K-State MPH Faculty Advisory Council Meeting Union Room 209 Wednesday, March 12, 2014, 10:30 AM Minutes

ommittee Member	Emphasis	Present	Not Present		
Cates, Michael	MPH Director	Х			
Choma, Kimathi	MPH Staff	Non Voting			
Stevenson, Barta	MPH Staff	Non Voting			
Rockler, Briana	MPH Student		Х		
Montelone, Beth	One Health Grant		Choma Proxy		
Canter, Deb	Core Instructor		McElroy Proxy		
Hsu, Wei Wen	Core Instructor	Х			
Larson, Robert	Core Instructor	Х			
Sanderson, Michael	Core Instructor		Larson Proxy		
Fung, Dan	FSB	Х			
Kastner, Justin	FSB	Х			
Nutsch, Abbey	FSB	Х			
Chapes, Stephen	IDZ		Х		
Renter, David	IDZ	Х			
van der Merwe, Deon	IDZ	Х			
Haub, Mark	PHN		Х		
Rosenkranz, Ric	PHN	Х			
Wang, George	PHN		Х		
Heinrich, Katie	PHPA	Х			
Mailey, Emily	PHPA	Х			
McElroy, Mary	PHPA	Х			

Dr. Cates called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM. There was a quorum present for the meeting.

1. Approval of minutes.

The minutes from the February meeting were approved.

2. Old Business.

- a. The group discussed the membership for the Ad Hoc Committee (which will meet and discuss ways to improve students' overall breadth of public health knowledge). Alumni and current students have volunteered as well as a member from the FSB emphasis area. Volunteers from the other emphasis areas were solicited. The committee will consist of:
 - Justin Kastner (FSB)
 - Robert Larson (IDZ)
 - Ric Rosenkranz or someone else (PHN)
 - Brandon Irwin or Emily Mailey (PHPA)

Dr. Cates will send the committee a list of the other volunteers and the committee will select at least one current student and alumni member. They will meet on April 9 at 10:30 AM in Coles Rm 343 in lieu of the FAC meeting.

Minutes

Dr. Kastner asked that the discussion and suggestions from the February minutes on this item be pulled out and sent to the committee.

- b. The group discussed the additional information on the student to be provided before the final defense to help with the rigor of the oral exam. In addition to the student assessment tool link (sent in a separate e-mail), it was suggested the following information be sent in an e-mail to the supervisory committee members no later than 24 hours before the final defense:
 - DARS report
 - Field Experience Agreement
 - Copy of core syllabi

After the Ad Hoc committee meets, if it is determined that other items or information would be helpful, it will be added.

3. Discussion Items.

- a. Dr. Cates reminded the group about the CEPH timeline for accreditation.
 - April 29, 2014: Deadline for KSU response to site team's report (Target is to mail the response on April 2, 2014)
 - June 12-14, 2014: Meeting of CEPH to cinder KSU for accreditation
 - Approximately one month after June meeting: CEPH will send decision to President of University
 - Site Team Concern Summary included as <u>Attachment 1</u> of Agenda, (starts on pg 4)
 - Draft Response (as of 3-11-2014) included as <u>Attachment 2</u> of Agenda, (starts on pg 6)
- b. Dr. Cates provided the decision by the Executive Council (Department Heads) to share with the MPH Program Director course evaluation information from MPH required courses. The information share would be what the faculty member shared with their respective department head during their annual review. This would be consistent with the University Handbook (C34.1) requiring that all "Faculty members, including regular faculty, instructors, graduate teaching assistants, adjuncts, etc., shall be evaluated by students for each course and section they teach each year in order to provide themselves and their departments with information pertaining to teaching efficacy as well as provide material for the assessment of the relationships between SLO achievement and teaching."

It was moved and seconded that this group (MPH Faculty Advisory Council) supported this decision by the Executive Council (Department Heads). The vote of the group was unanimous.

c. The CEPH response document was discussed. Dr. Cates asked the group to review the document and suggest information that should be added, reminding them that CEPH cautioned us not to repeat the information in the self-study document. The errors identified in the report from CEPH have been incorporated into the response document.

Minutes

After discussion of what would strengthen the section on diversity, it was suggested that each core course instructor would provide Dr. Cates with one or two sentences that illustrate the type of diversity and health disparity items routinely discussed in their course, but not necessarily delineated in the syllabus. Dr. Cates could then summarize the information in the section 1.8 Diversity.

4. Informational Items.

There was a brief discussion concerning the informational items and clarification of the information and its use.

- Programmatic Assessment Data (<u>Attachment 3</u>, starts on page 13)
- MPH Program Update (<u>Attachment 4</u>, starts on page 16)
- Curriculum changes for Food Safety/Biosecurity (FSB) and Public Health Physical Activity (PHPA) were approved by Graduate Council on March 4 as an expected proposal. The changed curricula will be effective Fall 2014. The MPH website will be updated along with all handouts.
- **5.** Future Meetings: 2nd Wednesday, 10:30 to Noon

Date	Time	Place
April 9, 2014 – Ad Hoc committee meeting in lieu of FAC meeting	10:30 AM	Coles, Rm 343
May 14, 2014	10:30 AM	Union Rm 209
June 11, 2014	10:30 AM	Mosier N202

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 AM.

Attachment 1: Site Team Concern Summary

CEPH Site Visit Team Report's Partially Met Criteria

1.2 Evaluation and Planning. The program shall have an explicit process for monitoring and evaluating its overall efforts against its mission, goals and objectives; for assessing the program's effectiveness in serving its various constituencies; and for using evaluation results in ongoing planning and decision making to achieve its mission. As part of the evaluation process, the program must conduct an analytical self-study that analyzes performance against the accreditation criteria.

Site Visit Team Concerns: Incomplete development of program evaluation and monitoring system. Inability of program director to review and act on student course evaluations. Limited analysis and use of student data.

1.8 Diversity. The program shall demonstrate a commitment to diversity and shall evidence an ongoing practice of cultural competence in learning, research and service practices.

Site Visit Team Concern: Lack of systematic incorporation of diversity within the program's curriculum and constituent groups. The program has done little to demonstrate its commitment to recruitment and retention of non-white students (no program-specific plans and policies to recruit non-white students).

2.3 Public Health Core Knowledge. All graduate professional public health degree students must complete sufficient coursework to attain depth and breadth in the five core areas of public health knowledge.

Site Visit Team Concern: Narrow focus of the two credit hour required core course in environmental toxicology (no measurable learning objectives in syllabus, course content offers little evidence toward environmental health competency; course content does not address full range of key public health challenges).

2.6 Required Competencies. For each degree program and area of specialization within each program identified in the instructional matrix, there shall be clearly stated competencies that guide the development of degree programs. The program must identify competencies for graduate professional, academic and baccalaureate public health degree programs. Additionally, the program must identify competencies for specializations within the degree program at all levels (bachelor's, master's and doctoral).

Site Visit Team Concern: Incomplete integration of competencies into the curriculum (examples: syllabi without learning objectives; primary faculty were not able to articulate how they ensured MPH students achieved core competencies).

2.7 Assessment Procedures. There shall be procedures for assessing and documenting the extent to which each student has demonstrated achievement of the competencies defined for his or her degree program and area of concentration.

Site Visit Team Concern: Varying level of rigor in assessment of the culminating experience.

3.3 Workforce Development. The program shall engage in activities other than its offering of degree programs that support the professional development of the public health workforce.

Site Visit Team Concern: Lack of comprehensive and ongoing strategy to identify needs of Kansas public health workforce.

4.4 Advising and Career Counseling. There shall be available a clearly explained and accessible academic advising system for students, as well as readily available career and placement advice.

Site Visit Team Concern: Limited availability of information pertaining to usefulness of current career advising methods.

Attachment 2: Draft Response (as of 3-11-2014)

1.2 Evaluation and Planning

The program shall have an explicit process for monitoring and evaluating its overall efforts against its mission, goals and objectives; for assessing the program's effectiveness in serving its various constituencies; and for using evaluation results in ongoing planning and decision making to achieve its mission. As part of the evaluation process, the program must conduct an analytical self-study that analyzes performance against the accreditation criteria.

Kansas State University is one of multiple institutions of higher learning in the state, under the oversight of the Kansas Board of Regents. Since the MPH program at Kansas State University was approved by the Board of Regents in 2003, it has functioned within the strategic educational framework of the state, the university, as well as the partnering colleges and department. There have been strategic and operational goals which have impacted the program, and the Board of Regents has a consistent set of policies and procedures for assessment of this and other graduate programs. As an interdisciplinary program at this university, we do not have a separate strategic plan but our numerous goals and objectives, approved by our partnering faculty and administrators, fit within the strategic and operational planning of those partners as well as with the university's newest strategic document "K-State 2025."

We have developed, and continue to improve programmatic assessment tools which are systematically used within the context of our structure. We feel that the blend of surveys of students, graduates, faculty, field experience preceptors, other public health practitioners along with the subsequent sharing of that information between all university partners (e.g., administration, faculty and students), is effective in identifying necessary changes in our program. In accordance with university policy, faculty instructors must be evaluated by students for each course they teach, in order to provide themselves and their departments with information pertaining to teaching efficacy. The department heads have agreed to share such course evaluation data with the MPH program director for its use in programmatic assessment.

Over the ten year history of this program, particularly within the four years of the self-study, we have made numerous changes to meet the needs of our students based on our program assessment and planning; examples have included significant changes in governance, fiscal and faculty resourcing, curricula, additional core and other required courses, as well as available formats and timing of some popular courses. With that said, we will continue to work continuously with the Office of Educational Innovation and Evaluation, along with our partners, to find new and better ways to further improve the assessment of our program.

1.8 Diversity

The program shall demonstrate a commitment to diversity and shall evidence an ongoing practice of cultural competence in learning, research, and service practices.

The MPH Program at Kansas State University is completely dedicated to an inclusive environment of learning, research and service. Through our multiple college and department partners, we have a wide variety of ongoing practices toward assessing and improving diversity within our program. Our faculty and administrators approved the diversity goals, based on what we perceived as underrepresented groups within our program, after we had worked with the university office of diversity in our review. To ensure continuing, appropriate levels of success in this area specifically for the MPH program, a task force headed by one of the partnering deans will provide recommended changes for consideration by program governance groups, faculty and staff.

We did not attempt to list all the university, college and department diversity-related efforts, but there is a university-wide commitment. Each of our college partners has a lead person, usually an associate dean, who coordinates diversity-related efforts throughout their college, and these impact our faculty and students as well. In addition, one of our program's staff members, Dr. Kimathi Choma, plays a significant role in recruiting for One Health Kansas, Pathways to Public Health, the College of Veterinary Medicine, as well as our program.

Although rarely listed as separate entries in a syllabus, most of our five core courses include multiple examples related to diversity in their course content. For example, the evaluation of risk by identifiable cohorts (exposure groups) is a foundational component in our epidemiology core course, MPH 754, and the instructor consistently teaches that identifying and quantifying health disparities is exactly the role of epidemiology toward public health.

We have no "quotas," but all recruitment and retention efforts, aimed at students and faculty members alike, stress inclusion and fairness for all. All trends for the four underrepresented populations of new students and graduates of this program over the past ten years show a positive incline.

We will continue to work with our university and college partners on this issue, and we are confident we will continue to benefit from the collaborative efforts. In our own program, our curricular and overall programmatic review process has and will continue to assess needs for other, specific changes in curricula, recruitment, and retention efforts.

2.3 Public Health Core Knowledge

All graduate professional public health degree students must complete sufficient coursework to attain depth and breadth in the five core areas of public health knowledge.

The MPH Program at Kansas State University is dedicated in providing breadth and depth in the five core areas to all our students. We disagree with the site team's perception that our core course in environmental toxicology has a narrow focus. In our opinion, environmental health is a very broad and many times challenging discipline, particularly when applied to population health. The required text of our core course for environmental health, MPH 806, Environmental Toxicology, is *Principles and Practice of Toxicology in Public Health*, by I. S. Richards and M. Bourgeois, and, as stated in the syllabus, the course aims to provide an overview of toxicological principles and the practical application of toxicology in public health.

The first section of the course, Overview and Basic Principles, includes two goals:

- 1) achieve familiarity with the basic concepts, terminology and language of environmental toxicology; and
- 2) know and understand the most common and important ways in which biological systems are exposed to, and react to, environmental chemicals.

The goals of the second section, Risk Assessment, are:

- 1) know and understand the paradigms and assumptions associated with risk assessment; and
- 2) know the components of a typical risk assessment and be able to interpret a risk assessment.

The approach in this course has been to focus on the broad knowledge of environmental toxicology as well as skills to assess, manage and mitigate a breadth of environmental risks to the public health. We acknowledge that the syllabus available to the site team needed improvement, particularly in clarity of goals and course content, and it has been rewritten for this semester's (Spring 2014) version of the course.

2.6 Required Competencies

For each degree program and area of specialization within each program identified in the instructional matrix, there shall be clearly stated competencies that guide the development of degree programs. The program must identify competences for graduate professional, academic and baccalaureate public health degree programs. Additionally, the program must identify competencies for specializations within the degree program at all levels (bachelor's, master's and doctoral).

We disagree with site team's perception that there is incomplete integration of competencies into the curriculum. All prospective and current students are provided with the complete list of required core and specific area of emphasis competencies at the same place as our required curricula.

This blend of competencies and curricular requirements are provided to students in handouts from the program office and in links on our website.

Food Safety and Biosecurity Area of Emphasis: http://www.k-state.edu/mphealth/pdf/competencies/FSB_Competencies_updated.pdf

Infectious Diseases and Zoonoses Area of Emphasis: http://www.k-state.edu/mphealth/pdf/competencies/IDZ_Competencies_updated.pdf

Public Health Nutrition Area of Emphasis: http://www.k-state.edu/mphealth/pdf/competencies/PHN_Competencies_updated.pdf

Public Health Physical Activity Area of Emphasis: http://www.k-state.edu/mphealth/pdf/competencies/PHPA Competencies updated.pdf

We also provide students the competencies and course alignment matrix, as required by CEPH and our university.

Core Competencies and Course Alignment Matrix: http://www.k-state.edu/mphealth/pdf/assessment/MPH%20Core%20Competencies%202013.pdf

Food Safety and Biosecurity Competencies and Course Alignment Matrix: http://www.k-state.edu/mphealth/pdf/assessment/FSB%20Course%20Matrix.pdf

Infectious Diseases and Zoonoses Competencies and Course Alignment Matrix: <u>http://www.k-state.edu/mphealth/pdf/assessment/IDZ%20Course%20Matrix.pdf</u>

Public Health Nutrition Competencies and Course Alignment Matrix: <u>http://www.k-state.edu/mphealth/pdf/assessment/PHN%20Course%20Matrix.pdf</u>

Public Health Physical Activity Competencies and Course Alignment Matrix: http://www.k-state.edu/mphealth/pdf/assessment/PHPA%20Course%20Matrix.pdf

2.7 Assessment Procedures

There shall be procedures for assessing and documenting the extent to which each student has demonstrated achievement of the competencies defined for his or her degree program and area of concentration.

Like all other graduate students at Kansas State University, MPH students are assessed on particular competencies at two main junctures, during the specific courses in the required curriculum and during their culminating experience. Each student's supervisory committee is comprised of at least three members of the university's graduate faculty. It is true that different faculty members may have different approaches in assessing students, in the classroom and/or during the culminating experience. However, our faculty approved the assessment tool developed with OEIE's assistance and used for the past three years, and it has been effective in driving and somewhat standardizing the individual assessment process without unduly constraining the individual faculty approaches during the culminating experience. It also provides programmatic information related to the competency assessment which is shared with individual instructors, the curriculum committee, as well as the various program governing entities. Course grades are also made available upon request from supervisory committee members, and students are encouraged to proactively address the competencies in the oral and/or written presentations associated with the culminating experience. Again, we think we have adequately developed and consistently used procedures for assessing and documenting the extent to which each student demonstrates required competencies.

3.3 Workforce Development

The program shall engage in activities other than its offering of degree programs that support the professional development of the public health workforce.

Our program is very actively involved with a comprehensive and ongoing strategy to identify the needs of the Kansas public health workforce. We do that on two major fronts: (1) working with our public health academic and practice partners across the state on collective efforts and (2) using survey data from public health practitioners to gain other specific insights.

The Kansas Public Health Systems Group has been an advisory group at the state level for over fifteen years, and Kansas State University has been an active part for over six of those years. For the past four years, there has been an active Kansas Public Health Workforce Development Coordinating Council, with Kansas State University, other state universities, local health departments, and the state health department as participants. The MPH Program Director serves as the Kansas State University representative to the Kansas Public Health Systems Group, the Kansas Public Health Workforce Development Coordinating Council, and in the past year, the Kansas Public Health Workforce Assessment Group. Together, these groups are working collectively and aggressively to assess the public health workforce needs across the state and to determine the best solutions to those needs.

In addition, we routinely interact with other public health practitioners though our student field experience preceptors, particularly in their student assessments and in potential employer surveys. This adds insights to our ongoing strategy of meeting the needs of the public health workforce.

4.4 Advising and Career Counseling

There shall be available a clearly explained and accessible academic advising system for students, as well as readily available career and placement advice.

Each new MPH student is provided an initial advisor from the MPH faculty. Then, the student is very active in identifying the major professor and other faculty members who are the right fit for his/her graduate supervisory committee. The MPH program director, field experience facilitator, and assistant also provide advice and counseling as needed. At any time, students may request changes to their advisor, major professor or committee members.

Currently, students are surveyed, particularly at mid-program and after graduation, on a variety of issues, to include advising. Graduates are surveyed about their experiences by three different entities: the MPH program, the Graduate School, and the university's Career and Employment Services (CES).

Career and Employment Services offers individual consultation and educational programs to assist both undergraduate and graduate students in career planning and job searches. MPH students can schedule an appointment with one of the Assistant Directors who will discuss career goals, assist students in identifying potential job opportunities, review resumes, provide mock interviews both face-to-face, telephone, or technology based such as Skype. CES host a university-wide employment fair each fall and targeted career fairs during spring semester. Throughout the year, they sponsor professional development and networking events. All of these programs and services are available to the MPH students to provide them with career and placement advice.

The university also provides an Academic and Career Information Center to assist students as they explore options and occupations which connect with their interests, abilities, and values.

The MPH Program has consistently collected and tracked survey data and any significant trends. All such data is routinely shared and discussed with the governing entities. The Career and Employment Services provides updates to the program at least once a year.

Attachment 3: Programmatic Assessment Data (for information) MPH Graduates -- Committee Assessment (Percent of Students receiving a 3 or 4 on Final Defense Assessments)

MPH Graduates Comm		essment 2012	(Percent	AY 2013		ving a 3 or 4 on Final Defense Assessments) AY 2014 Totals by AY						
Survey Questions			E14.2				S'14					
Survey Questions	S'12 (n=6)	Su'12 (n=3)	F'12	S'13 (n=16)	Su'13 (n=8)	F'13	(n=1)	AY'1: (n=9		AY'14 (n=9)		
Biostatistics 1	83%	0%	(n=7) 57%	38%	50%	(n=8) 50%	0%	56%		44%		
Biostatistics 2	83%	33%	71%	50%	88%	63%	0%	67%		56%		
Environmental Health 1	83%	33%	57%	56%	88%	75%	100%	67%		78%		
Environmental Health 2	100%	33%	57%	63%	63%	63%	100%	75%		67%		
Environmental Health 3	100%	67%	57%	56%	88%	63%	100%	88%		67%		
Epidemiology 1	83%	0%	57%	75%	75%	88%	0%	56%		78%		
Epidemiology 2	83%	67%	57%	63%	88%	38%	100%	78%		44%		
Epidemiology 3	100%	33%	57%	81%	88%	88%	100%	78%		89%		
Health Services Admin 1	100%	100%	71%	75%	88%	88%	100%	100%		89%		
Health Services Admin 2	100%	33%	86%	75%	75%	75%	100%	78%		78%		
Social & Behavioral Sci 1	100%	33%	86%	88%	88%	88%	100%	78%		89%		
Social & Behavioral Sci 2	100%	33%	71%	88%	88%	88%	100%	78%		89%		
Integration	50%	67%	57%	63%	88%	38%	100%	56%		44%		
FSB 1	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a		
FSB 2	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a		
FSB 3	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a		
FSB 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a		
FSB 5	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a		
IDZ 1	100%	67%	60%	64%	100%	57%	100%	86%	70%	63%		
DZ 2	100%	67%	60%	55%	75%	71%	100%	86%	60%	75%		
IDZ 3	100%	67%	60%	73%	100%	71%	100%	86%	75%	75%		
IDZ 4	100%	67%	60%	64%	100%	57%	100%	86%	70%	63%		
IDZ 5	100%	100%	60%	73%	100%	86%	100%	100%	5 75%	88%		
PHN 1	100%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	5 100%	n/a		
PHN 2	100%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	5 100%	n/a		
PHN 3	100%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	5 100%	n/a		
PHN 4	100%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	5 100%	n/a		
PHN 5	100%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	5 100%	n/a		
PHPA 1	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	50%	100%	n/a	n/a	80%	100%		
PHPA 2	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	50%	100%	n/a	n/a	80%	100%		
PHPA 3	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	50%	100%	n/a	n/a	80%	100%		
PHPA 4	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	50%	100%	n/a	n/a	80%	100%		
PHPA 5	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	50%	100%	n/a	n/a	80%	100%		
PHPA 6	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	0%	100%	n/a	n/a	60%	100%		

Student Exit Survey

Questions start		AY 2011			AY 2012		AY 2013			2014		Totals by AY			
with: How	F'10	S'11	Su'11	F'11	S'12	Su'12	F'12	S'13	Su'13	F'13	AY'11	AY'12	AY'13	AY'14	All
satisfied were you with the	n=3	n=3	n=4	n=8	n=6	n=3	n=4	n=12	n=3	n=6	n=1-	n=17	n=19	n=6	n=52
required "core" courses?	100%	100%	100%	88%	100%	67%	100%	83%	100%	83%	100%	88%	89%	83%	90%
required emphasis courses?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
elective courses?	100%	100%	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	96%
quality of academic advising?	67%	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%	67%	100%	83%	90%	94%	79%	83%	87%
availability of academic advisor?	67%	67%	100%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	80%	94%	100%	83%	92%
assistance of academic advisor?	67%	33%	100%	88%	100%	100%	75%	67%	100%	67%	70%	94%	74%	67%	79%
availability of faculty members?	100%	100%	100%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	94%	100%	83%	96%
approachability of faculty members?	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	100%	100%	98%
way degree requirements (policies and procedures) were explained?	67%	67%	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%	75%	100%	100%	80%	94%	84%	100%	88%
way admin deadlines and requirements were communicated ?	67%	67%	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%	92%	100%	83%	80%	94%	95%	83%	90%
Questions start		AY 2011			AY 2012			AY 2013		2014		Totals	by AY		Totals
with: Do you	F'10	S'11	Su'11	F'11	S'12	Su'12	F'12	S'13	Su'13	F'13	AY'11	AY'12	AY'13	AY'14	All
agree that	n=3	n=3	n=4	n=8	n=6	n=3	n=4	n=12	n=3	n=6	n=1-	n=17	n=19	n=6	n=52
instruction keeps pace with developments in the field?	100%	67%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	96%
there is a high degree of intellectual challenge?	100%	67%	75%	100%	83%	100%	100%	83%	67%	83%	80%	94%	84%	83%	87%
academic standards for faculty are high?	100%	100%	75%	100%	83%	100%	100%	92%	100%	83%	90%	94%	95%	83%	92%
courses were available when needed?	100%	100%	75%	100%	100%	67%	100%	75%	100%	100%	90%	94%	84%	100%	90%
Questions start		AY 2011			AY 2012			AY 2013		2014		Totals	by AY		Totals

Attachment 3: Programmatic Assessment Data (for information)

with: Please	F'10	S'11	Su'11	F'11	S'12	Su'12	F'12	S'13	Su'13	F'13	AY'11	AY'12	AY'13	AY'14	All
rate the	n=3	n=3	n=4	n=8	n=6	n=3	n=4	n=12	n=3	n=6	n=1-	n=17	n=19	n=6	n=52
availability of research opportunities	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	67%	50%	67%	83%	89%	73%	67%	79%
quality of research experience	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	86%	100%	93%	100%	94%
quality of advising for your research	50%	0%	100%	100%	50%	100%	75%	67%	50%	67%	71%	86%	67%	67%	72%
value of your research experience to your overall educational experience	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	86%	100%	92%	100%	93%
availability of field experience (practicum)	100%	67%	100%	67%	100%	67%	100%	67%	50%	83%	88%	77%	72%	83%	78%
quality of field experience	100%	100%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	86%	100%	94%	100%	95%
quality of advising in your field experience	100%	67%	67%	83%	100%	67%	75%	92%	50%	67%	71%	85%	83%	67%	80%
value of your field experience to your overall educational experience*	100%	100%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	86%	100%	100%	100%	98%
MPH Program's depth (i.e., ability to examine key concepts in detail).	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	67%	100%	83%	100%	83%	100%	94%	89%	83%	92%
MPH Program's breadth (i.e., ability to examine a variety of key concepts).	67%	100%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	96%
MPH Program's integration of diverse perspectives (i.e., ability to examine various viewpoints).	100%	100%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	83%	90%	100%	95%	83%	94%
MPH Program's preparation of students for future employment.	100%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	92%	33%	83%	90%	100%	79%	83%	88%

Attachment 4. MPH Program Update







As of Sep 2013