



October 28, 2014

Paula Gubrud-Howe, Sr. Associate Dean
Undergraduate Nursing Programs
School of Nursing

**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 Dr. Gubrud-Howe 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 Undergraduate Nursing 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 two members of the Academic Program Review Committee in May 2014. The program was given the opportunity to comment on the review prior to the report going to the Senate. The following commendations and recommendations summarize the Review Team's findings.

Commendations: The Review Team commends the Undergraduate Nursing program in the following areas: (1) evidence of strong stakeholder input, and clear understanding of the program's Mission, Purpose, Goals (MPGs); (2) good use of reflective practice to identify program needs and resource constraints; (3) responsive to workforce and community needs; and (4) utilizes curriculum mapping and development for benefit of student learning.

Recommendation: The Review Team recommends the following: (1) place more emphasis on school-wide research to help attract Ph.D. trained faculty; and (2) look into developing alternative funding streams and expansion of the grant portfolio.

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: Description of stakeholder input is impressive

Recommendation: Given the nature of the program, would be helpful to describe how the program fit into the overall workforce need and climate in Oregon.

Part 2. Overview

Rating: Highly Developed. Program has established its own set of unique clearly and concisely stated MPGs that are aligned with university MPGs.

Commendation: Clear understanding of the program's mission and goals and how it fits within the context of the University.

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 is clearly thinking about qualified faculty and clinical instructors, program needs, and salary balance, all within the context of resource constraints and a shortage/lack of access to doctoral prepared faculty.

Recommendation: Support a school wide emphasis on research in order to be more attractive to Ph.D. trained faculty.

Comment: Lack of overall detail in this section.

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: Enrollment, degree pathways (OCNE, RNBS), degree production and job placement illustrate responsiveness to community needs and program strength.

Recommendation: No recommendations.

Part 5. Other Resources

Rating: 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.

Commendation: Clear understanding of program's resource needs and what is available.

Recommendation: No recommendations.

Comment: Review Team would be interested to learn if there is a plan to increase funding in the future.

Part 6. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Rating: Developing. Program level student learning outcomes are clear and measurable; uses direct measures of learning; courses listed and linked to Student Learning Outcomes (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.

Commendation: Curriculum mapping efforts and curriculum development are impressive.

Recommendation: No recommendations.

Part 7. Other Information (Optional for Programs)

Rating: N/A

Part 8. Analysis and Conclusions

Rating: 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.

Commendation: Program demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness to incoming student needs.

Recommendation: Look at other areas to develop funding streams and expand the grant portfolio. Investigate rural network as a potential funding source for development. Strong leadership has been inconsistent for the last several years and could pose challenges to the program. Currently, the program seems to be thriving, despite this challenge.

Part 9. Response to Previous Program Reviews

N/A

Part 10. Overall Recommendations

Overall, the committee was very impressed with the program and report. The Undergraduate Nursing program is described as well organized, analytic, and well-presented. The report is very data driven, and the survey/feedback improvement CQI is very impressive across the school. Innovations at the program and course level were well articulated. The program has clearly been responsive to challenges—financial, distance, education, and leadership. The committee recognized that workforce needs have impacted the demand for this program. There was additional thinking centered on whether or not the report accurately addressed what is happening on the ground, given the leadership challenges faced by the School of Nursing.

The Academic Program Review Committee determined that the Undergraduate Nursing 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

Susan Bakewell-Sachs, Ph.D., R.N., P.N.P.-B.C., F.A.A.N., Dean & Vice President for Nursing Affairs