College of Health Sciences

Master of Science in Integrative Wellness (IWELL)

2025-2026

Program Learning Outcome (PLO) 1:

Apply evidence-based coaching skills and behavior change strategies to facilitate meaningful lifestyle changes and improved health outcomes

Criteria for Success: 80% of students score at or above 90% (144/160 points) on the rubric for the coaching final practical skills assessment in WEL 6067 (Advanced Health and Well-Being Coaching).

Signature Assignment: Final Practical Skills Assessment (WEL 6067)

Data:

2025-2026	**% of students scoring 90% or higher**
Spring 2026 (n=18)	83.3%

Interpretation and Conclusion: In Spring 2026, 83.3% of students (15/18) scored at or above 90% on the WEL 6067 Final Practical Skills Assessment, meeting the criterion for success. The cohort mean was 148.8 points (93.0%) and the median was 155 points (96.9%). Fifteen students scored between 148 and 160 points. Four of the students who met the benchmark scored within six points of it (148, 148, 149, 150), and three students scored below the benchmark (112, 121, 127).

Indirect evidence from program exit survey data support the direct assessment data, as 93.3% of students (14/15) reported their coaching skills were much enhanced (5/5 points) using a 5-point Likert scale. Together, the direct and indirect evidence in conjunction with board certification examination data provided by the National Board for Health & Wellness Coaching (NBHWC) indicate that the outcome is being met, with students leaving the program successfully able to apply evidence-based coaching skills and behavior change strategies.

NBHWC Exam Cycle	**IWELL Program Pass Rate**	**Candidate Pass Rate Across Accredited Programs**
Fall 2025 (n= 10)	90%	84%
Fall 2024 (n= 5)	100%	85%

Changes to Be Made Based on Data: The criterion for success was met, so no major curricular changes are planned following a redevelopment of this course during the 2025-2026 academic year to align with updated accreditation standards from the National Board for Health & Wellness Coaching (NBHWC) which went into effect January 1, 2026. However, given that three students scored well below the cutoff with scores ranging from 70% to 79.4%, the program director will work with adjunct faculty co-teaching the course to review and refine the rubric for the final practical skills assessment. This review will include examining the criterion-level rubric scores for the three students who did not meet the benchmark to determine whether their lower scores are concentrated in one particular skill area that could benefit from more targeted practice and developmental feedback following the formative assessments as well as the coach-to-coach feedback sessions that precede this final practical skills evaluation. Additionally, given the scaffolded curriculum between WEL 6047 (Foundations of Health and Well-Being Coaching) to WEL 6067 (Advanced Health and Well-Being Coaching), the program director will facilitate a collaborative meeting of adjunct faculty in both courses to identify any additional areas of alignment to further support skill development and refinement across the course sequence.

In light of the recently implemented changes to the NBHWC exam content outline (effective January 2026), the program director will also review score reports for the Fall 2026 exam cycle as well as the three exam periods in 2027 to evaluate if any changes may need to be made to the final practical skills assessment criteria to support students continued success in earning national board certification upon completion of the graduate program.

Rubric Used:

WEL 6067 – Coaching Final Practical Skills Assessment

Assessment Rubric

Criteria	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Non-Performance	Points	Comment
Embodiment of a coaching presence	**Distinguished:** Coach is present and flexible throughout the coaching experience, demonstrating unconditional positive regard for the client, truly respecting the client and seeing him/her as whole, resourceful and capable of change as evidenced through verbal and non-verbal communication skills. Engages in collaborative conversation with the client, avoiding the "righting reflex"/"expert approach." Fully adheres to ethical and professional standards of coaching. **20 to >15 pts**	**Proficient:** The collaborative nature of coaching was demonstrated at most times. Generally, the client was accepted and his/her autonomy was respected, however there is opportunity to further affirm client strengths and recognize his/her wholeness. For the most part adheres to the ethical and professional standards of coaching, though there may be times where the coach strays slightly outside of the role and/or scope of a health coach. **15 to >10 pts**	**Basic:** A coach approach was demonstrated at some points; however, an expert approach was demonstrated equally or more often (e.g., number of closed questions, judgmental tone, unsolicited advice, lack of recognition of client's worth, etc.); and/or coach does not adhere to coaching scope of practice of focusing on present and future possibilities with the client. **10 to >0 pts**	**Non-performance:** The student does not demonstrate this skill, as the interaction is more consistent with an expert approach/education. **0 pts**	**/20 pts**	
Use of powerful and curious questions	**Proficient:** Specifically demonstrates the consistent and predominant use of open-ended questions that encourage client self-discovery and forward movement toward self-directed goals. **20 to >15 pts**	**Proficient:** Engaged in some open-ended questions that support client in movement toward self-directed goals, however also utilized some closed questions which did not further the client's self-discovery and forward movement. **15 to >10 pts**	**Basic:** Engaged in mostly closed-ended questions and/or personal commentary that did not adequately demonstrate a coach approach nor support the client toward his/her self-directed goals and/or action steps. **10 to >0 pts**	**Non-performance:** The student does not demonstrate this skill, remaining the authority and decision maker throughout the session. No open-ended questions were asked throughout the session. **0 pts**	**/20 pts**	

Criteria	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Non-Performance	Points	Comment
Demonstration of active listening	**Distinguished:** Specifically demonstrates the appropriate use of silence and attentive listening, which includes the use of meaningful reflections. **15 to >10 pts**	**Proficient:** Demonstrates some active listening (appropriate use of silence, not interrupting client when he/she is speaking), however there are somewhat limited reflections offered. **10 to >5 pts**	**Basic:** Shows limited active listening (honors silence), however does not demonstrate truly hearing and building off of what the client has shared. **5 to >0 pts**	**Non-performance:** The coach regularly interrupts the client and/or does not provide any meaningful reflections. **0 pts**	**/15 pts**	
Highlights client's values and/or vision for the future	**Distinguished:** Within the coaching experience, the client's previously explored values are highlighted and/or skills are used to bring to light client's values; and/or connection is established or reinforced between client's current and/or desired actions and their vision for the future (for example, how established action step is in alignment with client's vision for his/her best future self). **15 to >8 pts**	**Proficient:** Within the coaching experience, the client's previously explored values are occasionally highlighted, as is their vision for the future. **8 to >4 pts**	**Basic:** Client's values are rarely, if ever, highlighted and there is not a connection established to reinforce the client's current or future actions with his/her vision for the future. **4 to >0 pts**	**Non-performance:** Client values and vision are not addressed in the coaching session. **0 pts**	**/15 pts**	

Criteria	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Non-Performance	Points	Comment
Use of strengths-based coaching approach	**Distinguished:** As opposed to dwelling on "problems" and/or seeing challenges or "setbacks" as failures, coach uses OARS skills to support clients in shifting their attention and action toward worthy ideas, untapped possibilities and a productive direction for moving forward based on lessons learned/insights gained from "experiments." This includes specifically using affirmations to highlight and leverage client strengths, attitudes, and abilities. **20 to >14 pts**	**Proficient:** Coach primarily focuses on what is "going right" for the client, helping him/her to leverage his/her own strengths and assets to move forward. **14 to >6 pts**	**Basic:** Client's strengths are rarely leveraged and/or the coaching session focuses primarily on coach-directed action steps and an assessment of how well the client has or has not met or succeeded in those steps. **6 to >0 pts**	**Non-performance:** Client strengths are not addressed in any way. **0 pts**	**/20 pts**	
Collaborative exploration and/or co-development of at least one clearly defined goal	**Distinguished:** Consists of either establishing, evaluating, re-designing and/or re-committing to one small SMART goal, depending on where the coach and client are in their unique client-coach partnership. **15 to >11 pts**	**Proficient:** A SMART goal is established and/or discussed in some way during the coaching session, but there is opportunity to further refine and/or explore this goal. **11 to >5 pts**	**Basic:** At least one goal is discussed during the coaching session, but the goal is not collaboratively explored or co-developed by both the client and the coach (the goal may be set by the coach only). **5 to >0 pts**	**Non-performance:** The student does not demonstrate this skill. **0 pts**	**/15 pts**	
Client-led creation of at least one small action step	**Proficient:** Demonstration of co-creation of at least one smaller, manageable step which supports the client's forward movement toward enhanced health and well-being. **15 to >8 pts**	**Proficient:** An action step is created, but it could benefit from further refinement to most optimally support the client's forward progress. **8 to >7 pts**	**Basic:** An action step is not fully developed and/or the action step is not collaboratively developed, as it is determined by the health coach. **7 to >0 pts**	**Non-performance:** The student does not demonstrate this skill. **0 pts**	**/15 pts**	

Criteria	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Non-Performance	Points	Comment
Manages progress and accountability	**Proficient:** Specifically addresses established system of accountability from previous coaching session OR supports client in establishing an accountability method that will best support their progress toward their self-determined goal. Discussion around accountability should be non-judgmental and should help to reinforce that ultimately clients are accountable to themselves. **15 to >10 pts**	**Proficient:** An accountability system is discussed, but could benefit from helping the client to be accountable to himself/herself instead of to the health coach. **10 to >5 pts**	**Basic:** Accountability is addressed but it is primarily or exclusively led by the health coach with little or no input from the client as to what would best serve them in their journey. **5 to >0 pts**	**Non-performance:** Accountability is not discussed at all. **0 pts**	**/15 pts**	
Provides concise summary within the coaching session	**Proficient:** A brief summary of what was explored during the coaching session is provided at some point in the coaching experience. **8 to >4 pts**	**Basic:** A few elements of the coaching conversation were reiterated at times, but a concise summary was not fully provided. **4 to >0 pts**	—	**Non-performance:** No type of summary was offered. **0 pts**	**/8 pts**	
Requests feedback from the client	**Proficient:** At the conclusion of the coaching session, the coach specifically asks for feedback from the client in order to strengthen the client-coach relationship and further enhance the coaching experience. This can be in the form of an open-ended question (for example, "What did you find most valuable in today's coaching session?"). **10 to >5 pts**	**Basic:** Coach briefly asks client for feedback but does not provide adequate time and/or opportunity for the client to provide meaningful feedback. **5 to >0 pts**	—	**Non-performance:** The client was not asked by the coach to provide feedback. **0 pts**	**/10 pts**	

Criteria	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Non-Performance	Points	Comment
Adheres to designated timeframe for coaching session, managing time effectively	**Proficient:** Coaching session is at least 30 minutes in length and no more than 33 minutes in length. **7 to >4 pts**	**Basic:** Coaching session is within 2 minutes of designated time frame (28 minutes – 35 minutes). **4 to >0 pts**	—	**Non-performance:** Session is more than two minutes outside of the designated timeframe (less than 28 minutes OR more than 35 minutes). **0 pts**	**/7 pts**	
				Total	**/160 pts**	

Program Learning Outcome (PLO) 2:

Collaborate with colleagues in a wide variety of settings to provide a whole-person approach to healthcare, health education, and health promotion.

Criteria for Success: 90% of students score at or above 85% (85/100 points) on the rubric for the advocating for whole-person health group white paper assignment in WEL 6017 (Mind-Body Medicine).

Signature Assignment:

1. Assignment #2 (WEL 6017)

Data:

2025-2026	% of students scoring 85% or higher
Fall 2025 (n=14)	100%

Interpretation and Conclusion: In Fall 2025, 100% of students (14 of 14) scored at or above 85% (85/100 points) on the WEL 6017 Group White Paper, meeting the criterion for success. The cohort mean was 94.9 points and the median was 96 points, with scores ranging from 87 to 99 points. 11 of the 14 students scored 95% or higher, and the three lowest scores were all 87%.

Changes to Be Made Based on Data: The criterion for success was met, so no changes to the assignment or course are planned.

Rubric Used:

WEL 6017 – Assignment #2: Group White Paper

Assessment Rubric

Criteria	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Below Expectations	Non-performance	Points	Comment
Quality of content	Addressed all major aspects as outlined in the assignment, including: an introduction to the chosen topic/pillar of lifestyle medicine; purpose of the white paper, to include specifically focusing on the one (1) specific dimension of wellness assigned to your group (mental, emotional, social or spiritual) AND at least two (2) components of the social-ecological model; review and integration of relevant literature in alignment with your specified areas/subtopics (to include a minimum of two (2) design-related elements that are content specific, e.g., graphs, charts, other visual representation of information, etc.); and application of the findings for other health and wellness professionals. **35 to >26 pts**	For the most part, sections of the paper present and explain the major aspects outlined in the assignment instructions, however slightly more information could be provided to enhance the depth of information on one of the two dimensions of whole person health and/or one of the two components of the social-ecological model. **26 to >18 pts**	Necessary topic areas are missing or occasionally are not explained in adequate detail, resulting in a lack of information in certain areas of the paper. This may include not adequately addressing at least two dimensions of whole person health and/or two components of the social-ecological model. **18 to >10 pts**	The paper is missing important information regarding the chosen topic which is necessary to provide a well-balanced academic paper that effectively examines the topic from a whole person and ecological perspective. **10 to >0 pts**	The assignment is not submitted. **0 pts**	**/35 pts**	

Criteria	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Below Expectations	Non-performance	Points	Comment
Integration of source information	Evidence-based content is incorporated into the paper demonstrating a thorough understanding of the chosen topic from both a whole person and ecological perspective; information attributed to sources is accurate and appropriately evaluated and synthesized. **25 to >19 pts**	For the most part, evidence-based content is incorporated into the paper demonstrating an understanding of the chosen topic, though additional details could help strengthen the paper. **19 to >14 pts**	Some key evidence-based information about the chosen topic is not included in the paper and/or some of the cited information is incorrect or incomplete. **14 to >8 pts**	Vital information regarding the chosen topic is not included in the paper and/or inaccurate information is presented, demonstrating a lack of effective evaluation of the literature. **8 to >1 pts**	Information from scholarly sources is not incorporated into the paper and/or the assignment is not submitted. **1 to >0 pts**	**/25 pts**	
Organization & Design	The ideas are arranged logically to support the purpose of the paper. Additionally, the paper includes a minimum of two (2) design-related elements that are content specific (e.g., graphs, charts, other visual representation of information, etc.). **10 to >8 pts**	For the most part the structure of the paper is easy to follow. The paper also includes the minimum of two design-related elements that are content specific. **8 to >6 pts**	There is some evidence that one or two sections of the paper should be reordered for better flow and clarity of information and/or the paper only has one design-related element that is content specific. **6 to >4 pts**	The paper often jumps around from section to section without providing a consistent logical flow and/or the paper does not include any design-related elements that are content specific. **4 to >0 pts**	The assignment is not submitted. **0 pts**	**/10 pts**	

Criteria	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Below Expectations	Non-performance	Points	Comment
Mechanics and Formatting	Paper is constructed error-free in AMA format, and includes a minimum of 10 scholarly sources, at least 8 of which are peer-reviewed journal articles; all sources are appropriately noted within the paper in the form of in-text citations as well as reference list entries following AMA guidelines; paper adheres to 8-10 page length (not inclusive of title, table of contents or reference page(s)). **10 to >8 pts**	This paper exhibits some limited difficulty with AMA formatting (general formatting, in-text citations or reference list entries), but lies within acceptable limits (2-3 errors); paper adheres to established 8-10 page length for core content. **8 to >6 pts**	The type and/or frequency of format and/or mechanical problems in this text is in need of attention. Does not consistently adhere to AMA guidelines and/or does not include at least 10 scholarly resources in the development of the paper. Paper may also slightly exceed (11 pages) or slightly fall short (7 pages) of the specified paper length (for core content). **6 to >4 pts**	The format and/or mechanical problems of the paper are unacceptable as they sometimes obscure the meaning of information presented. The core paper is less than 7 pages in length or more than 11 pages in length and/or the paper does not include the necessary number of references from scholarly sources. **4 to >0 pts**	The paper is not written in AMA format or the assignment is not submitted. **0 pts**	**/10 pts**	
Peer Evaluation of Contribution to Group	Regularly contributed to the group development of the project; effectively and respectfully communicated with all group members; contributed to the group assignment in a timely and meaningful manner by submitting quality work. **20 to >16 pts**	For the most part, regularly contributed to group collaborations, providing general feedback; provided work on time with minimal need for revisions, edits or changes; worked cooperatively with other group members, however an opportunity existed to take additional initiative. **16 to >12 pts**	Engaged in group discussions but provided minimal feedback, ideas and/or input; at times did not communicate effectively and/or regularly with the other members of the group. **12 to >8 pts**	Rarely contributed to group discussions, providing minimal input as to the development of the group project and/or work was not submitted on time or was not of the quality necessary to ensure group success. **8 to >0 pts**	Student did not contribute to the group in the development of the project. **0 pts**	**/20 pts**	
					Total	**/100 pts**	

Program Learning Outcome (PLO) 3:

Evaluate the influence of social determinants on health, healing, and well-being to inform the design and delivery of lifestyle interventions to prevent and treat chronic diseases.

Criteria for Success: 90% of students score at or above 90% (27/30 points) on the final project for WEL 6027 (Health Equity and Social Justice).

Signature Assignment: Final Project (WEL 6027)

Data:

2025-2026	% of students scoring 90% or higher
Fall 2025 (n=17)	100%

Interpretation and Conclusion: In Fall 2025, 100% of students (17 of 17) scored at or above 90% (27/30 points) on the Final Project for WEL 6027, meeting the criterion for success. The cohort mean was 29.1 points (96.9%), with scores ranging from 27 to 30 points.

Indirect evidence from program exit survey data support the direct assessment data, as 80% of students (12/15) reported their ability to evaluate the influence of social determinants on health and well-being to be much enhanced (5/5 points) upon completion of the program, with the remaining 20% (3/15) selected enhanced (4/5 points) using a 5-pont Likert scale.

Changes to Be Made Based on Data:

Based on the direct and indirect evidence, the criterion for success was met so no major changes to the assignment or course are planned for 2026-2027. However, being that nearly half of the students earned a perfect score and every student met the benchmark, the program director will work with the adjunct faculty teaching the course to review whether the rubric to determine if refinements are needed to better differentiate levels of performance and allow for more specific detail as to evaluation expectations. Additionally, consideration will be given to whether this final assignment may be best structured as a video-based presentation to further support student verbal communication skill development while aligning with profession-related expectations as it pertains to applying knowledge of social determinants of health in the context of the design and deliver of lifestyle interventions.

Rubric Used:

WEL 6027 – Final Project

Assessment Rubric

Criteria	Masterful	Skilled	Able	Developing	Novice	Points	Comment
Focus, Purpose, and Thesis (Controlling Idea or Argument)	Engaging, eloquent, and full development of a clear thesis and trajectory of the response paper; the reader is given a clear direction of what to expect. **6 pts**	Competent and well-developed thesis; thesis represents sound and adequate understanding of the assigned topic. **5 pts**	Mostly intelligible ideas; thesis is weak, unclear, too broad, or only indirectly supported. **3 pts**	Mostly simplistic and unfocused ideas; little or no sense of purpose or control of thesis. **2 pts**	Ideas are extremely simplistic; showing signs of confusion; misunderstanding of the prompt; thesis missing or not discernible. **1 pt**	**/6 pts**	
Ideas, Support, and Development (Evidence)	Consistent evidence with originality and depth; ideas work together as a unified whole; main points are supported with evidence; support is valid and specific; includes at least 3 required theories and/or required readings as references for single author papers or 4 for two authors. Reference list must meet the minimum requirement. **6 pts**	Ideas supported sufficiently, but written mostly as a list and not as a cohesive, unified whole; support is sound, valid, and logical. **5 pts**	Main points and ideas are only indirectly supported; support isn't sufficient or specific, but is loosely relevant to main points. **3 pts**	Insufficient, non-specific, and/or irrelevant support; demonstrates misunderstanding of key concepts from reading assignments. **2 pts**	Lack of support for main points; frequent and illogical organizations without support. **1 pt**	**/6 pts**	
Structure and Organization	Organization is sequential; paragraphs are well developed and appropriately divided; ideas linked with smooth and effective transitions. **6 pts**	Competent organization, but without sophistication; competent paragraph structure; lacking effective transitions. **5 pts**	Limited attempts to organize around a thesis; paragraphs are mostly stand-alone paragraphs with weak or non-evident transitions. **3 pts**	Organization was unsuccessful; paragraphs were simple, disconnected, and formulaic; no transitions or planned sequence. **2 pts**	Organization, if evident at all, is confusing and disjointed; paragraph structure is weak; transitions are missing, inappropriate, and/or illogical. **1 pt**	**/6 pts**	

Criteria	Masterful	Skilled	Able	Developing	Novice	Points	Comment
Audience, Tone, and Point-of-View	Clear discernment of distinctive audience, tone, and point-of-view. **6 pts**	Effective and accurate awareness of general audience; satisfactory tone and point-of-view. **5 pts**	Little or inconsistent sense of audience; tone and point-of-view not refined or inconsistent. **3 pts**	Shows almost no awareness of a particular audience. **2 pts**	Lacks awareness of a particular appropriate audience; tone and point-of-view somewhat inappropriate or very inconsistent. **1 pt**	**/6 pts**	
Sentence Structure (Grammar)	Each sentence structured effectively and powerfully; rich, well-chosen variety of sentence styles and lengths. Virtually free of punctuation, spelling, capitalization errors; appropriate format and presentation; uses correct and consistent citation format. **6 pts**	Effective and varied sentences; errors (if any) due to lack of careful proofreading; syntax errors (if any) reflect uses as colloquialisms. Contains only occasional punctuation, spelling, and/or capitalization errors; few formatting errors; most errors likely careless. **5 pts**	Formulaic or tedious sentence patterns; shows some errors in sentence construction; some non-standard syntax usage. Contains several punctuation errors, spelling errors, and/or capitalization errors; several errors in formatting or inconsistent formatting. **3 pts**	Sentences show errors of structure; little or no variety; no grasp of sentence flow. Contains many errors of punctuation, spelling, and/or capitalization; errors interfere with meaning in places; formatting incorrect in most places. **2 pts**	Simple sentences used excessively, almost exclusively; frequent errors of sentence structure. Contains many and serious errors of punctuation, spelling, and/or capitalization; errors severely interfere with meaning; formatting weak. **1 pt**	**/6 pts**	
					Total	**/30 pts**	