

**AAHE/NCATE  
Compliance with Specialty Guidelines**

**Professional Organization:** American Association for Health Education (AAHE)

**Institution Submitting Program:** Southern Connecticut State University

**Program:** Health Education

**Date of Review:** July, 2003

**Degree Level(s):** Masters (Basic Certification)

**Guidelines/Competencies NOT Met:**

All basic competencies have been met.

**Perceived Program Strengths:**

The rejoinder builds on the strengths noted in the first review. The program, as described, should provide a good grounding for the future school health educator. The reviewers noted the following program strengths:

- Many opportunities for students to gain computer and Internet skills.
- Opportunities for students to develop skills needed to teach skills-based learning, as well as to acquire content knowledge.
- Use of current and relevant resources, standards, guidelines, indices, etc.
- Use of the competencies and appropriate models and theories of health behavior change in designing courses.
- Faculty has revised course outlines for consistency, clarifying objectives, activities intended to meet each objective, and course content. The folio contained syllabi for all required courses.

**Perceived Program Weaknesses:**

The reviewers have also noted the following program weaknesses:

- The Group Process in School Health course added cooperative learning, as recommended in the previous review. However, the examples and references cited do not reflect a good knowledge of the process. References from Johnson and Kagan, such as Circles of Learning, or a special issue of Educational Leadership, would reflect a better understanding.
- The conflict resolution experience in The Group Process course was weak. Attending a school board meeting and observing how it handled controversy may not provide

adequate insight into conflict resolution. Some structured opportunities in class for avoiding and addressing controversy would strengthen students' skills in this area.

- Some dates of references were incorrect (i.e. NHES were published in 1995). Course 560 lists the textbook with dates of 1999 and 2000. These errors make reviewers uncomfortable with the lack of attention to detail.
- Some courses appear to address too many competencies. Adequate assessment would be difficult. Some courses are not required (i.e. SHE 556 and 552), yet they address many competencies.

**Other Comments:**

Most of the weaknesses are in the execution of the rejoinder, not in the program itself. While the competencies have been addressed, the inconsistencies in the report remain.

- There is still inconsistency between the various overviews. The list of students' course studies does not include the same required courses as the Table B or the Matrix.
- For some courses, the student outcomes did not seem to correlate with the content.
- The folio had typos, which was disconcerting because most appeared in courses where the requirements for students' work included the following: "All work must be proofread for both typographical and grammatical accuracy. Work will be evaluated on both content and styles." Faculty should hold themselves to the same standards.

**Professional Association's Recommendation Regarding Compliance or Non-Compliance with the Specialty Guidelines (i.e. has the institution adequately met the specialty guidelines):**

Program(s) in Compliance: **Southern Connecticut State University--Master's (Basic)**

**Additional Information Needed to Determine Compliance:**

None.