

COPH Faculty Assembly Meeting
July 20th, 2015
COPH Sam Bell Auditorium
10:30 – 12:00 am

President Dr. Tom Mason called the meeting to order at 10:41 am.

1. The Dean reminded faculty that our discussions are occurring within the framework of the performance metrics used to assess funding. The current metrics can be viewed at the Board of Governor's website here:

http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/performance_funding.php.

Dean Petersen stated that the legislature also allots funding based on preeminence (Preeminent State Research University Support -

<http://www.flsenate.gov/laws/statutes/2013/1001.7065>).

The following information was also shared by Dean Petersen:

- Doctoral admissions are up, largely due to the DrPH program.
 - Masters admissions are down:
 - Need to change emphasis to Master's recruitment.
 - Need to deny lowest scoring students, admit highest scoring, and have one committee review all others.
2. Dean Petersen mentioned that the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) has created new standards for undergraduate stand-alone programs and that this program does not include the traditional five core classes. The accreditation criteria can be found here: <http://ceph.org/assets/SBP-Criteria.pdf>.
 - a. Schools no longer required to offer the MPH in the five core disciplines
 - i. Schools are liberated to offer concentrations that make sense given faculty strengths, student interests and community needs.
 - ii. CEPH has issued no guidance yet (may write new criteria for concentrations)
 - iii. We currently offer the MPH in 27 concentrations with widely vary levels of applications, enrollments and completion rates.
 - iv. Our programs (49 variations on 6 themes):
 1. We offer 1 MPH
 - a. 27 concentrations (2 new, 1 inactive)
 2. We offer 1 MSPH
 - a. 15 concentrations (2 inactive)
 3. We offer 1 MHA
 4. We offer 1 BSPH
 - a. We also offer 7 minors
 5. We offer 1 DrPH
 6. We offer 1 PhD

- a. 10 concentrations
 - b. Schools will no longer be required to have five full-time faculty in each of the five core disciplines
 - i. CEPH has issued no guidance yet (minimum numbers? Qualifications?)
 - ii. Related to the concentrations, how we organize affects student-faculty ratios (required by CEPH) which vary widely
 - 1. Begs the question of how we should be organized as a college faculty.
 - c. Conversation ideas around curriculum
 - i. Yes to professional advising with faculty mentoring in the MPH
 - ii. Need to elevate importance of teaching, provide professional development, hold faculty accountable (in all media)
 - iii. Should move toward competency attainment, away from grades
 - iv. Embed practice throughout the MPH curricula (more “doing”)
 - v. Should rethink the special project
 - vi. Should explore centralizing the MPH like the DrPh and the BSPH
 - 1. Identify and build upon our key strengths and opportunities for innovation
 - 2. Enable students to build programs around their career goals
 - vii. Funding mechanisms may be driving decisions
 - 1. At departmental and individual student levels
3. On-line Programs/Courses
- a. We currently offer 7 of 27 MPH degrees fully on-line
 - b. We currently offer 10 of 24 graduate certificates on-line
 - c. Our new DrPH is largely on-line but not completely
 - d. 76% of all credit hours taught are taught on-line
 - i. 85% of undergrad, 48% of grad
 - e. Point of clarification:
 - i. 47% of undergrad courses are taught on-line
 - f. Conversations around online
 - i. Necessary to promote access
 - ii. Improve gatekeeping – on-line courses should be restricted to those required in on-line degree or on-line certificate programs.
 - iii. Improve advising – students should be steered to in-class options
 - iv. Quality can be good
 - 1. Utilize technological tools within pedagogical principles
 - 2. Assure content is current
 - 3. Employ high level assessment methods
 - 4. Seek to engage and monitor student progress
 - v. Quality MUST be good
 - 1. Faculty should be trained, perhaps even certified.
 - 2. Must adhere to quality standards
 - vi. Communication essential

1. Where do we want to be in five years?
2. Can we be more efficient and more impactful?
- vii. Great interest in blended or hybrid courses
- viii. Great interest in team-taught or shared courses
- ix. Great interest in modules or different course options
- x. Quality has to be the driver
 1. On-campus classes have to be “real” or true hybrid models

3. Doctoral Degrees

- DrPH
 - The advanced practice leadership degree in our field
 - Newly transformed, built on a cohort model
 - Attracting great applicants from around the country
 - Model is centralized and standardized with regard to applicant review, offers of admission (with the caveat that a faculty mentor has to be identified), curricular design and review, practice requirement, and research project
 - One degree, no concentrations, through we are looking to build emphasis areas
 - By definition these students are working professionals with significant experience, older and often supported by their employers
 - Curriculum characterized by its *breadth*
- PhD
 - One degree, in Public Health, ten concentrations
 - Very decentralized, very specialized
 - Students have widely varying experiences
 - Appropriate in some instances given the different methodological approaches
 - Less defensible in other instances (e.g. funding, assessment methods, mentoring, numbers of students in the program, professional development and other opportunities)
 - Curriculum characterized by its *depth*
- DrPH Enrollment
 - As of Summer 2015
 - 14 active students
 - 8 in the old program
 - 6 in the new program
 - 4 have graduated
 - Admitted for Fall 2016
 - 20 admitted, 19 confirmed
- PhD Enrollment

PhD concentration	Active Not Enrolled	Active Enrolled	Total	Admitted/Accepted Fall 2016
Biostatistics	1	5	6	5/4
Community and Family Health	2	26	28	4/3
EOH	1	4	5	0
Epidemiology	1	15	16	5/2
Environmental Health	0	1	1	1/1
Health Services Research	0	3	3	1
Industrial Hygiene	1	4	5	0
Occupational Health	1	1	2	1/0
Global Communicable Disease	3	14	17	6/4
Toxicology and Risk Assessment	0	8	8	0

3. Conversations around Doctoral Degrees

- General agreement that
 - As a college-wide degree, there should be college-wide accountability
 - There is room for more uniformity where it makes sense
 - There is room for more efficiency where we can achieve it
 - We should be identifying best practices within and applying across
 - Our ultimate responsibility is to ensure the highest quality educational experience
- General agreement that we need to increase the number of graduates
 - Increase the completion rates of those we admit
 - Decrease the time to degree to get them out faster
 - Provide more consistent funding
 - Admit more? Better qualified?

3. Recruitment

- Should consider recruiting as a College for our PhD program
 - Develop and implement a collective plan
 - Assess where we have “openings” (available funds, available mentors)
 - Recruit both broadly and specifically for these openings
 - Develop funding packages from all sources
 - Allow for program specific review of applicants within College oversight to assure we are selecting the best applicants for the best reasons
 - Once selected, go after them (really recruit!)

3. Treat as a cohort

- Create a community of PhD students
- One PhD in the Public Health Program Handbook
- Orient together, foster an interdisciplinary spirit
- Consider a “public health bootcamp” for the cohort
 - General exposure to public health and to public health research
- Develop some shared curricula

- A research methods core, exposing them to research ethics, to the variety of methods used in public health research and to faculty across the College
- A research seminar that they participate in together
- A professional development seminar that they participate in together

3. Mentoring

- After the common, comes the individual, within the specialization
- Absolutely essential that each admitted student has a clearly identified, appropriate, willing and available mentor
- Beyond that, interdisciplinary mentoring teams could be identified, based on each student's goals
 - Could guide course of study
- Could rethink “the academic unit” for purposes of developing committees – why not utilize the full complement of faculty expertise?

3. Promote uniformity where it makes sense

- Even with specialization there could be a common set of values, a common philosophy
- Level of rigor should be similar (and should be strong)
- Every doctoral student should be prepared to teach
- Procedures for qualifying exams, admission to candidacy and dissertation defenses should be examined for balance between the specialization and the overall degree

3. Promote efficiency where it makes sense

- In general, we need more 7000 level courses, but rather than design them in isolation for small groups of specialized students, we could be designing them
 - With teams of faculty
 - For broader audiences of students
 - In smaller increments (not everything has to be a 3-credit hour course)
 - Using technology, hybrid models
- Replace the required MPH with a great Public Health Bootcamp
- At least one research seminar per semester could be college-wide
- Mentor teams advising multiple students?

3. Common elements of success

- What might these be? We should discuss and agree upon these and then actively promote them
 - Publishing
 - Presenting at scientific meetings
 - Appropriate rate of academic progress
 - Experiences appropriate to the students' professional development
 - Should we rethink the 3 paper model? What do the 3 papers have to be? What about students who engage in interdisciplinary research efforts?

- What about translation of research findings to practice? Clearly a core element of the DrPH but what about the PhD?

3. Overarching Issues

- General agreement that we should develop a clear vision for our PhD program – what is it intended to produce?
- General agreement that there needs to be college-wide accountability
- General agreement that promoting quality teaching is essential
- Faculty development for new teaching competencies and skills
- Faculty development for best practice mentoring skills
- Should consider a central resource for student support
- Students need guidance to be better stewards of their own educational experience

3. Beer and Pizza!

- Interest in changing the culture
- Why don't they go to seminars, Dean's lectures, final defenses, etc
- We could require some number of credit hours in these areas
- We could somehow incentivize participation in non-curricular events
- Or we could just lure them out of their labs and cubicles with beer and pizza...
- Lots of things to work on!

4. Faculty Effort

- Robust conversations as usual
- In general, faculty felt as though the assignment *process* was reasonable and fair, with opportunities for negotiation with the chair.
- Some faculty weren't as confident that the assignments themselves were always reasonable and fair, particularly across departments.
 - Variance in amount of time assigned for teaching
 - Variance in availability of Teaching Assistants
 - Variance in amount of time assigned for research
 - Variance in committee/service assignments
 - Variance in availability of administrative support
 - Variance in access to resources, in general

4. Expectations

- Most faculty work more than 40 hours per week
 - Hard to know what the percentage really reflects
 - Some faculty have to “back in” to the assignment of time, others “go forward” resulting in sometimes stark differences in the amount of time assigned for the same general activity

- General agreement that we need to balance the “research intensive university” expectation with our statutory and professional obligation to teach and to teach at a high level of quality.
- General agreement that we are a diverse faculty and that we have to “expect” that there will be variation in assignments.
- Teaching pathway faculty have little capacity to contribute to the research mission.
- Research pathway faculty have little capacity to contribute to the teaching mission.
- May need to readjust how we think about these pathways as ALL ranked faculty MUST contribute to all mission areas.

4. Accountability

- General agreement that faculty should be held accountable for what they agreed to do at the time of assignment.
- In particular, there was strong agreement that as a collective we should demand the highest quality teaching effort
 - Training should be provided and in some cases assigned
 - Some mechanism should be in place to review syllabi, curricula, etc
 - Faculty should be expected to update materials and use higher level assessments
 - Faculty need to be assigned enough time BUT they also must demonstrate that they used that time
- Faculty given department-funded research assignments should produce as negotiated each year (grant proposals submitted, manuscripts submitted, etc).
- Faculty assigned to committees should attend and contribute
- Faculty are expected to engage in community or professional service but it should be linked to some clear benefit to the College or the University.
 - Faculty cannot choose to volunteer for something and then use that as an excuse not to meet their fundamental responsibilities.
 - “Fundamental responsibilities” in each group = teaching

4. Time for Research

- Strong agreement that tenure-earning assistant professors should have a minimum of 50% time assigned to research.
- Also strong agreement that they should all be assigned a GA
- Faculty in general need some department-funded research time to do the work that can’t be done under specific grant funds.
- Again, the annual evaluation should use the previous assignment as a metric by which to judge the production associated with the assigned time.

4. Time for Teaching

- General agreement that there can probably be no formula for this as needs vary by the discipline, number of students, complexity of the course, experience of the faculty member.

- Also general agreement though, that *every* offering of *every* course deserved some assignment of prep time for updating materials, and infusing new techniques, innovations, etc.
- Great interest in new models of teaching, i.e. not everything has to be a three-credit, full semester, single instructor-led course.
- Again, the annual evaluation should include a serious assessment of teaching quality.

4. “Relief”

- General agreement that if we could be more efficient or could shift some responsibilities to a more appropriate person/office that faculty would have more time to devote to the core mission areas
 - Support for professional advisors in the MPH program
 - Support of eliminating unnecessary committees.
 - Support for streamlining processes
 - Support for rethinking field experience and the special project

Leading up to the last conversation

- How much of this inequity (perceived or real) is due to our departmental structure or are there other ways to address these challenges?

Comment: Moving away from a 3-credit hour course requires careful look at total course hours required.

Comment: Will the CPH exam be considered service and what does it require? Answer: a large number of accredited faculty sends a message to students, illustrates that we really care about public health. CEUs are required every 2 years, you don’t have to buy the CEUs.

Comment: How will we keep current appointments in line with new recommendations coming down from the APT committee? Answer: This is one of many factors we need to consider in upcoming talks.

Comment: The number of concentrations within departmental boundaries may exist for historical reasons and may inhibit cross-discipline development.

Comment: The charge of excellence in teaching/research/outreach does not fit into a 40 hour/week. We have created this situation in which we have to do things we don’t want to do.

Adjourn: 11:05

Notes respectfully submitted by Jill Roberts.