

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: Health Education and Promotion (M.S.)

SUBMITTED BY: Liane M. Summerfield, Ph.D.

DATE: September 6, 2018

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED: Documents are stored electronically and in hard copy at the desk of Dr. Liane Summerfield, Malek School of Health Professions, Caruthers Hall, Room 1011. All data and documents stored electronically are on a password protected computer that only the director of the HEP program can access. All data and documents stored in hard copy are secured in a locked cabinet in the office of the director.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog: *This program prepares new and current health promotion practitioners to plan, implement, and evaluate health promotion and wellness programs in a variety of settings: hospitals, corporations, health maintenance organizations, community health agencies, health clubs, government agencies, and academic campuses. The program’s coursework provides the knowledge and skills needed by health promotion professionals, as defined by the Society for Public Health Education, the American Association for Health Education, and the National Commission for Health Education Credentialing, Inc.*

Upon successful completion of the health education and promotion program, students will be able to:

- *Exhibit the knowledge to function as competent graduate-level health educators;*
- *Apply theories and/or models to the process of needs assessment and planning health education/promotion strategies, interventions, and programs;*
- *Apply ethical standards to the development and implementation of health education/promotion programs;*
- *Utilize resource materials, equipment, industry tools/inventories, and/or other practical applications used in health education/promotion programming;*
- *Interpret research related to health education/promotion;*
- *Communicate about and promote health and health education/promotion*

List all of the program’s learning outcomes: *(regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)*

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
1. Exhibit the knowledge to function as competent graduate-level health educators.	2014-2015	X	2020-2021
2. Apply theories and/or models to the process of needs assessment and planning health education/promotion strategies, interventions, and programs.	2016-2017		2019-2020
3. Apply ethical standards to the development and implementation of health education/promotion programs.	2015-2016		2019-2020

4. Utilize resource materials, equipment, industry tools/inventories, and/or other practical applications used in health education/promotion programing.	2014-2015	X	2020-2021
5. Interpret research related to health education/promotion.	2016-2017		2020-2021
6. Communicate about and promote health and health education/promotion.	2014-2015	X	2020-2021

Describe briefly how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan (generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points):

The graduate Health Education and Promotion (HEP) program is designed to prepare students for careers in the health education and wellness industry. As such, the program uses as its guiding principle recommendations set forth by the National Commission for Health Education Credentialing, Inc. (NCHEC). NCHEC offers the premier professional certification in the industry known as the Certified Health Education Specialist (CHES). CHES certification establishes a national standard, attests to an individual’s knowledge and skill, and promotes continued professional development. NCHEC has established seven areas of responsibility (Source: <http://www.nche.org/credentialing/responsibilities/>) for the CHES exam to include:

- Area I: Assess Needs, Assets and Capacity for Health Education
- Area II: Plan Health Education
- Area III: Implement Health Education
- Area IV: Conduct Evaluation and Research Related to Health Education
- Area V: Administer and Manage Health Education
- Area VI: Serve as a Health Education Resource Person
- Area VII: Communicate and Advocate for Health and Health Education

The Health and Human Performance (HHP) department has used these recommended competencies to develop the learning objectives in the core HEP curriculum. The above is in harmony with the MU mission of combining *“a foundation in the arts and sciences with career preparation and opportunities for personal and professional development. Marymount is a student-centered learning community that values diversity and focuses on the education of the whole person, promoting the intellectual, spiritual, and moral growth of each individual.”* With the University strategic plan in mind, the HHP Department is a well-established part of the Malek School of Health Professions (MSHP) located in Caruthers Hall. The HHP Department has benefitted significantly from the kinesiology laboratory facility and the acquisition of new equipment thereby fostering an *“academic vision that emphasizes intellectual rigor; outstanding instruction; state-of-the-art facilities, technology, and learning resources.”* At present, the HEP program, through its learning outcomes, strives to remain current in the industry by utilizing NCHEC/CHES as its guiding resource in order to provide a *“high-quality academic program{s} and a learning environment that promotes student success”*. By considering the Malek School of Health Professions mission, the HEP program has at its core a responsibility to promote *“a scholarly climate that fosters critical thinking, creativity, ethical decision making, and self-directed lifelong learning in an environment where knowledge and research are valued; a prominent presence in the community by providing health care, health education and promotion, and continuing education offerings; graduates who are competent health professionals prepared to contribute and respond to society’s changing health needs; and respect for life, human development, and individual differences.”*

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements to the process, and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment (generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points):

Using the new assessment process developed and implemented in 2016-17, Learning Outcomes 1, 4, and 6 were assessed as follows:

- Student work was collected from courses taught in fall 2017 (HPR 502) and spring 2018 (HPR 540). The program director de-identified each assignment and organized all assignments collected by program learning outcome addressed. During the last department meeting of the year, the department met to assess the assignments collected using the rubric developed for each learning outcome. The program director made sure that the instructor of the assignment was not an assessor of the assignment. Each assignment underwent two evaluations by different faculty to maximize inter-rater reliability. Finally, the program director collected the assessment reports from each faculty and aggregated the data. In the appendix, the learning outcomes and the rubrics associated with each program learning outcome under review this year are included.
- For the one course in which papers and projects were not assigned (HPR 520, taught by a highly qualified adjunct professor), the distribution of course final grades was used as an indicator of attainment of learning outcomes.
- The Graduating Student Survey and Alumni Survey were administered by the Office of Institutional Assessment and results compiled and provided to the HEP program director. The response rate for the Graduating Student Survey was too low for a report to be generated, so this assessment report does not include those data.
- Agency Assessment of student interns was collected by the faculty internship coordinator and reviewed by the program director.
- Results of the CHES examination were obtained from NCHEC by the program director.

Results of assessments were shared with faculty members at a department meeting, and the department reflected upon the strengths of the program and identified opportunities to improve.

One strength of using student work for this assessment process is that it follows a rigorous and objective approach to assessment of the learning outcomes, utilizing rubrics for each learning outcome, which operationalizes the outcome and allows for faculty to more accurately identify the assignments that addressed the learning outcome. Finally, by developing target measures for each outcome, the department is better able to identify weaknesses and strengths and make a more targeted effort for improvements when necessary. Another strength of this element of the assessment process is that all full-time faculty in the department work together during a scheduled department meeting to determine the best way to assess the learning outcome and work together to assess the outcomes. Use of CHES examination results and Internship Evaluations are particularly applicable to the program's learning outcomes. Supplemental questions added to the Alumni Survey this year directly targeted HEP learning outcomes.

There are challenges associated with the process of assessing student work. The greatest challenge is that it is extremely time-consuming, both for the chair or program director in collecting and organizing materials for assessment, and for the faculty, who read each assignment. A significant challenge is matching course assignments to learning outcomes. Rarely does one assignment cover all the elements of a given learning outcome. This makes it difficult to determine if a given learning outcome has truly been met. In addition, it is challenging to coordinate assignments with adjunct faculty teaching courses in which student work is used for assessment. While the CHES examination results and Internship Evaluations are excellent for assessing student learning outcomes, the small number of students who take an internship or the CHES exam makes it difficult to generalize results. Questions on the Alumni Survey, while relevant to the overall university assessment process, do not specifically reflect HEP student learning outcomes; response rate to the Alumni Survey is low.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed.)</i>
<p>Apply theories and/or models to the process of needs assessment and planning health education/promotion strategies, interventions, and programs. (This is related to Learning Outcome 2)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content in core classes in the curriculum will be evaluated for alignment with the NCHEC/CHES competencies related to the application of theory and/or models in the planning of health programs. 2. Content and assignments in core classes will be reviewed and faculty will work to infuse the use and application of theory and/or models into existing assignments in at least four different courses across the curriculum. 3. New questions will be added to the alumni and graduating student surveys to assess this learning outcome more explicitly. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation of content in core classes is an ongoing process. 2. Application of theory/models was included in assignments in three courses: (a) An In-Class Assignment in HPR 540 required students to apply a theory/model to a particular aspect of health promotion. In the Health Promotion Program Portfolio assignment (HPR 540), a specific element of evaluation was incorporation of an appropriate theory/model to support planned interventions. (b) Two assignments in HPR 501 required use and application of theories and models – one, a review of an article with application of a theory or model, and the other a research paper. (c) HPR 580 taught in summer 2018 included three assignments that asked students to apply ethical theories to health cases. Course syllabi/assignments are in Appendix A. The fourth course in which theories/models would be included in assignments (HPR 555) was not taught in 2017-18 but will be taught in fall 2018. 3. Five supplemental questions were added to the alumni and graduating student surveys. See Appendix H.
<p>Interpret research related to health education/promotion. (This is related to Learning Outcome 5)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The department will work with our faculty liaison in Library and Learning Services and incorporate opportunities for the liaison to visit the classroom of at least four courses (two introductory courses, one mid-curriculum course, and one capstone course) to provide information about the resources available. 2. The department will work with our faculty liaison in Library and Learning Services to incorporate LibGuides specific to at least four courses (two introductory courses, one mid-curriculum course, and one capstone course) throughout the curriculum. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The faculty liaison visited the following classes in 2017-18: HPR 502 (fall 2017), HPR 540 (spring 2018). Because HEP students tend to be taking the same courses as a cohort, it seemed redundant for the liaison to visit other classes and present resource information multiple times. 2. LibGuides were created for HPR 540, and 591. Other HEP classes did not include assignments that would be aided by a LibGuide.

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed.)</i>
	3. A review of the program learning outcome rubric and the assignments chosen to assess the learning outcome will take place. This review will allow the department to make revisions to their assignments and to their course to include more opportunities to strengthen students' abilities to evaluate information and resources and to use that information to make a cogent argument to support a position.	3. The rubrics and assignments will be reviewed at a department meeting early in the fall 2018 semester.

Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:

Last year's University Assessment Committee accepted the report as submitted with no recommendations for this year's assessment report.

I. Executive Summary was rated as exemplary. Comments indicated that a great deal of work went into the revision of the assessment process; the action plan was comprehensive and thoughtful. There were no recommendations.

Response: The department will continue to utilize and refine the assessment process.

II. Implemented Improvements from Previous Year was rated as exemplary. There were no recommendations.

Response: The department will continue to be mindful of the need for improvements.

III. Outcomes was rated as exemplary. Comments reflected that the department has responded to previous committee feedback in revising outcomes. The curriculum map was considered one reason for the strength of outcomes.

Response: The department will continue to use assessment outcomes for continual improvement of the program.

IV. Assessment Measures and Targets was rated exemplary. Comments reflected that LO-2 had two direct and two indirect measures; and LO-5 had three direct and one indirect measure.

Response: The department will continue to meet or exceed minimum number of measures and targets.

V. Analysis of Results and Implications was rated acceptable. The committee commented that "it would be of value to spend more time reflecting on the implications the results have on the unit. Currently the details in this section are a narrative of the same results provide in the prior section."

Response: The program director will provide a more in-depth reflection on the implication of results.

VI. Use of Assessment to Improve Effectiveness was rated exemplary.

Response: The department will strive to continue to define areas needing attention and to plan improvements.

Outcomes Assessment 2017-2018

Learning Outcome 1: Exhibit the knowledge to function as a competent graduate-level health educator. (Courses that address this LO are HPR 520 Principles of Epidemiology, HPR 540 Designing & Evaluating Health Promotion Programs, and HPR 598 Internship; HPR 536 Stress Management also addresses the outcome but was not offered in 2017-18).

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<p>Proficiency reports (rubric) Direct Measure</p>	<p>Individualized rubric specific to this learning outcome was used that specified the score as: below standard; meets standard; or exceeds standard. This rubric is attached in Appendix B. The department reached consensus that the target score = 85% of students meets standard</p>	<p>A rubric (see Appendix B) was used to determine proficiency on a final project assignment from all HEP students in HPR 540 (n=14).</p>	<p>Two faculty independently assessed each project using the rubric and each arrived at a score. (1=Below Standard; 2=Meets Standard; 3=Exceeds Standard). The target measure was for 85% of students to “Meets Standard”.</p> <p>There was 100% inter-rater reliability. N= 14 students Below Standard = 57% Meets Standard = 0% Exceeds Standard = 42%</p>
<p>Internship Evaluation: selected items Direct Measure</p>	<p>The measure was the internship supervisor review form, which is completed by the internship supervisor (see Appendix E). A rating scale of five responses includes (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent, and (N/A). The department considers a score of (1) or (2) to be categorized as below standard, a score of (3) to meet standard, and a score of (4) to exceed standard. The department reached consensus that the target score = 85% Meets Standard.</p>	<p>An internship supervisor performance review was obtained for all students who were enrolled in an internship during the academic year.</p> <p>Of note, there was only 1 student in the program who was enrolled in an internship during the 2017-18 academic year.</p>	<p>The analysis process included a review of the internship supervisor performance sheet. The following is a summary of the items on the supervisor performance sheet that related to this learning outcome.</p> <p>HPR 598 Internship N=1 student</p> <p>Assesses individual and community needs for health education: Exceeds Standard = 1</p> <p>Plans effective health education programs: Exceeds Standard = 1</p> <p>Implements health education programs: Meets Standard = 1</p>

<p>Certification Results Direct Measure</p>	<p>Pass rate on certification exams and analysis of score on competency as compared to the cohort national average scores. The target is to be above the national average for pass rates and on related competencies.</p>	<p>CHES certification results were obtained by the HHP Chair in an annual report from CHES. (See Appendix F)</p>	<p>One student affiliated with the Health Education & Promotion program took the CHES exam in October 2017 and did not pass, receiving a total score of 82.00, compared with the national average of 101.54. Of the seven specific competencies measured by the exam, this individual only scored above the national average in one – Assess Needs.</p> <p>Two students affiliated with the Health Education & Promotion program took the CHES exam in April 2018 and both passed, with an average total score of 104.50, compared with the national average of 101.53. Of the seven specific competencies measured by the exam, these individuals scored below the national average in Assess Needs and Communicate/Advocate, but above the national average in Plan Programs, Implement Programs, Evaluate Programs, Administer Programs, Act as a Resource.</p> <p>Nationally the 2017-18 pass rate for the CHES exam was 60-62%. Marymount HEP students exceeded this pass rate, but only slightly (66%).</p>
<p>Select items from Alumni Survey Indirect Measure</p>	<p>Responses indicating positive ratings (good or excellent) of the program on the Alumni Survey for items relevant to learning outcome and qualitative feedback. The performance measure of 85% rating of good or excellent on survey items was target measure.</p>	<p>Alumni surveys (see Appendix G) were distributed to former HEP students to determine satisfaction in several areas with the HEP program and bringing to attention areas for improvement. Supplemental questions were added to the Survey this year (see Appendix H).</p> <p>Of note, there were only 12 respondents to the Alumni Survey, 7 of whom graduated in 2011-12 and 5 of whom graduated in 2015-16.</p>	<p>Two standard items on the Alumni Survey are somewhat relevant to this learning outcome. They are reported below in terms of the percent who stated good or excellent on the survey: Valid N=11</p> <p>Apply knowledge and skills to new situations = 63.6%</p> <p>Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills = 72.7%</p> <p>One supplemental question asked respondents to “indicate how well you believe your education prepared you to function independently as a health educator in a variety of settings. Valid N=12. 83% stated good to excellent.</p>

Quizzes, examinations, and homework assignments Indirect measure	An acceptable level of performance in HPR 520 was defined as 85% of students achieving a grade of B or better in the course.	The adjunct instructor in HPR 520 provided grade reports to the department chair.	N = 16 students Below Standard = 38% (final grade of 76.9%-83.1%) Meets Standard = 62% (final grade of 84.6%-98.5%) Average class grade = 87.9% (median = 86.2%)
--	---	---	---

Interpretation of Results

Describe the extent to which this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results):*

This learning outcome is really the essence of the HEP program, and it is disappointing that direct and indirect measure results are somewhat conflicting in determining whether the outcome was met. Whereas a “real-world” assessment of performance as a health educator (internship evaluation) and a validated test of proficiency as a health educator (CHES exam) suggested that this learning outcome was met, only one internship evaluation was available, and only three students took the CHES exam (and NCHEC does not report names of students taking the exam, so these could be recent graduates or graduates from 10 years ago; nor does NCHEC report if a person is repeating the exam). Other measures of this learning outcome – course proficiency reports, grades in one course, and Alumni Survey – offer more disappointing results. However, even the Alumni Survey has a significant limitation, in that the program has been revised since 2011-12.

Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

April CHES results, internship evaluation results, and graduates’ response to the very direct supplemental question on the Alumni Survey suggest that the program is producing competent graduate-level health educators. Nevertheless, there are opportunities for improvement. If the department continues to use rubrics to assess specific course assignments, the faculty will need to develop assignments that are “assessable” with respect to the outcome. This will necessitate discussions with adjuncts prior to syllabus development, so that they understand the importance of course assignments.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

The faculty will be discussing the creation of a Capstone course, to replace the required Internship (which is frequently waived). The course will be required of all HEP students and must be taken in the final semester. This course will allow us to more directly assess the seven areas of responsibility set forth by the National Commission for Health Education Credentialing and assessed by the CHES exam, which only a small proportion of our graduates take. We believe that this will give us better data on which to determine if we are meeting this learning outcome (and, in fact, other learning outcomes). In addition, HPR 540, which really captures the essence of this learning outcome, probably needs to be renumbered at a higher level, with pre-requisites; student work in the Capstone course and HPR 540 could then be used to better assess this outcome. Student work in HPR 520 and HPR 536 will no longer be used to assess this outcome. For this year, however, given that the department is preparing the 5-year HEP Program Review, a list of potential curricular changes will be compiled, but none will be implemented.

Learning Outcome 4: Utilize resource materials, equipment, industry tools/inventories, and/or other practical applications used in health education/promotion programming. (Courses that address this LO are HPR 520 Principles of Epidemiology, HPR 540 Designing & Evaluating Health Promotion Programs, and HPR 598 Internship; HPR 536 Stress Management also addresses the outcome but was not offered in 2017-18).

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
Proficiency reports (rubric) Direct Measure	Individualized rubric specific to this learning outcome was used that specified the score as: below standard; meets standard; or exceeds standard. This rubric is attached in Appendix C. The department reached consensus that the target score = 85% of students meets standard	A rubric (see Appendix C) was used to determine proficiency on a final project assignment from all HEP students in HPR 540 (n=14).	Two faculty independently assessed each project using the rubric and each arrived at a score. (1=Below Standard; 2=Meets Standard; 3=Exceeds Standard). The target measure was for 85% of students to “Meets Standard”. There was 100% inter-rater reliability for all except 4 papers, in which one reviewer rated the works as “Below Standard” and one reviewer rated the works as “Meets Standard.” N= 14 students Below Standard = 28% Meets Standard = 0%/21% Exceeds Standard = 42%
Internship Evaluation: selected items Direct Measure	The measure was the internship supervisor review form, which is completed by the internship supervisor (see Appendix E). A rating scale of five responses includes (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent, and (N/A). The department considers a score of (1) or (2) to be categorized as below standard, a score of (3) to meet standard, and a score of (4) to exceed standard. The department reached consensus that the target score = 85% Meets Standard.	An internship supervisor performance review was obtained for all students who were enrolled in an internship during the academic year. Of note, there was only 1 student in the program who was enrolled in an internship during the 2017-18 academic year.	The analysis process included a review of the internship supervisor performance sheet. The following is a summary of the items on the supervisor performance sheet that related to this learning outcome. HPR 598 Internship N=1 student Serves as a health education resource person: Exceeds Standard = 1 Selects, chooses, and implements contemporary technology and non-technology-based equipment, industry tools/inventories, and/or other practical “hands-on” applications in health and wellness: Meets Standard = 1
Select items from Alumni Survey Indirect Measure	Responses indicating positive ratings (good or excellent) of the program on the alumni survey for items relevant to learning	Alumni surveys (see Appendix G) were distributed to HEP students to determine satisfaction in several areas with the HEP	No standard questions on the Alumni Survey address this learning outcome. A new supplemental question asked respondents to “indicate how well you believe your education

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
	outcome and qualitative feedback. The performance measure of 85% rating of good or excellent on survey items was target measure.	program and bringing to attention areas for improvement. Supplemental questions were added to the Survey this year (see Appendix H). Of note, there were only 12 respondents to the Alumni Survey, 7 of whom graduated in 2011-12 and 5 of whom graduated in 2015-16.	prepared you to use resource materials and other tools to enhance health education programming or services. Valid N=12. 83% stated good to excellent.
Quizzes, examinations, and homework assignments Indirect measure	An acceptable level of performance in HPR 520 was defined as 85% of students achieving a grade of B or better in the course.	The adjunct instructor in HPR 520 provided grade reports to the department chair.	N = 16 students Below Standard = 38% (final grade of 76.9%-83.1%) Meets Standard = 62% (final grade of 84.6%-98.5%) Average class grade = 87.9% (median = 86.2%)

Interpretation of Results

Describe the extent to which this learning outcomes has been achieved by students (*Use both direct and indirect measure results*):

The one internship evaluation result and graduates' response to the very direct supplemental question on the Alumni Survey suggest that students are able to utilize resource materials, equipment, industry tools/inventories, and/or other practical applications in health education/promotion.

Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

This is a difficult outcome to assess using student work, unless an assignment specifically requires students to identify and explain a rationale for using a particular tool or inventory. The lack of inter-rater reliability on 4 student projects reflects this difficulty. If the department continues to use a rubric to assess specific course assignments in this area, the faculty teaching the course will need to develop assignments that are "assessable" with respect to the outcome. This will necessitate discussions with adjuncts prior to syllabus development, so that they understand the importance of course assignments.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

The faculty will be discussing the creation of a Capstone course, to replace the required Internship (which is frequently waived). The course will be required of all HEP students and must be taken in the final semester. This course will allow us to create specific assignments that will more directly determine students' ability to utilize resource materials, equipment, industry tools/inventories, and/or other practical applications in health education/promotion. Student work in the Capstone course and the possibly redesigned HPR 540 will be used to assess this outcome. Student work in HPR 520 and HPR 536 will no longer be used to assess this outcome. For this year, however, given that the department is preparing the 5-year HEP Program Review, a list of potential curricular changes will be compiled, but none will be implemented.

Learning Outcome 6: Communicate about and promote health and health education/promotion. (Courses that address this LO are HPR 502 Introduction to Public Health, HPR 540 Designing & Evaluating Health Promotion Programs, and HPR 598 Internship; HPR 536 Stress Management also addresses the outcome but was not offered in 2017-18).

Assessment Activity

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>Proficiency reports (rubric) Direct Measure</p>	<p>Individualized rubric specific to this learning outcome was used that specified the score as: below standard; meets standard; or exceeds standard. This rubric is attached in Appendix D. The department reached consensus that the target score = 85% of students meets standard</p>	<p>A rubric (see Appendix D) was used to determine proficiency on: (1) a final project assignment from all HEP students in HPR 540 (n=14); and (2) a final project assignment in HPR 520 (n=10).</p> <p>In addition, since one element of this learning outcome relates to proficiency in “verbal and nonverbal communication,” the HHP department chair and the HEP program director decided to incorporate in assessment the presentation rubric for grading a required oral presentation about the HPR 540 projects. This may be found in Appendix I.</p>	<p>Two faculty independently assessed each HPR 540 and 502 project using the rubric and each arrived at a score. (1=Below Standard; 2=Meets Standard; 3=Exceeds Standard). The target measure was for 85% of students to “Meets Standard”.</p> <p><u>HPR 540 Projects Analysis</u> There was 100% inter-rater reliability for 6 projects. For 8 projects, one reviewer rated the works as “Below Standard” and one reviewer rated the works as “Meets Standard.” N= 14 students Below Standard = 57% (reviewer #1); 0% (reviewer #2) Meets Standard = 0% (reviewer #1); 57% (reviewer #2) Exceeds Standard = 42%</p> <p><u>HPR 502 Projects Analysis</u> For 5 projects there was high inter-rater reliability, with all projects rated as “meets Standard” by reviewers 3 and 4. For 5 other projects inter-rater reliability was poor, with one reviewer rating all but one project as “Below Standard” and the other reviewer rating only 2 projects as “Below Standard.” N=10 students Below Standard = 40% (reviewer #1); 20% (reviewer #2) Meets Standard = 50% (reviewers 1,3,4); 70% (reviewers 2,3,4) Exceeds Standard = 10%</p> <p><u>HPR 540 Presentations Analysis</u> Students were rated in four categories by the course instructor: Non-verbal skills; content; verbal skills; and miscellaneous (professionalism, use of graphics, response to questions). A rating of 1 or 2 signifies “below Standard;” a rating of 3 signifies “Meets Standard;” and a rating of 4 signifies “Exceeds Standard.” N=14 students</p>

<p>Outcome Measures Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</p>	<p>Performance Standard Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</p>	<p>Data Collection Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</p>	<p>Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</p>
			<p>Nonverbal Communication: Below Standard = 7% Meets Standard = 21% Exceeds Standard = 72%</p> <p>Content Below Standard = 14% Meets Standard = 14% Exceeds Standard = 72%</p> <p>Verbal Communication Below Standard = 7% Meets Standard = 7% Exceeds Standard = 86%</p> <p>Miscellaneous Below Standard = 7% Meets Standard = 57% Exceeds Standard = 36%</p>
<p>Internship Evaluation: selected items Direct Measure</p>	<p>The measure was the internship supervisor review form, which is completed by the internship supervisor (see Appendix E). A rating scale of five responses includes (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent, and (N/A). The department considers a score of (1) or (2) to be categorized as below standard, a score of (3) to meet standard, and a score of (4) to exceed standard. The department reached consensus that the target score = 85% Meets Standard.</p>	<p>An internship supervisor performance review was obtained for all students who were enrolled in an internship during the academic year.</p> <p>Of note, there was only 1 student in the program who was enrolled in an internship during the 2017-18 academic year.</p>	<p>The analysis process included a review of the internship supervisor performance sheet. The following is a summary of the items on the supervisor performance sheet that related to this learning outcome.</p> <p>HPR 598 Internship N=1 student</p> <p>Communicates and advocates for health and health education: Exceeds Standard = 1</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
Certification Results Direct Measure	Pass rate on certification exams and analysis of score on competency as compared to the cohort national average scores. The target is to be above the national average for pass rates and on related competencies.	CHES certification results were obtained by the HHP Chair in an annual report from CHES. (See Appendix F)	One of the competencies measured by the CHES exam is Communication/Advocacy. The average national score for this element in October 2017 was 12.57; in April 2018 it was 12.41. The three HEP-affiliated students who took the exam had average scores of 11.00 in October and 12.00 in April, scoring below the national average.
Select items from Alumni Survey Indirect Measure	Responses indicating positive ratings (good or excellent) of the program on the alumni survey for items relevant to learning outcome and qualitative feedback. The performance measure of 85% rating of good or excellent on survey items was target measure.	Alumni surveys (see Appendix G) were distributed to former HEP students to determine satisfaction in several areas with the HEP program and bringing to attention areas for improvement. Supplemental questions were added to the Survey this year (see Appendix H). Of note, there were only 12 respondents to the Alumni Survey, 7 of whom graduated in 2011-12 and 5 of whom graduated in 2015-16.	One standard item on the Alumni Survey is relevant to this learning outcome: Indicate how well your education prepared you to deliver a coherent oral presentation Valid N=11 72.7% rated this good or excellent. Two new supplemental questions asked respondents to “indicate how well you believe your education prepared you to: “Deliver oral presentations to communicate about and promote health” Valid N = 12; 83% stated good to excellent. “Effectively communicate with others about health” Valid N = 12; 83% stated good to excellent.

Interpretation of Results

Describe the extent to which this learning outcomes has been achieved by students (*Use both direct and indirect measure results*):

Direct and indirect measure results are somewhat conflicting in determining whether the outcome was met. Whereas a “real-world” assessment of performance as a health educator (internship evaluation) suggests that this learning outcome was met, only one internship evaluation was available. Students’ self-assessment, evidenced by the supplemental question in the Alumni Survey, also suggests proficiency in communication, with 83% stating that they can effectively communicate with others about health. And the HPR 540 instructor’s assessment of oral communication proficiency was largely positive. But CHES exam results for 3 graduates fall below the national average in the area of communication/advocacy; and departmental assessment of projects in HPR 540 was mixed.

Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

Oral and written communication is a component of every course in the HEP program. Adding data from the HPR 540 presentation rubric provided information that was helpful in assessing oral communication and visual communication through use of PowerPoint slides. If the department considers this to be a useful adjunct to course project assessment,

raters other than the course instructor will need to be involved in viewing presentations. HPR 555 Health Communication, taught by an adjunct, is a required course in the program that directly addresses this learning outcome. This course should be a source of course material for assessment. This will necessitate discussions with the adjunct prior to syllabus development, so that he/she understands the importance of course assignments.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

In addition to adding HPR 555 as a source of course material for assessment, the Capstone course and redesigned HPR 540 course discussed earlier in this assessment report will allow us to create specific assignments that will more directly determine students' ability to communicate about and promote health. Student work in HPR 540 will continue to be used to assess this outcome. Student work in HPR 502 and HPR 536 will no longer be used to assess this outcome. For this year, however, given that the department is preparing the 5-year HEP Program Review, a list of potential curricular changes will be compiled, but none will be implemented.

Appendices

Appendix A. Syllabi and Assignments (HPR 501, 540, and 580)

Appendix B. Rubric for Learning Outcome 1

Appendix C. Rubric for Learning Outcome 4

Appendix D. Rubric for Learning Outcome 6

Appendix E. Internship Supervisor Review Form

Appendix F. CHES Certification Results

Appendix G. Alumni Survey Results

Appendix H. Alumni Survey Results: Supplemental Questions

Appendix I. HPR 540 Oral Presentation Rubric