

Report

COPH Faculty RE-ORG Survey

February 2nd 2018, 1:02 pm MST

Q1 - What do you like most about your job/position here in the college?

What do you like most about your job/position here in the college?
I work with wonderful colleagues who are doing impactful research and care about teaching.
The college respects independent research activities, yet promotes interdisciplinary research at the same time. I also like the fact that community engagement is highly encouraged for research, and junior faculty support is exceptional at the college level.
I am a new faculty member, and so far I like teaching our students and collaborating with other faculty with my research/teaching interests. Discussing issues with students in the course I'm teaching and hearing their perspectives on public health topics is immensely rewarding.
I like being part of an organization (the University, and the College of Public Health) that promotes education, information-sharing, the encouragement of independent thinking, and the encouragement to participate in goal-sharing activity, including paid activity but also volunteer activity as well.
The opportunity to interact with people in every facet of the College and community from students, to faculty to other staff members. My position allows me to ability to improve on the efficiency of process and procedure for the benefit of all stakeholders. I am personally enriched by the opportunity to meet potential applicants to our programs, watch them matriculate into the College, get to know them personally and graduate to positively impact the field of public health.
What I like the most is the fact that we as Faculty have an opportunity to facilitate the professional development (training and career placement) of our Best and Brightest !! I pride myself in serving in the European tradition of a 'Doctor Father'. This NOT restricted to my Doctoral students, and includes ALL students regardless of their degree path and/or discipline.
I like the multidisciplinary nature of the work environment, interacting with intelligent, competent individuals at all levels. I appreciate that I can work independently, without being "micro-managed", and having the opportunity to work collaboratively when necessary.
Great flexibility, challenges for my professional abilities, working with world class colleagues. A focus on professional practice and using public health knowledge to improve health outcomes.
Mentoring students working with community partners preparing the next generation
I like the flexibility in researching what interests me. I also like connecting students to community organizations for internships and jobs.
Be able to contribute with teaching and research in the areas of my interest and specialization (maternal and child health).
flexibility independence

<p>I hold a staff position within CPH. what I like most about my position is that I enjoy most everyone that I have the opportunity to work with in the college.</p>
<p>Staff (Administrative)</p>
<p>Ability to manage and drive programmatic activities that result in the improvement of people's health and well-being.</p>
<p>Most everyone gets along with little in-fighting</p>
<p>Ability to make a difference in the health and lives of individuals throughout the world.</p>
<p>I like teaching and advising students</p>
<p>My faculty position gives me the opportunity to do all of the work that I enjoy doing including teaching and mentoring students, conducting research, and collaborating with others to improve the health and wellbeing of women, children and families.</p>
<p>Interaction with students Collaboration with colleagues Support from the research office for grant submissions.</p>
<p>The college recognizes its social mission - i.e. I feel like I can do meaningful work here.</p>
<p>Mentoring students</p>
<p>Interactions with smart and talented people--the faculty, the students, the administrators--and the challenges we work on.</p>
<p>Progressive leadership, the ability to influence the next generation of public health professionals, and empathetic perspective of the college as a whole.</p>
<p>I like the overall environment in the college that supports individual creativity and provides for the needs of the faculty.</p>
<p>Freedom to pursue research interests. And my colleagues</p>

Q3 - Based on information presented in the Dean's Proposal for a Structural Reorganization of the COPH, USF, what are the key criteria you think should be used to determine how to best re-organize around RESEARCH?

Based on information presented in the Dean's Proposal for a Structural Reorganization of the COPH, USF, what are the key criteria you think should be used to determine how to best re-organize around RESEARCH?

1. Faculty with strong identity around a particular area (eg global health, health policy and management, maternal/child/family health, community health) should be maintained with a title that indicates a recognized 'cluster' in the academic world and lead by a strong, visionary leader who facilitates inter and intra collaboration with other 'clusters' and the broader university.
2. A process for determining whether a faculty is a 'fit' within a given cluster.
3. Central resources to support the research enterprise so that faculty can focus on the intellectual aspects of the research, and great grant support to pay attention to the non-intellectual aspects of grants.
4. A transparent, 'fair' budget allocation and budget model that facilitates high quality research, particularly as it relates to the 25% salary coverage required to be raised by faculty.
5. An agreed upon process for allocating budgets, determining areas of specialization for investing in faculty.
6. A mentoring model for junior faculty that holds mentors accountable for processes and methods to support the junior faculty member's success.
7. An APT committee that serves as a resource for junior faculty to be successful, provides ongoing (at least annual) feedback to junior faculty as a committee, and recognizes that different specializations within public health have different criteria that 'define' appropriate levels of scholarship (eg publications, grant opportunities).
8. That the COPH org chart clearly show which centralized functions/people support the research functions and research faculty governance structure and how.

I think that it should be re-organized by research topics/health outcomes. It would be good to have research groups. For example, I would be happy to be part of a obesity research group and would be willing to initiate forming a group related to obesity research topics. I also think that one person can be in multiple research groups.

I think restructuring around similar research topics or methodologies could increase collaboration by streamlining knowledge of who is interested in what. I think it could be a very positive change. However, caution should be exercised in making topic areas too narrow. Some epidemiologists and biostatisticians work on a myriad of topics linked by a common methodology. Also, research interests evolve over time and I think there should be thought towards not restricting individuals to one particular topic area.

Make sure that our students (and faculty and staff) understand the basics of research as well as the variety of ways research can be conducted, and then to promote the best practices of research.

An assessment of extramural funding opportunities. Determine a top three focus areas assess where these fields are headed in the next 10-20 years and then re-organize into hubs or groups based on research focus area.

I would suggest that we use the 'carrot' of incentives to encourage/require cross-disiplinary research. Specifically, I would encourage setting aside monies which can be used for the development of 'teams' of collaborators. Included would be travel to meetings/conferences, collection of 'pilot data' to support applications for funding, and 'publication fees' for collaborative research. The monies could ONLY be used to support collaborative effortys !!.

Making research more interdisciplinary so it will be more widely applicable and maximize the chance of being awarded funding.

Are senior collaborators available among different disciplines to provide expertise and credibility?

Assurance that the College will attract research leaders who bring expertise and understand the flattened structure. Will these types of leaders be attracted to a less focus area approach? How will centers of excellence be maintained?

Increasing opportunities for cross pollination is always helpful. No one operates well in a vacuum or a silo. Many faculty have a range of different skills and experience so finding a way to promote and share for truly

transdisciplinary work would benefit all.

What also seems to be missing, but is important is that we all must participate in research, but it happens in different ways depending on the track of faculty-research, teaching, tenure and a one size fits all approach will not work.

Certain types of scholarship require substantial grant funding, while others disciplines do not. These differences should be respected when evaluating scholarly performance.

Also, any reorganization that encourages interdisciplinary work represents an opportunity for early career faculty to develop new professional skills and to gain recognition for their special talents/perspectives.

For more established faculty, the College restructuring should enable them to lead and develop faculty outside their current sphere of influence (departments). Opportunities should be provided to them to articulate their vision throughout the Collge and to listen to other's perspectives.

Concentration areas translated into faculty working as Research Core Groups (e.g. Maternal and Child Health, Violence and Injuries, Global Communicable Diseases, Health Behavior, etc.). Each concentration area could have a government body such as the caucuses at APHA (APHA structure is a "metaphor" of an even larger structure that functions well), which are elected by the same members. Members should be faculty, doctoral and master students. They all could be part of one or many concentrations. Dean's office can function as "backbone support" in the same way collective impact framework proposes.

administrative support for grants
faculty assignment time to allow for grant development and submission
mentoring of junior faculty

Level of funding and notoriety brought to the college through the research of activity.
Results of the research.

Determination by upper management of how the reorganization/college will be structured (broad outline).
Decisions that can only be made at that level must be made before asking for input on how to fill in the more day-to-day things. There has to be executive decisions.

Research should be organized around 2-3 central themes that allow the College to excel in those areas. It is not possible to be excellent in everything!

I think the most important consideration would be to provide flexibility for faculty members to choose their research area. The research focus areas should be broad enough to accommodate many faculty members with similar interests while giving them the flexibility to work in their areas of interest and expertise.

* Also, I believe that faculty members should have the freedom to move between research clusters

Does the structure promote successful solicitation of grant and contract funding?
Does the structure promote ready ability to perform grant and contract work while providing and minimizing administrative efforts?
Does the structure support the development of faculty and students?
Does the structure provide the resources and opportunities to promote competitive capabilities by all faculty?

Support for proposal submission
Internal funding for pilot work
connections for collaborations

How to facilitate interactions between faculty researchers from all subdisciplines.
How to ensure all faculty members have appropriate, transparent, and equitable access to the resources (money, e.g. returned overhead, staff, guidance, equipment, soft and hard research support infrastructure, student support such as TA allocations and fellowships for research students) so that we can achieve our scholarship goals.

Concentration/focus areas

I don't think we should reorganize around research. I think each faculty member tends to pursue their own research agenda, and haven't been brought here because they fit into a pre existing program. I think people work

across departments and even colleges to find suitable collaborators. I think this is going fine.

Organization could be accomplished in two ways. 1. Researchers involved in specific areas of interest could be organized by topic. 2. Researchers focused on the method of research rather than topic could be organized by discipline.

I believe if office assignments are based upon a common research interest, there may be more collaboration.

Facilitation of collaboration

Q4 - Based on information presented in the Dean's Proposal for a Structural Reorganization of the COPH, USF, what are the key criteria you think should be used to determine how to best re-organize around TEACHING/EDUCATION?

Based on information presented in the Dean's Proposal for a Structural Reorganization of the COPH, USF, what are the key criteria you think should be used to determine how to best re-organize around TEACHING/EDUCATION?

1. That centralized resources and processes to support teaching/education/student issues have well defined and documented repeatable processes for course scheduling, faculty assignments, advising, and admissions that are logical, timely, and transparent, and supported by staff with the needed levels of technical and organizational skills to carry out the support functions collaboratively with faculty teaching leads.
2. That the concentration areas within the MPH, and the other degrees granted within the COPH (MHA, PhD, DrPH, etc.) have a core of identified faculty associated with them that care about the program's students, curriculum, quality, delivery, reputation, alumni, and other internal and external stakeholder groups of that concentration/program, and will show up for meetings regarding those programs.
3. That the COPH level education committee represents the leadership of the various concentration areas/degrees.
4. That quality of teaching is reviewed by each program faculty to provide mentoring for improving teaching performance and program/concentration quality.
5. That the COPH org chart clearly show which centralized functions/people support the teaching/education functions and the education faculty governance structure and how.

By program concentrations.

While the degree programs and students are at the core of the restructure, the impetus of the restructure seems to be focused around primary research areas. As Teaching Faculty, I'm not certain how I will be grouped since research is a lower percent of my appointment than research faculty and I teach core epidemiology methods courses with no particular public health topical focus.

Make sure that our students get the training that they need to succeed in the real world.

Assess what the community partners and/or organizations who hire our students are needing in terms of skill set from our graduates. Also, look at programs where students have been most successful in obtaining job immediately upon graduation. What skills can we teach our students that will best assist them in their occupational futures to further the field of public health and strongly represent the USF College of Public Health in the workforce. It is not necessary for the concentrations/degree programs to be housed in a specific research focus area or hub and this fluidity would allow the students to become more familiar with all areas of public health as defined by COPH.

From my experience, I would suggest that we become much more engaged with our students !! We, as faculty, need to sincerely communicate our interest/availability to meet with our students on some mutually-agreed-upon schedule. It is NOT acceptable to delegate our authority to schedulers, albeit well-intentioned. The professional fulfillment for us and our students is worth the effort !!

How to best prepare students for careers at every level.
What skills are most desirable and attractive to applicants?

It seems that the goal is to teach across disciplines, there will be a need to have individuals who have strong practice understanding and linkage to professionals in the field and perhaps to bring those experts to class or students to practice sites.

Again, we have quite a range of expertise and experience. Finding ways to more efficiently teach, team teach, teach across disciplines where possible would benefit students and faculty. We don't need 3 methods classes that teach similar things by 3 different faculty. Won't work for all topics BUT why not combine where possible?

Teaching/education should be valued on par with scholarship. Also, any college restructuring should encourage field-based education, allow for co-teaching, and enable more curriculum flexibility (e.g., 1 credit courses).

Criteria 1. Begin with the end in mind. Practice-based teaching as requirement for assignments.
Criteria 2. Interdisciplinary teaching. Teaching only about our own expertise is nice, but it will not meet the student needs in the 21st century. Thus, we need to build classes with multiple instructors from multiple departments or core concentrations.
Criteria 3. Student-centered philosophy, project-based or problem-based learning, with flipped classroom settings, and augmented-reality enhanced classrooms (e.g. teacher using tablet or cellphone interactions as the face-to-face class unfolds - the millennials' style) will be in great demand.
Challenges: To better integrate innovation, faculty need to be able to dedicate more time investment (protected time) to continuously improve and re-organize course offerings. Understanding the student demand for courses and learning styles may mean that traditional courses not always offered as they may be too inflexible to meet the needs.

1. college commitment to excellence in teaching for both on-line and in-class offerings
2. communicating a consistent message so that both forums are provided and valued (instead of going back and forth about live vs. on-line, continuously changing requirements-e.g., must have one live offering a year per every on-line course-this is not practical for programs that have only on-line students
3. allowing on-line students who live in the area to attend live classes if so desired)
4. decreasing the number of concentrations
5. determining concentrations based on enrollment, whether there is national certification, and potential for success among graduates

N/A

Concentrations should be reduced so that faculty can focus on the core degrees. Faculty will have more time to focus on research and scholarship if all faculty pulled together and taught in fewer focused areas.

In my opinion, it's best to cluster teaching faculty around concentrations offered for each of the degrees. I think that undergraduate education and online education need their own clusters, given their different demands.

- Does the structure promote successful student recruitment across disciplines and concentrations?
- Does the structure promote successful student graduation across disciplines and concentrations?
- Does the structure produce students able to succeed in meeting and exceeding the workforce needs across disciplines and concentrations?
- Does the structure promote maximizing faculty input and contributions to teaching operations?
- Does the structure help develop and maintain a solid teaching faculty?

Quality of courses

Elimination of duplicate courses. Can the content be taught in one cross cutting course. For example, perhaps we don't need several research methods courses.

equity around advising. Faculty assignments should reflect the number of students you are advising. if someone is advising 5 people their assignment for advising should not be the same as someone who advises 30 or 40

I am most concerned about the current disconnect between many faculty members and most students in the college, now that most of the formal classwork (and advising) is housed outside of departments. How will the new organization ensure interactions are rekindled between faculty and students? How can we ensure that the teaching and curriculum in the college reflect the vision of public health and the expertise of the entire faculty in the college and that all faculty members are involved in course teaching in an equitable and transparent way?

Concentration/focus areas

If we need to be organized in a more effective and efficient manner so that we're not duplicating classes across departments, let's look into that.

Teaching and education could be organized by level/degree (BSPH, MPH, PhD)

The problem is there is great interplay between assigning teaching and research. I think one thing we could do sooner is have college wide admissions for all MPH programs, but it would be challenging to have one person in charge of undergraduate teaching assignments, another MPH, and another PhD. There is often overlap in who teaches at each level. I would like to see teaching assignments done by the concentration with discussion since

some faculty will teach in multiple concentrations.

Faculty control of content and scheduling

Q5 - Based on information presented in the Dean's Proposal for a Structural Reorganization of the COPH, USF, what are the key criteria you think should be used to determine how to best re-organize around SERVICE?

Based on information presented in the Dean's Proposal for a Structural Reorganization of the COPH, USF, what are the key criteria you think should be used to determine how to best re-organize around SERVICE?

1. That the published research generated by COPH faculty is turned into digestible summaries (e.g. policy briefs, summaries for media), that are regularly and widely distributed to internal and external stakeholders on a regular basis with a well identified process for how this is accomplished, and the look and feel brand of the COPH.
2. That there be a systematic way of identifying and codifying the external partners that are collaborating with which COPH faculty to facilitate generating long-lasting, sustained community partnerships, rather than just project-based partnerships that dissipate once a project is done.
3. That there be a process that facilitates faculty serving on national organizations (AUPHA, ASPPH, Academy Health, etc.) and state and national committees-getting them nominated, etc.
4. That the COPH org chart clearly show which centralized functions/people support the service functions and how.

By function. The proposed committee structure looks fine, but I think that we need more administrative staff for each committee since faculty would not have time to expand their service duties much, and the department chairs did a lot allocating faculty to different committee groups and maintaining efficient communications among those groups.

I don't have any input on this since I am so new to my position.

Make sure that our students get the practice that they need to understand and appreciate SERVICE.

A better definition of what constitutes faculty service across the board. More concentrate deliverables to be established at the time of faculty assignment and assessed at the point of evaluation each year. From there, whomever is making the assignment should integrate and organize individuals around the area of service.

This College is positioned to maintain its reputation as 'being there ' for the Community, however Community is defined ! We are NOT elitist but are engaged !! To that end we would be well-served by having an Accessible Advisory Board who at the Operational Level in their respective organizations.

What areas of service deserve the most attention and how do we focus on providing what they need?

It needs to be more clear what the expectation is regarding service.

Similar to above, many involved in different projects but my sense is that it is not always known or recognized. Hard to know where to capture this. Also helping faculty learn when it is ok to say no. Not every ask we receive is appropriate or the best use of limited resources (time, students, experience for students, etc).

Flexibility to conduct service in a way that the faculty chooses. For example, some like to engage with community organizations and some like to assist with faculty governance. These preferences should be honored in the new College structure.

The service path must be broadly defined to include affiliation from community leaders in selected fields. It should also continue to include a service-learning mechanism for mentoring students that is monitored and counted toward tenure promotion. Community-engaged research takes time and some junior faculty stay away from it due to the penalties on tenure promotion (due to length of time).

no comment

the link isn't working to review the proposal.

Again, executive decisions must be made in order for the more day-to-day operations to make any sense.

Service as leaders of the Faculty Assembly and three standing committees should be given more effort.

Does the structure support, promote and reward meaning faculty contributions to service?

Again, equity and accountability.

Participation in service should be reflected in the assignments, not just 5% for all.

Engagement globally, nationally, statewide, and Tampa Bay Area.

Nope. Shouldn't do this, either.

Service could be organized by topic/population of interest, and level/degree if relevant.

I think we have made excellent steps already in service. The question will be who should be on the committees and perhaps including faculty at different levels, assistant, associate, and full.

True support for realistic service assignments