

MPH Program Learning Outcome Report Summary 2021

The following table summarizes the assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for MPH program for assessment cycle 2020-2021. This process is conducted regularly as part of the annual learning results assessments, which measure two or three PLOs for each program each year. This summary report is to be submitted to the EEC upon its completion.

Program	Master of Public Health (MPH)
Assessment Period	SU I 2021 to SP II 2021
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	<p>PLO 5: Apply critical thinking skills and a systems-based approach in evaluating public health research.</p> <p>PLO 6: Implement specific health professional competencies within a public health arena.</p> <p>PLO 7: Articulate the role of diversity and cultural awareness in promoting high professional standards and better public health outcomes.</p>
Closing the loop (from the last time these same PLOs were assessed)	N/A
Standards of Success	<p>PLO 5: Artifact Proficiency Standard: To have met two out of the three categories. Aggregate Achievement Standard: to have a benchmark of 80 percent</p> <p>PLO 6: Artifact Proficiency Standard: To have met two out of the three categories. Aggregate Achievement Standard: to have a benchmark of 80 percent.</p> <p>PLO 7: Artifact Proficiency Standard: To have met two out of the three categories. Aggregate Achievement Standard: to have a benchmark of 80 percent.</p>



Evidence	<p>PLO 5: PUBH 620 - Public Health Research Proposal Prospectus Part 4 - Discussion, References, and Complete Proposal Sample Size: 19 artifacts</p> <p>PLO 6: PUBH 610 - Part 3 - Conflict Negotiation and Strategy Practice Sample Size: 14 artifacts</p> <p>PLO 7: PUBH 570 - Public Health Community Recommendation: Addressing Controversial Topics to Achieve Better Public Health Community Outcomes Part 3 - Final Presentation and Rebuttal Sample Size: 15 artifacts</p>
Assessment Tool	<p>PLO 5: Direct-assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise conducted.</p> <p>PLO 6: Direct-assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise conducted.</p> <p>PLO 7: Direct-assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise conducted.</p>
Assessors	<p>Dr. Damien Byas Ms. Lois Chipman-Sullivan Dr. Robert Carter III (Tie-breaker)</p>
Results	<p>PLO 5: 19 artifacts 16 pass / 3 fail = 84% pass rate, PLO was met.</p> <p>PLO 6: 14 artifacts 12 pass / 2 fail = 86% pass rate, PLO was met.</p> <p>PLO 7: 15 artifacts 13 pass / 2 fail = 87% pass rate, PLO was met.</p>
Discussion of Results	<p>PLO 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the results measured against the performance levels of an 80% minimum pass rate for this criterion, the evidence demonstrates that PLO #5 for PUBH 620 was exceeded. The MPH PLO demonstrated the ability to solve problems, apply critical thinking and evaluate implications of research findings in the field of public health met the 80% minimum passing rate.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Out of the 19 artifacts randomly assigned, 16 passed (for an 84% pass rate). The two primary raters agreed on 9 of the items, and a tie break was used for 8 items. <p>PLO 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• According to the results measured against the performance levels of an 80% minimum pass rate for this criterion, the evidence demonstrates that PLO #6 for PUBH 610 was met. The MPH PLO regarding conflict negotiation and strategy practice in public health met the 80% minimum passing rate.• Out of the 14 Artifacts randomly assigned, 12 passed and 2 failed (for a 86% pass rate). The two primary rates agreed on 13 of the items, and a tie break was used for 1 of the items. <p>PLO 7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• According to the results measured against the performance levels of an 80% minimum pass rate for this criterion, the evidence demonstrates that PLO #7 for PUBH 570 was met. The MPH PLO related to addressing controversial topics to achieve better public health community outcomes in public health met the 80% minimum passing rate.• Out of the 15 Artifacts randomly assigned, 13 passed and 2 failed (for an 87% pass rate). The two primary rates agreed on 13 of the items, and a tie break was used for 2 of the items.
Proposed Changes	<p>PLO 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The results indicated that the PUBH 620 artifact demonstrated learner proficiency for problem-solving and research implications. However, PLO5 could still be improved regarding how students were able to integrate problem-solving and research proposal development in the field of public health. <p>The MPH Program Assessment Team discussed how students were able to better integrate critical thinking principles and alignment of proposal writing. Furthermore, the team discussed how the assignment (proposal) needs to better align with the objectives, rationale, problem statement, and statistical methodology. A course revision should provide instructions for the students to better understand the importance of overall alignment and clarity of the proposal.</p> <p>PLO 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The results indicated that the PUBH 610 artifact demonstrated proficiency in conflict negotiation and strategy practice in the



	<p>final assignment. No issues with this PLO and/or the assignment assessed.</p> <p>PLO 7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results indicated that the PUBH 570 artifact demonstrated proficiency in addressing controversial topics to achieve better public health community outcomes. No issues with this PLO and/or the assignment assessed.
<p>Rationale for Proposed Changes</p>	<p>PLO 5: No major proposed changes at this time. However, the MPH program team should consider reviewing the final assignment to ensure students understand the importance of data interpretation and research proposal development.</p> <p>PLO 6: No major proposed changes at this time.</p> <p>PLO 7: No major proposed changes at this time.</p>
<p>Financial Resources Required</p>	<p>PLO 5: Increasing sample sizes or testing additional artifacts will require additional funds for interrater reliability training and artifact assessment as determined by the Assistant Dean, Educational Effectiveness Committee, and Chief Academic Officer when the next cycle of assessment for this PLO is determined.</p> <p>PLO 6: Increasing sample sizes or testing additional artifacts will require additional funds for inter-rater reliability training and artifact assessment as determined by the Assistant Dean, Educational Effectiveness Committee, and the Chief Academic Officer when the next cycle of assessment for this PLO is determined.</p> <p>PLO 7: Increasing sample sizes or testing additional artifacts will require additional funds for interrater reliability training and artifact assessment as determined by the Assistant Dean, Educational Effectiveness Committee, and Chief Academic Officer when the next cycle of assessment for this PLO is determined.</p>
<p>Annual Learning Report recommended for approval</p>	<p>Approved by the Educational Effectiveness Committee on March 9, 2022</p>



Follow Up (Closing the Loop from previous year)	<p>For PLO 3:</p> <p>The proposed change was: Assessment rubric language will be clarified to reflect the focus of ethical principles as they are related to the standards of the public health profession.</p> <p>Report status: Dr. Robert Carter met with Dr. Byas and Ms. Chipman-Sullivan to consider changing the assessment rubric language during November, 2020.</p> <p>During the meeting, the individuals concluded the rubric was sufficient as stated.</p> <p>For PLO 4:</p> <p>The next step would be to revise the PLO to be more reflective of data analysis and interpretation.</p> <p>Along with a revision of the PLO, the assignment instructions would be revised to specifically address the importance of statistical analysis and interpretation for success, and to ensure that students understand the importance of creativity, organization, and consideration of all literacy levels and visually impaired populations.</p> <p>Report Status: PLO was revised on 10/13/2020 and approved on 10/14/2020 (per email from Dr. Christine Oh)</p> <p>Assignment instructions were revised February 2021</p>
--	---