

## Team Report Appendix

Institution: Western University  
of Health Sciences

### OFF-CAMPUS SITE

Kind of Visit: Special Visit

Date: March 5-8

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed<sup>1</sup>. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

#### 1. Site Name and Address

Western University of Health Sciences  
College of Osteopathic Medicine of the Pacific- Northwest  
200 Mullins Dr.  
Lebanon, OR 97355  
(541) 259-0200

#### 2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a regional center or off-campus site by WASC)

COMP-Northwest is the second medical school campus of the College of Osteopathic Medicine of the Pacific (COMP), the medical school of WUHS. COMP-NW operates from a newly constructed 55,000-square-foot Medical Education and Research Building on the Samaritan Health Sciences Campus in Lebanon Oregon. The building was built in partnership with the Samaritan Health System, owner of the building which is leased by WUHS. This latest expansion of WUHS continues the commitment of COMP to medical education in the Northwest, which was enhanced with the development of the Northwest Track in previous years, providing medical students with clinical externships in the region.

COMP-Northwest enrolled its first 100 medical students in 2011 and a second class in 2012. This is the only program currently offered on this site. Additional faculty members were hired to teach on this campus, though faculty members on both campuses teach across the two campuses. This is an expansion site of COMP in Pomona, and as such follows the same established curriculum developed at COMP during the past 35 years. Two members of the team met with the Interim Dean of COMP and nine other faculty and staff for the program on the Pomona campus and through a videoconference connection between the two campuses. Interviews with the start-up team indicated that the University has provided resources fairly comparable to the home campus for students on the new campus. University support services have hired staff to work on the Lebanon campus and interact with them weekly by phone or teleconference. Faculty travel regularly across the two campuses and teach their areas of expertise at both. The Dean and her staff are responsible for both campuses and operate out of both locations.

Interviews with the Provost indicate that though the implementation of the new campus has not been without some bumps in the road, classes are well underway and students appears to be receiving a comparable education on the two campuses. Effective use of technology and the availability of an experienced faculty on the Pomona campus have been strengths upon which the program can draw. The team concurs that a site visit should be made to this campus during the next regular CPR and EE visits.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

### 3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

No special materials were reviewed on this program with the exception of the letter from the Commission regarding the Substantive Change proposal at the time of initial approval. Two team members interviewed the Dean and a few faculty and staff on the Pomona site concurrent with a teleconference with approximately ten staff and faculty on the Lebanon campus. Discussion indicated students are receiving the same curriculum, being taught by the same faculty, have access to similar facilities, and are being served by the same student services support staff. Planning for the program seems to have been thoughtful and implementation has gone fairly smoothly. The completion of the new building and ongoing completion of research labs for faculty have provided adequate facilities for the operation.

### Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	Complete fit with mission.	None
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Good connections with the aid of technology and frequent travel by faculty and staff between campuses.	Less clear. Will need evaluation.
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	New facilities have been built an designed to meet needs of the program and faculty.  The Provost provides oversight.	Evaluation will be needed.  Develop of research labs for faculty was somewhat slower than desirable.
<i>Student Support Services.</i> <i>CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Student Services staff at Pomona have bridged the gap to provide comparable services on this campus.	Evaluation will be needed.
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty members are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Same faculty across the two sites. Technology used for meetings.	Current collaborative efforts appear to be working but assessment will be needed over time.
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]	Same courses, academic requirements, and faculty.	Evaluation needed over time
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	Not yet available. Retention of first class appears to be very good.	Evaluation needed over time

<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>The program will evaluate students with the same tools as the Pomona campus: exams, assignments, clinical evaluations, and clinical simulations.</p>	<p>Evaluation needed over time.</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes. CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>Same processes to be used across both campuses.</p>	<p>Evaluation needed over time.</p>