



July 15, 2013

Michael Liskay, Ph.D., Program Director  
Molecular and Medical Genetics  
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](mailto:goldschm@ohsu.edu)  
(p) 503-494-1445

**Sarah Kennedy, M.A.**  
Project Coordinator  
[kennedsa@ohsu.edu](mailto:kennedsa@ohsu.edu)  
(p) 503-494-4030

Dear Dr. Liskay 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 Molecular and Medical Genetics 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 May 2013. The following commendations and recommendations summarize the Review Team's findings.

**Commendations:** The Review Team commends MMG in three areas: (1) strong faculty; (2) providing evidence that the program trains good people for the field; and (3) demonstrating a culture in which faculty feedback is valued by holding monthly faculty meetings.

**Recommendation:** The next review in 2018 should strive to more wholly describe what the program is doing in all areas. Provide an overview of future plans, identifying recruitment strategies and explaining how student feedback is gathered and utilized.

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

### **Part 1. Introduction**

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

**Commendation:** Response demonstrates a process for eliciting feedback.

**Recommendation:** Provide documentation regarding feedback process.

### **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:** The goals are good, well developed and specific. The curriculum description is good as well.

**Recommendation:** Demonstrate clearer alignment with OHSU goals; provide a better sense of where the program is going strategically. In addition to underlining which areas of the OHSU mission the program aligns with, provide a more analytical response to the alignment.

### **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:** Faculty numbers are stable and some growth is apparent. It is clear that URM recruitment is underway. Committee noted one URM faculty member as a positive.

**Recommendation:** Provide more description of what faculty "do" and what they are working on. Be more explicit in describing the budget and funding model. Better align the narrative and data.

### **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:** The program has good strategies outlined for getting faculty to participate on committees. The committee noted the reference to summer program opportunities for diverse students as a positive. The graduation rate is good based on the number of students who matriculate into the program annually.

**Recommendation:** Provide explanation for the enrollment drop from previous years. Provide more clarity on time-to-degree ratio. Provide more detail about the program's strategy for recruiting underrepresented students.

**Other:** The committee felt there were more opportunities for the program to discuss its strengths in this section. They also noted the difficulty PMCB programs have recruiting students to their labs when there are many choices in the PMCB umbrella.

### **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:** Response in 5.3 is good.

**Recommendation:** More information and analysis in this section as a whole on the next review.

**Other questions to consider:** Is Philanthropy a funding source for the program? What competitors does the program lose students to and how do those competitors' stipends compare to OHSU's?

#### **Part 6. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment**

**Rating:** 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.

**Commendation:** Good responses in 6.1 and 6.2.

**Recommendation:** Provide more information about what alumni are doing beyond the first year out of the program. More detail/description in this section would be helpful including analysis on whether or not time-to-degree is improving.

#### **Part 7. Other Information (Optional for Programs)**

N/A

#### **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:** Monthly faculty meetings! In general the committee thought the program demonstrated a strong, solid faculty and evidence of producing good people in the program.

**Recommendation:** Explain how student information/feedback is gathered. Provide an overview of future plans for the program. Identify strategies for recruiting more students and include the faculty's role in recruitment.

#### **Part 9. Response to Previous Program Reviews**

N/A

#### **Part 10. Overall Recommendations**

The committee wanted more detail and information about the program in the report. They felt the program was doing more in all areas than what was documented.

The Molecular and Medical Genetics 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](mailto: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 Molecular and Medical Genetics 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