INSTRUCTIONS

For program:

1. This is the team's draft report based on the self-study and site visit. All of the text boxes are locked with the exception of the "School/program response" column.
2. Provide any substantive response to the team's findings in this column. While responses are not required for every criterion, you are encouraged to respond to non-compliant findings (i.e., partially met and not met).
3. Reference any supporting materials in your response in the applicable criterion, and include these materials as attachments to the email you will send to CEPH with your final response submission.
4. Factual corrections should not be submitted in this document; submit using this form.
5. Submit your response to the team's draft report and supporting materials to submissions@ceph.org by the response deadline (communicated to you when you receive the draft report).
6. The Council will review the team's evidence, the program response, the final self-study, and supporting materials to make a final decision on each compliance finding. If applicable, the Council will provide its response in the last column of this report template.

REVIEW FOR ACCREDITATION

OF THE

PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAM

AT

EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC HEALTH

SITE VISIT DATES:
> September 9-10, 2024

SITE VISIT TEAM:
> William Pilkington, DPA, MPA, MA—Chair
> Claudia Serna, PhD, DDS, MPH, MCHES, CPH

SITE VISIT COORDINATOR:
> Nicole Williams, MPH, PMP

CRITERIA:
> Accreditation Criteria for Schools of Public Health & Public
> Health Programs, amended August 2021

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Eastern Washington University (EWU) was founded in 1882 as the Benjamin P. Cheney Academy. The institution was renamed the State Normal School at Cheney in 1889 and then Eastern Washington College of Education in 1937 before becoming Eastern Washington University since 1977. EWU is a regional, public university with its main campus in Cheney, Washington. The university offers undergraduate degrees in over 120 fields, 55 master's degree programs, and two applied doctoral degree programs. As of fall 2023, the university enrolled 10,746 students. EWU is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities since 1919. EWU was most recently accredited in 2022 and is scheduled for its next evaluation in fall 2024. There are more than 20 areas of programmatic accreditation at EWU including athletic training, business, counseling, dental hygiene, engineering, music, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and music.

EWU comprises four colleges: the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences; the College of Professional Programs; the College of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics; and, the College of Health Science and Public Health (CHSPH). CHSPH houses the departments of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Dental Hygiene, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Public Health and Healthcare Administration, and Wellness and Movement. The college also houses regional initiatives in dental education and early head start. The Department of Public Health and Healthcare Administration includes the BS in healthcare administration, MBA in healthcare administration, a minor in healthcare administration, a graduate certificate in healthcare administration, the MPH, and a graduate certificate in public health.

The program's administrative offices are located in Spokane, WA. The program is currently supported by the department chair, three additional full-time lecturer faculty, six adjunct faculty, and two staff members. At the time of the site visit, the program enrolled approximately 620 students, though not all were actively enrolled in classes each term.

Program History: 2013-2020

The MPH program was created in 2013 as a collaboration of various programs across the university and moved to the Department of Public Health and Healthcare Administration in 2017. The program originated as a place-based program, enrolling approximately 15 new students each year; total student enrollment when the program submitted its previous self-study in 2019 was 48 students, with students at that time able to choose to complete all courses on campus, all courses online, or as a mix of the two formats; classes were offered over traditional academic semesters. The program received CEPH accreditation for the first time in June 2020. In the initial review, the program was found to be non-compliant with six criteria; the Council requested interim reporting in one year to show that the program had addressed the compliance issues.

In fall 2020, shortly after receiving initial CEPH accreditation, the program, in partnership with Risepoint, an education technology company, began a process to transition the MPH to its current format: an accelerated, online program designed to attract working professionals. CEPH did not become aware of this change until early 2023, as noted below. The revised program format, still in place today, offers courses in six-week terms with seven start dates each year. Students may enroll in up to two courses per term and can complete the program in as few as 14 months. All students begin with the same course, PUBH 501: Foundations and Theories in Public Health, and then complete the remaining courses according to their own timeframe. All students end the program with PUBH 593: Applied Practice Experience and PUBH 601: MPH Portfolio in their two final terms.

2021-2022

The program began enrolling students in the new program format during the 2021-22 academic year and significantly increased enrollment over the course of that year, with over 250 students newly enrolled during the 2021-22 academic year.

In June 2021, the Council reviewed the program's first interim report and accepted the report as evidence of compliance for three of the six criteria found non-compliant during the original review. The Council acted to require another interim report on the three remaining compliance issues: program evaluation, the applied practice experience, and the integrative learning experience, and to require a half-day distance-based consultation with CEPH staff to ensure clarity on these issues.

In March 2022, the Council accepted this second interim report as evidence of at least minimal compliance with each of the three outstanding issues but also required a new interim report in early 2023 to demonstrate that the recently-developed program evaluation plan had been implemented.

In December 2022, the program submitted its required annual report to CEPH. This was the first time the program reported its enrollment growth to CEPH and the first official indication to CEPH of the transition to a new curricular structure. This annual report also reported a 3% program graduation rate.

2023-present

In early 2023, the Council reviewed the annual report submission as well as the program's most recent interim report on program evaluation. Again, the Council accepted the interim report on program evaluation as evidence of minimal compliance, reflecting progress in conducting program evaluation, but required another interim report since the program could not demonstrate fully sustained implementation of program evaluation efforts.

On the basis of the annual report, the Council acted to require interim reporting on graduation rates and interim reporting to demonstrate that the program had adequate faculty resources to support the substantial increase in student enrollment.

In August 2023, the Council reviewed this interim report on graduation rates and faculty resources. The Council found that the report demonstrated evidence of compliance for graduation rates, noting that the 3% reported in the annual report had been an error based on faulty calculation methods. To ensure that the program continues to monitor and track graduation rates correctly, the Council required a new interim report related to graduation rates for April 2024.

The Council rejected the report as evidence of compliance with the criterion on faculty resources, noting that the program had not provided evidence of sufficient faculty to support the large student body, and requested additional interim reporting for early 2024. Based on information in this interim report, the Council requested additional information related to recruitment and admissions.

In November 2023, the Council acknowledged receipt of the additional information on recruitment and admissions and used information from this submission to provide supplemental guidance to the program for its April 2024 interim report on graduation rates. The Council rejected the interim report as evidence of compliance with the criterion on program evaluation, noting that the program

had not fully implemented a program evaluation plan that complies with CEPH criteria despite reporting on its efforts regularly since 2021. The Council required additional interim reporting on this issue for 2024.

In March 2024, the Council reviewed the most recent interim report on faculty resources and acted to reject the report as evidence of compliance, noting that the program had still not demonstrated that it meets the expectations defined in CEPH criteria in its second interim report on the topic.

Based on this March 2024 interim report review, the Council acted to require a focused on-campus site visit for fall 2024, the visit that is the subject of this report. Although the program's next full accreditation review had already been scheduled for June 2025 and the program had additional, outstanding interim reporting obligations later in 2024, the Council determined that a focused self-study and on-site visit was necessary to clarify the program's ability to sustain compliance with CEPH criteria, given the record of program challenges in demonstrating compliance via CEPH's written interim reporting processes.

This report reflects a self-study and site visit focused on eight criteria that have either been the subject of sustained compliance challenges or relate to and inform an understanding of the criteria with compliance challenges.

Note on program offerings

The self-study for this review indicates that the program offers a single, generalist MPH, and the focused review was conducted with that understanding. However, during the preparation of the team's report after the site visit, reviewers found that the program advertises two MPH degree offerings on its website and in its 2024-25 catalog: the generalist MPH and an MPH in health management and policy (websites accessed 9/26/24). Since the curriculum was not a topic of the focused review and faculty did not mention this curricular offering during site visit discussions, team members did not have an opportunity to investigate this further or incorporate this issue into its analysis. Additional curricular offerings beyond the generalist MPH depicted in the self-study that governed this review create implications throughout the accreditation criteria, including in Criterion C2 (Faculty Resources), which reviewers found to be partially met based on their understanding that the program offered a single concentration. An additional concentration would require additional faculty resources beyond the number considered during the site visit. Therefore, this issue raises additional concerns beyond those identified by the site visit team.

Instructional Matrix - Degrees and Concentrations				
			Place based	**Distance based**
Master's Degrees	**Academic**	**Professional**		
Generalist*		MPH		MPH

*As presented in the self-study and associated documentation. See above for information on inconsistency related to current curricular offerings.

B1. GUIDING STATEMENTS

Criterion Elements	Compliance Finding	Team's Evidence for Compliance Finding	School/Program Response	Council Comments
	Met with Commentary			
Defines a vision, mission statement, goals, statement of values	🟩	The program has defined vision, mission, goals, and value statements. The published vision of the program is *"Empowering students and the community with public health knowledge, skills, and ethics, the Master of Public Health program at Eastern Washington University influences the health of the Inland Northwest and those communities our graduates serve."*	The Accreditation Committee met to assess and update the MPH mission vision and value statements to the following: ONLY ONE COMMITTEE MET	
Taken as a whole, guiding statements address instruction, scholarship, service	🟩			
Taken as a whole, guiding statements define plans to 1) advance the field of public health & 2) promote student success	🟩	The stated mission of the program is *"The Eastern Washington University Master of Public Health Program strives for excellence and equity in scholarship, leadership, and advocacy to protect, promote, and embody health and wellbeing for all by fostering a diverse educational community in a forward-thinking and inclusive learning environment."*	**MISSION;** Our mission is to empower students through rigorous academic programs that foster critical thinking, professional expertise, and a strong commitment to social justice. We strive to develop public health professionals capable of addressing complex health challenges in diverse populations by integrating community-engaged scholarship, research, and service in public health.	
Guiding statements reflect aspirations & respond to needs of intended service area(s)	🟨			
Guiding statements sufficiently specific to rationally allocate resources & guide evaluation of outcomes	🟨	The program's values include education, respect, exploration, critical thought, and health. The program's six goals address scholarship, developing leaders, community engagement, diversity and equity, and program vitality. During the site visit, faculty explained that the guiding statements and strategic plan were developed before the program transitioned to its accelerated, online format. Additionally, program faculty said that none of the faculty	**VISION;** We envision a future where our graduates lead efforts to promote health equity, advocate for social justice, and implement evidence-based interventions that improve health outcomes both locally and	

| | | who developed these guiding statements are still employed by the program.

None of the faculty present were able to provide an analysis of how these guiding statements are relevant to the program's current form or student body. However, faculty said that as the university has just concluded its own strategic planning activities, the program can now begin development of its own strategic plan in fall 2024. One faculty member said that he hopes this strategic planning work will result in revised guiding statements which better align with and reflect the program's current form. The program faculty said that they want to prioritize aligning their plan with that of the institution. University leaders confirmed that the new EWU strategic plan is complete, and implementation will begin soon.

The commentary relates to the opportunity to update the program's guiding statements and goals to ensure systematic and consistent evaluation processes that reflect the program's current form and student body. The program's evaluation plan is loosely aligned with the current goals; as program faculty take ownership of these statements, there is an opportunity to define statements sufficiently specific to guide resource allocation and evaluation outcomes. | globally. By cultivating a culture of innovation, collaboration, and lifelong learning, our program seeks to create meaningful impact, inspire positive change, and contribute to building healthier, more equitable communities.

Values

- **Innovation and Academic Excellence In Instruction, Research, And Service:** a commitment to continual improvement through ongoing, critical evaluation of our program, regular assessment of student needs, and developing a responsive and quality online curriculum, scholarship, and service.
- **Health Equity and Diversity Through Community Collaboration and Advocacy:** a dedication to respect human differences and advance health equity by treating all people equitably and addressing the underlying social determinants of health.
- **Community Partnership, Teamwork, Collaboration, and Cooperation:** a promise to partner with | |

		communities and develop collaborative community-based solutions to advance health equity. • **Leadership, Professional Development, and Continuous Improvement:** A responsibility to develop a diverse public health workforce by equipping them with essential leadership skills to improve health in all communities. Ensure the program objectives are relevant to the practice of public health. • **Local, National, and Global impact:** a commitment to integrate public health skills and knowledge into evidence-based practice, policymaking, and advocacy locally, nationally, and globally.	

B2. EVALUATION AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Criterion Elements	Compliance Finding	Team's Evidence for Compliance Finding	School/Program Response	Council Comments
	Partially Met			
Collects & reviews all measures in Appendix 1	🟥	The department chair and program staff wrote the program's current evaluation plan in spring 2024 with limited input from one faculty member.	The program met during their faculty and assessment committee meetings to complete the self study. After receiving feedback from our students, advisory board, and other stakeholders we decided to ensure that the evaluation plan would be wrote and developed by all the fulltime faculty as a team.	
Measures mission & goals & addresses unit's unique context	🟨			
Reviews & discusses data	🟥	The self-study includes an evaluation plan with five measures defined by the program. Measures selected by the program relate to faculty and staff leadership; student educational opportunities in the classroom /scholarship; students' educational opportunities outside the classroom; program vitality; and diversity and equity opportunities in public health.		
Makes data-driven quality improvements	🟨			
Consistently implements evaluation plan(s) over time	🟥	The meeting minutes reviewed by the site visit team included limited evidence of discussion of topics related to the measures defined in the evaluation plan. For example, at the June 2024 meeting, the faculty discussed how to communicate service and scholarship opportunities to students at one faculty meeting. However, there was no evidence that the program faculty are engaged in regular, substantive review of evaluation findings as defined in the evaluation plan.	The faculty collaborated as a cohesive team in the development of the CEPH (Council on Education for Public Health) report, recognizing the importance of collective input and expertise. Initially, a steering committee was formed, consisting of faculty members from MPH and HCAD disciplines, to guide the report's creation. This committee divided the report into specific sections based on each faculty member's area of expertise. Through regular meetings, the team discussed key elements of the report, ensuring that each section was aligned with CEPH standards and accurately	
		The self-study shared three examples of improvements undertaken in the prior three years. These examples demonstrated minimal alignment with the evaluation plan and guiding statements. For example, the fall 2023 faculty meeting included a discussion around personality tests as an educational opportunity. As a result, the program		

| | | implemented use of The Real Colors workshop in its APE course. While this example demonstrates a commitment to improving the program, it does not appear to be a data-driven improvement resulting from an implemented evaluation plan.

In conversation with site visitors, program faculty provided one example of how informal, word-of-mouth student feedback was used to revise PUBH 510: Biostatistics to include more preparation in Excel. However, this example of data-driven decision making took place outside of the defined evaluation plan.

Site visitors asked how various survey results (e.g., the survey monkey instrument, course evaluations) were used to make quality improvements and the faculty were unable to provide examples. Individual faculty could reflect on their own course evaluations and name adjustments made within their own courses, but there was no evidence in the written documentation or site visit interviews to indicate that these discussions are happening at a program level.

While the program does have data collection mechanisms that could be integrated into an evaluation plan, reviewers expressed concern that most program surveys, as currently implemented, do not provide useful, actionable data. For example, the program implemented a survey to active students in spring 2024 addressing student perceptions of faculty resources, class size, support services, and other programmatic opportunities and offerings. This survey resulted in a modest response rate (215 responses from 395 students or 54%) and a dearth of responses (e.g., six responses from 215 respondents) to | represented the program's goals, strategies, and outcomes. Open communication and collaborative editing were essential to ensure consistency and cohesion across the entire document.

To further ensure the quality and comprehensiveness of the report, faculty members worked together to review and revise each section, providing constructive feedback to enhance clarity and depth. The team also conducted a series of internal reviews to ensure that all necessary data and documentation were included, addressing each of the CEPH criteria in detail. This collaborative approach not only fostered a sense of shared ownership over the report but also allowed faculty to leverage their diverse knowledge and perspectives to produce a robust and well-rounded submission. By working together as a team, the faculty was able to create a thorough and effective report that accurately reflects the program's strengths and aligns with the rigorous requirements of CEPH accreditation. | |

| | | the single open-ended question. When asked about their perceptions of the quality of information gathered, faculty said that the survey provided helpful information for decision-making, specifically from the quantitative scores. However, the program leader and faculty were unable to provide any examples of changes or improvements, whether executed or planned, based on these data.

When speaking to students, site visitors learned that there have been recent initiatives to elicit feedback from students. Students spoke of several small-group conversations held by the program in spring 2024. Students were unaware of any similar activities before spring 2024.

Students who met with the site visit team were unable to provide examples of times when their feedback resulted in changes to improve the program. Students said they had raised concerns a number of times relating to inaccurate course materials, and they hoped that courses were being updated based on this feedback, but they had not seen these updates firsthand and could not readily identify other uses of feedback they had provided.

The concern relates to the lack of evidence that the program has implemented an evaluation plan that includes regular, substantive review of evaluation findings and results in data-driven quality improvements. The university leaders who met with the site visit team acknowledged the need to develop and implement a well-defined and data-driven implementation plan. | Regarding data collection during our assessment meeting we met to determine which types of surveys worked best for our students and the frequency to implement them. As a group, we have decided to implement a reflection assignment in module three, administer an end-of-course survey, and request students' external LinkedIn profiles and email addresses for future connection. Additionally, students will be asked to complete an exit survey upon finishing the program.

Based on feedback gathered from student surveys, several improvements have been implemented to enhance the program's effectiveness and support student success. One key change is the inclusion of a reflection assignment in each course, scheduled during the third week. This allows students to assess their progress and identify areas for improvement, giving both students and instructors the opportunity to make adjustments for greater success in the remainder of the course and throughout the program. Additionally, the program will introduce a focus group starting in February 2025, with bi-annual | |

| | | meetings scheduled each academic year, providing a platform for students to voice their opinions and contribute to program improvements. A speaker series, launching in February 2025, will bring diverse individuals to campus, aiming to spark student interest and broaden their educational experience. To further enhance student engagement and opportunities, the program will attend the APHA conference in 2025, inviting one or two students to participate. The program will also maintain a strong connection with the Student Association, ensuring that one faculty member continues to serve as its sponsor. As part of ongoing efforts to foster long-term relationships with students, the program will continue to distribute end-of-course surveys and request students' external contact information, including email addresses and LinkedIn profiles, to stay connected and offer future support. These initiatives reflect the program's commitment to continuous improvement and a strong, supportive community for students. | |

B3. GRADUATION RATES

Criterion Elements	Compliance Finding	Team's Evidence for Compliance Finding	School/Program Response	Council Comments
	Met with Commentary			
Achieves graduation rates of at least 70% for bachelor's & master's degrees, 60% for doctoral degrees (Approach 1)	■	The program defines a six-year maximum time to graduation and provided graduation rate data for six cohorts, beginning with students entering in 2018-19. The first three cohorts (i.e., 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21) were enrolled in the program's previous format, prior to the move to an accelerated, solely distance-based format and prior to the substantial growth in enrollment. Students who enrolled in these earlier cohorts transitioned to the accelerated, distance-based format. The program enrolled 15, 15, and 19 students in these first three cohorts.

Of the 15 students who enrolled in 2018-19, 67% graduated within six years, a rate that falls below the threshold defined in this Criterion's Approach 1.

The next two cohorts have the potential to reach a 100% graduation rate. In the 2019-20 cohort, 10 students have already graduated (67% graduation rate) and the other five students are still enrolled in their final year of eligible enrollment. The 2020-21 cohort has already achieved a 79% graduation rate, with the four remaining students still enrolled and two years remaining until they reach the maximum allowable time. | During the 2018-2019 academic year, the MPH program was not fully established as an online accelerated program. The MPH program shifted to an online accelerated program in the 2020 academic year. Between 2018-2019, the MPH program had 15 students who entered the program. Beginning with academic year 2020, the graduation rate remained at 67% which is below the required threshold of 70%. This data is most likely due to loss to follow up. The program recognizes that although the graduation rate remained at 67% throughout the next 2 terms, there was a steady increase in graduation rates in | |
If applicable, achieves average graduation rates over the last three years of at least 70% for bachelor's & master's degrees, 60% for doctoral degrees (Approach 2)	■			
If applicable, achieves graduation rates that match or exceed grad rates of at least two comparable degree programs (Approach 3)	N/A			
If applicable, provides evidence of the following: • public disclosure of graduation rates within one click of homepage • recruitment & admissions processes accurately present program of study • proactive student advising & support	N/A			

11

• detailed analysis of factors that depress grad rates • interventions designed to address factors that depress grad rates • analysis of effectiveness of interventions		Following this criterion's approach, the program provided graduation rates of 83% for the 2016-17 cohort and 71% for the 2017-18 cohort to allow for an analysis under Approach 2, which looks at a three-year average. The average graduation rate for the last three years of cohorts to reach the maximum time to graduation is 74%, which meets this criterion's expectations. The self-study data shows students as withdrawn if they 1) have reached the six-year maximum period of enrollment without graduating, or 2) have not met the program's required cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher. Prior to being dismissed for GPA, students are put on academic probation and receive extra support and time to improve their grades. In the last three years, 12 of 825 students were dismissed for GPAs below the threshold. The commentary relates to the program's lack of policies to allow for accurate monitoring of student retention. The program allows students to remain unenrolled for consecutive terms with no action beyond email reminders taken until they reach the maximum allowable time; this appears to result in some students remaining inactive for years but still counted as continuing in the program until they "time out" at the six-year mark. For example, reviewers noted that five students from the 2018-19 cohort were considered as continuing for three years before all being withdrawn when they reached the six-year mark; i.e., all students who were going to graduate did so within three years, despite the allowance of six years to graduate. With appropriate monitoring, the program may have been able to identify these students as at risk for discontinuation and provide additional resources to	subsequent academic years once the program established a method of tracking graduation rates and contacting students by email who fail to enroll in the next term. For clarity, the program is currently and will continue to collaborate with the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Assessment and Accreditation to monitor real-time retention, progress toward degree completion, and graduation rates.	

		support them toward graduation. Similar trends are also evident in the previous two cohorts, with nine students being withdrawn at the end of their final year of eligibility.

When the program transitioned to the accelerated, solely distance-based format in 2021, enrollment increased by the hundreds. The most recent three cohorts (i.e., 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-34) enrolled 255, 318, and 252 students, respectively. Each of these cohorts may still potentially meet the 70% threshold with graduation rates of 55%, 30%, and 0% at the time of the site visit, but program leaders and faculty could not describe a protocol for monitoring students' enrollment patterns and progress toward graduation. The program notes that students enrolled in the accelerated, distance-based format are often completing their degree part-time and take breaks in course enrollment, so students are not required to enroll in consecutive terms.

As the program has only been offered in its accelerated, distance-based format for three years, the program notes that it has not yet had sufficient time to discern trends in graduation rates or analyze factors affecting its graduation rates. If the program does not monitor student retention and progress, the effect on graduation rates would not be evident until each cohort reaches its maximum time to graduation.

B4. POST-GRADUATION OUTCOMES

Criterion Elements	Compliance Finding	Team's Evidence for Compliance Finding	School/Program Response	Council Comments
	Met			

Collects, analyzes & presents data on graduates' employment or enrollment in further education post-graduation for each public health degree offered		The self-study presents post-graduation outcome data for 2021 through 2023 graduates that indicate 87-100% positive outcomes. In 2021, the program had two unknown outcomes out of 15 graduates. In 2022, the program had no unknown outcomes and 10 graduates. In 2023, the program reported six unknown outcomes of 78 graduates.	Click here to enter text.	
Chooses methods explicitly designed to minimize number of students with unknown outcomes				
Achieves rates of at least 80% employment or enrollment in further education for each public health degree		The program uses a survey that is completed by all students before they finish the MPH program to collect post-graduate placement data. Because the university does not allow students to retain university email addresses after graduation, the program survey collects personal email addresses and LinkedIn profile information. This allows the program to follow up those who do not have a job or spot in further education as of graduation to minimize number of students with unknown outcomes.

Program faculty noted to site visitors that the online modality has attracted many students who are already employed in public health and health care, so they expect post-graduation outcomes to continue to be positive. | | |

C2. FACULTY RESOURCES

Criterion Elements	Compliance Finding	Team's Evidence for Compliance Finding	School/Program Response	Council Comments
	Partially Met			
School employs at least 21 PIF; or program employs at least 3 PIF		The self-study documents that the program meets the first two steps of this criterion's three-part test for demonstrating adequate faculty resources, both of which focus on bright-line minimums for accreditation eligibility: the program has at least three primary instructional	The program has identified inefficiencies in its faculty resources, impacting its ability to fully meet the demands of its	
3 faculty members per concentration area for all concentrations; at least 2 are PIF;				

double-counting of PIF is appropriate, if applicable	■	faculty, which satisfies both parts 1 and 2 of this criterion's framework for a single-concentration program. However, the program fails to demonstrate that it meets this criterion's third, required element.	academic, research, and service missions. These inefficiencies have highlighted the need to reassess current faculty roles and strategically enhance the team's
Additional PIF for each additional degree level in concentration; double-counting of PIF is appropriate, if applicable	■	These current faculty resources, however, may not even satisfy part 2 of this criterion's framework due to the new concentration described in the introduction of this report.	capacity to address evolving priorities. By taking a proactive approach, the program seeks to create a more balanced distribution
Ratios for general advising & career counseling are appropriate for degree level & type	■	The concern relates to the program's failure to document adequate faculty resources to sustain all core functions, including advising, delivering coursework, and supporting essential functions such as program evaluation.	of responsibilities and ensure that its faculty expertise aligns with the program's long-term goals and aspirations.
Ratios for MPH ILE are appropriate for degree level & nature of assignment	■		
Ratios for bachelor's cumulative or experiential activity are appropriate, if applicable	N/A	The program reports four primary instructional faculty (PIF) and six non-PIF. Three of the PIF are lecturers fully	To address these challenges, the program is currently conducting an
Ratios for mentoring on doctoral students' integrative project are appropriate, if applicable	N/A	dedicated to the program. The fourth PIF is the department chair who divides her time among administrative and instructional duties associated with	open-rank faculty search. This strategic decision allows for the recruitment of scholars and
Students' perceptions of class size & its relation to quality of learning are positive (note: evidence may be collected intentionally or received as a byproduct of other activities)	■	three degree programs (BS in healthcare administration, MBA in healthcare administration, and generalist MPH), two certificate programs, and one minor. While the self-study reports the department chair as dedicating 1.0 FTE (i.e., her full effort) to the program, reviewers determined	educators at diverse stages, from assistant professors to the more experienced associate professor. By maintaining flexibility in rank and area of expertise, the program aims
Students are satisfied with faculty availability (note: evidence may be collected intentionally or received as a byproduct of other activities)	■	that this is not accurate. Data provided on request during the visit indicate that the department chair allocates 0.18 FTE to teaching across the BS and MPH degree programs, 0.62 FTE to administrative responsibilities for the department, and 0.2 FTE to research and service. Based on these data, site visitors estimate that the department chair allocates approximately 0.5 FTE to the unit of accreditation. The program was not able to provide an updated FTE allocation, beyond the figures cited above, to the team.	to attract diverse talent with the potential to contribute meaningfully to its mission. This initiative underscores the program's commitment to excellence and adaptability in building a robust and dynamic academic team. These new hires will bring fresh perspectives, expertise, and energy

The six non-PIF, together, account for 2.05 additional FTE, for a total of approximately 5.5 faculty FTE. The program has between 346 and 588 actively students enrolled in required courses during each term from fall 2023 through summer 2024.

The department chair is the only tenure-track faculty member. The remaining faculty members, with lecturer appointments, participate in faculty meetings; however, there is little evidence that these individuals have the workload capacity available to participate in program planning activities. The department chair said that the program evaluation plan for the self-study was developed primarily without faculty involvement. Additional information related to this issue is provided in Criterion B2.

The program is offered in six-week terms, year-round, with seven to nine days between courses, and many faculty are teaching different, sometimes large classes throughout the year with limited breaks. This structure may present challenges related to the workload associated with compressed instructional schedules and the effort associated with regularly and quickly switching course preparations.

For example, in spring 2024 term 1, one PIF taught two courses: PUBH 560: Epidemiology (93 students) and PUBH 601: MPH Portfolio (24 students). When term 2 began approximately seven weeks later, this same individual taught two different courses: PUBH 565: Health Equity and Advocacy (27 students) and PUBH 572: Biological & Radiological Health (41 students).

to the team, strengthening our capacity to deliver high-quality education, pursue impactful research, and engage in meaningful service. By increasing the number of tenure-track and tenured faculty, the program aims to enhance its stability, expand opportunities for mentorship, and ensure long-term sustainability in achieving its strategic goals.

Starting in fall 2025, with the hiring of new tenure-track faculty, the advising ratio will improve, providing a more favorable balance for students.

In alignment with the Universities Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and the Department's Policies and Procedures, the administrative release time for the Department Chair shall be 50% of a full-time teaching load. The current release time provided is 62%, exceeding the required assignment requirement.

While the program seeks to expand its tenure-track and tenured faculty, the strategic use of adjunct instructors will remain an essential component of its instructional model, allowing the program to

In the same time frame, one non-PIF with full-time employment outside the university taught PUBH 564: Environmental & Occupational Health (114 students) followed approximately seven weeks later by PUBH 572: Biological & Radiological Health (40 students).

The self-study states that program faculty provide general advising and career counseling to students while the student is enrolled in their course. Students are not assigned a faculty advisor and faculty do not have defined advising loads. As a result, faculty advising is not counted as a duty separate from teaching, and the advising ratios presented in the self-study reflect class size. During the 2023-24 academic year, the four PIF taught 35 course sections and the six non-PIF taught 21 course sections. The average advising load (class size) for PIF was 60 students and the maximum was 104. The average advising load (class size) for non-PIF was 48 students and the maximum was 114.

During the site visit, the team learned that lecturers, who constitute three of the four PIF, are not expected or permitted to provide general advising to students, based on lecturers' collective bargaining agreement. Only tenure-track faculty can provide general advising to support the staff advisor. All public health faculty can, however, provide career counseling.

Students who met with the site visit team said that they did not know that faculty are available to students for any category of advising, including public health career counseling. One student noted that faculty may include office hours in their email signatures, but the availability

adapt to changing enrollment patterns and course demand effectively. The program will strategically utilize adjunct faculty to address immediate course vacancies, ensuring students have access to a comprehensive range of learning opportunities. By leveraging their specialized knowledge, practical expertise, and flexibility, the program aims to maintain curricular continuity and uphold the quality of instruction.

Academic coaches are an option for faculty to utilize on an as-need basis to provide targeted support and enhance student success. These coaches serve as a supplemental resource, offering individualized guidance in areas such as study skills, time management, and subject-specific challenges. By leveraging academic coaches selectively, faculty can ensure that students receive the additional help they need to overcome obstacles and excel in their coursework. This approach allows faculty to focus on delivering high-quality instruction while ensuring that students have access to tailored support when necessary.

of advising as a service from each course faculty member is not explicitly communicated to students.

Both PIF and non-PIF advise students in the integrative learning experience, as there is a course associated with the ILE requirement. The average ILE advising load (class size) for PIF was 24 students, and the maximum number was 31. The average ILE advising load (class size) for non-PIF was 28 students, and the maximum was 29. For both the ILE and the required practice experience (APE), program faculty said that minimal advising to encourage students' self-sufficiency was intentional. Faculty assigned to the ILE or APE are often also teaching another course during the same six-week term.

Prior to the site visit, CEPH received a third-party comment from an APE preceptor. This preceptor spoke positively of the program but raised concerns that there is no direct communication from the program via faculty or staff about expectations, troubleshooting, etc. and that all information is passed through the student.

In response to site visitors' questions related to the third-party comment, program leaders confirmed that the lack of faculty involvement with preceptors was intentional. Program faculty want students to be the primary contact and noted that they receive evaluations from preceptors at the end of the APE. Site visitors questioned how preceptors would know whom to contact in the event that a student is not performing adequately. The program faculty acknowledged that this was a weakness and explained that some students had received an incomplete at the end of the semester as a result of poor preceptor evaluations. The program could not provide any examples

At times, student-to-faculty ratios do not align as expected, leading to an increased demand for certain courses. To address this, our resolution has been to open an additional section of the course and bring in an adjunct professor to help meet the instructional needs. This approach ensures that students receive a quality education with appropriate faculty support while maintaining manageable class sizes. By strategically expanding course offerings in this way, we can better serve our student population without overburdening faculty members or compromising academic standards.

Once registration closes, we evenly distribute students between the two course sections, ensuring balanced workloads for both instructors. In this structure, the full-time faculty member serves as the lead instructor, overseeing the course content, coordination, and overall instructional direction. This model allows for consistency in curriculum delivery while leveraging the expertise of both faculty members. By implementing this solution, we enhance the student learning experience and maintain

	of faculty support to remediate negative experiences in the APE for students or preceptors.

The program collected student perceptions of class size and availability of faculty through the survey in spring 2024 referenced in Criterion B2, which garnered 215 responses from 395 enrolled students. Seventy-nine percent of respondents rated class size and its relation to the quality of learning as good or excellent; 85% reported the quality of learning was good or excellent; and 84% reported faculty availability as good or excellent. Only six individuals provided qualitative feedback. The program characterized the qualitative feedback as mixed. Some students expressed satisfaction while others provided suggestions for improvement, highlighting issues such as unclear assignment descriptions and grading policies, large class sizes, and overburdened faculty.

The site visit team heard concerns related to class size from students during the site visit and via the third-party comment period that highlighted a negative impact on student learning. Students said that large class sizes made the online learning environment unwieldy, noting that with 100 students in a graduate-level class, the discussion board was difficult to navigate and limited the depth of engagement with course materials. One student speculated that in large classes, group work, often with large group sizes, functioned primarily to limit the amount of grading required. This student explained that one faculty member said that assignment feedback, beyond a grade, would be provided only on request because they (the faculty member) did not have the time to provide feedback to all students. | the integrity of our academic programs.

In response to student feedback and concerns, we have enhanced the marketing and promotion of our advising services to ensure students fully understand the range of support available. Our approach encompasses all levels of advising, including academic guidance, program-specific advising, and scheduling assistance.

Regarding student assignment and faculty load, tenured and tenured track faculty are able to administer the full spectrum of advising specifically the academic and programmatic advising, while full-time Lecturer's only administer mentoring and career advising. Course scheduling and sequencing responsibilities are managed by our Program Specialist II. If an adjunct faculty member is facilitating a course, they will refer all advising needs to the Department Chair, who will manage and delegate them appropriately. | |

| | | Students also said that course materials were often inaccurate and difficult to follow, observing that as online courses were copied into new semesters, materials were not updated and links were sometimes broken. One student noted that questions posted in the Q&A section of the courses often go unanswered by faculty.

Students who met with site visitors reported mixed availability of faculty and staff. They said that as class size grows, response times get longer. However, students did say that in smaller classes they appreciated the responsiveness and regular engagement of several faculty members.

The program reported that one new lecturer was hired to begin later in September 2024 and that the search for a tenure-track faculty member for fall 2025 was about to begin at the time of the site visit. University leaders who met with the site visit team expressed a commitment to supporting the program and highlighted the need for additional tenure-track faculty. They reported one failed search for a tenure-track faculty member in fall 2024. University leaders emphasized the need to improve the tenure density of the faculty complement. However, they also noted that hiring tenure-track faculty takes time and did not provide any plans or timelines for increasing overall faculty resources or tenure density beyond the two current searches. | The program now requires that all faculty include the levels of advising in their course syllabus to include course announcements in the beginning of the term. This will ensure students have multiple methods of viewing and receiving contact information for levels of advising. | |

Criterion Elements	Compliance Finding	Team's Evidence for Compliance Finding	School/Program Response	Council Comments
	Met			
Staff & other personnel are currently adequate to fulfill the stated mission & goals		The program is supported by an operations manager, program specialist, and academic coaches in its efforts to fulfill its stated mission and goals.	Click here to enter text.	
Staff & other personnel resources appear sufficiently stable		The self-study indicates that the operations manager and program specialist each dedicate 1.0 FTE to the program. During the site visit, however, the program specialist noted that in addition to approximately 600 public health graduate students, they also hold advising responsibilities for about 30 BS in healthcare administration students, which would reduce their effort slightly below the reported 1.0 FTE.

The program specialist is the primary academic advisor for all MPH students. They provide information about university resources to students, track enrollment numbers, and host program events, including orientation.

Students who met with the site visit team reported that this position had experienced turnover in recent years. Program faculty confirmed that this position had recently been vacant for approximately six months and that the department chair took over these responsibilities during that time. Students who met with the site visit team described the current program specialist as responsive and helpful. Students did not report any issues related to the availability of the program specialist. | | |

		The operations manager is responsible for supporting the program in activities including CEPH reporting, monitoring financial activities, setting up faculty profiles for human resources, assigning instructors to courses, and managing the university databases to add courses and adjust course sections. The university partners with Risepoint to deliver its online programs. Risepoint provides support in marketing, enrollment services, retention services, university infrastructure optimization, and project management. Risepoint is the first point of contact for students interested in the MPH program and provides onboarding to students including application walkthroughs and course registration. Risepoint staff also provide faculty with workshops and webinars and with program planning, course scheduling, and instructional design support. Additionally, Risepoint provides a retention services team to provide personalized check-ins, re-engagement emails for inactive students and reminders about payment and registration. The program also uses academic coaches who function as professional teaching assistants. These part-time, contract employees manage and provide feedback to students, discuss grading and assignments, and identify students who require additional support. As coaches take on these responsibilities, the program believes that faculty can focus on delivering the curriculum. The program requests coaches by course through Instructional Connection, a staffing company that works with Risepoint. Instructional Connection provides the program with resumes for academic coaches with experience and/or degrees in		

		public health or healthcare. The program uses these resumes to select appropriate coaches. Faculty who met with the site visit team said that academic coaches primarily answer questions about assignments and grading, grade student work, and provide student feedback on discussion board posts. Academic coaches are instructed to elevate any issues related to advising or outside their scope to the faculty. Faculty and coaches meet at least three times per term. In spring 2024, the program did not use any academic coaches, instead relying more heavily on adjuncts to teach additional sections of courses to keep class size low.	

H1. ACADEMIC ADVISING

Criterion Elements	Compliance Finding	Team's Evidence for Compliance Finding	School/Program Response	Council Comments
	Met with Commentary			
Students have ready access to advisors from the time of enrollment		As noted in Criterion C3, the program employs a full-time program specialist responsible for providing general academic advising to all MPH students. The program specialist is in contact with MPH students beginning at the time of their enrollment. As noted in Criterion C2, faculty also view advising as part of their role in teaching a class, though students may not consistently be aware of this resource. Students receive a welcome email within one week of confirming their matriculation into the program. The welcome email introduces students to the program specialist and provides a link to the EWU online student	Click here to enter text.	
Advisors are actively engaged & knowledgeable about the curricula & about specific courses & programs of study				
Qualified individuals monitor student progress & identify and support those who may experience difficulty				
Orientation, including written guidance, is provided to all entering students				

23

		orientation and an invitation to the MPH program orientation. The EWU online student orientation is a self-paced Canvas course provided to all online graduate students at the university from the Graduate Programs Office. This course orients students to the online platform they will use for each course. The MPH orientation is a synchronous Zoom meeting which takes place twice monthly. During this orientation, the program specialist provides an overview of the program's timeline and requirements, degree planning, and available resources. The program specialist also provides an overview of the MPH Flight Deck. The Flight Deck is an online resource, housed on Canvas, that includes department contacts, tools and resources for student success, program-specific announcements, discussion boards, and a guide to completing the program's requirements. All students must meet with the program specialist as part of their first MPH course, PUBH 501: Foundations and Theories in Public Health. During this meeting, the program specialist approves each student's degree plan and provides individualized guidance. All other meetings with the program specialist are optional and scheduled using an online appointment platform. In meeting with the site visit team, the program specialist said that she meets with approximately one to four MPH students per day.		

		The program specialist is oriented to their responsibilities through their onboarding by the university and to program-specific requirements by the department chair.		
		The program specialist is also responsible for monitoring student progress. She sends regular emails reminding students to register for their next course and sends enrollment numbers to the program faculty each term. While the program specialist tracks student progress and sends reminders, students may go unenrolled for consecutive terms. This issue is addressed in the commentary for Criterion B3 (Graduation Rates).		
		The self-study describes faculty advising responsibilities as covering topics such as professional development, research opportunities, practicum placements, and career goals. However, as noted in Criterion C2, the site visit team learned that three of the four primary faculty are contractually disallowed from providing academic advising, with the department chair the only program faculty member whose job duties include academic advising. Non-tenure-track faculty who met with the site visit team said that as soon as student questions appear to be general academic advising questions, they direct students to the program specialist.		
		Students who met with site visitors confirmed these practices: they could not provide any examples of advising or mentoring provided by program faculty.		
		Course evaluations are used to collect data on satisfaction with academic advising. The self-study provided data for academic years 2023 and 2024. During these years, approximately 60% of students reported satisfaction with		

| | | academic advising and 40% of students reported satisfaction with career advising. Reviewers did not receive the full survey results and were unable to confirm if the remaining students responded as neutral, dissatisfied, or as not having met with an advisor. During the site visit, the program faculty said they thought the low levels of satisfaction reported in the surveys may have resulted from turnover in the program specialist position. Site visitors asked how the program identified root causes of dissatisfaction or needed improvements. The program reported that they have not investigated these results or made any changes based on the findings. This relates directly to the concern identified in Criterion B2 (Program Evaluation).

The commentary relates to the opportunity to more clearly define and communicate advising roles and responsibilities of faculty and staff to students. The program relies heavily on advising materials provided to students via the Flight Deck and learning management system. Students who met with the site visit team were aware of these resources but did not know that faculty were available to serve as advisors in any capacity. University leaders who met with the site visit team expressed a commitment to increasing the tenure density of the faculty complement, which would result in additional individuals available to provide academic advising, but the timeline for this change will be protracted with the earliest possible addition of one individual in fall 2025. | | |

Criterion Elements	Compliance Finding	Team's Evidence for Compliance Finding	School/Program Response	Council Comments
	Met			
Implements recruitment policies designed to locate qualified individuals capable of taking advantage of program of study & developing competence for public health careers		The program works with Risepoint to locate qualified and capable applicants.

The marketing efforts provided by Risepoint include targeted marketing, paid searches, emails, billboard advertisements, and field recruitment. The university's Risepoint-supported website includes an MPH program web page with program information. | Click here to enter text. | |
| Implements admissions policies designed to select & enroll qualified individuals capable of taking advantage of program of study & developing competence for public health careers | | Prospective students can apply anytime via the program webpage and start at the beginning of any term. When a prospective student expresses interest via the webpage, a Risepoint representative contacts them to answer any questions and encourage an application. These conversations are guided by a script provided by the program and Graduate Programs Office. If a question falls outside of the script, the student is referred to the program specialist.

Admission requirements include a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, a minimum 3.0 GPA threshold, and a professional resume. The program faculty set the admissions requirements and provide these to Risepoint and Graduate Programs Office staff.

If an applicant meets all admission requirements, the Graduate Programs Office officially accepts the student into the MPH program. If there are any concerns about an | | |

| | | offer of admission (i.e., the student's GPA is slightly below the threshold, but they possess public health work experience), the department chair reviews all materials and makes a final decision.

Students who met with site visitors said that the application process clearly outlined program requirements and that their experiences have aligned with this information. One student noted that the time commitment required by completing courses in six-week terms could be more clearly communicated.

Risepoint is held to quality control standards by the program and all telephone conversations with prospective students are recorded and maintained for six months. When a student alleges misleading or inaccurate information from Risepoint, the Graduate Program Office reviews the recording to determine the legitimacy of a complaint and make corrections or provide training as needed.

As noted in previous sections, the program has dramatically increased the number of student admissions in recent years. The program admitted 15 students in academic year 2021 and 255 students in academic year 2022. The self-study reports a current headcount of 621 students, though not all are actively enrolled in any given term. The faculty told site visitors that their measure of recruitment and admissions success is to sustain the recent increase in enrollment, which aligns with the university's mission to provide access to education for all students. | | |

		The program tracks the percentage of under-represented students accepting offers of admission as a quantitative measure of the success of recruitment. The selected indicator aligns with the program's mission to demonstrate a commitment to diversity and equity. The program aims to have 60% of offers of admission to diverse students accepted. In the last three years 46%, 48%, and 49% of under-represented applicants have accepted offers of admission. The program plans to work with Risepoint to better market to under-represented prospective students by sharing success stories and building student advocacy networks.		

Sunday, September 8, 2024

5:00 pm   **Site Visit Team Executive Session**

Monday, September 9, 2024

8:30 am   **Resources & Advising**

Participants	Topics on which participants are prepared to answer team questions
1. Lynn Anidi, PhD - Chair and Assistant Professor 2. Scott Eubanks - Director, Graduate Programs 3. Shavonda Devereaux, PhD - Lecturer 4. Nicholas Swope, MS, MCHES, RPCV - Lecturer 5. Ola Martin, PhD - Adjunct 6. Shayla Clark, MEd - Program Specialist 2 7. Sarah Strong, MEd - Operations Manager	*Faculty resources* **(Criterion C2)** *Staff and other personnel resources* **(Criterion C3)** *Academic advising* **(Criterion H1)** *Recruitment and admissions* **(Criterion H4)** *Student enrollment*

10:00 am   **Break**

10:30 am   **Program Evaluation**

Participants	Topics on which participants are prepared to answer team questions
1. Lynn Anidi, PhD - Chair and Assistant Professor 2. Shavonda Devereaux, PhD - Lecturer 3. Nicholas Swope, MS, MCHES, RPCV - Lecturer 4. Ola Martin, PhD - Adjunct 5. Shayla Clark, MEd - Program Specialist 2 6. Sarah Strong, MEd - Operations Manager 7. Scott Eubanks - Director, Graduate Programs	*Guiding statements – process of development and review?* **(Criterion B1)** *Evaluation processes – how does program collect and use input/data?* **(Criterion B2)** *Graduation rates* **(Criterion B3)** *Post-graduation outcomes* **(Criterion B4)**

12:00 pm   **Break & Lunch in Executive Session**

1:00 pm   Students via Zoom Meeting

Participants	Topics on which participants are prepared to answer team questions
1. Mike Badgley - started program Spring 2024 2. Saul Gonzalez – started program Winter 2022 3. Shellie Hansen - started program Fall 2023 4. Katherine Heston - started program Spring 2023 5. Senan Kiambati - started program Spring 2022 6. Florence Ojuri - started program Winter 2024 7. Elizabeth Payne - started program Winter 2023 8. Beth Miller - started program Winter 2022	*Faculty resources* **(Criterion C2)** *Staff and other personnel resources* **(Criterion C3)** *Academic advising* **(Criterion H1)** *Recruitment and admissions* **(Criterion H4)** *Graduation rates* **(Criterion B3)** *Post-graduation outcomes* **(Criterion B4)**

2:00 pm   Break

2:30 pm   University Leaders

Participants	Topics on which participants are prepared to answer team questions
1. Shari McMahan, PhD - President 2. Jonathan Anderson, PhD - Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs 3. David Bowman, PhD - Dean, College of Science, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics; Interim Dean, College of Health Science & Public Health (until 7/31/2024) 4. Dawn Lewis-Kinnunen, PhD - Dean, College of Health Science & Public Health (as of 8/1/2024) 5. Brian Donahue, PhD - Assistant Dean, College of Health Science & Public Health	*Provision of program-level resources* **(Criterion C)** *Student recruitment and admissions* **(Criterion H4)** *Student enrollment* *Program evaluation* **(Criterion B2)** *Graduation rates* **(Criterion B3)** *Post-graduation outcomes* **(Criterion B4)**

3:15 pm   Break

4:00 pm   Site Visit Team Executive Session

5:00 pm   Adjourn

Tuesday, September 10, 2024

9:00 am   Exit Briefing