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Anne Maddeford, MS, MACOM, RT(T), LAC, Director
Radiation Therapy
School of Medicine

Dear Professor Bennett and Faculty:

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 Radiation Therapy (RT) program’s commitment to ongoing 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 November 2013. 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 the RT program in the following areas: (1) evidence of strong curriculum; (2) good program action plan and outcomes, with relevant data and a clear demonstration of work toward program improvement; and (3) opportunities for faculty professional development.

**Recommendation:** The Review Team recommends the following: (1) develop a five year financial plan and identify potential revenue streams; (2) focus on sections related to faculty and alignment with the university mission, purpose and goals (MPGs); (3) provide more information and analysis on student attrition, diversity, and curriculum alignment with current practices in this discipline.

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:** The program engages in a self-evaluation process annually.  
**Recommendation:** Provide more evidence about stakeholder engagement and the process for collecting feedback.  

**Part 2. Overview**

**Rating:** Developing. Program has established its own set of MPGs unique to the program, but MPGs are not aligned with university MPGs.  
**Commendation:** The Program of Study provides a strong sense of what students will accomplish over the course of the program.  
**Recommendation:** Demonstrate more specific alignment with OHSU’s MPGs. The JRCERT goals are very generic and the recommends more specificity in existing and future goals.  

**Part 3. Faculty and Staff Resources**

**Rating:** Early Development. No discussion of faculty trends that affect program development and faculty diversity no succession planning (recruitment, retention, retirement, need) is evident. Temporary/adjunct faculty teach the majority of courses in the curriculum. Program does not avail itself of academic and student services.  
**Commendation:** The program supports opportunities for faculty development, and ensures faculty remain current with industry standards.  
**Recommendation:** Provide more faculty credentialing information, and detailed information on the resources available to faculty. Provide information about faculty trends for evaluation of program sustainability from the faculty perspective.  
**Comment:** Lack of overall detail in this section.  

**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:** Good presentation of data and information; excellent completion rate; pass rates following 2009 demonstrate commitment to improve student outcomes.  
**Recommendation:** Provide more information and analysis on student attrition, diversity (beyond race and ethnicity), and curriculum alignment with current practice in the discipline.  

**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:** The program is small and self-sufficient.  
**Recommendation:** Conduct a five-year financial plan and identify potential revenue streams. Analyze faculty salary and size needs, program growth potential and overall demand.  
**Comment:** Program stability and security was difficult to assess.  

**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:** Evidence of well-developed action plan and outcomes. Tables were easy to read and provided relevant data. Provided clear demonstration of work designed for program improvement. **Recommendation:** Generate outcomes that are more measurable. For example: how will the program measure “develop critical thinking skills and values”.

**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:** Evidence of strong curriculum based on student acceptance rates into advanced programs following graduation. **Recommendation:** Expand upon ideas and concerns not addressed earlier in the report. Elaborate on the stability of instructors with patient care or physics, the need to strengthen the basic science curriculum, and building relationships with the Radiation Medicine department.

**Part 9. Response to Previous Program Reviews**

N/A

**Part 10. Overall Recommendations**

Overall, the committee believes the program is of high quality and may be engaging in more activities than was demonstrated in the report. There Review Team feels that more information summarizing the program is needed to help inform and education members about the program’s history, current activities and issues.

The Academic Program Review Committee determined that the RT 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
When submitting the Academic Program Review (APR), programs with specialized accreditation must include their self-study and evaluative report. Answer the questions in the template by cutting and pasting the appropriate response from the accreditation self-study into the space below, and noting the page number from the self-study where the question is addressed. If the self-study does not address a question, the program is required to provide a response in the space and manner requested below.

1. Introduction

   **Program Name:** Radiation Therapy

   1.1 Identify the participants in the self-evaluation process. Please select all that apply.

      - x Faculty
      - x Alumni
      - x Students
      - x Employers
      - x Staff
      - Others, please specify

   1.2 When were meetings held to complete this self-evaluation process?

      Held in April of each year

   1.3 Who prepared the document?

      Anne Maddeford

   1.4 Who reviewed the report?

      Linda Yates, David Robinson

   1.5 Describe the program’s process for eliciting feedback from faculty on the APR report.

      Faculty participate in the accumulation and documentation of student learning for the self-study used in reports to the JRCERT

2. Overview

   2.1 Describe the program:

      Program Mission:
      Program Purpose:
      Identify Program Goals:

**Program Mission**

The Radiation Therapy Program’s mission is to provide a means for each student to gain and apply the knowledge and skills necessary to become a competent and ethical practitioner in the art and science of radiation therapy. Build on the three components of the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists’ (ARRT) “equation for excellent” (education, ethics, examination), the program provides the preparatory education through didactic and clinical requirements to qualify graduates to take the ARRT national certifying exam. Promoting a culture of ethical behavior, the program promotes compliance with the ARRT rules of ethics required for initial and continuing certification. The mission and goals of this program are consistent with those of the university and school.

**Program Goals**

Upon completion of the Radiation Therapy program:

1. Students will be clinically competent:
   a. Identify and correctly use all patient set-up aids
b. Verify physician prescription prior to initiating treatments
2. Students will demonstrate effective communication skills:
   a. Demonstrate effective oral communication skills
   b. Demonstrate effective written communication skills
3. Students will model professionalism:
   a. Work effectively as a team member
   b. Determine the importance of continued professional development
4. Students will develop critical thinking skills:
   a. Assess a treatment plan and select appropriate treatment
   b. Recognize discrepancies in a treatment prescription

It is the philosophy of this program to provide a means for each student to gain and apply the knowledge necessary to be successful in the field of radiation therapy and to become a productive individual in society.

Although divided into academic and clinical categories, it is the intent of the program to provide an integrated course of instruction for the student.

The program will provide, to the best of its abilities, all possible means necessary to gain full knowledge, understanding and competency. The degree of success in the program and as a graduate radiation therapist will vary with personal motivation and determination.

Through instruction, guidance and a lot of hard work and interest on your part, you will become a competent and ethical individual skilled in the art and science of radiation therapy and also a contributing member of the health care team and society.

2.2 How do these align with, and contribute to, the fulfillment of OHSU's mission, strategic goals and core themes?

The Program aligns with OHSU’s mission and goals by providing health care education in Radiation Therapy to the students of Oregon and SW Washington.

2.3 Describe the curriculum, and if more than one award is given, highlight the progression in difficulty and performance expectations.

   Include the curriculum as a separate document.

The curriculum is based on a solid background in the basic sciences which is delivered during the 1st year. The second year is dedicated to coursework specific to Radiation Medicine and is integrated with clinical rotations that occur each quarter the student is enrolled in the program. A copy of the curriculum is included (appendix 2.3).

3. Faculty and Staff Resources

3.1 Describe the major research thrusts of faculty, areas in which the research is particularly strong, areas that need to be strengthened and current research support.

   Complete Table 3.1 to provide detail faculty information.

3.2 Describe how the program has maintained adequate qualified faculty members and staff members in relation to the program’s enrollment, clinical and/or research efforts over the last five years.
Program faculty attend both regional and national conferences each year in addition to maintaining national and state licensing and credentialing requirements.

3.3 Provide data for the last five years illustrating program faculty: total number, rank and series numbers, number recruited, number retired or left position, number promoted or awarded tenure. Analyze the program’s success in attracting and retaining faculty and leadership?

We have not needed to recruit new faculty for the last 10 years.

*Complete Table 3.3 to provide detail faculty data.*

3.4 If your program is responsible for recruitment and retention, and efforts have not produced desired diversity, what are your plans to recruit diverse faculty? What resources will be used or are needed to achieve these results?

We have not needed to recruit faculty within the last 10 years.

*Include the program’s Diversity Plan.*

3.5 What process is in place to evaluate faculty effectiveness and teaching quality? With what frequency do faculty get evaluated and what is the feedback mechanism?

Faculty are evaluated by the students each course utilizing Sakai. The program director and the clinical coordinator review and analyze the student learning outcomes and program effectiveness date in December each year. At this time graduates have completed the national certifying exam the scores are available for review. We also hold faculty development seminars for current teaching and testing methods.

*Include any supporting documentation.*

4. Enrollment/Degree Production

4.1 Is the five-year enrollment trend appropriate to the program's capacity? What is the program’s strategic plan to maintain or grow capacity?

The program is limited in the number of students admitted by the number of Radiation Oncology Centers available in the Portland Metropolitan area.

4.2 Has the number and/or quality of matriculates changed in the last five years? If so, how? What is the impact?

The number of students has not changed over the last five years. The quality of students has risen with the increase in prerequisite requirements for physics and math. We have accepted 9 students per year for the last 10 years.

4.3 In the last five years has the trend in awarding degrees and certificates been appropriate to the program’s resources and capacity? What is the average time-to-degree for students in the program? What percentage of students complete their degree on time?

*Complete Table 4.3 below demonstrating the number and percentage of students completing on-time and those completing at the next benchmark. Adjust column headings and years to accurately reflect usual program time. (e.g., PhD’s usual time = 6 years, next*
benchmark = 7 years; MD’s usual time = 4 years, next benchmark = 6 years) Provide analysis of this data related to program effectiveness. 2 years for RXT

Table 4.3: Time-to-degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Enrolled</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Dropped out</th>
<th>Completing After 4 Years (on-time)</th>
<th>Completing After 6 years (next benchmark)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Graduated by # # %</td>
<td>Graduated by # # %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005-06 2009-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008-09 2010-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10 2011-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010-11 2012-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix 4.3, Program Effectiveness

4.4 In alignment with OHSU’s Vision 2020 strategic goal, “Be a great organization, diverse in people and ideas,” the university submitted core theme objective 1.1 to NWCCU for regional accreditation: develop a student pipeline to meet the health needs of an increasingly diverse Oregon and nation. The following indicator will demonstrate fulfillment of this objective: 20 – 30 percent of diverse students in OHSU programs, of total OHSU students.

With the enrollment held at 9 students we have years where our student population is diverse (30% for the last two years). However, there have been years where it is has been 0%. In the past we have worked closely with Leslie Garcia to improve these numbers by participating in college fairs aimed at the underrepresented populations.

What percentage of the program’s population is diverse (underrepresented minority, rural background, disadvantaged background)? How will the program endeavor to fulfill the university diversity initiative?

4.5 If you have not achieved desired results, what are your plans to recruit diverse students that add value to the learning environment? What resources will be used or are needed to achieve these results?

In the past several years we have seen an increase in the number of students applying and qualifying for the program who come from these groups of students.

4.6 What is the evidence of regional, national or international need for additional qualified individuals such as the program is producing? Please specify.

I have checked for the regional and national organizations (ASRT, ARRT and OBRT). Due to the very small number of students/practicing therapists, these studies have not been done.

5. Other Resources

5.1 What revenue sources does the program have access to? Choose all that apply and include the percentage of the program’s total revenue that comes from the selected sources:

- [X] Tuition 100%
- √ State Appropriations
- √ Clinical/Patient Care
- √ Philanthropy
- √ Indirect Cost Return
- √ Research Grants
5.2 What percentage of faculty are grant funded? What percentage of students are on faculty grants?

0%. The accrediting body requires the program director and clinical coordinator be 100% positions only. This does not allow for faculty to be grant funded.

5.3 What is the current budget (present year) for this program?

The resources for the program come for tuition and institutional support. The tuition supports 2.0 FTE for Radiation Therapy Faculty. OHSU provides support to the program through the A & P courses and the department provides support through the instruction of physics and dosimetry. A copy of the current budget is included (appendix 5.3).

5.4 How does tuition (or graduate stipends) compare to similar programs at other institutions (ideally, compare against programs on the institutional peer list)?

Our tuition runs in the top 10% of programs nationally.

5.5 What resources is the program utilizing to fulfill its mission (e.g. library, computer equipment, facilities, research labs, clinical placements)? What resources, if any, is the program sharing with other programs (facilities, computer equipment, labs, clinical placements)?

The program’s students utilize the normal resources (library, labs and clinical placements at each of the major hospitals in the Portland Metropolitan area that offer Radiation Medicine Services.

5.6 Has anything happened since the last review that has influenced expenditures?

☐ Yes  X ☐ No
If “yes” was selected, please explain.

6. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

6.1 What are the program’s student learning outcomes? How are student learning outcomes assessed? How is achievement defined and how do students receive feedback? What do these results communicate about program effectiveness?

1. Students will be clinically competent:
   a. Identify and correctly use all patient set-up aids
   b. Verify physician prescription prior to initiating treatments

2. Students will demonstrate effective communication skills:
   a. Demonstrate effective oral communication skills
   b. Demonstrate effective written communication skills

3. Students will model professionalism:
   a. Work effectively as a team member
   b. Determine the importance of continued professional development

4. Students will develop critical thinking skills:
   a. Assess a treatment plan and select appropriate treatment
   b. Recognize discrepancies in a treatment prescription

The program director and the clinical coordinator review and analyze the student learning outcomes and program effectiveness date in December each year. Graduates have completed the ARRT exam and the scores are available for review. We review the total scores and scores for each section (subscale) of the exam and compare the scores on the exam to student performance in the corresponding coursework and student learning outcomes on the assessment plan. We map out
any changes that we are considering in the assessment plan, the course objectives or the sequencing of the courses and these considerations are presented to the Vice Provost. We also gather information from the course instructors and from Advisors at our “feeder” institutions. With this information, any major changes to the curriculum are presented to the Advisory Committee in March. Input and approval from the Advisory Committee is solicited at this time. If approval is received from the Advisory Committee, the plan is taken back to the Vice-Provost for final approval.

See Appendix 6.1

Include any evidence that is relevant to the response.

6.2 Summarize how assessment results are used to improve the program curriculum, learning experiences, instruction, student recruitment and/or academic and learning support.

See above in 6.1

See Appendix 6.2 for an example of a program Action Plan.

6.3 What percentage of students in the program have mentors? What percentage of students are retained? What percentage of students entering the program graduate?

Students have mentors in their clinical instructors, however, there is not a formal method of assigning a mentor. Approximately 90% of the students graduate within the 2 year time frame and pass the boards on the first attempt. 97% of the students graduate but several have needed additional clinical time prior to getting their degree.

6.4 What evidence does the program have about employment and/or further professional or graduate-level activities of program completers? What and how are alumni doing (e.g., industry or self-employment, geographic location, job, success indicators)?

The job market in Portland has been tight for the last 4-5 years. We have several students from last year who have not secured permanent positions in Radiation Medicine. If students are willing to leave the area they are able to obtain employment in the field. Alumni have done well in regards to obtaining advanced training (dosimetry) and in being promoted to supervisory positions.

7 Other Information (optional)

Use this space to provide any additional information about the program, that would help the committee better comprehend the program and its effectiveness.

8 Analysis and Conclusions

8.2 What are the strengths and achievements of the program's faculty, students and graduates?

The program’s students and graduates are recognized for their strong background in physics and dosimetry that the program requires of all its students. This has enabled several students to be accepted directly from the program into advanced certifying programs in dosimetry immediately after graduation.

8.3 What areas does the program believe need strengthening over the next three to five years?

Areas that need improvement include the continuity of the physics education and stability in the instructors for patient care.
8.4 How will this self-study be used for improvement against goals and targets? How will it inform planning, decision making and allocation of resources and capacity for the next five years?

Since we have just completed an interim report for the JRCERT, the information received from that review and this will be used to strengthen the basic science curriculum.

8.5 Are new resources needed to achieve these goals and improvement targets? What can the university do to better support the program?

We will need to continue to build the relationship with the Department of Radiation Medicine.

9 Response to Previous Program Reviews

This section is completed by programs that have previously undergone a five-year academic program review.

9.2 What commendations did the committee have in the previous review?

9.3 What recommendations did the committee have in the previous review?

9.4 What did the program do to respond to recommendations?

9.5 In the last five years, have there been any significant changes in the program due to the previous academic program review? Please describe.

10 Signature and Submission (signature and title of person submitting the report)

Submitted 10/17/2013
(signature) (date)

Anne Maddeford, Director
(printed name and title)
### New students starting Summer 2013

#### 8/12/13 – 9/20/13 – Summer B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTT 305</td>
<td>Medical Terminology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN 310</td>
<td>Anatomy I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: (6)

#### 9/30/13 – 12/20/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN 310</td>
<td>Anatomy II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT 311</td>
<td>Introduction to Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT 313</td>
<td>Radiographic Technique</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: (8)

#### 1/6/14 - 3/21/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTT 309</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHY 311</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT 320</td>
<td>Basic Patient Care Skills In Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT 313</td>
<td>Radiographic Technique</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: (14)

#### 3/31/14 – 6/20/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTT 309</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT 314</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT 315</td>
<td>Radiation Therapy CT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT 321</td>
<td>Patient Care In Radiation Oncology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT 330</td>
<td>Radiation Physics I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT 401</td>
<td>Independent Research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: (13)
2nd year students admitted Fall 2012

7/1/13 - 9/20/13
12 week Summer - Junior Year
RTT 309 Clinic 8
RTT 331 Radiation Therapy Physics I 3
CON 312A Intro to Medical Research & Review 1
RTT 341 Pathophysiology 2
CON 311 Aging for Health Care Providers 1

(15)

9/30/13 – 12/20/13
Fall - Senior Year
CON 411 Medical Ethics 1
RTT 405A Radiation Oncology I 3
RTT 409 Clinic 5
RTT 411 Dosimetry I 2
RTT 430 Radiation Therapy Physics II 3
RTT 401 Independent Research 1

(15)

1/6/14 – 3/21/14
Winter - Senior Year
RTT 405B Radiation Oncology II 3
RTT 409 Clinic 5
RTT 412 Dosimetry II 2
RTT 431 Radiation Therapy Physics III 3
CON 412 Medical Law 2
RTT 401 Independent Research 1

(16)

3/31/14 – 6/20/14
Spring - Senior Year
RTT 405C Radiation Oncology III 3
RTT 409 Clinic 5
RTT 413 Dosimetry III 2
RTT 432 Radiation Therapy Physics IV 3
RTT 401 Independent Research 1
CON 312B Intro to Medical Research & Review 1

(15)

Summer 2014 - Session A - 6/30/14 - 8/8/14
Summer - Senior Year
RTT 307 Sem: Patient Care 2
RTT 409 Clinic 8
RTT 407 Treatment Planning Seminar 4

(14)
## 3.1. Program Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name, include credential</th>
<th>Primary Appointment</th>
<th>Research Areas</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Mentorships</th>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Other roles/ functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Yates</td>
<td>Radiation Medicine</td>
<td>Introduction to Radiation Therapy, Radiologic Technology, Simulation, Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Committee Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>Clinical Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Maddeford</td>
<td>Radiation Medicine</td>
<td>Medical Terminology, Law, Ethics, Radiation Oncology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allied Health Council, Progress and Promotion – Allied Heath, Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3 Faculty Data: Rank and Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Total # Professor</th>
<th>Total # Assoc. Prof</th>
<th>Total # Asst. Prof</th>
<th>Total # Senior Instructor</th>
<th>Total # Instructor</th>
<th>Total # Affiliate</th>
<th>Total # Scientist</th>
<th>Total Recruited</th>
<th>Total Promoted/Tenured</th>
<th>Total Retired/Departed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsrch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsrch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsrch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsrch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsrch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsrch</td>
<td>Sr Assoc Asst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Metrics for OHSU Radiation Therapy Program

Percent Passing ARRT Licensure Exam on First Attempt

Percent of Students Completing Radiation Therapy Program
2005 through 2012

Radiation Therapy Graduates in Jobs Six Months After Graduation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Admitted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Graduated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediated/Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National 88.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year Average USA/OHSU</td>
<td>86.8/90.1</td>
<td>87.0/87.6</td>
<td>87.0/87.9</td>
<td>87.3/88.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement Rate</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>77.70%</td>
<td>88.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Placed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent Passing Licensure Exam on First Attempt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent of RT Students Completed Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Cohort</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Understanding Why Students Do Not Complete Radiation Therapy Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediated/Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographics

- % Female: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
- % Minority: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
- % Underrepresented Minority: 0, 0, 0, 0

OHSU GPA

Other items/variables of note?
## Appendix 5.3

### PROPOSED BUDGET SUMMARY F&L

**Select Department:** 51707 - HP Radiation Therapy PGM  
**Select Fund Type:** U021 - University Unrestricted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY13 YTD Actual (Dec)</th>
<th>FY13 Budget</th>
<th>FY14 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Patient Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts/Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>185,142</td>
<td>377,392</td>
<td>397,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Services/Other</td>
<td>(56,609)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(119,146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>128,533</td>
<td>377,392</td>
<td>278,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>119,768</td>
<td>242,595</td>
<td>252,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td>8,182</td>
<td>6,484</td>
<td>13,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Cost Allocation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>113,218</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expense</strong></td>
<td>127,950</td>
<td>362,297</td>
<td>265,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income/Loss</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>15,095</td>
<td>12,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,075</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income/Loss Before Foundation</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>60,770</td>
<td>12,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Consolidation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income/Loss After Foundation</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>60,770</td>
<td>12,684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>UNIVERSE GENERAL FUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>AN.RADIATION THERAPY FGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi Obj</td>
<td>Prg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-4231-000-0000-000</td>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE TUITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-4232-000-0000-000</td>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE TUIT-ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-4261-000-0000-000</td>
<td>DEFERRED TUITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>TUITION (4200-4299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-4894-000-0000-000</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY TRANSFERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-4899-000-0000-000</td>
<td>PRIOR YEAR CARVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>OTHER REVENUE (4800-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-5141-000-0000-000</td>
<td>REGULAR PAY FACULTY(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-5149-000-0000-000</td>
<td>FACULTY OPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-5175-957-0000-000</td>
<td>PAYROLL Adjustments-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>SALARIES AND WAGES (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-5301-000-0000-000</td>
<td>OFFICE &amp; ADMINISTRAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-5501-000-0000-000</td>
<td>SPEAKER FEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-5542-000-0000-000</td>
<td>DUPLICATING &amp; COPYING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>PURCHASED SERVICES (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-6311-000-0000-000</td>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-6326-000-0000-000</td>
<td>HOSTING GROUPS &amp; GUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-6332-000-0000-000</td>
<td>TUITION/FEES PRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>OTHER &amp; CAPITAL EXPENSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-6599-000-0000-000</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROSS MARGIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Outcomes/Tools</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Time/Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Students will be clinically competent | 1a. Students will identify and correctly use all patient set-up aids. | 1. Juniors final evaluation for 4th quarter clinical rotation question #1 ≥ 3 (4.0 scale)  
2. Final clinic performance evaluation juniors ≥ 80% | Annually, Clinical Coordinator (CC) |
| | 1b. Students will verify physician prescription prior to initiating treatment. | 1. Seniors 4th quarter oral testing score ≥ 80%  
2. Seniors final linac evaluation question #7 ≥ 3 (4.0 scale) | Annually, CC |
| 2. Students will demonstrate effective communication skills. | 2a. Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills. | 1. Grade on radiation oncology presentation 2nd quarter ≥ 85%  
2. Oral clinic exam 4th quarter ≥ 80% | Annually, Program Director (PD)  
Annually, CC |
| | 2b. Students will demonstrate effective written communication skills. | 1. Grade on final senior research paper ≥ 80%  
2. Grade on case study 3rd quarter radiation oncology ≥ 80% | Annually, CC  
Annually, PD |
| 3. Students will model professionalism. | 3a. Students will work effectively as a team member. | 1. Seniors 4th quarter final evaluation question #13 ≥ 85%  
2. Grade on team project in Physics IV ≥85% | Annually, CC  
Annually, PD |
| | 3b. Students will determine the importance of continued professional development. | 1. Students will participate in the evaluation of grade school student science fair projects with Dr. William Cameron.  
2. Students will write a final paper that reflects on their journal documenting the clinical experience of two years. | Annually, PD  
Annually, CC |
| 4. Students will develop critical thinking skills | 4a. Students will assess a treatment plan and select appropriate treatment. | 1. Seniors final linac evaluation question #2 ≥ 3 (4.0 scale).  
2. Grade on final dosimetry project ≥ 3 (4.0 scale) | Annually, CC  
Annually, PD |
| | 4b. Students will recognize discrepancies in a treatment prescription. | 1. Students will receive a grade ≥ 85% on the midterm for Dosimetry (RDTT 413)  
2. Students will receive a grade ≥ 85% on their QA project. | Annually, PD |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Actual Outcome</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduates will possess communication, problem solving and critical thinking skills</td>
<td>1a. A Grade ≥ 80% on their radiobiology paper</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>These grades have been above benchmark for several years. We feel confident the students are obtaining a good grasp on radiobiology will be reevaluating this benchmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b. 90% of senior students will receive an evaluation ≥ good by the clinical instructor for interpersonal skills</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>The students have consistently scored above average on this section of the evaluation for several cycles. Next year this benchmark will be changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1c. 90% of students will receive an average score ≥ 80% on their oral clinic exams each year demonstrating critical thinking &amp; problem solving skills</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>Although the students seem to meet this benchmark, we will continue to monitor due to the importance of these skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Program will graduate baccalaureate entry-level radiation therapists to meet the growing needs of the radiation therapy community and the patients they serve.</td>
<td>2a. 90% of students will receive an overall score of 3 or higher demonstrating clinical competence</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>Students achieved this benchmark, however in the past this has been a critical indicator of possible problems. Although we may alter this benchmark, the clinical coordinator will continue to monitors this each quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b. 90% of responding employers will indicate yes on satisfaction with clinical competence</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>For respondents, satisfaction seems to be holding steady. The clinical instructors workshops have helped us identify areas where potential employers have had concerns early and we have been able to rectify most problems prior to employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2c. Job placement rate of 80% within 6 months of graduation over the past 5 years</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>This area is a concern with the economic instability in the local and national markets. I have discussed this with university administration and they do not wish to decrease student enrollment at this time. Many of the students are not willing to leave the area to secure employment due to family obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2d. 75% of students matriculating into the program will graduate over the past 5 years</td>
<td>5 year average 93%; 2011 100%</td>
<td>Student dismissal tends to be a greater issue than student withdrawal. Dismissal has been directly related to either didactic or clinical performance. The program has worked extensively with students who did not meet course requirements to remediate. Of those not completing within the prescribed curriculum, 2/3 required remediation and graduated upon successful completion of the program. The other was due to student death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduates will be prepared for the national certification exam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e. 90% of responding students will indicate yes on adequate preparation</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Students seem confident in their ability upon finishing the program. We will reevaluate whether to continue with this monitor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3a. ARRT pass rate ≥ 90% over the past 5 years | 85% | This rate declined significantly with the class of 2011. I was advised by current employers that this was due to overconfidence prior to taking the exam. We will be exploring the possibility of adding a board preparation course to the curriculum. At this time we do designate some class time to board preparation, but this component is not graded. |

| 3b. ARRT average score ≥ national average over past 5 years | Above average for 3 of the last 5 years/well below in 2009 | 2011 OHSU 83.9/National 83.2 Again, we will consider adding a board preparation course since the students seem to be falling behind the national average. With a small cohort, I do not want to change the curriculum without adequate data. |

| 3c. 80% positive response Question #1 6-month Graduate Survey over the past 5 years | 100% | Of respondents the students felt prepared for the boards, however, the pass rate does not reflect this. This could be due to the fact that the respondents passed the boards with a score they felt was reflective of the time and effort they put into their studies. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Graduates will value the importance of continuing their professional growth and development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. 80% positive response on Questions #7 Employer Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4b. 80% student participation at annual OSRT Radiation Therapy Conference | 100% | Continue involving students in helping with the conference. We may want to change this benchmark to something more reliable. |
Academic Program Review Rubric

Program Name: Radiation Therapy

Review Date: 11/5/2013

APR Committee Reviewers: Joanne Noone, Margaret Scharf, Karla Kent

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: The program engages in a self-evaluation process annually.

Recommendation: Provide more detail about stakeholder engagement and the feedback process.

2. OVERVIEW

☐ 1. Early Development:
Overview is incomplete; program has not created MPG 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:

Commendation: The Program of Study provides a strong sense of what students will accomplish over the course of the program.

Recommendation: Demonstrate more specific alignment with OHSU's Mission, Purpose and Goals; the JRCERT goals are very generic and the committee wanted the program to have more specific goals in addition to these.

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:
Commendation: There appear to be lots of opportunities for faculty development and to ensure that faculty remain current with industry standards.

Recommendation: Provide more faculty credentialing information to give reviewers a more complete picture of the program's faculty resources; provide information about faculty trends to better evaluate the sustainability of the program from a faculty perspective.

Overall the review committee thought this section was too sparse.

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:
Commendation: Good presentation of data and information; graduation rate is excellent; pass rates following 2009 demonstrate commitment to improve student outcomes

Recommendation: The section needed more information/analysis regarding student attrition, diversity (beyond race/ethnicity), and curriculum alignment with current practices in the discipline.

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:** Program appears to be small and self-sufficient

**Recommendation:** Committee suggests program conduct a 5-year financial plan and identify potential revenue streams; analyze faculty salary and size needs; program growth potential; and demand. Program security was difficult for the committee to assess.

### 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 action plan and outcomes; tables were easy to read and provided a lot of relevant data; clear demonstration of work toward program improvement.

**Recommendation:** Outcomes could be more measurable, for example how will the program measure, ‘develop critical thinking skills and values’?

### 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 no 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: Evidence of strong curriculum based on students being accepted into advanced programs following graduation.

Recommendation: This section was vague, and mentioned things that were not addressed earlier in the report and raised concerns: stability of instructors with patient care or physics; a need to strengthen the basic science curriculum; and building a relationship with the Radiation Medicine department.

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): 13

Does the sub-committee believe the program meets OHSU academic standards?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Additional comments for Faculty Senate consideration.

Overall, the committee believes the program is high quality and doing more than was demonstrated in the APR. There needed to be more information summarizing the program to help inform/educate the committee about what the program does, for example, where is the program situated in the university, what kinds of issues have they faced (if
The report needed to be more analytical. The benchmarking and student section was the strongest section in the report and provided the most information for the committee about the program. The sections on faculty and alignment with the university mission, purpose and goals needed the most work.