



October 28, 2014

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

### 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

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 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 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. The 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