**Department of Public Health (MPH Degree Program)**

**1. What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?**

**Outcome 1.1:** Graduates will be able to interpret quantitative and qualitative data.

**Outcome 1.2:** Graduates will be able to describe the characteristics of a population-based health problem.

**Outcome 2.1:** Graduates will be able to develop plans to implement policies and programs.

**Outcome 3.1:** Graduates will be able to interpret demographic, statistical, programmatic, and scientific information for use by professional and lay audiences.

**Outcome 4.1:** Graduates will be able to incorporate strategies for interacting with persons from diverse backgrounds.

**2. What instruments did you use to assess them?**

**Outcome 1.1**

**Instrument:** In PH 202, students participated in a mini research project involving cooperation within a group of 2-3 members. Students completed 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, and a discussion pertaining to the strengths and limitations associated with the project; and an oral presentation to the class. Projects were evaluated using two rubrics: one for the written component and one for the oral presentation component.

**Benchmark:** A score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section, is considered passing. A score of 12 or higher on the oral communication rubric, with a score of 3 or greater for each section, is considered passing. At least 80% of the students are expected to meet this learning outcome. This will be measured every other year. See Appendix A for the written communication rubric. See Appendix B for the oral communication rubric.

**Outcome 1.2**

**Instrument:** In PH 225A, students took an exam with embedded questions related to this learning outcome.

**Benchmark:** At least 80% of the students will score 80% or higher on the embedded questions specific to this learning outcome. This will be measured every year.

**Outcome 2.1**

**Instrument:** In PH 225A, studentsconducted a needs assessment, and based on the results, developed a written proposal for a program that included planned strategies for implementation and evaluation.

**Benchmark:** A score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section, is considered passing. At least 80% of the students are expected to meet this learning outcome. This will be measured every other year. See Appendix A for the written communication rubric.

**Outcome 3.1**

**Instrument:** In PH 209, students took an exam with embedded questions related to this learning outcome.

**Benchmark:** At least 80% of the students will score 80% or higher on the embedded questions specific to this learning outcome. This will be measured every year.

**Outcome 4.1**

**Instrument:** In PH 225A, students were assigned a chapter from a cultural competency textbook to present to the class. Presentations had to have some type of class interaction, and had to include a discussion pertaining to possible strategies that can be utilized within various backgrounds. Oral presentations were evaluated using an oral presentation rubric.

**Benchmark:**A score of 12 or higher on the oral communication rubric, with a score of 3 or greater for each section, is considered passing. At least 80% of the students are expected to meet this learning outcome. This will be measured every other year. See Appendix B for the oral communication rubric.

**3. What did you discover from these data?**

**Outcome 1.1:** For PH 202, out of 9 students, 3 (33.3%) earned a score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section. Also for PH 202, out of 9 students, 3 (33.3%) earned a score of 12 or higher on the oral communication rubric, with a score of 3 or greater for each section.

**Outcome 1.2:** For PH 225A, out of 11 students, 8 (72.7%) earned a score of 80% or higher on the embedded questions related to this learning outcome.

**Outcome 2.1:** For PH 225A, out of 11 students, 11 (100%) earned a score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section.

**Outcome 3.1:** For PH 209, out of 11 students, 11 (100%) earned a score of 80% or higher on the embedded questions specific to this learning outcome.

**Outcome 4.1:** For PH 225A, out of 11 students, 11 (100%) earned a score of 12 or higher on the oral communication rubric, with a score of 3 or greater for each section.

**4. What changes did you make as a result of the findings?**

The following changes will be made to address Outcome 1.1: the syllabus will now include information pertaining to resources offered through the Graduate Writing Studio on campus to assist in strengthening writing skills; additional information on what constitutes a “passing” written and oral assignment will be discussed; and an additional question/answer session will be provided before these assignments are due. The following changes will be made to address Outcome 1.2: supplemental material describing the embedded questions will be provided; group discussions regarding the embedded questions will be created to reinforce the material; and a discussion/review session will be provided before the exam.

**5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-17 academic year?**

**Outcome 1.1**: Graduates will be able to interpret quantitative and qualitative data.

**Instrument:** In PH 298/PH 299 (Culminating Experience), students will be refining chapters 1-3 of their project/thesis and completing chapters 4-5. The project/thesis will be evaluated using a written communication rubric.

**Benchmark:** A score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section, will be considered passing. At least 80% of the students are expected to meet this learning outcome. This will be measured every other year. See Appendix A for the written communication rubric.

**Outcome 1.2:** Graduates will be able to describe the characteristics of a population-based health problem.

**Instrument:** In PH 225A, students will take an exam with embedded questions related to this learning outcome.

**Benchmark:** At least 80% of the students will score 80% or higher on the embedded questions specific to this learning outcome. This will be measured every year.

**Outcome 3.1:** Graduates will be able to interpret demographic, statistical, programmatic, and scientific information for use by professional and lay audiences.

**Instrument:** In PH 209, students will take an exam with embedded questions related to this learning outcome. In PH 298/PH 299 (Culminating Experience), students will be refining chapters 1-3 of their project/thesis and completing chapters 4-5. The project/thesis will be evaluated using a written communication rubric.

**Benchmark:** For PH 209: At least 80% of the students will score 80% or higher on the embedded questions specific to this learning outcome. This will be measured every year. For PH 298/299: A score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section, will be considered passing. At least 80% of the students are expected to meet this learning outcome. This will be measured every other year. See Appendix A for the written communication rubric.

**Outcome 5.1:** Graduates will be able to conduct a comprehensive review of the scientific evidence related to a public health issue, concern, or intervention.

**Instrument:** In PH 280, students develop the first three chapters of their thesis or project. Chapter 2 is a review of the related literature. These proposals will be evaluated using a written communication rubric. In PH 298/PH 299 (Culminating Experience), students will be refining chapters 1-3 of their project/thesis and completing chapters 4-5. The project/thesis will also be evaluated using a written communication rubric.

**Benchmark:** A score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section, will be considered passing. At least 80% of the students are expected to meet this learning outcome. This will be measured every other year. See Appendix A for the written communication rubric.

**Outcome 5.2:** Graduates will be able to incorporate the Core Public Health Functions and Ten Essential Services of Public Health into the practice of the public health sciences.

**Instrument:** In PH 285F, students will complete a written paper consisting of the following three parts: a discussion describing how their goals and objectives were met via the internship; a discussion describing what they did during the internship, including copies of any products they created; a discussion on how their internship provided experiences related to the Core Public Health Functions and the Ten Essential Services of Public Health; and a discussion pertaining to personal development opportunities for the public health workforce. This paper will be evaluated using a written communication rubric.

**Benchmark:** A score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section, will be considered passing. At least 80% of the students are expected to meet this learning outcome. This will be measured every other year. See Appendix A for the written communication rubric.

**Outcome 6.1:** Graduates will be able to prepare proposals for funding from external sources.

**Instrument:** In PH 213, students develop a proposal for funding. This proposal consists of the following components: program need; theoretical framework; goals and objectives; program methodology; program evaluation; and a budget. This proposal will be evaluated using the written communication rubric.

**Benchmark:** A score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section, will be considered passing. At least 80% of the students are expected to meet this learning outcome. This will be measured every other year. See Appendix A for the written communication rubric.

**Outcome 7.1:** Graduates will be able to establish mentoring, peer advising, coaching or other personal development opportunities for the public health workforce.

**Instrument:** In PH 285F, students will complete a written paper consisting of the following four parts: a discussion describing how their goals and objectives were met via the internship; a discussion describing what they did during the internship, including copies of any products they created; a discussion on how their internship provided experiences related to the Core Public Health Functions and the Ten Essential Services of Public Health; and a discussion pertaining to personal development opportunities for the public health workforce. This paper will be evaluated using a written communication rubric.

**Benchmark:** A score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, with a score of 4 or greater for each section, will be considered passing. At least 80% of the students are expected to meet this learning outcome. This will be measured every other year. See Appendix A for the written communication rubric.

**6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**

The MPH action plan consisted of 7 items. The progress made to date on each of these items is indicated below.

**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, these 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.

**Item #2 (Curriculum-Online Course Development)**

* Two MPH courses (PH 206 and PH 213) are currently being converted into online courses through the Graduate Net Initiative in an effort to assist in remaining competitive with other master-level programs offering courses and programs online. These courses will be implemented during the next academic year.

**Item #3 (Assessment)**

* The SOAP for the MPH program was revised to reflect the integration of the core competencies during the last academic year. A plan to implement consistent methods to collect accurate data from students, alumni, and employers was also created and implemented.

**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 (CEPH) 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.

**Appendix A**

**Written Communication Rubric**

Written Communication Rubric

Written assignments will be evaluated using the following scoring rubric. Students will be scored on a basis of 1 (beginning) to 5 (exemplary) in three areas: style and format, mechanics, and content and organization. A score of 12 or higher on the rubric with a score of 4 or greater for each section is considered passing.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Beginning | Developing | Satisfactory | Accomplished | Exemplary |
| Style and Format | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Mechanics | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content and Organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Total Score |  / 15 |

I. Style and Format:

**5-Exemplary**: In addition to meeting the requirement for a "4," the paper consistently models the language and conventions used in the scholarly/ professional literature appropriate to the student’s discipline.

**4-Accomplished**: While there may be minor errors, conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Demonstrates thoroughness and competence in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper.

**3-Satistfactory**: The style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. There is selection of less suitable scientific sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information, etc.). Weak transitions and apparent logic gaps occur between topics being addressed. The style may be difficult to follow so as to detract from the comprehensibility of the paper.

**2-Developing**: Paper lacks consistency of style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty referring back to cited sources. Significant revisions would contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper.

**1-Beginning**: The stylistic conventions of scientific writing are not followed. Fails to demonstrate thoroughness and competence in documentation. Inappropriate style and format make reading and comprehensibility problematic.

II. Mechanics:

**5-Exemplary**: In addition to meeting the requirements for a "4," the paper is essentially error free in terms of mechanics. Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. Transitions effectively establish a sound scholarly argument and aid the reader in following the writer's logic.

**4-Accomplished**: While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures such as subheadings are effectively used which help the reader move from one point to another.

**3-Satisfactory**: Grammatical conventions are generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. Effective scientific vocabulary is used.

**2-Developing**: Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is some confusion in the proper use of scientific terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point; appropriate transitions are lacking.

**1-Beginning**: Paper contains numerous errors in spelling, grammar, and/or sentence structure, which make following the logic of the paper extremely difficult. Scientific terms are misused.

III. Content and Organization:

**5-Exemplary**: In addition to meeting the requirements for a "4," excels in the organization and representation of ideas related to the topic. Raises important issues or ideas, which may not have been represented in the literature cited. Would serve as a good basis for further research on the topic.

**4-Accomplished**: Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is carefully focused. Clearly outlines the major points related to the topic; ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the reader's attention. Does a credible job summarizing related literature. General ideas are expanded upon in a logical manner thereby extending the significance of the work presented beyond a re-statement of known ideas.

**3-Satisfactory**: Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Certain logical connections or inclusion of specific topics related to the student’s area of study may be omitted. Ideas and concepts are generally satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic being presented such that the relationship to the student’s area of study is obvious.

**2-Developing**: The paper is logically and thematically coherent, but is lacking in substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.

**1-Beginning**: Analysis of existing scholarly / professional literature on the topic is inadequate. Content is poorly focused and lacks organization. The reader is left with little information about or little understanding of the paper's topic.

**Appendix B**

**Oral Communication Rubric**

# Oral Communication Rubric

Oral presentations will be evaluated using the following scoring rubric. Students will be scored on a scale from 1 to 5 in four areas: delivery, content, organization, and introduction/conclusion. A score of 16 or higher on the rubric with a score of 4 or greater for each section is considered passing.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Beginning  | Developing | Satisfactory | Accomplished | Exemplary |
| Delivery  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Organization  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Introduction/Conclusion  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Total Score |  / 20 |

**Delivery**

 **5.** The speaker’s voice is fluent, understandable, and engaging. The speaker maintains *consistent* eye contact with limited reference to notes. The speaker enhances his or her delivery with effective gestures. The presentation is polished and confident.

 **4.** The speaker’s voice is fluent and understandable. His or her tone is generally varied. The speaker may occasionally refer to notes, but (s)he generally makes eye contact with the audience.

 **3.** The speaker’s voice is understandable and reasonably fluent. (S)he attempts extemporaneous delivery, rather than reading notes or a manuscript.

 **2.** The speaker’s voice is understandable, but the speaker is tentative or reads the presentation from notes or a manuscript. At times, the delivery contains verbal tics and fillers that distract from the presentation.

 **1.** The speaker’s voice is difficult to understand, or the speaker is so uncomfortable when presenting that the vocal or nonverbal delivery detracts from the presentation.

**Content**

 **5.** The content is excellent for the speaker’s field and the presentation context. (S)he *regularly* cites credible research sources to support claims. Supporting materials significantly add to the understandability or persuasiveness of the presentation.

 **4.** The content is good for the speaker’s field and the presentation context. (S)he cites a number of credible research sources to support claims. Supporting materials often add to the understandability or persuasiveness of the presentation.

 **3.** The content is appropriate for the speaker’s field and the presentation context. The speaker makes reference to a reasonable number of research sources to support claims. The presentation includes supporting materials that relate to the main ideas being developed.

 **2.** Some content is relevant to the speaker’s field and presentation context, but other content is inaccurate or inappropriate. The speaker refers to some research sources, but also makes assertions without needed supporting evidence. The main ideas are not supported by sufficient supporting materials.

 **1.** The content contains significant errors or is inappropriate for the presentation context. The speaker does not cite research sources. If supporting materials are used, they do not relate to the speaker’s main ideas.

**Organization**

 **5.** The presentation is clearly divided into an introduction, body, and conclusion. Main points can be easily identified and they are *consistently* supported with relevant ideas. The speaker consistently uses transitions, previews**,** summaries, or signposts so that listeners can easily follow the development of the topic.

 **4.** The presentation is clearly divided into an introduction, body, and conclusion. Main points can be easily identified and they are generally supported with relevant ideas. The speaker generally uses transitions, previews, summaries, or signposts so that listeners can follow the development of the topic.

 **3.** The speech is divided into an introduction, body, and conclusion. The body of the speech is divided into explicit main points, supported with relevant content.

 **2.** The speaker appears to have an introduction, body, and conclusion, along with main points. At times during the presentation, it is difficult to identify the speaker’s organizational structure or it is unclear how the topic is being developed.

 **1.** The speech does not have a clear division into an introduction, body, and conclusion. Main ideas are difficult to identify and it is generally unclear how the topic is being developed.

**Introduction and Conclusion**

 **5.** The introduction gains audience attention effectively, clearly indicates the thesis or topic statement, relates the topic to the audience, and establishes speaker credibility. The conclusion clearly summarizes the main ideas and wraps up the presentation in a manner that leaves a lasting impression.

 **4.** The introduction gains audience attention effectively, clearly indicates the thesis or topic statement, and relates the topic to the audience. The conclusion clearly summarizes the main ideas and effectively wraps up the presentation.

 **3.** The introduction begins with an attempt to gain the audience’s attention and the thesis or topic is explicit. The conclusion summarizes the main ideas and wraps up the speech.

 **2.** The introduction provides some indication of the speaker’s topic or thesis. The speaker ends with a conclusion, although it does not clearly summarize main ideas and wrap up the presentation.

 **1.** The beginning of the presentation does not gain audience attention and clearly express the topic or thesis statement. The ending of the presentation neither summarize main ideas nor wraps up the presentation.