

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

**Due to your dean by June 1
Due from dean to assessment**

office by June 15

Degree Program Name: Masters Health Science- Public Health **Contact Name and Email** matt.hutchins@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1. Epidemiology GSLO- Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession</p>	<p>Research paper- AHS 612 Weekly Quizzes- AHS 612</p>	<p>80% of the students will complete the paper with a B or better 80% of students complete exams with a B or better</p>	<p>19/19 (100%) of students completed the research paper with a B or better 15/19 (78.94%) students had average quiz scores of a B or better</p>	<p>The faculty of record for the course sections (Ayodele and Doss) were responsible for collecting and submitting the data to the Graduate Program Director (Hutchins). A summarized report of the data was given to AHS faculty via email and discussed in a Health Sciences program meeting</p>
<p>2. Social and Behavioral Sciences GSLO- Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession</p>	<p>Health Program Proposal- AHS 617 Justification Essay- AHS 617</p>	<p>80% of the students will complete project with a B or better 80% of the students will complete the paper with a B</p>	<p>13/18 (72.22%) of students completed the project with a B or better. Average score was 88.95%. 13/18 (72.22%) completed the essay with a B or better.</p>	<p>The faculty of record for the course (Hutchins) was responsible for collecting and submitting the data. A summarized report of the data was given to AHS faculty via email and</p>

GSLO- Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession GSLO- Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies		or better	Average score was 88.41%	discussed in a Health Sciences program meeting
--	--	-----------	--------------------------	--

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

In 2016-17, the department collected data on the epidemiology and social and behavioral sciences aspects of our program. This included an epidemiology research paper and weekly quizzes in AHS 612 and a health program proposal design and justification of health education essay in AHS 617. Faculty members expect that at least 80% of the students will complete these assignments with a score of B or better. As the chart above shows, only one of the four outcomes was met. The other three outcomes fell short of the 80% benchmark.

Data suggest that students perform well on writings that allow them to reflect, summarize, and report the work of others. Students are not performing as well on assignments that force them to synthesize material and/or develop and justify their own plans of action for research or program implementation. The department is trying to address this by having more assignments that focus on reflection, application, evaluation and synthesis of materials in all courses, but especially in the early courses within the program. For example, research methods instructors are being asked to revamp the course to include a mini-research proposal (modified chapters 1-2-3) and all faculty are being asked to hold students to a higher standard in terms of their writing and grad accordingly. To help students develop improved writing skills, the department is pursuing the hire of a Graduate Student from the English Department to serve as a sort of writing resource person for all AHS students.

Faculty report trends that show a decrease in scores for the mathematical component on the epidemiology quizzes. Faculty are now providing additional examples in the form of worksheets and trying to include more one-to-one sessions with students to help improve their understanding of the various calculations. This has proven to be a challenge within an on-line program. Faculty are investigating ways to improve the immediate feedback and work with examples that comes with live conversations. Virtual office hours and a series of how to videos are being considered as possible means to address this concern.

Department is also considering hiring a graduate student worker dedicated to assisting AHS students with writing skills. The Dean of the Graduate school is scheduled to speak with faculty about being sterner with grading of written work.

As accreditation efforts for health sciences programs begin, the assessment plan may need to change to reflect revised standards from the accrediting body.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: MS in Health Science- Public Health Date: 12.10.17

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
<p>1. Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified in this report.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. They do in the plan, not in this report.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). They do in the plan, not in this report.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different</p>

				<p>modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) They appear to be.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some</p>

		<p>unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p>standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p>high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.)</p>
--	--	---	--	--

				<p>were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p>

				<input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.

				<input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

As was the case with the report for the doctoral program, my rating on this report would have been higher if you had identified the specific outcomes you assessed. Without that information—and without more information about the measures—it is difficult for me to determine whether they are aligned and what results actually show about what students know/can do well and less well. Also, since you use grades as your performance benchmarks, you also need to demonstrate that they are calibrated to rubrics or keys directly connected to your outcomes. Otherwise, you are grading, not assessing. Part Two is very well done: It includes reflection, analysis, and plans for improvement. Thank you!