MPH Program Survey Data Highlights Fall 2015

The Master of Public Health (MPH) program at Kansas State University has worked with the Office of Educational Innovation and Evaluation (OEIE) since 2010 to collect evaluative feedback on the program. Over this time, OEIE has collaborated with the MPH director and faculty to develop a variety of survey instruments to gather data from students, preceptors, employers and alumni. Currently, the MPH program administers these surveys on a planned rotation to minimize requests for response from a particular group, but ensuring that the program receives on-going feedback.

In fall 2015, OEIE reviewed these data to identify longitudinal trends or highlights for the program. The following table summarizes the data used in this analysis.

Data Collection Instruments	Date Range of the Data
Student Entrance Survey	Spring 2013 to Summer 2015
Student Mid-program Survey	Spring 2011 to Spring 2015
Student Field Experience Survey	Summer 2010 to Summer 2015
Student Exit Survey	Fall 2011 to Summer 2015
Preceptor Evaluation	Spring 2011 to Summer 2015
Employer Survey	Summer 2011 to Spring 2013
Alumni Survey	Summer 2011 to Fall 2014

Survey Highlights

- Since 2013, the top four factors that have consistently been identified as "Important" or "Very Important" when the student chose the MPH program at K-State are:
 - University reputation
 - o Curriculum
 - o Accreditation status of program
 - Quality of faculty
 - "Alumni network" and "class size" have been the least important factors reported by students since 2013 in choosing the MPH program at K-State. This may be a reflection of the relatively new program, so it may be of interest to monitor the ongoing surveys to determine if this continues.
- Beginning in Summer of 2014, financial assistance and scholarship availability have also been identified as "Very Important" in the students' decision to choose the MPH program at K-State.

- Since 2010, students have consistently reported they are "Satisfied" to "Very Satisfied" with four program elements:
 - o Availability of academic advisor
 - Availability of faculty members
 - o Approachability of faculty members
 - The way in which administrative deadlines and requirements were communicated
- Since 2010, students rated the quality of their field experiences, the value the field
 experience brought to their overall educational experience and the breadth of the MPH
 program (ability to examine a variety of key concepts) as good to excellent. However,
 the availability of research opportunities, quality of advising for research, and
 availability of field experiences has consistently been rated fair to good.
- On the mid-program survey, students have consistently rated their level of knowledge on the Epidemiology Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) the highest and Biostatistics the lowest of the five concentration areas (mean scores are shown as a 5-point scale)
 - o Biostatistics 3.29
 - Environmental Health Sciences 3.67
 - o Epidemiology 4.08
 - Health Services Administration 3.67
 - Social and Behavioral Sciences 3.84
- Feedback from preceptors, since 2010, has consistently indicated that students have worked cooperatively and positively with the agency staff. Preceptors indicated that students are now more adequately prepared to meet the objectives of the field experience, as compared to the earliest cohorts (2010-2011). The preceptors generally reported that their agencies/organizations have benefitted from hosting an MPH student, and have been willing to host multiple placements.
- As employers have only been surveyed twice (2011 and 2013) it is difficult to identify trends in their responses. However, in both years, employers agreed that the following topics are important or very important to include in the K-State MPH curriculum (mean scores are shown as a 5-point scale):
 - o Epidemiology 4.59
 - Program Evaluation 4.42
 - Writing Skills for Professionals 4.44

By continuing to administer these surveys on a regular rotation, the MPH staff can monitor feedback from students, preceptors, employers and alumni to make data-based decisions about the program. These efforts may be helpful in documenting processes and outcomes as required by the university, the Kansas Board of Regents, and the Council on Education for Public Health.