

# Academic Program Review Rubric

Program Name

Cell and Developmental Biology

Review Date:

6/24/2013

APR Committee Reviewers:

Charles Allen, David Covell, Paul Gorman

## 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:*

**Commendations:** This section was clearly written.

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

The committee noted that the change in leadership could have had an impact on the preparation 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:*

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

**Recommendations:** The committee wanted the program to provide more analysis and detail regarding their institutional role. Demonstrate how the program is viable in training/teaching students according to current requirements in Cell and Developmental Biology field.

## 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:*

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

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

#### 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:*

**Commendations:** 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.

**Recommendations:** 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.

#### 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:*

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

**Recommendations:** 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. Can the program obtain more specific numbers about program revenue and costs in order to more proactively address resource and budget needs?

## 6. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

**1. Early Development:** Program-level student learning outcomes 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.

### 2. Developing:

Program-level student learning outcomes clear and measurable, 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 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.

*Reviewer's Comments:*

**Commendations:** 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.

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

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 has remained intact despite the loss of the Developmental Biology Training Grant.

The committee did question 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?

## 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:*

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

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

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.

## 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):

19

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

Yes  No

*Additional comments for Faculty Senate consideration.*

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.

