



October 28, 2014

David Farrens, Ph.D., Director
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
School of Medicine

**Academic Program Review
Committee**

Charles Allen, PhD
Senior Scientist, Oregon Inst Occ
Hlth Sci and Professor, Behavioral
Neuroscience

Elena Andresen, PhD
Professor, SOM
Health Services Research

David Covell, PhD, DDS
Associate Professor, SOD
Orthodontics

Paul Gorman, MD
Professor, SOM
Medical Informatics

Karla Kent, PhD
Professor, SOD
Integrative Biosciences
Former Senator

Owen McCarty, PhD
Associate Professor, SOM
Biomedical Engineering

Sean Malloy, PhD
Administrative Director
Vollum Institute

Joanne Noone, PhD, RN, CNE
Campus Associate Dean and
Associate Professor, SON

Margaret Scharf, DNP, RN
Clinical Associate Professor, SON
Advanced Practice Nursing
Psychiatric Mental Health

Ex officio, nonvoting members:

Anna Teske, MPA
Assistant Vice Provost

Dear Dr. Farrens and Faculty:

The primary goal of the Academic Program Review is to maintain and strengthen the quality of OHSU's undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Reviews are intended to be helpful and supportive in (i) recognizing strengths and achievements of academic programs; (ii) promoting program planning and goal setting aligned with OHSU's strategic plan (Vision 2020), the requirements of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, and specialized accreditation agencies; and (iii) identifying areas unique to and/or common among academic programs that require attention. In carrying out these aims, each program will be reviewed at least once every five years. In preparing for this review, each unit scheduled for review conducts a self-review that focuses on its current situation and expectations for the next three to five years.

Completing the five-year Academic Program Review indicates the Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (BMB) program's commitment to on-going programmatic improvements and excellence. As this self-review process is new to OHSU, the Academic Program Review Committee values your contribution as we contemplate the most effective and efficient way to carry out this work.

Your self-review report was discussed and evaluated by a Review Team of three members of the Academic Program Review Committee in May 2014. The subcommittee's recommendations were approved by the full APR Committee and the Faculty Senate. The following commendations and recommendations summarize the Review Team's findings.

Commendations: The Review Team commends the BMB program in three areas: (1) strong evidence that the program is dedicated to rigor and producing graduates that are 'strong thinkers'; (2) number of publications per student; and (3) strong graduate outcomes and professional post-program placements.

Recommendation: The Review Team recommends the following: (1) utilize faculty in the development of the report; (2) review a model of a well-written APR report to better understand the spirit of the process; (3) develop specific Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) modifying uniform SLOs and more clearly link learning to those SLO's; and (4) articulate the vision of the program's future.

The Review Team's comprehensive evaluation including ratings, commendations and recommendations specific to each section of the report follows.

Part 1. Introduction

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

Commendation: Evidence of monthly faculty meetings.

Recommendation: Demonstrate more stakeholder engagement. After cancellation of student lunch sessions, it is not clear how student feedback will be collected.

Part 2. Overview

Rating: Developing. Program has established its own set of Mission, Purpose, Goals (MPGs) unique to the program, but MPGs are not aligned with university MPGs.

Commendation: Strong evidence that the program is dedicated to rigor and producing 'thinking graduates'; program outcomes match well to core competencies.

Recommendation: Provide purpose statement; goals need to be more explicit for the degree.

Comment: The committee is aware of the Graduate Studies endeavor to create and adopt uniform SLOs across all PhD programs, is there a way within those uniform SLOs to illustrate more program-specific outcomes?

Part 3. Faculty and Staff Resources

Rating: 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.

Commendation: Narrative indicates a highly qualified faculty.

Recommendation: Complete faculty tables (3.1 and 3.3) to provide more detailed information about faculty qualifications and duties; identify issues and/or resource constraints faculty are facing, if any, and if not, indicate as such.

Part 4. Enrollment/Degree Production

Rating: 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. There was some discussion about student diversity and planning for recruitment.

Commendation: Graduate outcomes and professional post-program placements are strong.

Recommendation: Work on creating a more articulate plan for recruitment participation within the PMCB structure; provide more data and analysis in this section.

Part 5. Other Resources

Rating: 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.

Commendation: Critical insight into program's reliance on sophisticated instrumentation.

Recommendation: Create a 5 year plan for resources, identifying revenue sources and diversification, and where resources are likely to become scarce.

Part 6. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Rating: Early Development. Program-level student learning outcomes are vague and not measurable; 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.

Commendation: Publication rate per student is consistent.

Recommendation: Include the whole assessment plan to demonstrate how outcomes are measured and/or map student activities to outcomes; consider linking mandatory authorship to an SLO, to criteria for program completion; provide examples of intermediate level evaluation.

Part 7. Other Information (Optional for Programs)

Rating: N/A

Part 8. Analysis and Conclusions

Rating: 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.

Commendation: Identification of six targets to address over the next five years.

Recommendation: Create a five year plan and identify specific ways to address target areas.

Part 9. Response to Previous Program Reviews

N/A

Part 10. Overall Recommendations

Overall, the committee was impressed by the number of publications per student and the clear commitment to ensuring graduates are strong thinkers. The committee noted a general lack of analysis in the report and a sense of 'apathy'.

The Academic Program Review Committee determined that the BMB program **meets** the academic standards of Oregon Health & Science University. Based on these findings, your next review is scheduled for 2019-20 by the Faculty Senate APR Committee, with your self-review and school-level processes beginning and concluding no later than 2018-19.

Sincerely,



Charles Allen, Ph.D., Committee Chair

CC: Jeanette Mladenovic, M.D., M.B.A., M.A.C.P., Provost

Mark Richardson, M.D., M.Sc.B., M.B.A., Dean

Allison Fryer, Ph.D., Associate Dean