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Program Information

- Began in Autumn 2008
  - Admit 20-25 students annually
  - Graduating 6\textsuperscript{th} in June of 2015

- Key Elements
  - Cohort-Based Learning Program
  - Traditional, Evening-Based Courses
  - Integrated 9-month Practicum

- Community Health Practice focus

- Based in Chicago, Illinois, USA
DePaul MPH Program

The mission is to prepare public health leaders to work collaboratively with diverse communities to prevent disease and ill-health, prioritize and investigate health concerns, achieve lasting social change, and foster health equity to promote the health and well-being of all people.
Preface: First CEPH Process Framing
Accreditation Timeline

- September 2008: Admitted First Cohort
- April 2010: Applied for accreditation
- June 2010: Graduated first MPH cohort class
- June 2010: Accepted into accreditation (2006 criteria)
- January 2013: Hosted site visit
- March 2013: Received site visit report
- June 2013: Received accreditation decision
- April 2014: Submitted interim report
- June 2014: Received accreditation decision
ACCREDITATION

CRITERIA

PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS

AMENDED JUNE 2011
Site Visit Response

2.7 Assessment Procedures

Criteria: There shall be procedures for assessing and documenting the extent to which each student has demonstrated competence in the required areas of performance.

• This criterion is met
• This criterion is met with commentary
• This criterion is partially met
• This criterion is not met
The program’s meticulous tracking of evidence and indicators for all of the competencies supports a robust, largely successful student assessment process.

- Competencies are linked to coursework, practice & capstone experience
- Student performance (GPA, low probation, & advising)
- Student outcomes (pre-post self-assessment, graduation & job placement rates, alumni survey)

The concern relates to the fact that at the time of the site visit, the program had not yet implemented its employer survey. The program presented a survey instrument and the timeline for administering the survey.
Action = Employer Survey = Interim Report

- January – March 2014 Timeline

- Developed a brief, 7-item, survey \((\text{Likert scale} \& \text{open-ended})\)
  1. Assess graduates’ abilities to perform in a professional public health practice setting
  2. Assess graduates’ overall strengths and weaknesses
  3. Assess overall satisfaction with the graduates’ performance
  4. Assess general experiences with graduates

- Sample
  - Alumni \(\rightarrow\) Employer Information \(\rightarrow\) Employer Database

- Timeline
  - Duration to complete: 2 weeks
  - Follow-up: Via phone, email & alumni

- 61% response rate

- Wrote and submitted response report: \textit{succint and direct}
And then:  We sent it off!

29 April 2014

Mollie Mulvanity, MPH
Deputy Director
Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH)
1010 Wayne Avenue, Suite 220
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Ms. Mulvanity,

Enclosed is the required interim report from the DePaul University MPH Program. The report provides evidence that the program has reviewed and assessed data collected from employers of MPH graduates who addressed the attainment of the program's defined competencies (Criterion 2.7). Per request, the report contains the data and analysis.

Please contact me directly if you require any additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Outcome: Thank you for submitting an interim report to the Council on Education for Public Health. The CEPH Board of Councilors reviewed the report at its June 12-14, 2014 meeting and determined that the program has demonstrated compliance with Criterion 2.7 (Assessment).
And then: We Did Our Happy Dance!
Lessons Learned
recognize mistakes
observe what works
document them
share them
Lessons Learned: Process

• The ongoing ‘self-study’
  ▫ A part of everyday program life: CEPH Cultural Shift
  ▫ Roadmap/Timeline: Descriptive & Evaluative
  ▫ Celebrating successes: Work Hard, Play Hard
  ▫ Time & Space: Every day work life vs. retreats

• Point people in your MPH program
  ▫ Time & % effort: Who’s doing the work? At what level?
  ▫ Skill set: Align & delegate
  ▫ Personality & Synergy: Test, Try, Re-boot, If it Ain’t Broke...

• Faculty & Stakeholder involvement: steady & evolving
  ▫ Core group: More than your CEPH formulas
  ▫ Responsive, emerging trends: How and when?
Lessons Learned: Content

• AAPHP: Friends in various MPH places
  ▫ Content Expertise: SS sections, Focal Areas
  ▫ Been in the trenches: Interim Report experience
  ▫ “Critical” Friends: Experienced folks without filters!

• Other self-studies
  ▫ Programs of similar focus and size: CEPH guidance
  ▫ Recommended self-studies: CEPH guidance

• CEPH point person
  ▫ In-person: On-site, campus
  ▫ Email or Phone: Just ask!
thank you
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