Please attach a narrative (not to exceed 4 pages, excluding appendices) addressing the following:

- What are the student learning outcomes? Please provide a numbered list.
- Which learning outcomes were assessed?
- How were they assessed? (Programs must use at least one direct assessment of student learning.)
- Undergraduate programs should assess at least one University Undergraduate Learning Outcome (UULO) each year, which may or may not overlap with a program learning outcome.
- Graduate programs should assess at least one outcome related to one of the following graduate level requirements each year:
  - student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression and/or appropriate high-level professional practice.
  - activities requiring originality, critical analysis and expertise.
  - the development of extensive knowledge in the field under study.
- What was learned from the assessment results?
- How did the program respond to what was learned?

Please limit the narrative portion of your report to no more than four pages. You may attach appendices with data, tables, charts, or other materials as needed. Please explain the relevant conclusions from any appendices in your narrative. Please contact the Office of Academic Assessment if you have questions or need assistance.
### 1. Student Learning Objectives for the program

List the Student Learning Objectives for the program. All objectives must be assessed by the end of the 3rd year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objective</th>
<th>Plan year in which this LO will be assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Independently produce sound translational research by generating innovative research questions, developing appropriate study designs, implementing protocols, analyzing data, interpreting the results, and presenting outcomes in written form.</td>
<td>Year 4 (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Identify external funding sources that are relevant to the research focus area and generate an interdisciplinary grant proposal that is appropriate for that funding announcement.</td>
<td>Year 4 (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Disseminate translational research findings orally and critique the scientific literature in area of specialty with sufficient depth</td>
<td>Year 4 (2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Evaluative Tools used in this assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Instrument (e.g., survey, exit exam)</th>
<th>Learning outcome(s) assessed (list by #)</th>
<th>When and where will data be collected?</th>
<th>Expected Measures (results that would indicate success)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey to students and a unique survey to sub-plan coordinators.</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>PhD Sub-Plan Program Coordinator. Analyzed every year for graduates.</td>
<td>Adequate support or funding for dissertation studies so that 90% of students are completed in 1.5 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Use of Results

Plan for acting on your findings

Survey data, including responses about strengths and weaknesses of the program, will be compiled with other program evaluation data and analyzed in aggregate to determine if the curriculum and rigor are at a sufficient level. These findings will then be reported to the faculty in all of the sub-plans. These data will be used to change or modify program curriculum, policies, and/or procedures. These data will be presented to and reviewed by all School of Nursing (SON) PhD faculty, School of Allied Health Sciences (SAHS) PhD
4. Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>A Qualtrics survey with 4 questions was distributed to faculty teaching within the PhD in IHS. There were only 3 respondents, one each from the Kinesiology, Rehabilitation Sciences and Health Physics sub-plans. There was no response from the Nursing sub-plan. Faculty were asked to indicate how many students in their sub-plan were enrolled in 0 – 12, 13 – 24, 25 – 36, or 37 – 48 credits and how many had passed the comprehensive exam, how many had started their dissertation, and how many had defended their dissertation. <strong>Kinesiology</strong> reported 6 students in the 0 – 12 credit stage, 1 student passing the comprehensive exam, and 1 student starting dissertation (total 8 students). <strong>Rehabilitation Sciences</strong> reported 2 students in the 0 – 12 credit and 3 students in the 13 – 24 credit stages (total 5 students). <strong>Health Physics</strong> reported 1 student in the 13 – 24 credit and 1 student in the 25 -36 credit stages (total 2 students). <strong>Strengths</strong> of the program provided by respondents included: “flexibility in program of study”; “interdisciplinary nature”; “team science concepts”; “enrollment has been decent”; “room for growth”; “broad choices of courses”; “variety of faculty expertise”; and “opportunity to develop grant writing skills”. <strong>Suggestions for improvement</strong> of the program provided by respondents included: “lack of policies/procedures”; “update of handbook”; “increase number of students across all sub-plans”; “communication to the students”; “policies and procedures need more development”; “add dental medicine and SOM”; and “limit number of didactic courses in favor of research experience”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>A Qualtrics survey with 12 questions was distributed to students in the PhD in IHS. There were 12 respondents and only 1 of the 12 had taken (and passed) the comprehensive exam. Research presentations associated with their PhD work had been presented at the regional (3); and national (1) levels only, and none of these presentations were interdisciplinary in nature. Research associated with their PhD work had resulted in 1 paper in review and 2 papers published. Only 1 of the published papers was interdisciplinary in nature. Respondents reported applying for a total of 6 internal and 6 external grants. Only 2 of the internal grants had been awarded and none of the external grants were awarded. None of the internal grants were interdisciplinary in nature, whereas 3 of the external grant applications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were interdisciplinary in nature. Out of the 12 respondents, 5 were GA funded in the PhD program. In response to the question “How has your appreciation for interdisciplinary research changed?” respondents provided a mean score of 73.08 on a “0” = not much at all and “100” = a very great deal scale.

**Strengths** of the program provided by respondents are provided in Appendix 1. Some consistent themes from the responses indicate that students appreciate the interdisciplinary nature of the coursework, the broader experiences provided by faculty from an interdisciplinary perspective, and the flexibility of being able to take courses online. Students felt the program provides opportunity to “meet and work with those of other disciplines and to see how to bring it all together to help understanding and how to be successful”.

**Suggestions for improvement** of the program are provided in Appendix 2. Some consistent themes from the responses indicate that students were wanting better communication between representatives from all the involved departments, and also opportunities for students to communicate better amongst themselves. There were concerns raised about the differential tuition fees associated with DPT and NURS courses, and requests for more guidance to students as the progress through the coursework and program. Finally, there was concern that courses were not offered every year due to enrollment numbers, and this could hamper progress for students when courses they needed would not be offered until the following year.

---

### 5. Recommendations going forward Plan for acting on findings

From the feedback provided by faculty and students, the following steps are recommended:

1. Complete and update policies and procedures, then disseminate to faculty and students
2. Update program handbook and disseminate to faculty and students
3. Develop and implement a plan for enhanced communication with students in the program
4. Develop and implement a plan for enhanced communication between faculty from different departments of the program
5. Change course designators for the NURS and DPT courses to eliminate differential fees
6. Evaluate when different courses are offered to make sure they are available to students in a reasonable timeframe

### 6. Further recommendations going forward

1. This assessment report does not include metrics from the Nursing sub-plan as no one from that sub-plan completed the Qualtrics survey. We need to include their data in the future.
2. Recommend collecting and reporting on data of the quality of students entering the program (GPA, GRE, etc.)
Appendix 1:

Comments provided by students regarding **strengths of the program**:

- “Opportunity to network with faculty and students from other disciplines' 
- “More course options to focus on training required to meet specific research needs” 
- “Platform for acquiring broader perspectives of science advancement in general” 
- “Flexibility” 
- “Collaborative focus” 
- “Course diversity” 
- “Approachable interdisciplinary resources” 
- “Provides structured opportunities to work with faculty outside of home department” 
- “Provides opportunity to work with other PhD students not from home department” 
- “Having less credits necessary to fulfill the degree requirements” 
- “Classes offered in the evenings” 
- “Classes with all PhD students” 
- “Interdisciplinary” 
- “Focus on independent research” 
- “Preparation for collaboration & grant writing and expansion of possible research topics” 
- “The required coursework is a great introduction to interdisciplinary work” 
- “Inclusion of all SAHS departments in required classes” 
- “Learning is enhanced since professors are experts in their respective field/course being taught” 
- “Great flexible faculty (asking input for when classes should be held)” 
- “Great curriculum to prepare us to be independent researchers” 
- “Great opportunities for interdisciplinary research” 
- “Interdisciplinary approach is evident from professors” 
- “Wide variety of options for elective classes” 
- “Strong push for research” 
- “Great faculty, great vision and preparation for future researching (preparing us for what we will need to do on our own)” 
- “Very accommodating to professional schedules outside of school” 
- “It has been very rewarding to be able to meet and work with those of other disciplines and to see how to bring it all together to help understanding and how to be successful”
Appendix 2:

Comments provided by students regarding **suggestions for improvement of the program**:

- “Briefings by representatives from all the involved departments during the orientation period will help IHS students gain a better overview of the program”
- “Availability of an office of administrators to assist students in resolving academic and research issues across departments”
- “The use of RSS feeds or newsletters will keep IHS students better informed about the talks and events that are available in various departments”
- “More specialized programs that are more skill/technical based rather than theoretical/academic”
- “Reduce seminar requirements”
- “Greater access to undergraduate/graduate courses outside of our specialty (differential tuition waivers for students who want this option)”
- “Have a clear schedule about when the courses are going to offered”
- “Ensure that students are aware of when courses will be offered well in advance”
- “Differential tuition needs to be waived or reimbursed (unless we're being awarded a DPT degree, as well)”
- “The cross over between disciplines creates challenges of teaching and instruction style...having some sort of standard would be beneficial for optimal learning”
- “Improve inconsistencies in when DPT and HSC classes are offered/not offered”
- “It would be helpful for coordinators to meet with all students in their discipline/track once a year or semester”
- “Clarification on the degree plan and comprehensive exams”
- “Less coursework with more focus on independent research”
- “Since there is such a focus on team science, there could be a way, beyond completing coursework, for students to earn credit for participating in collaborations”
- “Required coursework should be offered more often during the semester (HSC 704 & 705)”
- “More guidance on academic milestones needing to be satisfied and further information on qualifying exam prep (handbook like some other departments)”
- “Offer all the classes every year when you get more students”
- “Some way to communicate between graduate students (common site or forum)”
- “Some professors could work on getting even basic feedback on assignments returned a little more quickly to students”
- “More direction for incoming students”
- “More understanding of what is expected from classes so students can know when to take specific classes in their matriculation”
- “Scheduled meetings/consults with adviser to review progress/plan”
- “Offer classes every year when you have enough students to take them”
- “Better communication between disciplines”
- “We need some way for all the grad students to communicate, like a centralized website or something”
- “I would say get rid of differential tuition but I hear that is happening”
- “The online courses have been very helpful and have forced some to really expand on utilizing technology”
- “I would encourage a continuation of the online course work as well as in person”