

2021 Undergraduate Certification Final Review Report

Response ID:16 Data

2. Program and Review Team Information

1. Program Under Review

Weber State University

2. Review Team

Chair : George R Audi

Chair email address : george.audi@famu.edu

Reviewer : Cassie Henson

Reviewer : MaryMargaret Sharp-Pucci

Observer(s) : Chris Nesser/Don Zimmerman

3. Preface

4. Overall Eligibility

A. Programs in the United States must be located in a college or university accredited by a regional agency recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Programs outside of the United States and its territories must be located in a college or university that is accredited by the appropriate accrediting body for that country.

The program has met this requirement.

B. The program must be officially approved by the governing body of its college/university and be listed in the college catalog as a course of study leading to a baccalaureate degree.

The program has met this requirement.

C. The program must have graduated its first cohort of students prior to the self-study year.

The program has met this requirement.

D. Programs with 150 or fewer students enrolled (inclusion of both full-time and part-time) must have a minimum of two full-time terminally-degreed faculty members whose primary appointments are in the health services management program and who hold academic rank (at the level of assistant, associate, or full professor). Programs with more than 150 students enrolled must have an additional faculty member meeting the above criteria for every 100 additional students over 150.

The program has met this requirement.

E. All students enrolled in the program must receive not less than 25% of the instruction within the program from full-time university faculty.

The program has met this requirement.

F. The program must require each student to complete a faculty-supervised internship of not less than 120 hours, or an alternative applied learning experience that is equivalent to the 120 hours of faculty-supervised internship, in any field across health and social services.

The program has met this requirement.

G. The program may not unlawfully discriminate based upon race, ethnic origin, creed, gender or disability in any of its activities and must be in full compliance with relevant laws as well as university policies regarding affirmative action and

equal opportunity. Institutions with religious affiliations may adopt policies related to such affiliations provided adequate notice of such policies is given to all applicants, students, faculty, and employees.

The program has met this requirement.

Eligibility Conclusion

Fully meets

Eligibility Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Eligibility Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Eligibility consultative recommendations(s)

5. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

Program met these minimum requirements with some areas of concern.

Strengths

The faculty appeared to be very earnest with their involvement and have the focus of students as a high priority.

Criterion 1 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 1 Criterion Related Recommendations(s)

Criterion 1 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 1 Consultative Recommendations(s)

The review team highly recommends that faculty be given financial support time for research and the ability to attend professional meetings.

6. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

The program has met this requirement.

Strengths

The goals and objectives are well stated.

Criterion 2 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 2 Criterion Related Recommendations(s)

Criterion 2 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 2 Consultative Recommendations(s)

The review committee recommends a yearly review of goals and objectives to ensure that the needs of community and industry stakeholders are met.

One area that the review committee strongly recommends is that there is a documented increase in inter-professional research and educational activities within the school.

Please refer to comments on criteria 27 for more details.

7. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

This requirement was **fully met**.

Strengths

The faculty are very dedicated to student success.

Criterion 3 Conclusion

Fully met

Criterion 3 Criterion Related Recommendations(s)

Criterion 3 Consultative Recommendation

The review committee recommends an increase in relief time for faculty to conduct research, increase teaching effectiveness and also a decrease in the amount of required student advising that is required. It is the team's opinion that much of the advising should be conducted by trained advisors.

Criterion 3 Consultative Recommendations(s)

8. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

This standard was met.

Strengths

The faculty indicated their desire to increase professional development in the near future and have a path to do so.

Criterion 4 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 4 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 4 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 4 Consultative Recommendations

The team highly recommends that the director and all faculty increase their involvement in industry specific professional

activities.

9. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

The criteria's requirements are met.

Strengths

While the teaching loads are high, faculty were able to demonstrate that they are able to provide a high quality of instruction to students.

Criterion 5 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 5 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 5 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 5 Consultative Recommendation(s)

The team highly recommends that professional development increases through national professional programs and that there is an increase in requirement of future faculty from a more diverse geographic standpoint.

10. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

The program has met this requirement.

Strengths

The review team is very impressed, but still somewhat worried about the faculty members teaching and advising loads.

Criterion 6 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 6 Criterion related recommendation(s)

Criterion 6 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 6 Consultative Recommendation(s)

The review team strongly recommends that faculty not be given large advising loads, compared to industry standards.

11. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

Department is meeting their requirements.

Strengths

Department is meeting their requirements.

Criterion 7 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 7 Criterion Related Recommendations(s)

Criterion 7 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 7 Consultative Recommendation(s)

The team recommends that the faculty be given access to relief time to increase their ability to conduct research. As mentioned in prior criteria, an increase in inter-professional research with other departments within the school.

The team also recommends that the teaching loads for faculty be reduced to help facilitate research and professional involvement.

12. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

The team recommends that this criteria has been met.

Strengths

Adjuncts are in-field professionals that provide current information on the industry to students.

Criterion 8 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 8 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 8 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 8 Consultative Recommendation(s)

13. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

Based on the submitted top-line budget, it appears that there is adequate funding.

Strengths

The department indicated that they are adequately funded.

Criterion 9 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 9 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 9 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 9 Consultative Recommendation(s)

14. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

This criteria was fully met.

Strengths

This criteria was fully met.

Criterion 10 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 10 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 10 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 10 Consultative Recommendation(s)

15. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, FACULTY, AND RESOURCES

Discussion

The department has met this requirement and has met the requirements for students instruction.

Strengths

The department has met the standards for this criteria.

Criterion 11 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 11 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 11 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 11 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

16. Student Support Systems

Discussion

The program has an established admission criteria and process with four primary entry points. Because of these defined entry points, the major is accessible to a wide reach of prospective students.

Strengths

The program requires a minimum GPA of 2.75 and completion of general education and pre-requisite courses prior to entry

into the major. These requirements help ensure accepted students have high potential for success in the major.

Criterion 12 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 12 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 12 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 12 Consultative Recommendation(s)

17. Student Support Systems

Discussion

Advising and career planning supports and resources are in place to promote student success. The program integrates both advising and career planning functions into the overall program.

Strengths

None noted

Criterion 13 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 13 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 13 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 13 Consultative Recommendation(s)

18. Student Support Systems

Discussion

Students have significant opportunity to participate in peer networks and professional health management organizations. They may gain management skills through student-run FHLA organization and build a professional network through events like the golf tournament. In total, students have opportunity to develop professional skills, network and engage with the health care community in these out-of-classroom experiences.

Strengths

None noted

Criterion 14 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 14 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 14 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 14 Consultative Recommendation(s)

19. Student Support Systems

Discussion

The program has an established process by which a student may address concerns and/or complaints. The process follows the Weber State University guidelines.

Strengths

None noted

Criterion 15 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 15 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 15 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 15 Consultative Recommendation(s)

It is advised the program break out the processes by which students register academic versus non-academic (e.g. Title IX) grievances. It is recommended language be provided the student describing the process, differentiating between grievances, and include website linkages. This discussion may be provided the student in a handbook and/or the program website.

20. Professional and Alumni Linkages

Discussion

The program recognizes the importance of strong linkages and ties with professionals in the health care field. The program benefits from an Advisory Board with a defined role, including an active role in curriculum and interaction with students. The Advisory Board is populated with a good mix of community professionals and alumni. It serves as an important network for the program as a whole and the internship in particular.

Strengths

None noted

Criterion 16 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 16 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 16 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 16 Consultative Recommendation(s)

21. Professional and Alumni Linkages

Discussion

The program's integration into community and professional organizations provides substantial networking, internship, and job opportunities for the student population.

Strengths

Faculty are involved in a diverse range of professional associations. Students gain broad exposure to a wide variety of specializations and viewpoints as a result.

The program leverages community connections in multiple productive ways (e.g., guest lectures, research projects, post-graduate employment).

Criterion 17 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 17 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 17 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 17 Consultative Recommendation(s)

22. Professional and Alumni Linkages

Discussion

Alumni relations seem to be a strength of the program. They are doing a commendable job maintaining and leveraging alumni connections.

Strengths

The program offers a wide variety of invitational events to attract alumni back to campus. Events have the added benefit of building strong interactions between alumni, community professionals, faculty and current students.

Alumni represent a significant percentage of internship preceptors (42%), keeping alumni connected to the program and students engaged by working with alumni.

Criterion 18 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 18 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 18 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 18 Consultative Recommendation

23. Curriculum and Teaching

Discussion

The department has met this requirement.

Strengths

None at this time.

Criterion 19 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 19 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 19 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 19 Consultative Recommendation(s)

24. Curriculum and Teaching

Discussion

The department has met this requirement with some recommendations.

Strengths

The department has met the requirements at this time, with minor changes.

Criterion 20 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 20 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 20 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 20 Consultative Recommendation(s)

The team does recommend that there is better documentation of meetings as related to curriculum and competency changes in the future.

25. Curriculum and Teaching

Discussion

This criteria has been met.

Strengths

The department has met the requirements at this time.

Criterion 21 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 21 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 21 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 21 Consultative Recommendation(s)

26. Curriculum and Teaching

Discussion

The department has met this requirement.

Strengths

The department has met the requirements at this time.

Criterion 22 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 22 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 22 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 22 Consultative Recommendation(s)

27. Experiential and Applied Learning

Discussion

This requirement has been met.

Strengths

The department has met the requirements at this time.

Criterion 23 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 23 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 23 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 23 Consultative Recommendation(s)

SLOs for students need to be better outlined.

The department should start to advocate for students to increase paid internships.

28. Experiential and Applied Learning

Discussion

This criteria was met.

Strengths

The department has met the requirements at this time.

Criterion 24 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 24 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 24 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 24 Consultative Recommendation(s)

29. Experiential and Applied Learning

Discussion

The department meets this requirement, but with some reservations.

Strengths

The department has met the requirements at this time.

Criterion 25 Conclusion

Fully meets

Criterion 25 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

Criterion 25 Consultative Recommendation

Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 25 Consultative Recommendation(s)

Better course mapping and integration of different skill sets would greatly strengthen the student experience.

30. Program Evaluation and Improvement

Discussion

The program demonstrated they have an annual assessment process of student learning outcomes in place, but they did not provide the full assessment results for the self-study year. The program's process is to evaluate student competency outcomes of half the program's courses each year and to report those outcomes in the Evidence of Learning and Student Outcomes Reports; however, reports were only provided for 7 of the 11 courses due in the self-study year and the rest were not available upon request. While it was stated that faculty review their course outcomes after each course and those outcomes are discussed in the faculty meetings, there was no evidence provided to that effect. It is not clear who is specifically responsible for tracking student competency outcomes across the program.

Strengths

The department has met the requirements at this time.

Criterion 26 Conclusion

Partially meets

Criterion 26 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

The current method of measuring student competency achievement does not permit the program to track each student's competency achievement throughout the program, especially when only half of the courses report their learning outcomes each year. One approach would be to have faculty report each students' competency attainment level for each course, each year and to maintain a program-level tracking record per student (using Excel files is an efficient way to do this). One benefit is

that the student-level data on each competency could be aggregated to see how well the program is achieving learning outcomes by competency. This can then drive change across the program and not just within one course.

Criterion 26 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 26 Consultative Recommendation(s)

31. Program Evaluation and Improvement

Discussion

The program has clearly stated goals, objectives, and some measures for those objectives as presented in response to Criterion 2b; however, they were not able to provide the results from assessing their progress towards those specific program goals/objectives. While the department strategic planning document was provided, the information in it did not align with the stated program goals/objectives and this report also did not provide results towards progress on each of their strategic initiatives identified. No other documentation of data collected was provided that would demonstrate the tracking of program effectiveness takes place.

Strengths

The program has clearly stated goals, objectives, and some measures for those objectives.

Criterion 27 Conclusion

Does not meet

Criterion 27 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

This criterion would needs future exploration prior to next re-certification.

Criterion 27 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 27 Consultative Recommendation(s)

32. Program Evaluation and Improvement

Discussion

The program did describe a few program changes (i.e., related to long-term care degree, HAS 4225, and HAS 4225), but they were unable to demonstrate how data gathered from student learning outcomes and assessment of program goals and objectives (which were missing) were used to drive programmatic revisions and improvements.

Strengths

The program did describe a few program changes (i.e., related to long-term care degree, HAS 4225, and HAS 4225) and appears to be diligent in updated aspects of assessment.

Criterion 28 Conclusion

Does not meet

Criterion 28 Criterion Related Recommendation(s)

The program has clearly stated goals, objectives, and some measures for those objectives as presented in response to Criterion 2b; however, they were not able to provide the results from assessing their progress towards those specific program

goals/objectives. While the department strategic planning document was provided, the information in it did not align with the stated program goals/objectives and this report also did not provide results towards progress on each of their strategic initiatives identified. No other documentation of data collected was provided that would demonstrate the tracking of program effectiveness takes place.

Criterion 28 Consultative Recommendation

No Consultative Recommendation

Criterion 28 Consultative Recommendation

33. SUMMARY OF SELF-STUDY REVIEW

Overall Assessment of Program

On behalf of your 2021 AUPHA review team, we would like to thank you for your hard work as it was evident through your packet that your department has a strong program with a number of valuable resources and provides value to its student body, community and healthcare industry. Overall, the review team was satisfied with your Healthcare Management Department, there are a number of areas that we are strongly suggesting are addressed prior to your next review. These areas of concern can be broken into two sections, moderate and high concern and include;

Strengths/Best Practices of Note

Again, it is important to note that your program is without question a strong program, these recommendations are designed to assist your program advance and become stronger during your next review.

Specific Concerns

Areas of moderate concern

- Resources for faculty to increase their research output
- Need for inter-professional research throughout your college is strongly encouraged
- Resources to assist faculty in presenting research at national and regional conferences
- Staff or other related resources to assist faculty with their advising requirements
- Increase diversity within advisory board and stakeholders
- The overall presentation of the packet was difficult to follow at times

Areas that were of high concern

- Lack of transparency between courses and competency requirements
 - Insufficient tracking of student progression
 - Proper documentation of meetings and advancements in curriculum
-

34. Recommendations

Criterion Related Recommendations

Eligibility

Criterion 1

Criterion 2

Criterion 3

The review committee strongly recommends an increase in relief time for faculty to conduct research, increase teaching effectiveness and also a decrease in the amount of required student advising that is required. It is the team's opinion that much of the advising should be conducted by trained advisors.

Criterion 4

Criterion 5

Criterion 6

Criterion 7

Criterion 8

Criterion 9

Criterion 10

Criterion 11

Criterion 12

Criterion 13

Criterion 14

Criterion 15

Criterion 16

Criterion 17

Criterion 18

Criterion 19

Criterion 20

Criterion 21

Criterion 22

Criterion 23

Criterion 24

Criterion 25

Criterion 26

The current method of measuring student competency achievement does not permit the program to track each student's competency achievement throughout the program, especially when only half of the courses report their learning outcomes each year. One approach would be to have faculty report each students' competency attainment level for each course, each year and to maintain a program-level tracking record per student (using Excel files is an efficient way to do this). One benefit is that the student-level data on each competency could be aggregated to see how well the program is achieving learning outcomes by competency. This can then drive change across the program and not just within one course.

Criterion 27

This criterion would needs future exploration prior to next re-certification.

Criterion 28

The program has clearly stated goals, objectives, and some measures for those objectives as presented in response to Criterion 2b; however, they were not able to provide the results from assessing their progress towards those specific program goals/objectives. While the department strategic planning document was provided, the information in it did not align with the stated program goals/objectives and this report also did not provide results towards progress on each of their strategic initiatives identified. No other documentation of data collected was provided that would demonstrate the tracking of program effectiveness takes place.

Consultative Recommendations

Eligibility

Criterion 1

The review team highly recommends that faculty be given financial support time for research and the ability to attend professional meetings.

Criterion 2

The review committee recommends a yearly review of goals and objectives to ensure that the needs of community and industry stakeholders are met.

One area that the review committee strongly recommends is that there is a documented increase in inter-professional research and educational activities within the school.

Please refer to comments on criteria 27 for more details.

Criterion 3

Criterion 4

The team highly recommends that the director and all faculty increase their involvement in industry specific professional activities.

Criterion 5

The team highly recommends that professional development increases through national professional programs and that there is an increase in requirement of future faculty from a more diverse geographic standpoint.

Criterion 6

The review team strongly recommends that faculty not be given large advising loads, compared to industry standards.

Criterion 7

The team recommends that the faculty be given access to relief time to increase their ability to conduct research. As mentioned in prior criteria, an increase in inter-professional research with other departments within the school.

The team also recommends that the teaching loads for faculty be reduced to help facilitate research and professional involvement.

Criterion 8

Criterion 9

Criterion 10

Criterion 11

Criterion 12

Criterion 13

Criterion 14

Criterion 15

It is advised the program break out the processes by which students register academic versus non-academic (e.g. Title IX) grievances. It is recommended language be provided the student describing the process, differentiating between grievances, and include website linkages. This discussion may be provided the student in a handbook and/or the program website.

Criterion 16

Criterion 17

Criterion 18

Criterion 19

Criterion 20

The team does recommend that there is better documentation of meetings as related to curriculum and competency changes in the future.

Criterion 21

Criterion 22

Criterion 23

SLOs for students need to be better outlined.

The department should start to advocate for students to increase paid internships.

Criterion 24

Criterion 25

Better course mapping and integration of different skill sets would greatly strengthen the student experience.

Criterion 26

Criterion 27

Criterion 28

35. Review Team Recommendations to AUPHA Board and Progress Report Schedule

Certification Recommendation:

Recommend Certification

Term of Certification

Six-year certification—program is in substantial compliance

Comments

Progress Report Requirement

Progress Report due by January 5th of the following year. Please see the Progress Report Requirements below.

36. Progress Report Requirements

Eligibility

Criterion 1

Criterion 2

Criterion 3

Criterion 4

Criterion 5

Criterion 6

Criterion 7

Criterion 8

Criterion 9

Criterion 10

Criterion 11

Criterion 12

Criterion 13

Criterion 14

Criterion 15

Criterion 16

Criterion 17

Criterion 18

Criterion 19

Criterion 20

Criterion 21

Criterion 22

Criterion 23

Criterion 24

Criterion 25

Criterion 26

The current method of measuring student competency achievement does not permit the program to track each student's competency achievement throughout the program, especially when only half of the courses report their learning outcomes each year. One approach would be to have faculty report each students' competency attainment level for each course, each year and to maintain a program-level tracking record per student (using Excel files is an efficient way to do this). One benefit is that the student-level data on each competency could be aggregated to see how well the program is achieving learning outcomes by competency. This can then drive change across the program and not just within one course.

Criterion 27

This criterion would needs future exploration prior to next re-certification.

Criterion 28

The program has clearly stated goals, objectives, and some measures for those objectives as presented in response to Criterion 2b; however, they were not able to provide the results from assessing their progress towards those specific program goals/objectives. While the department strategic planning document was provided, the information in it did not align with the stated program goals/objectives and this report also did not provide results towards progress on each of their

strategic initiatives identified. No other documentation of data collected was provided that would demonstrate the tracking of program effectiveness takes place.

37. Thank You!

Confirmation Email

Aug 26, 2021 22:31:52 Success: Email Sent to: mryan@aupha.org

Confirmation Email

Aug 26, 2021 22:31:52 Success: Email Sent to: george.audi@famuedu