

# Academic Program Review Rubric

Program Name

Molecular and Medical Genetics

Review Date:

5/29/2013

APR Committee Reviewers:

David Covell, Karla Kent, Sean Molloy

## 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:

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

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

The committee suspects that more is being done to elicit feedback than was clear in this section. In future reports provide examples of the kind of input faculty, staff and students provide and the mechanisms for collecting input.

## 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 chose to award **2.5 points.**)

**Commendation:** The committee stated that the goals were good. They were well developed and specific. Additionally, they said the curriculum description was good.

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

The committee was unclear about the time-to-degree for this program and also questioned the award of an MS.

### 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:*

(The committee chose to award **2.5 points**.)

**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.

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. Lastly, though URM student recruitment is underway, the committee wanted more detail about the program's strategy for recruiting underrepresented students.

### 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 chose to award **2.5 points**.)

**Commendations:** 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. They thought the graduation rate was good based on the number of students who matriculate into the program annually.

**Recommendations:** Provide explanation for the enrollment drop from previous years.

The committee noted again that more clarity is needed for time-to-degree and also for the program's current enrollment.

## 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:*

**Commendation:** The response in 5.3 was good.

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

Questions from the committee: 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?

## 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:*

**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.

Overall the committee wanted more detail/description in this section and wanted to know if the time-to-degree was improving.

## 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 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:*

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

**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.

## 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):

15.5

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

- Yes  No

Additional comments for Faculty Senate consideration.

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.