



October 28, 2014

William Lambert, Ph.D., Director of Education
Dept. of Public Health & Preventative Medicine
School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Lambert and Faculty:

**Academic Program Review
Committee**

Charles Allen, PhD
Senior Scientist, Oregon Inst Occ
Hlth Sci and Professor, Behavioral
Neuroscience

Elena Andresen, PhD
Professor, SOM
Health Services Research

David Covell, PhD, DDS
Associate Professor, SOD
Orthodontics

Paul Gorman, MD
Professor, SOM
Medical Informatics

Karla Kent, PhD
Professor, SOD
Integrative Biosciences
Former Senator

Owen McCarty, PhD
Associate Professor, SOM
Biomedical Engineering

Sean Malloy, PhD
Administrative Director
Vollum Institute

Joanne Noone, PhD, RN, CNE
Campus Associate Dean and
Associate Professor, SON

Margaret Scharf, DNP, RN
Clinical Associate Professor, SON
Advanced Practice Nursing
Psychiatric Mental Health

Ex officio, nonvoting members:

Anna Teske, MPA
Assistant Vice Provost

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), 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 Masters of Public Health (MPH) 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 work.

Your self-review report was discussed and evaluated by a Review Team of three members of the Academic Program Review Committee in February 2014. The subcommittee's recommendations were approved by the full APR Committee and the Faculty Senate. The following commendations and recommendations summarize the Review Team's findings.

Commendations: The Review Team commends MPH in three areas: (1) excellent demonstration of alignment between the program and university mission; (2) consistency in the quality of students, enrollment and degree production; and (3) a comprehensive assessment of student learning outcomes.

Recommendation: The Review Team recommends the following: (1) identify targets and areas for change based on Review Team findings; describe what is happening within the program to address any issues and how these translate into an action plan; (2) dedicate efforts to closing the loop on ongoing evaluations from student and faculty, and determine if the evaluations are resulting in program change; and (3) alter mindset and/or approach to long-term planning at the program level for matriculation, drop-out rate, financial analysis, etc.

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: Participation in the self-evaluation process seems broad; program answered key questions.

Recommendation: Though there was reference to faculty engagement in the Council on Education for Public Health report, it was difficult to tell how involved faculty were in the compilation of this report; provide more specific information about the program's overall feedback process.

Part 2. Overview

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

Commendation: Excellent work demonstrating alignment between the program and the university mission; positive overlap between program and OHSU.

Recommendation: Program mission statement could use some revision and strengthening.

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: Provided a good amount of information; did a good job of setting goals.

Recommendation: Provide more information about efforts to recruit underrepresented minority faculty and describe the follow-through on goals. Retain goals for next review.

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: This section illustrates a lot of consistency in the program's quality of students, enrollment and degree production.

Recommendation: Provide more analysis of the long-term implications of lower applicant numbers, drop-out rate, ratio of full-to part-time students; demonstrates that data is being collected and that these issues have been acknowledged as part of the process.

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: Peer university comparison was thorough.

Recommendation: Demonstrate more planning for revenue in the next five years; include adjustments/alignment with Portland State University. In the future, be more analytical and less descriptive in this section; utilize section as place to creatively examine financial options and gain stronger financial footing.

Part 6. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Rating: 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.

Commendation: Comprehensive assessment of student learning outcomes.

Recommendation: Provide more discussion of how results and feedback are used to improve curriculum; provide more detail of alumni outcomes.

Part 7. Other Information (Optional for Programs)

Rating: Developing. Additional information was relevant, but did not contribute significantly to the reviewers' evaluation of program effectiveness.

Commendation: Provided context for upcoming program changes, and the expanding partnership with the School of Public Health.

Recommendation: Discuss and analyze how the program will be impacted by the described changes.

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; Core Themes considered.

Commendation: Identified areas that need strengthening, including addition resources required.

Recommendation: Be more analytical; clearly contract the needs identified by the program (internal) and CEPH requirements and/or identified needs (external).

Part 9. Response to Previous Program Reviews

N/A

Part 10. Overall Recommendations

Overall, the committee believes MPH to be a strong program, which was likely doing more than was demonstrated in the report. The committee also recognizes that with the upcoming changes and development of the School of Public Health, this program will likely look very different at the next five year review.

The Academic Program Review Committee determined that the Masters of Public Health program **meets** the academic standards of Oregon Health & Science University. Based on these findings, your next review is scheduled for 2019-20 by the Faculty Senate APR Committee, with your self-review and school-level processes beginning and concluding no later than 2018-19.

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