



July 15, 2013

Robert Duvoisin, Ph.D., Program Director
Physiology and Pharmacology
School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Duvoisin 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 the Physiology and Pharmacology 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 PH2 in three areas: (1) the number of student publications; (2) faculty teaching load; and (3) resourceful management of the Steinberg Endowment.

Recommendation: The next review in 2018 should strive to be more analytical, provide more detail and utilize program data to objectively illustrate evidence.

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

Part I. Introduction

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

Commendation: Eliciting faculty involvement and feedback.

Recommendation: Be more specific about how student feedback is collected and utilized. If student feedback is not collected in a structured manner, consider developing more specific student feedback mechanisms.

Part 2. Overview

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

Commendation: The program description is excellent. Considering the size of the program, the committee felt the teaching load was impressive and that the program is involved with teaching at both the department and PMCB levels.

Recommendation: Overall, the committee felt more analysis was needed. Specifically, in addition to underlining the areas in the OHSU mission statement that the program believes it aligns with, more description would demonstrate *how* the program fulfills those university mission areas.

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: Gender of the faculty is diverse.

Recommendation: Further develop the diversity strategic plan for the next review cycle (2018), with understanding of the limited internal, program resources.

Other: The committee noted that the program's plan in 3.4 relied upon the OHSU Diversity Strategic Plan to address faculty diversity. Generally the committee understands the need for the program to rely on the larger university infrastructure; however, they concluded more analysis and description, or comments on actions being taken by the program (outreach, conference attendance), would more fully address the questions in 3.3 and 3.4.

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: Time to Degree is good, the program does a good job of retaining and graduating their students. Provided great data.

Recommendation: To be considered "highly developed" in this section, address the ways students can be recruited earlier in the PMCB process--once they are in PMCB, but haven't chosen a track; demonstrate that the program is proactively considering actions that can be taken to matriculate students.

Other: The committee acknowledged the challenges articulated by the program regarding the PMCB gateway and in recruiting URM students. Questions for consideration: Does the program need more resources for recruitment? If more students matriculate (program desires 4 additional students annually), does the faculty have funding to support the increase in students.

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: Receipt and management of a substantial endowment.

Recommendation: Provide more description of the program's funding model, potentially providing some analysis.

Other questions to consider: Based on other responses in the report, the committee had some additional questions regarding the program's funding: How will the Steinberg Endowment be sustained? Are the number of students accepted related to the funds available? How many students are rotating out and how many ultimately stay and is that based on the Steinberg Endowment?

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: The provided rubric was a great example. Student publications and time-to-degree are impressive.

Recommendation: Demonstrate a direct correlation between SLO's and outcomes' assessments. Provide more description of the qualifying exam. Provide more description and explanation of the Thesis Committee meetings that increase after the third year (Appendix 1).

Part 7. Other Information (Optional for Programs)

N/A

Part 8. Analysis and Conclusions

Rating: 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.

Commendation: Number of student publications is impressive. The committee felt the response in 8.3 was interesting and illustrated a need university-wide.

Recommendation: The responses in this section were sparse and vague. Utilize metrics in future responses to provide more specificity.

Other: As an additional note to the 8.3 response, the committee asked if PH2 utilized alumni in career discussions and prospective student outreach.

Part 9. Response to Previous Program Reviews

N/A

Part 10. Overall Recommendations

The committee noted that they knew more about the program than is represented in the report, and believe the program is stronger than demonstrated in the report. They felt that some of the responses were incongruous. For example, the program expressed the desire to matriculate more students, but discussed limited funding as an issue they will deal with in the future with regard to the Steinberg Endowment.

Generally, there was a request for more information and more detail about the information that was provided. The committee expressed understanding about the program's review taking place early in the development of the APR process, but hopes that the program's 2018 review will be a more detailed examination and analysis of the program.

The Physiology and Pharmacology 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 Physiology and Pharmacology 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



School of Medicine

Department of Physiology and Pharmacology

Mail code: L-334
3181 S.W. Sam Jackson Park Road
Portland, OR 97239-3098
tel 503 418 2665 fax 503 494-4352

Robert M. Duvoisin, Ph.D.
Professor
duvoisin@ohsu.edu

August 13, 2013

Faculty Senate Academic Program Review Committee
c/o Sarah Kennedy,
Office of Academic Programs, Policy and Accreditation
Oregon Health & Science University

RE: Physiology and Pharmacology graduate program five-year Academic Review

Dear Reviewers:

Thank you for the time you spent reviewing our program, for the valuable feedback, and for ultimately deciding that our program meets OHSU's academic standards.

We take good note of the parts you rated as Developing and will follow your recommendations. Overall, we will be collecting more data on our training program which will allow for more analysis, and in particular,

- i) we will develop more specific mechanisms to collect and use student feedback (part 1);
- ii) we are continuing to take measures to increase exposure of 1st year PMCB students to the Physiology and Pharmacology program (part 4);
- iii) as regards to funding, the Steinberg Endowment has been able to partly support all students in the Department until now. Whether this is sustainable with further reductions in federal grant funding is unclear. Currently, Departmental funds are available as backstop, although these are also threatened (part 5);
- iv) as SLOs are finalized, we will be better able to correlate them with outcomes' assessment. The Qualifying Exam is currently being revised centrally by Graduate Studies (part 6);
- v) we will utilize metrics in future reviews and set targets (part 8).

However, we disagree with the committee's recommendation that our Graduate Program should be more involved in the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty (part 3). Graduate Programs have no ability or funds to hire or retain faculty. However, one of our faculty, Dr. Beth Habecker, will be attending ABRCMS this fall. We hope this may help recruit URM students to our program but we doubt it will effect faculty recruitment.

In summary, we thank the committee for its work, agree with nearly all its recommendations, and hope to be able to provide more details and metrics for the next review in 2018.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert Duvoisin". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Robert Duvoisin, PhD
Physiology and Pharmacology Graduate Program Director