

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): PhD Public Health Studies

Department: NA

Degree or Certificate Level: Doctorate

College/School: CPHSJ

Date (Month/Year): May 2023

Assessment Contact: Travis Loux

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected?

This report is based on data from AY 2021-2022

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated?

2018

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization or subject to state/licensure requirements?

Yes

If yes, please share how this affects the program's assessment process

PHS 6010.: Research Project. Students conduct a research project and write a formal report including data acquisition, quantitative data analysis, and interpretation of results. This is an in-person class offered only to doctoral students in the PhD Public Health Studies program. The instruction for the research project includes: (1) Clearly write a statement of the research problem to indicate what was investigated. The statement should indicate the variables of interest and the specific relationship that was studied between the variables, (2) Sample: briefly describe where your sample was obtained from and how you selected your subsample, if applicable, (3) Measures: Define the dependent variable, primary independent variable, and other covariates. How was each variable measured, classified, or recoded? Each variable should be associated with a meaningful name (e.g., lung cancer, smoking status, etc.), value label (e.g., 1=smoke, 2=non-smoke, etc.), and corresponding questionnaire question. A table can be used to present the above information, (4) Statistical analysis: Describe which statistical methods are used to examine the relationship between variables. Explain why each statistical model is appropriate for your research question and variables. What statistics are going to be reported? (5) R26/R26/R26/le926 (s)9.6 (t)-3 ((t)-3 (19 (is)19 (is)19 (isf5E4)3h)26)-6.7 ()-3 (p)2.3 (ec)-1.9 (rib)2.2

still reviewing how the written exam is assessed and plan to re-evaluate the rubric to clarify some points that have been brought up over the year.

Students are well-prepared for their oral exams and dissertation defenses.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss the results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The venue for sharing these findings is the Doctoral Steering Committee. Due to a professional accreditation site visit this year, these findings were not complete in time for sharing, but will be shared next year.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- x Course content
- x Teaching techniques
- x Improvements in technology
- x Prerequisites

- x Course sequence
- x New courses
- x Deletion of courses
- x Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- x Student learning outcomes
- x Artifacts of student learning
- x Evaluation process

- x Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- x Data collection methods
- x Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

N/A

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

The written exam has long been a point of contention within the program. While there are no immediate plans for a full-scale revision of the process, we may consider it if additional annual assessments identify this as a concern which smaller changes to not address.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted/appended into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document. Thank you.

PHD ORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION
STUDENT OUTCOMES EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Approved by Doctoral Committee on 6-2-2016

Student Name: _____ Date: _____ Committee Member Name: _____

Each committee member can Td ()/TT0 06 T2(t)-6(t)-6n< (-)Tj 0.3 06 -tN>-tÔs q Sd6i1tEab1.08 re f* EMC 3r1(r)6(cwo3 06-5(C2(kse)-

6	The candidate understands the details of the methodological and analytical work related to the dissertation.				
7	The candidate is able to answer additional questions posed by the faculty and adequately participated in a discussion related to the dissertation topic.				
8	The candidate presented in a professional manner with confidence.				

- x Committee Members may change their initial votes throughout the process. Members are encouraged to make notes throughout the presentation and Q&A session.
- x After the exam, this worksheet will be given to the chair/mentor as a tool to help address problems or deficiencies in the project. The chair/mentor then provides the worksheets to the doctoral program coordinator who keeps them for programmatic quality assessment.

PHD ORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION
STUDENT OUTCOMES EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Approved by Doctoral Committee on 6-2-2016

Student: _____

Grader: _____

Rubric for Grading the Comprehensive Written Exam¹

Approved by Doctoral Committee 12/12/2022

Component Pass with Distinction (2 points)

Pass (1 point)

Fail (0points)

Component	Pass with Distinction (2 points)	Pass (1 point)	Fail (0 points)	SCORE
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Provides thorough and comprehensive description of study design, setting, participants, data source or measurement, quantification of variables and statistical methods x Flows from question and theory x Uses state-of-the-art tools, techniques, or approaches x Uses multiple methods/analyses x Analysis is sophisticated, robust, and precise 	x		

Dissertation

Dissertation Defense Procedures

Step 1: After the presentation is completed, the chair/mentor conducts at least two formal rounds of questions from the committee members, and then permits follow-up questions and additional inquiries until the committee is finished. The chair/mentor will invite questions from the audience. It is very important that the student demonstrates his/her command of the topic by answering the questions and not relying on the committee members for assistance.

Step 2: After questions have concluded, the mentor will close the public portion of the examination. Other students, faculty, and guests are excused. If needed, the committee will meet with the student privately to go over additional questions not suitable for the public forum.

Step 3

Guidelines for Quality of Written Dissertation

Component	Pass with Distinction	Pass	Fail
Methods/Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Original, clear, creative, and innovative x Provides thorough and comprehensive description x Identifies strength and weakness/advantages and disadvantages x Flows from question and theory x Uses state-of-the-art tools, techniques, or approaches x Applies or develops new methods, approaches, techniques, tools, devices, or instruments x Uses multiple methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Appropriate for the problem x Uses existing methods, techniques, or approaches in correct and creative ways x Discusses why method was chosen 	

