



July 15, 2013

Philip Copenhaver, Ph.D., Program Director
Cell and Developmental Biology
School of Medicine

Faculty Senate Academic Program Review Committee

Charles Allen, Ph.D., Chair
Senior Scientist, CROET

Elena Andresen, Ph.D.
Professor,
School of Medicine

Aaron M. Cohen, M.D., M.S.
Faculty Senate, Educational
Policy Committee Chair
Associate Professor,
School of Medicine

David Covell, Ph.D., D.D.S.
Associate Professor,
School of Dentistry

Paul Gorman, M.D.
Associate Professor,
School of Medicine

Karla Kent, Ph.D.
Associate Professor,
School of Dentistry

Owen McCarty, Ph.D.
Associate Professor,
School of Medicine

Sean Molloy, Ph.D.
Administrative Director,
Vollum Institute

Joanne Noone, Ph.D.
Campus Associate Dean,
School of Nursing

Margaret Scharf, D.N.P.
Assistant Professor,
School of Nursing

Office of Academic Programs, Policy and Accreditation

Nancy P. Goldschmidt, Ph.D.
Associate Vice Provost
goldschm@ohsu.edu
(p) 503-494-1445

Sarah Kennedy, M.A.
Project Coordinator
kennedsa@ohsu.edu
(p) 503-494-4030

Dear Dr. Copenhaver 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) and 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 Cell and Developmental Biology 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 trailblazing work.

Your self-review report was discussed and evaluated by a Review Team of three members of the Academic Program Review Committee in June 2013. The following commendations and recommendations summarize the Review Team's findings.

Commendations: The Review Team commends CDB in three areas: (1) well-written Student Learning Outcomes; (2) evidence of a strong mentorship culture; and (3) adaptability in the face of adverse circumstances (loss of a training grant and a substantial period of time without leadership).

Recommendation: The next review in 2018 should strive to provide more detail and analysis in all sections.

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

Part I. Introduction

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

Commendation: This section was clearly written.

Recommendation: Demonstrate engagement from a larger group: identify and include stakeholders outside OHSU and broader departmental engagement.

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: Overall the section was good at providing a broad picture of the program.

Recommendation: Provide more analysis and detail regarding the program's institutional role. Demonstrate how the program is viable in training/teaching students according to current requirements in the Cell and Developmental Biology field.

Part 3. Faculty and Staff Resources

Rating: 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.

Commendation: It is clear that the program has adapted despite a period without a chair; broad cross-section of faculty across programs is a strength.

Recommendation: Given the number of adjunct/affiliate and jointly appointed faculty, demonstrate how the faculty are engaged and how their engagement is evaluated.

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. Some discussion about student diversity and planning for recruitment.

Commendation: Data provides evidence the program is tracking enrollment and degree production. Program is aware of enrollment and recruitment challenges and demonstrates a willingness to address the challenges in the future.

Recommendation: In order to effectively evaluate the impact of program-identified changes such as the development of the Cancer Biology program, new faculty recruitment, and the development of new research programs on CDB recruitment and enrollment, data collection and analysis over the next several years is imperative.

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: Maintaining a program despite economic challenges and increased fiscal demands from the institution.

Recommendation: The program identifies many financial challenges in the section which indicates a need to be more thoughtful about funding considerations and plans for the future. Obtain specific numbers about program revenue and costs in order to more proactively address resource and budget needs.

Part 6. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Rating: Highly Developed. Program-level student learning outcomes are clear and measurable; 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.

Commendation: SLO's are clear, well-written and appropriately address student training goals. The program demonstrates a strong mentorship culture and the one-on-one interactions are evident.

Recommendation: Provide more detail regarding outcomes and assessment at a program level. Include evidence of how assessments effectively measure outcomes.

Part 7. Other Information (Optional for Programs)

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

Comments: The program provided a coherent description of challenges and uncertainty over the last few years. Departmental contraction factors clearly articulated. The committee was impressed that the program has remained intact despite the loss of the Developmental Biology Training Grant.

Other: The committee questioned the results of the review by the External Advisor Panel and wondered how the program responded to this review; what was the value of the perspective provided in the review?

Part 8. Analysis and Conclusions

Rating: Developing. Reflects spirit of continuous improvement; directions for next 5 years are reasonably developed; selected one indicator for improvement and set a realistic target.

Commendation: Clear understanding and articulation of challenges facing the program. Response 8.4 regarding the PMCB umbrella was well stated.

Recommendation: As stated in section 5, striving to better understand program costs and revenues, issues could be addressed more effectively.

Other: The committee recognizes that the program's ability to plan long-term is somewhat inhibited by the arrival of the new chair and the evolution of her vision for the program.

Part 9. Response to Previous Program Reviews

N/A

Part 10. Overall Recommendations

The committee was thoughtful and aware throughout the review that the program is on the brink of many changes due to the leadership change and hiring of Dr. Lisa Coussens as the new program chair. Overall the committee wanted to see more detail and analysis in all sections.

The Cell and Developmental Biology program is invited to submit comments addressing the Review Team's findings, or any component of the Academic Program Review process. Send comments to Sarah Kennedy (kennedsa@ohsu.edu) by August 19, 2013, and those comments will be included in the report to Faculty Senate at the September 12, 2013, meeting.

The Academic Program Review Committee determined that the Cell and Developmental Biology program **meets** the academic standards of Oregon Health & Science University. Based on these findings, your next review is scheduled for 2018-19 by the Faculty Senate APR Committee, with your self-review and school-level processes beginning and concluding no later than 2017-18.

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