**Major Assessment Report (MPH Program)**

Please download this document and provide a response to each question in the appropriate section. Send your assessment reports to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Melissa Jordine ([mjordine@csufresno.edu](mailto:mjordine@csufresno.edu)). (Reports can be sent to Dr. Jordine via campus mail to mailstop SS 21). Please complete a separate report for each B.A/B.S. and M.A/M.S. program offered by the department.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section. Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.   SLO: **Outcome 1.2:** Graduates will be able to describe the characteristics of a population-based health problem.  SLO: **Outcome 5.1:** Graduates will be able to conduct a comprehensive review of the scientific evidence related to a public health issues, concern, or intervention. |
| 1. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be “On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric.”   For Outcome 1.2, students took an exam in PH 225A with embedded questions related to this learning outcome. The questions on the exam were specific to population-based problems, and included short-answer/essay questions.  **Benchmark:** For this outcome, we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score 80% or above on the exam.  For Outcome 5.1, students completed a written assignment in PH 210, which served to fulfill the graduate writing requirement. This is a new change in the MPH program as the writing requirement was previously in PH 280. This change provides students with feedback earlier in their academic career (year one instead of year 2), and will be included in future SOAP reports. The PH 210 paper had the following components: statement of the problem; approach to problem-identification of empirical issues in policy debate; literature review; critical review of empirical literature; discussion of implications for policy and research/practice; and specific recommendations for next steps in research and policy analysis.    **Benchmark:** For this outcome, students must earn a score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, including a score of 4 or greater on each of the three sections, to pass this requirement (please see attached rubric). For this outcome, we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a passing score on the rubric. |
| 1. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).   For Outcome 1.2, out of 30 students, 20 (66.7%) achieved a score of 80% or above on the exam with embedded questions related to this learning outcome. In general, students performed better on questions asking about the different types of data gathering instruments and their role in helping to understand population-based problems. Performance was weaker on questions that required application of theory to population-based problems.  \*Note: cohort sizes are small each academic year, so the sample size discussed above reflects students across three cohorts.  For Outcome 5.1, out of 8 students, 7 (87.5%) earned a score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, including a score of 4 or greater on each of the three sections.  \*Note: this sample only includes the most recent cohort of students as this was the first year this course included this requirement. |
| 1. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.   For Outcome 1.2, the course will now include an additional review period to address how to apply theories to population-based problems. Students will also receive additional resources on this subject. The faculty will need to consider this weakness during the program revision process to ensure the proper introduction and reinforcement of this material.  For Outcome 5.1, it was determined that this requirement will continue to be evaluated in this course as it is earlier in the students’ academic career. The faculty will continue to review this data in future years. |
| 1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-2018 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.   **Direct Measure**  **Outcome 1.1:** Graduates will be able to interpret quantitative and qualitative data.  **Measures/Assessment Activities:** In PH 202, students will participate in a mini research project involving cooperation within a group of 2-3 members. Students will complete the following components as a group: project proposal consisting of a brief description of how the project will be conducted (methodology); project data to be collected and entered into SPSS; written report including results, a discussion pertaining to the strengths and limitations associated with the project; and an oral presentation to the class. Points will be evaluated using two rubrics: one for the written component and one for the oral presentation component. Only the oral presentation component will be included in the report for the 2017-2018 academic year.  **Indirect Measure**  **Exit survey:** graduating students will complete an exit survey to assess program satisfaction and competence in the field of public health. |
| 1. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”   The MPH action plan consisted of the following 7 items:  **Item #1 (Curriculum-Competencies)**   * 10 competencies from the Core Competencies for Public Health Professionals developed by the Council on Linkages between Academia and Public Health Practice were aligned to the program mission statement, curriculum, course goals/objectives, student learning outcomes, assignments, and/or learning activities. Additionally, the core competencies were mapped to the required coursework, including the culminating experiences. Assignments and/or learning activities were also identified during this process as “primary” and “reinforcing” experiences for each of the core competencies. * The Council on Education for Public Health, the accrediting body for the MPH program, identified new competencies for all MPH programs during the 2016-2017 academic year. The faculty are meeting to determine if the current curriculum reflects these new competencies, and to discuss any changes that need to be made to the curriculum. Future SOAP documents will reflect these changes.   **Item #2 (Curriculum-Online Course Development)**   * PH 206 was offered online for the first time in the fall 2017 semester, and PH 213 will be offered online during the next academic year. The faculty decided to offer some of the content-heavy curriculum online to assist in remaining competitive with other master-level programs offering courses and programs online.   **Item #3 (Assessment)**   * The SOAP for the MPH program was revised to reflect the integration of the core competencies during the last academic year. An additional revision will be needed as the competencies for this program changed during the 2016-2017 academic year.   **Item #4 (Tracking of Current Students)**   * An Excel spreadsheet was created for each cohort to track student progress to ensure course completion (including letter grades earned), and fulfillment of program requirements (i.e. classified standing, writing requirement, advancement to candidacy, fieldwork placement, thesis/project completion, etc.).   **Item #5 (Attrition/”Revolving Door”)**   * A policy was created to reduce the number of students who drop in and out of the program. This policy states that students will need to reapply to the university and to the program for a leave of absence extending more than one semester. Additionally, this policy states that readmission to the MPH program will not be allowed after more than two semesters.     **Item #6 (Graduation Rates)**   * The process to increase graduation rates began during the fall semester of 2013 with the inclusion of more restrictive admission standards. Additionally, the culminating experience courses were redesigned to consist of a more structured format (students meet regularly with their chairperson to create timelines and to assess progress), which has resulted in higher graduation rates. Progress still needs to be made on this action item in order to reach the required graduation rate of 70% as indicated by the Council on Education for Public Health accrediting body.   **Item #7 (Collaboration with UC Merced)**   * No progress was made on this action item. The MPH Director and the Department Chair are investigating additional opportunities for collaboration, including a joint MPH/PhD program or a joint MPH/MBA program.   **Additional Guidelines:** If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions. |