

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): PhD in Public Health Sciences

Department: Intra-Department Concentrations (Epidemiology & Biostatistics; Behavioral Sciences & Health Education; Health Management & Policy (Including SLUCOR Health Outcomes Research))

College/School: College for Public Health & Social Justice

Date: June 21, 2018

Primary Assessment Contact: Mario Schootman, Program Director (Mario.Schootman@slu.edu)
Deb Jaegers, Program Coordinator (deb.jaegers@slu.edu)

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Rubrics used in PHS 6050; Written Exam, Oral Exam and Dissertation Defense assess Learning outcomes #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. However, we are examining how these rubrics assess PLO #4 and need to prepare some professional development sessions to enhance assessment of Management and Leadership.

We choose to focus on Domain 3: Communication for this year's report. This PLO is defined as: Demonstrates mastery of written and oral presentations and publications to enhance the effectiveness of dissemination of research to diverse audiences.

Rubrics for Written Exam, Oral Exam and Dissertation Defense were used to capture data that relate to some communication competencies.

The Director designed an Oral Communications rubric to be used in all PhD courses for presentations going forward. (Exhibit F). We are also increasing presentation requirements by adding a required "Research Seminar Series" starting in 2018-19 in which every student will present their research annually.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

- PHS 6050 Artifacts - Exhibit A: Final Presentation Rubric
Goal: Average Cohort score was above 92 points (total possible points is 100); our first year of data gives us a baseline average score of 94.40 out of 100 - Achieved
- PHS 6060 Artifacts - Final Grant Review and Mock Study Section Judging (Exhibit B)
Goal: Average of the overall impact score is 4.0 or below for all students (on a scale of 1-9); Partially Met-2 students were below 4.0 average though entire student average was 4.6
- Written, Integrated Exam Implemented 1/2018 with Rubric (Exhibit C)
Goal: 95% of students taking exam will pass – **Not Achieved** (7 of 8 students passed so 87.5%); We propose changing our plan and goal to 80%; given low numbers any one student failure will not allow us to reach initial goal.
- Oral Exams Rubric (Exhibit D) -with 2 years of data
Goal: 90% of student taking exam will pass or pass with distinction – Achieved
- Dissertation Defense Rubric (Exhibit E) with 2 years of data
Goal: 90% of students defending will score 30 points or above – Achieved

(In April 2018 Rubric was revised with items 7 & 8 becoming one item to match graduate education's dual balloting of written dissertation and oral defense. This has, therefore, changed scale and made it impossible to compare data between years.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

Data was collected from faculty who used rubrics in courses and tracked into data sheets by coordinator. Written, oral and dissertation data is tracked via rubrics collected by coordinator with ballots or results. Data was then reviewed by the director for analysis. See Exhibits A-F.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

It is challenging to find any major findings with two years of minimal data (especially with only 3 oral exams in 2017-18). However, our focus on using rubrics shows promise of capturing longitudinal data, especially for the PHD PHS 2017-18 cohort who will be the first cohort to use rubrics consistently throughout coursework and exams. We continue to identify key aspects of the program that should be revised or modified.

We have had oral exam scoring in communication as well as more dissertation defenses with "Passing with Distinction" for the oral defense.

For written exam, a student failing and retaking the exam a second time helps ensure competency attainment as student progresses toward oral exam and dissertation. There is a risk for students to fail this exam if not adequately prepared by writing research publications during their first year with mentor. We are revising our plan to 80% goal with the understanding that there may be failures for a few students when taking the exam for the first time.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

Analyzed data shows we are on track with our communication competencies but need more data from 2018-19 to compare and make assessments. PHS 6060 rubric scoring was lower than expected so we may need to ensure students are exposed to grant writing earlier in program. We will also develop a rubric that evaluates the writing of the students that will be used in our PHS courses.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

Our first steps were based on prior CEPH accreditation assessments that required us to increase competencies and rigor; which we have done by revising PHS 6050, 6060 and now adding 6040 and 6045. Our second year of PHS 6050 (Science, Theory & Public Health) has focused on training students to produce better literature reviews, deepen their understanding of conceptual models, and ask better research questions, thus strengthening their competencies especially for PLO's 1 and 3 (Critical Thinking and Communication).

We plan to build more management and leadership skills units into the Professional Development course, PHS 6990, to ensure those competencies are being met.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

Exhibit C: PHD PHS Written Exam Results						
Jan-18						
BSDP Student A (PASS)	<i>Intro</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Disc & Conclusion</i>	
First Grader	1	1	1	1	1	5
Second Grader	2	1	1	1	2	7
BSHE Student B (PASS with Distinction)	<i>Intro</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Disc & Conclusion</i>	
First Grader	2	2	1	2	2	9
Second Grader	2	1	1	2	1	7
BSHE Student D (PASS)	<i>Intro</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Disc & Conclusion</i>	
First Grader	1	1	1	1	1	5
Second Grader	1	2	1	1	1	6
BST Student D (PASS with Distinction)	<i>Intro</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Disc & Conclusion</i>	
First Grader	2	2	1	2	2	9
Second Grader	2	2	2	2	2	10
EPI Student E (Pass after Tie Break)	<i>Intro</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Disc & Conclusion</i>	
First Grader	1	1	1	1	1	5
Second Grader	1	0	1	1	2	5
Tie Breaker	1	1	1	1	1	5
HMP Student F (Fail)	<i>Intro</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Disc & Conclusion</i>	
First Grader	0	0	0	0	0	0
Second Grader	0	1	1	1	1	4
Tie Breaker	1	0	0	1	1	3
HMP Student G (Pass after Tie Break)	<i>Intro</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Disc & Conclusion</i>	
First Grader	1	1	1	1	1	5
Second Grader	1	1	0	1	1	4
Tie Breaker	1	1	1	1	1	5
HOR Student H (PASS)	<i>Intro</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Disc & Conclusion</i>	
First Grader	1	1	1	1	2	6
Second Grader	2	1	1	1	2	7

Scale - Fail (0); Pass (1); Pass with Distinction (2)	Earned Rubric Points	1. Significant breadth and depth of knowledge in the area of emphasis and dissertation topic.	2. Able to analyze and synthesize information at an appropriate level of a doctoral student.	3. Research is original and there is potential for publication and dissemination.	4. Adequate knowledge of recent advances in methodolo- gical issues relevant to the topic area.	5. Methodology of proposed research is rigorous.	6. Understands details of methodo- logical and analytic work related to the dissertation.	7. Able to answer additional questions posed by the faculty and adequately participated in a discussion related to the dissertation topic.	8. Presented in a profes- sional manner with confidence.
2016-17									
Student A	Passing with Distinction	Old Rubric Used							
Student B	Pasing with Distinction	4 PD; 1 P	5 PD	3 PD; 2 P	2 PD; 3 P	3 PD; 2 P	3 PD; 2P	2PD; 3P	4 PD; 1 P
	66	9	10	8	7	8	8	7	9
Student C	Passing	2 PD; 3 P	2 PD; 3 P	2 PD; 3 P	1 PD; 4 P	5 P	1 PD; 4 P	2 PD; 3 P	2 PD; 3 P
	52	7	7	7	6	5	6	7	7
Student D	Passing with Distinction	3 PD; 2 P	1 PD; 4 P	3 PD; 2 P	5 P	2 PD; 3 P	1 PD; 4 P	3 PD; 2 P	5 PD
	58	8	6	8	5	7	6	8	10
Student E	Passing with Distinction	3 PD; 2 P	1 PD; 4 P	3 PD; 2 P	3 PD; 2 P	5 PD	3 PD; 2 P	1 PD; 4 P	5 PD
	64	8	6	8	8	10	8	6	10
Student F	Passing	3 PD; 2 P	2 PD; 3 P	5 P	5 P	5 P	5 P	2 PD; 3 P	5 PD
	52	8	7	5	5	5	5	7	10
Student G	Passing	1 PD; 4 P	3 PD; 2 P	2 PD; 3 P	5 P	5 P	2 PD; 3 P	1 PD; 4 P	3 PD; 2 P
	52	6	8	7	5	5	7	6	8
Student H	Passing with Distinction	4 PD; 1 P	3 PD; 2 P	4 PD; 1 P	4 PD; 1 P	4 PD; 1 P	4 PD; 1 P	4 PD; 1 P	5 PD
	72	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	10

Scale - Fail (0); Pass (1); Pass with Distinction (2)	Earned Rubric Points	1. Significant breadth and depth of knowledge in the area of emphasis and dissertation topic.	2. Able to analyze and synthesize information at an appropriate level of a doctoral student.	3. Research is original and there is potential for publication and dissemination.	4. Adequate knowledge of recent advances in methodolo- gical issues relevant to the topic area.	5. Methodology of proposed research is rigorous.	6. Understands details of methodo- logical and analytic work related to the dissertation.	7. Able to answer additional questions posed by the faculty and adequately participated in a discussion related to the dissertation topic.	8. Presented in a profes- sional manner with confidence.
2017-18									
Student I	Passing with Distinction	5 PD	3 PD; 2 P	4 PD; 1 P	5 P	3 PD; 2 P	1 PD; 4 P	3 PD; 2 P	3 PD; 2 P
	62	10	8	9	5	8	6	8	8
Student J	Passing	1 PD; 4 P	1 PD; 4 P	1 PD; 4 P	5 P	5 P	5 P	1 PD; 4 P	4 PD; 1 P
	48	6	6	6	5	5	5	6	9
Student K	Passing	1 PD; 4 P	5 P	2 PD; 3 P	5 P	5 P	5 P	2 PD; 3 P	4 PD; 1 P
	47	6	5	7	5	5	5	7	7

Scale - Fail (0); Pass (1); Pass with Distinction (2)	WRITTEN DISSERTATION							DEFENSE	
	Earned Rubric Points	1. Intro	2. Lit Review	3. Theory	4. Methods/ Approach	5. Results & Data Analysis	6. Discussion & Conclusion	7. Able to answer additional questions posed by the faculty and adequately participated in a discussion related to the dissertation defense	8. Presented in a profes- sional manner with confidence.
Student 1 3 Cmte	<i>Written:</i> Passing; <i>Defense:</i> Passing with Distinction	1 PD; 2 P	1 PD; 2 P	1 PD; 2 P	1 PD; 2 P	3 P	2 DP; 1 P	3 DP	3 DP
	36	4	4	4	4	3	5	6	6
Student 2 4 Cmte	<i>Written:</i> Passing with Distinction <i>Defense:</i> Passing with Distinction	4 PD	3 PD; 1 P	1 PD; 3 P	2 PD; 2 P	1 PD; 3 P	2 PD, 2 P	4 PD	4 PD
	53	8	7	5	6	5	6	8	8
Student 3 3 Cmte	<i>Written:</i> Passing with Distinction <i>Defense:</i> Passing with Distinction	3 PD	2 PD; 1 P	2 PD; 1 P	3 PD	2 PD; 1 P	2 PD; 1 P	3 PD	3 PD
	44	6	5	5	6	5	5	6	6
Student 4 3 Cmte	<i>Written:</i> Passing with Distinction <i>Defense:</i> Passing with Distinction	3 PD	3 PD	2 PD; 1 P	2 PD; 1 P	2 PD; 1 P	2 PD; 1 P	2 PD; 1 P	3 PD
	43	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	6
Student 5 3 Cmte	<i>Written:</i> Passing with Distinction <i>Defense:</i> Passing with Distinction	3 PD	3 PD	1 PD; 2 P	2 PD; 2 P	3 PD	3 PD	1 PD; 2 P	3 PD
	42	6	6	4	4	6	6	4	6

Scale - Fail (0); Pass (1); Pass with Distinction (2)	Earned Rubric Points	1. Intro	2. Lit Review	3. Theory	4. Methods/ Approach	5. Results & Data Analysis	6. Discussion & Conclusion	7. Able to answer additional questions posed by the faculty and adequately participated in a discussion related to the dissertation defense	8. Presented in a profes- sional manner with confidence.
Student 6 3 Cmte	<i>Written:</i> Passing with Distinction <i>Defense:</i> Passing with Distinction	3 PD	3 PD	2 PD; 1 P	3 PD	3 PD	3 PD	3 PD	3 PD
	47	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	6
Student 7 3 Cmte	<i>Written:</i> Passing with Distinction <i>Defense:</i> Passing	3 P	2 PD; 1 P	1 PD; 2 P	3 PD	3 P	1 PD; 2 P	1 PD; 2 P	3 PD
	35	3	5	4	6	3	4	4	6
Student 8 3 Cmte	<i>Written:</i> Passing with Distinction <i>Defense:</i> Passing with Distinction	3 PD	3 PD	3 P	3 PD	2 PD; 1 P	2 PD; 1 P	3 PD	3 PD
	43	6	6	3	6	5	5	6	6
Student 9 3 Cmte	<i>Written:</i> Passing with Distinction <i>Defense:</i> Passing with Distinction	2 PD; 1 P	3 PD	2 PD; 1 P	3 PD	3 PD	3 PD	3 PD	3 PD
	46	5	6	5	6	6	6	6	6

Exhibit F: Rubric for Assessing Oral Communication Skills

Speaker name: _____ **Date:** __ / __ / 2018

Speaker will:	Quality of Student Presentation and Related Score				Score
	0	1	2	3	
Clearly state the purpose and thesis of their presentation.	The purpose of the presentation was not stated nor did the speaker have a sense of his or her focus.	The purpose and thesis of the presentation were not clearly stated, but were implicit.	The purpose and thesis of the presentation were clearly stated, but the presentation strayed from its central point.	The purpose and thesis of the presentation are clearly understood and serve to focus the presentation.	
Analyze particular audiences and select appropriate ethical communication strategies.	The speaker did not seem to understand his or her audience.	The speaker had a general understanding of the audience, but did not present information effectively for that audience.	The speaker had a general understanding of the audience but missed key opportunities to communicate effectively with the audience.	The speaker clearly understood his or her audience and spoke appropriately and ethically with the audience in mind.	
Use slides appropriately to enhance their presentation.	Most slides were difficult to read and most graphs/figures were hard to understand.	Some slides were difficult to read and some graphs/figures were hard to understand.	Most slides were easy to read and graphs/figures were easy to interpret.	Slides enhanced the presentation; they were easy to read and graphs/figures were easy to interpret.	
Present a clearly organized set of ideas.	The organization lacked any structure.	The presentation had easily identifiable main points, but lacked internal structure.	The presentation was organized, but the speaker sometimes strayed from this organization.	The presentation had a clear and deliberate organizational structure.	
Use clear and engaging language and delivery	Language was unclear; delivery relied exclusively on notes.	Language was weak, unclear or wordy; delivery relied too much on notes and lacked spontaneity.	Language and delivery were generally good, but could have been more effective.	The language was effective; delivery was clear and powerful.	
Use the allocated time appropriately	The presentation did not stay within the allotted time and/or there was little balance between the points made and their relative importance.	The presentation did not strike an appropriate balance between the points made and their relative importance, but stayed within the allotted time.	The balance between the points made reflect their relative importance, but could have been more effective. The presentation, stayed within the allotted time.	The presentation was well timed, points made reflect their relative importance, and the presentation stayed within the allotted time.	
Total score:					