

January 17th 2013

To: Patricia Wren, Program Director
Department of Health Sciences

From: Graham Cassano, Chair
University Assessment Committee

Subject: Reply to Master of Public Health Program Assessment Plan Submitted 9/1/2012

Thank you for submitting the Master of Public Health Program assessment plan dated 9/1/2012. The University Assessment Committee (UAC) has reviewed and approved the plan, pending revisions. In reviewing your plan, the UAC was glad to see the following.

- The plan is well written.
- Much time and thought has been spent on this including many details.
- You have matched the program goals with those of OU (specifically in Appendix G).

Before the plan moves onto the next step, the UAC requests that you address the following revisions and provide answers to the following questions, then **submit your plan revision by January 25, 2013**

1. On page 5 of the Program Proposal, why is the delivery method listed under point 2 in the "Workforce Development Goals" section?
2. Include your mission statement on page 6, right under the "Self Study" section.
3. Include a comparison to other programs on page 11; 44 credits are required for this program with a breakdown (reference Appendix B).
4. Change the sample curriculum on page 12 to a sequential list.
5. Provide some explanation on page 13, in the "MPH Core Required Courses (20 credits)" section, as to why these particular courses were chosen as the Core.
6. Highlight the specific requirements that are referenced on page 17 in the "Accreditation" section, as this will be important in program assessment.
7. The connections between program goals and student learning objectives do not appear to be clear—a table that lists each program goal and its related student learning objectives might be helpful.
8. Please clarify how the results of measures will be used to improve student learning.
9. Please clarify to what extent faculty will participate in the planning/implementation as well as review/analysis. It sounds like at least a couple of faculty may score assessments using rubrics, but the extent of participation is not clear.
10. In Appendix G in the "Student Learning Outcomes" section, 'demonstrate an' preceding 'apply' is redundant in points 3 and 4. The parenthesis in point 1 can be eliminated. The first part of point 6 can be deleted up to just before 'apply.' Point 8 seems like it would be more appropriate as a program goal as opposed to a student learning outcome.
11. In Appendix G in the "Direct Measures of Student Learning Outcomes" section, points 1 and 2 say 'evaluator' but it's not clear if these are internal, external or both. In point 2, 'from the' after '300 hours' should be replaced by 'of.' In item 3, will the quizzes be multiple choice or short answer essay? If it is an essay then once again a common evaluation rubric should be developed and used by the evaluators.
12. In appendix G in the "Indirect Measures of Student Learning Outcomes" section, the first two measures seem to be the best ones, while the final two do not seem practical. On point

- 2, depending on the questions in the survey, this could be either a direct or an indirect measure, correct? We question the potential response rate for points 3 and 4.
13. In Appendix G in the “Public Health Practicum Course Grading Rubric” section, we recommend that you develop two different rubrics for the poster presentation and the paper. Both should be included in the updated materials. In addition, the categories for the rubric need a bit more development—the dimensions that are being assessed do not appear to be changing in a consistent manner throughout the categories.

The UAC thanks you for the verbal response to the above on January 14, 2013 that resulted in the following responses to the above points:

1. Distance learning is an important enough aspect of the Program and Department that it is included here. It is also the vehicle by which health sciences will engage in capacity-building with our community partners.
2. This will be done.
3. The reference will be moved where it is clearer.
4. It is not a "sample" curriculum, but instead represents the required sequence of courses to be completed by the full-time cohort.
5. These five courses represent the required foundations courses in each of the five traditional disciplines within public health; a paragraph will be written for this.
6. This will be done.
7. This is a very important point and a section on this will be written.
8. This will be done in the revised proposal.
9. Faculty participation will be extensive and this will be clear in the revision.
10. The redundancy will be eliminated. Point 8 is appropriate as a student learning outcome.
11. ‘External and internal’ will precede ‘evaluators.’ The nature of the quizzes is yet to be determined.
12. Even though employer surveys have a lower response rate, they are still valuable. 1 and 2 are stronger, but all data should be collected.
13. The rubrics will be changed to better match rubrics typically used to assess outcomes in public health and medicine—i.e., excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor.

Your assessment report will be due February 15, 2015, with all future assessment reports due on a 2-year cycle. Please consult the OU Assessment website at www.oakland.edu/oira for an updated schedule, copies of reporting forms, and copies of forms detailing the criteria the UAC uses to review assessment plans and reports.

If your faculty would like further meetings with members of the UAC for more specific comments and assistance, please contact Chris Kobus (x2489, cjkobus@oakland.edu), Cynthia Miree-Copin (miree@oakland.edu), or Tanya Christ (christ@oakland.edu).

REMINDER: assessment report is due February 15, 2015.

cc: UAC files

Kenneth Hightower, Dean, Health Sciences

Susan Awbrey, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost