



Master of Health Administration and Policy (MHAP) Program

Administrative Residency Handbook

2019 – 2020

Health Services Administration Division

Department of Preventive Medicine and Biostatistics

The F. Edward Hébert School of Medicine

Uniformed Services University

[THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

CONTENTS

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------|----|
| About this Handbook | 1 |
| Program of Study and General Requirements | 2 |
| Accreditation | 3 |
| Overview of the Residency Year | 4 |
| MHAP Administrative Residency | 4 |
| MHAP Graduate Management Project..... | 4 |
| Administrative Residency Process | 5 |
| Minimum Requirements | 5 |
| Phase 1: Student Preparation..... | 5 |
| Phase 2: Residency Planning and Selection | 6 |
| Roles and Responsibilities..... | 9 |
| Preceptor..... | 9 |
| Administrative Resident (Student) | 9 |
| Residency Director | 10 |
| Faculty Project Advisor | 10 |
| Graduate Management Project | 11 |
| Choosing a GMP | 11 |
| Getting Started on a GMP | 11 |
| Graduate Management Project Proposal..... | 12 |
| GMP Grading | 13 |
| GMP Courses of Action..... | 14 |
| Institutional Assurance..... | 17 |
| Barbour / Mittelman Award | 19 |
| Scoring Criteria | 19 |
| Final Remarks..... | 20 |
| Appendix | 21 |
| A - Administrative Residency Proposal Form | 22 |
| B - Mid-Residency Preceptor Evaluation | 23 |
| C - Final Preceptor Evaluation | 24 |
| D – Resident Site Evaluation..... | 26 |
| E – GMP Proposal Form..... | 27 |
| F – Rubric for GMP Oral Presentation | 28 |
| G – Rubric for Written GMP | 29 |
| H – GMP Guidelines..... | 31 |
| I – General Timeline | 35 |

ABOUT THIS HANDBOOK

This handbook provides complete program information on the residency requirements and Graduate Management Project (GMP) for the Masters of Health Administration and Policy (MHAP) degree in the Department of Preventive Medicine and Biostatistics (PMB) at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USU), Bethesda, Maryland. While primarily structured to provide important project and residency information for students and faculty, it is also a useful reference for residency preceptors and program support staff. This information will enable Faculty Project Advisors to guide students through the process of developing and successfully completing a value-added, competency-building residency experience as well as a professionally relevant GMP. If there are any areas that require clarification, please contact the Residency Director of the Masters of Health Administration and Policy, (hereafter referred to as the MHAP Residency Director), LCDR Austin Haag at austin.haag@usuhs.edu.

PROGRAM OF STUDY AND GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Located at the Uniformed Services University, the Master of Health Administration and Policy (MHAP) (MHAP) is a two-year graduate degree program for the uniformed services, federal health policy partners, and allied host nation personnel.

The MHAP consists of both a didactic and residency phase. During the first year, students will engage in an in-depth approach to the study of health care management, health policy, public health, applied science, and leadership. The second year of the program consists of an Administrative Residency, typically in the National Capital Area, and a related Graduate Management Project (GMP).

The MHAP program Core Competencies (as shown below) include Policy, Transformation, Readiness, Execution and Leadership. The MHAP seeks to develop leaders in health who are proficient in these competencies as they pertain to health policy, management and leadership. The residency year is an opportunity for students to apply the competencies gained throughout the curriculum.

There are two separate requirements for the MHAP degree, the administrative residency requirement and the Graduate Management Project. Both requirements are described in detail in this manual.

The two requirements are interconnected. The culmination of these two components is referred to in this manual at the “residency year.” The residency year is a vehicle for professional degree students to solidify and apply the MHAP competencies through practical experience and engagement with practitioners. The requirements incorporated into the residency year are a vital component to the success of USU MHAP graduates.



ACCREDITATION

The Commission on Accreditation for Healthcare Management Education (CAHME), the national accrediting organization for schools and programs of health administration, requires academic programs to ensure that graduates who complete the program are well-prepared to pursue careers consistent with program goals and recognized competencies. Students' career preparedness must be monitored, documented and used in program evaluation as well as a basis for continuous improvement. Further, CAHME requires the program to provide experiences at appropriate points in the curriculum for students to interact with practitioners across the broad range of health professions.

Likewise, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), the national accrediting organization for schools and programs of public policy and administration, advocates experiential learning to be an indispensable element of public affairs/public administration programs. NASPAA considers public service internships (residencies) to be an integral part of the student's professional education. In NASPAA's view,

"The public service internship provides the student with a work experience to give him/her a realistic exposure to an organizational-bureaucratic environment. This experience should develop the student's awareness of the internal dynamics of an organization and of the value and attitudes of public employees to both their clientele and their administrative-political superiors. The internship should give the student the opportunity to become aware of his/her obligations as a professional and to the public. The internship may be one of the few opportunities the student has to test the skills and attitudes development discussed in his/her academic program."

Both CAHME and NASPAA also recommend that, as part of the residency experience, students should be required to prepare an academic paper. CAHME refers to this as a "culminating experience." This culminating experience may take a number of forms. For example, a comprehensive examination or a master's thesis may be submitted. In the MHAP program, students are required to conceive, develop, and carry out a Graduate Management Project (GMP) that demonstrates the ability to synthesize, integrate, and apply the knowledge and skills acquired throughout the coursework in the core program disciplines, i.e., business statistics, policy evaluation, and leadership. Most students will draw on previous professional training and interests to identify a project with health administration and policy relevance that is aligned with their personal and professional goals.

Thus, the successful completion of both the residency and the GMP is a graduation requirement for all students in the MHAP program. The purpose of the residency is to enhance the didactic portion of the MHAP program by providing students with opportunities to develop practical skills and competencies in health administration, policy, and leadership. The GMP constitutes a capstone experience for the MHAP year and demonstrates the student's ability to synthesize and integrate the new knowledge gained throughout the program of study. In some instances, this effort results in a scientific manuscript for publication or other scholarly endeavor. Students should anticipate completing the planning phase during the Fall Quarter, including a preliminary literature search and formulation of a project outline.

OVERVIEW OF THE RESIDENCY YEAR

MHAP ADMINISTRATIVE RESIDENCY

During the second year of the MHAP, students will participate in an approved Administrative Residency designed to develop practical experience in health administration, policy, and leadership. Preceptors, along with the Residency Director of the MHAP, will team to provide a customized residency experience that will meet not only the requirements for graduation, but also the professional development needs of the individual resident. Residency rotations are 12 months in duration.

The objectives of the MHAP Administrative Residency program are to enable students to:

- Develop the leadership and management skills necessary to lead healthcare systems in an ever- changing environment.
- Develop policy analysis skills and comprehensive expertise to influence the strategic policy decisions facing federal healthcare. Obtain (synthesize and apply) practical information and knowledge about health systems leadership and policy.
- Produce a Graduate Management Project that makes a measurable contribution to the effective delivery of health services.
- Build lasting professional relationships.

MHAP GRADUATE MANAGEMENT PROJECT

As part of the residency year, students are also required to complete a Graduate Management Project. The MHAP GMP demonstrates a student's ability to synthesize and integrate the fundamental concepts and principles of health administration, policy, and leadership. The GMP should be directly linked to the experiences derived from the administrative residency. The GMP is an opportunity for the student to draw on the core disciplines and competencies taught throughout the didactic year. Students will utilize the MHAP foundation to assess health administration and policy problems, create sound, practical alternatives, and evaluate the effectiveness of programs and policies.

Subject matter for the GMP may encompass, but is not limited to: global health policy and humanitarian assistance; health finance/economics, health policy; health systems support and delivery; organization and leadership; or population health. Throughout the student's preparation of this project, the faculty and Preceptor will place a special emphasis on applied, publishable research.

The final products of the GMP will include an oral presentation and a written paper. The presentation will be held with the resident's Preceptor and senior staff, along with invited MHAP faculty. The student will give a 15-minute formal podium presentation followed by a 30-minute question and answer period. The final written report will be a minimum of 25 pages in length and include the following sections: an executive summary or abstract, background and significance, methods and procedures, results, discussion, implications, recommendations, conclusions, and references.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESIDENCY PROCESS

Note: For the purpose of instruction, this manual breaks down the residency year into individual phases. All phases of the residency year must be completed in accordance with this manual to receive credit for graduation.

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

All MHAP students must complete a 12-month residency, defined as a planned, supervised, and evaluated activity at an organization, generally outside USU, with a health administration and policy focus. No waivers will be granted to this requirement.

Funding is generally not available for students wishing to travel to distant sites for their residency experience. However, if the residency site meets certain governmental guidelines, a residency outside of the National Capital Area may be possible.

PHASE 1: STUDENT PREPARATION

Due to the unique nature of the MHAP program at USU, the student body is largely comprised of individuals with considerable previous military and civilian health-related experience. Most students have a professional degree and come to this program with proven ability to succeed as adult learners. We expect that students will learn a great deal from interactions with each other, as well as with the faculty. Because the MHAP Program at USU is rigorous, our goal is to make the process of meeting the residency year requirements time-efficient, productive, professionally relevant, and personally rewarding for all participants.

All students are encouraged to think about potential residency sites, GMP topics, and general areas of interest early in the didactic year. The Residency Director and MHAP faculty members are always available to discuss and provide overall guidance to students. The use of local area residency sites is typically required and has distinct advantages: one is the relative ease of integrating the residency requirement into an already demanding academic schedule, the other is the wealth of local, regional, and national organizations (military and civilian) in the National Capitol region.

It is important to note that the objective of the residency requirement is to provide an opportunity for students to directly apply knowledge and skills acquired in the classroom. The residency is a chance to expand capabilities, see issues from varying perspectives, add to expertise, and widen professional networks. In the process, students learn first-hand about the organizational framework, day-to-day operations, and special activities of selected agencies, institutions, and industries with a health administration and policy mission. Students may gain insight into program management, resource allocation, regulatory compliance, public relations, legislative agendas, and/or special investigations.

It is well established that a graduate level instructional program is enhanced by the addition of interactive, participatory, or experiential learning activities to the more traditional, didactic lecture format in the classroom. The MHAP residency experience serves that purpose by providing experiential learning activities. The residency is more than shadowing practitioners as they go about their daily activities, but rather it should encompass a broad range of experiences. Depending on the residency site, Administrative residents may have the opportunity to participate in: multi-disciplinary, international, interagency collaboration for research or policy purposes; briefings

to military commanders, civilian counterparts, Presidential Commissions, or Congressional hearings; business and policy guideline development; planning for medical support of operational missions in concert with international partners; or disaster preparedness and response planning, among others.

PHASE 2: RESIDENCY PLANNING AND SELECTION

In order to place students in appropriate residency sites, each student is responsible for meeting with the Residency Director to discuss organizational preferences, learning objectives, career interests, and other pertinent information. With assistance from the MHAP Residency Director, Faculty Project Advisor, and MHAP Program Director, every attempt will be made to accommodate each student's interests and capabilities, taking into account the background of each student and the type of residency that would be most beneficial to the student's professional development and service/agency needs.

Typically, the MHAP program does not have pre-established residencies at off-site locations. However, administrative residency opportunities are arranged in cooperation with a vast array of government, non-profit, and private healthcare agencies and organizations. Students' background and interests vary widely within the MHAP, so students should pursue residency opportunities in agencies where they have the most interest. Therefore, each student must develop and arrange a residency activity that will meet his or her individual needs and interests. It is the student's responsibility to identify and select a residency activity and a site Preceptor in consultation with his/her Faculty Project Advisor, the MHAP Program Director, and the Residency Director.

To facilitate this process, the MHAP Program has established relationships with various organizations that meet the requirements for residencies. These facilities are interested in working with MHAP graduate students, but it is up to the student to work with the Residency Director to identify potential sites. Any MHAP faculty member is also a potential source of information for a residency site. Faculty members may be able to provide ideas and/or a point of contact for a residency experience related to their area of research or past experience. Once identified, students will meet with their potential Preceptor to decide whether there is a good match in terms of schedules, types of projects, residency activities available, mutually agreed-upon time commitments, and expectations for respective roles and responsibilities.

Once a student has been matched with a residency and a Preceptor, it is time to proceed with planning a residency experience. Students begin by providing the Preceptor with general program information and resume, and by requesting current curriculum vitae from the Preceptor for the MHAP files. It's important that the student discuss preliminary arrangements with the MHAP Residency Director and Program Director well in advance of the Residency Year. Residency site Preceptors must agree to directly supervise student activities and evaluate their performance. Students and their site Preceptors jointly develop learning objectives for the residency experience.

A formal inter-institutional relationship through a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between USU and a residency site is required. The MHAP Residency Director will work with the student and Preceptor to ensure compliance with USU and the residency site requirements. Depending on the Preceptor, the residency site, and levels of interest in a particular placement, students may compete for placement using a combination of interviews and reviews of the resident's background and career needs. The final placement decision rests with the MHAP Program Director.

POTENTIAL RESIDENCY SITES

Residency sites are selected to offer our residents the opportunity for hands-on involvement in challenging administrative and policy-based issues. Residency sites are selected based on the expectation that the host site management is willing and able to commit the time and resources that our students deserve. Preceptor and organizational support and involvement are key to the student's success.

Residencies may be of the more traditional nature, exploring the operations of health care systems or they may be more policy-focused. The best residency option combines the best of both worlds. Residency opportunities may include service health care lead organizations, government agencies, think-tanks, private, public, or non-profit hospitals, medical group practice management organizations, consulting firms, information systems organizations, managed care organizations, or industry interest groups.

Residency assignments typically begin in July. Residents are encouraged throughout the year to take advantage of the numerous seminars, group discussions, and conferences on contemporary federal health administration policy issues and leadership development. Many of these events occur on the USU campus. Others are free and available at various think-tanks and institutes in the Washington DC area. On a regular basis, the cohort will attend sessions at various government agencies, policy-making bodies, treatment facilities, and think tanks. Additionally, residents will be required to participate in seminars with first year MHAP students at various times throughout the year.

Students are strongly encouraged to recommend sites in which they may be interested. Potential residency sites may include:

- Defense Health Agency
- Department of Health and Human Services
- US Public Health Service
- RAND
- Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
- Walter Reed National Military Medical Center
- Air Force Medical Support Agency
- Food and Drug Administration
- Department of Veterans Affairs
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
- Institute of Medicine
- Service Surgeons General Offices
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Center for Naval Analysis
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
- Department of State and Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA)
- Department of State
- Defense Security Cooperation Agency Office of Personnel Management
- US Agency for International Development
- US Acute Care Solutions
- Center for Global Health Engagement

- National Capital Region Medical Directorate
- Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS)
- Kimbrough Ambulatory Care Center
- Inova Fairfax Hospital

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

PRECEPTOR

Preceptors are carefully selected based on their commitment to, and mutual interests with, USU and the administrative resident. During the residency period, the Preceptor serves as the resident's direct supervisor. The Preceptor is responsible for providing careful oversight, mentoring, and organizational support during the residency period.

The MHAP faculty members place a tremendous level of importance on the role of the Preceptor and an appropriate Preceptor/resident match. Preceptors are making a personal and professional commitment to the student and are selected only after an interview with the Residency Director and approval by the MHAP Program Director. Preceptors are selected only if they demonstrate the ability to create an environment conducive to creative learning experiences and professional development of the resident. Preceptors are also expected to make the necessary time commitment to serve as a mentor to the resident, involving the resident in daily meetings and activities, meaningful projects, and assisting the resident in the preparation and design of their GMP.

Specific Preceptor expectations include:

- Working with the resident to develop a written plan for the residency experience including specified activities and learning objectives (Appendix A).
- Interacting with the resident on a routine basis, providing regular communication and constructive feedback throughout the residency experience.
- Submitting a written evaluation of the resident's experience and performance at the midpoint and conclusion of the residency program (Appendix B).
- Mentoring, coaching, and encouraging the resident toward self-directed learning.
- Working closely with USU MHAP faculty to ensure the residency experience ties to academic preparation and the MHAP Competency Model.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESIDENT (STUDENT)

The Administrative Resident remains a student of the USU during the residency period and residents are expected to conduct themselves in a professional manner at all times. Residents should coordinate time away from their residency site with the Preceptor.

Specific Resident expectations include:

- Actively progressing to completion of the GMP.
- Working with the Preceptor, Residency Director, and Faculty Project Advisor to follow the written plan for the residency experience.
- Communicating with the Preceptor, Residency Director, and Faculty Project Advisor regarding the required objectives and activities of the residency experience.
- Developing a comprehensive understanding of the organization's mission, processes, structure, operations and key internal and external forces.
- Attending and contributing to internal and external meetings at all levels of the organization.

- Actively engaging with the Preceptor for the purposes of constructive feedback and evaluation.
- Working closely with USU MHAP faculty to ensure the residency experience ties to academic preparation and the MHAP Competency Model.
- Providing feedback to the Residency Director on the residency experience.
- Maintaining service requirements through the USU Brigade.

RESIDENCY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

To receive credit for the MHAP residency, students must submit the following documents:

- Quarterly Residency Reports
- Residency Proposal
- Final Report on the Residency
- Residency Site Evaluation Form (Appendix C)
- Student Performance Evaluation Form

Templates for these reports are in the appendix of this document. The Residency Director will also work with students on facilitating completion of these reports. All forms are available electronically. Submit the completed evaluation forms (hard copy or electronic) to the MHAP Residency Director no later than one week prior to the end of the academic year. Both evaluation forms must be received for the residency requirement to be met.

RESIDENCY DIRECTOR

The Residency Director will stay in contact with the student and the preceptor on a regular basis throughout the residency year. Regular discussions between the Residency Director, preceptor, and resident include assessment of the resident, his/her involvement in organizational initiatives, movement toward a proposed GMP, and overall progress. The Residency Director will also regularly seek feedback from the Resident as to the involvement of the Preceptor and general organizational fit with the purpose of the MHAP Residency.

FACULTY PROJECT ADVISOR

The Faculty Project Advisor (FPA) serves as the primary faculty advisor on the resident's GMP. The Academic Director in consultation with the Program Director identifies the appropriate FPA after review of the GMP subject matter. The FPA meets with the student as necessary to ensure the GMP meets the USU academic requirements for graduation.

GRADUATE MANAGEMENT PROJECT

CHOOSING A GMP

The GMP marks the culmination of a student's graduate level education, and is the final milestone prior to graduation. The GMP encompasses competencies learned in the didactic portion of the curriculum, and developed and refined in the residency phase. The GMP is similar in nature to a thesis performed at other academic institutions. We realize the need to allow flexibility when choosing the structure of the GMP, as all residencies and residency experiences are not alike. As such, our program offers two options for completing the GMP: (1) a robust one-topic academic paper and a formal presentation, or (2) a three-topic option and a formal presentation. The following subsections detail these options.

A GMP could cover a wide range of topics. MHAP residents should strive for projects of impressive quality, demonstrating innovation, strong and persistent initiative, and integration across multiple competencies of the MHAP Program Competency Model. GMPs are not limited to conducting classic research or to data collection and analysis in particular. The project may involve, but is in no way limited to, policy formulation, survey instrument development, analysis of an existing data set from an ongoing or completed research project, or development and/or evaluation of an administrative or policy activity or program. The final product for this requirement should reflect a systematic approach and the investment of considerable time and effort. The final paper should reflect the following:

- In-depth knowledge of a problem or issue from a health administrative or policy perspective.
- Analysis and/or interpretation of data to support evidence-based decision making or policy development.
- Graduate-level effort under faculty supervision/mentorship.
- Appropriate responses to requests for information or to feedback from peer reviewers/faculty.
- Adherence to timeline for project milestones.
- Effective written and oral communication skills.

GETTING STARTED ON A GMP

To optimize this experience and to ensure a smooth administrative residency / GMP execution phase, students will need to do some preliminary information gathering and planning early in their residency year. To find a topic, start with your preceptor to discuss areas of research interest and to seek information on potential project opportunities. At this point, you should also decide whether to pursue a one-topic, or three-topic option. Students are also welcome to meet with one or more MHAP faculty members for advice and consultation on a regular basis.

Once an initial project is identified, follow up with the Residency Director and Faculty Project Advisor for further discussion and approval of the project. Projects require final concurrence of both the Faculty Project Advisor and the preceptor. Of course, all MHAP faculty members are available to act as a resource or to provide support at any time.

In summary, during the process of designing and developing the GMP, students will interact with at least three individuals:

- Residency Site Preceptor

- MHAP Residency Director
- MHAP Faculty Project Advisor

Your final written report will be due approximately two weeks prior to graduation. All students will be scheduled to present your project findings during the last month of their residency year.

GRADUATE MANAGEMENT PROJECT PROPOSAL

Students should complete and submit a GMP proposal by December 15 of their residency year. Students that elect the three-option topic may not have the third topic clearly identified at this point. If so, make sure this point is noted in your proposal form and ensure your preceptor and faculty advisor are aware of the situation.

Appendix D contains descriptive information about your proposal and serves as the cover sheet. This document requires the signature of your preceptor. The Project Advisor will sign this form upon review and approval.

As an attachment to Appendix D, please prepare a brief description of your GMP, including its administrative and policy significance, a draft research question or project purpose, and an estimated timeline for project milestones. Elements of this proposal and suggested lengths are listed below. Please note that all USU guidelines regarding plagiarism apply to all components of the GMP.

Students should pay particular attention to issues such as project design and scope. If conducting original research, consider the type of sampling methods, sample size; analytic approach appropriate to the research question; and anticipated time required to obtain institutional approvals prior to conducting the study. The GMP proposal is the foundation for the final report, so expect to invest some time and thought in its preparation.

The completed proposal should be submitted to the Faculty Project Advisor with a copy to the Residency Advisor. The Faculty Project Advisor will serve as your primary source of guidance throughout the GMP phase. It is absolutely imperative that you meet with your Faculty Project Advisor regularly throughout the GMP phase of your residency and keep the Residency Advisor apprised of your progress via the Quarterly Residency Reports.

| Elements of the Proposal | Page Length |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Background / Significance: Provide a concise summary of relevant background information. What has other work shown? Why is your particular project important? This should demonstrate your familiarity with the existing body of knowledge and the relevance to your residency site. Use appropriate citations. What is the health administrative or policy significance of your study? | 1–2 |
| Objectives: State your research question or project proposal statement. What are the broad goals / objective(s) of your project? List your specific aims to accomplish your goals. | 1–2 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <p>Methods: Briefly describe the methods you will use to conduct your project. For example, a description of your study population; study design; methods for obtaining data, defining variables, analyzing data; approach to program development and/or evaluation; etc. This section will vary depending on the type of project and format selected.</p> | <p>1</p> |
| <p>Timeline: Description of important milestones of your project and when you intend to accomplish them. List project deliverables or study end- points and due dates, including literature search, institutional approval process, first draft report, final report, and oral presentation.</p> | <p>1–2</p> |
| <p>References: List of all references cited in your proposal.</p> | <p>-</p> |

GMP GRADING

The overall grade for your GMP will consist of the following components: proposal score, oral presentation score, and written report score.

| Project Deliverable | Total Possible Points |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Proposal | 15 |
| Oral Presentation | 35 |
| Final Report | 50 |

The proposal grade (numeric score out of a possible 15 points) is carried forward from the initial proposal document. The grade for the final written report (numeric score out of a possible 50 points) is determined by calculating a weighted average of the score submitted by the FPA (weighted x 2). Graders will be provided with evaluation criteria for each of the project deliverables. The criteria for grading project deliverables may be subject to change, but students will be notified of any changes well in advance of due dates, along with the faculty. The panel of MHAP faculty asked to rate the oral presentations will use the Scoring Criteria for MHAP Graduate Management Project Oral Presentations form. Scores are calculated out of a total possible 35 points and averaged over the selected faculty members.

GMP COURSES OF ACTION

There are two subsections to this section (the one-topic option and the three-topic option). Students would only choose one of the two options for their GMP.

ONE-TOPIC OPTION

Students choosing to pursue the one-topic option will complete a written report and an oral presentation.

WRITTEN REPORT

Students are also required to produce a final written report (approximately 20 – 25 pages in length) to present the results of their work. Peer review is encouraged during all phases of the project, but preparation of the final report is the resident's responsibility and must be completed in accordance with Appendices F and G. Consultations with their Preceptors, FPAs, or other advisors during the iterative process of preparing the final report is expected.

The final written report should conform to scientific standards for the type of project or analytic approach selected (e.g., a policy paper, project proposal, scientific proposal, a study using an existing data set).

Appendix H details the sections and elaborates on the components for each section. The final report should include the following sections:

- Introduction
- Literature Review
- Methods
- Results
- Conclusion
- References

Students should plan on submitting a draft report to the FPA several weeks before the paper is due for grading. This will allow adequate time for the iterative process of review and revision and ultimately result in a better product. Schedule regular meetings with your FPA and consult other faculty members as the need arises. Finally, students should anticipate the fact that there will be less time available (both your time and that of faculty members) for in-depth review of draft reports, as deadlines get closer.

Students should plan on completing the final draft of your written report the week prior to the oral presentations. The written report should be submitted by email to the Residency Director for distribution to the FPA. A hard copy of your final project report will be bound for program files. The final paper must be submitted and graded in order for this capstone project requirement to be fully met.

While it is not required, all graduate students should consider preparing a manuscript to submit to a peer-reviewed journal for publication. In addition to your FPA, there may be opportunities to collaborate with other experienced faculty members and/or health administration policy professionals on an expanded project and subsequent manuscript. Appendix G contains the GMP guidelines for authorship, as well as the Department's manuscript clearance form. All manuscripts, including abstracts for presentation/posters at professional meetings, should be submitted to the PMB Department Chair or designated alternate for clearance/approval. In some cases,

signatures by the Dean, School of Medicine and Public Affairs Office may be necessary. Publication may take place soon after graduating from the MHAP Program. In other cases, publication takes place a number of months or years post-graduation. The responsibility to meet service / agency requirements for publication rests solely with the student.

ORAL PRESENTATION

At the conclusion of the residency year, the Resident will provide a presentation of their GMP at the residency site, in front of the preceptor, peers, MHAP faculty, and other invited guests. MHAP GMP presentations are expected to be very high quality.

Students should feel free to invite project mentors, interested friends, family and guests to attend the presentation. Each student will be scheduled for a 15-minute presentation to outline his/her GMP and associated results, followed by 30-minutes for questions and answers. Students should treat this event as if it were a professional meeting. Accordingly, presenters should be in military dress uniforms or appropriate civilian attire.

Oral presentations are graded by PMB faculty and constitute 35% of the overall project grade (Appendix E). Questions from the faculty panel or audience may pertain to core MHAP concepts as they relate to the student's project. Individual score sheets will be made available to presenters upon request. Consultation with the Faculty Project Advisor should occur during early phases of planning the presentation. Students will need to apply effective communication skills and the judicious use of appropriate visual aids to address the key points of the presentation within the allotted amount of time. Practice sessions with faculty and classmates are strongly recommended.

THREE-TOPIC OPTION

Students choosing to pursue the three-topic option will complete a written report and an oral presentation.

WRITTEN REPORT

The written report is similar in length to the one-topic option; however, the report will consist of three topics where the sum of all three works will equal the one-topic option in terms of intensity, rigor, and quality. Peer review is encouraged during all phases of the project, but preparation of the final report is the resident's responsibility and must be completed in accordance with Appendices F and G. Consultations with their Preceptors, FPAs, or other advisors during the iterative process of preparing the final report is expected.

The final written report should conform to a set of standards for the type of project or analytic approach selected (e.g., a policy paper, project proposal, scientific proposal, a study using an existing data set, a technical summary of an applied project). Consult your faculty advisor for specifics regarding the standards for your report.

Appendix H details the sections and elaborates on the components for each section. The final report should include the following sections:

- Introduction (Overall)
- Topic One
 - Introduction
 - Literature Review

- Methodology
- Results
- Conclusion
- Topic Two
 - Introduction
 - Literature Review
 - Methodology
 - Results
 - Conclusion
- Topic Three
 - Introduction
 - Literature Review
 - Methodology
 - Results
 - Conclusion
- Conclusion (Overall)
- References

Students should plan on submitting a draft report to the FPA several weeks before the paper is due for grading. This will allow adequate time for the iterative process of review and revision and ultimately result in a better product. Schedule regular meetings with your FPA and consult other faculty members as the need arises. Finally, students should anticipate the fact that there will be less time available (both your time and that of faculty members) for in-depth review of draft reports, as deadlines get closer.

Students should plan on completing the final draft of your written report the week prior to the oral presentations. The written report should be submitted by email to the Residency Director for distribution to the FPA. A hard copy of your final project report will be bound for program files. The final paper must be submitted and graded in order for this capstone project requirement to be fully met.

While it is not required, all graduate students should consider preparing a manuscript to submit to a peer-reviewed journal for publication. In addition to your FPA, there may be opportunities to collaborate with other experienced faculty members and/or health administration policy professionals on an expanded project and subsequent manuscript. Appendix G contains the GMP guidelines for authorship, as well as the Department's manuscript clearance form. All manuscripts, including abstracts for presentation/posters at professional meetings, should be submitted to the PMB Department Chair or designated alternate for clearance/approval. In some cases, signatures by the Dean, School of Medicine and Public Affairs Office may be necessary. Publication may take place soon after graduating from the MHAP Program. In other cases, publication takes place a number of months or years post-graduation. The responsibility to meet service / agency requirements for publication rests solely with the student.

ORAL PRESENTATION

The oral presentation for the three-topic option is similar to the oral presentation for the one-topic option; however, the student will present all three-topics within the same timeframe allotted for the one-topic option. At the conclusion of the residency year, the Resident will provide a presentation of their GMP at the residency site, in

front of the preceptor, peers, MHAP faculty, and other invited guests. MHAP GMP presentations are expected to be very high quality.

Students should feel free to invite project mentors, interested friends, family and guests to attend the presentation. Each student will be scheduled for a 15-minute presentation (five minutes per topic) to outline his/her GMP and associated results, followed by 30-minutes for questions and answers. Students should treat this event as if it were a professional meeting. Accordingly, presenters should be in military dress uniforms or appropriate civilian attire.

Oral presentations are graded by PMB faculty and constitute 35% of the overall project grade (Appendix E). Questions from the faculty panel or audience may pertain to core MHAP concepts as they relate to the student's project. Individual score sheets will be made available to presenters upon request. Consultation with the Faculty Project Advisor should occur during early phases of planning the presentation. Students will need to apply effective communication skills and the judicious use of appropriate visual aids to address the key points of the presentation within the allotted amount of time. Practice sessions with faculty and classmates are strongly recommended.

INSTITUTIONAL ASSURANCE

Please note there is no expectation for MHAP students to perform original research projects – as in the public health program. However, all PMB graduate students are required to complete the Collaborative IRB Training Initiative (CITI) Program in the Protection of Human Research Subjects. A copy of the Completion Certificate should be submitted to the Residency Director by August 1st of the residency year. The hyperlink for the online course is below.

<https://www.citiprogram.org>.

Register for an account and select an existing institution (begin typing "Office of the Under Secretary of Defense" [autofill should complete the rest]). The course you need to take for human subjects research is Social and Behavioral Investigators and Research Study Team.

While the MHAP GMPs are typically not considered to meet the definition of "research" and involving human participants, this does not mean they are not options for GMP work. If choosing to perform an original research project, the USU IRB must review the study prior to implementation. While many of the projects conducted by MHAP students may ultimately be determined to be "exempt" human use studies, that determination is made by the IRB, not the investigator. Please do not assume that a study that only involves de-identified data for secondary analysis does not need IRB approval in all cases. The Office of Research will determine whether or not submission of the appropriate USU Form is required. The IRB review and approval process can take several weeks or even several months. It is imperative that students anticipating the need for IRB approval for the GMP project. Students are responsible for submitting appropriate (and current) forms for institutional assurances/ approvals, and should receive notification of project approval (either email message or official notice of project approval) prior to conducting the study.

The determination of the need for IRB review is made within the Office of Research in consultation with the Office of Human Research Protections Program, as appropriate. Students should be prepared to complete the applicable forms for IRB submission if requested. Conducting human subject research without appropriate IRB review and approval may place the student's research, the PMB Department, and the University at considerable risk of losing research privileges. If there is a question regarding the need for IRB review, it may be possible to ask for a preliminary review.

The Director, Human Research Protections Program, not the investigator, makes the determination for an expedited review. It is important to note that some projects may require more than one institutional approval (e.g., additional approval from WRAIR or NNMC IRB) and, therefore, additional lead-time for completion. Other projects may involve the use of laboratory animals or the supervised use of biohazards, controlled or dangerous materials, and/or radiation or radioactive materials; these require appropriate assurance committee review and approval. Documentation of mandatory laboratory safety training may be required. Even if a pre-existing approved protocol, with the Faculty Project Advisor as the principal investigator, specifically covers the proposed student project, USU Form 3202 must be submitted to the USU Office of Research. The advisor will also need to submit a protocol amendment adding the student as an associate investigator to his protocol.

BARBOUR / MITTELMAN AWARD

The faculty panel also votes on GMPs to be considered for the Dr. Galen Barbour/RADM Mike Mittelman Award. The award is presented annually to an MHAP graduate student for the outstanding GMP in health administration and policy. The graduate student recipient is selected by the MHAP faculty panel from among the top ranked MHAP GMPs based both on the oral and written products.

The recipient of the Barbour/ Mittelman Award will be recognized at the PMB graduation ceremony. The names of the award winners will be displayed on a plaque located outside the Health Services Administration Division.

SCORING CRITERIA

1. What was the quality of the following elements of the GMP?
 - a. Background
 - b. Research question / specific aims / objectives
 - c. Methods
 - d. Results
 - e. Discussion / conclusions / recommendations
 - f. Overall significance to health administration and policy
 - g. Overall significance to military medicine
2. How effective was the paper in terms of the following?
 - a. Organization
 - b. Clarity
 - c. Application
 - d. Impact
 - e. Conciseness
3. How effective was the oral presentation in terms of the following?
 - a. Organization
 - b. Clarity
 - c. Appropriate use of audio / visual material
 - d. Delivery / presentation skills
 - e. Response to questions
 - f. Conciseness
4. Does this GMP have the potential to impact health policy and administration? Does it have organizational, federal, or military relevance?
5. To what degree was it apparent that this particular GMP required substantially more time and effort for design, development, and execution than would be expected on average?
6. Does the project represent synthesis and integration of knowledge across the core disciplines of health administration and policy?

FINAL REMARKS

The residency year is a vehicle for professional degree students to solidify and apply the MHAP competencies through practical experience and engagement with practitioners. It is designed to be a busy, yet rewarding time for both the Resident and the Preceptor. Appendix H provides a general timeline complete with assignments, due dates, and involved parties. For months without a designated date, these will be provided at the beginning of the residency year.

APPENDIX

A - ADMINISTRATIVE RESIDENCY PROPOSAL FORM

Prior to students departing on Spring Break, it is imperative the Residency Director receive this completed form from each student as to the student's desire for performing their administrative residency. Please complete the questionnaire below and submit it via email to the MHAP Program Residency Director at todd.leroux@usuhs.edu.

Student Name: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Date: [Click here to enter text.](#)

PreceptorName: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Preceptor Title: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Organization: [Click here to enter text.](#)

RESIDENCY LEARNING OBJECTIVES

1. [Click here to enter text.](#)
2. [Click here to enter text.](#)
3. [Click here to enter text.](#)
4. [Click here to enter text.](#)
5. [Click here to enter text.](#)

B - MID-RESIDENCY PRECEPTOR EVALUATION

At the six-month date in the student’s administrative residency, we request each preceptor complete an evaluation of the student’s performance. Please complete the questionnaire below and submit it via email to the MHAP Program Residency Director at todd.leroux@usuhs.edu.

Preceptor Name and Title: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Organization: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Name of Resident: [Click here to enter text.](#)

COMPETENCIES

Please complete the table below. This table pertains to the administrative resident’s level of mastery for competencies in our graduate program.

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Policy Skills – Student demonstrates the ability to | | |
| 1. | Perform policy analysis with consideration to the role of different actors in the policy arena. | Choose an item. |
| 2. | Apply policy tools in decision-making scenarios. | Choose an item. |
| 3. | Synthesize and formulate policy recommendations that add value to healthcare and government organizations. | Choose an item. |
| Transformation Skills – Student demonstrates the ability to | | |
| 4. | Apply an organizational vision and mission to a given project. | Choose an item. |
| 5. | Stimulate a change process. | Choose an item. |
| Execution Skills – Student demonstrates the ability to | | |
| 6. | Translate vision and strategy into optimal organizational performance. | Choose an item. |
| Overall People Skills: Student demonstrates the ability to | | |
| 7. | Recognize and develop leadership responsibility for creating a high-performing learning environment. | Choose an item. |
| Leadership Skills: Student demonstrates the ability to | | |
| 8. | Understand the art and science of leadership in healthcare administration and policymaking and be prepared to take on the role of a healthcare leader. | Choose an item. |

C - FINAL PRECEPTOR EVALUATION

At the completion of the student’s administrative residency, we request each preceptor complete an evaluation of the student’s performance. Please complete the questionnaire below and submit it via email to the MHAP Program Residency Director at todd.leroux@usuhs.edu.

Preceptor Name and Title: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Organization: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Name of Resident: [Click here to enter text.](#)

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

1. Please describe as to whether the resident’s skills and knowledge met your expectations during the administrative residency experience.
[Click here to enter text.](#)
2. What were the resident’s accomplishments and / or skills that impressed you most?
[Click here to enter text.](#)
3. Please describe areas where the resident requires room for improvement to function successfully as a healthcare administrator.
[Click here to enter text.](#)
4. Please outline skills or competencies the student improved during their time in residency at your facility.
[Click here to enter text.](#)
5. If funding, resources, opportunities, or capacity existed within your organization, would you consider hiring this resident as a permanent employee of your organization? Please describe why or why not.
[Click here to enter text.](#)
6. Please use the space provided below for comments or concerns, if they exist, that were not addressed in the questions above.
[Click here to enter text.](#)

COMPETENCIES

Please complete the table below. This table pertains to the administrative resident’s level of mastery for competencies in our graduate program.

| Policy Skills – Student demonstrates the ability to | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. | Perform policy analysis with consideration to the role of different actors in the policy arena. | Choose an item. |
| 2. | Apply policy tools in decision-making scenarios. | Choose an item. |
| 3. | Synthesize and formulate policy recommendations that add value to healthcare and government organizations. | Choose an item. |
| Transformation Skills – Student demonstrates the ability to | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 4. | Apply an organizational vision and mission to a given project. | Choose an item. |
| 5. | Stimulate a change process. | Choose an item. |
| Execution Skills – Student demonstrates the ability to | | |
| 6. | Translate vision and strategy into optimal organizational performance. | Choose an item. |
| Overall People Skills: Student demonstrates the ability to | | |
| 7. | Recognize and develop leadership responsibility for creating a high-performing learning environment. | Choose an item. |
| Leadership Skills: Student demonstrates the ability to | | |
| 8. | Understand the art and science of leadership in healthcare administration and policymaking and be prepared to take on the role of a healthcare leader. | Choose an item. |

D – RESIDENT SITE EVALUATION

Student Name: Click here to enter text.

Date of Submission: Click here to enter a date.

Preceptor Name: Click here to enter text.

Preceptor's Organization: Click here to enter text.

RESIDENCY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Please select the item that best identified how your experience and interactions with your preceptor.

| Based upon my residency experience, I believe my preceptor | | Frequency |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. | Is regularly available to meet with me as needed. | Choose an item. |
| 2. | Is readily accessible, if needed. | Choose an item. |
| 3. | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of their role as a preceptor. | Choose an item. |
| 4. | Demonstrates understanding of leader / management roles. | Choose an item. |
| 5. | Serves as an effective role model for leadership and management principles. | Choose an item. |
| 6. | Demonstrates strong positive interpersonal skills with other members of the team. | Choose an item. |
| 7. | Demonstrates negotiation and conflict management skills. | Choose an item. |
| 8. | Facilitates resident's identified goals and objectives. | Choose an item. |
| 9. | Provides opportunities for and encourages resident engagement. | Choose an item. |
| 10. | Considers resident background and level of competency. | Choose an item. |
| 11. | Provides feedback in a timely and appropriate manner. | Choose an item. |
| 12. | Demonstrates critical thinking skills. | Choose an item. |
| 13. | Assists resident in decision-making process. | Choose an item. |
| 14. | Allows and encourages resident to make suggestions and recommendations. | Choose an item. |
| 15. | Provides additional learning experiences to meet resident's needs. | Choose an item. |

E – GMP PROPOSAL FORM

Project Title: Click here to enter text.

Student Name: Click here to enter text.

Submission Date: Click here to enter a date.

Faculty Project Advisor: Click here to enter text.

Faculty Project Advisor has reviewed this proposal form (student indicate): Yes No

Residency Preceptor Name: Click here to enter text.

Residency Location: Click here to enter text.

Residency Preceptor has reviewed this proposal form (student indicate): Yes No

Does this project involve human subjects, personal health information, or personally identifiable information?

Yes No

F – RUBRIC FOR GMP ORAL PRESENTATION

The following table presents a rubric to evaluate the student’s presentation of the GMP. This rubric is intended to be filled out by faculty attending the presentation, as the preference is for the preceptor and organization to focus on the material being presented without needing to evaluate the individual components of the presentation.

| Criteria | Excellent Presentation 5 points | Good - Fair Presentation 4 – 3 points | Poor Presentation 2 – 0 points | Score |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Introduction | Contains a complete and well-organized overview statement and purpose. | Contains a complete but somewhat disorganized overview/purpose statement. | Provides little or no overview of project purpose. | |
| Completeness | Addresses all required project guidelines. | Addresses most of the required project guidelines. | Addresses few of the project guidelines or does so poorly. | |
| Organization and Flow | Presentation is well organized, flows nicely, and moves from general to specific information. | Presentation is somewhat disorganized and provides too much detail without giving a good explanation of the work. | Presentation is disorganized and deals completely with details without providing a broad explanation of the work. | |
| Implications to the field of Healthcare Management | Student clearly defines and presents the implications to the field of health administration and policy. | Student does not clearly connect the project to implications to the field. | Makes no connection to implications to the field. | |
| Communication Skills | Uses presentation resources as a guide, gives, detailed explanations, is easy to understand and follow, and keeps eye contact with the audience | Relies heavily on the presentation to make the report, somewhat comfortable with the topic. | Primarily reads the material from the presentation or paper to make the report, uncomfortable with the topic. | |
| Visual Aids | Contains visual aids that help the audience understand the work, visuals are neat and look professional, easily understandable, and used well to make points. | Contains few or inadequate visual aids or visual aids have a neat and professional appearance, but are poorly used to make points. | Contains no visual aids or visual aids are extremely poorly constructed. | |
| Responses to Q&A | Answers questions clearly and accurately. | Answers only some questions well. | Answers none of the questions well. | |

Total Points

G – RUBRIC FOR WRITTEN GMP

The following table presents a rubric to evaluate the student’s written GMP. This GMP is suitable for evaluating both the one- and three-topic option. This rubric is intended to be filled out by the student’s Faculty Project

| Criteria | Outstanding (5) | Above Average (4) | Average (3) | Below Average (2) |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Introduction / Background | <p>Question(s) researchable and could potentially make a contribution to the field.</p> <p>Question(s) relevant, timely and offers new insights into the area of research.</p> | <p>Question(s) researchable.</p> <p>Question(s) timely and relevant to the teaching and/or learning of /content areas.</p> <p>Question(s) reflects the philosophy and guiding principles of the program.</p> <p>Description of the context is clear.</p> | <p>Question(s) some- what researchable</p> <p>Question(s) timely or relevant to the teaching and/or learning of the content area(s), but not both.</p> <p>Question(s) somewhat reflects the philosophy and guiding principles of the program.</p> <p>Description of the context is unclear or confusing.</p> | <p>Question(s) not researchable</p> <p>Question(s) not timely or relevant to the teaching and/or learning of content areas.</p> <p>Question(s) does not reflect the philosophy and guiding principles of the program.</p> <p>Description of the context is not clear.</p> |
| Literature Review | <p>Literature review cites comprehensive research and theoretical knowledge of the field.</p> <p>Literature review is synthesized (appropriate connections are made) Connections substantiate this research.</p> | <p>Literature review cites salient research in the field.</p> <p>Literature review includes contemporary research in the area.</p> <p>Literature review has appropriately identified the gap in the research that demands further study.</p> | <p>Literature review cites research and theory in the field of study that is salient or comprehensive but not both.</p> <p>Literature reviewed includes some contemporary research in the area.</p> <p>Literature review identifies the gap in the research that demands further study but does not support it well with research.</p> | <p>Literature review doesn’t cite salient research or theory or research and theory cited is inadequate.</p> <p>Literature reviewed does not includes contemporary research in the area.</p> <p>Literature review does not identify the gap in the research that demands further study.</p> |
| Methodology | <p>Rationale for methodology is very well-developed, sophisticated.</p> <p>Methodological rigor is evident.</p> | <p>Plan for studying research question(s) is clear and systematic.</p> <p>Methods chosen are appropriate.</p> <p>Rationale for methodology is sound and well-supported.</p> | <p>Plan for studying research question(s) is clear OR systematic but not both.</p> <p>Methods chosen are appropriate given the research question.</p> <p>Weak rationale for research methodology is presented.</p> | <p>Plan for studying research question(s) is not clear and systematic.</p> <p>Methods chosen are not reasonable given the research question(s).</p> <p>No rationale is presented for the methodology.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Results | <p>Analysis includes techniques beyond normal scope of the research.</p> <p>Presentation of results suggest analytical interpretation</p> <p>Relationships among data are presented graphically.</p> | <p>Analysis techniques used are appropriate for the purpose and scope of the research</p> <p>Results from raw data are summarized in a clear and systematic format</p> <p>Results section includes clearly articulated graphs or tables.</p> <p>Assessment data (results) are adequately described.</p> | <p>Analysis techniques used are minimally appropriate for the purpose and scope of the research.</p> <p>Results from raw data are summarized but needs a more clear and systematic format.</p> <p>Results section include graphs or tables without interpretable style.</p> <p>Assessment results are used but results and information are not thoroughly described.</p> | <p>Analysis techniques are not appropriate for the data.</p> <p>Results from raw data are not well summarized.</p> <p>Results are not clearly articulated.</p> |
| Conclusion / Discussion | <p>Interpretation of data shows synthesis of previous and current research.</p> <p>Trends or patterns clearly identified in the data.</p> <p>Description of meaning of results pushes knowledge and understanding of the subject.</p> | <p>Valid interpretation of data.</p> <p>Trends or patterns in the data clearly identified.</p> <p>Adequate description of meaning of results.</p> <p>Assessment of impact of intervention is valid. Results confirm or refute previous research.</p> | <p>Partial interpretation of data.</p> <p>Trends or patterns in data marginally identified.</p> <p>Marginal description of meaning of results.</p> <p>Assessment of impact of intervention is valid but minimally explained</p> <p>Results not tied well to research</p> | <p>Invalid or incomplete interpretation of data</p> <p>Trends or patterns in data not clearly identified.</p> <p>Inadequate description of meaning of results.</p> <p>Assessment of impact of intervention is missing</p> <p>Results not tied to research</p> |
| Writing Ability | <p>Clearly developed analysis and argument that shows relationships between all the components of the research.</p> | <p>Demonstrates ability to use academic language.</p> <p>Clear focus, well organized.</p> <p>Conceptual clarity.</p> | <p>May only contain one of the following:</p> <p>Demonstrates ability to use academic language, or has a clear focus, or is well organized, or has conceptual clarity.</p> | <p>Academic language not used.</p> <p>Poorly organized.</p> <p>Unclear thoughts evident.</p> |
| Formatting | <p>Clearly flow and arrangement, clear organization and logical arrangement, properly identification and utilization of all supportive materials.</p> | <p>Logical and clear flow.</p> <p>Well organized.</p> <p>Proper use of headings and subheadings.</p> <p>Proper use of appendix/supportive material.</p> | <p>Fairly well organized.</p> <p>Some logical flow.</p> <p>Some appropriate use of heading and subheadings.</p> | <p>Does not incorporate supportive materials as appendixes.</p> <p>Poorly organized.</p> <p>No logical flow.</p> <p>Inaccurate use of headings and subheadings.</p> |

Total Points:

H – GMP GUIDELINES

GENERAL GUIDELINES

Regardless of the student’s decision to pursue the one- or three-topic option, the written GMP should be approximately 20-25 double-spaced pages (not counting references and appendices) with one-inch margins in length. The paper must reflect proper grammar, proper spelling, and logical organization consistent for graduate level education. Points may be deducted if the above guidelines are not followed, or if the paper is turned in late (three points per day). The paper, references, and appendices should be prepared according to the citation format agreed upon between the student and the Faculty Project Advisor (oftentimes this is the American Psychological Association). To maintain readability, make use of headings and subheadings. If you have any remaining questions about tailoring the paper to meet the needs of your project, please consult your Faculty Project Advisor.

SUBMISSION PROCEDURE

Submit two hard copies of the paper when submitting the final version in addition to one electronic copy to your Faculty Project Advisor.

TYPICAL CONTENTS OF A WRITTEN GMP

The following list is an example of contents typical in a written GMP. As different scenarios may dictate, work with your Faculty Project Advisor to ascertain the required contents for your GMP. Please note not all contents below will be required or other requirements may pertain – consult your Faculty Project Advisor.

ONE-TOPIC OPTION

- Title Page
- Title of your work (ensure your title page contains the following information)
 - Student Name (to include rank and military service)
 - Date of submission
 - Faculty Project Advisor
- Table of Contents
- Abstract
The abstract is a brief summary of your work and covers the main components of your paper (no more than one page).
- Introduction
The introduction could contain the following information (not to be construed as sub-headings)
 - What is the general topic area?
 - What is the specific area of interest?
 - Why is the topic relevant?
 - What is the research question or study objective?

- Identify and explain research problem, which is relevant to health policy and/or health administration
- What is the intended purpose of the study? What will be gained?
- Why is this project significant to the field or the specific organization targeted?
- Literature Review (consult your Faculty Project Advisor on specification for this area)
- Methodology
The Methods section could contain the following information (not to be construed as sub-headings).
 - Describe the study design and rationale for using this design
 - What were the methods of data and information collection?
 - What instruments were used (if applicable)?
 - What was the reliability and validity of these instruments and methods (if applicable)?
 - Population and sample (if applicable)
 - Describe the population and demographics
 - Nature of population
 - General geographic location
 - Method of sample selection
 - Total number of subjects and inclusion / exclusion criteria
 - Statistical analysis (if applicable)
 - Specify how the data was analyzed
 - What were the quantitative methods used?
- Results
The Results section contains the relevant information that answers your study question or details your findings study objective.
- Conclusion
The Conclusion could contain the following information (not to be construed as sub-headings).
 - A high-level view of your findings in light of the research question or study objective.
 - Why your project matters
 - Strengths of this study
 - Weaknesses of this study
 - What are the overall implications to the field of health management / policy?
 - Are there any unintended consequences?
- References
- Appendix (if applicable)

THREE-TOPIC OPTION

- Title Page
- Title of your work (ensure your title page contains the following information)
 - Student Name (to include rank and military service)
 - Date of submission
 - Faculty Project Advisor
- Table of Contents
- Abstract

The abstract is a brief summary of your work and covers the main components of your paper (no more than one page). **One abstract should include all three topics.**
- Topic 1
 - Introduction

The introduction could contain the following information (not to be construed as sub-headings)

 - What is the general topic area?
 - What is the specific area of interest?
 - Why is the topic relevant?
 - What is the research question or study objective?
 - Identify and explain research problem, which is relevant to health policy and/or health administration
 - What is the intended purpose of the study? What will be gained?
 - Why is this project significant to the field or the specific organization targeted?
 - Literature Review (consult your Faculty Project Advisor on specification for this area)
 - Methodology

The Methods section could contain the following information (not to be construed as sub-headings).

 - Describe the study design and rationale for using this design
 - What were the methods of data and information collection?
 - What instruments were used (if applicable)?
 - What was the reliability and validity of these instruments and methods (if applicable)?
 - Population and sample (if applicable)
 - Describe the population and demographics
 - Nature of population
 - General geographic location
 - Method of sample selection
 - Total number of subjects and inclusion / exclusion criteria
 - Statistical analysis (if applicable)
 - Specify how the data was analyzed
 - What were the quantitative methods used?

- **Results**
The Results section contains the relevant information that answers your study question or details your findings study objective.
- **Conclusion**
The Conclusion could contain the following information (not to be construed as sub-headings).
 - A high-level view of your findings in light of the research question or study objective.
 - Why your project matters
 - Strengths of this study
 - Weaknesses of this study
 - What are the overall implications to the field of health management / policy?
 - Are there any unintended consequences?
- **Topic 2 (see Topic 1 sub-bullets for details)**
 - Introduction
 - Literature Review
 - Methodology
 - Results
 - Conclusion
- **Topic 3 (see Topic 1 sub-bullets for details)**
 - Introduction
 - Literature Review
 - Methodology
 - Results
 - Conclusion
- **References (only one reference section for the three-topic option)**
- **Appendix (if applicable)**

I – GENERAL TIMELINE

The following outlines milestones associated with the GMP and their respective due dates along with who should receive the documentation or information.

| Assignment | Timeline / Due Date | Receiver |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Completed CITI Certificate | 1 August | Residency Director |
| Residency Quarterly Report # 1 | 1 October | Residency Director |
| Residency Quarterly Meeting # 1 | 15 October | Residency Director Program Director |
| Draft GMP Proposal | 15 November | Residency Director Faculty Advisor |
| Final GMP Proposal | 15 December | Residency Director Faculty Advisor |
| Residency Quarterly Report # 2 | 15 January | Residency Director |
| Residency Quarterly Meeting # 2 | 31 January | Residency Director Program Director |
| Draft GMP | 15 March | Faculty Advisor |
| Schedule GMP Presentation | 31 March | Ms. Sandra Elliott Preceptor |
| Residency Quarterly Report # 3 | 1 April | Residency Director |
| Residency Quarterly Meeting # 3 | 15 April | Residency Director Program Director |
| Mock GMP Presentation | 17 or 24 April | Residency Director Ms. Sandra Elliott |
| Final GMP Presentation | 1 - 31 May | Residency Director Ms. Sandra Elliott Preceptor Faculty Advisor |
| Final GMP Report | 1 - 31 May | Residency Director Faculty Advisor |
| Student Residency Evaluation | 1 June | Residency Director |
| Preceptor Evaluation | 1 June | Residency Director |