

Academic Program Review Rubric

Program Name

Physiology and Pharmacology

Review Date:

5/3/2013

APR Committee Reviewers:

Karla Kent, Owen McCarty, 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:

(Committee chose to award **2.5** points)

Commendations: Eliciting faculty involvement and feedback.

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

The committee wondered if student input is utilized more than is demonstrated throughout the report.

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:

Commendations: 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.

Recommendations: Overall, the committee felt more analysis was needed.

The committee agreed that the method of underlining the areas in the OHSU mission that it felt it was in alignment with was creative, efficient and an "interesting" approach. There was a sense that more analysis or description would benefit the program's perception to outsiders, and, in this instance, show how the program fulfills the areas it says it

aligns with from the OHSU mission.

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:

Commendations: Sex of the faculty is diverse.

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

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

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:

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

Recommendations: For the program to earn a "3" in this section, address the ways they can recruit students earlier in the PMCB process, once they are in PMCB, but haven't chose a track yet; demonstrate that the program is proactively considering actions that can be taken to matriculate the students.

The committee acknowledged the challenges articulated by the program regarding the PMCB gateway and in recruiting URM students. There was agreement that these challenges could be paired with ways to address the challenges from the program's perspective. For example, does the program need more resources for recruitment? There was also a question of if more students matriculated (program desires 4), did the faculty have funding to support the increase in students.

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:

Commendations: Receipt and management of a substantial endowment

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

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 and how many ultimately stay and is that based on the Steinberg Endowment?

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:

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

Recommendations: 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).

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:

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

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

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

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):

14.5

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

- Yes No

Additional comments for Faculty Senate consideration.

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.