

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20 *Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.*

Unit/Program Name: Applied Health Sciences/ MPH **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Olabode Ayodele,
Olabode.ayodele@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data from Spring 2020 is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? <i>Can expand on this in Part 2.</i>
1. Policy in Public Health Propose strategies to identify stakeholders and build coalitions and partnerships for influencing public health	In AHS 655 , students were expected to successfully develop a public health policy, identifying key stakeholders for potential collaboration, and present policy advocacy plan.	Eighty percent (80%) of students will achieve a grade of B or higher in the assignment.	AHS 655 (Fall 2019) N= 10. All the 10 students enrolled (100%) met the metric. Scores on the assignment ranged from 70 to 73, out of 75 possible points.	No recommendations for changes at this time. Continue to use the metric for assessment.
2. Planning & Management to Promote Health Design a population-based policy, program, project or intervention	In AHS 630 , students were expected to successfully identify and design/develop a public health project and submit a final report.	Eighty percent (80%) of students will achieve a grade of B or higher in the assignment.	N= 7. All the 7 students enrolled (100%) met the metric. Scores on the assignment ranged from 70 to 73, out of 75 possible points.	No recommendations for changes at this time. Continue to use the metric for assessment.
3. Systems Thinking Apply systems thinking tools to a public health issue	In AHS 691 , students were expected to successfully complete a CDC training module about systems thinking.	Eighty percent (80%) of students will achieve a grade of B or higher in the assignment.	N= 7. All the 7 students enrolled (100%) met the metric. Scores on the assignment ranged from 8 to 9.5, out of 10 possible points.	No recommendations for changes at this time. Continue to use the metric for assessment.

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.

- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

1) Cohort Sizes (Enrolled in Fall 2019)

2013-1
2014-5
2015-3
2016-6
2017-4
2018-9

2019-10

2) Year-to-Year Retention

2016- 83%
2017- 75%
2018- 74.5%
2019- 84%

3) 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate)

Average time to completion = **2.8years** (Degree conferred count =14)

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities – required for undergraduate programs; optional for graduate programs

If you submitted a report last year, you only need to resubmit if there are changes to your current career readiness competencies map.

If you have not previously done so, please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

- 1) the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)**

Overall, the outcomes assessed this year showed good student performance. Our students have excelled in their ability to demonstrate accomplishment and mastery of the program goals.

- 2). findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed).**

Faculty will continue to identify areas of challenges for our students and develop strategies to help them overcome the challenges and boost retention. Further, faculty will continue to develop a variety of formative assignments for the MPH courses in order to prepare students for summative assessment.

- 3. what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**

In the coming year, the plan is to include outcomes associated with program planning, coordination, and evaluation. In the past years, these outcomes have not been assessed.

- 4. how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

This information will be shared with faculty individually, and discussed at program and department meeting.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2019-20 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President’s Office and the Provost’s team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: Master of Public Health	Overall Rating: Developing (1.88/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measurable. • Measures for outcomes assessment are clearly described and directly linked to the outcome performances. • Expectations for performance are clear and appropriate. • Actual performance data is clearly reported. • Some information is provided about what was learned from assessment data, including a desire to add more formative assessment to support ongoing student learning. • Clear information is provided about how results will be shared with faculty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note alignment of learning outcomes to Graduate Student Learning Outcomes to evidence graduate level rigor. • Consider adding brief details about how student performance was evaluated. Since multiple measures used are project-based, using analytical rubrics to evaluate performance can enhance accuracy of the data, as well as provide insights to faculty regarding student strengths and weaknesses within larger performances. • For outcome 3 – Students are required to “<i>apply</i> systems thinking” – does the CDC training module rise to the level of application or just knowledge? This is just a question, as obviously I would not be familiar with the content of the training.

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why it was selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>No (program) learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.</p>	<p>Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection if offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results in provided.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Please see reviewer notes for more details.