



July 15, 2013

Cynthia Morris, Ph.D., M.P.H., Program Director
Human Investigations Program
School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Morris and Faculty:

**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

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 Human Investigations 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.

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 March 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.

Commendations: The Review Team commends HIP in three areas: (1) thorough, well documented, relevant student learning outcomes; (2) collecting and reporting detailed data; and (3) monitoring graduate progress and alumni outcomes to assess the program's value in the workforce.

Recommendation: The next review in 2017 should strive for more description and analysis regarding resources and funding in light of maintaining the high quality of the program.

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

Part I. Introduction

Rating: Highly Developed. Process is complete, with dates of meetings and voting record; engagement of faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders is broad and collaborative.

Commendation: This section was good and complete.

Recommendation: N/A

Part 2. Overview

Rating: Highly Developed. Program has established its own set of Mission, Purpose, Goals (MPGs) unique to the program, AND are aligned with university MPGs and stated clearly and concisely.

Commendation: The committee thought this section was clearly written and laid out well.

Recommendation: In future reports, place the program goals in the larger context of OHSU.

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: The detail information in the Appendix of the original report is excellent.

Recommendation: Questions for consideration in future reports:

3.1, What would be a nice addition to the faculty to strengthen the program?

3.2 How have they been able to maintain adequate, qualified faculty to keep this program going?

Part 4. Enrollment/Degree Production

Rating: 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.

Commendation: Very impressive tracking of student activities and outcomes. (The committee felt the program could provide training to other programs in the university on alumni tracking.)

Recommendation: In future reports, provide more information about what the program is doing to recruit a more diverse student population; the data provided is excellent, provide analysis of the data as it relates to diversity.

Part 5. Other Resources

Rating: N/A

Commendation: Clear description of program funding sources.

Recommendation: The committee wanted more information and detail in this section specifically, more discussion regarding adequacy of resources and comparison between OHSU's program and similar programs at other universities.

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: This section was Excellent ; Very Impressive!

Recommendation: None at this time.

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; 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.

Commendation: The report provided excellent detail backed by data in many sections. The program's ability to track alumni and therefore assess the program's value in the work force is excellent. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessments are thorough, relevant and well documented.

Recommendation: In future reports provide more description and analysis regarding resources and funding as they relate to maintaining the high quality of the program.

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 Human Investigations 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 Human Investigations 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 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