



October 28, 2014

Gary Westbrook, Ph.D., Program Director
Vollum Institute • Neuroscience Graduate Program
School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Westbrook 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 Neuroscience Graduate Program's (NGP) 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 two members of the Academic Program Review Committee in April 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 NGP in the following areas: (1) the use of a well-developed faculty table, which serves as a strong model for other programs; (2) easy to understand faculty contribution and student mentorship; and (3) well-developed system to create a diverse student population and support recruitment and retention.

Recommendation: The Review Team recommends the following: (1) identify strategies for producing additional data points related to institutional improvement and contribution; and (2) engage students in a more formalized process around student learning outcomes and assessment.

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

Part 1. 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: The external review demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement.

Recommendation: More specific detail about the program may be helpful.

Comment: Other programs want to know how the external review panel was gathered, as well as details about the execution of the review.

Part 2. Overview

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

Commendation: This section was thorough and well-written.

Recommendation: No recommendations.

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: Program has gone out of its way to create opportunities for diverse students and recruitment, and has prioritized retention; evidence of a strong faculty.

Recommendation: No recommendations.

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: Commitment to hands-on, experiential learning for all students; highly intensive, holistic learning opportunities; innovative (neurobiology disease); program is working hard to address URM recruitment; enrollment indicates stable numbers with successful outcomes; alumni data is rich and thorough.

Recommendation: Provide an updated data table to illustrate current enrollment.

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: Program appears to be making good use of the resources available and not overextending themselves.

Recommendation: There seems to be financial uncertainty that limits longer term planning (the committee noted this limitation, but did not have a specific recommendation).

Part 6. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Rating: Highly Developed. Program-level student learning outcomes clear and measurable; uses direct measures of learning; courses listed and linked to Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) (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 findings.

Commendation: Leverages alumni outcomes and student recruitment; program demonstrates a clear knowledge of its students.

Recommendation: 6.2 - demonstrate more formal student feedback process, as it is intimated in other areas of the report.

Part 7. Other Information (Optional for Programs)

Rating: 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; Core Themes considered.

Commendation: There is a clear culture of self-evaluation within the program.

Recommendation: Be more explicit about what “institutional support” means to the program—more money, more infrastructure, etc.; compare program to other, peer institutions to describe where their support comes from, level of stipends, etc.; address faculty and student attrition by providing exit interview data.

Part 9. Response to Previous Program Reviews

N/A

Part 10. Overall Recommendations

Overall, the committee believes NGP to be of strong quality. The committee suggested that the program could be more forthcoming with details relating to institutional improvement and contribution. In addition, the committee recommends engaging students in a more formalized process around student learning outcomes and assessment.

The Academic Program Review Committee determined that NGP **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