

**Council on Education for Public Health
Adopted on October 7, 2016**

REVIEW FOR ACCREDITATION
OF THE
STANDALONE BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM
AT
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC HEALTH

SITE VISIT DATES:
March 3-4, 2016

SITE VISIT TEAM:
Kelly Bishop, MA, MCHES, FASHA, Chair
Karin Opacich, PhD, MHPE, OTRL, FAOTA

SITE VISIT COORDINATOR:
Nicole E. Williams, MPH

CRITERIA:
Accreditation Criteria for Standalone
Baccalaureate Programs, amended June 2014

Table of Contents

1.0 LEADERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE.....	1
Criterion 1.1.....	1
Criterion 1.2.....	3
Criterion 1.3.....	5
Criterion 1.4.....	7
Criterion 1.5.....	9
Criterion 1.6.....	11
2.0 RESOURCES.....	13
Criterion 2.1.....	13
Criterion 2.2.....	15
Criterion 2.3.....	17
Criterion 2.4.....	19
Criterion 2.5.....	21
Criterion 2.6.....	23
3.0 FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS.....	25
Criterion 3.1.....	25
Criterion 3.2.....	27
Criterion 3.3.....	29
Criterion 3.4.....	31
Criterion 3.5.....	33
4.0 CURRICULUM.....	34
Criterion 4.1.....	34
Criterion 4.2.....	36
Criterion 4.3.....	39
Criterion 4.4.....	41
Criterion 4.5.....	44
5.0 PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.....	46
Criterion 5.1.....	46
Criterion 5.2.....	47
Criterion 5.3.....	49
Criterion 5.4.....	50
Criterion 5.5.....	54
Criterion 5.6.....	57
Criterion 5.7.....	59
Criterion 5.8.....	61
Criterion 5.9.....	63
Criterion 5.10.....	65
Criterion 5.11.....	67
6.0 ADVISING.....	69
Criterion 6.1.....	69
7.0 DIVERSITY.....	71
Criterion 7.1.....	71
8.0 DISTANCE EDUCATION PROGRAMS.....	74
Criterion 8.1.....	74
Criterion 8.2.....	76
Criterion 8.3.....	77
Criterion 8.4.....	78
AGENDA.....	80

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.

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

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The program maintains an organizational chart that depicts the way in which the BS in Health Sciences (BSHS), Department of Public Health Studies (DPHS) and College of Health, Education And Human Development (HEHD) are related to one another.

The program, a BS in Health Science, with three concentrations included in the unit of accreditation, is housed within the Department of Public Health Sciences in the College of Health, Education and Human Development. There are five colleges and schools at Clemson University, including HEHD.

The SBP is managed on a daily basis by the undergraduate coordinator, under the supervision of the designated leader and DPHS chair. The chair reports to the acting dean of HEHD, who reports to the provost and vice president of academic affairs. The provost reports to the president of Clemson University.

Within DPHS, there are three programs: the BSHS, an MS in Applied Health Research and Evaluation and a PhD in Applied Health Research and Evaluation. The BSHS has four concentrations, three of which are included in the unit of accreditation.

Observations on Site

The organizational arrangement described and depicted in the self-study document was confirmed by the team on site.

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 1.2: 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

(For evidence, see DR 1-3)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

Recurring resources (ie, state and tuition funds) are allocated by the provost to the dean, who allocates them to the department. The department also earns non-recurring resources, such as income generated from certificate programs, summer school and indirect costs from externally funded research. The allocation of resources is at the discretion of the chair for hiring temporary and part-time faculty, funding student and faculty travel and purchasing classroom equipment.

Personnel policies are implemented by the department chair according to the rules and procedures specified by the University's Faculty Manual and the State of South Carolina's personnel policies for staff and graduate student employees. The chair negotiates final offers to regular faculty hires, after candidates are selected through a departmental search committee, approved by the dean and provost and cleared by the university's Access and Equity and Office of Human Resource. If needed, the chair has personnel and budgetary authority to hire auxiliary faculty to teach classes; the chair involves faculty members in these decisions.

The chair and undergraduate coordinator determine teaching assignments for courses in the program. Faculty interests, experience, expertise and other duties are factored into the assignment load. The central campus makes classroom assignments.

Consistent with other departments in the university, the department implements academic policies and procedures that are set by the Division of Academic Affairs, the registrar or other higher levels of university administration. The department has autonomy to set some policies, such as increasing the minimum GPA for continued registration. The chair negotiates target numbers for freshman admissions to the SBP with the admissions office.

Program faculty members have the authority to develop and review curriculum through the Curriculum Committee. The committee reviews course and teaching evaluations and periodically conducts curriculum reviews. The committee recommends course and curricular changes, which must be approved by department faculty, and the college's and university's undergraduate committees. The State Commission on Higher Education must approve major curricular changes.

Observations on Site

The chair and undergraduate coordinator were able to describe the program's administrative autonomy related to allocation of program resources, implementation of policies and procedures, development and implementation of curricula and admission to the major. The team determined that program has sufficient autonomy to make critical decisions in these areas.

While the program does not have the autonomy to set a GPA for first-time enrollment in the major, the program can set a minimum GPA requirement that students must maintain in order to remain in the program. The chair's Advisory Committee makes admissions decisions for Clemson students applying to change their major to BSHS.

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: The program has a single individual who serves as the designated leader. The designated leader is a **full-time faculty member** at the institution and has immediate responsibility for developing and monitoring the program's curriculum.

Finding:

Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The chair of the DPHS is the designated leader of the program. He is a full-time, tenured faculty member at Clemson University. The chair delegates some administrative authority for the program to the undergraduate coordinator, also a full-time faculty member in the department. While curricular matters are under the purview of the chair, the Curriculum Committee makes recommendations to the faculty and any changes require approval by a majority vote of the faculty. Once approved by the faculty, the curricular changes must be approved by the college and university curriculum committees.

Observations on Site

The program's designated leader (the chair) was recruited to lead a departmental transformation, which is currently in the second year of a five year plan. Since the chair's arrival, he has delegated more authority to the undergraduate coordinator. The undergraduate coordinator has some administrative authority over the program and serves as mentor for all new faculty.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

The commentary relates to the fact that the designated leader delegates much of authority for the day-to-day management of the program to the undergraduate coordinator. The program may benefit from greater clarification and better delineation and delegation of roles and responsibilities between the chair and undergraduate coordinator.

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 1.4: Program administrators and 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.

(For evidence, see DR 1-3 and DR 2-4)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The department is governed by bylaws that are developed by the faculty. There is a Bylaws Committee in the department that reviews the bylaws and may make recommendations for changes. All regular faculty members in the department must vote to approve any changes to the bylaws.

The Curriculum Committee, as defined in the bylaws, includes three elected members who have at least 50% teaching responsibility for courses offered for academic credit. Members serve a three-year term. The chair of the Curriculum Committee is one of the department's representatives to the college and university curriculum committees. One student, a junior or senior in good academic standing, also serves on the curriculum committee. The Curriculum Committee makes recommendations on all academic requirements and courses. The committee may act on behalf of all faculty when a minor change, (eg, renumbering or retitling a course or rewording a course description), has been unanimously approved by the committee.

The department chair has an Advisory Committee that makes recommendations on the use of discretionary funds for equipment purchases and renovations and on distributing funds for special student learning projects from an endowed fund. Faculty members serve on the Advisory Committee.

Observations on Site

The chair's Advisory Committee includes three faculty members who are elected by the faculty for a two-year term. The terms are staggered. Primarily, the Advisory Committee helps the chair make the decision on which students requesting to enter the department through a change of major are allowed to join 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.

Criterion 1.5: 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).

(For evidence, see DR 1-4)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

All tenured, tenure-track and visiting faculty are expected to attend and participate in monthly departmental meetings and may be appointed to the department's committees. Part-time faculty members are encouraged to attend faculty meetings once per month. Where voting is not restricted by policy (promotion and tenure), all full-time faculty members are allowed to vote. The department also hosts social events annually to promote collegiality and interaction between full- and part-time faculty. The university's Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation invites all Clemson faculty, including part-time and adjunct, to gather to discuss issues related to teaching, career development, faculty review preparation and scholarship.

Observations on Site

Several times during the site visit, faculty members mentioned the use and value of the university's Office of Teaching Effectiveness. Faculty members seek assistance from the office to improve classroom instructional skills, address diversity issues in the classroom and gain knowledge and skills on the use of technology in the classroom. Everyone spoke highly of the resources available through the office to benefit individual faculty and the program as a whole. The program uses very few part-time faculty. During the spring 2015 semester, part-time faculty taught only three of 26 sections of required courses. However, those part-time faculty teaching in the office are also eligible and encouraged to take use of all Office of Teaching Effectiveness resources.

Department leaders and faculty talked with great pride about the collegial relationships between and among faculty and staff. The undergraduate coordinator mentors all new faculty, which also contributes to this environment.

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 1.6: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 3-5, DR 5-16 and DR 5-17)

Finding:

Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The university's undergraduate catalog, Undergraduate Announcements, provides information on program courses, the academic calendar, program admission, grading and graduation requirements and undergraduate academic integrity. The program's website includes direct links to Undergraduate Announcements.

The undergraduate catalog is revised annually, and any changes approved by the department, college and university curriculum committees are automatically included in each revision. Each year, prior to the publication of the revised Undergraduate Announcements, the department chair and undergraduate coordinator review the text for accuracy and completeness and submits edits if necessary and appropriate.

The description for each SBP concentration can be found on pages 120-122 of the catalog, and all HLTH course descriptions are found on pages 199-200.

Observations on Site

The team reviewed the program's website and confirmed all materials are accurate and readily available.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

The commentary relates to several typographical and connectivity errors found while navigating the website. For example, on the Clemson Public Health Sciences, Academic Degrees and Certificates page, under "More Information," on the right side of the web page, the link to "major requirements" for each concentration does not direct users to the concentration-specific details. When following each link, the viewer will find only the Cardio Vascular Imaging Leadership Orientation requirements.

The program noted that the website has been undergoing updates, and faculty and staff will continue to review the website for all errors.

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.

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.

(For evidence, see DR 2-1, DR 2-2, DR 2-4 and DR 2-5)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The Department of Public Health Sciences consists of 30 faculty members, 17 of whom are full-time and 13 of whom are part-time. 15.25 of the department's 19.75 faculty FTE is devoted to teaching and supervising students in the program. The remaining FTE is devoted to graduate teaching, one undergraduate certificate and funded research.

Tenured or tenure track full-time faculty members who teach four classes per year, advise students and conduct research are considered 1.0 FTE. Full-time lecturers who teach eight classes per year are considered 1.0 FTE. These full-time lecturers can be released from two courses in order to fulfill administrative responsibilities related to the program. Part-time faculty members are calculated at 0.125 FTE per three credit hours.

Observations on Site

Students told site visitors that faculty are always available to students, both as instructors and as formal and informal advisors. Students explained that small classes ensure that they are able to form strong relationships with all of their instructors. Alumni reported that these relationships continue as faculty remain professional advisors and mentors after graduation. As an example of faculty responsiveness, one student said that a faculty member was able to provide a letter of recommendation on only one day's notice.

Faculty reported that their advising workloads stay consistently within 12-15 students. This allows faculty to adequately prepare for and manage their overall responsibilities each year.

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 2.2: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 2-3, DR 2-5 and DR 3-1)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The program relies primarily on full-time faculty. Part-time faculty provide 2.75 of the program's total 15.25 FTE.

During academic year 2014-2015, full-time faculty served as primary instructors for 45 courses or sections. In comparison, part-time faculty served as the primary instructor for six courses or sections. Full-time faculty were also responsible for independent study courses and honors courses.

In fall 2015, the department hired several new part-time faculty to temporarily replace faculty with sabbatical leave or temporary research buyout. These hires are intended to be temporary, rather than a permanent change in staffing.

Observations on Site

Site visitors confirmed that faculty are primarily full-time. All faculty present at the site visit were full-time institution employees.

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 2.3: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 2-6 and DR 2-7)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

Students are admitted to the program upon admission to the university each fall. The program uses the university programs Fact Book and Data Center to track the number of students enrolled in the major each fall. In addition, the program accepts 40-60 change of majors after the fall semester is complete. These change of major requests are primarily from freshmen. The fall data and change of major data is used to project spring enrollments.

As of spring 2016, there were an estimated 408 students enrolled in the program. In fall 2015, the official student headcount was 371.

Observations on Site

On site, program leaders described the process of tracking enrollment. Most change of major transfers apply in the fall of their freshman year and are accepted in the spring. This is a result of a university policy that does not allow students to change majors without a recorded GPA. These change of major students result in higher enrollment during the spring semester. Enrollment numbers are lower again in the fall after May graduations.

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 2.4: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 2-6, DR 2-7 and DR 2-8)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

<p>The program's SFR and average class size respectively were 25.9 and 22.2 in fall 2014, 28.3 and 25.9 in spring 2015, 26.1 and 22.8 in fall 2016 and are 28.7 and 21.4 in spring 2016. In comparison, in spring 2016 the comparable program identified had a SFR of 25:1 and an average class size of 26.</p>

The university strives to keep the student-faculty ratios of all undergraduate departments within 26:1 to 28:1. The program has worked to improve its SFRs over the past decade and meets the university goals during the fall semesters, based on official numbers.

The program provided two pieces of data related to the average advising load. As freshmen and sophomores, students are advised by a full-time staff person. In fall 2014, the staff advising load was 150:1, in spring 2015, 205:1, in fall 2015, 150:1 and in spring 2016, 195:1. The program faculty also advise students. The faculty advising load has remained 15:1 for the past four semesters.

The program selected the BS in Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management (PRTM) as its comparable program. Both programs are housed in departments within the College of HEHD. The BS in PRTM is also a professional degree with multiple concentrations. Like public health, the BS in PRTM prepares students for a variety of careers as well as graduate and professional training. While the PRTM department is slightly larger, the DPHS expects to grow to similar size within five years. The PRTM department has a large graduate program with faculty effort to that program estimated at 25%, and so the faculty FTE is decreased by that amount for the purpose of calculating the SFR.

Observations on Site

<p>Class sizes range from two to 65 students. Students said that the small class sizes of the program are an important, positive aspect of the program. One student said that the one-on-one relationships between faculty and students is possible because of the small class size.</p>
--

Faculty reported that advising loads stay consistently within the range of 12-15 students. Students reported no difficulties in utilizing their assigned advisor.

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 2.5: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 2-1, DR 2-9, DR 2-10 and DR 2-11)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The department's revenues have nearly doubled from \$1,774,007 in fiscal year 2012 to a projected \$3,021,341 for fiscal year 2016. Prior to fiscal year 2015, the department was exclusively undergraduate and 100% of funds went to the program. Since FY15, graduate education is included in the department, but the budget is not segmented by program. The majority of funds are budgeted for salaries of full-time faculty. At a minimum, 77% of the department's instructional budget, approximately \$1.46 million, is allocated to the BSHS for the current fiscal year.

The department is housed in a single building and includes offices for all full-time program faculty and staff members, the HEHD advising office and center, classrooms ranging from 30 to 60 seats, three laboratories and other college entities. The classrooms are primarily "smart" classrooms.

Observations on the Site Visit

The budget reflects multiple revenue streams. Resources are predicated on consistent enrollment of 400 students (across all four years of study). Program leadership said that resources have never been a concern.

The program has designated space for faculty offices and instruction that support teaching and learning. Both the department and the campus have additional spaces for students to meet, study and convene for co-curricular activities. Site visitors observed students utilizing public meeting space within the department's building.

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.

(For evidence, see DR 2-1, DR 2-12 and DR 2-13)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The university, college and DPHS provide the students with a variety of support services. During the first two years of study, students receive advisement from a designated HEHD advisor, and students are assigned to a faculty advisor for the junior and senior years. These faculty serve as an important resource for public health-related career counseling. Throughout the program of study, students have access to computing and technology services through Clemson Computing and Information Technology (CCIT) and the Learning Resource Center, as well as a full array of library services. Additionally, students are encouraged to utilize the Clemson Writing Center in association with at least two courses (HLTH 2030 and HLTH 2400). The campus supports students with disabilities through the professional staff in Student Disability Services.

Observations on Site

Students affirmed consistent advisement that meets their needs from the HEHD program advisor in the first two years and from their assigned faculty advisor in the last two years. They noted ready access to faculty for academic planning and career direction.

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.

(For evidence, see DR 3-1, DR 3-2, DR 3-3 and DR 3-6)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

All 14 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty in DPHS have a PhD degree and some health system experience. Ten of the 14 have a masters or doctoral degree in public health, and the remaining four hold degrees in closely related fields (ie, health services research, public administration, health administration, community psychology) and years of experience in public and community health.

The program employs three senior lecturers, all of whom have appropriate educational qualifications and professional experience; one has a PhD, one has an MPH and one has an MS in Health and Exercise Science. One faculty member has an MEd in Health Education and 18 years of teaching experience prior to joining the department.

Part-time faculty teaching specific classes have related degrees and/or experience related to their course topics.

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 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.

(For evidence, see DR 3-1)

Finding:

Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The SBP's designated leader has a PhD from SUNY Cortland in Public Administration and Policy. He has had significant experience within the military health system. He served as a military health care administrator for several military health systems, senior health policy analyst on the clinical operations staff of the US Navy Surgeon General, interim chair of the Biomedical Informatics department and director of the Department of Defense Patient Safety and Quality Academics Collaborative at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. His research interests include improving health care delivery and patient health through physician decision-making, clinical documentation, and enhanced communication.

Daily management of the SBP, including course teaching assignments and curricular matters for the undergraduate program, is delegated to the undergraduate coordinator. She earned her MPH from UC Berkeley and her PhD in Environmental Risk Assessment from Clemson. She is a senior lecturer in the department.

Observations on Site

Click here to enter text.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

The commentary relates to the fact that the designated leader of the SBP does not have a public health degree. His professional experience is primarily in health care administration. However, the designated leader has delegated authority to the undergraduate coordinator who does have an MPH with a concentration in environmental epidemiology and biostatistics, as well as a PhD in a public health discipline. In addition, nine full- and part-time department faculty have either a masters or doctoral level degree in a public health discipline.

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.

(For evidence, see DR 3-4)

Finding:

Partially Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

While the program has a sizable regular faculty with robust qualifications, most adjuncts who contribute to the program are reflective of fields related to or outside public health. A number of practitioners are listed as contributing to the academic program. While all are associated with human and/or health service endeavors, it is unclear which of these reflect public health practice. There appear to be very few public health practitioners on the roster who can share their experiences in the field with students.

Observations on Site

In meeting with community representatives, preceptors, alumni, and employers, involvement in HLTH 4200 Internship was most common. A few of the practitioners who met with site visitors reported being invited to present as a guest lecturer. Many of the community representatives and preceptors were clinicians who provided supervision specific to their disciplines as students both fulfilled the required assignments of HLTH 4200 and completed observations necessary for application to professional programs (eg, MD, DDT, PT, OT).

Commentary:

(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:

(if Partially Met or Not Met)

There are limited opportunities for interaction with individuals actively engaged in public health practice. While some students encounter public health practitioners through research projects or internships, others seem to interact primarily with practitioners in the clinical disciplines to which they aspire. The program does not have a mechanism to ensure students are exposed to public health practitioners through a variety of instructional methods.

Institution Comments:

The site visit helped the program to become more aware of this issue. The Chair, Undergraduate Coordinator, and program faculty have discussed a number of mechanisms to increase contact with active public health practitioners during coming years. At least one public health practitioner from CDC or from South Carolina DHEC (each a roughly four hour round trip from Clemson) will be invited as a featured speaker each semester, and multiple classes/instructors will provide extra credit for students who attend and write a brief reflection paper on the talks given by these public health practitioners. Local public health practitioners located within twenty miles of campus include individuals who will be invited to participate in classes related to their work, e.g. family planning professionals from public health units for classes that include units of reproductive health (Men's Health, Women's Health, Maternal and Child Health), and environmental public health practitioners (Public and Environmental Health). The department also notes that four of its full-time faculty members previously held full-time positions as public health practitioners in state or local health departments before beginning their academic careers (Griffin, Falta, Williams, Kemper) and one worked full time in international public health (Truong) so this brings additional experience of public health practice to the classroom.

Council Comments:

The Council appreciates the program's response and looks forward to reviewing an interim report that documents implementation of the planned strategies.

Criterion 3.4: All faculty members are informed and current in their discipline or area of public health teaching.

(For evidence, see DR 3-5)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

Program faculty stay current and informed in their area of public health through participating in research, serving as reviewers and editorial board members for journals in their field, attending and presenting at annual meetings (eg, APHA), attending specialized trainings and reading current journals.

DPHS makes funds available to faculty for meeting participation. In the past three years, multiple faculty have participated in annual meetings of organizations including APHA, Academy Health, American Academy of Health Behavior, American Diabetes Association and the South Carolina Public Health Association.

Faculty are expected to publish in peer reviewed journals in order to be eligible for promotion. In the past two years, faculty have published in 21 publications including the Journal of Behavioral and Health Services Research, the Journal of health Administration Education, the American Journal of Public Health and Health Promotion Practice among others.

Observations on Site

The department chair reported that faculty members are awarded discretionary funds annually to apply to their own professional development. Professional development needs and interests are reviewed annually with the chair with input from the Committee on Promotion Tenure and Retention.

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 3.5: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 3-7)

Finding:

Not Applicable

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The program does not use course instructors currently enrolled as graduate students.

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 (eg, 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.

(For evidence, see DR 4-1, DR 4-2, DR 4-3, DR 4-8 and DR 4-9)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The university requires students to complete 31 credit hours in general education coursework. The general education requirements, together with major-specific coursework, ensure that students are introduced to each of the required domains.

The program's major coursework includes HLTH 2980, Human Health and Disease, which connects the life sciences to concepts of health and disease. Additionally, all concentrations except health services administration require two semesters of biology with a lab, two semesters of chemistry and two semesters of anatomy and physiology.

All Clemson students complete six credit hours of social and behavioral sciences as well as three hours of "Cross-Cultural Awareness" and three credit hours of "Science and Technology in Society." The program all requires all majors to complete HLTH 2400, Determinants of Health Behavior, which includes coursework in health behavior theories and analyzes health behaviors based on psychological, social, cultural and environmental factors.

The general education requirements mandate that all students demonstrate mathematical literacy. The program requires all students to complete a math course (MATH 1010, 1020 or 1060) and a statistics course (2300 or 3090).

The general education requirements include six credits of arts and humanities for all university students. This requirement includes three credits of literature and three credits in a non-literature field (ie, art, music, etc.).

Observations on Site

The team confirmed the university general education requirements onsite.

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 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).

(For evidence, see DR 4-1, DR 4-2, DR 4-4, DR 4-8 and DR 4-9)

Finding:

Partially Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

All three concentrations require a core of 24 credit hours of health sciences, six of which are dedicated to the internship. The program mapped the core courses to the required domains and demonstrated coverage of the domains in the eight courses all BSHS students must take.

Two concentrations, health promotion and education and health services administration, require a second set of 10-15 credit hours of specialized health science courses plus two additional elective health sciences courses. The third concentration, pre-professional, requires only the core courses plus four health science electives (12 credit hours) of the student's choosing. The remainder of the credit hours required to graduate are selected based on the student's plans for graduate or professional school.

The program defines its determinations that a domain is “introduced” or “covered” as follows: a domain is introduced if a topic is included on a slide. A domain is covered if there is a full class session, a reading or an assessment on the topic. Each faculty member assessed his or her own courses to determine what domains are being introduced and covered. The full faculty then met to assure consistency across interpretations. The undergraduate coordinator did a final review of the course map.

The health promotion track consists of 58 students and health administration has 48 students. In comparison, the pre-professional concentration has 262 students. There is disparity in the amount and specificity of public health content between health promotion and education and health services administration and the pre-professional concentration.

The faculty stated that the program plans to implement a change in the pre-professional concentration in academic year 2016-2017. The public health elective requirement will decrease from 12 credit hours to six credit hours. Of these six credit hours, three will be redistributed to add HLTH 4780 Health Policy, Ethics and Law as a concentration requirement and the other three credit hours will apply to preparation for the clinical discipline that the student is pursuing.

The faculty acknowledged that graduate and professional school requirements play a role in defining the pre-professional concentration curriculum. The faculty did not see a need to include further public health content in the pre-professional concentration.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:

(if Partially Met or Not Met)

According to the program’s mission statement, the program prepares students, “...by providing core classes with a broad overview of key concepts in public health combined with a concentration that provides in-depth knowledge in a chosen area of public health.” The in-depth public health focus of the health promotion education and health services administration concentrations is evident in the core and concentration-specific requirements.

The concern relates to the pre-professional concentration. This concentration does not have an in-depth public health focus. This approach does not align with the program's mission statement. Reviewers are concerned that students in the pre-professional concentration do not receive a complete public health education. The program must align the concentration curriculum to the program's mission by developing an in-depth public health focus that would students' potential clinical pursuits.

Institution Comments:

We appreciate the site visit team's identification of this issue and we agree that the pre-professional concentration has not provided the same level of specificity of non-core classes that the other two concentrations have provided. Initial discussions have already taken place with the Curriculum Committee Chair and revisions will be introduced during the first meeting of the new academic year to add specificity to the other HLTH classes required of these students. During 2015-2016 the Curriculum Committee removed one "selective" (i.e., "any HLTH class") and replaced it with a requirement that students in the pre-professional concentration must take HLTH 4780 "Health Policy Law and Ethics". The proposal to the Curriculum Committee will be to replace the remaining nine hours of selective classes with coursework required from three domains. The first of these domains would address macro-level public health system issues by having students choose among: Global Health (HLTH 4700, Public and Environmental Health (HLTH 4310), or Improving Population Health (HLTH 4980). The second domain focuses on the public health needs of population subgroups and students would choose one of the following courses: Maternal and Child Health (HLTH 4100), Women's Health (HLTH 3100), Health Maintenance for Men (HLTH 3200), Public Health Issues in Obesity and Eating Disorders (HLTH 4150), Health Needs of High Risk Children (HLTH 4110), or Social Epidemiology (HLTH 3150). The third proposed domain addresses public health research and skill development and may include either Geographic Information Systems for Public Health (HLTH 4850/4851), Health Information Systems (HLTH 4600), Health Appraisal Skills (HLTH 3980) or three credits from an approved University Undergraduate Research Creative Inquiry course or independent study research on a public health project with a faculty mentor (HLTH 4990). This concept will be discussed by the Curriculum Committee early in the Fall Semester and forwarded (with any additions or modifications) to the full faculty of the department and then to the college and university committees for discussion and approval. Once approved it will be effective for the first cohort of students entering the university after it appears in the Undergraduate Announcements (catalog).

Council Comments:

The Council appreciates the program's response and looks forward to reviewing an interim report that documents implementation of the planned strategies.

Criterion 4.3: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 4-1, DR 4-2, DR 4-5, DR 4-8 and DR 4-9)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

BSHS students demonstrate skills in public health communication and information literacy in required courses across the curriculum.

For example, oral communication is assessed through mock interviews, and students communicate through a variety of media by developing a public health video in HLTH 2020.

Students locate, use, evaluate and synthesize public health information in assignments such as epidemiology statistics assignments, article critiques and an infectious disease investigation.

Observations on Site

Faculty, student, and preceptors discussed examples of the students' abilities to convey public health information in assignments and in co-curricular activities.

Internship preceptors noted these abilities as strengths of Clemson students.

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 4.4: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 4-1, DR 4-2, DR 4-6, DR 4-9, DR 4-10 and DR 4-11)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

<p>All students are required to complete a 180-hour internship and professional seminar for internship preparation prior to graduation. The internship experience is individually developed by the student to meet his/her career goals. The internship site is approved by the student's instructor, and the student contacts and interviews with the specified agency. In addition to the 180 internship hours, the student is required to complete an electronic professional portfolio, daily logs, a midterm and final evaluation of the learning experience and a PowerPoint presentation with information about the internship experience.</p> <p>In addition, the student is required to complete a capstone writing project that assesses the student's ability to relate the internship experience to the social determinants of health, demonstrate an understanding of organizational behavior and governance in the context of their internship site and develop a concentration-specific reflection on their internship experience.</p> <p>Students also have the opportunity to implement a theory-based curriculum with elementary-aged girls, conduct pre- and post-intervention surveys, develop and implement a public health week campaign and conduct research through policy assessment and observations.</p> <p>The self-study document describes several required or elective classes that involve service learning and allow students to apply knowledge to real-world settings. Activities include completing an infectious disease outbreak case study and CITI training for research on human subjects; helping an older adult develop a personalized health behavior change plan; collaborating with a local coalition and school to plan, implement and evaluate efforts to promote walking in the community; and obtaining informed consent and collecting heart rate measures on family members and caregivers of those with dementia.</p>
--

Observations on Site

In meeting with current students, the site visit team heard examples of how the students were able to apply the knowledge and skills they'd learned in the classroom to community-based service learning. Examples including writing language for a legislative bill, creating a video, conducting screenings and measurements within a clinic setting and entering data to examine trends.

Students praised their internship experiences, noting they had already received certifications (eg, first aid, CPR) during their coursework that put them ahead of interns of other programs. Almost all students who were doing or had done their internship spoke highly of the internship preparation course, HLTH 4190, and the internship coordinator. The students felt they were much better prepared for internships and conducted themselves in a more professional manner during the internship than interns from other universities. The students appreciated the attention that is paid to ensuring students are placed in an internship site that meets their professional goals.

In meeting with preceptors, they too spoke very highly of the great job the internship coordinator does in finding the right students for the needs of the organization. They also noted that students are better prepared in "soft skills" and conduct themselves in more professional manner than some students from other institutions. Preceptors stated that they always felt like they were going to get the right student for their needs. They also said they were disappointed when the internship coordinator would inform them that she had no student at that time to meet the agency's needs. One preceptor stated she was impressed that students from the SBP were able to communicate with and interact with clients or patients and were capable of leading individual discussions and gaining needed information.

Many of the internships for pre-professional students are with clinical practitioners. The students and preceptors both reported that many of the activities undertaken during the internship are of a clinical nature. While the students may apply the public health knowledge, it is not inherent in the practical setting. However, the complementary capstone project is designed to help students tie their practice experiences to public health concepts.

Another preceptor cited only one time that he had an issue with a student who lacked interpersonal communication skills. After discussing the issue with the internship coordinator, the preceptor was able to assign the student to more writing assignments at which she could

succeed. The preceptor felt this student was more of an outlier and the issue was more related to personality and not to professional preparation.

Several alumni mentioned that they got their first job out of college at their internship sites, and a few preceptors stated emphatically that they wished they had job openings so they could hire the students who completed internships within their agency.

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 4.5: 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

(For evidence, see DR 4-1, DR 4-2, DR 4-7 and DR 4-9)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

<p>The program emphasizes life-long skills and career readiness throughout its curriculum.</p> <p>The program exposes students to the required concepts through various required courses and experiences. For example, the required epidemiology course (HLTH 3800) includes case studies in disease patterns, and student must create interventions at different levels of society (eg, community education, health policy). Students develop independent work and personal work ethic through individual presentations, cultural contexts in which public health professionals work by examining health systems in different cultures and organizational dynamics by closely examining the US health care system. The process of identifying, obtaining and completing the internship exposes students to concepts including professionalism.</p>

Observations on Site

<p>Students and preceptors both indicated that HLTH 4190 Introduction to the Internship is particularly helpful in helping to prepare students for success in the workplace. One student compared his own preparedness in professionalism to interns from other universities at his site. He reported feeling much more equipped for success in a professional environment. Additionally, preceptors praised the course and internship coordinator for appropriately preparing students in the soft skills necessary for success.</p>

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).

(For evidence, see DR 5-1)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The program provides mission statements for both the Department of Public Health Sciences and the baccalaureate program in public health. These mission statements align with the mission of Clemson University. Clemson University is committed to social, scientific, economic and professional engagement, healthy and ethical lifestyles and tolerance and respect for others.

Observations on Site

On site, program leadership confirmed that the program and department mission statement are used to guide program activities.

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 5.2: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 5-2)

Finding:

Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The program defines seven student learning outcomes that align with the program's mission and guide the program's core curriculum and internship:

1. Demonstrate university-level competencies that characterize critical thinking.
2. Define public health and identify examples of public health promotion and risk in the community.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of and ability to apply theoretical frameworks that explain health behavior.
4. Demonstrate an understanding of key objectives and components of health care systems with focus on the US system.
5. Demonstrate the ability to define and use key concepts of epidemiology and health data management including study designs and data analysis.
6. Demonstrate public health knowledge/skills and professional demeanor and behavior in settings consistent with career goals.
7. Demonstrate the application of ethical reasoning to discuss and evaluate issues in the ethics of health system policies or legal/political decisions affecting population health.

The taxonomical levels of the outcomes do not seem to reflect the full intent and extent of the curriculum.

Observations on Site

On site, faculty confirmed that the student learning outcomes are aligned only to the core curricular requirements, not to the concentrations.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

The commentary relates to the clarity and strength of the program's learning outcomes. The program may find that more concise outcomes with higher taxonomical levels will aid in guiding curriculum design and programmatic assessment.

Additionally, the student learning outcomes are only aligned with the core classes. They are not aligned with the program's concentration or the portion of the program's mission specific to the program's concentrations.

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 5.3: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 4-8)

Finding:

Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

Syllabi are required for all courses and must include either student learning outcomes or course objectives. The information provided on the syllabi is sufficient to demonstrate that the courses address the domains identified in Criterion 4.

Observations on Site

Site visitors confirmed that the program has course syllabi that include student learning outcomes or major objectives. In reviewing syllabi, site visitors found that the program inconsistently uses the term student learning outcomes and/or course objectives.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

Syllabi reflect inconsistencies in the representation of student expectations. Some clearly state expected learning outcomes while others use the term “objectives” stated more from the instructor’s perspective of class activities. Some conflate both. Consistency in approach to syllabi would more clearly demonstrate that the courses address the domains identified in Criterion 4.0.

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 5.4: The program defines and implements a student assessment plan that determines whether program graduates have achieved expected student outcomes and assesses the program's effectiveness. Assessment 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 assessment plan includes regular **surveys or other data collection** (eg, focus groups, key informant interviews, data from national exams (eg, CHES) from enrolled students, alumni and relevant community stakeholders (eg, practitioners who teach in the program, service learning community partners, internship preceptors, employers of graduates, etc.).

(For evidence, see DR 5-3, DR 5-4 and DR 5-5)

Finding:

Partially Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The self-study describes student assessment but no planned, ongoing assessment of the program's effectiveness. The program does survey graduating seniors to assess their career plans, satisfaction with the curriculum and departmental services and recommendations for improvement. Response rates have been low, and even after converting to an online system, the response rate is approximately 40%.

The program reports that data have been used to inform the Curriculum Committee and that the committee has recommended changes based on data. As an example, on the 2015 graduation survey, students reported feeling less prepared to analyze health policies for legal and ethical implications. As a result, the Curriculum Committee has recommended that HLTH 4780 (Health Policy Law and Ethics) be a required course for students in the pre-professional concentration.

The self-study does provide sufficient information to lead the site visitors to believe program administrators are effectively assessing student learning outcomes. The program uses curricular opportunities to assess each of the seven student learning outcomes.

The SBP's Health Promotion and Education coursework qualifies students to sit for the Certified Health Education Specialist (CHES) exam; however, the program does not require those students to sit for the exam.

The university sends a survey to students one and three years after graduation to assess students' perceptions on the quality of instruction and services provided on campus. The self-

study notes that the response rate has been disappointing and the responses they have received have been positive, with most scores being “very good” or “excellent.”

The program noted that feedback from preceptors during the evaluations with the internship coordinator provides them with information on student preparation.

Observations on Site

In conversations with department leaders and faculty with significant responsibilities, there was some confusion regarding the difference was between assessing student learning outcomes and assessing program effectiveness. Faculty members said that they had assessed program effectiveness in the past but have moved away from doing so over the years. After further discussion, faculty were able to identify ways in which they could assess program effectiveness. For example, program faculty recognize that the CHES exam could serve as a standardized measure to assess the program’s effectiveness, at least for the health promotion and education concentration. The program now recognizes the need for an assessment plan that is organized, systematic and sustained.

Faculty mentioned that the university does not allow the department to survey the graduates because surveys are done at the university level. However, the faculty are collecting contact information for graduating students and have plans to conduct their own surveys in the future.

The site visitors learned that the department has revised its assessment plan for student learning outcomes based on the CEPH criteria; however, data collected on student learning outcomes have not been reviewed for approximately two years. Typically, student learning outcomes are planned at the beginning of the year and data are put in a system at the end of the year. A report is generated, and in the past, the information was presented to faculty at the fall meeting. Depending on the issues, some results may be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee or Advisory Committee for further review, and committee recommendations are brought back to the full faculty for vote. If the issue is related to curriculum, the recommendation also has to be approved by the Academic Advising Center and university curriculum committees. This system creates the potential for a long lag time between discovering a problem and making a change to address it.

Commentary: *(if applicable)*

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Compliance Concern:

(if Partially Met or Not Met)

The first compliance concern is that the SBP does not have any analytical, planned, systematic and sustained assessment of the program's overall effectiveness. The program has not conducted its process of review for student learning outcomes in the past two years.

The next concern is that the program does not have a formal system in place to survey alumni, community stakeholders, and preceptors about program effectiveness. Alumni and preceptors confirmed that they had not received any surveys about program effectiveness. The university does survey alumni; however the program reports that data from the university's surveys have been limited in value due to low response rates.

Institution Comments:

Efforts are underway to broaden and deepen measurement of both learning objectives and programmatic outcomes. The department's Assessment Coordinator and Chair have been developing a set of ideas for redesigning and improving the process for measuring all aspects of outcomes. Review and scoring of the capstone essays, a major measure of the student's ability to synthesize multiple learning objectives into a coherent statement, has been continuous throughout this transition and will be maintained as one of the key measures of learning objectives. A retreat during the coming academic year will address additional ideas and enhance the measurement processes that will be used for future cohorts. One of several possibilities for assessing programmatic outcomes is to explore whether eligibility changes can be made that will allow senior students in CEPH accredited baccalaureate programs to sit for the Certified in Public Health (CPH) exam.

A survey of alumni to help assess overall program effectiveness is in development and will be implemented in summer 2016. As background, surveys of baccalaureate program graduates have always been conducted at the university level. While these surveys provided limited feedback for departments, surveys conducted directly by departments have been discouraged by past university administrations. Therefore, in the past, the type of survey expected for accreditation has not been conducted routinely by the department and the program has relied on university data as noted in the self-study and site visit report. This is changing. When accreditation criteria for SBPs were promulgated in 2014 the department recognized the need for a more thorough survey conducted by the department. The current Chair began developing an Assessment Database to conduct such a survey shortly after he arrived in August 2014. Beginning in May 2015 all graduates were asked to provide contact information (parents' address and continuing email address) prior to graduation. As noted in the self-study, in summer 2015 the SBP also developed a database of December 2013 and May 2014 graduates and a multiple pronged effort (phone calls, personal contacts, Facebook, LinkedIn) was used to ascertain placement in graduate/professional programs and/or employment. The program was successful in identifying this information for a large majority of these "one year out" graduates as shown in the spreadsheet included in the Resource File. During the 2015-2016 academic year a staff member under the supervision of the Chair continued developing the much more comprehensive Assessment Database that merged all available departmental data on program graduates with contact data obtained from institutional sources. This Assessment Database will be used to conduct electronic surveys of alumni starting in summer 2016.

Survey groups will be selected based upon date of graduation to represent proximal and distal programmatic outcomes. The database also will be used to plan the department's 25th anniversary celebration for fall 2016, during which we will begin establishing an Alumni Advisory Committee. The departmental survey of graduates, which will be conducted for a subset of graduates each summer, will provide more detailed information about perceptions of curriculum and overall strengths and needs for improvement of the effectiveness of the program as a whole.

No survey of preceptors has been conducted. This is primarily because the Internship Coordinator speaks with preceptors on a regular basis (at least annually and frequently more often) The department holds an annual preceptor breakfast/workshop which is well attended by preceptors in the area (most of our preceptors). This typically includes an educational session to inform preceptors about changes in the curriculum or program goals and an open discussion/feedback session in which the Internship Coordinator and Department Chair probe for questions, issues and opportunities for improvement of the program. The Internship Coordinator also annually visits preceptor sites in the Charleston area (who precept only during summer) in order to solicit similar feedback. While this process has been very beneficial, we are also considering the use of a Qualtrix online survey. This is a straightforward process given that the college has a license for this software and a staff member maintains current email addresses for 100% of the preceptors. The benefits and potential content of such a survey will be explored with those in attendance at the fall 2016 breakfast

A survey of stakeholders will also be considered. To date, the department has relied primarily on personal contacts with stakeholders and on members of the Advisory Committee of the College to provide industry, academic and public health practitioner perspectives on the program and its graduates. The universe for such a survey will be discussed at the assessment retreat to be held during the upcoming academic year.

Beyond surveys, the Chair is planning invitational regional gatherings of alumni based on locations identified from the Assessment Database. Gatherings are planned for Charlotte, Atlanta, Charleston, and possibly the Washinton,D.C area, areas where we have numerous alumni. These will be two hour events during the 2016-2017 academic year and will review the three CEPH undergraduate concentrations with alumni who attend from each region with an overview of progress and an assessment of relevance and sequencing of courses and an effort to identify lacunae in professional preparation. This information will be used to shape future programmodifications and to bolster data in the annual WEAVE assessment system.

Council Comments:

The Council appreciates the program's response and looks forward to reviewing an interim report that documents implementation of the planned strategies.

Criterion 5.5: The program collects quantitative data at least annually on the following:

- 1) graduation rates within the maximum time to graduation allowed by the institution
- 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.

(For evidence, see DR 5-4, DR 5-6, DR 5-7 and DR 5-9)

Finding:

Partially Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

<p>The program collects quantitative data at least annually on graduation rates. Those data do not, however, include graduates who entered the program through a change of major or as a transfer student. According to the self-study, a large proportion of the SBP's graduates enter the program through a change of major process.</p> <p>As a result, the program has recently proposed a process in which faculty review the university's Office of Institutional Research graduation lists and compare that list with their list of students who entered the program through a change of major in order to calculate the percent of those students who graduate within five years of entering the department. However, this has not yet been systematically implemented</p> <p>The university surveys graduates after one year and three years, and the SBP has been able to add specific questions to that survey in the past. However, the response rate for that survey is less than 20%.</p> <p>Due to the program's inability to gather sufficient and accurate information on graduates' job placement or continuing education data, the chair has recently asked all faculty members who advise graduating seniors gather non-university email addresses to create a tracking list for collecting these data in the future.</p>

Observations on Site

In meeting with program administrators, site visitors learned that the university does not have a maximum time to graduation for undergraduate students.
--

Commentary:

(if applicable)

Click here to enter text.

Compliance Concern:

(if Partially Met or Not Met)

The first concern is that graduation rates only include students who entered the program as freshman and does not include transfer students or those who entered the department from other majors. The available data do not provide an accurate graduation rate for the program.

The second concern is that the university survey used to survey graduates on job placement rates only has a 20% response rate. The program must supplement this university-level data to obtain sufficient data.

Institution Comments:

With reference to the first concern, the only official "graduation rate" that the university reports is the percentage graduating from Clemson University within six years of entry as a freshman. That was what was reported in the Self-Study. Our departmental and institutional data allow us to calculate graduation rates from Clemson University for students entering through change of major and transfer from another university. These are unofficial rates and do not have university sanction. Given that most change of majors enter as first year students we calculated a six year graduation rate for students entering through changes of major in 2008 (graduation by 2014), 2009 (graduation by 2015) and 2010 (graduation by 2016). These rates respectively were 2008 = 94.4%, 2009 = 91.7%, and 2010 = 93.9%. Descriptively, nearly all of these students graduated from Clemson long before the six year window, with the vast majority graduating within four years of entering the department. Given that the small number of transfer students accepted each year (98 to 10) typically come from a two year college we calculated a five year graduation rate for those students entering in 2009 (2014 graduation) 2010 (2015 graduation) and 2011 (2016 graduation). Graduation rates for transfer students by year of matriculation were 2009 = 71.4%, 2010 = 100%, and 2011 = 100% with most having graduated within two years of entering Clemson.

* We note that additional information showed that several students who did not graduate from Clemson transferred to other universities for a variety of reasons (sports scholarship, marriage, financial exigencies, etc.) and have graduated. One who left for professional athletics completed his degree, but outside the six year window.

We agree that a departmental survey is needed and are implementing one beginning in summer 2016. This is discussed at length in our comments on Criterion 5.4.

Council Comments:

The program notes that the program's response addresses the first concern identified above. The program will need to report graduation rates in each year's annual report in a manner that is consistent with the approach to this criterion provided in the above response. The Council appreciates the program's plans to address the second concern and looks forward to reviewing an interim report that documents implementation of the planned changes.

Criterion 5.6: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 5-8)

Finding:

Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The program provided a list of job titles and locations where their graduates were employed. Of the 17 noted, 11 were related to the healthcare industry; two were in information technology; and one each was listed in medical software, insurance, assisted living and consulting agency. For types of further education, the self-study listed seven master's-level degrees were noted, a BS to RN and three terminal degrees (doctor of medical dentistry, doctorate of physical therapy and speech pathology). Although no number was assigned, "several" continued to the College of Medicine at the Medical University of South Carolina. There was no description about how these data are collected.

Observations on Site

Program leaders described the challenges they have had in trying to collect this information from graduates. Site visitors were informed that the university does not allow the department to survey students post-graduation and that the university's attempts to collect the data have had disappointing response rates. To gather the data for the self-study, a faculty member primarily searched LinkedIn and Facebook profiles or collected feedback from faculty who had kept in touch with students as the data collection methods. As a result, the chair has asked faculty to collect contact emails from graduates to facilitate future data gathering efforts.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

The commentary is that the data are limited. While social media platforms are a helpful source of data, the program might consider implementing a more systematic approach to data collection.

Compliance Concern:

(if Partially Met or Not Met)

Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:

Departmental comments under Section 5.4 relate to this Criterion as well

Council Comments:

Click here to enter text.

Criterion 5.7: 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. Data collection methods for graduates' destinations are sufficient to ensure at least a 30% response rate. If the program cannot demonstrate that it meets these thresholds, the program must document the following:

- 1) that its rates are comparable to similar baccalaureate programs in the home unit (typically a school or college)
- 2) a detailed analysis of factors contributing to the reduced rate and a specific plan for future improvement that is based on this analysis.

(For evidence, see DR 5-10, DR 5-11 and DR 5-12)

Finding:

Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The self-study provides six-year graduation rates for freshmen entering the department in 2007, 2008, and 2009. Graduation rates on the percentage of students who graduated within six years of entering the program in 2007, 2008 and 2009 are 81.8%, 92.3%, and 92.6% respectively. These data are collected from a report issued by the university's Office for Institutional Research. It is unclear from the undergraduate catalog, located in the resource documents, what the maximum time to graduation is for the university.

Of the 91 graduates, employment data were collected from 76. Of those 76, 41 (54%) were employed full time, with two of those also were pursuing online graduate degrees. Thirty-two (42%) of graduates, for whom they had data, were enrolled in graduate or professional school. Therefore, 95% of graduates for whom the program had data were either employed or pursuing additional education within one year of graduation.

Observations on Site

Site visitors confirmed the data presented in the self-study with program leaders.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

The commentary is related to the lack of employment data for recent graduates. Data are only presented for December 2013 and May 2014 graduates. When asked why data were not collected from December 2014 graduates, program leaders said it was too early; however, the site visit team noted that it has been more than a year since students graduated in December 2014 and also explained that the criteria states the program is to demonstrate that students are employed or enrolled in further education within one year of graduation.

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 5.8: The program establishes a schedule for reviewing data on student outcomes.

(For evidence, see DR 5-13)

Finding:

Met with Commentary

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The program reviews data from graduation surveys and university post-graduation surveys (one and three years) annually as the chair completes a report through the university's online system, Weave Online. The program intends to include results from the upcoming department survey in this annual review.

The program continually assesses its learning objectives. Each year, the program identifies a subset of the learning objectives to measure and assess annually. The results are considered by the chair with the Advisory Committee and, if necessary, the Curriculum Committee.

Faculty discuss issues related to learning outcomes and career outcomes as part of faculty meetings and Curriculum Committee meetings. The department chair reviews the capstone essays each semester. The internship coordinator reviews preceptor evaluations each semester.

Each semester, the program identifies students who are in jeopardy due to failed courses or low GPAs and those who are on probation. These individuals are included in a report on student admissions, quality, progress and outcomes submitted to the department chair and university assessment coordinator.

Observations on Site

Over the academic year, the program collects data results from various sources including university surveys. This information is input to the Weave Online report at the end of the spring semester. The data of the previous year are reviewed at the first faculty meeting of the fall semester. Faculty may forward results to decision-making bodies such as the Curriculum Committee and Advisory Committee. Any recommendations are approved by the program faculty and any necessary college or university committees (eg, the HEHD curriculum committee). Process changes may be made immediately by the chair.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

The commentary relates to the lack of a fully comprehensive schedule for reviewing all student outcomes. While the program does review some student outcomes on an annual basis, there is no formal schedule or system in place that ensures all outcomes are assessed within a set timeframe.

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 5.9: The program uses student and faculty assessment results to improve student learning and the program.

(For evidence, see DR 5-14)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

<p>The program uses student and faculty assessment results to improve student learning and the program.</p> <p>For example, the faculty found that students in upper-level courses did not have adequate knowledge of the health care system. As a result, the curriculum committee added a new introductory-level course, Overview of Health Care Systems (HLTH 2030) to the required curriculum.</p> <p>In 2011, faculty found that the ethical judgement portion of students' portfolios were not of sufficient quality. In response, a policy-ethics paper was added to HLTH 2030. This paper requires an analysis of an ethical issue in health policy or management.</p> <p>Of the alumni who respond to the university survey of graduates, many expressed a desire for more potential employers and graduate programs to visit campus. As a result, the program has strengthened its relationship with Greenville Health System, inviting more speakers to departmental events. The program has also worked to invite recruiters for graduate programs in medicine, public health, pharmacy and other health fields to meet with the program's juniors and seniors.</p>

Observations on Site

<p>The program was able to discuss changes it has made to improve student learning and the program. Site visitors confirmed the program's commitment to quality improvement. For example, the department chair detailed how alumni survey results revealed alumni wanted more interaction with potential employers and graduate school recruiters. In response, the chair began to schedule events with these individuals.</p> <p>However, the majority of changes provided as examples in the self-study lacked specific detail regarding how the need for these changes was identified. While the program leaders could discuss the developments with site visitors, they could not point to the assessment results that prompted these decisions.</p>
--

Commentary:

(if applicable)

The commentary relates to the lack of evidence of changes made as the result of assessment data. Although the program does make appropriate changes to improve student learning and the program, these changes are not consistently made as a result of assessment data.

Compliance Concern:

(if Partially Met or Not Met)

Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:

Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:

Based on the information in the site visit team's original report and self-study, the Council determined that the program did provide evidence that changes had been made based on information gathered from a variety of sources. Therefore, the Council changed the finding from met with commentary to met.

Criterion 5.10: The program regularly evaluates its mission and expected student outcomes to ensure their continuing relevance.

(For evidence, see DR 5-15)

Finding:

Partially Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

The department holds a series of day-long retreats approximately every two years to address issues including the department's mission.

The Curriculum Committee and undergraduate advisor annually discuss developments in graduate school requirements and employment skills that may require a need for curricular revisions.

Observations on Site

The program last conducted a major evaluation and revision of its mission in 2012. The mission was scheduled to be evaluated again in December 2015. This evaluation needed to be postponed and has not yet been rescheduled.

The student learning outcomes are continuously revised by program faculty. The program leaders were unable to provide a schedule for regular review of the student outcomes. While minor wording changes are made as deemed necessary, the program did not know when the last full evaluation was conducted. The program does not have an evaluation scheduled.

Commentary:

(if applicable)

The commentary relates to a lack of regular evaluations of student learning outcomes to ensure their continuing relevance. Minor edits are made continuously, however a full review of the outcomes has not occurred and no evaluation is planned.

Additionally, while the mission was last reviewed in 2012, the next review was postponed and has not been rescheduled.

Compliance Concern:

(if Partially Met or Not Met)

Click here to enter text.

Institution Comments:

Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:

The Council changed the finding from met with commentary to partially met. This change was based on the Council's assessment of severity of the issues identified by the site visit team.

Criterion 5.11: 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.

(For evidence, see DR 5-16 and DR 5-17)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

Clemson University has a standardized process for undergraduate students to submit grievances. All undergraduate students are encouraged to work with the ombudsman to resolve complaints and conflicts informally. The Ombuds Office is a neutral and confidential resource for students, but it does not replace formal administrative channels.

The Academic Grievance Committee hears grievances on topics from grade disputes to discrimination. No formal grievances have been filed by department students in the past three years.

The detailed rules and procedures for filing an academic grievance are available in the Undergraduate Announcements.

Observations on Site

Site visitors confirmed that the policies on student grievances are publicly available on the university website.

The Undergraduate Announcements are available online and are provided in hard copy to students at freshmen orientation.

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.

(For evidence, see DR 6-1, DR 6-2 and DR 6-3)

Finding:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

All students are assigned an advisor upon admission to the university to assist them with issues related to degree planning, course selections, withdrawals, degree requirements, academic policies, academic difficulty, campus resources and other general information. DPHS students are advised in this capacity by the HEHD Academic Advising Center (center) during their freshmen and sophomore years. One professional staff member in the center is designated for the BSHS. Clemson University has recently implemented Degree Works, an online system, to help students and their advisors monitor progress toward degree completion.

Juniors and seniors are assigned to a faculty advisor within the program. Each faculty member has approximately 15 advisees. This advising is more focused on the students' discipline of interest and career goals. Training for faculty advisors is provided primarily at faculty meetings.

Students can change advisors by submitting a formal request to the director of the center (freshmen and sophomores) or the chair of the department (juniors and seniors). DPHS administers an academic advising survey each spring. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness collects data on faculty advising that is sent directly to the faculty member.

Observations on Site

The DPHS staff advisor explained that he first meets with students at freshmen orientation and then again at the beginning of each semester of their freshmen and sophomore years to go over academic planning.

Faculty described a process of individualized sessions that address both program planning and career advisement.

Students expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their interactions with advisors from the professional staff advisement during the first two years to the faculty advisement during their

junior and senior years. Students said that the program expectations are very clear and advisors help them ensure they complete all the requirements.

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:

Met

Team Comments:

Observations from the Self-Study

<p>The program curriculum incorporates diversity and cultural competency considerations. The general education coursework requires at least three credit hours in cross-cultural awareness. All BSHS students are also required to take HLTH 2400 Determinants of Health Behavior, which addresses the socio-economic and behavioral impacts on human health. The required internship and associated preparation course also provides an opportunity for some students to work with diverse populations in a practice setting.</p>
--

<p>The BSHS makes an effort to attract a diverse student body. As of academic year 2014-2015, the DPHS undergraduate population was 8.4% African American compared to 7.3% at the college-level and 6.5% at the university level. Additionally, the DPHS undergraduate population had greater representation of Asian, multiracial and international students than the university-level. However, the program population was only 1% Hispanic compared to 3% at the university-level. In order to increase student diversity, the program participates in a statewide initiative, Bench 2 bedside (B2B), which connects students to new career opportunities through</p>
--

video sessions. Additionally, the department is working to increase awareness of the major among eligible students graduating from high schools with large minority populations.

Faculty positions are always shared with the chief diversity officer and advertisements are placed in online resources that target possible minority applicants.

There is a commitment to improving diversity at the institution level. Clemson University is currently searching for new chief diversity officer. In addition, the president has included increasing student and faculty diversity as a central part of his short-term plan.

Full- and part-time faculty often work in international community development and public health. Current faculty have done work in Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, southeast Asia, Cosa Rica and China. Students are often involved in research related to this work. Students are also involved in research and volunteer opportunities locally including with the Joseph Sullivan Nursing center's mobile health clinic. The clinic serves Spanish-speaking farm workers in Oconee County.

Observations on Site

Institutional administrators, program leaders and faculty articulated a detailed, multi-faceted strategic plan for addressing diversity and inclusion. The interim chief diversity officer and chief of staff detailed the university's commitment to improving diversity at the institutional-level. Diversity is a key component of the university's new strategic plan. This plan includes development and enhancement of pipelines to higher education for minority students and better recruitment and retention of minority faculty across the disciplines.

The university has several programs to help minority and low socioeconomic status students succeed, from completion grants funded by private dollars to programs targeting first generation students and veterans in the academic support center. The university also plans to target already admitted minority students to encourage them to choose to attend Clemson over their other options.

Faculty described opportunities to teach and model cultural competency through the delivery of content, course activities and internship placements.

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.

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:

Click here to enter text.

Council Comments:

Click here to enter text.

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.

Council Comments:

Click here to enter text.



AGENDA



Standalone Baccalaureate Program (SBP) Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) Site Visit

March 3-4, 2016

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 2016

TIME(S)	AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION
Open	Arrival of the Site Visit Team
6:00 pm	Executive Session of the Site Visit Team
7:00 pm	Site Visit Team Dinner

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2016 (DAY 1)

TIME(S)	AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION
8:30 am	Site Visit Team Request for Additional Documents Dr. Lee Crandall
8:45 am	Team Resource File Review
9:15 am	<i>Break</i>

**Standalone Baccalaureate Program (SBP) Council on Education
for Public Health (CEPH) Site Visit**
Department of Public Health Sciences
March 3-4, 2016

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2016 (DAY 1 – CONTINUED)

TIME(S)	AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION
9:30 am	<p>Meet with Institutional Academic Leadership / University Officials <i>Discuss: Criterion 1: Leadership, Management & Governance (1.1-1.6); Criterion 2: Resources (2.5, 2.6); Criterion 3: Faculty Qualifications (3.2); Criterion 5: Program Effectiveness (5.1)</i></p> <p><u>Attendees (Clemson University Officials):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Max Allen, B.S., Chief of Staff, Office of the President 2. Debra Jackson, Ph.D., Vice Provost for Academic Affairs & Assistant to the President for Institutional Effectiveness 3. Robert Jones, Ph.D., Executive VP for Academic Affairs & Provost 4. Windsor Sherrill, Ph.D., Associate VP for Health Research at Clemson University & Chief Science Officer at Greenville Hospital System (GHS) 5. Brett Wright, Ph.D., Interim Dean, College of Health, Education & Human Development
10:45 am	<i>Break</i>
11:00 am	<p>Meet with Program Leader & Faculty/Staff with significant roles relating to the following criteria: <i>Criterion 1: Leadership, Management & 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)</i></p> <p><u>Attendees:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ronald Gimbel, Ph.D., Dept. Chair 2. Lee Crandall, Ph.D., Professor, Public Health Sciences 3. Deborah Falta, Ph.D., Undergraduate Program Coordinator & Senior Lecturer, Public Health Sciences 4. Khoa Truong, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Public Health Sciences, & Chair, Tenure, Promotion & Reappointment Committee 5. Cheryl Dye, Ph.D., Professor, Public Health Sciences & Director, Institute of Engaged Aging 6. Angie Wolff, Administrative Assistant, Public Health Sciences

**Standalone Baccalaureate Program (SBP) Council on Education
for Public Health (CEPH) Site Visit**
Department of Public Health Sciences
March 3-4, 2016

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2016 (DAY 1 – CONTINUED)

TIME(S)	AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION
12:15 pm	Break
12:30 pm	<p>Catered Lunch with Students</p> <p><u>Attendees:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Megan Farrell, Senior, Health Promotion & Education 2. Quintin Hall, Senior, Health Promotion & Education 3. Grace Burden, Senior, Health Promotion & Education 4. Chelsea Reynolds, Senior, PreProfessional Hlth Studies 5. Natalia Gonzalez, Senior, PreProfessional Hlth Studies 6. Michaela Morris, Senior, Health Services Administration 7. Worth Beatie, Sophomore, PreProfessional Hlth Studies 8. Rosa Marie Compton, Sophomore, PreProfessional Hlth Studies 9. Emily Schultz, Sophomore, PreProfessional Hlth Studies 10. Jessica Liang, Senior, Health Services Administration 11. Logan McFall, Senior, PreProfessional Hlth Studies 12. Karen Wortham, Senior, PreProfessional Hlth Studies
1:45 pm	<p>Meet with Program Leader & Faculty Related to Curriculum & Degree Program</p> <p><i>Discuss: Criterion 4: Curriculum (4.1-4.5); Criterion 5: Program Effectiveness (5.1-5.11); Criterion 8: Distance Education Program (8.1-8-4)</i></p> <p><u>Attendees:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ronald Gimbel, Ph.D., Dept. Chair 2. Lee Crandall, Ph.D., Professor, Public Health Sciences 3. Deborah Falta, Ph.D., Undergraduate Program Coordinator & Senior Lecturer, Public Health Sciences 4. Hugh Spitler, Ph.D., Professor, Public Health Sciences, & Chair, Curriculum Committee 5. Karen Kemper, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Public Health Sciences 6. Kathleen Meyer, M.S., Senior Lecturer, Public Health Sciences
2:45 pm	Break
3:00 pm	Resource File Review & Executive Session
3:45 pm	Break

**Standalone Baccalaureate Program (SBP) Council on Education
for Public Health (CEPH) Site Visit**
Department of Public Health Sciences
March 3-4, 2016

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2016 (DAY 1 – CONTINUED)

TIME(S)	AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION
4:00 pm	<p>Meet with Alumni, Community Representatives & Preceptors <i>Discuss: Criterion 2: Resources (2.5-2.6); Criterion 3: Faculty Qualifications (3.3); Criterion 4: Curriculum (4.3-4.5); Criterion 5: Program Effectiveness (5.1-5.2, 5.4, 5.11); Advising (6.1); Criterion 7: Diversity (7.1)</i></p> <p><u>Attendees:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Barb Baptista, MS; Executive Director, Anderson Free Clinic 2. Terri Ann Belk, BS, CHES; Wellness Manager, Glen Raven Custom Fabrics, LLC; 2010 3. Matt Cannon, DO; Discipline Chair of Family Medicine, Edward Via College of Osteopathic Medicine; 1997 4. Stephanie Davis, DPT; Clinical Director of Physical Therapy, Excel Rehabilitation & Sports Enhancement; 2009 5. Heather Goss, MBA, BS; Director, Mountain Lakes AccessHealth at Oconee Memorial Hospital 6. Melanie Jett, BS; Supervisor, Dept. of Neurophysiology, Mount Sinai Hospital System; 2001 7. Hunter Kome, MBA, BA; President, GHS Oconee Medical Campus 8. Misty Lee, MCHES, BS; Community Systems Health Educator; DHEC-Oconee Co. Health Dept.; 1994 9. John McRoberts, DDS; Dentist; Clemson Family Dentistry 10. Ruthie Millar, AA; Marketing Specialist, Clemson Downs 11. Shannon Owen, MHA, BS; Chief Operating Officer, United Way of Anderson County; 1997 12. Blythe Smith, MPH, BS, CHES; Community Relations, AnMed Health; 2004 13. Nelson Vasquez, OT; Occupational Therapist, Clemson Sports Medicine 14. Julie Vidotto, Director, Osher Lifelong Learning Institute 15. Paula Watt, PhD, FNP, BC; Director, Joseph F. Sullivan Center, Clemson University 16. Amie White, DPT, OCS; Director of Physical Therapy, Clemson Sports Medicine & Rehabilitation-Seneca; 1999
5:00 pm	Adjourn

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 2016 (DAY 2)

8:00 am	Site Visit Team Pickup
8:00 am	<p>Meet with Faculty & Staff with significant responsibilities related to the following criterion: <i>Discuss: Criterion 1: Leadership, Management & Governance (1.4-1.5); Criterion 2: Resources (2.4-2.6); Criterion 3: Faculty Qualifications (3.4); Criterion 6: Advising (6.1); Criterion 7: Diversity (7.1)</i></p> <p><u>Attendees:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deborah Falta, Ph.D., Undergraduate Program Coordinator & Senor Lecturer, Public Health Sciences 2. Hugh Spitler, Ph.D., Professor, Public Health Sciences, & Chair, Curriculum Committee 3. Khoa Truong, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Public Health Sciences & Chair, Tenure, Promotion & Reappointment Committee 4. Cheryl Dye, Ph.D., Professor, Public Health Sciences & Director, Institute of Engaged Aging 5. Aaron Howard, M.A., Advisor, Public Health Sciences
9:30 am	<i>Break</i>
9:45 am	Executive Session & Report Preparation
11:45 am	Working Lunch, Executive Session & Report Preparation
12:45 pm	<p>Exit Interview</p> <p><u>Attendees:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ronald Gimbel, Ph.D., Dept. Chair 2. Lee Crandall, Ph.D., Professor, Public Health Sciences 3. Deborah Falta, Ph.D., Undergraduate Program Coordinator & Senor Lecturer, Public Health Sciences
1:30 pm	Team Departs