

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

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

SUBMITTED BY: Jennifer L. Tripken, EdD

DATE: September 15, 2017

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. Jennifer Tripken, Malek School of Health Professions, Caruthers Hall, Room 2031. All data and documents stored electronically are on a password protected computer that only the chair of the department can access. All data and documents stored in hard copy are secured in a locked cabinet in the office of the chair.

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		2017-2018
2. Apply theories and/or models to the process of needs assessment and planning health education/promotion strategies, interventions, and programs.	n/a	X	2020-2021
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		2017-2018
5. Interpret research related to health education/promotion.	2013-2014	X	2020-2021
6. Communicate about and promote health and health education/promotion.	2014-2015		2019-2020

Describe how the program's outcomes support Marymount's mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

The graduate Health Education and Promotion (HEP) program is designed to prepare students for a career 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 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

Source: <http://www.nche.org/credentialing/responsibilities/>



The Health and Human Performance (HHP) department has used these recommended competencies to develop the new 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 NCHC/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.”*

Each of the learning outcomes assessed herein builds specifically on the MU mission and strategic plan, and the current MSHP plan.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment:

The assessment process used this year was very different from previous years. We first revised and developed a new set of program learning outcomes to reflect the core knowledge and material of the program and align it with the competencies of the NCHC/CHES standards. Once these learning outcomes were developed, we identified the various direct and indirect measures that would be used to assess these. This process included developing a curriculum map and identifying which courses in the program addressed each learning outcome. We also identified the various indirect measures that would be used (i.e., graduating student surveys, alumni surveys). The next step was the development of rubrics for each learning outcome. The development of the rubric helped the department to operationalize each learning outcome. We then revisited the curriculum map and identified the assignments in each course that addressed the learning outcome. The department also identified target measures. In other words, we identified what percentage of our students should achieve the “meets standard” criteria for each program learning outcome. Finally, the department developed a plan for the gathering and measuring of the data. Using the curriculum map, the chair identified which courses addressed the program learning outcomes under review for the year. The chair then randomly selected a sample of students from each course and informed the instructor of the course to submit the program learning outcome associated assignment (ungraded) to the chair upon completion of the assignment/course. The chair de-identified each assignment and organized all assignments collected by program learning outcome addressed. During the last department meeting of the year, after final grades were submitted, the department met to assess the assignments collected using the rubric developed for each learning outcome. The chair 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 chair collected the assessment reports from each faculty and aggregated the data. The results are described further in this document. In the appendix, the revised learning outcomes, the curriculum map, and the rubrics associated with each program learning outcome under review this year are included.

Assessment Process	What was Done
Step 1: Revise Program Learning Outcomes	The program learning outcomes for HEP were revised to reflect the knowledge and material of the program and to reflect the competencies of the NCHC/CHES standards.
Step 2: Develop rubrics for each learning outcome	For each program learning outcome, a holistic rubric was developed to operationalize the outcome.

Step 3: Map the Curriculum	The HEP curriculum was mapped and courses were identified in which the learning outcomes were addressed. Each course then identified which assignment(s) addressed which learning outcomes.
Step 4: Identify direct and indirect measures used for each learning outcome	The direct and indirect measures used to assess the learning outcomes were identified.
Step 5: Set target measures for each learning outcome	The department reached consensus about what percentage of students should meet the “meets standard” target measure for each learning outcome. These target measures utilized the rubric to develop the standards.
Step 6: Gathering of Data	The department chair identified the courses that addressed the learning outcomes under review this year and randomly selected students from each course to assess the assignment(s) that addressed the outcome. An email was sent to each instructor of the course stating that assignments for the selected students should be submitted, ungraded, to the department chair by a set date.
Step 7: Assessment of Data	Each assignment for each learning outcome under review was assessed using the developed rubric by two faculty members, neither of whom were instructors of the course in which the assignment was given.
Step 8: Analyzing completed data	The department chair collected all assessment measures and aggregated the data.
Step 9: Sharing of data	The results of the assessment process was shared with faculty at a department meeting and the department reflected upon the strengths of the program and identified opportunities to improve.

One strength of this assessment process is that it follows a rigorous and objective approach to assessment of the learning outcomes. By taking the time to map the curriculum and in which courses the program learning outcomes are addressed allows the department to identify gaps and to strengthen the curriculum and individual courses. Another strength of this process was that the development of rubrics for each learning outcome operationalized the outcome and allowed 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 our process is that all core 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.

The challenges associated with this process were few. One challenge is that this was the first time the assessment process in the department ran in this fashion and there was a learning curve to the why the revisions were necessary and how the results of the process would be used. The chair was responsible for the selection of students to be assessed, the collection of all assignments associated with each program outcome, and the organization of the assessment day, including de-identifying each assignment, organizing assignments by learning outcomes, making copies of each assignment, and assigning assessment of assignment to faculty who were not instructors of the course. While not difficult, it was extremely time-consuming. An opportunity exists to share the workload with the other faculty in the department next year.

The new assessment process conducted this year reflects a culture of continuous improvement in the department to identify strengths and opportunities for improvement within the curriculum. The revised program learning outcomes and the associated rubrics have helped faculty operationalize exactly what we want our students to learn from the program and to better assess if we are achieving our standards. The chair met with the Director of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness several times prior to writing of this report to better understand the process. In addition, the chair used the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Handbook throughout the assessment process and many aspects of this handbook have been incorporated into this year’s assessment process. Finally, the results of the assessment process were shared with faculty at the first department meeting of the upcoming academic year. This allowed for the department to reflect upon the strengths of the program and how to maintain these, as well as to reflect upon the areas of improvement and identify ways to strengthen the program.

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. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
<p>Evaluate the rationality and sensitivity of values and ethics in the health and wellness field using critical thinking behaviors/skills.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on this assessment of the learning outcome, the Chair will encourage faculty to continue to incorporate inquiry guided learning assignments/projects pertaining to the moral and ethical conduct considerations of health education programming and client-practitioner interactions. While the majority of faculty are already taking this approach, it is imperative to reflect upon current assignment to align with the learning outcome and current CHES guidelines. In addition, the faculty who have taken the Ethics I Seminar will be asked to share their experiences and outcomes, including how they incorporate ethics into their coursework. 2. Coursework will continue to be analyzed for inclusion and development of this learning outcome in all core classes, from the introductory courses to the culminating internship experience. A planned curricular change to the program will be to make HPR 580 Ethical Issues in Public Health a permanent course that will be offered yearly. While this course currently stands as an elective, the faculty will reflect upon its role in the program and consider adding it as a core course, based upon student evaluations and CHES competencies. Several students in the program have also elected to take HPR 599, the independent research study course. This 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty who had taken the Ethics I seminar shared their experience with faculty at a department meeting as well as at a presentation at Teaching Toolbox in January 2016. • Faculty were encouraged to attend all faculty development workshops to enhance their understanding of inquiry guided assignments and projects. • Faculty were encouraged to attend the Ethics I and Ethics II seminars if they hadn't done so already. Two (2) faculty in the department are enrolled in the Ethics II seminar during the Summer 2017. • A new course, HPR 580 Ethical Issues in Public Health, was developed and the proposal was approved by Faculty Council as a new course in the program in Fall 2016. Enrollment in the program is relatively low and as a result, elective coursework in the HEP program was not offered during the past year. As the department works to increase student enrollment to sustainable levels, the addition of this class to the core curriculum will be tabled until the program stabilizes.

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<p>course can be used as an elective in the program or as a substitute for the internship experience. With its increasing popularity among students over the past two years (n=10), this course offers an opportunity to apply the concepts learned in core courses to a real world issue. Developing a more formalized approach to this course, that incorporates an emphasis on ethical concepts, might strengthen student's ability to respond to ethically challenging situations, an area that needs improvement. Faculty will also explore other courses in which this aspect might be addressed more fully in the curriculum.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four (4) students were enrolled in HPR 599 this past year. This reaffirms that this class is continually popular in the program. Faculty who supervised these projects were asked to incorporate the NCHEC/CHES competencies into the project, including a focus on ethics and values. • A review of the new NCHEC/CHES competencies took place during Fall 2016. This included mapping the competencies to our current course offerings to ensure that the program is adequately addressing each competency. The results of this analysis affirmed that ethics is being addressed in several courses throughout the curriculum. The additional of HPR 580 Ethical Issues in Public Health further strengthens the focus on ethics in the HEP field.
<p>Evaluate various methods of technology in the classroom, in designing and evaluating health promotion programs, and/or in the clinical setting.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confidence in the use and application of appropriate technology in the workplace is an integral part of preparing a competent health professional. As more and more health care providers move toward digital electronic health record keeping and using technology as a means to communicate and deliver health information, it is imperative that graduating students develop competency in this area and this learning outcome should be closely monitored and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program learning outcome that addresses technology was substantially revised to ensure a stronger focus and measurement process. Technology is just one aspect of larger inventories and tools used in HEP. A rubric individualized to this learning outcome was developed to ensure that the technology competency is operationalized and measures were identified to assess this outcome.

Outcome	Planned Improvement	<p style="text-align: center;">Update</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i></p>
	<p>emphasized by the faculty whenever appropriate.</p> <p>2. The use of social media is a growing medium for the dissemination of health information. The program will continue to prepare its faculty in the use of technology of the classroom and in the professional setting via attendance at seminars such as Teaching Toolbox and Teaching with Technology offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning. Faculty will also be encouraged to attend professional organization conferences and webinars that address technology in the field.</p> <p>3. To strengthen graduating and alumni students perception of their confidence in using technology in the workplace, the department will take several steps, including reviewing the HEP curriculum and identifying the courses in which technology can be more fully integrated. In addition, gaining insight into why alumni and graduating students feel this area could be improved would provide important information to strengthen the program. Focus groups of current and graduating students are one way to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty were encouraged to attend the Teaching with Technology and Teaching Toolbox seminars. Six of the seven full-time faculty in the department attended a professional organization conference during the 2016-17 academic year and were asked to share any acquired information and skills as a result of this attendance with others at a Spring department meeting. • A review of the HEP curriculum as it relates to the NCHEC/CHES competencies of technology was undertaken during the development of revised program learning outcomes. • The graduating student survey for 2016-17 was not available to the chair for review due to low sample size. • Focus groups were considered, but only 3 students graduated from the program in 2016-17, with 2 of those students graduating during December 2017. This would have not produced any significant input.

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<p>increase our understanding of how to best strengthen this learning outcome.</p> <p>4. Additionally, a review of the curriculum will be undertaken in the 2016/17 academic year to ensure alignment with the new competencies of the CHES (www.nchec.org). This review should add insight into the expected technological competencies of a CHES and provide suggestions for improving the integration of such technology in the curriculum. Although our pass rates were high on the CHES exam for the past two years (above national average), there is certainly an opportunity to further extrapolate why alumni students have a low perception of confidence in using technology.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of the HEP curriculum as it relates to the NCHEC/CHES competencies of technology was undertaken during the development of revised program learning outcomes. This was completed in Fall 2016. The results of this review confirmed that the program adequately addresses the technology competency. A review of the CHES exam scores, as broken down by competency, was also analyzed to confirm technology skills were aligned with national competencies. In sum, students who graduate from our HEP program score higher than the national cohort on this competency.

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

Feedback: I. Executive Summary: Strengths and challenges are discussed. It may aid the program to prioritize the challenges and ensure that the strengths are maintained. Please be careful in your use of terms.

Response: The Chair will continue to focus on detailed sections on strengths and challenges. The prioritization of challenges was included in this year’s assessment report.

Feedback: II. Implemented Improvements from Previous Year: The program name change does seem to have been an effective improvement of the program. It appears that a significant amount of work has been done with planned improvements. The program also appears to be responsive to some UAC feedback. It may help the program’s improvement effort if time lines were set for the vague we “will” work on suggested improvement sometime in the future.

Response: Timelines are included in this year’s assessment report and in preparation for the upcoming program review in 2018-2019.



Feedback: III. Outcomes: The program was given specific suggestions for immediate improvement of multiple outcomes. The response that the program would “review” and “make changes as needed” is good. The failure to do so before the next assessment cycle means that another cycle has occurred where poorly focused objectives have been examined. All the detailed feedback from the last UAC report remains relevant. Please see last year’s feedback. In addition: Outcome 2 and Outcome 5 on the master list in the Executive Summary overlap. There is an opportunity to streamline these technology issues. Is the intent to have students evaluate technology or are you seeking to evaluate students’ use of technology? Outcome 3 (evaluated this year) is awkwardly worded. Is the intent to have students be able to articulate their own values and ethics to clients? To use their values and ethics in communicating with clients? To develop a set of personal values and ethics? If the intent is unclear then spending time measuring an unfocused objective might be wasted.

Response: All program learning outcomes were revised this past year. These revisions considered the NCHEC/CHES competencies, the feedback received from UAC, and the core courses taught within the curriculum. Some outcomes were slightly revised to be more focused while others were deleted entirely and replaced with more focused outcomes. Appendix A demonstrates the changes to the program learning outcomes.

Feedback: IV. Assessment Measures and Targets: As noted earlier, if the outcomes are not well-structured, then the measurements may measure what was intended. This is a re-occurring problem in the assessment process. The previous UAC feedback suggested that the use of more data from the NCHEC review might be useful in assessing measures. The link to the review is not evidence in this report. It might provide useful data on range of assessment issues. Standards (targets) for a measure are needed. What percentage of students must reach the target? If 100%, please say that. Outcome 1 in this report: notes data on research abilities that do not appear to be relevant to ethics. Outcome 2 of this report. Measures seem to relate more to Outcome 2 in the master list in the Executive Summary. They look at the use of technology in research. In-classroom assessment of this measure seems limited to the use of PowerPoint in classroom presentations, along with communication skills. Certification results seem too tangentially related to be relevant.

Feedback: As stated above, all program learning outcomes were revised this past year. The measurement process and target determination also were revised this year. The department has mapped the curriculum to identify which courses address the learning outcomes and rubrics were developed for each learning outcome. In addition, the department reached consensus on the standards for each outcome (targets). A more standardized approach to assessment took place this year, as explained in the assessment process section above.

Feedback: V. Analysis of Results and Implications: The analysis section seems only to repeat the information in the description of the measurement data in Section III. There is an opportunity to do the in-depth analysis of relevant data that may move this program to the next level of excellence. Some analysis is also off target. For example, in the second learning outcome assessed this year a discussion is about using “electronic...record keeping” which has nothing to do with classroom use of technology. It also discusses faculty development in the use of technology that is not again measurement data that was collected. Appendix I is not linked to either outcome, however, it misses the opportunity to make any connection between the “communicate/advocate” information to classroom technology performance. What purpose does this Appendix serve?

Response: The revised assessment process undertaken this past year allowed for a more in-depth analysis of measurement data and interpretation. However, small numbers impact the interpretation of some results.

Outcomes Assessment 2016-2017

Learning Outcome 2: Apply theories and/or models to the process of needs assessment and planning health education/promotion strategies, interventions, and programs.

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>
Proficiency reports (rubric) Direct Measure	Individualized rubric specific to this learning outcome was used that specified the score as: below standard, meets standard, and exceeds standard. This rubric is attached in Appendix C. The department reached consensus that the target score = 85% Meets Standard	<p>Rubrics (see appendix C) were generated and used to determine proficiency on assignments in targeted classes as identified from the curriculum map and a randomly selected sample of students.</p> <p>The student population for the HEP program was very limited this year. In fact, only 9 students were enrolled in the program. As such, all students were evaluated for this assessment report.</p>	<p>Two courses were identified to have addressed this learning outcome. Assessment of this learning outcome utilized the holistic rubric developed for the learning outcome. The target measure was for 85% of students to “Meets Standard”.</p> <p>HPR 534: Topics in Nutrition and Weight Management N= 4 students Below Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 1 In sum, 75% of students either met or exceeded standard. Unmet</p> <p>HPR 591: Research Methods in Health Education N= 5 students Below Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 2 In sum, 80% of students either met or exceeded standard. Unmet</p> <p>Combined Assessment N= 9 students Below Standard = 2 Meets Standard = 4 Exceeds Standard = 3</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 the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.
			In sum, 77.8% of students either met or exceeded standard. Unmet
Select items from Graduating Student and 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 D) were distributed to HEP students to determine satisfaction in several areas with the HEP program and bringing to attention areas for improvement. Of note, there were only 13 respondents to the Alumni Survey, 8 of whom graduated in 2010-11 and 5 of whom graduated in 2014-15.	Two items on the alumni survey were relevant to this learning outcome. They are reported below in terms of the percent who stated good or excellent on the survey: N=13 Apply knowledge and skills to new situations = 61.5% Unmet Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills = 76.9% Unmet
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 included (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent, and (N/A). The department considered 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. This rubric is attached in Appendix E. 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 were only 3 students in the program who were enrolled in an internship during the 2016-17 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 and the number of students who met or exceeded the standard, as identified by the supervisor: HPR 598 Internship N=3 students Assesses individual and community needs for health education: Below Standard = 0 Meets Standard = 0 Exceeds Standard = 3 In sum, 100% of students either met or exceeded standard. Met

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 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.
			Plans effective health education programs: Below Standard = 0 Meets Standard = 0 Exceeds Standard = 3 In sum, 100% of students either met or exceeded standard. Met Implements health education programs: Below Standard = 0 Meets Standard = 0 Exceeds Standard = 3 In sum, 100% of students either met or exceeded standard. Met
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)	Three students affiliated with the Health Education & Promotion program took the CHES exam in April 2017. MU HEP Pass Rate: 100% Met Associated Competencies: Assess Needs: Met Plan Programs: Met

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

Learning outcome 2 was assessed via three direct measures (proficiency reports, internship evaluation, and Certification results). Two courses that ran in 2016-17 addressed this learning outcome. In **HPR 534 Topics in Nutrition and Weight Management** (N=4), students were asked to write a 2-3 page summary of a controversy in weight management including a review of the underlying theory or model associated with the controversy. All 4 students enrolled in the class were evaluated for this outcome. Three had achieved an assessment of meets or exceeds standard. In **HPR 591, Research Methods in Health Education**, (N=5), students were asked to write a final research paper on a specific content area of health education and promotion. Part of the guidelines for this assignment was the selection and integration of a theoretical framework to plan a health education program. All 5 students who were enrolled in the class were evaluated for this outcome. Four had achieved an assessment of meets or exceeds standard. In sum, a total of 9 students were assessed in two separate classes on two different assignments and 7 of the 9 (77.8%) were



assessed to have either met or exceeded the standard based on the rubric. This is below the targeted measure of 85% of students who met or exceeded the standard that the department had determined to be a goal prior to the assessment process.

The second direct measure of assessment was the internship supervisor review form, which is completed by the internship supervisor at the end of the semester. Three items on this form addressed the learning outcome (*Assesses individual and community needs for health education, Plans effective health education programs, and Implements health education programs*). A total of 3 students were enrolled in the internship during the 2016-17 academic year. All 3 students were rated as “exceeds standard” for the three items on the review form. This is above the targeted measure of 85% of students who either met or exceeded the standard that the department had determined to be a goal prior to the assessment process.

The third direct measure of assessment was the certification results of the CHES exam. The CHES exam is a national examination that assesses all competencies associated with a competent and qualified health education specialist. The Health Education & Promotion graduate program curriculum is aligned with the competencies of this examination and the outcomes of this exam reflect an application of content taught in the program. A total of 3 students took the CHES exam in April 2017. All 3 students passed the exam (100% pass rate), which was well above the national average of 68.48%. Two competencies of the CHES exam related to this learning outcome as they incorporate the use of theories and model: *Assess Needs* and *Plan Programs*. In both competency areas, students scored above the national average. For *Assess Needs*, the national average was 15.06, whereas graduates of the MU HEP program averaged 18.00. For *Plan Programs*, the national average was 18.07, whereas graduates of the MU HEP program averaged 20.33. These results are above our target measure of scoring above the national average.

One indirect measure was used to assess this learning outcome. The results of the alumni survey included 13 respondents, 8 from the 2011-12 cohort and 5 from the 2014-15 cohort. Two items on the alumni survey addressed this learning outcome (*Apply knowledge and skills to new situations* and *Solve problems in your field using knowledge and skills*). 61.5% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent to the item *Apply knowledge and skills to new situations*. While this is below the performance standard set by the department (85%), this is an improvement from the 2015 alumni survey in which 54.5% indicated a rating of good or excellent. Looking a bit more deeply at trends regarding this item, there is fluctuation. In 2013, 88.9% of alumni indicated a rating of good or excellent. 76.9% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent to the item *Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills*. Similar to the item above, while this is below the performance standard set by the department (85%), this is an improvement from the 2015 alumni survey in which 63.6% indicated a rating of good or excellent. This item too has had fluctuation in reporting over the years. In 2013, 88.9% of alumni indicated a rating of good or excellent.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

While the program has many strengths, it is clear that there are opportunities for improvement. A clear strength of the program is the application of the material relative to the real-world setting. The internship evaluation of students by supervisors demonstrates that students are able to engage in aspects of health programming that require the use of theories and/or models at a proficient level. The high pass rate (100%) on the CHES examination this past year is further evidence that students are competent in assessing and planning health programs. While students demonstrate proficiency in the application of materials in their internship and through the national examination, there are opportunities to strengthen the use of theories and/or models throughout the curriculum. Students are introduced to the use of theories/models in HPR 501, which is offered every Fall and all new students are advised to take this course first. However, the HEP program has rolling admissions and students who enroll in the Spring or Summer semesters do not take this foundational course until later in their program. In addition, the HEP program does not have pre-requisite courses because of our rolling admissions process. Thus, students may choose not to take HPR 501 in their first semester, despite being advised to do so. An area for improvement will be to review the curriculum to ensure that students receive an adequate foundation in theory/models in several courses throughout the curriculum. Finally, the measures used to assess this outcome on the graduating and alumni surveys relate to relatively broad outcomes of the use of theory/models and there are no current questions that specifically address the use and incorporation of theory/models.

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

1. Content in core classes in the curriculum will be evaluated for alignment with the NCHC/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.

Learning Outcome 5: Interpret research related to health education/promotion.

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 the data collected and 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, and exceeds standard. This rubric is attached in Appendix C. The department reached consensus that the target score = 85% Meets Standard</p>	<p>Rubrics (see appendix C) were generated and used to determine proficiency on assignments in targeted classes as identified from the curriculum map and a randomly selected sample of students.</p> <p>The student population for the HEP program was very limited this year. In fact, only 9 students were enrolled in the program. As such, all students were evaluated for this assessment report.</p>	<p>Two courses were identified to have addressed this learning outcome. Assessment of this learning outcome utilized the holistic rubric developed for the learning outcome. The target measure was for 85% of students to “Meets Standard”.</p> <p>HPR 534: Topics in Nutrition and Weight Management N= 4 students Below Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 3 Exceeds Standard = 0 In sum, 75% of students either met or exceeded standard. Unmet</p> <p>HPR 591: Research Methods in Health Education N= 5 students Below Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 2 In sum, 80% of students either met or exceeded standard. Unmet</p> <p>Combined Assessment N= 9 students Below Standard = 2</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 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>
			Meets Standard = 5 Exceeds Standard = 2 In sum, 77.8% of students either met or exceeded standard. Unmet
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 D) were distributed to HEP students to determine satisfaction in several areas with the HEP program and bringing to attention areas for improvement. Of note, there were only 13 respondents to the Alumni Survey, 8 of whom graduated in 2010-11 and 5 of whom graduated in 2014-15.	Four items on the alumni survey were relevant to this learning outcome. They are reported below in terms of the percent who stated good or excellent on the survey: N=13 Find appropriate sources of information = 69.2% Unmet Evaluate the quality of information = 69.2% Unmet Conduct research to support a position = 46.2% Unmet Use quantitative/qualitative techniques within your professional field = 38.5% Unmet
Internship Evaluation Direct and Indirect Measure	The measure used was the internship supervisor review form, which is completed by the internship supervisor (see Appendix E). A rating scale of five responses included (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent, and (N/A). The department considered a score of (1) or (2) to be categorized as below standard, a score of (3) to	An internship supervisor performance review was obtained for all students who were enrolled in an internship during the academic year. Of note, there were only 3 students in the program who were enrolled in an internship during the 2016-17 academic year.	The analysis process included a review of the internship supervisor performance sheet. The following is a summary of the item on the supervisor performance sheet that related to this learning outcome and the number of students who met or exceeded the standard, as identified by the supervisor: HPR 598 Internship N=3 students Evaluates the effectiveness of health education programs: Below Standard = 0 Meets Standard = 0

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 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.
	meet standard, and a score of (4) to exceed standard. This rubric is attached in Appendix E. The department reached consensus that the target score = 85% Meets Standard.		Exceeds Standard = 3 In sum, 100% of students either met or exceeded standard. Met
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)	Three students affiliated with the Health Education & Promotion program took the CHES exam in April 2017. MU HEP Pass Rate: 100% Met Associated Competencies Act as a Resource: Met

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

Learning outcome 5 was assessed via three direct measures (proficiency reports, internship evaluation, and Certification results). Two courses that ran in 2016-17 addressed this learning outcome. In **HPR 534 Topics in Nutrition and Weight Management** (N=4), students were asked to write a research paper on a diet book and provide an analysis and critique using current and credible evidence. All 4 students enrolled in the class were evaluated for this outcome. Three had achieved an assessment of meets standard. In **HPR 591, Research Methods in Health Education**, (N=5), students were asked to write a final research paper on a specific content area of health education and promotion. Part of the guidelines for this assignment was a literature review and a synthesis of research to develop a health education program. All 5 students who were enrolled in the class were evaluated for this outcome. Four had achieved an assessment of meets or exceeds standard. In sum, a total of 9 students were assessed in two separate classes on two different assignments and 7 of the 9 (77.8%) were assessed to have either met or exceeded the standard based on the rubric. This is below the targeted measure of 85% of students who met or exceeded the standard that the department had determined to be a goal prior to the assessment process.

The second direct measure of assessment was the internship supervisor review form, which is completed by the internship supervisor at the end of the semester. One item on this form addressed the learning outcome (*Evaluates the effectiveness of health education programs*). This item was selected as it relates to using research to evaluate and support the effectiveness of a program. A total of 3 students were enrolled in the internship during the 2016-17 academic year. All 3 students were rated as “exceeds standard” for the item on the review form. This is above the targeted measure of 85% of students who either met or exceeded the standard that the department had determined to be a goal prior to the assessment process.



The third direct measure of assessment was the certification results of the CHES exam. The CHES exam is a national examination that assesses all competencies associated with a competent and qualified health education specialist. The Health Education & Promotion graduate program curriculum is aligned with the competencies of this examination and the outcomes of this exam reflect an application of content taught in the program. A total of 3 students took the CHES exam in April 2017. All 3 students passed the exam (100% pass rate), which was well above the national average of 68.48%. One competency of the CHES exam related to this learning outcome: *Act as a Resource*. This competency was chosen as it includes the use of research and credible information to inform others. For this competency area, students scored above the national average. For *Act as a Resource*, the national average was 9.14, whereas graduates of the MU HEP program averaged 10.67. These results are above our target measure of scoring above the national average.

One indirect measure was used to assess this learning outcome. The results of the alumni survey included 13 respondents, 8 from the 2011-12 cohort and 5 from the 2014-15 cohort. Four items on the alumni survey addressed this learning outcome (*Find appropriate sources of information, Evaluate the quality of information, Conduct research to support a position, and Use quantitative/qualitative techniques within your professional field*). 69.2% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent to the item *Find appropriate sources of information*. While this is below the performance standard set by the department (85%), this is an improvement from the 2015 alumni survey in which 63.6% indicated a rating of good or excellent. Looking a bit more deeply at trends regarding this item, there is fluctuation. In 2013, 88.9% of alumni indicated a rating of good or excellent. 69.2% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent to the item *Evaluate the quality of information*. This is below the performance standard set by the department (85%). The 2015 alumni survey reported that 81.8% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent and the 2013 alumni survey reported that 88.9% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent. 46.2% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent to the item *Conduct research to support a position*. This is below the performance standard set by the department (85%). The 2015 alumni survey reported that 63.6% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent and the 2013 alumni survey reported that 66.7% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent. 38.5% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent to the item *Conduct research to support a position*. This is below the performance standard set by the department (85%). The 2015 alumni survey reported that 72.7% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent and the 2013 alumni survey reported that 66.7% of respondents indicated a rating of good or excellent.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The HHP department has seven full time faculty, six of whom hold doctoral degrees. Most faculty are actively involved in scholarly activities, including research presentations and publications, including 11 international or national conference presentations and six peer-reviewed journal articles produced during the 2016-17 academic year. Another strength of the program is that HPR 591 Research Methods in Health Education and Promotion ran as a new course in the department in 2017. Historically, students were required to take NU 591, which was taught by a Nursing faculty and students from different disciplines were enrolled in the course. Feedback from the program review found that students desired a more health education focused research methods course. The incorporation of a discipline specific research methods course should strengthen the curriculum.

The development of a rubric to assess this learning outcome and the standardized measurement of this assessment via several assignments in the curriculum revealed that opportunities exist to strengthen the ability of students to interpret research related to health education/promotion. The opportunity to integrate a focus on research methods in selected courses may enhance students' ability to conduct research and support a position using this research. Another opportunity for improvement is to collaborate with the Library and Learning Services to expose students to the vast resources available through the library system.

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

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.
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.

Appendices

Appendix A: Revised Program Learning Outcomes

MS in Health Education and Promotion – Learning Outcomes Proposed Revision

2015-16 LOs	Proposed Revisions	Associated NCHEC/CHES Competencies
1. Exhibit the knowledge and skills to function as competent graduate-level health educators	1. Exhibit the knowledge to function as competent graduate-level health educators	1. Assess needs, resources, and capacity for health education/promotion
2. Select, choose, and implement contemporary non-technology-based equipment, industry tools/inventories, and/or other practical "hands-on" applications in health and wellness	Delete	
3. Evaluate the rationality and sensitivity of values and ethics in the health and wellness field using critical thinking behaviors/skills	3 Apply ethical standards to the development and implementation of health education/promotion programs.	3. Implement health education/promotion
4. Evaluate various methods of technology in the classroom, in designing and evaluating health promotion programs, and/or in the clinical setting	4 Evaluate resource materials, equipment, industry tools/inventories, and/or other practical applications used in health education/promotion programing.	4. Conduct evaluation and research related to health education/promotion
5. Plan, implement, administer and evaluate health education strategies, interventions and programs	2 Apply theories and/or models to the process of needs assessment and planning health education/promotion strategies, interventions, and programs.	2. Plan health education/promotion 5. Administer and manage health education/promotion
6. Critique research in order to assess individual and community needs for health education	5 Interpret research related to health education/promotion.	6. Serve as a health education/promotion resource person
7. Advocate and communicate for health and health education	6 Communicate about and promote health and health education/promotion.	7. Communicate, promote, and advocate for health, health education/promotion, and the profession

Curriculum Map

These will be sent for review and feedback to the Liberal Arts Core Committee.

GRADUATE CURRICULUM MAP

Degree Program: Health Education and Promotion (M.S.)

Year: 2016-17

Program Outcomes:

Program Outcome	Critical Reading ¹	Written Communication	Oral Communication/Persuasive Argument	Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline	Scholarly Presentation and the Use Resource Materials
Exhibit the knowledge to function as competent graduate-level health educators.	X	X	X	X	X
Apply theories and/or models to the process of needs assessment and planning health education/promotion strategies, interventions, and programs.	X	X	X	X	X
Apply ethical standards to the development and implementation of health education/promotion programs.	X	X	X	X	X
Utilize resource materials, equipment, industry tools/inventories, and/or other practical applications used in health education/promotion programming.	X	X	X	X	X
Interpret research related to health education/promotion.	X	X	X	X	X
Communicate about and promote health and health education/promotion.	X	X	X	X	X

¹ Graduate program competencies derived from GSC Committee Requirements for New Graduate Programs: "Achieving this criteria may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to:

1. Course content that is increasingly more complex and rigorous than UG courses (course objectives, learning activities, outcome expectations, etc.)
2. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in reading critically.
3. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in writing clearly.
4. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in arguing persuasively.
5. Coursework that produces graduates competent in identifying, investigating, and applying theory and principles of the discipline to new ideas, problems, and materials.
6. Competence in the scholarly presentation of the results of independent study and in the use of bibliographic and other resource materials with emphasis on primary sources for data.
7. A capstone or final integrative activity that demonstrates achievement of graduate-level knowledge and application of the theory and principles of the discipline"

Curriculum Map:

For each course, indicate which competencies are included using the following key. Please refer to the director of assessment in Planning and Institutional Effectiveness if you need more detailed explanation of the four core competencies.

Level of instruction: F-foundational, A-advanced, M-mastery

Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-other (explain briefly)

Required Course	Critical Reading ¹		Written Communication		Oral Communication/Persuasive Argument		Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline		Scholarly Presentation and Use of Resource Materials	
	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess
HPR 501 Foundations of Health Education and Health Promotion	F	E, OT – case studies, PR	F	PR, OT – case studies	F	PR, O	F	E, PR, O, OT – case studies	F	PR, O
HPR 502 Intro to Public Health	F	E, P,	F	P	F	O	F	E, P, O	F	O, P
HPR 520 Principles of Epidemiology	A	E, PR	A	PR, P, E	A	O	A	E, PR, P, O	A	O, PR, P
HPR 534 Nutrition	F	OT- case studies, P, OT- Diet analysis	F	O, P	F	O	F	O, P, OT – case studies, OT – Diet analysis	F	O
HPR 500 Exercise Physiology	F	OT- lab experiences	F	OT- Blog, website	F	O	F	O, OT – lab experiences, OT – Blog, website	F	OT-blog,website
HPR 540 Designing and Evaluating Health Promotion Programs	A	PR, OT – case studies,	A	PR	A	PR, O	A	PR, O	A	PR, O, P
HPR 555 Health Communication	A	O, P	A	P	A	O	A	O, P, OT – class discussions	A	O, P
HPR 598 Internship	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I
HPR 591 Research Methods in Health Education & Promotion	M	E, P, OT- CITI online training module, OT in-class discussion	M	p	M	O	M	E, P, OT – in-class discussions, OT – SPSS	M	O, P