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

July 15, 2013

William Hersh, M.D., Professor and Chair
Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology
School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Hersh 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 Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology'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.

Between the time you submitted the self-review report and the APR Committee was installed fully, the self-review template changed to improve clarity. The evolution was taken into account when your self-review report was discussed and evaluated by a Review Team of three members of the Academic Program Review Committee in February 2013. Noting that the program submitted the APR prior to the revised format, the committee's recommendations primarily focus on changes to make in future reports. The following commendations and recommendations summarize the Review Team's findings.

Commendation: The Review Team commends DMICE in three areas: (1) being collaborative and interprofessional in program design and implementation; (2) utilizing a highly trained, expert faculty; and (3) monitoring graduate progress or alumni outcomes and the evidence of solid workforce placement.

Recommendation: The next review in 2017 should strive for more analysis and self-reflection about future plans and goals. This might be considered in light of the program's financial model and funding sustainability.

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

Part I. Introduction
Finding: The original template did not ask programs to record the data required in this section. The committee acknowledges this change in requirements from the original submission.

Part 2. Overview
Rating: Highly Developed. Program has established its own set of Mission, Purpose, and Goals (MPGs) unique to the program, AND are aligned with university MPGs and stated clearly and concisely.
Commendation: The program did a good job describing the alignment with and contribution to the OHSU mission.
Recommendation: For future reports, separate the program purpose and goals from the program mission statement.

Part 3. Faculty and Staff Resources
Rating: 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.
Commendation: The faculty list represents an impressive cross-section of the university.
Recommendation: The committee felt that more analysis in this section is needed in future reports.

Part 4. Enrollment/Degree Production
Rating: Developing. Curriculum appears to reflect current practice in the discipline. No discussion of employment projections or prospects for program graduates. Some discussion about student diversity and planning for recruitment.
Commendation: Clearly demonstrated understanding of the barriers to having a more diverse student population and articulated ideas of how to address the issue.
Recommendation: Provide more discussion and analysis about how the number of students being admitted works toward the program's enrollment goals**.**

Part 5. Other Resources
Rating: Highly Developed. Detailed analysis of resource adequacy for the 5-year period; uses data to identify program needs and priorities. Informed by comparison to peer universities.
Commendation: The program demonstrated significant available resources and provided good detail regarding the source of those resources.
Recommendation: Provide more information about circumstances influencing program expenditures and adequacy of other resources necessary to support the program.

Part 6. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
Rating: 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.
Commendation: The committee was thoroughly impressed with the alumni tracking system (response to 6.4, Employment Outcomes).
Recommendation: More clearly link SLO's and assessments; spell out acronyms.

Part 7. Other Information (Optional for Programs)
N/A

Part 8. Analysis and Conclusions

Rating: Highly Developed. Reflects spirit of continuous improvement and self-reflection; specific program/curricular changes are discussed and based on evidence and trends.

Commendation: Overall the committee felt the report did a great job describing the program. Some of the strengths of the program as demonstrated in the report: students seem to be doing extremely well finding positions based on their training; the program is finding needs in the larger community for their program and successfully placing students to meet community needs; demonstration of expert faculty; collaborative and interprofessional; funding for students is impressive and strong (coupled with concern below); program mission accomplished.

Recommendation: In general more self-evaluation and analysis is needed in all areas in future reports. Set benchmarks for improvement. Provide more description and evidence of the program's financial model and funding sustainability.

Part 9. Response to Previous Program Reviews

N/A

Part 10. Overall Recommendations

The program submitted their report prior to the development of the new Academic Program Review template and the committee took this into consideration in every part of the evaluation.

The Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology 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 Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology program **meets** the academic standards of Oregon Health & Science University. Based on these findings, your next review is scheduled for 2017-18 by the Faculty Senate APR Committee, with your self-review and school-level processes beginning and concluding no later than 2016-17.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Allen

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