Central Washington University
Assessment of Student Learning
Department and Program Report

Please enter the appropriate information concerning your student learning assessment activities for this year.

Academic Year of Report: __2010-2011_ College: ____CEPS________
Department ____PESPH_______ Program: ___Public Health Education_____

1. **What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?**

We continue to feel that it is critical to assess student learning outcomes that reflect the Certified Health Education Specialist’s (CHES) Seven Areas of Responsibility, and imply core competencies for entry-level health educators. By doing so we ensure graduates are ready for the field and for further study if they choose to pursue such study. Our curriculum is structured around these competencies, which are listed below.

**Seven Outcomes/Areas of Responsibility** - Students will be able to:
I: Assess Needs, Assets and Capacity for Health Education
II: Plan Health Education
III: Implement Health Education
IV: Conduct Evaluation and Research Related to Health Education
V: Administer and Manage Health Education
VI: Serve as a Health Education Resource Person
VII: Communicate and Advocate for Health and Health Education

Each outcome relates to College Goal 1, and University Goal 1. Each outcome also reflects departmental mission, vision, and values.

2. **How were they assessed?**

   **A) What methods were used?**
   **B) Who was assessed?**
   **C) When was it assessed?**

Please see Appendix 1 “Public Health Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan” for a summary of methods and classes in which assessments took place. All students who completed courses in which the various assignments were completed, whether public health majors or not, were assessed. Students were assessed as part of the normal classroom grading protocols. The table on the next page provides results for each outcome, including numbers of students.

Additionally, for several classes a new Student Assessment of Learning Gains (SALG) tool was used, an indirect survey measure aimed at helping students to self-assess their competence and confidence with skills and concepts, their interest in the material, certain attitudes toward complexity of public health issues and comfort with such issues, etc., as well as the value of specific course components as contributors to learning. A course-specific SALG tool was designed and administered in the following classes during AY 2010-11, beginning in winter 2011: HED 209, 230, 320, 330, 450, and 473. As a program team, in 2012 we will be exploring the potential usefulness of SALG tools for all classes, along with ways to improve on the initial SALG tools used this first time out for the classes listed above. Please see Appendix 2 for an example SALG tool used in HED 450 (note that
it includes items that reflect an initial attempt to measure students’ thinking around advocacy; this attempt will be strengthened by program team discussions of SALG style evaluation during 2012) Because a few AY 2010-11 classes represent a trial use of SALG style evaluation tools, we did not have expectations regarding it; however, the SALG for HED 450 did at least attempt an initial attitudinal assessment for the advocacy outcome.

3. **What was learned?**

Data summary appears in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Criterion of Mastery</th>
<th>Assessment Venue &amp; Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Students will conduct & formally present a needs assessment | **Assessment Project:** 90% of student projects will qualify for at least **“good”** on a 4-pt rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) signifying demonstration of ability to design an assessment project; use practical validation tools/skills; implement the assessment; analyze collected data; and report results, including a literature review in support of study. | **HED 330**  
Fall 2010 - 31 students  
87% scored at least good (an 80% on rubric) - including two students who did not complete course; adjusting for them, 93.5% scored at least good  
**Criterion of 90% was met**  
**Winter 2011 - 23 students**  
100% scored at least good  
**Criterion of 90% was met** |
| 2. Students will plan an effective education strategy, intervention or program. | **PREC EDE Model Write-up:** 90% of students will obtain a **“good”** on a 4 pt. rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) for all PREC EDE model components: Phase 1- Social Assessment, Phase 2- Epidemiological Assessment, Phase 3- Educational & Ecological Assessment, Phase 4- Administrative & Policy Assessment & Intervention Alignment | **HED 471** |
| 3. Students will implement a health education strategy, intervention, and program. | **Program Plan/Program:** 90% of students will obtain a **“good”** on a 3pt. rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) for all components related to implementation of the wellness project. These components include: 1) Mission Statement, Goals, Objectives, 2) Budget and Time-lines, 3) Marketing Materials, 3) Intervention plans and Theoretical Constructs, 4) Implementation, and 5) Wellness project evaluation | **HED 472** |
| 4. Students will evaluate a strategy, intervention or program. | **Program Evaluation Report:** 90% of students will qualify for at least **“good”** on a 4-pt rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) signifying demonstration of ability to analyze evaluation data and report findings, including suggestions for programmatic improvement. | **HED 473**  
Spring 2011 - 50 students  
28 in sectn 1 - 100% scored at least good  
22 in sectn 2 - 91% scored at least good  
**Criterion of 90% was met** |
5. Students will be able to administer health education strategies, interventions, & programs.

   Grant application: A minimum expectation is that 90% of students receive “Good” on a 4 pt. rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work).

   **HED 475**

6. Students will be able to serve as a health education resource person.

   Environmental Health Blog: At least 90% of students will earn a “good” or better on all components of the rubric (Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) attached to the group blog project. Project components will include at a minimum a history/background of the issue, including a timeline showing positive and/or negative milestones that affect population health; a weekly myth vs. fact; a suggested reading/resource list; individual weekly posts in response to instructor prompts; and a comparative “state of affairs/efforts” detailing diverse local-, state-, or country-level situations and solutions surrounding the issue.

   **HED 320**

   Winter 2011 - 40 students
   75% scored at least good. Criterion of 90% was not met. (Includes several students who did not pass the class.)

7. Students will be able to communicate & advocate for health & health education.

   Advocacy Portfolio: At least 90% of students will earn a “good” or better on all components of the rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) attached to the portfolio project. Project components will include a background/rationale for advocacy strategies to improve a particular population health outcome, a letter to the editor, an op/ed piece, and an exploration of an advocacy-focused agency or organization related to the issue.

   **HED 450**

   Winter 2011 - 42 students
   For winter 2011, the planned project was not used, based on the fortuitous arising of situations in the community that led to impromptu but substantial assignments students and instructor agreed upon as valuable and organically relevant to course outcomes. However, a component of the assessment was used, and 95% scored at least good on this component.

8. Dispositions

   ? - as of AY2010-11 program team still drafting language

   ? - as of AY2010-11 program team still drafting outcome language

---

*As a result of faculty changes, HED 475 was taught by a non-program instructor during spring 2011 and the project planned to be assessed as discussed in the Standard of Mastery column was not used as an assessment.*
Given the current state of our progress on our assessment plan, changes in faculty, and our team’s developing emphases on programmatic work, we recognize that we still have work to do. We are working to strengthen/unify our approach, particularly around the use of rubrics that will allow us to present consistent rigor for class projects related to standards of mastery and outcomes. The results in the table above show that our students are “on track” according to our current/evolving thinking around outcomes.
4. **What will the department or program do as a result of that information?**

This was again a working year for our program in terms of assessments and curriculum revision. We anticipate continuing our process of enhancing our curriculum, which is already tighter, more specific to needs, and will allow our students to continue to meet with success.

1. This year, we rewrote Outcomes using language we felt was more measurable and active.
2. We continued to look at ways to improve our curriculum, including connections between classes, and between classes and the “real world” our students will face as entry-level professionals.
3. We continue to utilize our in-house expertise in developing and implementing more meaningful assessments of our program.
4. Administered an exit survey to all graduates, and plan to spend time together as a team in early 2012 to explore findings from it.
5. Established a system of interviewing students as they graduate from our program. This has been put on hold pending approval of Human Subjects, and will utilize various social media for this project.
6. Continuing work around a Dispositions/Professionalism outcome.
7. Our program continues to grow and develop. We continue to place students in nursing programs, jobs, and graduate programs across the country.

We are beginning, through the exit survey and other planned assessment pieces, to strengthen our capacity to make decisions such as those above based on data. Currently, decisions such as #3 and 4 above are based more on our data limitations, and we anticipate rectifying those limitations over the coming years.

5. **What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?**

We rewrote Programmatic Assessments and Student Learning Outcomes. Based on the assessments from last year, we developed all new assessments. They reflect the use of rubrics, exit interviewing, and also reflect stronger community/campus collaboration for our students. These can be found in Appendix 1. This work represents extensive review and collaboration in developing this assessment. We are excited about enhancing our use of rubrics next year, and recognize the challenge we face in ensuring consistency of rigor and expectations across sections and courses.

Based on our new program goals, we are working actively to make the “match” between goals and course strategies. As is relevant for goal especially #3 - Collaboration: Community/Campus partners are actively engaged in program activities, events, and enhancement - we are, for example, successfully working with outside partners to pursue projects that include a funding base (HED 330 fall 2011 & winter 2012) and/or stable offerings of service-learning hours for students (HED 230)

We continue to discuss and take steps toward initiating an advisory board for the program.

As discussed in Question 2, a SALG style evaluation is currently administered in several classes and potentially in all classes down the road. Using it provides a look at how students view their own growing competence and confidence, as well as taking a “values”-oriented approach asking them to explore whether they are in fact truly interested (and/or concerned) about issues and ways they have been presented as important in thinking/working in public health. We believe that building a strong indirect measure such as this for several if not all of our classes, along with a well-designed and used Dispositions/Professionalism outcome and assessments for it, will substantially strengthen our programmatic assessment.
As can be seen in the table showing results for Question 3, we have improved our report to show numbers of students in courses and sections, as has been suggested in past feedback.

As noted above in Question 4, we have developed and implemented an exit survey designed to compare graduates’ perceptions with our results of direct assessments. By including open-ended questions, the survey strengthens our results by providing a semi-qualitative component not available in the direct, rubric- and grade-based assessments.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University:

There is still no opportunity for the Program to include a narrative of the accomplishments and growth within the program in the assessment. We teach our students the value of BOTH quantitative AND qualitative evaluation. We would encourage additional questions or opportunities to report this type of data.

One such opportunity for reporting might involve numbers of students involved in undergraduate research. Our program has a new and growing emphasis on providing research experiences, including those that engage other students and the community. We are happy to report the following:

2009 - American School Health Association Conference
A student submitted an abstract for a poster

2010 - SOURCE
Two student groups presented posters based on project work in HED 330

2011 - SOURCE
One student group presented orally based on project work in HED 330;
One student presented a poster based on project work in HED 330, winning a CEPS award.

2011 - Eta Sigma Gamma Student Monograph
A student group successfully submitted a manuscript for publication

2011/12 - Community Health Assessment/Community Health Improvement Project (CHA/CHIP)
External funding received for county and university collaboration involving plans for HED 330 class project for fall 2011 and winter 2012, to include assessments of faculty, staff, and students as part of Kittitas County CHA. Students involved in all aspects of project, from planning through dissemination of results.

Getting the chance to take class project results to an “above and beyond” class work level and collaborate with faculty to submit presentations and publications is phenomenal for our students, in particular as more of them consider and pursue graduate school.
## Public Health Programmatic Outcomes and Assessments (AY 2010/2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program Goals</th>
<th>Related College Goals</th>
<th>Related University Goals</th>
<th>Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?)</th>
<th>Who/What Assessed (population, item)</th>
<th>When Assessed (term, dates)</th>
<th>Criterion of Achievement (Expectation of how good things should be?)</th>
<th>Results for 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will be prepared to enter the field of Public Health by demonstrating the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for success.</td>
<td>Goals 1 and 2</td>
<td>Goal I</td>
<td>Portfolio review of Student Learning Outcomes artifacts and internship artifacts; capstone internship preceptor evaluations.</td>
<td>All senior students</td>
<td>Initial review at mid-term of internship, and again on completion of the internship</td>
<td>All students will provide artifacts for all seven Student Learning Outcomes and materials they may have created during their internship, including evaluation by supervisor; all students will successfully complete their internship experience</td>
<td>We will be working as a program team to develop processes to determine results of Goal 1 assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty and students will remain current in the Public Health profession.</td>
<td>Goals 2 and 2</td>
<td>Goals V and VI</td>
<td>Conference attendance, papers published, presentations given at conferences, trainings attended; services provided to university, profession, and community.</td>
<td>Faculty and students</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer terms</td>
<td>All faculty will participate in some form of scholarship (Category A or B) annually; all faculty and 10% of students will attend at least one state, regional, national, or international conference annually.</td>
<td>Faculty are striving to meet the assessment of this goal, as is evident in reappointment materials. Data will be made available here as it becomes available for each faculty member and as regards student data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Collaboration: Community/Campus partners are actively engaged in program activities, events, and enhancement.

| Goals 1, 2, and 4. | Goals I, IV, V, and VI. | Number of courses and projects that include community/campus partners; advisory board meeting minutes. | Curriculum, Attendance at Advisory Board Meetings | Fall, Winter, Spring, & Summer terms | 100% of our core process courses have a community/campus collaborative component (HED 230, 330, 422, 440, 471, 472, 473, 475); At least one advisory board meeting per academic year. | Discussed in response to Question 5 |
## Appendix 1

**CWU Student Learning Outcomes**

**Assessment Plan Preparation Form (AY 2010/2011)**

**PESPH; Public Health Education Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes (performance, knowledge, attitudes)</th>
<th>Related Program/Departmental Goals</th>
<th>Related College Goals</th>
<th>Related University Goals</th>
<th>Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?)*</th>
<th>Who assessed (Students from what courses – population)**</th>
<th>When Assessed (term, dates)</th>
<th>Standard of Mastery/Criterion of Achievement (How does performance have to be?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will conduct &amp; formally present a needs assessment</td>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>Goal 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Assessment Project</td>
<td>HED 330</td>
<td>Fall, Winter</td>
<td>90% of student projects will qualify for at least “good” on a 4-pt rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) signifying demonstration of ability to design an assessment project; use practical validation tools/skills; implement the assessment; analyze collected data; and report results, including a literature review in support of study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students will plan an effective education strategy,</td>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>Goal 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>PRECEDE Model Write-up</td>
<td>HED 471</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>90% of students will obtain a “good” on a 4 pt. rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?)*<br>
**Who assessed (Students from what courses – population)**<br>

---

*Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?):* Assessment Project<br>
**Who assessed (Students from what courses – population):** HED 330<br>

---

*When Assessed (term, dates):* Fall, Winter<br>

---

*Standard of Mastery/Criterion of Achievement (How does performance have to be?):* 90% of student projects will qualify for at least “good” on a 4-pt rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) signifying demonstration of ability to design an assessment project; use practical validation tools/skills; implement the assessment; analyze collected data; and report results, including a literature review in support of study. 90% of students will obtain a “good” on a 4 pt. rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work).
### Intervention or Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Students will implement a health education strategy, intervention, and program.</th>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>Goals 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Wellness Program</th>
<th>HED 472</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

90% of students will obtain a “good” on a 3pt. rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) for all components related to implementation of the wellness project. These components include: 1) Mission Statement, Goals, Objectives, 2) Budget and Timelines, 3) Marketing Materials, 3) Intervention plans and Theoretical Work) for all PRECEDE model components: Phase 1- Social Assessment, Phase 2- Epidemiological Assessment, Phase 3- Educational & Ecological Assessment, Phase 4- Administrative & Policy Assessment & Intervention Alignment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs, 4) Implementation, and 5) Wellness project evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Students will evaluate a strategy, intervention or program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will qualify for at least “good” on a 4-pt rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) signifying demonstration of ability to analyze evaluation data and report findings, including suggestions for programmatic improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students will be able to administer health education strategies, interventions, &amp; programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum expectation is that 90% of students receive “Good” on a 4 pt. rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students will be able to serve as a health education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students will earn a “good” or better on all components of the rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resource person.

| 7. Students will be able to | Goal 1 | Goal 1 | Goals 1 | Advocacy | HED 450 | Winter | At least 90% of students will earn a (Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) attached to the group blog project. Project components will include at a minimum a history/background of the issue, including a timeline showing positive and/or negative milestones that affect population health; a weekly myth vs. fact; a suggested reading/resource list; individual weekly posts in response to instructor prompts; and a comparative “state of affairs/efforts” detailing diverse local-, state-, or country-level situations and solutions surrounding the issue. |
communicate & advocate for health & health education. & 2 & Portfolio & “good” or better on all components of the rubric (i.e. Excellent, Good, Average, Needs Work) attached to the portfolio project. Project components will include a background/rationale for advocacy strategies to improve a particular population health outcome, a letter to the editor, an op/ed piece, and an exploration of an advocacy-focused agency or organization related to the issue.

| Dispositions | Goals 1,2, & 3 | ? | ? | ? | ? |

*Method(s) of assessment should include those that are both direct (test, essays, presentation, projects) and indirect (surveys, interviews) in nature.

**Data needs to be collected and differentiated by location (Ellensburg campus vs University Centers – see NWCCU standard 2.B.2)

***Timing of assessment should be identified at different transition points of program (i.e., admission, mid-point, end-of-program, post-program)
Appendix 2

1. As a result of your work in this class, what GAINS did you make in your UNDERSTANDING of:
   --CO/coalition concepts & strategies  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain
   --reasons for using CO/coal’n strategies  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain
   --ways to use these strategies  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain
   --advocacy & lobbying concepts  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain

   Please comment: _____________________________________________________________________________________________

2. As a result of your work in this class, what GAINS did you make in the following SKILLS?
   --finding CO/coal’n literature & examples  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain
   --analyzing a CO/coal’n effort to find ways to improve it  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain
   --communicating importance of CO  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain
   --knowing if you’re advocating vs. lobbying  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain

   Please comment: _____________________________________________________________________________________________

3. As a result of your work in this class, what GAINS did you make in your ATTITUDES?
   --interest in CO/coal’n strategies  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain
   --confidence in using CO/coal’n strategies  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain
   --comfort with complex ideas/issues  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain
   --willingness to discuss such issues as relevant to public/community health  no gains a little gain moderate gain good gain great gain

   Please comment: _____________________________________________________________________________________________

4. How valuable were each of the following aspects of class in contributing to your LEARNING?
   --pre-class readings  no value a little value moderate value much value great value n/a didn’t read
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Value Options</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending lectures</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>missed 2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in class</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>didn’t participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to discussions/answers</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>didn’t listen effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing group work/in-class activities (such as “speed dating”)</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>missed 2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>didn’t use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood mapping</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study paper/presentation</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal writing</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers (including debriefing/other activities surrounding them)</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a - missed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Ham, Planned Parenthood</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a - missed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Read, Food Access Coalition</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a - missed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley Cat Artists</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a - missed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eburg Food Coop</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a - missed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Harrison, Campus Coalition</td>
<td>no value, a little value, moderate value, much value, great value</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a - missed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>no help, a little help, moderate help, much help, great help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment: 
__________________________________________________________________________