## Single Event Provider (SELF-STUDY) Report From

Please submit quarterly, Date Oct – Dec, 2009

- NCHEC Provider Number: SSP3033 / SSP3266 (renewed to new number during quarter)
  Provider Name: Jim Grizzell
  Address: 1805 S. Grant St.
  City/State/Zip: Arlington, VA 22202
  Contact Person: Jim Grizzell
  Phone: 909-856-3350 Fax:
- II. Program Title: Using Social Marketing for Health Promotion and Health Education Programs # of CECH assigned to the Title: 10.5 Total # of CECH taken by CHES for Self-Study Title: 220.5 Total number of CHES participating: 24
- III. Please attach a CHES Participant Roster that includes names and CHES ID numbers of participants and the number of CECH earned for each CHES. Indicate your NCHEC provider number and the program title at the top of each roster.
- IV. Please attach a summary of participant evaluations.

Date of Report: Jan 15 14, 2010

Signature of contact person:

fim May ell

Name of contact person: Jim Grizzell

(Please type or print)

## **Please Note:**

Be sure you have completed and enclosed the following:

X Self-Study Provider Report Form
 X CHES Participant Rosters for each Title offered
 X Evaluation Summary

## CHES PARTICIPANT ROSTER


NCHEC Provider Number SSP3033/3266

Program Title: Using Social Marketing for Health Promotion and Health Education Program

Total CECH Earned .....

220.5

PARTICIPANT NAME and CHES #	CECH EARNED
1 Taryn West 13090	10.5
2 Mary dickman 13279	10.5
3 Cesar Alvarez 16753	10.5
4 Jessica Mullen 13365	10.5
5 Christine Michalski 12880	10.5
6 Melissa Overman 7402	10.5
7 Amber Valencia 14242	10.5
8 Amy Oggel 12917	10.5
9 Allen Naidoo 8310	10.5
10 Larry Fleck 16576	10.5
11 Delphone Rossi 3519	10.5
12 Jessica Alger 14629	10.5
13 Laura Blosser 14174	10.5
15 Mary Feeney 14802	10.5
17 Diana Rodriguez 15638	10.5
19 Emma Wolfe 15306	10.5
20 Robin Liston 11930	10.5
21 Terri Eastman 13214	10.5
22 Karen DeBonis 14756	10.5
23 Patricia Talbert 16872	10.5
24 Sherry Hausman 5753	10.5
	220.5



2. How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 1, Problem Description?									
	Not met	Not very well met	Somewhat met	Well met	Very well met	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 1, Problem Description?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)	35.0% (7)	60.0% (12)	0.0% (0)	4.55	20	
		answered question							
						skipped	question	0	

3. How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 2, Market Research?									
	Not met	Not very well met	Somewhat met	Well met	Very well met	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 2, Market Research?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)	30.0% (6)	65.0% (13)	0.0% (0)	4.60	20	
		answered question							
						skipped	question	0	

4. How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 3, Market Strategy?									
	Not met	Not very well met	Somewhat met	Well met	Very well met	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 3, Market Strategy?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	40.0% (8)	60.0% (12)	0.0% (0)	4.60	20	
		answered question							
						skipped	question	0	

5. How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 4, Interventions?									
	Not met	Not very well met	Somewhat met	Well met	Very well met	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 4, Interventions?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)	30.0% (6)	65.0% (13)	0.0% (0)	4.60	20	
		answered question							
						skipped	question	0	

6. How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 5, Evaluation?									
	Not met	Not very well met	Somewhat met	Well met	Very well met	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 5, Evaluation?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)	35.0% (7)	60.0% (12)	0.0% (0)	4.55	20	
		answered question							
						skipped	question	0	

7. How well were the learning object	7. How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 6, Implementation?										
	Not met	Not very well met	Somewhat met	Well met	Very well met	Rating Average	Response Count				
How well were the learning objectives met for Phase 6, Implementation?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)	70.0% (14)	25.0% (5)	4.20	20				
		answered question									
		skipped question									

8. Please rate the degree to which the course met your learning needs.									
	Not met	Not very well met	Somewhat met	Well met	Very well met	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Met your needs	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (10)	50.0% (10)	0.0% (0)	4.50	20	
		answered question							
		skipped question							

9. Please rate the online course instructors (in videos) and course planner/administrator on each category in the table below.

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Knowledge of Subject Matter	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	35.0% (7)	50.0% (10)	15.0% (3)	4.59	20	
Organization/clarity of Presentation	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	20.0% (4)	65.0% (13)	15.0% (3)	4.76	20	
Useful Information	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	20.0% (4)	65.0% (13)	15.0% (3)	4.76	20	
Speaker/Participant Interaction	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	35.0% (7)	20.0% (4)	35.0% (7)	4.15	20	
Use of Allotted Time	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	35.0% (7)	35.0% (7)	30.0% (6)	4.50	20	
Audio/Visual Aids	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)	20.0% (4)	60.0% (12)	15.0% (3)	4.65	20	
Handouts	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (5)	50.0% (10)	25.0% (5)	4.67	20	
Other (please specify)									
answered question									
						skipped	question	0	

10. Was your facility, online/virtual classroom (i.e., the method and location(s) you used to participate in the course), conducive to learning for you? NOTE: this question is revised since it is one used for typical in classroom courses.

	Yes	No	Response Count
Size of room	100.0% (20)	0.0% (0)	20
Room set-up	95.0% (19)	5.0% (1)	20
Room temperature	100.0% (20)	0.0% (0)	20
Acoustics	95.0% (19)	5.0% (1)	20
Lighting	100.0% (20)	0.0% (0)	20
		Comments	3
		answered question	20
		skipped question	0

11. You answered "No" to the prev	11. You answered "No" to the previous question. Please describe contributing factors in the space below.							
		Response Count						
		5						
	answered question	5						
	skipped question	15						

12. Please rate the overall quality of the course on the scale below.									
	Very Poor	Poor	Somewhat met	Well met	Very well met	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Overall Quality	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	30.0% (6)	70.0% (14)	0.0% (0)	4.70	20	
		answered question							
						skipped	question	0	

13. Please provide any comments about your experience with the course.		
		Response Count
		6
	answered question	6
	skipped question	14