges openly  
For example what is amiss that has caused the repeated dean turnover?

---