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1.0 LEADERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE

Criterion 1.1: The program maintains an organizational description and organizational chart(s) that define the program’s administrative structure and relationships to other institutional components. The organizational chart presents the program’s relationships with its department(s), school(s), college(s) and other relevant units within the institution.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:
Observations from the Self-Study
The university employs a clear organizational structure in which the program and department can operate. The program is housed within the Department of Health Sciences, and the lines of authority are clearly delineated from the designated leader of the BSPH program who is also the department chair, to the College of Science, the Provost’s Office, the president and the Board of Trustees. The Department of Health Sciences also houses the BS in nursing program and the BS in health administration program.

Observations on Site
The site visit team confirmed that the program has a defined administrative structure. The program’s designated leader is also the department chair which allows fluid dialogue with the dean of the college and the provost when needed.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.
Institution Comments:
On June 10, 2015, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education confirmed the Notification of Change from the Bachelor of Science degree in Health Promotion to the Bachelor of Science degree in Public Health.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
Criterion 1.2: The program demonstrates administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm its ability to fulfill its mission and goals and to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Administrative autonomy refers to the program's ability, within the institutional context, to make decisions related to the following:

- allocation of program resources
- implementation of personnel policies and procedures
- development and implementation of academic policies and procedures
- development and implementation of curricula
- admission to the major

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

Budget allocation requests originate from the department chair (also the program's designated leader) who submits requests to the dean and then the provost for approval. Once allocated, the chair oversees department spending and manages requests from faculty. The provost must approve funds for new faculty hires before recruitment can begin. The department search committee conducts the interview process, with the dean approving final hiring decisions. The chair may hire temporary faculty directly to fulfill teaching needs.

Personnel policies are created at the university level and enforced at the department level by the chair and dean. Faculty performance is evaluated every year with an annual activity report. In addition, each faculty member is evaluated after the third year of service for adequate progress and again after the fifth year of service for tenure and promotion. The criteria for these performance evaluations are set at the university level and the reviews are conducted at multiple levels within the institution.

The faculty have primary responsibility for maintaining the program curriculum. They may initiate changes at any time, and changes must be approved through multiple levels, including the chair, dean, college committee, university committee, and faculty senate. Faculty retain primary authority to delivery courses based on approved curriculum, determine appropriate learning activities and assign student grades.

The designated leader in conjunction with the program's primary faculty oversees admission to the major once students have attained the required amount of credits and have met the
minimum admissions requirement. The program’s requirements for admission to the major include: 1) students must see an advisor in the program for guidance; 2) complete PUBH 121, PUBH 201, and PUBH 350 with a grade of C or better in each course; and 3) have completed a minimum of 60 semester credit hours (junior standing) for admission to the following classes: PUBH 410, PUBH 481, PUBH 485, PUBH 491, and PUBH 495.

Observations on Site
The program clarified that the chair conducts performance evaluations for part-time faculty every semester using student course evaluation results. Student evaluations are conducted at the end of each course and become available to the chair a few weeks later, allowing enough time to use the feedback for hiring decisions for the next term. The chair also conducts classroom observations if students indicate concerns about the faculty member’s performance.

Curriculum changes are initiated by program faculty and approved at multiple levels throughout the university, including the College of Science Curriculum Committee, the Academic Affairs Committee, the Faculty Senate, the provost and the registrar. This entire review process is completed electronically, which allows it to be completed within a few months. Program faculty can attend any of these committee meetings to offer explanations and receive feedback for revisions if needed.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:
Click here to enter text.
Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
Criterion 1.3: Faculty have clearly defined rights and responsibilities concerning program governance and academic policies. Program faculty have formal opportunities for input in decisions affecting curriculum design, including program-specific degree requirements, program evaluation, student assessment and student admission to the major. Faculty have input in resource allocation to the extent possible, within the context of the institution and existing program administration.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study
Faculty have authority and responsibility to maintain a relevant and effective program curriculum. Changes originate with the public health program faculty and proceed through multiple levels of approval, including the department faculty, chair, dean, college committee, university committee, and faculty senate before being implemented. Program faculty may also initiate changes to the university-wide core requirements. These recommendations go to the Core Curriculum Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, and Faculty Senate. Faculty meet with the chair several times throughout the semester to discuss needs and concerns of all types, including curriculum and resource allocations.

The department has identified a faculty member to serve as assessment coordinator and work with university-wide assessment efforts to support continuous improvement. Student outcomes are compared to program goals to identify deficiencies.

Observations on Site
Site visitors confirmed that primary program faculty have input into decisions affecting curriculum design, program evaluation, student assessment and student admission to the major. Faculty have input in resource allocation to the extent possible. Some part-time faculty participate by communicating their concerns to the designated leader or by attending faculty meetings each semester.

Commentary:
(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.
Criterion 1.4: The program ensures that all faculty (including full-time and part-time faculty) regularly interact and are engaged in ways that benefit the instructional program (eg, instructional workshops, curriculum committee).

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study
Primary faculty meet as a group at the start and end of each semester and meet individually with the chair every over week. All full-time and part-time faculty are invited and encouraged to attend group faculty meetings. Some part-time faculty members attend meetings via teleconference or skype as their schedule permits. The department has holds annual faculty retreats for all full-time faculty within the department to review program needs and future directions. There is no formal mentoring program, but the University Center for Teaching Excellence to Advance Learning provides regular opportunities for faculty development through seminars and workshops. Full-time faculty are also expected to attend professional meetings on a regular basis. These meetings are also open to part-time faculty but few attend.

Observations on Site
In addition to regular department meetings during the semester, the program holds faculty workshops designed specifically to address program needs. These workshops function just like faculty meetings, but are scheduled as needed to address specific program development tasks.

Neither the university nor the program have an established, formal mentoring program for new faculty. This does not appear to be a problem, however, because of many additional supports available for new faculty development. These include the department chair, the research office, chair workshops, a university ombudsman and summer leadership workshops. The provost has made a conscious decision not to formalize the mentoring program, but to instead allow faculty to identify their own mentoring relationships organically as they get to know colleagues across the university. Program faculty spoke highly of the support they receive from each other and did not indicate any need for a formal mentoring program.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.
Compliance Concern:  
(if Partially Met or Not Met)  
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:  
Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:  
Click here to enter text.
**Criterion 1.5:** Catalogs and bulletins used by the program, whether produced by the program or the institution, to describe its educational offerings accurately describe its academic calendar, admission policies, grading policies, academic integrity standards and degree completion requirements. Advertising, promotional materials, recruitment literature and other supporting material, in whatever medium it is presented, contains accurate information.

**Finding:**
Met

**Team Comments:**

**Observations from the Self-Study**

The university utilizes a clear system of approvals for managing all changes to the program curriculum, design, and requirements. This system is clearly identified with a flow chart in the self-study document. The Faculty Senate, the provost and president approve all changes to program requirements. The registrar ensures that all approved changes are included in the catalog for the following year, and faculty have an opportunity to review and approve these changes before publication.

The program was admitted to CEPH’s applicant process with a health promotion concentration, and this matches the curricular focus on health promotion and inclusion of CHES-related learning outcomes. However, the self-study document identified the program as having a generalist concentration, along with three additional specialty tracks. Supporting documents in the resource file, including the program website and undergraduate catalog, confirmed this apparent contradiction.

**Observations on Site**

Faculty clarified that the program offers a generalist degree in public health. They also explained that the university requires all students, in every major, to complete a cognate consisting of 15 hours of additional coursework outside the student’s chosen major. The program has devised three cognate recommendations that have been pre-approved by the university – in communication, exercise science, and health services leadership. Students may select one of these three options or select their own cognate courses.
Commentary:
(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)

The concern relates to the inconsistency in the information presented on the program’s website related to its degree offerings and its concentration. As presented on the website, the program offers three areas of focus in which students can complete their public health degree: exercise science, health services leadership and health communication. Faculty explained that they do not offer three separate concentrations and that these options are examples of cognates required by the university. However, the information on their website and in the catalog do not make this clear. Furthermore, the website does not clearly identify the program’s concentration as either generalist or health promotion. The program will need to revise official program publications to accurately reflect its focus and clarify that cognates are required by the university and if examples are provided, they are not meant to function as tracks for further specialization within the program.

Institution Comments:

On June 10, 2015, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education confirmed the Notification of Change from the Bachelor of Science degree in Health Promotion to the Bachelor of Science degree in Public Health.

Necessary public health program changes have been approved through the academic affairs process at the University (program, College Curriculum Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Faculty Senate, provost, president). A final review will be made in May 2018 before the changes appear in the University Catalog for 2018/2019. Descriptions and information from the University Catalog will be used on all official program publications, the University website and printed media.

The following changes have been made: consistency of materials, revision of the cognate information to clarify that the University values cognates as part of a degree program, clarification that the program is a generalist public health degree program that qualifies
graduates to sit for the Certified Health Education Specialist (CHES) exam through the National Commission for Health Education Credentialing (NCHEC).

The updated information will clarify that students majoring in public health have the flexibility of either declaring a minor (18 – 22 credits) or completing a cognate, which is part of the University’s tradition. Cognates (15 credits) are classes that are similar in nature so that students get an understanding of an area of study to complement their major. There are four cognate options in the public health program: 1) general cognate (100 – 200 level basic science courses or 300 – 400 level coursework outside of the major); 2) communication; 3) exercise science; and 4) health services leadership. Cognates in communication, exercise science and health services leadership have pre-approved sequences of courses.

In addition, clarification has been made that the program is a generalist public health degree (that fulfills the nine public health domains) with a health promotion focus (that meets the certified health education specialist (CHES) criteria). The University has a tradition of degree programs having cognates so that students can take courses outside of the major, that are of interest, provide a complementary perspective, and ensure that students reach 120 credit hours of instruction to attain a bachelor’s degree (60 credits of core requirements, 45 credits of major courses and 15 credits of cognate courses). Cognate courses are expected to be similar in nature or provide complementary instruction from other disciplines. Students, working with an advisor, can take courses as pre-requisites for graduate or professional degree options. Therefore, the course selections should make sense to the student’s future work or graduate school interests. Cognates are not concentrations, tracks or specializations.

Council Comments:
The Council notes that, since the site visit, the program has made changes to clarify cognate requirements and ensure consistent presentation of curricula. The program has also clarified its degree offering as a generalist program that prepares graduates for the CHES exam.
2.0 RESOURCES

Criterion 2.1: The program has **sufficient faculty resources** to accomplish its mission, to teach the required curriculum, to oversee extracurricular experiences and to achieve expected student outcomes. Generally, the minimum number of faculty required would be 2.0 FTE faculty in addition to the designated leader’s effort each semester, trimester, quarter, etc., though individual circumstances may vary. The FTE calculation follows the institution or unit’s formula and includes all individuals providing instruction in a given semester, trimester, quarter, etc.

**Finding:**

Met

**Team Comments:**

Observations from the Self-Study

As of fall 2017, the program had nine primary faculty contributing a total of 9.0 FTE and nine part-time faculty contributing a total of 4.98 FTE. One FTE equates to a teaching load of 21 credit hours, or seven courses during the academic year.

All full-time faculty members who contribute 1.0 FTE are classified as either tenured or tenure-track and are responsible for advising students and conducting research. Faculty members can also be classified as a salaried full-time lecturer teaching 10 courses per year. Part-time faculty members are calculated at 0.249 FTE per three credit hour course. Faculty members teaching less than three credit hours, typically independent study or creative inquiry courses, are prorated in this calculation.

Much of the part-time faculty effort is dedicated to a university “service course” that the program provides. The program offers PUBH 121 - Personal and Community Health, which is a mandatory course for all students at the university and addresses the university-wide required core curriculum Goal 7: Knowledge of Human Health and Behavior. In Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, nearly 1,500 students enrolled in PUBH 121. Most of these students were not public health majors. Because of this structure, public health tenure-track faculty members seldom teach this class and primarily focus their teaching on upper-level required courses for the major. The instructors of the PUBH 121 classes, however, are master’s-prepared in areas related to public health.
Observations on Site

Faculty who met with the site visit team expressed that though the program currently has sufficient faculty resources, as the program grows, the program will need additional faculty lines.

Students who met with the site visit team also noted their satisfaction with the program’s current faculty resources, but also noted that more faculty would allow the program to offer more courses and additional sections of current courses.

Commentary:
(if applicable)

The commentary relates to the faculty’s identified need for additional faculty resources. Although current faculty resources meet minimum requirements, and students commended faculty availability, it does appear that the program could benefit from additional faculty lines. Departmental use of adjunct faculty is exacerbating the need because they are unable to contribute to the governance of the program or assist with advising, research and service.

The designated leader serves as the chair of the Department of Health Sciences, oversees the Health Administration and Nursing programs, teaches upper-level public health courses, advises students and mentors junior faculty. The program could benefit from adding a public health program coordinator, consistent with the other programs in the department.

Institutional leaders who met with site visitors noted that given the name change, the increase in student enrollment, and the increase in outreach in alignment with the university’s mission, the program is next on the priority list to receive an additional faculty line.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)

Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:

The University’s strategic plan, goals and objectives support the distribution of resources for programs as outlined in Goal 1.3, to “support a balanced faculty model that promotes the teacher-scholar ideal which values the combined impact of outstanding teaching and exposure
to research scholarly and creative activities to enhance student learning and engaged experiences” and objective 1.3.2 “CCU will identify adjustments, process and resource requirements to support a manageable balance and appropriate recognition in delivering meritorious and notable contributions to multiple areas of teaching, scholarly/creative productivity, and student/community engagement.” The program is completing a comparative review of course size and availability, faculty distribution and diversity, student enrollment, and generated revenue and will work with the administration to ensure that the allocation of program resources are sufficient in order to be efficient, effective and productive.

Council Comments:
The program’s response, validated by the Council, indicates that the original commentary has been addressed. Program and university leaders are mindful of the program’s resource needs.
Criterion 2.2: The mix of **full-time and part-time faculty** is sufficient to accomplish the mission and to achieve expected student outcomes. The program relies primarily on faculty who are full-time institution employees.

**Finding:**
Met

**Team Comments:**

**Observations from the Self-Study**

The program has a sufficient mix of full-time and part-time faculty who teach both required and elective courses. During academic year 2013 and 2014, the program maintained eight part-time faculty members but, within the last two academic years, have increased to nine part-time faculty members.

The public health program has six full-time, tenure-track faculty members and three full-time lecturers; these faculty members teach core courses. Part-time faculty teach sections in eight of the 15 required courses and one of the elective courses. A health educator teaches a section of PUBH 310 Issues in Family Life and Sexuality, and dietitians teach a section of PUBH 304/404 Nutrition, to support both nursing and education students.

**Observations on Site**

Part-time faculty, who are also categorized as adjuncts and teaching associates, teach the core course PUBH 121 that all students in the university including public health majors have complete for their general education requirement.

Institutional leaders noted that there is a benefit in working with adjunct faculty because they contribute a unique perspective to the curriculum. Leaders also noted that the faculty can request a conversion of faculty appointments (ie, from lecturer to professor) dependent on program needs.

**Commentary:**

*(if applicable)*

Click here to enter text.
Criterion 2.3: The program tracks student enrollment to assist in gauging resource adequacy. Given the complexity of defining “enrollment” in an undergraduate major or baccalaureate degree program, the program uses consistent, appropriate quantitative measures to track student enrollment at specific, regular intervals.

**Finding:**
Met

**Team Comments:**

**Observations from the Self-Study**

The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Analysis tracks general student enrollment for the program and produces internal and official enrollment reports for the department chair/designated leader each semester; the reports include data about student enrollment, credit hours and FTE.

A full-time student is a student who is enrolled for 12 or more credit hours. A part-time student is a student enrolled for 11 or fewer credit hours. The student FTE is calculated by taking the number of student credit hours generated by public health students and dividing that number by 15 (the maximum credits students can register for).

**Observations on Site**

The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Analysis track students who declare the public health major, not students who have met the admissions requirements set by the program. The difference is that not all students who declare the major are admitted into the major. The office can stratify student enrollment by the program’s admissions requirements; the designated leader would have to make a special request to receive that data. Currently, faculty advisors within the program tracks the number of students who have met the admissions requirements and report that enrollment data to the administrative assistant.

**Commentary:**

(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.
Criterion 2.4: The program’s **student-faculty ratios (SFR) are sufficient** to ensure appropriate instruction, assessment and advising. The program’s SFR are comparable to the SFR of other baccalaureate degree programs in the institution with similar degree objectives and methods of instruction.

**Finding:**
Met

**Team Comments:**

Observations from the Self-Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>SFR</th>
<th>Average Class Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As of spring 2017</td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In fall 2016</td>
<td>21:1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lowest average class size was with the cohort of students during spring 2016, in which the SFR was 19:1. In spring 2015, the program had an SFR of 13:1 with an average class size of 23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program uses a group advising model to provide advising for students. As of fall 2016, the average advising load among faculty in the program is 41. In spring 2016 it was 33, in fall 2015 it was 40 and in spring 2015 it was 38.

The program chose the bachelor’s degree in sociology as its comparable program to contextualize SFR data. The sociology major has a similar number of students (approximately 200; public health has between 240 and 260) and a similar number of faculty to the public health program. The sociology program’s objectives and curriculum are also like those of the public health program. Sociology students can participate in internships with various local agencies. For spring 2017, the sociology program had an SFR of 18:1 with an average class size of 25.

The advising load for faculty who teach in the sociology program was very similar to that of faculty who teach in the public health program. The sociology program offers one-on-one advising and had an average advising load of 35 in fall 2016. In spring 2016 it was 24, in fall 2015 it was 25 and in spring 2015 it was 21.

Observations on Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>SFR</th>
<th>Average Class Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and program administration noted that they are comfortable with the program’s SFR, as it is currently below the university’s recommended ratio of 20:1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students noted their satisfaction with the small class sizes within the program and the group advising model. Students stated that small class sizes and the group advising model helps to
create a familial environment between the faculty and the students and among the students themselves. Multiple students noted that faculty members know each student by name and make it a point to treat each student as an individual rather than just another number. Students also stated that small classes allow them to get to know their peers and work together as they matriculate through the program.

Faculty members noted that the group advising allows them to be consistent when discussing available resources.

**Commentary:**
*(if applicable)*

**Compliance Concern:**
*(if Partially Met or Not Met)*

Click here to enter text.

**Institution Comments:**

Click here to enter text.

**Council Comments:**

Click here to enter text.
**Criterion 2.5:** The program has access to financial and physical resources that are adequate to fulfill its operating needs, accomplish the mission, teach the required curriculum and provide an environment that facilitates student learning, including faculty office space, classroom space and student gathering space.

**Finding:**
Met

**Team Comments:**

**Observations from the Self-Study**

The program has access to financial and physical resources that are adequate to fulfill its operating needs, accomplish the mission, teach the required curriculum and provide an environment that facilitates student learning.

The university maintains 115 buildings with more than 2.7 million square feet of usable space across 1,700 acres. The department is located within a new 40,000 square foot facility that provides dedicated office space for faculty, open space for student gatherings, classrooms and lab space. These labs provide additional resources for student projects and learning, such as an InBody machine, diet analysis software, a mobile kitchen and social media tools.

Program funds come from multiple sources, including tuition and fees, state appropriations, grants, contracts, fees for service, and investments. These funds have risen steadily over the last five years, increasing by more than $1.2 million.

**Observations on the Site Visit**

The program has access to two dedicated classrooms. One is a multi-purpose room designed to accommodate classes, meetings and distance learning activities. The other classroom is a demonstration kitchen that is used for nutrition classes. The program has access to many other classrooms across campus as needed for classes, all of which have integrated learning technology and versatile seating options. Some smart classrooms are available to facilitate hybrid course delivery.

The program also provided a revised budget that indicates both revenues and expenditures. The department, through all offered courses, generated $2,989,720 for fiscal year 2015-16. Part of that amount funds the BSPH program, with the remainder going back to the college general fund. The allocation to the public health program for FY 2015-16 was $1,157,008, and
the expenditures for that year totaled $1,158,737. This slight overage of expenses was covered by the college general fund discussed above.

Commentary:  
(if applicable)  
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:  
(if Partially Met or Not Met)  
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:  
Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:  
Click here to enter text.
Criterion 2.6: The academic support services available to the program are sufficient to accomplish the mission and to achieve expected student outcomes. Academic support services include, at a minimum, the following:

- computing and technology services
- library services
- distance education support, if applicable
- advising services
- public health-related career counseling services
- other student support services (eg, writing center, disability support services), if they are particularly relevant to the public health program.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:
Observations from the Self-Study
Across the university, students have access to 1,105 computer stations and 21 printers housed within 38 computer labs. Student Computing Services provide all students with an array of technical supports, including troubleshooting, access, academic projects, and computer-related purchases.

The Kimbel Library and Bryan Information Commons provides students with access to both electronic and printed information sources. It holds 300,000 items in all formats, including 121,000 periodical subscriptions, and provides access to an additional 375,000 e-books from a library consortium across South Carolina state universities. Students may access all holdings and citations via the internet portal.

The university also helps faculty develop online courses to maintain academic integrity and quality through the Coastal Office of Online Learning.

Students receive general academic advising from the College of Science by trained advisors with expertise in science education and institutional requirements. After declaring a major, students receive advising and career counseling from program faculty.

Observations on Site
The university supports development of high-quality online courses via the Coastal Office of Online Learning, which provides technical supports, faculty training, and design consultation.
for online courses across the university. The director of the office noted that one public health course was recently recognized for outstanding online course design.

The students also commended the availability and usefulness of campus academic supports. For example, they noted that the university career services office offers counseling, resume development and free printing services; they praised the math lab and peer tutoring services; and they were very pleased that the library allows students to check out free copies of course textbooks, study materials and tablets. Students also complimented faculty availability and responsiveness and the usefulness of the university website.

**Commentary:**
*(if applicable)*

Click here to enter text.

**Compliance Concern:**
*(if Partially Met or Not Met)*

Click here to enter text.

**Institution Comments:**

Click here to enter text.

**Council Comments:**

Click here to enter text.
3.0 FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

Criterion 3.1: The program meets the requirements of regional accreditors for faculty teaching baccalaureate degree students. Faculty with doctoral-level degrees are strongly preferred and, in most cases, expected. A faculty member trained at the master’s level may be appropriate in certain circumstances, but the program must document exceptional professional experience and teaching ability.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The university sets standards and policies for faculty qualifications, searches and hiring and performance evaluations. University policies stipulate that faculty hires must be based on “training, experience, and other characteristics which best suit an individual to the job to be performed.” Faculty searches are governed by a strict set of procedures that ensure candidates are qualified, and teaching demonstrations are included during the interview process. Once hired, each faculty member is evaluated yearly for adequate performance, through a process that involves review and approval at multiple levels in the institution.

Nine full-time faculty are dedicated to the program, six of whom hold a doctoral degree. Of the doctoral faculty, five have earned tenure. All faculty have expertise in public health, through some combination of academic preparation, research experience and years of practice.

Observations on Site

Students noted that faculty members are well versed in a variety of fields in public health and that faculty members’ personal networks have helped students attain professional opportunities.

Commentary:
(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.
**Criterion 3.2:** The designated leader of the program is a **full-time faculty member** with educational qualifications and professional experience in a **public health discipline**. If the designated program leader does not have educational qualifications and professional experience in a public health discipline, the program documents that it has sufficient public health educational qualifications, national professional certifications and professional experience in its primary faculty members. Preference is for the designated program leader to have formal doctoral-level training (eg, PhD, DrPH) in a public health discipline or a terminal professional degree (eg, MD, JD) and an MPH.

**Finding:**

Met

**Team Comments:**

Observations from the Self-Study

The department chair serves as the designated leader of the public health program. She is a tenured Professor of Public Health with a PhD in Health Education and has been employed at the university since 2008. As designated leader, she oversees all daily operations of the program, provides leadership for strategic planning, leads program development, and troubleshoots problems as they arise. She actively involves the faculty in program decisions and reports directly to the dean.

Observations on Site

Faculty within the department vote to elect a qualified designated leader every three years. The dean oversees this voting process.

**Commentary:**

*if applicable*

Click here to enter text.

**Compliance Concern:**

*if Partially Met or Not Met*

Click here to enter text.
Institution Comments:
Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
**Criterion 3.3:** Practitioners are involved in instruction through a variety of methods (eg, guest lectures, service learning, internships and/or research opportunities). Use of practitioners as instructors in the program, when appropriate, is encouraged, as is use of practitioners as occasional guest lecturers.

**Finding:**

Met

**Team Comments:**

**Observations from the Self-Study**

Students interact with practitioners via the PUBH 201 Philosophy and Principles of Public Health and Education course, and PUBH 485, Internship in Health Careers. PUBH 201 is a pre-internship, 30-hour volunteer experience taken early in the curriculum and PUBH 485 is the 290-hour supervised work experience.

**Observations on Site**

The site visit team learned that practitioners are involved in the curriculum as guest lecturers, and some practitioners also serve as part-time faculty. Faculty also mentioned that students have an opportunity to work with practitioners in planning a program based on community needs during PUBH 481 Behavioral Foundations and Decision Making in Health Education.

Students mentioned during their meeting with the site visit team that if faculty know what profession(s) the student is interested in pursuing; faculty have planned for the students to contact a practitioner for more information.

**Commentary:**

 *(if applicable)*

Click here to enter text.

**Compliance Concern:**

 *(if Partially Met or Not Met)*

Click here to enter text.
Institution Comments:
Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
**Criterion 3.4:** All faculty members are informed and current in their discipline or area of public health teaching.

**Finding:**
Met

**Team Comments:**

**Observations from the Self-Study**
Tenure-track faculty members attend professional conferences and meetings to stay current on public health issues. The College of Science provides funds for faculty to become members in professional organizations, and provides support for travel and attendance to at least one annual scientific meeting each year. All lecturers are given the opportunity to attend an annual professional meeting of their choice.

Tenure-track faculty have made more than 40 presentations at conferences and published more than 30 peer-reviewed manuscripts and book chapters. Faculty have presented at national conferences such as APHA, SOPHE, Academy of Food and Nutrition, American School Health Association, Association of Third World Studies, Society of Behavioral Medicine, and the International Conference on the Health Risks of Youth.

Faculty have published manuscripts in several journals including World Medical and Health Policy, Evaluation and the Health Professions, Journal of Sexuality Education, Journal of Correctional Health, Pedagogy in Health Promotion and American Journal of Health Studies.

**Observations on Site**
Students who met with the site visit team noted that faculty members have diverse areas of expertise and they are very knowledgeable about the field of public health.

The dean of the College of Science noted that he supports faculty attendance to at least one annual scientific meeting each year by covering 33% of the total cost. The department covers the remaining amount.

**Commentary:**
*(if applicable)*
Click here to enter text.
**Criterion 3.5:** Course instructors who are currently enrolled graduate students, if serving as primary instructors, have at least a master’s degree in the teaching discipline or are pursuing a doctoral degree with at least 18 semester credits of doctoral coursework in the concentration in which they are teaching.

**Finding:**
Not Applicable

**Team Comments:**

**Observations from the Self-Study**
Click here to enter text.

**Observations on Site**
Click here to enter text.

**Commentary:**
(If applicable)
Click here to enter text.

**Compliance Concern:**
(If Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

**Institution Comments:**
Click here to enter text.

**Council Comments:**
Click here to enter text.
4.0 CURRICULUM

Criterion 4.1: The overall undergraduate curriculum (e.g., general education, liberal learning, essential knowledge and skills, etc.) introduces students to the following domains:

- the foundations of scientific knowledge, including the biological and life sciences and the concepts of health and disease
- the foundations of social and behavioral sciences
- basic statistics
- the humanities/fine arts

The curriculum addresses these domains through any combination of learning experiences throughout the undergraduate curriculum, including general education courses defined by the institution as well as concentration and major requirements or electives.

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

Public health students complete between 17-28 credit hours of courses in the four areas of the university’s core curriculum including: science, social and behavioral sciences, math/quantitative reasoning and humanities/fine arts. Public health faculty advisors work closely with students to ensure that the classes taken allow students to gain a deeper knowledge of a specific area in public health that aligns with the students’ interests.

Students are required to complete 12 credit hours of general education coursework in the biological and life sciences. The public health program requires students to take the following courses: BIOL 232 Human Anatomy and Physiology I & II with lab, and a choice between CHEM 101 Introduction to Chemistry or CHEM 111 General Chemistry.

Students are required to complete three credit hours of general education coursework in the social and behavioral sciences including: PSYC 101 Introduction to Psychology or SOC 101 Introduction to Sociology.

Students are required to complete three credit hours of math at the college algebra or above level. The program also requires that students complete a statistics course. Students take MATH 130 – College Algebra and have the option to choose between STAT 201 Elementary Statistics, PSYC 225 Psychological Statistics with lab or CBAD 291 Business Statistics.
Students are required to complete six credit hours of coursework in the humanities/fine arts, and have the option of selecting two of the following:

1) ENGL 205 Literature and Culture  
2) ENGL 231 Film, New Media, and Culture  
3) ENGL 287 Major Writers of American Literature  
4) ENGL 288 Major Writers of British Literature  
5) PHIL 101 Introduction to Philosophy  
6) PHIL 102 Introduction to Ethics  
7) THEA 101 Introduction to Theater Art  
8) THEA 130 Principles of Dramatic Analysis

**Observations on Site**

Students are required to complete 15 credit hours of coursework outside of their major which the program has categorized as a cognate. To assist students with choosing courses that align with students’ areas of interest, the program has developed three cognate examples: communication, exercise science and health services leadership. These are not concentration areas, as students are not required to choose one of these focus areas. Students can choose any combination of courses to complete the required 15 credit hours.

**Commentary:**
*(if applicable)*

Click here to enter text.

**Compliance Concern:**
*(if Partially Met or Not Met)*

Click here to enter text.

**Institution Comments:**

Click here to enter text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Council Comments:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 4.2: The requirements for the public health major or concentration provide instruction in the following domains. The curriculum addresses these domains through any combination of learning experiences throughout the requirements for the major or concentration coursework (ie, the program may identify multiple learning experiences that address a domain—the domains listed below do not each require a single designated course).

- the history and philosophy of public health as well as its core values, concepts and functions across the globe and in society
- the basic concepts, methods and tools of public health data collection, use and analysis and why evidence-based approaches are an essential part of public health practice
- the concepts of population health, and the basic processes, approaches and interventions that identify and address the major health-related needs and concerns of populations
- the underlying science of human health and disease including opportunities for promoting and protecting health across the life course
- the socioeconomic, behavioral, biological, environmental and other factors that impact human health and contribute to health disparities
- the fundamental concepts and features of project implementation, including planning, assessment and evaluation
- the fundamental characteristics and organizational structures of the US health system as well as the differences in systems in other countries
- basic concepts of legal, ethical, economic and regulatory dimensions of health care and public health policy and the roles, influences and responsibilities of the different agencies and branches of government
- basic concepts of public health-specific communication, including technical and professional writing and the use of mass media and electronic technology

If the program intends to prepare students for a specific credential, then the curriculum must also address the areas of instruction required for credential eligibility (eg, CHES).

Finding:
Partially Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The curriculum consists of 12 required courses: PUBH 304 Nutrition; PUBH 310 Issues in Family Life and Sexuality; PUBH 333 Environmental Health; PUBH 350 Community Public Health Strategies; PUBH 403 Leadership in the Health Professions; PUBH 410 Epidemiology and Quantitative Research Methods; PUBH 481 Behavioral Foundations and Decision Making in Health Education; PUBH 485 Internship in Health Careers; PUBH 491 Needs Assessment, Planning and Evaluation Methods in Public Health; PUBH 495 Senior Seminar. Two of the required courses (PUBH 121 Personal and Community Health and PUBH 201 Philosophy and Principles of Public Health Education) are classified as core courses. The core courses provide students with a foundational knowledge of public health, and the remaining courses provide
students with an opportunity to practice the skills and apply the knowledge gained in core courses. The internship serves as the capstone for the curriculum.

The program’s primary faculty mapped the curriculum to the public health domains, specifying which courses were introducing or covering content.

Observations on Site

The site visit team learned that program faculty designated each of the required domains as “introduced” or “covered” in the curriculum based on the following: “introduced means that concepts in the domain were discussed in class but students were not assessed on the content; “covered” means the student was assessed on the concept/domain.

When asked why the public health domains were mostly covered in elective courses, faculty members referred to their past participation in the SOPHE/AAHE Baccalaureate Program Approval Committee (SABPAC) review. Reviewers noted that much of the confusion surrounding curriculum appears to arise from the program’s focus on the SABPAC criteria, which governed an approval process for health education programs and was sunset after the advent of accreditation for standalone baccalaureate programs.

Faculty indicated that they were encouraged to use their elective courses to map the curriculum to the CHES Areas of Responsibility. Because of the program’s transition from a health promotion/health education focus to a generalist focus, the program decided to maintain the curricular format and map the public health domains to elective courses that are broader and inclusive of a variety public health focus areas. Faculty also noted that they assumed mapping the domains to elective courses was a requirement of the criterion.

When asked why the curriculum mapped to the CHES Areas of Responsibilities in addition to the public health domains, the site visit team was informed that the faculty reported being told they could not make any changes to their curriculum once they started the accreditation review process.

The program faculty stated that they have had formal and informal conversations about curricular changes. The designated leader and faculty plan to begin curricular revisions at their spring 2018 faculty workshop.
Students stated that they enjoyed the in-class activities and would like to have more epidemiology and human sexuality classes. Alumni stated that they appreciated the program planning course content and the grant writing course.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
The concern relates to the lack of coverage of the required Public Health Domains in the required public health curriculum. Except for one class covering the ethical dimensions of health care and public health policy, the required curriculum does not adequately cover the following domains: 1) Overview of Health Systems and 2) Health Policy, Law, Ethics and Economics. The program mapped content from these domains to elective courses, but there is no mechanism to ensure that all students complete the courses to which these domains are mapped.

Institution Comments:
To address the lack of coverage in two areas of the domains, the program completed a curriculum map and found areas where there was saturation of domain coverage in required and elective courses and areas where there was little to no domain coverage. There was a need to restructure some classes to be more intentional in what was being covered as well as change required offerings to ensure domain coverage. The changes approved through the academic affairs process at the University are as follows: Moved PUBH 304 Nutrition and PUBH 310 Issues in Family Life and Sexuality from required courses to electives and moved PUBH 380 Essentials of the US Health Care System (includes comparative health care systems) and PUBLIC 320 Public Health Policy and Advocacy (addresses basic concepts of the legal, ethical, economic and regulatory dimensions of health policy) from electives to required courses. Starting in Fall 2018, all course syllabi will include which of the nine public health domains are covered in the course. Additionally, the PUBH 495 Senior Seminar capstone class will transition to assess the two new courses PUBH 320 Public Health Policy and Advocacy and PUBH 380 Essentials of the US Health Care System in the end-of-program cumulative examination once all students have gone through the updated cycle (about 2 years). Courses were revisited to
ensure that there is introduction and coverage of the nine domains throughout the curriculum. The assessments for each required course were reviewed to ensure that the nine domains and sub domains are covered throughout the curriculum.

Council Comments:

Click here to enter text.
Criterion 4.3: If the program intends to prepare students for a specific credential, then the curriculum must address the areas of responsibility required for credential eligibility (eg, CHES).

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The program prepares students around the Seven Areas of Responsibility of the Certified Health Education Specialist (CHES) credential. The self-study maps the CHES Areas of Responsibility with the required and elective courses and lists whether the area is introduced or covered. The program includes a required course, PUBH 495, Senior Seminar – CHES Review, that students take for a pass/fail grade. Students must score at least 70% on the exam, which consists of 75+ multiple-choice questions. If students do not pass the exam on their first attempt, they are given a second opportunity to pass with a score of at least a 70%. The second exam includes multiple-choice questions and comprehensive essay items. If students do not pass the second exam, they are required to repeat the course.

Observations on Site

Faculty members indicated that students who do not pass the exam on the first attempt can take the second exam as early as the week following the initial exam. If students do not pass the exam on the second attempt, they are required to retake the course. This cycle continues until the student passes the exam, changes their major or otherwise leaves the program. The faculty also stated they are not aware of the university having any limit on the number of times a student takes a course.

From Fall 2011 through Spring 2017, 353 students took the exam. Of those 353 students, 318 (90%) passed on their first attempt, 29 (~8%) passed on their second attempt, and 6 (~2%) were required to retake the course, although some may have chosen to leave the program at that time.

In meeting with program faculty, they noted that the alignment with the CHES competencies is a holdover from the experience with SABPAC approval.
Criterion 4.4: Students must demonstrate the following skills:

- the ability to communicate public health information, in both oral and written forms and through a variety of media, to diverse audiences
- the ability to locate, use, evaluate and synthesize public health information.

Finding:
Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

To demonstrate oral communication skills, students present poster presentations and PowerPoint presentations in more than 10 different classes. In PUBH 382 Concepts of Disease, students must give a presentation on a specific disease topic using VoiceThread technology.

To demonstrate written communication skills, students write papers, complete community-based health proposals and answer essay-style questions. In PUBH 375 Global Health Perspectives, students are required to complete a six to ten-page paper about an international non-governmental organization.

To demonstrate communication skills with diverse audiences, the program encourages preceptors to ensure that students are demonstrating this skill throughout their internship experience. Also in PUBH 350 Community Health Promotion Strategies, students develop an advocacy plan in which they communicate a complex health issue in a logical and coherent manner to diverse audiences such as lay members of the community, stakeholders and decision makers.

Students communicate through a variety of media in courses including PUBH 304 Nutrition, and PUBH 420 Health Policy. In the nutrition course, students use a dietary analysis program, a PowerPoint or Prezi presentation for Nutrition News. In the policy course, students are required to develop social media tools for advocacy messages.

Students demonstrate their ability to locate, use evaluate and synthesize information throughout the entirety of the program. For example, PUBH 201 Philosophy and Principles of Health Promotion/Education, allows students to demonstrate these skills during the completion of a literature review and health program portfolio project and proposal.
Observations on Site

Current students and alumni reported feeling confident in their abilities to demonstrate skills in public health communication and information literacy. Alumni noted that the program allowed them to learn public health skills that they can use in their current place of employment. Current students expressed satisfaction with the fact that faculty teach the content in a way that allows students to learn and demonstrate their skills versus simply memorizing facts.

Community partners praised students’ skills in information literacy and their ability to locate, use, evaluate and synthesize public health information. While preceptors said that they were pleased with student skills overall, they did note an area for improvement. Preceptors noted that students struggle with public speaking and delivering public health information to diverse groups. Preceptors recognized that students were not always confident in their knowledge and skill set, which translated to challenges in their delivery of information.

Commentary:
(if applicable)

The commentary relates to opportunities for the program to enhance assessment of students’ ability to communicate with diverse audiences and their public speaking skills. While issues were not described as widespread, several community partners who met with site visitors agreed that allowing students to gain more exposure to presenting information to different audiences and being confident in the way in which they present public health data is an area for improvement within the program.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)

Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:

Students complete presentations in the majority of the public health classes to develop oral communication skills. The program will be more intentional in providing opportunities to expose students to different audiences starting with the 30-hour internship experience in the sophomore year and covering it specifically in PUBH 350 Community Health Program Strategies, where students must complete a health communication and advocacy project.
Students first create a coalition recruitment plan to identify key stakeholders and find individuals and organizations that have a shared purpose and common goal as the coalition for addressing the specific health issue. Next, the students identify relevant health information and existing resources for the specific health issue and develop a strategic plan for addressing that issue. The students then communicate this information as a presentation in a logical and coherent manner to their classmates as though presenting to stakeholders and decision makers. In the capstone internship experience, students further hone their presentation skills while working with diverse audiences such as stakeholders and decision makers at the internship sites.

Council Comments:
Criterion 4.5: Students have opportunities to integrate, synthesize and apply knowledge through cumulative and experiential activities. All students complete a cumulative, integrative and scholarly or applied experience or inquiry project that serves as a capstone to the education experience. These experiences may include, but are not limited to, internships, service-learning projects, senior seminars, portfolio projects, research papers or honors theses. Programs encourage exposure to local-level public health professionals and/or agencies that engage in public health practice.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:
Observations from the Self-Study
For cumulative opportunities, students are required to register for PUBH 485 and complete a supervised internship in a public health setting and produce a senior professional portfolio. The internship experience is 290 hours, and approximately 20 students participate in the internship per semester. To be eligible for the internship, students must be in their final semester, have completed at least 90 credits and have a GPA no less than 2.25 in all university courses.

Students have interned at more than 45 different sites including the Red Cross, the American Heart Association, Autism Advocates Foundation and the Boys and Girls Club. Students have also interned at other departments within the university, medical centers and non-governmental organizations.

The internship coordinator provides a list of internship sites to students; students are expected to initiate contact with the site and develop a plan for their internship experience. The faculty member who teaches PUBH 485 approves all placements. Students are to meet with their preceptors, develop goals and objectives, keep a journal of activities, log their hours worked, make a presentation on their experience, prepare a professional portfolio and complete midterm and final evaluations.

Preceptors evaluate students on the learning outcomes based on the public health domains. Preceptors also evaluate students on attitude, dependability, quality of work, maturity, judgment, ability to learn, initiative, relations with others, work habits and attendance and the CHES areas of responsibility. Students evaluate their internship for perceived value of the experience, quality of site supervision, ability to attain their internship goals, and their
professional confidence. Student evaluations are used to identify any areas in need of improvement for future placements.

For the senior professional portfolio, students provide a personal interpretation of their internship experience and an artifact for each CHES competency. For each competency, the student explains the competency, how health educators use the competency and why it is important. Students also provide a detailed justification of how the artifact accurately represents the competency.

Observations on Site

When asked why students are required to complete a pre-internship at the beginning of the program in addition to the internship that feeds into the cumulative activity, program faculty members stated this was a requirement for SABPAC approval. At the time, the later internship did not meet SABPACs requirement of 290 hours of experiential learning, so the program created this “pre-internship” experience to make up the difference in experiential hours. In fall 2017, the program implemented PUBH 484, which is a seminar course, to prepare students for the internship and will be offered the semester prior to the internship.

Preceptors indicated that they received sufficient guidance on their roles and responsibilities for the internship. They also provided glowing comments on the availability and responsiveness of the internship coordinator throughout the internship process. Preceptors noted that the internship coordinator reaches out to them on a regular basis and stated that they believe the internship process is more organized than other departments’ experiences and consider the process a model for other programs.

Preceptors were highly complementary on the quality of students coming from the program, stating that students are ready to hit the ground running. One preceptor noted that many of the programs created by interns still exist even after the internship has ended, maintaining the sustainability for their program efforts.

The provost and dean mentioned that a strength of the program is its high level of experiential learning, which aligns with the university mission. They mentioned the program engaging in activities that specifically serve the community and provide community outreach scholarship.
Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:
Although there is no need to add information as the finding was "Met," we wanted to clarify that internships are local, national and international. Students have the option to identify sites in addition to selecting from a list provided by the Internship Coordinator.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
Criterion 4.6: The overall undergraduate curriculum and public health major curriculum expose students to concepts and experiences necessary for success in the workplace, further education and life-long learning. Students are exposed to these concepts through any combination of learning experiences and co-curricular experiences. These concepts include the following:

- advocacy for protection and promotion of the public’s health at all levels of society
- community dynamics
- critical thinking and creativity
- cultural contexts in which public health professionals work
- ethical decision making as related to self and society
- independent work and a personal work ethic
- networking
- organizational dynamics
- professionalism
- research methods
- systems thinking
- teamwork and leadership

Finding:
Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

Students are introduced to cross-cutting concepts in the following courses: PUBH 201 Philosophy and Principles of Public Health Education, which addresses cultural contexts in which public health professionals work; PUBH 350 Community Health Promotion Strategies, which explores community engagement strategies; PUBH 410 Epidemiology and Quantitative Research Methods, which covers concepts related to disease prevalence and research methodology; and PUBH 403 Leadership in the Health Professions, which addresses leadership and advocacy strategies and techniques. All public health students are required to successfully complete 320 hours in internship experiences at approved public health organizations. A 30-hour pre-internship is completed as a portion of the course requirements for PUBH 201 Philosophy and Principles of Public Health Education. PUBH 485 Internship in Health Careers requires the successful completion of a Senior Professional Portfolio and a 290-hour senior-level internship.

The public health faculty also seek to offer additional opportunities. For example, the Department of Health Sciences has sent a team of students to the Society of Public Health Education case study competition for the past three years.
Observations on Site

Preceptors validated the program’s ability to address a number of areas, including many aspects of professionalism. They stated they were generally pleased with the students’ creativity, application of public health theory and overall level of preparedness. However, they did note a need for improved professional dress and independent work ethic in terms of thinking outside of the box and taking the initiative outside of designated responsibilities for some students.

Public health students have numerous opportunities to participate in research, specifically with the PUBH 411 nutrition lab, which allows students to work with real patients and conduct dietary analysis; independent study, which allows students to cultivate their own research projects; and the Swain’s student research scholarship. Students also receive support to travel to conferences with faculty for research projects.

Commentary:
(if applicable)

The commentary relates to opportunities for the program to provide additional exposure to student professionalism and development of independent work ethics. While issues were not described as widespread, several community partners agreed that professionalism and taking the initiative outside of designated responsibilities are areas for improvement for students.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)

Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:

Prior to completing a nine credit hour internship during the last semester of study in the program, sophomore students in PUBH 201 Philosophy and Principles of Public Health interact with students in the senior internship course (PUBH 485), where they can ask questions and discuss the expectations of the internship. The Senior Internship prepares students to function professionally in a community public health setting. Students are required to develop personal goals and objectives and complete an original project at the internship site. In addition, students are required to create and adhere to a schedule for internship, thus exhibiting dependability. The main purpose of the senior internship is to develop leadership skills and professionalism in the field of public health. Additionally, courses throughout the curriculum offer students an
opportunity to develop and practice leadership skills and professionalism. For example, students in PUBH 350, PUBH 403, and PUBH 481 complete in-class group activities to reinforce the concepts that are being taught. In PUBH 350 and PUBH 481, all students have the opportunity to participate in leadership roles to complete specific tasks in a variety of group assignments. For example, one student per group acts as the facilitator for the activity and is responsible for relaying the information to the whole class. Additionally, faculty provide critique about professionalism, exhibition of leadership, and ability to communicate effectively during class presentations.

Council Comments:

Click here to enter text.
Criterion 4.7: Syllabi for required and elective courses for the major include objectives that are sufficient to demonstrate that they address the domain(s) identified in Criterion 4.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study
Following the university’s guidelines, the program requires that all syllabi have course objectives and student learning outcomes listed.

Observations on Site
Upon review of all syllabi in the electronic resource file, the site visit team confirmed that the syllabi provided met the requirements set by the university. The course objectives and student learning outcomes were clearly aligned with the public health domains.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:
Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
5.0 PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Criterion 5.1: The program defines a mission statement that guides program activities and is congruent with the mission statement(s) of the parent institution(s).

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The self-study presents two public health mission statements. The first is: “To integrate theoretical concepts, creative research activities, ethical perspectives, an appreciation for the richness of global diversity, and community health outreach opportunities to best prepare undergraduates who are ready for graduate study or professional careers. Through collaborative, engaged learning experiences in assessing community health needs as well as planning, implementing, conducting, administering, and evaluating health education and promotion strategies, graduates are prepared to take leadership roles in protecting and improving the community’s health. Public health faculty members strengthen the profession of public health by providing student-centered, experiential learning in a challenging, positive academic environment, which is nationally recognized for excellence by the Society for Public Health Education and the American Association for Health Education.”

The second mission statement says, “the mission of the public health program is to prepare graduates who are guided by public health principles and who are able to respond to and respect diverse individual needs.”

Observations on Site

When asked about the two mission statements, program administration and faculty admitted that the second mission statement originated from the university’s requirement to include experiential learning and diversity in their mission statement and curriculum.

Faculty members seemed to be unsure of what the true mission of the program was and noted the need to revise, consolidate and shorten the mission statement during the next faculty workshop in spring 2018.
Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
The concern relates to the fact that there are two mission statements listed in the self-study document. The first mission statement is quite lengthy and confusing, limiting its usefulness in program development. Although program representatives stated that the curriculum is developed to reflect the mission statement, it was not evident to the site visit team. Site visitors noted a misalignment between the fact that the program’s first mission statement focuses on health promotion and education, while the second statement aligns with a generalist degree.

The program advertises that it offers a generalist degree, however, the curricular focus is in health education, confirmed by the fact that the curriculum is structured around the Seven Areas of Responsibility of a Certified Health Education Specialist in addition to the public health domains. Faculty noted that the elective courses were developed to align with a generalist degree. However, as elective courses, not all students will complete the same combination of courses.

Institution Comments:
The previous mission was a remnant from when the program was health promotion and it was located in the College of Education. Since the CEPH Site Visit, the mission of the public health program has been revised to guide the program objectives and the student learning outcomes.

The full-time faculty met four times over spring 2018 to determine our expectations of the program, what we want our students to know and do when they graduate from the public health program, and how we as a program intend to accomplish the outcome. The mission is now revised and the current working mission of the public health program is "to prepare students to protect and improve the health of individuals and communities through a challenging academic program with experiential learning opportunities.” Program goals and objectives and student learning outcomes were developed from the mission.
Strides have been made to ensure that the public health program is generalist. The nine public health domains are now represented and covered in the curriculum by moving two content classes (PUBH 304 Nutrition and PUBH310 Issues in Family Life and Sexuality) to electives and making two elective classes (PUBH 320 Public Health Policy and Advocacy and PUBH 380 US Health Care System) to required ones. Other required courses include statistics, epidemiology, environmental health, leadership, program planning, and behavioral change theory. In addition, to being generalist, the program has a health promotion focus so that students are eligible to take of the Certified Health Education Specialist examination and as such fulfills the competency requirements.

Council Comments:
Since the site visit, the program has revised its mission statement and used it to guide the program objectives and student learning outcomes. The program's response, validated by the Council, indicates that the original concern has been addressed.
Criterion 5.2: The program defines expected student learning outcomes that align with the program’s defined mission and the institution’s regional accreditation standards and guide curriculum design and implementation as well as student assessment.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The program has developed five student learning outcomes that appear to align with the public health domains.

- Students will demonstrate broad knowledge of health education/public health content.
- Students will be able to design basic public health programs in response to an identified health need in the community.
- Students will be able to conduct evaluation related to public health programs.
- Students will demonstrate leadership skills.
- Students will demonstrate professional behaviors and overall ability based upon the internship site supervisor evaluation both on the mid-term evaluation and the final evaluation.

Observations on Site

It was difficult for the team to determine if the SLO’s relate to the mission due to the confusion mentioned in Criterion 5.1 However, the SLO’s do appear to guide curriculum design & implementation and student assessment. Although this is the case, the confusion brought on by the varying mission statements can be seen in student’s perception of the degree program as a whole.

During discussions with students, it seemed that students saw the program as a feeder program to other healthcare-related professions, rather than as a public health degree. There was only one student that mentioned this program preparing her for a master’s in public health degree or a career in a public health-related field. Most students noted that they wanted to become a dietitian, nutritionist or physician’s assistant.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.
Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:
There is concern that the image of the program is one of a feeder into programs other than public health. The University's generalist public health program aims to prepare students for both the workforce and graduate school. After completion of the public health program, students can enter the public health workforce, elect to take the Certified Health Education Specialist (CHES) exam, seek employment in the health education field, complete graduate studies in public health or related fields, or apply for positions in other health-related professions. There will be more focus on providing students with materials for graduate programs in public health discipline in addition to those provided for other health professions.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
Criterion 5.3: The program regularly revisits its mission and expected student outcomes to ensure their continuing relevance.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study
The university expects departments to review their mission and student learning outcomes on a regular basis. Faculty members in the Department of Health Sciences typically meet at the beginning and end of each semester to discuss the continued relevance of the program’s mission and student learning outcomes. The self-study also notes that two public health faculty members serve as the Public Health Assessment Committee, which meets regularly to evaluative the program’s progress on student learning outcomes.

Observations on Site
Faculty members stated that the mission statement has been in place since the program sought SABPAC approval and that since then, they have only added "bits and pieces" to it. In conversations with faculty and staff with key responsibilities for the program, the site visit team learned that the mission statement has not undergone review for alignment with student outcomes since the mission statement was prepared for SABPAC approval during academic year 2008. It appeared to site visitors the program faculty were waiting for feedback from the site visit before revising their mission statement.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
The concern is that the program does not systematically and regularly review the mission statement. The mission statement has not had a thorough review since its conception when the program was seeking SABPAC approval in academic year 2008. Faculty noted that a few words were added so that the mission statement would better reflect health promotion and education.
Institution Comments:
Following the CEPH site visit, the mission statement for the public health program was revised. Going forward, the mission of the program will be reviewed every three years by program faculty to determine its consistency with the program focus. Additionally, the student learning outcomes were revised to be consistent with the program focus. Student learning outcomes data will also be reviewed every year by the public health faculty and the College of Science Assessment Committee and revised as needed based on the data collected. However, the student learning outcomes will be revised by the program faculty every three years as needed.

Council Comments:
The program’s response to the site visit team’s report, validated by the Council, demonstrates that the mission statement has been revised and a system has been outlined for regular review. This addresses the original concern.
**Criterion 5.4:** The program defines and implements a plan that determines the program’s effectiveness. Methodologies may vary based on the mission, organization and resources of the program, but whatever the approach, assessment processes are analytical, useful, cost-effective, accurate and truthful, carefully planned and organized, systematic and sustained.

At a minimum, the plan includes regular surveys or other data collection (eg, focus groups, key informant interviews, data from national exams (eg, CHES) from:

- enrolled students
- alumni
- relevant community stakeholders (eg, practitioners who teach in the program, service learning community partners, internship preceptors, employers of graduates, etc.)

Data collection must address student satisfaction with advising.

The program collects quantitative data at least annually on 1) graduation rates within the maximum time to graduation allowed by the institution and 2) rates of job placement or continued education within one year of graduation. The program defines plans, including data sources and methodologies, for collecting these data, identifies limitations and continually works to address data limitations and improve data accuracy. The program’s plan does not rely exclusively on institution- or unit-collected data, unless those data are sufficiently detailed and descriptive. Data collection methods for graduates’ destinations are sufficient to ensure at least a 30% response rate.

The program collects qualitative data on the destination of graduates related to both employment and further education, such as type of graduate degree pursued and sector of employment, as defined by the program.

**Finding:**

| Partially Met |

**Team Comments:**

Observations from the Self-Study

A variety of methods are used to evaluate student learning outcomes for the public health degree including: mastery of skills-based assignments in required public health classes, successful completion of 320 internship hours, evidence of mastery of the public health and education competencies in the Senior Professional Portfolio and a grade of C or better on the senior comprehensive review/end-of-program exam.

The Public Health Assessment Committee meets to evaluate progress on the program’s student learning outcomes. Faculty members collect grades for specific assessment opportunities mapped to the student learning outcomes at the end of each semester for the courses they have taught. Faculty members then provide the data to the Public Health Assessment Committee at the beginning of the next semester. Following the analysis of the data and the progress on the student learning outcomes, the committee submits a report each
year to the university-wide Assessment Committee, which assesses the program committee’s annual report and provides feedback to the department.

The program collects quantitative data on the senior comprehensive review/end-of program exam, which assesses core public health knowledge. The exam is mapped to content in the following courses: PUBH 201 Philosophy and Principles of Public Health Education; PUBH 350 Community Public Health Strategies; PUBH 481 Behavioral Foundations and Decision Making in Health Education; and PUBH 491 Needs Assessment, Planning, and Evaluation Methods in Public Health. Content knowledge from PUBH 304 Nutrition and PUBH 310 Issues in Family Life and Sexuality is also included.

In PUBH 485 Internship in Health Careers, the program collects quantitative data from the Leadership Survey, which assesses five constructs related to each student’s leadership abilities. The program also collects qualitative data with the senior professional portfolio, included in the PUBH 485 course. Students interpret CHES competencies and provide examples of how they have met each competency. The course instructor uses a rubric to evaluate the content structure, internship experiences and student interpretation of the CHES competencies as demonstrated in the portfolio.

Based on the data collected within the past academic year, 70% of students passed the comprehensive exam on their first try (SLO 1); of those who had to take the second attempt (approximately seven students per semester), 50%-100% successfully passed over the four-year period. To assess students’ progress related to SLO 2, 69% of students demonstrated the ability to design basic health education programs at a satisfactory level and 85% of students passed the senior professional portfolio with at least a C grade. When assessing student’s progress to attaining SLO 3, 77% of the students demonstrated the ability to conduct evaluation using effective research methods. For SLO 4 and 5, the program has not completed data analysis of the leadership surveys or the preceptor evaluation data.

The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Analysis publishes graduation and completion rates for a specific cohort of students. This information is gathered annually based on public health degrees conferred and is reported to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (SCCHE) and The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Students are expected to graduate within six years.
The program collects information on the destination of graduates’ post-graduation through surveys administered by offices across the university (e.g., Office of Alumni Relations, Office of Career Services, Department of Health Sciences). The program also collected data from the National Student Clearinghouse to determine whether students who left the university attended another institution. The program has maintained at least a 30% response rate for job placement rate data.

Observations on Site
The program’s assessment plan is designed to fulfill the university’s requirement for strategic planning. Every year the program collects, and uploads data related to the SLOs into the CampusLabs assessment software for the university, and produces an assessment report. This process only includes data collection and presentation. The program does not have goals or targets associated with the assessment plan.

The program began administering a survey in fall 2017 to assess the students’ satisfaction with advising and career counseling. The program plans to administer the survey once a semester after students have received advising. Preceptors who spoke with the site visit team stated that the internship coordinator sends emails to check in with preceptors and lets the preceptors know they have the freedom to voice any concerns and provide feedback.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
The first concern relates to lack of processes to assess overall programmatic effectiveness. The program’s assessment plan includes data related only to student performance and SLOs. Although preceptors evaluate students’ attainment of the student learning outcomes in the internship course, the program does not solicit feedback from preceptors or employers specific to the overall effectiveness of the program.
The second concern relates to the fact that the program relies heavily on university data collection methods and does not have access to consistent data due to this reliance. During the site visit, the program was unable to provide data from academic year 2015-2016 because the university did not request assessment for that year. Also, as noted in the self-study, the surveys administered through offices throughout the university (alumni, career services, etc.) do not have a high response rate. To increase response rates, the program now ensures that surveys are administered to public health alumni five months after graduation in October and May. The department also makes follow-up phone calls and completes the survey or leaves a message directing students to the survey. In addition, social networks (LinkedIn and Facebook) are used to contact public health alumni to gather information about their work or graduate study.

Program leaders acknowledged the gaps in the assessment of overall programmatic effectiveness and stated that the program plans to begin improving their assessment process in spring 2018.

**Institution Comments:**

There was concern about a lack of processes to assess overall programmatic effectiveness. In the past, the public health program collected data as part of the assessment requirement for the institution. The data collected was based on student performance on the student learning outcomes (SLOs) and used that to determine the effectiveness of our program. After the site visit, we became aware that we were falling short of our assessment. This critique is also presented in the current report. To address the compliance concern, the faculty of the Public Health program met over the course of the 2018 spring semester to develop strategies that would address the compliance concerns. We first explored who we were as a program, what we envisioned our students should be able to know and do, and finally, how we as program could help them achieve our expectations. After completing a mapping exercise and identifying key terms, we came up with a revised mission statement. The full time faculty of the program then developed program goals (the program faculty will meet in Fall 2018 to outline program objectives for the program goals), overarching student learning goal and student learning objectives that are reflective of the Public Health program’s mission.

The goals of the Public Health Program at Coastal Carolina University are written to reflect what we would like our students “to look like” when they graduate and what does the program
need to do to get the student to that point. The Public Health program at Coastal Carolina University aims to:

1. prepare students to pursue entry-level careers in the public health field (particularly health education and health promotion); apply to MPH, health-related or complementary graduate programs; or gain additional training or schooling within other health professions;
2. ensure a generalist public health curriculum design that is based on the nine public health domains and seven certified health education specialist (CHES) competencies;
3. provide diverse course offerings within the Public Health program;
4. provide flexibility of coursework outside of the major by declaring a minor or completing a cognate;
5. engage all public health majors in experiential learning; and
6. provide academic and career advising by qualified and engaged faculty.

Over the summer of 2018, we will be soliciting information from our stakeholders (site supervisors) about the current internship process, stakeholder needs, student preparation for the internship and student preparation for the workforce/graduate school programs. The program will host the site supervisors (stakeholders) at the University for a three hour workshop to 1) thank them for their support of the program and providing internship opportunities to our students; 2) providing resources for what to expect when hosting a student intern; and 3) gain stakeholder perspectives about the internship component of the public health program. We will also ask the stakeholders to serve in an advisory capacity to acquire feedback about what skills are needed to be productive in the dynamic public health environment and to identify potential stakeholders that we previously missed. In addition, the site supervisor evaluation is being revised to solicit appropriate feedback related to student preparation in the public health program. Questions requiring Likert-style responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree will include:

- Student is knowledgeable about public health content and concepts.
- Student can effectively communicate public health messages to community members.
- Overall, I believe that the Public Health program at Coastal Carolina University prepares students to work in the public health workforce.

The information that is collected from the workshop and the data that is gathered from the revised site supervisor evaluation, will be presented to the faculty at the next planned faculty meeting to discuss our strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats in order to seek potential opportunities and address potential and real concerns. Meetings will be held annually, to show our appreciation, provide data that have been collected over the year and update site supervisors of any new process. Workshops will be held every other year to provide information
that indicated as well as gain formal stakeholder perspectives about the internship and provide training for new site supervisors. In addition, the program is completing a comparative review of the student enrollment and faculty distribution of programs, number of courses offered and size of classes to identify the needs and best allocation of resources. This component is aligned with Coastal Carolina University's Strategic Plan Goal 1.3 to "support a balanced faculty model that promotes the teacher-scholar ideal which values the combined impact of outstanding teaching and exposure to research scholarly and creative activities to enhance student learning and engaged experiences" and specifically objective 2: “CCU will identify adjustments, process and resource requirements to support a manageable balance and appropriate recognition in delivering meritorious and notable contributions to multiple areas of teaching, scholarly/creative productivity, and student/community engagement.” As our enrollment numbers continue to increase and our courses continue to be overcapacity, the justification of new lines, resource requests and allocations appear evident. However, a thorough review can only help to ensure a manageable balance so that the program and its faculty are efficient, effective and productive.

As mentioned, the student learning goal was developed and the SLOs that were revised over in the spring semester to reflect the mission and what we would like our students to know and what skills we expect them to possess and they go through and complete the program.

**Student Learning Goal:** Students in the Public Health program at Coastal Carolina University will develop professional development skills and apply public health theory and concepts to public health practice.

**The following are the Student Learning Outcomes:**

1. Students will demonstrate broad knowledge of health education/public health content (PUBH 495) and application of public health and health education concepts (PUBH 485).
2. Students will be able to identify health needs and concerns of a community by developing a literature review (PUBH 201).
3. Students will be able to exhibit confidence in developing strategies to improve community health (PUBH 350).
4. Students will demonstrate program-planning skills (PUBH 350 & PUBH 491).
5. Students will develop skills needed to apply theory to public health practice (PUBH 481).
6. Students will demonstrate professionalism through practical experiences in a setting related to Public Health based on site supervisor student evaluations (PUBH 485).
The student learning outcomes are attached to assessments in specific classes, which is where the data for the assessments will be gathered. Each semester, the public health assessment team will gather the assessment data from the faculty teaching the courses to best understand how the students are progressing. If students fall below the threshold (earning lower than a C in the assignment used for assessment), then feedback will be provided to the student so that improvement may be made on future assignments or in repeated course. If there is a majority of students are not earning a C or higher on an assignment, then a review of the material will be conducted and delivery of the material will be examined to determine how best to present the material to students.

Regarding the second point of heavy reliance on University process has been revisited. The Public Health program assessment team will collect data to assess program effectiveness and student learning outcomes annually for our program purposes, regardless of whether the University requires it. The outcomes of the data will be distributed to the faculty and discussed in the first faculty meeting of the semester to ensure the faculty are aware of areas that need additional focus so that changes can be implemented as needed. In addition, data collected will be submitted to the College Assessment Committee for review and input. Annually, the program review of College Assessment Committee input of the assessment data of SLOs is used to make refinements to the program as deemed necessary.

As mentioned already, since the CEPH site visit, student-learning outcomes were revised and one overarching goal developed to reflect the program mission and address more clearly the expectations of our students in the program. In addition program goals have been developed and program objectives are currently being developed and will be available in Fall 2018. In addition, a process is now in place to involve stakeholders in our student success beyond the site supervisor evaluation. Stakeholders will now be instrumental in evaluating our program effectiveness by providing feedback about our student readiness for the workplace and graduate school. We will also solicit feedback about the needs of the changing public health workforce so that our public health students are prepared to meet the needs of a dynamic profession to ensure that our program is effective. Finally, the program is undergoing a comparative review of similar sized programs, reviewing the program growth to determine what resources are needed and the best allocation of current resources.

**Council Comments:**

Click here to enter text.
Criterion 5.5: The program demonstrates that at least 70% of students for whom data are available graduate within six years or the maximum time to graduation as defined by the institution, whichever is longer. The program demonstrates that at least 80% of graduates for whom data are available have secured employment or enrolled in further education within one year of graduation. If the program cannot demonstrate that it meets these thresholds, the program must document 1) that its rates are comparable to similar baccalaureate programs in the home unit (typically a school or college) and 2) a detailed analysis of factors contributing to the reduced rate and a specific plan for future improvement that is based on this analysis.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study
Students are admitted to the major once they have completed 60 credits at the university and have completed the PUBH 121, PUBH 201 and PUBH 350 courses with a grade of C or better. For students who have reached the maximum allowable time to graduate, students who were admitted to the major in academic year 2014-2015, the graduation rate was 95.9%. The graduation rate so far for students who were admitted to the major in 2015-2016 is 86.7%.

Of those that responded to the university’s alumni survey, the job placement rate was 100% in 2014-2015, 96% in 2015-2016 and 87% in 2016-2017. In 2014-2015, no students were actively seeking employment, two students were actively seeking employment in 2015-2016 and six students were actively seeking employment in 2016-2017. The program accesses job placement and continuing education rates from the university-administered alumni post-graduation survey. The program has been working with the university’s Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Analysis to identify the best process that allows the program to collect this data on their own.

Students pursued job placements in fields such as medical centers and non-profit organizations. Students pursued further education in programs such as health administration, nutrition, occupational therapy, social work and nursing.

Observations on Site
The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Analysis collects graduation rate data for the program. Graduation rates are calculated based on a three-year maximum allowable time to graduate from when the student is admitted to the major (six years as a student at the university).
The program maintains internal documents of students who transfer out of the major. Students are required to submit a change of major form to the designated leader/department chair. To calculate graduation rates and retention rates including transfers out of the major, the designated leader removes the number of transfers from the total number of students within each cohort.

**Commentary:**
*(if applicable)*

Click here to enter text.

**Compliance Concern:**
*(if Partially Met or Not Met)*

Click here to enter text.

**Institution Comments:**

Click here to enter text.

**Council Comments:**

Click here to enter text.
Criterion 5.6: The program establishes a schedule for reviewing data on student outcomes and program effectiveness. The program uses data on student outcomes and program effectiveness to improve student learning and the program.

Finding:
Partially Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The University-Wide Assessment Committee for Student Learning collects data from every department on campus concerning student learning outcomes. This committee meets every month to review these assessment reports to evaluate program performance and provides feedback to each program to recommend improvements.

Observations on Site

Discussions with faculty confirmed that they submit performance data to the university-level committee and that these data are related specifically to their student learning outcomes. No other measures of success are included in these reports. The program intends to start a new process for the next five years to conduct a more comprehensive assessment review, required by the university; that review will identify how the data is used to make changes or decisions.

The program recently introduced a Leadership Survey to help collect data on students’ development of specific leadership skills. Although this was intended to expand the scope of data collected for program improvement, faculty indicated that the data remained entirely focused on individual student performance.

Faculty continue to refine methods for using data for program-level improvements, but they have not completed that process yet.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
The concern relates to the lack of a process for using data. Although the program appears to engage in data gathering and analysis, and does receive feedback from the university
assessment system, it has not yet created a process for utilizing it to make program improvements in a systematic and informed manner.

Institution Comments:
Individual faculty, who provide assessment data are included in the data collection process. If students fall below the threshold (earning lower than a "C" in the assignment used for assessment), then feedback will be provided to the student so that improvement may be made on future assignments or in repeated course. If there is a majority of students not earning a C or higher on an assignment, then a review of the material will be conducted and delivery of the material will be examined to determine how best to present the material to students.

Faculty provide data to the program assessment team to enter in the University assessment platform for review by the College Assessment committee. Currently only SLO information has been uploaded, however, starting Fall 2018, program data will be collected. Assessment data from the SLOs and feedback from the college assessment committee are used to make refinements to the program as needed. New program goals and yet to be developed program objectives will also be used for this purpose. The program assessment team will review the information and generate comments. In addition, we will continue to take under advisement stakeholder perspectives that are gathered during site supervisor meetings and workshops.

Once feedback has been received from the college assessment committee, the program assessment team meets annually to discuss possible revisions to the curriculum based on SLOs assessment findings and comments generated from the initial review. Faculty are provided with the information from the SLO findings at faculty meetings at the beginning of the academic year to ensure the faculty are aware of areas that need additional focus so that changes can be implemented as needed. Every three years the program will revisit the mission, program goals and objectives and student learning goals and outcomes, and site supervisor input to ensure that our program meets the needs of students.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
Criterion 5.7: The program maintains clear, publicly available policies on student grievances or complaints and maintains records on the aggregate number of complaints received for the last three years.

Finding:
Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study
The university has defined detailed procedures for both academic and non-academic student complaints, which are published every year in the Undergraduate Catalog. The department received two student grievances over the last three years. Both were resolved at the college-level committee, which included representation from the department, the faculty member involved, and the student filing the grievance.

Observations on Site
Students confirmed that they knew how to access procedures for filing grievances, and felt comfortable with voicing their concerns to any faculty member within the program.

Commentary:  
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:  
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:  
Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:  
Click here to enter text.
6.0 ADVISING

**Criterion 6.1:** Students are advised by program faculty (as defined in Criterion 2.1) or qualified program staff beginning no later than the semester (quarter, trimester, term, etc.) during which students begin coursework in the major and continuing through program completion. Advising includes academic planning and selection of courses as well as public health-related career counseling.

**Finding:**
Met

**Team Comments:**

**Observations from the Self-Study**

The Advising Center in the College of Science has four full-time professional staff advisors who advise freshmen during their first two semesters at the university. These advisors assist primarily with core curriculum requirements and university policies and procedures.

At the beginning of the sophomore year, program faculty provide group and one-on-one advising to public health majors. Group advising includes an orientation to the program, planning for the internship, course advising and graduation requirements. Students are invited to attend one of ten scheduled advisement sessions. Students must attend group advising sessions to enroll in courses and to begin the internship process.

There is no formal policy for students who want to change advisors, however, students can make a request to the department chair for a different advisor.

Faculty advisors receive training from senior members of the department and can take a seminar on academic advising from the University’s Center for Teaching Excellence to Advance Learning. Faculty advisors assist students with their schedules and provide information about employment and further educational opportunities.

The self-study notes that the program’s advising model is highly regarded at the university. The College of Business Administration sought consultation from the department and program when it wanted to improve its advising system.

**Observations on Site**

The group advising sessions are held in October and March. The sessions last up to 75 minutes, of which the first 15-20 minutes covers overview issues related to the program and
curriculum, followed by one-on-one meetings with students. There are at least two to three students per session that seek one-on-one advising. If students have additional needs, they set up an appointment for another face-to-face meeting.

The faculty members reported having a “very open” open door policy, being available at least eight to nine hours per week. They also noted that students reach out to them via email. Faculty expressed they enjoy having the one-on-one conversations with the students during which they might give career advice, talk about career goals and get to know the students on a more personal basis, which allows the faculty to write better letters of recommendation.

In conversations with the students, the site visit team heard equally positive comments on students’ advising experiences with faculty. Students reported a high degree of availability and stated that all faculty know each of them well, which is why they feel so comfortable speaking with other faculty on advising issues if needed. Students who transferred from other programs noted the public health advisors being much more available, often being able to see them the very same day. Students also expressed that their advisors are very good about reaching out to them to let them know what opportunities exist based upon their career interests and goals.

The students also spoke highly of the career counseling service on campus noting they can receive guidance and advice on preparing their resume, that the Career Services office has an informative website, and that there are other resources on campus that are available to help them succeed. Specifically, they mentioned the foreign language center, math lab, writing lab, the library and all the resources available to them on loan.

The program provided data on group advising satisfaction. Overall, students noted that they were satisfied with both academic and career advising.

The provost and dean also expressed their support for the program’s advising approach.

**Commentary:**

(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.
Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:
Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
7.0 DIVERSITY

Criterion 7.1: The program demonstrates a commitment to diversity and provides evidence of an ongoing practice of cultural competence in student learning.

Aspects of diversity may include, but are not limited to, age, country of birth, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, language, national origin, race, refugee status, religion, culture, sexual orientation, health status, community affiliation and socioeconomic status. This list is not intended to be exhaustive.

Cultural competence, in this context, refers to skills for working with diverse individuals and communities in ways that are appropriate and responsive to relevant cultural factors. Requisite skills include self-awareness, open-minded inquiry and assessment and the ability to recognize and adapt to cultural differences. Reflecting on the public health context, recognizing that cultural differences affect all aspects of health and health systems, cultural competence refers to the skills for recognizing and adapting to cultural differences. Each program defines these terms in its own context.

Programs can accomplish these aims through a variety of practices including the following:

- incorporation of diversity and cultural competency considerations in the curriculum;
- recruitment/retention of faculty, staff and students; and
- reflection in the types of research and/or community engagement conducted.

(For evidence, see DR 7-1 and DR 7-2)

Finding:

Partially Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The university's mission statement notes a commitment “to recruit highly qualified and motivated students, faculty, and staff from the region, state, nation, and world to create a diverse and dynamic student-centered learning.” The program includes diversity issues in multiple classes and use examples that incorporate diversity of gender, gender identity and sexual orientation.

Diversity and cultural competence are addressed in 15 required and elective courses. A few of the concepts noted include the following: people with intellectual or acquired disabilities, low income populations, women, elderly, sexual identity, gender identity, sexual orientation, access to health care, intended and unintended consequences of policies, community values and beliefs, ethical issues related to research, advocacy for social policies and social determinates of health. In addition, students have been able to work directly with diverse populations through
PUBH 201, and in the Global Health Perspectives course, students have been offered opportunities to study in Barbados, Sierra Leone, and South Africa.

The program has a greater percentage of Hispanic (8.5%), American Indian/Alaskan Natives (0.8%), Asian (1.2%), Black/African American (35.8%), two or more races (5.4%) and non-resident alien (0.8%) students compared to the college and university as of fall 2016. For the faculty complement, two (11.8%) faculty members are Black/African American, 14 (82.4%) are white and one (5.9%) is unknown. There are no faculty members who identify as the other underrepresented groups (Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Natives, Asian, two or more races and non-resident alien).

Observations on Site

When asked about plans or processes to guide diversity efforts, program administrators admitted that the program does not have a consistent and intentional process for recruiting and maintaining diversity. Faculty members noted that diverse students naturally declare public health as their major, making it easy to maintain a diverse student population. In terms of recruitment of diverse faculty, the program seems to have taken a passive approach by waiting to see the diversity of the application pool and then hiring diverse faculty based on their qualifications, versus actively seeking diverse applicants.

The provost mentioned the university's desire and focus for increased diversity among faculty. The provost noted that it is up to the program faculty to make sure the pool is diverse. He also noted that the market for faculty is extremely competitive and that programs can ask for additional funds to recruit a highly qualified candidate.

Students stated that they feel that the university provides safety for all students regardless of race, religion or sexual orientation, and they believe the university cares about every individual. They were very excited about the university's new Office of Diversity and Inclusion.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.
Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
The concern relates to the lack of intentionality and a systematic process for recruiting diverse faculty and students. Program administration noted that although 47% of students enrolled in the major and 12% of faculty are from underrepresented groups, the program does not have a process for recruiting diverse faculty and students. Program leaders noted that the program will adhere to the university’s policies when conducting searches for a new faculty member, if they are granted a new faculty line, but they did not describe any strategies for recruiting underrepresented groups.

Institution Comments:
There is concern that the program does not have a process for recruiting diverse faculty and students. We don’t believe that we have an issue with recruiting diverse students. As noted, 47% of the students enrolled in the program are from underrepresented groups, whereas in the College of Science it is 37% and at the University it is 32% for racial minorities. We will continue to work with the community college to facilitate the transition between of students entering the program from a two-year program. We will work with the Dalton and Linda Floyd Mentoring program to so that students from underrepresented groups in the surrounding community so that students have a better understanding of public health as a degree program in college and a career.

It is true, however, that our faculty is not reflective of our student body at 12% but we are comparative to the College and University. In order to be more intentional at recruiting faculty for the program so that we are more reflective of our student body, at the program level, there will be more intentionality with recruiting diverse faculty. We will work closely with the Office of Human Resources to identify strategies for increasing the diversity pool so that the faculty are prepared when the time comes for new hires. Specifically, the Public Health program will ensure that position announcements are sent to professional associations that have a focus on diversity, circulated to placement services at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) or going through the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities.

In addition, the University level, Coastal Carolina University is actively searching for a Diversity and Inclusion Officer, with whom we shall collaborate and who will be instrumental in ensuring that work is continued with diversity and inclusion at the institution. Also, in the Faculty Senate
there is a committee that focuses on ensuring that the campus is diverse and inclusive. At the program level, there will be more intentionality with recruiting diverse faculty.

Council Comments:
8.0 DISTANCE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

**Criterion 8.1:** A degree program offered via distance education is a curriculum or course of study designated to be primarily accessed remotely via various technologies, including internet-based course management systems, audio or web-based conferencing, video, chat, or other modes of delivery. All methods used by the SBP support regular and substantive interaction between and among students and the instructor either synchronously and/or asynchronously and are:

a) consistent with the mission of the program and within the program’s established areas of expertise;

b) guided by clearly articulated student learning outcomes that are rigorously evaluated;

c) subject to the same quality control processes that other degree programs in the university are; and

d) provide planned and evaluated learning experiences that take into consideration and are responsive to the characteristics and needs of online learners.

*(For evidence, see DR 8-1 and DR 8-2)*

**Finding:**

Not Applicable

**Team Comments:**

**Observations from the Self-Study**

Click here to enter text.

**Observations on Site**

Click here to enter text.

**Commentary:**

*(if applicable)*

Click here to enter text.

**Compliance Concern:**

*(if Partially Met or Not Met)*

Click here to enter text.

**Institution Comments:**
Criterion 8.2: The university provides needed support for the program, including administrative, communication, IT and student services.

(For evidence, see DR 8-2)

Finding:
Not Applicable

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study
Click here to enter text.

Observations on Site
Click here to enter text.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:
Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
Criterion 8.3: There is an ongoing effort to evaluate the academic effectiveness of the format, to assess learning methods and to systematically use this information to stimulate program improvements. Evaluation of student outcomes and of the learning model are especially important in institutions that offer distance learning but do not offer a comparable in-residence program.

(For evidence, see DR 8-2)

Finding:
Not Applicable

Team Comments:
Observations from the Self-Study
Click here to enter text.

Observations on Site
Click here to enter text.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:
Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:
Click here to enter text.
Criterion 8.4: The program has processes in place through which it establishes that the student who registers in a distance education course or degree is the same student who participates in and completes the course or degree and receives the academic credit. Student identity may be verified by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as a secure login and pass code; proctored examinations; and new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identity. The university notifies students in writing that it uses processes that protect student privacy and alerts students to any projected additional student charges associated with the verification of student identity at the time of registration or enrollment.

(For evidence, see DR 8-3)

Finding:
Not applicable

Team Comments:
Observations from the Self-Study
Click here to enter text.

Observations on Site
Click here to enter text.

Commentary:
(if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:
(if Partially Met or Not Met)
Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:
Click here to enter text.
AGENDA

Coastal Carolina University
Council on Education for Public Health Site Visit
November 12 - 14, 2017

Monday, November 13, 2017

8:30 am  Site Visit Team Request for Additional Documents
Fredanna McGough, PhD, Associate Professor/Department Chair
Michael Dunn, PhD, Associate Professor, CEPH Accreditation Coordinator
Sherer Royce, PhD, Associate Professor/Associate Department Chair
Christine Mee, Executive Director of Planning & Research
Pam English, Administrative Specialist-Health Sciences

8:45 am  Team Resource File Review

9:15 am  Break

9:30 am  Meet with Program Leader and Faculty/Staff with significant roles relating to the following criteria:
- Criterion 1: Leadership, Management and Governance (1.1-1.6)
- Criterion 2: Resources (2.1-2.6)
- Criterion 3: Faculty Qualifications (3.1-3.5)
- Criterion 7: Diversity (7.1)
Fredanna McGough, PhD, Associate Professor/Department Chair
Michael Roberts, PhD, Dean of Science/VP for Research and Emerging Initiatives
Stephanie Cassavaugh - Director & IRB Administrator
Ariana Baker - Distance Learning Librarian/Assistant Librarian,
Jenifer Riddei - Student Technology Support and Computing Labs Manager
Jennifer Shinaberger - Director, Center for Teaching Excellence to Advance Learning
Tracy Gaskin - Faculty Development Program Coordinator
Jane Johanson - VP of Finance
Kimberly Sherfesee - Associate VP for Human Resources
Pat Singleton-Young - Director of Multicultural Student Services

10:45 am  Break

11:00 am  Meet with Program Leader and Faculty Related to Curriculum and Degree Programs
Fredanna McGough, PhD, Associate Professor/Department Chair
Stephen Firsing, PhD, Assistant Professor
Sherer Royce, PhD, Associate Professor/Associate Department Chair
Sharon Thompson, EdD, Professor/TEAL Nutrition & Swain Scholar Coordinator
John Yannessa, PhD, Associate Professor
Amy Edmunds, MA, Senior Lecturer/Campus & Community Research Collaborative
Mary Kate Powell, MPH, Lecturer/PUBH Internship Coordinator
Kristi Forbus, MA, Lecturer/Health Administration Coordinator

12:15 pm  Break

12:30 pm  Lunch with Students (HTC Hospitality Suite 207)
Kristan Blaney
Kerry Dittmeier
1:30 pm  Break

1:45 pm  Meet with Faculty and Staff with Significant Responsibilities related to the following criteria:
- Criterion 1: Leadership, Management and Governance (1.4, 1.5)
- Criterion 2: Resources (2.4-2.6)
- Criterion 3: Faculty Qualification (3.4)
- Criterion 6: Advising (6.1)
- Criterion 7: Diversity (7.1)

Michael Dunn, PhD, Associate Professor, CEPH Accreditation Coordinator
Fredanna McGough, PhD, Associate Professor/Department Chair
Sherer Royce, PhD, Associate Professor/Associate Department Chair
Sharon Thompson, EdD, Professor/TEAL Nutrition & Swain Scholar Coordinator
John Yannessa, PhD, Associate Professor
Stephen Firsing, PhD, Assistant Professor
Mary Kate Powell, MPH, Lecturer/PUBH Internship Coordinator
Pam English, AAS, Administrative Specialist – Health Sciences

2:45 pm  Break

3:00 pm  Resource File Review and Executive Session
3:45 pm  Break

4:00 pm  Meet with Alumni, Community Representatives and Preceptors
Katie Dwulet, B.S. (PUBH ’16) Habitat for Humanity
Jonathan Bennett, B.S. (HPRO ’12) A Father’s Place
Ashlee Case, MS (HPRO ’09) Coastal Carolina University/Teaching Associate, Dept. of Kinesiology
Anita Smalls (PUBH ‘16) Family Outreach of Horry County
William Johnson, B.S. (HPRO ’14) Playcard Environmental Center/Horry County Schools
Jessie Marlowe, B.S. (HPRO ’11) Shoreline Behavioral Health Services
Colleen Hileman American Red Cross
Dione Buonto, MPH Boys & Girls Club of the Grand Strand
Chris Donevant- Haines, M.A Coastal Carolina University/Wellness Outreach, Counseling Services
Sherry Coutain, R.N. Family Outreach of Horry County
Blakely Roof, B.S. Habitat for Humanity
Marie Valentine, B.Ed Lakewood Elementary/Horry County Schools
Jamie Wheeler Delgado, MPH Little River Medical Center
Ben Abercrombie, B.S. Playcard Environmental Center/Horry County Schools
JoAnn Tufo Brightwater Senior Living

5:00 pm  Adjourn

Tuesday, November 14, 2015

8:30 am  Meet with Institutional Academic Leadership/University Officials
Ralph Byington, PhD, Provost and Executive Vice President
Michael Roberts, PhD, Dean of Science/VP for Research and Emerging Initiatives

9:15 am  Break

9:30 am  Executive Session and Report Preparation

11:30 am  Working Lunch, Executive Session and Report Preparation

12:30 pm  Exit Briefing
David DeCenzo, PhD, President Coastal Carolina University
Ralph Byington, PhD, Provost and Executive Vice President
Michael Roberts, PhD, Dean of Science/VP for Research and Emerging Initiatives
Jim Solazzo, PhD, Associate Provost for Assessment and Accreditation
Christine Mee, ME, Executive Director of Planning & Research
Vivian Ford, MS, Associate Director, Institutional Effectiveness
Fredanna McGough, PhD, Associate Professor/Department Chair
Sharon Thompson, EdD, Professor/TEAL Nutrition & Swain Scholar Coordinator
Michael Dunn, PhD, Associate Professor, CEPH Accreditation Coordinator
Sherer Royce, PhD, Associate Professor/Acting Department Chair
John Yannessa, PhD, Associate Professor
Stephen Firsing, PhD, Assistant Professor
Amy Edmunds, MA, Senior Lecturer/Campus & Community Research Collaborative
Mary Kate Powell, MPH, Lecturer/PUBH Internship Coordinator
Kristi Forbus, MA, Lecturer/Health Administration Coordinator
Wanda Dooley, DPN, Associate Professor of Nursing/Director of Nursing
Susan Montenery, DPN, Assistant Professor of Nursing

1:15 pm  Team Departs