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Introduction

This report presents the findings of the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) regarding the Robert Stempel College of Public Health and Social Work (RSCPHSW) at Florida International University (FIU). The report assesses the school’s compliance with the Accreditation Criteria for Schools of Public Health, amended June 2005. This accreditation review included the conduct of a self-study process by school constituents, the preparation of a document describing the school and its features in relation to the criteria for accreditation, and a visit in April 2012 by a team of external peer reviewers. During the visit, the team had an opportunity to interview school and university officials, administrators, teaching faculty, students, alumni and community representatives, and to verify information in the self-study document by reviewing materials provided on site in a resource file. The team was afforded full cooperation in its efforts to assess the college and the self-study document.

FIU was chartered by the Florida legislature in 1965 and opened its doors in 1972 to the largest opening student enrollment in the history of American higher education. FIU initially focused on upper-division undergraduate classes to accommodate transfers from area community colleges and had limited graduate programs. The university added lower-division undergraduate courses in 1981 and received authorization to offer doctoral degrees in 1985. FIU operates two campuses in Miami-Dade County and enrolls 46,000 students in undergraduate and graduate degree programs. FIU leads the nation in the number of baccalaureate and master’s degrees awarded to Hispanic students.

FIU has offered master’s degrees in public health since 1983, initially operating as a public health program. FIU added concentrations to its MPH program and added doctoral education in public health and was accredited as the Robert Stempel School of Public Health in 2007. Since its inception, the unit has included public health graduate degrees as well as undergraduate and graduate degrees in dietetics and nutrition. The unit has undergone great amounts of transition, particularly in terms of degrees offered, since the initial accreditation in the school of public health category. It added additional doctoral degree concentrations in public health in 2005-2006, and discontinued one, in community nutrition, in 2009. The college discontinued its master of health services degree in 2009, with the final students completing the program in 2011. Until 2011, the unit offered a bachelor’s degree in a public health field, the bachelor of health services administration; that degree has been moved to another college at RSCPHSW’s request. Most significantly, the existing school merged with FIU’s School of Social Work in 2008 to form the unit that is currently being considered for accreditation.

At the time of the school’s initial accreditation, the Council requested an interim report in 2009 on four non-compliant criteria. The Council accepted the interim report as evidence of compliance with the five criteria but requested a new interim report based on evidence of non-compliance in other areas that was presented
with the 2009 interim report. The Council also requested multiple interim reports in 2010 on the basis of information submitted in notices of substantive change and information in the school’s annual report. In 2010, the Council acted to confer probationary accreditation on the college based on serious deficiencies in two areas: faculty resources and public health curricula for other professional degrees in the college. This is the college’s first full review since the conferral of probationary accreditation.
Characteristics of a School of Public Health

To be considered eligible for accreditation review by CEPH, a school of public health shall demonstrate the following characteristics:

a. The school shall be a part of an institution of higher education that is accredited by a regional accrediting body recognized by the US Department of Education.

b. The school and its faculty shall have the same rights, privileges and status as other professional schools that are components of its parent institution.

c. The school shall function as a collaboration of disciplines, addressing the health of populations and the community through instruction, research, and service. Using an ecological perspective, the school of public health should provide a special learning environment that supports interdisciplinary communication, promotes a broad intellectual framework for problem-solving, and fosters the development of professional public health concepts and values.

d. The school of public health shall maintain an organizational culture that embraces the vision, goals and values common to public health. The school shall maintain this organizational culture through leadership, institutional rewards, and dedication of resources in order to infuse public health values and goals into all aspects of the school's activities.

e. The school shall have faculty and other human, physical, financial and learning resources to provide both breadth and depth of educational opportunity in the areas of knowledge basic to public health. As a minimum, the school shall offer the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree in each of the five areas of knowledge basic to public health and a doctoral degree in at least three of the five specified areas of public health knowledge.

f. The school shall plan, develop and evaluate its instructional, research and service activities in ways that assure sensitivity to the perceptions and needs of its students and that combines educational excellence with applicability to the world of public health practice.

These characteristics are evident in the FIU RSCPHSW. The university has appropriate regional accreditation, and the college and its faculty have the same rights, status and privileges as other FIU colleges. The college encourages interdisciplinary work, and its strong engagement with local communities, particularly in research and service, provide a venue for using an ecological perspective and focusing on professional public health values. Though the school includes dietetics and nutrition degrees and social work degrees in addition to traditional public health degrees, the college’s mission clearly reflects public health values.

Ensuring that there are adequate faculty resources to provide the breadth and depth of public health educational programs offered has been a challenge for the college in recent years, but college leaders have implemented effective measures to address this challenge: a significant number of new faculty hires and the move or closure of several degree programs that were offered in addition to the MPH and
doctoral degrees in core public health knowledge areas have been critical to bolstering the adequacy of resources. The college has a robust planning and evaluation process and strong ties to the local practice community that ensure that the college maintains educational excellence and applicability to public health practice.

1.0 THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

1.1 Mission.

The school shall have a clearly formulated and publicly stated mission with supporting goals and objectives. The school shall foster the development of professional public health values, concepts and ethical practice.

This criterion is met. The RSCPHSW has a mission statement that includes education, training, research, translation of research to practice and a role in promoting the health of the diverse and underserved population of South Florida. The mission statement includes reference to knowledge and application and ethical decision making in public health and social welfare. The mission statement was developed as part of the process for the college's Strategic Plan for 2011-2016. The vision, mission and values for the school were approved in August 2010 and were revised and accepted in September 2011. The revised mission and objectives reflect all disciplines (public health, social work and dietetics/nutrition) within the college. The school's mission is as follows:

The mission of RSCPHSW is to serve the South Florida community by increasing, sharing, and applying knowledge, wisdom, and ethical decision making in public health and social welfare. The College carries out this mission by:

- Educating and training future leaders, researchers, and practitioners.
- Conducting innovative research and translating research into policy, programs, and practice.
- Promoting healthy lives for diverse and, especially underserved populations, here and abroad.

There are four goals and 12 measurable objectives. Broad goal statements related to education and training, research and service provided a context for the program’s activities. These goals reflect a commitment to serving the diverse population and needs of South Florida’s communities, specifically underserved populations. The program desires to share and apply research findings in public health, dietetics and nutrition and social work to promote healthy lives for these diverse communities. In addition, the program seeks to nurture an environment of collegial excellence.

A series of objectives supports each of the goal statements. These objectives indicate the intent to improve completion rates and financial support of doctoral students; improve graduation rates; improve faculty student ratios; establish competency standards; increase levels of service; increase funding for research and institutional expenditures for students; improve faculty and staff diversity; and develop inter-
professional educational opportunities through joint degrees, specifically degrees that combine the MPH with the MSW, MD and MSN.

The college’s mission, vision and core values are reviewed as part of the strategic plan every five years. The review process includes collegiate leadership, faculty, staff, students, the RSCPHSW External Advisory Committee and other constituent groups including alumni, preceptors and employers of graduates. The Faculty Assembly adopts the strategic plan by majority vote. The strategic plan and vision, mission and values statement are posted on the college website. Vision, mission and values statements are posted in the building.

The college’s values are aligned with those of the university. College leadership and faculty work to make these values evident in the classroom and their work with the community. Students, faculty and administration validated the importance of the values specifically the celebration of individual and community diversity in sessions throughout the site visit process. Various stakeholder groups validated familiarity with the mission and strategic plan during the on-site sessions.

1.2 Evaluation and Planning.

The school shall have an explicit process for evaluating and monitoring its overall efforts against its mission, goals and objectives; for assessing the school’s effectiveness in serving its various constituencies; and for planning to achieve its mission in the future.

This criterion is met with commentary. The college has a thorough evaluation and planning framework to support its mission and operations. Categories of activities described in the self study and verified on site include strategic planning, faculty, administrative and staff evaluations, student learning and program outcomes, surveys and college and university committees and assessment systems.

Under the oversight of the Dean’s Office, the college conducts an annual review of the goals and outcomes outlined in the strategic plan. Associate/assistant deans and directors ensure the collection and analysis of required data. The dean drafts the annual report, which is shared and discussed with the Executive Committee, Faculty Assembly, Staff Council, Student Advisory Committee and External Advisory Committee. The final report is posted on the college website for public review.

Measures reported include student graduation/retention rates, competency measures, graduate job placement rates, workforce development efforts, faculty grant funding, number of publications per faculty and overall growth of the college in terms of resources.

The self-study report includes a description of the assessment and feedback loops for student learning and program outcomes. Several of these are required of all departments/schools at FIU for institutional accreditation purposes (including doctoral candidacy and dissertation; graduation rates for professional
degrees and MPH competencies achievement). The RSCPHSW Office of Academic Affairs assists the academic units in data collection and analysis and recently assigned an administrative staff person to assist in this process. The college’s Educational Effectiveness Council (associate dean for academic affairs, academic public health director, director of social work and chair of dietetics and nutrition) develops the Administrative Assessment Report and reviews the student learning outcomes and program outcomes for all degree granting programs in the college.

University assessments conducted by the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability are done every seven years. The RSCPHSW will report to the University Assessment Committee in June 2013. The document framework for this reporting matches information provided in the self-study. The university review of the MPH and PhD degrees in public health will be completed in 2012-2013, with a summary report due to the Board of Governors in December 2013.

Results of evaluation and planning are used to improve operations and programs. Examples of using data to improve program include the following: changes in the PhD curriculum to facilitate timely completion of program; an increase in availability of advanced-level courses in several majors/tracks; and an effort to improve scoring consistencies within and across departments, based on preliminary results from competency assessments (fall 2011). The position of public health practicum coordinator/career advisor was created in response to the 2010 Exit Survey. Alumni surveys will be facilitated by having graduates retain FIU email addresses post graduation. These are examples of operational improvements based on evaluation feedback and dialogue with stakeholders.

The self-study describes ways in which various constituent groups are involved in evaluation and planning. Feedback is routinely obtained from faculty, staff, students and the External Advisory Board. The Executive Committee meets monthly. The newly created Academic Public Health Group meets to discuss and ensure consistency in each public health course and review/discussions on competency schedules, admission criteria and student learning outcomes. Staff, students and external constituents provide feedback. The university and state-mandated processes also reinforce planning and evaluation efforts for program improvement and outcomes. Evidence of the evaluation and planning cycle as well as inclusion of constituent groups was validated by the site visit team and a review of the resource file.

A small team of faculty members and administrators took responsibility for writing each draft of the CEPH self-study. The Executive Committee, the Faculty Assembly and its various standing committees, the Student Advisory Board, the Staff Council and the External Advisory Committee met regularly to provide recommendations for changes to sections of the document (or the complete document when available). The data used for the final report included recurring assessments related to the strategic planning cycle, CEPH annual and interim reports, SACS self-study and review, survey data and university program
reviews. The strategic plan SWOT analysis provided incentives to address weaknesses and opportunities in preparation for the CEPH review. The process of review and revision provided by interim documents and a mock site visit appears to be inclusive of multiple data sources and feedback cycles.

The commentary relates to the need for the college to move from process to documentation of results from evaluation and program improvement. The college has made significant strides but remains limited in demonstrating results and achieving targets. Faculty resources have improved, but critical hiring is still in process. The competencies are defined and are being integrated into practice, but the use of the framework and assessment plan for MPH students is in a very early stage. Response rates for alumni, exit surveys and employer surveys remain extremely low.

The culminating experience, which is the cornerstone of the MPH program, includes a more rigorous approach to the practicum, preceptor training and collaboration on selecting the competency focus for the experience. The integrated seminar provides an additional opportunity to review core and discipline specific competency requirements. Neither of these experiences has been provided as intended to a current cohort of students, however, so these, and their impact on program outcomes, cannot be fully evaluated at this time.

1.3 Institutional Environment.

The school shall be an integral part of an accredited institution of higher education and shall have the same level of independence and status accorded to professional schools in that institution.

This criterion is met. FIU is a multi-campus public research university offering a broad array of undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. The university has two main campuses: the 344-acre Modesto Maidique Campus in western Miami-Dade County and the 200-acre Biscayne Bay Campus in northeast Miami-Dade County. Through 11 colleges and schools, FIU offers more than 180 bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral degree programs and conducts basic and applied research. FIU was chartered by the Florida Legislature in 1965 and opened to student enrollment in 1972. The university has an enrollment of 46,000 students and is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to award bachelor's, master's, post-master's certificate, doctoral and first professional degrees with re-accreditation recently occurring for a period of 10 years through 2020. Professional degree programs at FIU are accredited or approved by the appropriate professional accreditors or are pursuing full professional accreditation or approval. The academic affairs organization of the university is shown in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Florida International University Organizational Structure
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As confirmed with the president and provost during the site visit, all schools and colleges have equal status and similar accountability and reporting lines to the provost and executive vice president, as depicted in Figure 1, who, in turn, reports to the university president. The provost chairs the Dean’s Advisory Council, which meets at least monthly, and the provost also meets monthly with each dean individually. The meetings of the Dean’s Advisory Council focus on policy, procedural, budgetary, personnel and organizational issues.

The president and provost confirmed their very strong commitment to the college, as evidenced by an increase in the school’s funding during a period of funding reductions for the campus and by their commitment to a new building to house all of the offices for the school's programs, with groundbreaking planned to occur in July 2012. The president and provost also confirmed a strong commitment to a campus priority of health: health is one of the four recently defined campus-wide strategic priorities. University leaders noted the important role that the college is envisioned as playing in this health priority. They also noted that the mission of the school is very consistent with the community-engaged mission for the university.

Site visitors concluded that the school enjoys the same prerogatives as other schools and colleges in the university. It is free to manage its funds, space and faculty promotion/tenure processes with the same latitude as other university academic units. The university president and provost confirmed that the college is a strongly valued part of the university and is integral to meeting the campus mission of community engagement; community engagement, in turn, is critical to meeting the university’s role as an urban campus and to fulfilling the strategic priority of developing health-related campus programs.

1.4 Organization and Administration.

The school shall provide an organizational setting conducive to teaching and learning, research and service. The organizational setting shall facilitate interdisciplinary communication, cooperation and collaboration. The organizational structure shall effectively support the work of the school’s constituents.

This criterion is met. The college’s structure includes six departments and a school: the Department of Biostatistics; the Department of Dietetics and Nutrition; the Department of Environmental and Occupational Health (EOH); the Department of Epidemiology (EPID); the Department of Health Policy and Management (HPM); the Department of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention (HPDP); and the School of Social Work. Reporting to the dean are two associate deans (one for academic affairs and a relatively new associate dean for research and engagement); an assistant dean for student and alumni affairs; the director of budget, operations and human resources; the academic public health director; and a number of support staff. Figure 2 presents the school’s organization.
In January 2011, the associate dean for research and engagement’s position was created to serve as a liaison with the FIU Division of Research and to alert faculty of opportunities for private and government funding for research, student scholarships, and training. The associate dean’s office also provides support centralized within the college for pre- and post-award grant development and management. In February 2011, the academic public health director’s position was created to oversee core course scheduling, work with department chairs to ensure consistency in core courses and to develop rubrics used to assess identified competencies. The assistant dean of student and alumni affairs’ position was created in fall 2008 to work with the chairs/director to coordinate admissions and advising services and to provide students with information on scholarships, assistantships, stipends, the curriculum and graduation application deadlines. Following the resignation of the former assistant dean for student and alumni affairs, a newly appointed assistant dean began in the fall 2011. The position of practicum coordinator/career advisor was reestablished in fall 2011 and now handles inquiries regarding internships for public health students.

The college’s organization enhances the potential for fulfillment of its stated mission and goals as outlined in the strategic plan. Further, the administrative structure and resources allow the college to carry out its teaching, research and service functions devoted to public health disciplines. Despite the relatively recent development of some aspects of the administrative structure, school leaders and faculty all seem to understand and effectively use the structure. The college promotes and supports interdisciplinary cooperation and collaboration as evidenced by examples involving scientists and practitioners from “adjacent” or similar disciplines. Interdisciplinary collaboration is also supported and promoted through the organizational structure of the college and the academic disciplinary backgrounds of its faculty members. As verified during the site visit, faculty members routinely collaborate across departments/school within the college and with other colleges by serving on standing and ad hoc committees, capstone projects and thesis and dissertation committees and in other ways. For example, the Department of Biostatistics reported working closely with the Departments of Psychology and Statistics and with the College of Medicine. College leadership and faculty confirmed during the site visit their strong interest in strengthening these collaborations with other colleges.

The environment, as confirmed by meetings with school administrators, faculty, students, staff and External Advisory Council members, is characterized by a commitment to the integrity of the institution, including high ethical standards in the management of its affairs, fairness in its dealings with all constituents, support for the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and accountability to its constituencies. Students, major external partners and members of the school’s External Advisory Council provided examples of the high ethical standards developed by the college in the management of its affairs and its receptivity to and value of feedback from constituents. Constituents also highlighted the college’s fairness in dealing with students and external partners. The college has established a Student Advisory
Committee to advise the dean; the Student Advisory Committee also appoints a representative to attend the college’s Faculty Assembly meetings, and the student representative is offered time on the agenda to speak to the Assembly about student concerns, student-sponsored events, and to provide the student perspective on other matters that come before the assembly.

Site visitors also identified clear policies for dealing with student grievances. As described in the self-study, during annual orientation sessions students are provided information about the complaint procedures of the university and the college. In the first six months of academic year (AY) 2011-2012, as reported in the self-study, no academic grievances were filed. In the previous academic year (AY 2010-2011), only two academic grievances were filed by students; one was settled between the faculty member and the student, and the other was settled in favor of the student.

1.5 Governance.

The school administration and faculty shall have clearly defined rights and responsibilities concerning school governance and academic policies. Students shall, where appropriate, have participatory roles in conduct of school and program evaluation procedures, policy-setting and decision-making.

This criterion is met. The RSCPHSW’s Constitution and Bylaws are designed to provide for effective, flexible and responsive faculty governance. The Faculty Senate and FIU Chairs’ Advisory Council are vehicles for active roles in the university’s academic governance.

The college’s Executive Committee reviews and considers all policies. The dean, associate and assistant deans, budget director and academic public health director participate. Issues may be referred to subcommittees or departments for further consideration. The college proceeds on the principle that the more important the matter to be decided, the more widespread the agreement needs to be. Departmental issues are discussed at the departmental level in faculty meetings and then brought to the dean or Executive Committee if needed. All major policy changes are discussed at faculty meetings, using an appropriate approval process.

The Faculty Assembly’s standing committees include the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), Nominations, College Promotion and Tenure and Departmental Promotion and Tenure. The EPC is concerned with academic policy issues and overall coordination and direction of undergraduate and graduate studies. This committee assesses new course proposals, course changes and provides oversight for requirements for all degrees. There are two EPC representatives (primary and alternate) from each department/school as voting members. Non-voting members include a student representative from the Student Advisory Council, the academic public health director and the associate dean for academic affairs.
There are seven college administrative standing committees including the Educational Effectiveness Council, Executive Committee, IT Committee, Mentoring Committee, Academic Public Health Group (APHG), Research Committee and Student Advisory Committee.

The Educational Effectiveness Council is chaired by the associate dean for academic affairs and develops the Administrative Assessment Plan and reviews student learning outcomes and program outcomes for all degree programs in the college.

The Executive Committee assists the dean in interpreting and implementing policies and provides advice on administrative matters and budget development.

The Academic Public Health Group, which is newly established, is composed of public health department chairs, who consider curriculum matters (prior to submission to the EPC), recruitment, enrollment management, scheduling and review/revision of core competencies and rubrics as needed.

Faculty participate in departmental committees, the Faculty Assembly and various administrative standing committees. Departmental committees may vary by department or school and range from a committee of the whole to 11 committees for social work, with a mode of four committees for the public health departments. Generally, the department committees make recommendations to the full department’s faculty body, where final decisions are made. The dean and the department chairs meet regularly without other administrative leadership for dialogue on academic and administrative matters.

RSCPHSW faculty serve on a wide range of university committees (15 standing committees and 13 others). Four faculty members serve as Faculty Senate representatives.

The main input to governance from external constituents is through the External Advisory Committee which includes public health, nutrition and social work practitioners and representatives of the South Florida community. The committee meets at least bi-annually to review progress towards the mission and goals. The committee most recently assisted with defining/revising the MPH core and discipline-specific competencies and revising the competency assessment within the practicum and integrative seminar courses. The active involvement of this advisory group in many matters including the self study and its value to the school was clearly validated through on-site interviews.

Students serve on committees, including the Faculty Assembly and EPC, where they serve as non-voting members. Students may be invited to sit on ad hoc committees. There are seven student organizations listed in the self-study, including two honor societies. The Stempel Public Health Association is a student-run organization for public health graduate students and alumni and is open to all FIU students, faculty
and staff. The group focuses on community service and professional development opportunities. Meetings are generally every other week. Student association leaders serve as a vital communications network for external stakeholders seeking volunteers and promoting opportunities for service.

1.6 Resources.

The school shall have resources adequate to fulfill its stated mission and goals, and its instructional, research and service objectives.

This criterion is met. The budget and other resource areas appear adequate for the college to meet its stated mission. Despite a university budget reduction of 17% from fiscal years (FY) 2007-2008 through 2011-2012, the college’s core educational and general fund (E&G) budget has increased by 68%, representing a $4.4 million increase, with 52% of this increase ($2.3 million) a result of the merger with the School of Social Work in summer 2008. The remaining 48% of the increased funding has been for new faculty positions (14 positions) based on the FIU faculty funding model. Overall, the RSCPHSW E&G budget has more than doubled since the college’s initial 2007 accreditation ($4.7 million). Current financial resources for the school over the past five years from FY 2008–2012 are summarized in Table 1.

The allocation of E&G to the college and to other FIU units is primarily based on the previous year’s allocation, adjusted for recurring/non-recurring legislative line items, budget cuts and increases and adjustments for critical investments. Additions include cost-of-living salary and fringe benefit increases. Occasional one-time transfers include temporary support for salary retention issues, recruitment packages and PhD graduate stipend enhancements. Currently, the college’s allocation covers faculty salaries and fringe benefits, a portion of administrative and staff salaries and fringe benefits, a portion of graduate research assistant and teaching assistant salaries and fringe benefits, equipment purchases, IT expenses, communications expenses, publications, office supplies and expenses incurred in serving prospective and enrolled students. In accordance with university policy, 50% of the college’s year-end available E&G balance is made available to the college during the following fiscal year as a non-recurring budget item. The other 50% reverts to the university for re-allocation for university initiatives.
### Table 1. RSCPHSW Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF FUNDS</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance: Carryforward</td>
<td>$348,872</td>
<td>$6,130,061</td>
<td>$6,515,461</td>
<td>$7,197,678</td>
<td>$8,435,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance: Auxiliary</td>
<td>$997,747</td>
<td>$1,197,961</td>
<td>$1,291,949</td>
<td>$1,248,123</td>
<td>$1,420,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations (excl. travel)</td>
<td>$576,708</td>
<td>$1,263,569</td>
<td>$1,308,632</td>
<td>$1,257,866</td>
<td>$1,623,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$66,730</td>
<td>$66,637</td>
<td>$68,040</td>
<td>$70,420</td>
<td>$117,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Temporary Salaries - i.e. Adjuncts, Extra State Compensation)</td>
<td>$428,701</td>
<td>$479,628</td>
<td>$479,648</td>
<td>$671,140</td>
<td>$374,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support (Temporary Salaries - Graduate Assistants, hourly)</td>
<td>$393,052</td>
<td>$522,939</td>
<td>$511,078</td>
<td>$279,692</td>
<td>$779,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Tax</td>
<td>$9,145</td>
<td>$9,870</td>
<td>$14,145</td>
<td>$28,723</td>
<td>$36,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Institutional Expenditures (excludes Research, Extramural, and Research Fellowships/Scholarships)</td>
<td>$6,397,102</td>
<td>$9,242,666</td>
<td>$9,620,140</td>
<td>$10,421,853</td>
<td>$11,899,765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERDIENCES:**

- **Faculty Salaries & Benefits**
  - 2007-08: $3,617,873
  - 2008-09: $6,130,061
  - 2009-10: $6,515,461
  - 2010-11: $7,197,678
  - 2011-12: $8,435,031

- **Staff Salaries & Benefits**
  - 2007-08: $997,747
  - 2008-09: $1,197,961
  - 2009-10: $1,291,949
  - 2010-11: $1,248,123
  - 2011-12: $1,420,936

- **Operations (excl. travel)**
  - 2007-08: $576,708
  - 2008-09: $1,263,569
  - 2009-10: $1,308,632
  - 2010-11: $1,257,866
  - 2011-12: $1,623,723

- **Travel**
  - 2007-08: $66,730
  - 2008-09: $66,637
  - 2009-10: $68,040
  - 2010-11: $70,420
  - 2011-12: $117,931

- **Other (Temporary Salaries - i.e. Adjuncts, Extra State Compensation)**
  - 2007-08: $428,701
  - 2008-09: $479,628
  - 2009-10: $479,648
  - 2010-11: $671,140
  - 2011-12: $374,140

- **Student Support (Temporary Salaries - Graduate Assistants, hourly)**
  - 2007-08: $393,052
  - 2008-09: $522,939
  - 2009-10: $511,078
  - 2010-11: $279,692
  - 2011-12: $779,590

- **University Tax**
  - 2007-08: $9,145
  - 2008-09: $9,870
  - 2009-10: $14,145
  - 2010-11: $28,723
  - 2011-12: $36,933

**Total Institutional Expenditures (excludes Research, Extramural, and Research Fellowships/Scholarships)****

**1. In accordance with University policy, 50% of RSCPHSW's year-end available E&G balance is made available to the College during the following fiscal year as non-recurring budget (Carry forward funds). The other 50% reverts to the University for reallocation.

2. Effective 2010-11, University is postponing the transfer of Online Revenues to the College until the beginning balance is exhausted.

3. Employee benefits for Fiscal Years 2007-08 to 2009-10 were allocated to faculty, staff and temporary salaries based on the fringe benefits percentages from FY 2010-11. The University reports for those years provide total benefits and do not allocate them between faculty, staff, or student support/other temporary employees.

4. University Tax is a tax assessed by the University to the departments for central administration oversight on auxiliary activities.

5. Includes actual expenditures through January 31, 2012 and estimated expenses through the remaining of Fiscal Year 2011-12 (February 2011 through June 2012).

6. Includes actual expenditures through December 31, 2011.**
Auxiliary funds are categorized into four types: online fees, clinical fees, lab fees and general auxiliaries. Auxiliary funds are managed as self-supporting activities through fees charged to customers for products or services rendered. An auxiliary management fee (currently 6.5%) is collected by the university’s Office of Financial Planning for central operations and services, such as accounting and finance, legal, human resources, information technology and internal audit. The fee is applied to salaries and operating expenses. Contracts and grants are defined as funding obtained through external awards via various funding mechanisms, including grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with federal, state, or local government agencies, as well as awards from nongovernmental organizations. Concession funds are resources generated from the vending machines on the university campuses. The university allocates these concessions resources to the college, which in turn, uses them to subsidize college-wide events. Foundation funds are donations defined by terms and conditions set by the donors and by FIU Foundation policies and procedures. Finally, technology fees paid by students are used to enhance instructional technology resources for students. Colleges are provided funding for special projects.

Faculty headcounts and FTE data for primary and other faculty have increased considerably and currently exceed CEPH requirements. Headcount data of public health primary faculty by department are currently as follows for core public health areas: biostatistics—four; environmental and occupational health—seven; epidemiology—eight; health policy and management—four; and health promotion and disease prevention—11. The site visit confirmed that additional searches are in progress or have already resulted in new hires or offers pending for all departments, except epidemiology, where four new faculty were just hired last year.

Student faculty ratio data by total faculty FTE (SFR by total FTE) across the five core areas varies from 4.1 to 11.7. These SFRs are substantially lower than in previous years in which the SFR ranged to as high as almost 60. The SFR by total faculty FTE for the MPH online generalist program remains high (currently 45), but this program is being phased out, no new students are being admitted and the online program director clearly indicated to the site visit team that she is making diligent efforts to remain in contact with these students to move them through the program as reasonably quickly as possible. SFRs for total faculty FTE in the dietetics and nutrition and MSW programs are currently 33 and 25, respectively, although these programs and SFR requirements are subject to criteria established by other accrediting bodies as well. Further, leaders in these programs confirmed during the site visit that they are taking active steps to reduce SFRs in their areas.

Administrative staff at the departmental level remains lean, although currently marginally adequate. College leadership, departmental/school leadership and faculty consistently reported during the site visit that central support for both pre- and post-award grants/contracts has increased considerably under the direction of the associate dean for research and engagement.
The college occupies a physical space in eight different buildings, presenting logistical and collaboration barriers. However, construction is to begin in July 2012 for a state-of-the-art building to house the college and allow the office space for all college faculty to be moved into this one location. This new building will provide the college with approximately 7,000 net square feet (sf) of space more than the school’s almost 36,000 current sf; since approximately 6,000 net sf of existing lab space will be retained by the college, the school’s leadership reported that there will be a net increase, in essence, of approximately 13,000 net sf, providing adequate space for growth during at least a moderate period.

Library, computing and telecommunications facilities available for research and instruction are adequate to support the school’s activities. As described during the site visit, the associate dean for research and engagement has assumed responsibility for being the point-of-contact for all IT issues in the college. He has an IT specialist working under his direction to assist with IT issues; when appropriate, this employee serves as the contact for college IT matters with the university’s IT support staff.

Two student commons areas (one shared by public health and dietetics and nutrition and one for social work students) are available. The college also has a dedicated computer lab, which is used for several biostatistics courses but is open to use by all college students. During the site visit, students reported that these labs in the college are used by them and also serve as a location for them to network and interact. Other computers are also available to students, such as in the library where loaner laptops and iPads are available for student use.

Outcome measures for resource adequacy appropriately include the following: institutional expenditures; FTE students; expenditures per FTE student; research expenditures (excludes extramural and research fellowships/scholarships); FTE core faculty; research expenditures per FTE faculty; extramural funding expenditures; research fellowships and research scholarships; total expenditures; extramural funding as a % of the total expenditures. Though the college has not met its targets for all outcome measures, data indicate a promising trend.

2.0 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS.

2.1 Master of Public Health Degree.

The school shall offer instructional programs reflecting its stated mission and goals, leading to the Master of Public Health (MPH) or equivalent professional masters degree in at least the five areas of knowledge basic to public health. The school may offer other degrees, professional and academic, and other areas of specialization, if consistent with its mission and resources.

This criterion is met with commentary. The college offers a range of academic and professional degrees in public health, dietetics and nutrition and social work. In public health, the college offers the MPH in the
five core areas of public health knowledge and academic degrees in three of the areas: environmental and occupational health, epidemiology and health promotion and disease prevention. The college has undertaken some restructuring of degree programs in recent years: a bachelor of health services administration degree was transferred to the College of Nursing and Health Sciences in August 2011, a master of health services administration degree was discontinued, with the final group of students graduating in 2011, and the online generalist MPH is being phased out and stopped accepting new students in fall 2011. The college has developed individualized teach-out plans for each of the remaining students in the generalist MPH, and December 2013 is the target date for bringing all remaining students to completion. Table 2 presents the college’s degree offerings.

The commentary relates to the minimal curricular definition for the online generalist MPH. Aside from MPH core courses, the practicum and the culminating experience, students in this degree program only have one required class in research methods. The remainder of the curriculum is chosen by the student in consultation with the advisor based on an individualized set of career goals. Although site visitors verified that all remaining students have intentional, tailored curricular plans based on career goals, this approach is at best minimally compliant with this criterion’s expectation that each concentration offered a planned sequence of learning experiences designed to attain specified competencies. The planned discontinuation of this degree program should render this issue moot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Degrees Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor’s Degrees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetics &amp; Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master’s Degrees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Occupational Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Policy &amp; Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion and Disease Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Generalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetics &amp; Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degrees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Occupational Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion &amp; Disease Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetics &amp; Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-public health, aka “other professional” degrees. See Criterion 2.8 for additional information.  
** Currently in teach-out mode. Program targeted to close in December 2013.
2.2 Program Length.

An MPH degree program or equivalent professional masters degree must be at least 42 semester credit units in length.

This criterion is met. All MPH degrees require completion of at least 45 semester credits. The university defines one credit as 50 minutes of classroom instruction or the equivalent each week for an entire academic term. The typical three semester-credit course includes 150 contact minutes per week over a 16-week semester, or the equivalent of 40 contact hours per three-hour course.

2.3 Public Health Core Knowledge.

All professional degree students must demonstrate an understanding of the public health core knowledge.

This criterion is met. All MPH students are required to take five courses covering the core public health knowledge areas. The core courses published in the 2011-2012 catalog include: PHC 6000 Introduction to Epidemiology, PHC 6065 Health Statistics, PHC 6102 Introduction to Public Health Policy and Management, PHC 6315 Introduction to Environmental Health, and PHC 6410 Health Behavior and Public Health. Each course is offered at three credits. The college provided course descriptions for each of the five core courses documenting the content the students will have studied during the course. The syllabi demonstrated that the required core courses provide sufficient lecture information, independent and group exercises and readings to build the MPH students' knowledge of the five core knowledge areas. Site visitors' review of syllabi indicated that adjunct faculty teach a significant portion of the core courses, but faculty reported that state regulations require that at least 50% of the required courses offered in a graduate degree program must be taught by full-time faculty, and the college complies with this requirement.

2.4 Practical Skills.

All professional degree students must develop skills in basic public health concepts and demonstrate the application of these concepts through a practice experience that is relevant to the students’ areas of specialization.

This criterion is met. All MPH students complete a practicum. Students are required to complete 200 hours of practice experience, and they receive three semester credits associated with the course PHC 6495. The self-study describes a process in which students must work closely with the MPH practicum coordinator, who provides general oversight for the entire course experience and acts as a liaison with the field-based preceptor.

College documents clearly and explicitly define the roles and responsibilities of the student, practicum coordinator and preceptor. Documents also describe the process used to assess the quality of the student’s practicum experience. Students identify a work plan as well as competencies that they will address during the practice experience, and the plan must be approved by the practicum coordinator and preceptor prior to the experience’s beginning. The self-study presents a list of preceptors and sites from
the past three years, and sites include governmental public health agencies, non-profit organizations and non-governmental organizations in the local area and across the nation and the world. Preceptors are selected based on their public health experience and ability to serve as appropriate mentors and supervisors for students. Each preceptor and site must be vetted and approved by the practicum coordinator. While the college has traditionally provided written guidelines to preceptors to explain their roles, the college recently developed and implemented an in-person training module for preceptors that focuses, in particular, on assessment and competency evaluation and responds to any questions that preceptors may have about their role in the practice experience.

In the summer of 2011, the college updated its policies and procedures concerning practicum waivers. Students with at least three years of public health experience may request waivers by providing extensive documentation of the past experience and its relation to the MPH and concentration competencies. The practicum coordinator, department chair and or academic public health director must all agree in order for a waiver to be granted. In the past three years, a total of 14 students have been granted waivers; on an annual basis, the percentage of students receiving waivers has ranged from .7% to 5.3%.

Site visitors discussed the newly established training and other aspects of the experience with a number of preceptors; they consistently stated that the training was well-presented and helpful. Several preceptors indicated that they sponsor students for a practicum on a regular basis, and they find students to be well-prepared and faculty to be extremely responsive and easy to work with. Preceptors also stated that in instances where students may demonstrate a deficit in skills such as grant writing, that they had an established and respected relationship to the college and could telephone faculty members or administrators to discuss possible recommendations for required or elective pre-practicum coursework. Preceptors reported that in some cases their recommendations were executed in a fairly short time period, and all were confident that their input on students’ training and preparation is valued by school leaders and administrators.

2.5 Culminating Experience.

All professional degree programs identified in the instructional matrix shall assure that each student demonstrates skills and integration of knowledge through a culminating experience.

This criterion is met with commentary. Beginning in fall 2011, the practicum requirement was reduced from six to three credit hours, with a parallel reduction from 300 to 200 required contact hours. One motivation for this change was to use the newly available three hours for the new PHC 6930C Integrative Seminar, the new culminating experience required in all MPH concentrations. Students must complete this seminar during their last semester and at least one semester after the MPH practicum, although current students are allowed to complete the practicum and integrative seminar concurrently so that their graduation will not be delayed by this new requirement.
The seminar includes a final paper and an oral presentation through which the student demonstrates ability to “apply public health knowledge and principles in a practical setting.” These products are supposed to represent both public health core and concentration-specific competencies and are based on either the student’s practicum project or work experience if the practicum requirement was waived. The seminar also includes sessions with faculty from various departments who review each MPH competency individually. The self-study document notes that the culminating experience allows the student to address those competencies not assessed in the practicum; if particular competencies are not relevant to a particular practicum project, they are not likely to well-addressed in a paper about that project. However, on site, faculty members acknowledged that the seminar paper would reflect basically the same competencies as the practicum experience. Regardless, students must complete a major paper and presentation for a pass/fail class. Although the seminar is designed for all MPH students to take concurrently, this level of assessment requires a very individualized approach for evaluation. While site visitors strongly appreciate the value of exposing students to the breadth of public health disciplines, they question the efficiency of the approach.

The commentary relates to the incomplete implementation of the integrative seminar. The seminar has only been offered in a “hybrid” format concurrent with the abbreviated practicum. This created a workload challenge for some students and resulted in confusion for faculty advisors who were unsure of the expectations. In addition, after on-site review of the syllabus, site visitors observed that the seminar provided more of an overview of competencies across the core areas and all five concentrations, rather than requiring integration of the competencies, though the paper and presentation certainly may require integration of competencies.

2.6 Required Competencies.

For each degree program and area of specialization within each program identified in the instructional matrix, there shall be clearly stated competencies that guide the development of educational programs.

This criterion is partially met. The school has invested considerable time and thought in articulating a well-developed set of competencies for the MPH core knowledge areas and for each MPH concentration area aside from the online generalist degree. Social work degrees and the BS degree in nutrition and dietetics also have solid competency sets based on guidelines from those disciplines and their accrediting bodies. The PhD core competencies for public health disciplines are sufficient, as are the concentration-specific competencies for the PhD in environmental and occupational health.

At the time of the site visit, visitors noted a concern related to the competencies for the doctoral degree concentrations in epidemiology and health promotion and disease prevention. The competencies listed in the self-study for these areas were insufficiently developed and not formulated as measurable competency statements, as this criterion requires. The listed competencies in these areas lacked the
necessary specificity and outline general areas of knowledge rather than naming specific knowledge, skills and abilities that students are to attain. In the college’s response to the site visit team’s report, it provided revised competencies for both degrees, which satisfactorily addressed the team’s concern.

A remaining concern relates to the graduate degrees in dietetics and nutrition, though the last self-study for CADE (Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education) lists profession-wide competencies and maps them to the curricular requirements; it appears that the competencies presented in the self-study document and on the college’s website are a distillation of the properly-formulated competencies (described as “learning outcomes” in the CADE self-study). The college’s response identifies additional competencies, but the Council found that the additional competencies continued to reflect profession-specific concepts, rather than identifying the broad introductory public health knowledge and skills that students must attain.

A final concern relates to the fact that the college has not identified competencies for the online generalist concentration in the MPH degree. Although this concern may soon be moot if the concentration is discontinued as scheduled, the lack of competency structure constitutes a deficiency under this criterion.

In social work, the competencies are prescribed by the accrediting agency (CSWE).

In public health, faculty began with a process to define core competencies that are common to all MPH students. They began with the 10 Essential Services and refined the competency set in a series of stages with input from stakeholders. The MPH Competency Taskforce included faculty representatives from the five core disciplines, and the taskforce’s iterative process included several stages of formal validation by public health practitioners. After agreement on core competencies, each public health discipline developed concentration competencies for the MPH and shared and reviewed all other concentration sets as well. The doctoral competencies were developed in 2005-2006, and the self-study indicates that the adopted sets are based on faculty’s review of competency sets from other accredited schools of public health at the time. All public health competencies are reviewed annually, and, among the PhD degrees, the Department of Environmental and Occupational Health most recently revised its competencies in a process that was informed by the self-study and regular annual review.

The Competency Taskforce continues to play a role in ongoing evaluation of competency sets. The taskforce will review competency assessment for three semesters, culminating in fall 2012, to determine the effectiveness of the college’s competency assessment efforts. The college also identifies a number of mechanisms for ensuring currency and relevance of competencies on an ongoing basis. These mechanisms include regular feedback from adjunct faculty who work as full-time public health
practitioners, attendance at state and national public health meetings and feedback from the External Advisory Committee.

Departments are responsible for ensuring that competencies map to coursework, and syllabi for public health core and required concentration courses list learning objectives and indicate which competencies the course-level learning objectives link to. Syllabi for the social work and dietetics and nutrition degrees also list either course objectives or learning outcomes or both.

2.7 Assessment Procedures.

There shall be procedures for assessing and documenting the extent to which each student has demonstrated competence in the required areas of performance.

This criterion is partially met. The school has defined competencies and is finalizing procedures to measure them, as the revised MPH core and concentration-specific competencies were implemented in fall 2011. The progress of MPH students in achieving the expected competencies is planned to be evaluated through a combination of coursework (for core and concentration competencies), the practicum, and the integrative seminar as the culminating experience. All courses in the MPH program require students to demonstrate progress based on course examinations, quizzes, projects and presentations in each of the areas of concentration. Student presentations are used to determine oral communication skills. Writing assignments may include development of study proposals, literature reviews, papers on particular topics and policy documents. A grade of ‘B’ or better is required to pass each core MPH course, with a ‘B-’ allowed in one course only.

MPH student performance in the practicum is based on the student and faculty advisor reviewing the list of competencies and determining which can be attained and evaluated during a particular practicum. As verified during the site visit, assessment of the competencies identified for the practicum is determined by the preceptor in consultation with the practicum coordinator. Preceptors began being trained in January 2012 on evaluating students on a four-point scale for the competencies relevant to the particular practicum, but data on the performance of students during their spring 2012 practica were not yet available for review by the site visit team. For the integrative seminar, all MPH students must complete a final paper and presentation to demonstrate attainment of MPH core and concentration-specific competencies. Assessment of competencies during the integrative seminar is determined by a faculty member from the student’s department of concentration. Demonstration of having attained all required MPH core and concentration-specific competencies is required of students to graduate from the MPH program.

The process determined by the school for assessment of core and concentration-specific competencies is very elaborate, reflecting the effort that leadership, faculty and the External Advisory Council, as documented during the site visit, have invested in these plans. When asked about how the school will
adjudicate the inevitable discrepancies in the assessment of competencies between different assessments of the same competency during core, concentration-specific, practicum and integrative seminar assessments, both college leadership and faculty confirmed that these details have not yet been worked out. While the school is to be commended for the significant effort which has gone into planning for the assessment of MPH competencies, it was evident to the site visit team that further effort is still required to finalize details and work out a viable system for these complicated plans.

PhD students are admitted to candidacy by passing the qualifying (candidacy) exam based on one of two options: a traditional written and oral qualifying (candidacy) examination, or defense of an NIH-type research proposal. For PhD students, the dissertation is the primary culminating experience for which they must complete an original research project, followed by a public oral defense. A minimum of five faculty members, from within and outside the student’s department, are required for evaluation of the dissertation. Students receive a final grade of pass/no pass. The qualifying examination, proposal and dissertation defense are used to assess competencies. The qualifying examination is prepared and graded by a committee consisting of a minimum of three faculty members. Students are allowed two attempts to pass the examination. PhD programs monitor the academic performance of their students on an ongoing basis. Students are required to attain mastery of core and other courses and fulfill all requirements to graduate.

Assessment of competencies and discipline-specific knowledge also occurs within the college’s other professional degrees offered by the Department of Dietetics and Nutrition and the School of Social Work.

The college has defined outcome measures for competency attainment: 70% or more of MPH students must receive a score of “meets expectations” or higher on all competencies. While only preliminary data are available, they demonstrate an overall MPH rate of 82.8%, exceeding the school’s target. The school’s target for graduation rates within six years in graduate and undergraduate professional degree programs is 70%. The overall graduate professional degree graduation rates fall somewhat lower than the target in all three years of data presented, but the college provides a thorough analysis of the factors that contribute to the lower graduation rate and provide data that demonstrate that these rates are comparable to, or higher than, other FIU professional and graduate programs.

The target for student advancement to doctoral candidacy is defined by the college as 80% of doctoral students achieving candidacy within three years of enrollment; overall candidacy rates among all doctoral programs across the three years of reporting vary from 22% to 72%. The school’s target for doctoral dissertation completion rates within nine years is 70%; overall reported completion rates across all doctoral programs vary from 55% to 73% across the three years of reporting.
Finally, target job placement rates for professional degree students are defined by the college as 70% of graduates securing discipline-relevant practice jobs or admitted to advanced educational degree programs within one year of graduation; actual job placement rates across three years of reported data vary from 44.8% to 69.8%. While low numbers of reporting students/alumni for some of these outcome measures affects the stability of point estimates, the relatively consistent pattern of falling below the college’s targets for student outcomes suggests concerns about the extent to which students are progressing satisfactorily in the college’s educational programs.

Until recently, data concerning alumni and job placement rates for graduates were lacking, but methods have now been implemented to address both of these areas. Alumni surveys and student exit surveys have now been developed for electronic distribution.

The concern relates to two areas: 1) the fact that assessment plans for identified competency assessments had not yet been fully developed at the time of the site visit, and data were not available for review by the site visit team; and 2) the fact that the school falls short of meeting nearly all of its targeted outcomes for student achievement, including student progress to graduation, timely graduation and job placement. Related to the former concern, the college has not fully developed plans for determining whether individual students meet expectations for competencies which may be scored discrepantly when assessed at multiple points in their MPH program. The college must determine methods for adjudicating discrepancies in competency assessment if current plans for multiple assessment points of the same competencies are to be effective. The college’s response documented further development and implementation of an assessment plan; however, it has not yet been fully implemented and data is not yet available.

2.8 Other Professional Degrees.

If the school offers curricula for professional degrees other than the MPH or equivalent public health degrees, students pursuing them must be grounded in basic public health knowledge.

This criterion is met. The college offers two bachelor’s and two master’s degrees classified as other professional degrees: the BS and MS in dietetics and nutrition and the BSSW and MSW in social work. The approach to providing basic public health knowledge is different for each degree program.

For the BS in dietetics and nutrition, the self-study identifies basic public health knowledge in six separate courses, five of which are required: STA3145 Statistics for the Health Professions, DIEE317 Dietetics in Community Health, DIEE4365 Management of Nutrition Programs, HUN3191 World Nutrition (Elective), HUN4404 Nutrition, Physical Activity and Special Populations and DIEE3125 Management of Dietary Systems. While a more cohesive approach would enable students to understand what public health encompasses, site visitors verified, based on review of syllabi and course learning objectives, that the
content of these courses is sufficient to provide grounding in public health knowledge from a fairly narrow perspective.

For the MS in dietetics and nutrition, students complete three courses with public health content, primarily related to analytic and research methodology, and are required to take PHC6500 Foundations of Public Health Practice. The latter course addresses the history, philosophy and scope of public health; organization and administration of public health programs; recent developments and trends; and public health law and regulations.

In addition to STA3145 Statistics for the Health Profession, BSSW students are required to complete PHC3101 Introduction to Public Health. This course provides an overview of public health with an emphasis on the ecological model and developing a population perspective. Content includes descriptive epidemiologic measures; environmental, social, biological and behavioral determinants of health; health care delivery; and the essential interactions of many disciplines to foster a healthy society.

MSW students complete the one-hour course PHC5108 Foundations of Public Health Practice for Social Workers. Faculty members have also identified public health content in five social work courses. The course objectives for PHC5108 are appropriate to provide grounding in public health knowledge, but it is difficult to understand how the amount of content outlined in the learning objectives can adequately be conveyed in a one-credit hour course.

The site visit team commented on the need for a stronger and more cohesive population perspective for the BS degree in dietetics and nutrition. In addition, visitors noted that during the college’s next review, revised criteria will require the college to demonstrate the equivalent of three credit hours of public health content for all programs. The college’s response included a revised syllabus of the DIE 3317 Nutrition in Community Health, which is a three-credit course with identifiable public health content.

2.9 Academic Degrees.

If the school also offers curricula for academic degrees, students pursuing them shall obtain a broad introduction to public health, as well as an understanding about how their discipline-based specialization contributes to achieving the goals of public health.

This criterion is partially met. The college offers the PhD in public health with specializations in environmental and occupational health, epidemiology and health promotion and disease prevention, as well as PhD degrees in dietetics and nutrition and in social welfare.

Students in the PhD in public health program, regardless of specialization, complete 12 hours of PhD public health core curriculum in addition to 18 hours in the content area, several methods courses and a secondary area curriculum prior to dissertation research. The core curriculum provides a strong
introduction to public health, including substantial epidemiology content. In addition, students in the EOH concentration have the option of at least two epidemiology content courses, and students in the HPDP concentration have additional statistics and methodology courses.

The PhD in dietetics and nutrition and in social welfare both include several quantitative and research methods courses with substantial epidemiology content. Faculty members have identified public health content in other discipline-specific courses. The linkage of public health concepts to the respective fields of study is strong.

The concern relates to the lack of broad introduction to public health in the PhD program in dietetics and nutrition. The self-study lists two courses as having public health content. One course, HUN7523 Community Nutrition, has not been taught in at least three years. The second course, Nutrition Science and Implications for Community Health, was last taught in fall 2010; a review of the syllabus indicates that the course focuses on very specific nutritional components (vitamin D, sodium, and folate) with some discussion of policy implications. Site visitors reviewed transcripts of current students. Some students do take other courses with public health content including PHC6500 Foundations of Public Health Practice, but this has not been addressed consistently for all students.

2.10 Doctoral Degrees.

The school shall offer at least three doctoral degree programs that are relevant to any of the five areas of basic public health knowledge.

This criterion is met with commentary. The college offers the PhD in public health with specializations in environmental and occupational health, epidemiology and health promotion and disease prevention and the PhD in dietetics and nutrition and in social welfare. Because of recent faculty hires in EOH and EPI, there is sufficient faculty support for mentoring of doctoral students in all programs.

The recent drop (from AY 2010-2011 to AY 2011-2012) in number of applications for the three PhD in public health programs is concerning, especially for the HPDP specialization, where the self-study reports a 50% reduction in applications.

The commentary relates to the lack of courses for the specialization in HPDP. Although this is the most popular of the public health doctoral programs, based on current student enrollment, the students have no options for course work in the specialization area; only 18 hours of courses are provided; several of these are very broad with minimal content focus. According to the college’s response, additional courses will be implemented in the future, but were not yet in place.
The site visit team also identified the availability of research mentoring as an area of commentary. Because of the requirement that the faculty member must have dissertation advisor status with FIU’s Graduate School, a status that cannot always be attained by junior faculty, site visitors observed that doctoral students might find a limited pool of faculty members who are qualified to supervise research in the intended area. According to the college’s response, ten additional faculty were granted dissertation advisor status in Spring 2012, and actions are in place to recruit additional research mentors.

2.11 Joint Degrees.

If the school offers joint degree programs, the required curriculum for the professional public health degree shall be equivalent to that required for a separate public health degree.

This criterion is not applicable.

2.12 Distance Education or Executive Degree Programs.

If the school offers degree programs using formats or methods other than students attending regular on-site course sessions spread over a standard term, these programs must a) be consistent with the mission of the school and within the school’s established areas of expertise; b) be guided by clearly articulated student learning outcomes that are rigorously evaluated; c) be subject to the same quality control processes that other degree programs in the school and university are; and d) provide planned and evaluated learning experiences that take into consideration and are responsive to the characteristics and needs of adult learners. If the school offers distance education or executive degree programs, it must provide needed support for these programs, including administrative, travel, communication, and student services. The school must have an ongoing program to evaluate the academic effectiveness of the format, to assess teaching and learning methodologies and to systematically use this information to stimulate program improvements.

This criterion is met with commentary. The online generalist program is currently in teach-out mode. The last incoming students were accepted in spring 2011, and the program director has worked individually with each remaining student to develop a plan that will allow degree completion by December 2013. Because this degree program is still operational, it must be assessed for compliance with all criteria, though if its discontinuation progresses as planned, any compliance issues will become moot.

The online generalist program was developed in response to the specific needs of current public health workforce members and aligns well with the college’s mission and experience. Core competencies, as well as learning objectives for individual courses, are identical to those defined for the in-person MPH program, so, in those respects, the online generalist MPH is guided by articulated, evaluated student learning outcomes. The college provided instructional design support to faculty developing the online courses to ensure that the learning experiences are responsive to adult learners’ needs.

The college subjects online courses and faculty to the same standards of quality control and evaluation as it uses for its in-person degree offerings, and the school has performed an analysis of the GPAs of online versus onsite students in both core MPH classes and overall to determine the effectiveness of the
format. The analysis found no meaningful differences in the three areas analyzed, though core course GPA was slightly higher for onsite students.

The commentary relates to inadequate attention to the online program’s overall quality control processes, particularly with regard to the online program’s ability to provide tailored curricular advisement for students in this largely self-directed program. The self-study acknowledges that lack of enrollment management led to unacceptably high student-faculty ratios, and faculty noted that, for some students, the curriculum lacked rigor equivalent to that of on-campus students; this was not due to the quality of instruction or the challenge of individual courses, but related to the fact that students were free to choose all courses beyond the core and a research methods course, an approach that may result in a less intentional assembly of knowledge and skills. The online program’s current director has clearly taken a strong leadership role in ensuring that each remaining student has an adequate teach-out plan and in responding to student concerns, so the current concern appears to be largely a relic of past inattention.

3.0 CREATION, APPLICATION AND ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE.

3.1 Research.

The school shall pursue an active research program, consistent with its mission, through which its faculty and students contribute to the knowledge base of the public health disciplines, including research directed at improving the practice of public health.

This criterion is met with commentary. The college’s research goals are clearly stated, and research plays a central role in the college. Multidisciplinary research and service which addresses health and social disparities are particularly important to the college’s mission. While average salary support from extramural funding falls moderately short of the 20% goal outlined in the college’s strategic plan (16% in FY 2012 to date and 19% in FY 2011), the self-study reports that per capita extramural funding level is the highest of any college at FIU. The self-study also makes note of the challenges of high teaching loads and the current limited amount of available federal funding for research as challenges to the ability of faculty to obtain higher extramural funding levels. To help meet these challenges, the school reports a number of actions being taken, including the following: identification of an associate dean for research and engagement; addition of staff to the college’s research office; development of a Research Committee to advise the associate dean and suggest approaches to enhance and support research; and development of a mentoring committee to assist junior faculty in establishing research agenda, honing grantsmanship and preparing written and oral presentations.

The college’s total grant funding in FY 2011 including research grants, center grants and training grants was over $7.6 million, including both primary and secondary faculty. This compares to a little over $13 million in FY 2010, and funding level for grants in the first six months of FY 2012 are reported in the self-study to be only about $2.7 million. In the self-study, these declining amounts of extramural support are
explained by FY 2010 being a very successful year for faculty, the worsening federal funding environment and some senior-level researchers not submitting new grants when previous grants ended.

The college acknowledges in its self-study that there are gaps in its research program. Hence, several research groups have been established to bolster gap areas and solidify strength areas. Research groups meet regularly to discuss research efforts and develop research programs. These research groups include such areas as HIV/AIDS, community-based interventions and aging.

FIU has been rated as a research university with high activity and has been given a community engagement rating for “Curricular Engagement and Outreach and Partnerships” by the Carnegie Foundation. Within the college, collaborative partnerships is a focus within a number of projects, spanning areas that include cardiovascular disease, obesity, diabetes, practice-based research, outcomes research, community-based and community-based participatory research, health disparities research, safe water systems, domestic violence, aging, children’s health and mental health, substance abuse, food safety and HIV/AIDS. Although much of this work with community-based organizations is not research, some does involve community-based research. For example, the NIH-funded CRUSADA Center has formal arrangements with four local health and social service providers in the South Florida region. The college’s HIV/AIDS research group similarly has a formal relationship with the Borinquen Health Care Center where two large NIH-funded research projects are being conducted.

Student involvement in research is viewed as a critical priority. The college promotes both formal and informal research training opportunities for students. Both master’s and doctoral level students may take independent study courses to work with faculty on research projects or to work on scholarly products. The college also provides an average of 46 full stipends and tuition waivers per year with most of this support as research assistantships.

In discussions with the dean, president, provost and others during the site visit, it was made clear that recognition as an excellent college of public health is of fundamental and primary importance to the college and the university. These leaders also recognized the importance of research to the development of excellence.

The site visit team identified commentary related to the fairly dramatic reduction in extramural funding which had occurred over the three-year period reported in the self-study and the very modest average faculty extramural funding level of less than 20%. Even though the college has provided an explanation for this shift in extramural funding and has taken very positive steps to address the identified challenges, these reductions in funding levels are clearly dramatic and bound to affect the college’s overall research environment. The college’s response, however, provided updated and final numbers for research funding.
for the academic year: the final total of average funding level is closer to 31%, and total awards were on par with the previous year at about $7 million.

The commentary relates to the fact that, along with other existing efforts to promote and develop faculty research, the college may also attempt to develop methods to address the legislatively mandated teaching load of three courses per semester during each semester of faculty members’ nine-month appointments. While it was reported during the site visit that the teaching load for assistant professors is reduced to two courses per semester and that faculty can “buy out” of teaching for 12.5% of extramural funding, additional methods for further reductions in teaching loads should be explored if further expansion of research activities is sought.

3.2 Service.

The school shall pursue active service activities, consistent with its mission, through which faculty and students contribute to the advancement of public health practice.

This criterion is met. RSCPHSW faculty have clear and solid relationships with various local community organizations. The self-study notes that FIU has received commendation from the Carnegie Foundation as a “community engaged” institution based on the university’s consistent curricular outreach and partnership engagement.

There are official memoranda of understanding in place with the Monroe and Miami-Dade departments of public health, as well as a non-profit organization addressing opportunistic infections among Haitian persons living with HIV/AIDS. The self-study indicates that over the past three years 92% of the public health faculty have engaged in community service. A similar level of commitment to service engagement is observed among the dietetics & nutrition and social work faculty. The social work faculty support a professional development program that develops curriculum and training materials for the Florida Department of Children and Families. The self-study and resource file provide an extensive list of faculty service involvement. Service activities include professional activities (grant reviewer) as well as community-based activities (consultation, service on advisory boards). Organizations and agencies that provide venues for faculty service are largely locally- and state-based organizations, a focus that aligns with the college’s mission and engagement with the local community, including the Health Foundation of South Florida, the local AHEC and Prerana Women’s Health Initiative. The importance of faculty participating in service efforts on a regular basis was also underscored in the discussions the site visit team had with the university administrators regarding their vision for the college and it’s faculty.

Discussions with faculty indicated that service engagement is considered and valued in promotion and tenure decisions. However, faculty, both senior and junior, expressed a concern with the competing
demands of the expected level of service engagement, teaching load and research agenda, noting that it is challenging to sustain expected levels of participation in all three.

Students are active in service, participating in faculty-sponsored service opportunities as well as those initiated by fellow students. RSCPHSW students were instrumental in the recent initiative that resulted in FIU’s becoming a tobacco-free campus and in the establishment of a farmers’ market on the FIU campus. Students participate in a wide variety of service activities during Public Health Week and student organizations sponsor volunteer service opportunities throughout the year.

3.3 Workforce Development.

The school shall engage in activities that support the professional development of the public health workforce.

This criterion is met. The RSCPHSW provides opportunities to develop the professional skills and interest of the public health workforce through a number of community events and trainings. The college conducted an evaluation in 2006 of the local health department staffs from two counties (n=102). Lessons learned from the evaluation informed the type, content, format and other important details used to develop a comprehensive workforce development program. More recently, the college engaged the Executive Advisory committee to provide specific, updated recommendations on topics and methods used to present needed topics to employees in public health agencies. The self-study lists an extensive array of continuing education programs and identifies, for each, the community partner who collaborated in the presentation and the number of employees served. This presentation makes clear that the college’s approach to workforce development has been one that is truly based on identified needs at local agencies and that offers sessions at times and locations that facilitate employee attendance. In 2011, the college initiated a new needs assessment under the auspices of the Puerto Rico-Florida Public Health Training Center. This recently-completed needs assessment, which included more than 17,000 Florida Department of Health employees, will shape the college’s workforce development programming for the next four years, with the first four courses to be offered in summer 2012.

The RSCPHSW offers four graduate level certificates in environmental and occupational health, epidemiology, health promotion and disease prevention and public health foundations. Each requires the completion of 18 credits of coursework. Enrollment in the certificate programs by non-FIU affiliated individuals has been limited (fewer than five students per year in each certificate, with no non-FIU individuals enrolled in the occupational and environmental health certificate), the college plans to continue offering the certificates for individuals who wish for a more structured credential short of a graduate degree.
4.0 FACULTY, STAFF AND STUDENTS.

4.1 Faculty Qualifications.

The school shall have a clearly defined faculty which, by virtue of its distribution, multidisciplinary nature, educational preparation, research and teaching competence, and practice experience, is able to fully support the school's mission, goals and objectives.

This criterion is met. The full-time faculty, together with the adjunct and secondary faculty, have extensive training and expertise in diverse disciplines and are qualified to support the college’s academic and professional programs and its research and service activities.

The self-study documents 72 full-time, tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty members primarily responsible for supporting the degree programs; half of these are in the core public health disciplines. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute to the teaching, research and service activities of the school, while adjunct faculty are credentialed to teach specific courses. The current faculty complement includes 20 professors, 18 associate professors, 20 assistant professors, one clinical associate professor, one clinical assistant professor, 10 instructors/clinical instructors and one lecturer, with multiple ongoing searches. Of the 21 non-tenure-track faculty, seven have assistant professor titles. The college has strategically hired across all ranks to facilitate rapid growth in research and mentoring capacity.

The self-study notes the inclusion of nationally and internationally recognized scholars in various disciplines. The value of this was reiterated by several students. About half the faculty members in the public health core disciplines have either an MPH or DrPH or an academic degree from an accredited school of public health. Several faculty members report substantial public health practice experience in diverse settings such as county health departments, USPHS, CDC and NIH. In addition the college utilizes practitioners as adjunct faculty for specific courses, practicum preceptors and guest lecturers.

4.2 Faculty Policies and Procedures.

The school shall have well-defined policies and procedures to recruit, appoint and promote qualified faculty, to evaluate competence and performance of faculty, and to support the professional development and advancement of faculty.

This criterion is met with commentary. The college follows the policies, procedures and guidelines established by FIU. This information is published on the university website and in the Faculty Handbook. Policies include those governing faculty recruitment and selection, tenure and promotion, appointment and promotion of non-tenure-track faculty and employee performance evaluation. Specific evidence expected and criteria for annual evaluation for faculty in the college were also provided. These evaluation procedures are closely paralleled by procedures for appointment as graduate faculty and approval for
doctoral advisor status, both offered through the Graduate School. In addition, all faculty members are represented by the United Faculty of Florida, a faculty union for the entire state.

Faculty members are actively involved in each search and screen process for new faculty. Before the search and screen committee reviews candidate applications, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity must certify them as having sufficient representation of minority and female applicants. After campus interviews, the dean discusses the candidates with the search and screen committee and with the department chair/school director before making a formal offer. The department/school must approve an offer of appointment with tenure. A new faculty member can negotiate a reasonable start-up commitment.

Each department/school and the college have promotion and tenure committees. To earn tenure and promotion, faculty members are expected to show excellence in teaching, meaningful research and scholarly contribution in their area of expertise, and to provide useful service to their fellow citizens and their profession. The department/school promotion and tenure committee, department chair/school director, college promotion and tenure committee, dean, provost and FIU president all review each file for promotion and tenure, which must include at least five letters from external reviewers. Commitment to community service is inherent to the mission and goals of the college and is therefore part of every faculty member’s annual work assignment. However, at least for the annual review process, rating as unsatisfactory service performance requires the total absence of active contributions to the college or university or to the community at large, so ratings lower than “satisfactory” are extremely rare.

In addition to the promotion and tenure review process, every faculty member must complete an annual faculty activity report that is evaluated according to the college faculty performance appraisal guidelines in the context of the current differentiated work assignment. These faculty appraisal guidelines are very specific about number and type of activities expected for the various rankings for teaching and research: excellent/outstanding, very good, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Tenure-earning faculty members also complete a third-year review. During the site visit, the dean informed the site visitors that the college was in the process of revising the promotion criteria for clinical faculty.

The college offers a variety of opportunities for faculty development. There are limited department/school and college funds available for faculty travel, but many faculty have start-up commitments that include travel. Campus activities include a variety of workshops and similar opportunities for faculty development in the area of scholarship and teaching. In particular, the Center for the Advancement of Teaching provides many resources on effective teaching and student evaluation methods. In addition, the college is in the process of establishing a mentoring program for all junior faculty members. The newly formed
Mentoring Committee will support junior faculty members to develop scholarship programs as well as to develop greater teaching skills.

The university provides and analyzes a student assessment of instruction standardized form that is used for all full-time and adjunct faculty members. In addition, the department chairs/school director often observe faculty teaching. If a need for improvement is noted, the chair/director will immediately develop a plan to address the concern.

The commentary relates to the faculty performance appraisal guidelines and the lack of criteria for tenure and promotion. The faculty performance appraisal guidelines are very specific in some regards, with explicit benchmarks for publications and grant awards. In contrast, there are no written criteria for tenure and promotion. Recommendations are apparently made on the cumulative performance reflected in the annual reviews, but those rating are dependent on the annual work assignments. Faculty members are aware of this gap and are considering development of department/school-school specific criteria. Site visitors encourage consideration of more qualitative standards in this process.

4.3 Faculty and Staff Diversity.

The school shall recruit, retain and promote a diverse faculty and staff, and shall offer equitable opportunities to qualified individuals regardless of age, gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or national origin.

This criterion is met. The RSCPHSW faculty and staff is diverse and representative of the community served. This visibly expresses the school's overarching commitment to diversity. The faculty breakdown by gender is 47% male and 53% female. Approximately 12% of the core faculty is Black, 17% Hispanic, 17% Asian/Pacific Islander, 3% Native American and the remaining 51% White, non-Hispanic. The RSCPHSW staff also reflect the surrounding community, which consists of people of diverse ethnic backgrounds. Eighty-five percent of the college's staff are female; males are 15%. The ethnicity profile is 15% Black, 57% Hispanic, 7% Asian/Pacific Islander and 21% White, non-Hispanic. In 2011-2012, the college's level of diversity among faculty and staff approximated or exceeded the level in the university as a whole. As of fall 2011, the college has 47% minority faculty, 39% female faculty and 79% minority staff. Females hold 44% college administration positions and there are 44% minority college administrators. The college is committed to expanding the diversity of the faculty as it hires or obtains approvals for new positions.

Both the faculty and staff profiles reflect the diversity and richness of Black and Hispanic cultures as well as an eclectic ethnic/international mix. This is an asset for public health education, community service and interdisciplinary and health disparities research.
Policies and procedures of both the college and university support the creation of an inclusive environment. The university has sound human resources practices for announcing and advertising positions (targeting ethnically diverse populations and women) and faculty search and screen committees require diverse membership. As the RSCPHSW search committees attempt to fill current faculty vacancies, based on their expressed interest to expand the school’s research portfolio in chronic disease prevention research, the college has an opportunity to recruit well-qualified persons who not only have a sound chronic disease research portfolio and publication record, but who also represent US-based communities reported in the current surveillance data on persons most impacted by chronic disease.

There are campus-wide initiatives related to diversity, eg, Diversity Week sponsored by the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs and other events focused on hot topics (eg, immigration, racial justice, religion, current events, and disabilities). Faculty, staff and students can participate in the FIU President’s Access and Equity Committee which has subcommittees focused on disability/access, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender issues, Minority/Female issues and Quality of Worklife. Overall, faculty and students reported an environment of inclusion at the school.

4.4 Student Recruitment and Admissions.

The school shall have student recruitment and admissions policies and procedures designed to locate and select qualified individuals capable of taking advantage of the school’s various learning activities, which will enable each of them to develop competence for a career in public health.

This criterion is met. The RSCPHSW provides clear and easily accessible policies and procedures intended to locate and select qualified students. The Office of Student and Alumni Affairs (OSAA) website provides an adequate description of its role in supporting RSCPHSW applicants and students in a variety of ways.

The college’s website is the primary source of information on the recruitment and admissions processes. Applicants for all public health degrees must submit a transcript showing completion of a baccalaureate degree with a minimum GPA of 3.0, GRE scores, a personal statement, a resume/CV, three letters of recommendation and, for doctoral students only, a writing sample. International students must submit TOEFL scores. All applications are processed by OSAA in cooperation with the university’s Graduate School. After initial processing and verification of completion, OSAA forwards the materials to the appropriate departmental committee. Departmental committees can recommend that the student be admitted, offered conditional admission, deferred (a designation for students who do not meet the standards for admission but would like to take classes to improve chances of future admissions) or denied.
Applicants for dietetics and nutrition and social work degrees follow similar processes. The requirements for admissions are slightly different across degree programs, yet a competitive standard consistently exists among all of the degrees.

Self-study data show steady increases each year in the number of applicants for all degree programs (except the BSW, for which numbers have fluctuated during the reporting period). The college has been judicious, however, in maintaining a level of admissions that is appropriate for existing resources; hence, the number of students admitted each year in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 is significantly lower than the number of students admitted in 2009-2010. The total MPH student population has declined from 310.3 FTE in 2009-2010 to 266.0 FTE in 2011-2012. Enrollment in the public health doctoral programs has grown slightly over the three year period from an FTE of 35.4 in 2009-2010 to 38.9 in 2011-2012.

4.5 Student Diversity.

Stated application, admission, and degree-granting requirements and regulations shall be applied equitably to individual applicants and students regardless of age, gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or national origin.

This criterion is met. The college has an extremely strong record of attracting and enrolling a diverse student body. A majority of students enrolled in the MPH program are from under-represented racial and ethnic groups. FIU is a designated Hispanic-Serving Institution.

Goal 4 of the college’s strategic plan is “nurture a collegial environment in a college that is committed to excellence,” and an objective in this area relates to diversity of faculty and staff. In 2011-2012, 69% of the students were minority (including international students) or 66% excluding international students. The strategic plan includes the objective to have a student body where 70% of the annual enrollees represent minority groups. Females represent 81% of the college’s active student population and 85% of new enrollees.

The college’s targeted recruitment efforts include participation in the following programs: McKnight Doctoral Fellowship Program for African-Americans and Hispanics pursuing PhDs; McNair Scholars Program; and a recent relationship with Morehouse College’s Public Health Sciences Institute to recruit students from historically black colleges and universities.

Recruitment and retention of diverse students will require continued attention to financial support as well as to robust but flexible course scheduling and high quality advisement to ensure timely graduation and employment. Many students work full time, have long commute times to campus and juggle significant work/life balance issues. The college recognizes these obstacles to graduate education. On-site
interviews revealed that administrators, staff, faculty and students engage in continuous dialogue on finding solutions for individuals and the college as a whole.

4.6 Advising and Career Counseling.

There shall be available a clearly explained and accessible academic advising system for students, as well as readily available career and placement advice.

This criterion is met. The college conducts an orientation each semester in addition to the university’s orientation. Public health students are admitted in the fall semester only, so there is one annual orientation for public health students and dietetics and nutrition students. The social work degrees accept students in spring and fall and hold orientations for each admitted cohort. In addition to orientation, all students receive online and print publications from the university, college, and, in some cases, program of study, that outline resources, policies and procedures.

The college employs four full-time student services coordinators who serve as first-line advisors and resources for all of the college’s graduate students. Two coordinators are dedicated to the public health degrees, one is dedicated to nutrition and dietetics graduate students and one is dedicated to social work graduate students. The coordinators liaise with department chairs, staff and faculty on all matters that require departmental consent and maintain all graduate student files, housed in the Office of Student and Alumni Affairs. In the social work and dietetics and nutrition areas, the coordinators play a central role in career advising, along with faculty members.

The university-wide Undergraduate Academic Advising Center handles advising for all undergraduate students. Undergraduate students in social work and dietetics and nutrition also are assigned to a faculty advisor who can help with career mentorship and other related issues.

In addition to the advising resources mentioned above, all graduate students have an assigned or self-selected faculty advisor. Advisor assignment may be based on shared research or practice interests or may be assigned randomly if students do not have a preference. Faculty advisors approve student registration and program changes; assist in the development of practicum and/or research projects, as applicable; guide students in course selection; and serve as readers on student committees. The public health disciplines are moving to a practice of assigning faculty advisors soon after the admissions process to ensure that students have early and frequent contact with their advisors.

Several recent hires and changes in the student services area have greatly affected both academic and career advising. A new assistant dean for student services, hired in fall 2011, has created more efficient database and tracking systems to support faculty and department chairs’ review of students’ progress. The college has also hired a full-time coordinator for the MPH practicum and for public health career
advising. The individual holding the position is an MPH alumna with experience in the local public health practice community. Her services, available to graduate students and alumni, include resume and cover letter review and targeted career advising. All college students have access to the university-wide career services office, which provides a wide range of opportunities, including career fairs and forums.

The college has surveyed alumni who graduated between 2006 and 2010 as well as recent graduates (who graduated in 2010 and 2011) for satisfaction with advising by student services staff as well as a number of other measures. The survey did not, however, specifically address career advising. Satisfaction was moderate to high, with slightly lower satisfaction scores from recent graduates than from alumni. The college has begun administering an exit survey to all MPH students during the integrative seminar, a move that it expects will greatly boost response rates and usable data.
Wednesday, April 11, 2012

8:30 am  Site Visit Team Arrives on Campus
8:45 am  Request for Additional Documents or Information
         Gil Ramirez, DrPH, MPH; Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
9:00 am  Resource File Review
9:30 am  Meeting with Core Leadership Team
         Michele Ciccazzo, PhD, RD, Interim Dean
         Gilbert Ramirez, DrPH, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
         Richard Beaulaurier, PhD, Associate Dean for Research & Engagement
         Elena Bastida, PhD, Chair (HPDP)
         Mary Helen Hayden, EdD, Director (SW)
         Fatma Huffman, PhD, RD, Chair (D&N)
         Wasim Maziak, MD, PhD, Chair, (Epi)
         Mark Williams, PhD, Chair (HPM)
         O. Dale Williams, MPH, PhD, Chair (Bio)
         William Darrow, PhD, Professor (HPDP); Chair RSCPHSW Faculty Assembly
         Maryann Camps-Gato, MBA, Director of Budget & Operations
10:45 am Break
11:00 am Meeting with Self-Study Team
         Michele Ciccazzo, PhD, RD, Interim Dean
         Gilbert Ramirez, DrPH, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
         Richard Beaulaurier, PhD, Associate Dean for Research & Engagement
         Vukosava Pekovic, MD, MPH, PhD, Academic Public Health Director
         Virginia McCoy, PhD, Professor (HPDP)
         Maryann Camps-Gato, MBA, Director of Budget & Operations
11:45 am Break
12:00 pm Lunch with Students
         Paulette Acevedo, MSW student (SW)
         Anshul Saxena, MPH student (Bio)
         Siobhan Radix-Keane, MSW student (SW)
         Carla Duenas, Undergrad student (D&N)
         Leslie Davis Masters student (D&N); President Association for Graduate Students in DN
         Tiffanie Stewart, PhD student (D&N)
         Nan Aisha Garba, PhD student (EOH)
         Vincent Avevilla, MPH student (EOH)
         Kelly Winter, PhD student (Epi)
         Neha Upadhya, MPH student (Epi)
         Tarang Kheradia, MPH student (Bio)
         Dana Farell, PhD student (HPDP)
         William Barry, MPH student (HPDP)
         Muddasir Mohammed, MPH student (HPMP)
         Vicky Quintana, BSSW student (SW)
         Nicola Bryan, MSW student (SW)
         Bora Paz, PhD student (SW)
         Karen Iglesias, President Stempel Public Health Association
1:30 pm Break
1:45 pm Meeting with Faculty: Instruction Part I
         Abu S. Abdullah, MD, MPH, PhD, Associate Professor (Epi)
         Ahmed Albatineh, PhD, Assistant Professor (Bio)
         Consuelo Beck-Sague, MD, Assistant Professor (HPDP)
Thursday, April 12, 2012

8:30 am  Meeting with Faculty: Creation and Application of Knowledge
Elena Bastida, PhD, Chair (HPDP)
Marianna Baum, PhD, RD, Professor (D&N)
Mario De la Rosa, PhD, Professor & Director of CRUSADA (SW)
Jessy Devieux, PhD, Associate Professor (HPDP)
Purnima Madhivanan, MBBS, MPH, PhD, Associate Professor (Epi)
Wasim Maziaq, MD, PhD, Chair (Epi)
Virginia McCoy, PhD, Professor (HPDP)
Lanakila McMahon, PhD, MPH, Assistant Professor of Research (EOH/GLOWS)
Vijaya Narayanan, PhD, Assistant Professor (D&N)
Richard Palmer, DrPH, Assistant Professor (HPDP)
Deodutta Roy, MPH, PhD, Professor (EOH)
Mary Jo Trepka, MSPH, MD, Associate Professor (Epi)
Eric Wagner, PhD, Professor, C-BIRG Director (SW)
Mark Williams, PhD, Chair (HPM)
Q. Dale Williams, MPH, PhD, Chair (Bio)
Changwon Yoo, PhD, Assistant Professor (Bio)

10:00 am  Break

10:15 am  Meeting with Faculty: Instruction Part II
Jennifer Abeiloff, MSW, BA, Associate Director School of Social Work; Coordinator of Field Education & BSSW Program (SW)
Nasar Ahmed, PhD, Associate Professor (Epi)
Adriana Campa, PhD, Associate Professor (D&N)
Alok Deoraj, PhD, Instructor (EOH)
Jessy Devieux, PhD, Associate Professor (HPDP)
Mehmet Dorak, MD, PhD, Associate Professor (EOH)
Mary Helen Hayden, MSW, EdD, Director (SW)
Fatima Huffman, PhD, RD, Chair (D&N)
Hafiz Khan, PhD, Associate Professor (Bio)
Mark Macgowan, MSW, PhD, Professor (SW)
Wasim Maziaq, MD, PhD, Chair (Epi)
Richard Palmer, DrPH, Assistant Professor (HPDP)
Deodutta Roy, PhD, Professor (Epi)
Nicoile Ruggiano, MSW, PhD, Assistant Professor (SW)
Stephen Wong, MSW, PhD Associate Professor (SW)

11:45 am  Break

12:00 pm  Lunch with Community Stakeholders
Paul Ahr, MD; President and CEO, Camilus House (EAC member, employer)
Suzanne Berrios, LCSW; Director Mental Health, Miami-Dade County Public Schools (SW preceptor)
Mayda Castro, RD; Food Service Director, West Gables Rehabilitation Hospital (DN preceptor)
Roger Clegg, Regional Director, ARAMARK FIU (DN preceptor)
Dana Cohen, MS, RD, LD/N; Clinical Nutrition Manager, Baptist Healthcare (DN preceptor, employer)
Andrew Cuddihy, MPH; Program Director, American Lung Association (HPDP/EOH preceptor)
Monica Dawkins, MS; USDA Cooperative Extension Faculty, Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) (DN preceptor)
Andrew Dean, MD, MPH; (EAC member)
William Duquette, CEO, Homestead Baptist Hospital (EAC member, employer)
Wayne Ferdinand, MPH; Associate Administrator, Environmental Health, Safety and Emergency Management, Jackson Health System (EOH preceptor)
Stephen Gula, RD, LD/N; Food Service Director, St. Anne’s Nursing Home (DN preceptor)
Lillian Gutierrez, MPH; Public Health Specialist, Royal Caribbean Cruises Ltd., Medical and Public Health Department (MPH online preceptor)
Bruce Hayden, MSW; President and CEO, Banyan Health Systems, Inc. (EAC member, employer)
Scott Kleier, General Manager, Dining Services, title Baptist Healthcare (DN preceptor)
Marilyn Losa, MHSA; Executive Director, Health Council of South Florida (EAC member, HPM/HPDP preceptor, employer)
Steve Marcus, EdD; President and CEO, Health Foundation of South Florida (EAC member, employer)
Stephanie Rakofsky, LCSW, Director of Social Work Services, South Miami Hospital (SW preceptor)
Lillian Rivera, PhD, MPH; Director Miami-Dade County Health Department (EAC member, employer)
Martha Sanchez, Chief Executive Officer, Miami-Dade AHEC, Inc. (EAC member, preceptor, employer)
Katy Sorenson, President and CEO, Good Government Initiative (Co-Chair of EAC)

1:30 pm  Break

1:45 pm  Meeting with University Leaders
Mark B. Rosenberg, PhD, President
Douglas Wartzok, PhD, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

2:15 pm  Break and Resource File Review

3:00 pm  Meeting with Faculty: Faculty, Staff and Student Issues
Jennifer Abeloff, MSW, BA, Associate Director School of Social Work, Coordinator of Field Education & BSSW Program (SW)
Rashida Biggs, DHSc, MPH, CHES, Clinical Assistant Professor (HPDP)
Maryann Camps-Gato, MBA, Director of Budget & Operations
William Darrow, PhD, Professor (HPDP)
Florence Greer, MPH, MPA, Practicum Coordinator & Career Placement Advisor
Mary Helen Hayden, MSW, EdD, Director (SW)
Fatma Huffman, PhD, RD, Chair (D&N)
Aparajita Maitra, PhD, Assistant Dean, Student & Alumni Affairs
Timothy Page, PhD, Assistant Professor – Search Committee Chair
Vukosava Pekovic, MD, MPH, PhD, Public Health Academic Director
Gilbert Ramirez, DrPH, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
Paul Stuart, MSW, PhD, Professor - Search Committee Chair
Mark Williams, PhD, Chair (HPM)
O. Dale Williams, MPH, PhD, Chair (Bio)

4:15 pm  Executive Session and Resource File Review

5:00 pm  Adjourn

Friday, April 13, 2012

9:00 am  Executive Session

12:30 pm  Exit Interview