**Annual Assessment Report for 2018-2019 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2018-2019 AY will be due September 30th 2019 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Melissa Jordine (mjordine@mail.fresnostate.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. Furthermore, only report on two or three student learning outcomes even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: Public Health Degree: MPH

Assessment Coordinator: The Department Chair works with the MPH Director on assessment. Assessment activities are also discussed in faculty meetings.

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.

**Outcome 1.2:** Describe the characteristics of a population-based health problem.

**Outcome 5.1:** Conduct a comprehensive review of the scientific evidence related to a public health issue, concern, or intervention.

\*Please note: PH 225A (Foundations of Health Promotion I) was used to assess Outcome 1.2. PH 280 (Research Methods) was used to assess Outcome 5.1.

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? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

For Outcome 1.2, students took an exam with questions related to population-based health problems. For instance, one of the exam questions asked the students to use a public health model to assess the problem of diabetes among the adult Hispanic population. The exam was worth 50 points. Please see attached exam.

For Outcome 5.1, students were responsible for writing a research proposal consisting of a draft of chapters 1-3 of their thesis or project. Chapter one contained an introduction to the topic, chapter 2 was a literature review of the topic, and chapter 3 contained a description of how the project was to be conducted (methodology). The proposal was worth 90 points and the students were evaluated on the following criteria: style and format; mechanics; and content and organization. Please see attached rubric.

**Benchmark:**

For Outcome 1.2, we expected 80% of students to achieve a score of 85% or higher on the exam. The percent indicated above was not included in the SOAP document, but determined through consultation with faculty in the department. The department is revising the SOAP document, and percentages will be included in future versions.

For Outcome 5.1, we expected 80% of students to achieve a score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric. A score of 3 or higher was also required in each section. The percent indicated above was not included in the SOAP document, but determined through consultation with faculty in the department. The department is revising the SOAP document, and percentages will be included in future versions.

1. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient.

\*For Outcome 1.2, out of 21 students, 13 (61.9%) achieved a score of 85% or higher on the exam.

\*\*For Outcome 5.1, out of 4 students, 3 (75.0%) achieved a score of 12 or higher on the written communication rubric, and a score of 3 or greater in each section.

\*Please note: cohort sizes are small each academic year, so the sample size discussed above reflects students across three cohorts.

\*\*Please note: this cohort was unusually small, therefore; this outcome will be assessed again in future years.

1. What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?

For Outcome 1.2, the faculty will review in greater detail concepts related to population health problems. Additionally, the faculty will provide additional examples related to the application of public health models to population health problems.

For Outcome 5.1, although the students scored reasonably high, the rubric will be reviewed to determine its appropriateness for measuring this outcome. Faculty have been concerned about students’ written communication skills for a number of years. To assist in addressing this concern, the graduate writing requirement was moved to the first semester in the program so problems can be identified and addressed earlier. Additionally, the College of Health and Human Services has created a writing task force, and the Department of Public Health has faculty representation on this task force.

1. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in last year’s assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.

In last year’s assessment report, we recommended additional review periods on oral communication skills. We also recommended a revision to our exit survey. These recommendations are in progress as our accrediting body recently revised our program competencies. The MPH faculty are in the process of revising the course syllabi to include these competencies. Additionally, the exit survey items are being assessed to determine how the new competencies can be reflected in these items.

1. What assessment activities will you be conducting during the next academic year?

**Direct Measure**

**Outcome 5.1:** Conduct a comprehensive review of the scientific evidence related to a public health issue, concern, or intervention.

**Indirect Measures**

**Employer Survey:** an employer survey will be administered to employers to assess graduate students’ competence in the field of public health.

**Intern Survey:** an intern survey will be administered to interns to assess their internship experience.

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

The MPH action plan consisted of the following 7 items:

**Item #1 (Curriculum-Competencies)**

* The Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), the accrediting body for the MPH program, identified new competencies for all MPH programs during the 2016-2017 academic year. During the 2016 – 2017 academic year, the faculty met to match competencies to the course syllabi. A discussion pertaining to the how the assignments addressed each competency was completed during a MPH Faculty Retreat held in November of 2018. CEPH reviewed these syllabi and some minor revisions were needed. It is expected that these revisions will be completed by the end of the fall 2019 semester. Future SOAP documents will reflect these changes.

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

* 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. PH 206 was offered online for the first time in the fall 2017 semester, PH 213 was offered online for the first time in the spring 2019 semester, and PH 225A was offered online for the first time in the fall 2019 semester. Additionally, it is anticipated that PH 280 will be offered in an online format during the 2020-2021 academic year.

**Item #3 (Assessment)**

* The SOAP for the MPH program was revised to reflect the integration of the core competencies in previous academic years. An additional revision is in progress 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 and now consist of class meetings, and this has resulted in higher graduation rates. Additionally, the MPH faculty are exploring additional culminating experience options with CEPH. Progress still needs to be made on this action item in order to reach the required graduation rate of 70% as indicated by CEPH.

**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.