Academic Program Review Rubric

Program Name	DMICE
Review Date:	2/15/2013
APR Committee Reviewers:	Charles Allen, David Covell, Karla Kent, Owen McCarty, Sean Molloy, Tracy Bumsted, Joanne Noone, Margaret Scharf

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:

The committee gave the program a pass in this section, recognizing the change in requirements from their original submission to the current template.

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:

The committee again noted the differences in what was requested when the program originally submitted the report and the changes in the new template/request. Committee felt that the program's mission statement encompassed mission, purpose and goals and could perhaps be separated to distinguish these three areas.

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:

This section was given a "pass" due to the committee's awareness of the change in reporting requirements. In future reports, more analysis needed.

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:

The committee wanted to see more discussion about how the number of students being admitted were working toward the program's enrollment goals.

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:

The committee thought this section contained a lot of good detail and indicated that significant resources were available to the program.

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:

The committee thought the tracking system was great. They wanted to see a clearer link between SLO's and assessments as well as a clearer articulation of the goals of each assessment. Acronyms should be eliminated or defined. Noting the change in requirements from a previous report template to the current report template, in the future, the committee wants to see more self-evaluation and benchmarks for improvement.

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 no
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:

Overall the committee felt the report did a great job describing the program.

Strengths: 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.

Areas for Improvement: financial model and sustainability of funding; more analysis needed in future reports;
demonstrate SLO's linked with learning experiences

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):

20

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

◉ Yes   ○ No

Additional comments for Faculty Senate consideration.

The program submitted their report prior to the development of the new Academic Program Review template.