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Introduction

This report presents the findings of the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) regarding the School of Public Health and Information Sciences at the University of Louisville. The report assesses the school's compliance with the *Accreditation Criteria for Schools of Public Health, amended June 2011*. 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 January 2013 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 in a resource file. The team was afforded full cooperation in its efforts to assess the school and verify the self-study document.

The University of Louisville (UofL) traces its origins to 1798 and the plan to establish the Jefferson Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. The seminary opened in the fall of 1813 and closed in 1829. The pathway of the modern day UofL continued with the Louisville Medical Institute (LMI), chartered in 1833 and opened in 1837, and the Louisville Collegiate Institute (LCI), chartered in 1837. In 1840, LCI was named Louisville College and in 1844 it inherited the portion of the estate of Jefferson Seminary designated for the use of higher education in Louisville. The LMI saw large enrollments and financial prosperity however; the LCI experienced difficulties and struggled to remain open. In 1846, the Kentucky legislature created the UofL proper, which combined the LMI, LCI and a newly created law school. Despite this action, the LCI did not survive due to the fact that each entity retained financial autonomy.

Many changes and additions have occurred over the years to establish the present day UofL as a state-supported urban university in Kentucky’s largest metropolitan area. Today the university consists of three campuses: the Belknap Campus, Health Sciences Center (HSC) and the Shelby Campus. The Belknap Campus is the university’s main campus and houses eight of the university’s twelve colleges and schools. The HSC, located downtown, includes the School of Public Health and Information Sciences (SPHIS), School of Medicine, School of Nursing, School of Dentistry and the University of Louisville Hospital (ULH). The Shelby Campus is located in eastern Jefferson County and includes the Center for Predictive Medicine, a National Institute of Health Biosafety Level three facility.

The institution offers associate, bachelor, master, specialist, doctoral and first-professional degrees (DMD, JD and MD). UofL is made up of 12 colleges and schools (1) arts and sciences; (2) business; (3) dentistry; (4) education and human development; (5) interdisciplinary and graduate studies; (6) social work; (7) law; (8) medicine; (9) music; (10) nursing; (11) public health and information sciences; and (12) engineering. The SPHIS was established in 2002 to offer professional degree programs to complement the already established research-oriented master’s and doctoral degrees.
This is the school’s second review for accreditation. The school received initial accreditation in fall 2007 with a term of five years and an interim report due in fall 2009. The site visit was originally scheduled for November 2012 however; it was rescheduled to accommodate the use of the 2011 CEPH criteria. The CEPH Board of Councilors acted to extend the term of accreditation by one month at its 2011 Administrative Committee Meeting.
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 SPHIS. The UofL is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and the SPHIS and its dean have rights, privileges and status equivalent to other schools. UofL has been accredited by SACS since 1915. All degrees offered by the school are structured with an ecological perspective. The association with the Louisville Metro Department of Public Health, community organizations, the interdisciplinary faculty and the cross-collaboration between the other colleges and schools at UofL are evidence of the school's aims to promote collaboration and foster professional public health values. The school currently utilizes five sources of funding: state appropriations; external funds for sponsored research; indirect cost recovery; fundraising and endowment funds; and tuition and fees. The school continues to develop and implement new evaluation methods to ensure the professional preparation of its graduates. The school faculty and leadership emphasize the commitment to public health education, desire for the school to expand its degree offerings to include an undergraduate degree in public health and the continued bonds of trust and work to improve the public health of Kentucky residents and beyond the borders of Kentucky.
1.0 THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

1.1 Mission.

The school shall have a clearly formulated and publicly stated mission with supporting goals, objectives and values.

This criterion is met. The SPHIS has a mission statement that includes research, teaching and service. The mission statement of the school is:

We advance knowledge for the public’s health in the increasingly complex and interconnected world of the 21st century. We accomplish this through activities in the three cornerstone areas for advancing health knowledge:

- **Research.** We create knowledge by seeking new discoveries and understanding through scientific exploration. We communicate our findings.
- **Teaching.** We share knowledge with students committed to and prepared for learning in a facilitated environment. Our learners are our students, our faculty and our staff. We commit to preparing our learners for success.
- **Service.** We apply knowledge through quality services to the communities of which we are a part – the university, Louisville Metro, Kentucky, the United States and their respective environments.

The school has five goals that relate to academics, research, diversity, partnerships and service. They are to:

- Provide educational and academic excellence through a responsive, challenging and supportive educational environment characterized by high standards, commitment to quality and student success.
- Build a public health and information science research enterprise by focusing energy and resources to enhance the scholarly agenda, thereby striving toward national prominence.
- Foster a diverse, open, and accessible school of public health and information sciences with an integrated system of access and intercultural understanding that promotes and supports race and gender diversity, inclusivity, equity and open communication.
- Promote collaboration and community/state partnerships by developing and integrating interdisciplinary activities associated with teaching, research and service. Support existing partnerships and engage new partners to contribute to the educational, social and economic progress of the region and state.
- Focus on school effectiveness and service through systematic quality improvement assessment, CEPH self-study and accreditation and a dedication to fulfill the mission and vision of SPHIS.

The mission statement, vision, goals and objectives were developed through a consensus process that began in 2004. Faculty and staff were involved in committees, monthly meetings and a retreat during this process. During spring 2012, the school’s department chairs reviewed the mission, values, goals and objectives and recommended no changes. Additionally, the school requested feedback from the Student
Government Association (SGA) and the Community Advisory Board, and they also recommended no changes.

The school’s vision is to be an internationally recognized center of excellence for the creation, sharing and application of knowledge for the public’s health.

There are objectives for each goal. Most of the objectives are measureable and time-based. The school uses the university-wide implementation scorecard method to measure objectives. The dean and the university provost collaborate to develop scorecard measures. The scorecard is not comprehensive of all that the school wants to achieve so the school developed additional objectives for measurement. The scorecard is revised annually but may be revised any time during the year.

The school’s strategic plan relates each goal to a university plan area and to a school strategy. The plan lists tactics, actions, gauge, thresholds and targets for each goal.

Faculty, staff and students have reviewed the goals on an annual basis since 2007 (except 2011) as part of the strategic planning process. Additionally, the Community Advisory Board reviews any changes. The school shares any changes with the school’s partners and stakeholders on its website.

The school is guided by eight core values to fulfill their mission. They are:

- We nurture an academic setting that fosters ethics, respect, diversity, cooperation, learning and fun.
- We strive to improve our approach and performance through a program of active feedback and deliberate change.
- We embrace innovative ideas for advancing knowledge.
- We investigate new techniques and technologies for doing research, teaching and service.
- We think globally and act locally.
- We collaborate with anyone who will join us in working for the public’s health.
- We recognize that public health starts with the individual.
- We advocate for the public’s health.

The school’s mission, vision, and values are available on the school website. Additionally the mission and vision are also on display in the school’s lobby.

1.2 Evaluation and Planning.

The school shall have an explicit process for monitoring and evaluating its overall efforts against its mission, goals and objectives; for assessing the school’s effectiveness in serving its various constituencies; and for using evaluation results in ongoing planning and decision making to achieve its mission. As part of the evaluation process, the school must conduct an analytical self-study that analyzes performance against the accreditation criteria.
This criterion is met with commentary. The school has established several planning and evaluation processes and procedures to monitor and assess their mission, goals and objectives. A team of school faculty and staff along with a faculty member from the College of Education and Human Development developed the school’s evaluation plan, which is grounded in the school’s mission. The school uses the university’s quality assurance framework to illustrate graphically the data sources they use for external accountability and internal quality improvement. The school has conducted strategic planning five of the last six years and plans to continue to do so, on an annual basis.

The school receives data from a variety of sources. One is the Community Advisory Board, which provides input to the dean that is used in evaluation of the school’s goals towards accomplishing its mission. This board has 23 members representing government agencies, businesses and service organizations in the Louisville metro area.

The school conducts its internal review annually and shares the summary report with the faculty, staff and the Executive Committee. The summary report includes data from annual surveys, committee reports, program evaluations and from the university scorecard developed collaboratively between the school and the university. Students and faculty review the data from student and faculty performance assessments on an annual basis.

Evaluation data are reviewed on several levels. The Council of Chairs and Deans, which includes student representatives, reviews evaluation documents annually and is charged with developing a plan to manage any issues that need to be addressed.

The school uses the evaluation data to make changes when needed. For example, as part of their evaluation process the school identified a need to record, monitor, update and assess faculty teaching, service, and research and noted that students needed a way to identify service and career opportunities. As a result, the school identified and began to utilize online data collection and survey systems that had been purchased by the University. Secondly, the most recent evaluation led to the identification of a need to poll students, staff, and faculty and an online survey system was purchased. Additionally, the Department of Epidemiology and Population Health identified a need to improve their students' quantitative skills. Following this, the MS in Epidemiology Program created two new lab courses, PHEP 648 and 649, to enhance the quantitative skills of its students.

The school has an accreditation steering committee that was responsible for the self-study. The committee began meeting in February 2011 and included the associate and assistant deans and department chairs. The self-study was accessible to students, and the school invited anonymous feedback from students via Blackboard. No comments were received. The school disseminated
information about the self-study to stakeholders through their website, social media postings and announcements in university media. Students, alumni, and stakeholders during the site visit reported that they were familiar with the self-study process and document.

The commentary relates to the fact that the school follows no single structured process for planning and evaluation. The school is to be commended for using the university’s quality assurance framework but a written, structured process that: describes all the sources of data; timelines for collection: and how, when and by whom the data are analyzed, reported and used for future planning would be beneficial. This single structured process would ensure that a continuous feedback loop exists for data source, storage, point of contact, analysis, evaluation and implementation.

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. SACS accredits the UofL to award associate, bachelors, masters, specialist, doctoral and first-professional degrees (DMD, JD, MD). The UofL is a state-supported institution in Kentucky’s largest metropolitan area.

The university has well-defined policies that are described in the university Redbook and other university documents. The dean serves with other deans on the university’s Administrative Council, along with the president, provost and vice presidents. The dean is the chief executive officer of the school and reports directly to the executive vice president and university provost as do all other deans at the UofL. The dean also reports to the executive vice president for health affairs (as do the three other health science deans: medicine, dentistry and nursing). Each dean has an equivalent degree of autonomy and responsibility in resource allocation. The provost has control over the university budget, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees. The dean of the school has authority over distribution of budgets to the departments. Expenditures are subject to university regulations and policies.

The Board of Trustees must approve faculty appointments on recommendation of the president. The dean makes recommendations to the president on faculty appointments based on faculty committees’ recommendations. The university is an Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity employer and maintains a Human Resources Affirmative Action Department.

All graduate degrees are managed by the school and its departments. The various programs and the Office of Academic and Student Services manage student recruitment and applications. The school’s executive faculty recommends the awarding of degrees to the Board of Trustees. The School of
Interdisciplinary and Graduate Studies is responsible for establishing and overseeing university policies and procedures for graduate education.

1.4 Organization and Administration.

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

This criterion is met. The school has five departments: bioinformatics and biostatistics, environmental and occupational health sciences, epidemiology and population health, health management and system sciences, and health promotion and behavioral sciences. The school also houses the Center for Health Hazards and Preparedness. Each department has a designated chair. Executive authority rests with the dean, who is assisted by four associate deans and a director of finance and administration. The associate deans are responsible for academic affairs, student affairs, faculty affairs and research.

School leaders actively encourage collaboration across departments and with other units in the university. There is a well-developed committee structure with representation across departments, which supports working across units. Monthly research incubation meetings also bring together faculty, staff and students from across the university. There is a Community Advisory Board that advises the school and dean on matters related to cooperation and collaboration with the community.

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 school is governed by bylaws and rules that establish the school’s governance. Faculty, students and other stakeholders are active participants in developing and monitoring the school’s policies and procedures.

The school has six standing committees and ten ad-hoc committees that are the major governance bodies of the school. Executive faculty may be found on some of these committees. Executive faculty hold a full-time academic appointment in the UofL with a primary appointment in the SPHIS. The six committees are as follow:

The Committee on Performance Criteria and Economic Welfare includes two tenured faculty members who are elected by the executive faculty and one tenured faculty who is appointed by the dean. This committee works with the dean and administrative officer to address issues related to salaries and other benefits to ensure that there are no inequities in salaries and benefits.
The Council of Chairs and Deans includes the dean; all department chairs; all vice, associate and assistant deans; two executive faculty appointed by the dean; two non-executive faculty appointed by the dean; and two students who are elected by the school’s Student Government Association (SGA). The dean serves as the chair and council serves as an advisor to the dean on a variety of topics. Also, the Council addresses development and evaluation.

The Faculty Forum includes the dean, elected representatives from each department, two students elected by the SGA, an elected representative from the Council of Chairs and Deans, and an elected Faculty Senate representative. The dean is the chair, and serves as the executive faculty's board when the executive faculty is not in session.

The Promotion, Appointment, and Tenure Committee is comprised of four elected and two appointed executive faculty who must hold the rank of professor. This committee is responsible for developing comprehensive academic personnel documents with the participation and approval of the executive faculty and in compliance with the school’s bylaws and rules.

Department chairs submit their request for faculty positions to the dean. When a faculty position is approved or there is a vacancy the dean appoints a search committee who reviews applications and makes recommendations to the relevant department chair. A search committee consists of at least three faculty members and must include minority representation. The school advertises the opening through publications and professional events. Faculty candidates must make a formal presentation to school faculty. When it is time to make a hiring decision, the faculty members of the department for which the candidate is applying vote for their choice. The dean and department chair make the final hiring decision based on the department faculty vote and the search committee’s recommendation.

The Rules, Policies and Credentials Committee includes two faculty members who are elected and one executive faculty member who is appointed by the dean. This committee is responsible for revision and interpretation of the bylaws and rules and development and review and nomination of candidates for university-wide and school committees. Additionally, this committee is responsible for elections procedures.

The Student Academic Grievance Committee includes executive faculty members (two elected, one appointed by the dean) and two students elected by the SGA.

The school has eleven ad-hoc committees. These are (1); Academic Affairs Committee; (2) Accreditation Steering Committee; (3) Bioinformatics Advisory Committee; (4) Curriculum Committee; (5) Diversity
Committee; (6) Faculty Affairs Committee; (7) MPH Advisory Committee; (8) Research Committee; (9) Service Committee; and (10) Student Affairs Advisory Committee and (11) Dean’s Executive Committee. Participation includes faculty and students, depending on the responsibility of the committee. The Research and Service Committees develop all research and services policies for which the dean has final approval. These policies are reviewed annually.

The school has a Community Advisory Board whose members represent businesses, local and state government and community agencies. 23 members advise the dean and the school on opportunities for collaboration with the greater Louisville community.

The dean has the final authority and responsibility for governance except for personnel policies and procedures and curricular decisions for which the executive faculty are responsible. The dean receives input in a variety of ways and approves policies with input from the appropriate standing committee or ad-hoc committee. A source of input to the dean is the Executive Committee, which includes the associate deans and the department chairs. Academic affairs, student affairs and research are the purview of the associate deans.

The school has had an active SGA since 2005. The SGA is involved in committees with oversight on school polices that affect students. The SGA sponsors public health speakers and panels about professional issues; develops and implements public health activities; participates in a wide variety of professional organizations; and appoints members to the university’s graduate student council. Additionally, the SGA formed the local student chapter of the Kentucky Public Health Association. The SGA leadership provides an important communication link between students and administrators and faculty.

The site visit team noted that the school’s bylaws and rules were written in 2002. Based on this feedback, the faculty have begun a review and have committed to completing a comprehensive review and updating of these documents.

1.6 Fiscal Resources.

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

This criterion is met. Sufficient funds exist for the school to fulfill its mission, goals and objectives in instruction, research and service. The school proposes an operating budget each fiscal year, which is approved by the Board of Trustees. The university allocates funds to the school based on the school’s priorities, determined through the university’s scorecard process. Funds are received through the state and those funds identified by the university administration, and through the university’s Research
Infrastructure Fund based on participation in funded activities. Department chairs are responsible for financial management within their departments following internal policies and processes.

The school’s budget is based on five sources: 1) state appropriations; 2) external funds for sponsored research and revenue from a travel clinic (which has recently been transferred to the school of medicine); 3) indirect cost recovery; 4) fundraising and endowment funds; and 5) tuition and fees. The financial resources of the school have been relatively stable for the past five years with total amounts ranging from around $11 million to $12 million. Grants and contracts have been a significant source of revenue, ranging from $3 million to $4 million. There is an indication of a recent drop in research funding. Indirect cost recovery has risen from a low in 2007-08, to about $1 million dollars in each of the past two years. Some research funds are returned to investigators to incentivize research development.

The school’s funds and expenditures are shown in Table 1. Tuition funds generated by the school are shown in Table 2.

Because the university provost determines the allocation of certain sources of revenue, there is a degree of variation between categories from year to year. This is particularly true for tuition; the sums listed in Table 1 are only the funds allocated to SPHIS by central administration. Tuition dollars generated by SPHIS are listed in Table 2.

In addition, the financial information included in Table 1 does not include the amounts carried forward from previous years; rather noted are current revenue and expenses only. It is permissible to utilize carryover funds from previous years to cover current deficits. If there is an instance in which the school does not have sufficient carryover to cover a current deficit, university’s central administration provides one-time funds to cover the year-end shortfall.

Despite reductions in state support for the university, the school has been able maintain its budget. For the past two years, the school has exceeded tuition targets set by the university. Plans for undergraduate degree programs in public health are a potential source for increased revenues. Plans also exist to increase fund-raising from alumni and friends of the school.

In separate meetings with the president, provost and vice president for health affairs, the site team learned of strong university support for the school and of a large recruitment package for a new dean (who was announced during the site visit), including resources for additional faculty hires. University leaders also indicated strong support for the implementation of an undergraduate program.
### Table 1. Sources of Funds by Major Category, Fiscal Years 2008 to 2012

<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>Tuition &amp; Fees¹</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>98,197</td>
<td>12,293</td>
<td>40,247</td>
<td>59,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation²</td>
<td>5,714,380</td>
<td>6,299,358</td>
<td>6,570,207</td>
<td>6,004,840</td>
<td>6,026,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funds</td>
<td>227,109</td>
<td>248,194</td>
<td>217,391</td>
<td>267,934</td>
<td>255,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Contracts</td>
<td>3,381,406</td>
<td>2,821,666</td>
<td>3,432,999</td>
<td>4,250,276</td>
<td>3,463,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery³</td>
<td>397,904</td>
<td>602,940</td>
<td>907,951</td>
<td>1,038,299</td>
<td>978,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment⁴</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>5,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>3,313</td>
<td>9,756</td>
<td>22,891</td>
<td>16,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Clinic</td>
<td>510,832</td>
<td>468,089</td>
<td>470,168</td>
<td>426,364</td>
<td>338,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other⁶</td>
<td>483,789</td>
<td>480,143</td>
<td>516,549</td>
<td>708,987</td>
<td>491,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,796,114</td>
<td>11,025,765</td>
<td>12,139,099</td>
<td>12,761,646</td>
<td>11,635,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</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>Faculty Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>6,001,191</td>
<td>6,609,094</td>
<td>6,849,372</td>
<td>6,849,372</td>
<td>6,972,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>1,594,521</td>
<td>1,780,678</td>
<td>1,763,719</td>
<td>1,763,719</td>
<td>2,008,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations⁷</td>
<td>2,540,379</td>
<td>1,685,087</td>
<td>1,544,753</td>
<td>1,769,733</td>
<td>1,301,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel⁸</td>
<td>156,969</td>
<td>154,042</td>
<td>132,630</td>
<td>170,502</td>
<td>150,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support⁹</td>
<td>474,617</td>
<td>603,087</td>
<td>526,936</td>
<td>522,925</td>
<td>433,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Tax</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery¹⁰</td>
<td>397,904</td>
<td>602,940</td>
<td>907,951</td>
<td>1,038,299</td>
<td>978,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11,165,581</td>
<td>11,434,928</td>
<td>11,725,361</td>
<td>12,154,860</td>
<td>11,845,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Tuition Funds Generated by SPHIS, Fiscal Years 2008 to 2012¹¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</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>Goal</td>
<td>$1,095,656</td>
<td>$1,353,399</td>
<td>$1,365,234</td>
<td>$1,304,169</td>
<td>$1,479,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>$1,095,656</td>
<td>$1,353,399</td>
<td>$1,359,326</td>
<td>$1,389,702</td>
<td>$1,508,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$(5,908)</td>
<td>$85,533</td>
<td>$29,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Tuition funds in Table 1 comprise the mandatory technology fee and distance education charges only. Tuition funds are retained centrally by the university. For information on tuition funds generated by SPHIS, please see Table 2.

² State Appropriations include state general funds and university funds from the Executive Vice President for Health Affairs (EVPHA).

³ University Funds include university scholar funds, which are used to support faculty salaries and fringe benefits.

⁴ Indirect Cost Recovery is retained centrally by the university. Approximately 10% is returned to investigators and 10% to investigators’ departments in the form of Research Infrastructure Funds (RIF). For additional information on RIF, please see Section 3.1.

⁵ Endowment Funds represent only the amount available to the school, which is the interest collected on the total donation.

⁶ Other revenue represents funds received from the practice plan, royalties, the Statistical Consulting Center, etc., and excludes intra-university transfers.

⁷ Operations include non-salary expenses, equipment and grant expenditures.

⁸ Travel includes registration, in-state and out-of-state travel for employees, recruitment expenses, and non-employee travel, including hotel and out of pocket expenses.

⁹ Student Support includes stipends, fringe benefits and tuition payments.

¹⁰ Indirect Cost Recovery represents those indirect costs recovered and retained by the university.

¹¹ FY2011 and FY2012 tuition amounts do not reflect the new credit hour production allocation methodology used by the university’s budget office.
Four outcome measures are indicated, all related to funded research. The school is on track to meet the 2015 goal of having $4.5 million in grants and contracts. There is a goal to increase the number of faculty on funded research from 26 (in 2011-12) to 35 and to increase the number of students on sponsored research training programs from eight in 2011-2012 to 10 in 2015. The school has exceeded its goal of $100,000 per FTE faculty every year.

1.7 Faculty and Other Resources.

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

This criterion is met. The self-study documents a sufficient number of faculty for each degree program. Over the period documented in the self-study (2009 – 2012) there has been growth in faculty headcount for epidemiology and population health from nine to 11. Bioinformatics has dropped slightly from 13 to 12. Environmental health and occupational health sciences has remained at six. Health promotion and behavioral sciences has dropped from six to five. Health management has six faculty members. The number of primary faculty meets the minimum requirements needed to sustain the curricular requirements for each core area for the MPH as well as for the five areas offering doctoral degrees (biostatistics, epidemiology, environmental, health management and health promotion).

The student-faculty ratio (SFR) exceeds minimum expectations with a high of 2.2 for the MSc in clinical investigative sciences. Many degree programs have SFRs around one or below. For the largest MPH concentration in terms of students, in 2012-2013, the SFR was 1.0. The low ratios are influenced by relatively small enrollments in some programs. Based on the faculty numbers, there is capacity for increased growth in enrollments.

There has been a drop in staff from 37 in 2010 to 27 in 2012. This is due to moving the international travel clinic out of the school and to the conclusion of some grant-funded projects. Staff in the dean’s office handle purchasing and fiscal processing centrally. Staff resources appear adequate and appear to be able to rise and fall in relation to funded research needs.

The space available to the school is appropriate to support faculty, staff, and students. The school is based in a free-standing, 36,500 gross square foot building located on the Health Sciences Center, which houses all health science schools. The school’s allocated space includes some classroom space, but additional, varied classroom space is available through the Health Science Center. All classrooms have network connectivity. There are 45 faculty offices and a dean’s suite. A quiet study area (for about 40 students) and student lounge (for about 25 students) is available to students. The school has four distinct laboratory spaces in the Medical Dental Research Building and the “A” Tower Building. Three EOHS faculty members and two EPH faculty members have laboratories. Additional space must be requested
centrally to the Office of Planning and Budget. HSC laboratory space must be approved by the assistant vice president for health affairs. Faculty indicated that space was adequate but does not allow for needed growth.

Computer facilities are appropriate. The school employs a full-time technology and facilities manager who works with university information technology staff to serve the school’s information technology needs. Full-time staff is also provided to support and troubleshoot information technology issues. There is a three-year replacement policy for faculty, staff and lab computers. Other key information technology resources for audio/video are available for loan. Students at the SPHIS must use their own laptops. The school provides state-of-the-art software, and other specialty software can be purchased at academic pricing through the university. Students also have access to a 28-station computing center. The university also maintains Kentucky’s fastest and largest supercomputer. Cutting edge resources and advice are available related to a number of matters such as data security, database design and programming.

Library resources are appropriate and include access to over two million volumes and more than 66,000 electronic journals. There is a specialized health sciences library that includes more than 85,000 books and 737 journals. Fourteen hundred titles are identified in public health disciplines. The university library services are state-of-the-art, including online access and multiple databases.

The relationship with the Louisville Metro government is strong. The director of the Louisville Metro Public Health and Wellness, who is a full-time faculty member in the Department of Health Management and Systems Science, has an 80% service allocation to the health department. There is a formal relationship with the Metro Government for student placement sites.

The school has appropriate outcome measures that include focus on the number of core faculty and the maintenance of strong levels of staff support. There is a goal to increase the number of faculty to 45 by 2015. As of 2011-12, the number of faculty was 39. There is a commitment to keep at most a ratio of one staff to every four faculty; the current ratio is 1:3.

1.8 Diversity.

The school shall demonstrate a commitment to diversity and shall evidence an ongoing practice of cultural competence in learning, research and service practices.

This criterion is met with commentary. The school and the university demonstrate a strong commitment to diversity. The school established a Diversity Committee in 2006. The school’s commitment to diversity is evident in its diversity plans, diversity statement and goals. The diversity statement reflects a broad definition of diversity including disabilities, age, sexual orientation, ethnicity, race, gender and sexual orientation. The school developed a document in 2006, *Ensuring Diversity in Faculty, Staff and Students*:
Policies and Procedures, to detail diversity plans, policies, procedures and strategies. The school integrates diversity and cultural competence into the curriculum and provides students with a range of opportunities for practica, projects, theses, dissertations and learning opportunities in community-based learning courses that address diversity issues. The minutes of the Diversity Committee indicate that the committee actively works to address diversity issues.

According to the self-study, the school’s goal is to increase enrollment, of African American and Hispanic/Latino students. The school’s enrollment of African American students has risen since 2009-2010. In academic year of 2009-2010, African Americans made up 9% of the school’s enrollment. In academic year 2010-11, the percentage was 12%; in 2011-12 the percentage was 11%; and in 2012-13 the percentage was 12%. The enrollment of Hispanics/Latino has been between 1% to 2% during the last three years. For 2018, the school has set goals to increase the number of African American students to 18% and to increase the number of Hispanic/Latino students to 4%. These goals will help them surpass the populations of African Americans in the university’s Area of Geographic Responsibility (AGR), upon which the school bases its targets, and move closer to the representation of the AGR for Hispanics/Latinos.

The school’s diversity policies and procedures document describes information about faculty recruitment and retention. The school has a written process to notify qualified persons of vacancies. The school makes an effort to appoint diverse search committees. The current search committee for a new dean included a diverse membership and included students.

Of current faculty membership, 60% are women and 40% are men. Twenty-five percent of faculty members are Asian, 5% are Black, 3% are Hispanic and 68% are white. During the last three years, three females and four males have been promoted to associate professor. Of these promotions, one was African American, two were Asians and four were non-Hispanic whites. Two females and one male were promoted to professor. Of these, two were Asian and one professor was non-Hispanic white.

The school’s policies support diversity in staff members in similar ways that they support diversity of faculty members. These policies, procedures, and strategies for recruiting and retaining a diverse staff are described in the previously mentioned Ensuring Diversity in Faculty, Staff and Students: Policies and Procedures developed in 2006.

The school has established relationships with several Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic-Serving Institutions. Additionally, the school promotes their programs among minority students in the university. Recruitment occurs at conferences and college fairs and through the school website.
The school evaluates its diversity efforts in a variety of ways. The school has used several scholarships, grants, and organizational financial awards to encourage students to enroll and to retain their enrollment. The school conducts an annual survey of faculty, staff and students to assess its efforts at encouraging a diverse climate. The university has recently developed a diversity planning scorecard that collects data on access for and retention of minority candidates, students and faculty.

The commentary relates to the low percentage of African American (5%) and Hispanic faculty (3%). The school has made solid efforts to recruit minority faculty and the school is supported by the university and by active involvement from the school’s diversity committee. One African-American faculty member (term track) and two African-American professional staff members have been hired in the past four years.

2.0 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS.

2.1 Degree Offerings.

The school shall offer instructional programs reflecting its stated mission and goals, leading to the Master of Public Health (MPH) or equivalent professional master’s 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. The SPHIS offers professional MPH degrees in six concentrations, and the MPH may be completed jointly with a medical degree, the master of urban planning degree or a bachelor’s degree. The school offers the academic master of science (MS and MSc) in biostatistics-decision science, epidemiology and clinical investigation sciences and the academic doctoral degree (PhD) in biostatistics, with optional emphases on bioinformatics and decision science, and in public health sciences with emphasis in environmental health, epidemiology, health management and health promotion. The school also offers a joint academic master of science (MSc) with medical degree and a joint academic master of science (MS) with an academic doctoral degree (PhD). The school plans to offer two undergraduate degrees in public health in fall 2013. Table 3 presents the school’s degree offerings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Degrees Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS in Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Occupational Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion and Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics – Decision Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Investigation Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Degrees Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics with optional emphases on Bioinformatics and Decision Science</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Management</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>MPH/MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>MD/MSc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>MPH/BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>MPH/BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>MPH/MUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>PhD/MS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Program Length.

An MPH degree program or equivalent professional public health master’s degree must be at least 42 semester-credit units in length.

This criterion is met. The school requires a minimum of 47 semester credits for the MPH.

All MPH degrees awarded to date have exceeded 42 credit hours. In 2007, the school increased the MPH degree credit hour requirement from 45 to 47 credit hours; all subsequent graduates have completed 47 credit hours for the MPH degree.

The MPH program operates on a semester system. The school follows the SACS definition of a credit in which a credit hour represents an hour (50 minutes) of instruction and 150 minutes of work outside of a class over a 14-week period.

The MPH program allows students to transfer up to nine credits of graduate-level courses. Transfer credit requires approval from the associate dean for academic affairs and includes a review of the syllabus of the course that is being considered. Students must have attained a grade of a B or better for transfer credit to be granted.

2.3 Public Health Core Knowledge.

All graduate professional degree public health students must complete sufficient coursework to attain depth and breadth in the five core areas of public health knowledge.

This criterion is met. All MPH students are required to complete five core courses. The core courses address the five knowledge areas in public health and total 15 credit hours. In addition to the five core courses, all MPH students are required to enroll and successfully complete three additional courses. These courses are: (1) PHPH-696 Issues in Public Health (two credit hours); (2) PHPH-610 Statistics and Data Management for Public Health using SPSS (three credit hours); and (3) PHPH-614 Critical Thinking.
and Program Evaluation (three credit hours). These courses are designed to provide skills that faculty have identified as critical to public health practice and reinforce the five core knowledge areas that are introduced via the public health core curriculum. The five core discipline courses are listed in Table 4.

The site visit team reviewed syllabi, and core courses are appropriate for master’s level study.

Based on feedback from students to the site-visit team regarding PHST-500 Introduction to Biostatistics, which had only been available in an on-line format, the school has developed a new two-course sequence that will be available on campus beginning in the fall semester, 2013-2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Knowledge Area</th>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
<td>PHST-500 Introduction to Biostatistics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td>PHEP-501 Introduction to Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health Sciences</td>
<td>PHEH-500 Introduction to Environmental Health Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>PHPB-501 Introduction to Health Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Administration</td>
<td>PHMS-501 Introduction to Public Health Practice and Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Practical Skills.

All graduate professional public health 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 students’ areas of specialization.

This criterion is met. The MPH program requires a field experience that places students in a practice-based situation. Sites for practicum experiences include health departments, schools, community organizations, hospitals and private institutions. Field experiences are typically unpaid. Students, in consultation with their faculty mentors, are responsible for finding and arranging a practicum site. Students have several resources to locate a practicum site: (1) email communication from the MPH program explaining the name of an organization, the type of practice opportunity being offered and contact information for the experience; (2) an electronic list of previous practicum sites with contact information as well as a list of potential practicum projects at selected sites; (3) student field practice presentations at the end of the spring semester, which allow students to interact with students who have completed practicum experiences and site preceptors and; (4) school faculty members and other faculty members and other university faculty members. Students may also propose a placement organization from their own networking experience.

All field placement sites are assessed by the student’s faculty mentor and the MPH program director for providing an appropriate practicum experience. Field placement sites should: (1) provide services
relevant to public health; (2) provide support, resources, supervision and workspace for students; (3) provide regular contact with public health practitioners; (4) offer a variety of public health related experiences that include both opportunities within a student’s area of concentration and other public health practice opportunities; and (5) encourage the application of academic knowledge to practice opportunities.

All field placement sites must have a completed and signed affiliation agreement between the site and the university before a student may begin fieldwork. This is a legal document that addresses all items pertaining to the university’s guidelines for student field work. It is completed by the dean’s office and must contain an original signature in triplicate and both the university and practicum site maintains a copy. All students must complete a student practice site agreement, which is an agreement between the student and the school. The document provides practice guidelines and specifies a code of conduct for the student while at the practice site. Once the practice site and the school agree to the overall terms of the affiliation agreement, each student must sign a practice site agreement.

Students are required to develop and submit a one-page description of proposed activities to their faculty mentor once a practice site is identified. The document is reviewed, approved and signed by the faculty mentor and the MPH program director prior to the practicum experience beginning. This document ensures that the proposed practicum site will be appropriate for a public health-related practice experience. Students complete a practice site profile form.

Students complete a practicum experience learning agreement signed by the student, faculty mentor and site preceptor. The document is an individualized, fluid agreement between the student and the practice site that outlines the learning objectives of the practicum and how they are to be met during the field experience. The document must identify specific learning activities related to the practice site that assist the student in achieving the overall learning objectives of the practicum. If the scope of work changes the learning agreement can be updated to reflect the needed changes.

Working students may complete their practicum in their primary place of employment as long as it is above and beyond their normal work duties and does not include reporting to their regular supervisor. Students must discuss this placement option with their faculty mentor and MPH program director and approval must be given for this type of practicum to occur.

The practicum experience consists of a total of a minimum of 336 hours. MPH students may enroll in the practicum after the completion of the core MPH courses. A total of six credit hours is required to complete the practicum. Generally, students register and complete one credit hour the summer after their first year in the MPH program, then three credit hours in the fall of their second year and two credit hours in the
spring of their second year. No student has received a waiver of the practicum experience since the inception of the MPH program.

Practicum preceptors should possess some combination of the following: (1) academic training in public health; (2) years of public health related experience; (3) level of responsibility within the organization; (4) previous experience as a practice preceptor for the MPH program; (4) willingness to assist the student to complete the identified practicum deliverables; (5) willingness to provide routine guidance to the student; (6) willingness to provide the student with opportunities to apply academic skills in a practice environment; and (7) willingness to integrate the student as an active participant in the organization. The school has set a target of all preceptors having an MPH or other health related post-graduate degree. However, this is not always possible due to a lack of MPH-trained personnel at practicum sites so exceptions are made when the proposed mentor has work experience in the content or skill area of the practicum. All preceptor exceptions are reviewed and approved by the student’s faculty mentor in consultation with the MPH program director.

The faculty mentor and preceptor work closely to evaluate student performance. This evaluation process includes: (1) regular monitoring and discussion of the student’s progress towards fulfillment of the learning agreement through email contact between the faculty mentor and preceptor; (2) faculty mentor and preceptor participation in the preparation and review of the student’s final paper, oral presentation and electronic poster; (3) the site preceptor student evaluation; and (4) the faculty mentor grading the practicum. The final grade which is an A, B, C, or F basis is determined by the student’s faculty mentor with eight weighted components. The preceptor’s student evaluation (through direct consultation or the evaluation form) may be considered in determining the student evaluation in one or more of the eight components.

Students complete an evaluation of the practicum site. This evaluation provides students a confidential opportunity to assess their practicum experience, including guidance from the MPH program, faculty mentor, site preceptor as well as an overall assessment of the practicum experience.

Preceptors spoke enthusiastically about student field experiences and the knowledge that students bring to their field experiences. Preceptors shared with the team that students take leads in projects assigned to them during their field work at high functioning levels and produce quality output. Site visitors learned from alumni and students that their practice experiences reinforced their knowledge of public health and expanded their knowledge and abilities to work in the field of public health.

Based on site visit team feedback, the school is developing a manual for practicum site-preceptors; expanding the number of sites available, including some that are international; creating a position for and
recruiting an MPH practicum coordinator; and engaging site preceptors to analyze the apparent downward trend in student performance.

2.5 Culminating Experience.

All graduate professional degree programs, both professional public health and other 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. All MPH students are required to complete a culminating experience during their final semester for a total of three credits. The culminating experience is completed through the capstone course, PHPH-697 Integrating Learning and Experience in Public Health. The capstone experience requires students to work individually and in teams to complete the required elements. At the start of the course, students are assigned to teams of five to six members. Teams are always constructed to represent as many different concentrations on a team as possible.

Teams are required to review the ASPH (Association of Schools of Public Health) core and cross-cutting competencies in the first two weeks of class. Individual teams are assigned one core and one cross-cutting competency category and required to assess those competencies and lead a class discussion regarding the relevance of that competency category and how it applies to public health practice. Following the competency assignment, teams are required to evaluate and present two small cases (1 page vignettes) that have been selected to represent real world public health events. Each team is then required to present a large case derived from the literature. Teams during their case assignments are required to do the following: (1) provide a description of the case and relevant background information; (2) identify the decision-makers and decision to be made; (3) lead a discussion of the team decision or recommended course of action; and (4) discuss the key issues in the case and any core and cross-cutting competencies used in the analysis of the case. The next requirement of the course is that each team research, develop, write and present a new public health case. Students receive both written and oral guidance regarding case development. The team-developed cases are used in future capstone classes as the large case presentation requirement. All team members who are the non-presenting students for the large case analysis and developed case presentation are required to write a summary of the presentation that identifies the key issues for each case.

The final requirement of the capstone course is the completion of a comprehensive exam modeled after the National Board of Public Health Examination. This exam is offered both as an individual exam and as a team exam. The exam is given twice, once in the middle of the semester and once at the end of the semester. All students are required to take the exam the first time it is given on an individual basis. Students who pass the exam with a grade of 80% or better the first time are not required to take the exam the second time unless they want to try to improve their score. The team test is taken by students in the capstone class. The higher score is used to calculate the student’s portion of the grade for the exam.
Students who do not pass the exam the first time are required to take the exam the second time. Students who do not achieve an 80% or better the second time receive an incomplete for the course regardless of the scores on the other evaluation components of the course. Students are required to enroll in PHPH 601 for the next term or semester and to successfully complete a remediation project as specified by the course instructors by the end of the term or semester in order to graduate. Successful completion of the remediation project allows the incomplete grade to be replaced with the one calculated using an 80% score on the individual exam. If the project is not successfully completed, the student’s grade for the course is an F, and the student does not graduate with the MPH degree. Site visitors learned that to date no students have had to enroll and successfully complete the remediation project.

Site visitors reviewed several of the small and large case assignments and they showed academic rigor, professionalism and creativity.

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 degree programs. The school must identify competencies for graduate professional public health, other professional and academic degree programs and specializations at all levels (bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral).

This criterion is partially met. The school has clearly articulated and chosen appropriate sets of competencies for each of their academic programs. Competencies for the MPH program and proposed BA/BS degrees in public health are adapted from the ASPH competencies. The respective departments developed the competencies for the academic degrees.

All MPH students must demonstrate competence in the domains of epidemiology, environmental health, biostatistics, health management, health behavior, communication and information, cultural competency, leadership, public health biology, professionalism, program evaluation and systems thinking. The MPH concentrations use the ASPH competencies associated with the concentration (e.g., biostatistics). Thus, the concentration competencies, as listed, simply replicate one sub-set of the core competencies expected of all MPH students. The school has used Bloom’s Taxonomy to indicate the depth that each course goes into regarding the ASPH competencies. For example, students are expected to achieve the ASPH core competencies at the lower levels of Bloom’s taxonomy in the core courses. Concentration classes focus on developing competencies at the higher levels of Bloom’s taxonomy.

The self-study provides matrices that map each degree’s competencies with the required courses and learning experiences. Each course is rated as either “P” for providing a learning experience in which a competency is primarily introduced or “R” for a course in which a particular competency is reinforced.
The BS/BA program has defined the ASPH undergraduate public health learning outcomes model as its set of competencies. The self-study indicates, however, that these may be revised by the school after the degree is approved.

Competencies are reviewed at the program, school and university levels. Program faculty members develop or revise competencies that are then reviewed for approval by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Forum. The competencies are the foundation upon which the school develops its curriculum including student learning outcomes. The school shares the competencies with employers of MPH graduates and with other stakeholders to determine their appropriateness. At the university level, the competencies are reviewed as part of the university’s five-year program review. Additionally, the university prepares reports on student learning outcomes. Because this reporting program was just established, the reports will not be available until the next academic year.

As part of its strategic plan, the school has established a goal to continually improve teaching and learning. One of the planned actions is to develop a plan for reviewing course outcomes. School leaders intend to establish a schedule of review and revision of programs using program reports of outcomes. The program disseminates information about the competencies in several ways. The program shares the competencies through sharepoint, the school’s current eCatalog, published in January 2013, at orientation, in classes, through student meetings, including those with faculty advisors, and during preparation for the culminating experience and the practicum. Few syllabi list relevant competencies, however the school is revising its requirements for syllabi and creating a template that will include competencies. Currently, the competencies are not in the school catalog but the school plans to include them in the next revision. Some students with whom the site visit team talked were familiar with the competencies, while others were not.

The concern relates to the lack of distinct competencies for each concentration in the MPH and for the BA/BS public health degrees. Currently the school uses competencies as developed by the ASPH competency projects for public health core courses (MPH) as competencies for the concentrations. ASPH developed learning outcomes intended for all undergraduate education and opportunities, not for degree programs (BA/BS). The school has used Bloom’s Taxonomy to distinguish the depth with which each course covers the ASPH competencies. For example, students are expected to achieve the ASPH core competencies at the lower levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy in the core courses. Student competencies for the concentration classes use the same ASPH competencies for each domain but focus at the higher levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy. While Bloom’s Taxonomy is useful to indicate an increase in analytical and evaluative skills expected of students in the concentrations, each concentration should have competencies expected of a concentration in that area which would not be expected of all MPH students.
2.7 Assessment Procedures.

There shall be procedures for assessing and documenting the extent to which each professional public health, other professional and academic degree student has demonstrated achievement of the competencies defined for his or her degree program and area of concentration.

This criterion is partially met. In the absence of a fully developed system of competencies, which is discussed at length in Criterion 2.6, the school must demonstrate that it has systems in place to monitor student achievement in relation to expected outcomes. Learning objectives serve to define expectations of the students completing a particular course. Each department reviews all courses offered to determine whether the syllabus indicates clear methods for determining whether students have achieved the learning objectives defined in the syllabus. Core and concentration courses use varied methods, including examinations, papers, presentations and group projects. MPH students also complete a practice experience that provides an opportunity for student assessment of knowledge gained during the two years of study. Finally, students in all degree programs have a culminating experience in the form of a capstone class (MPH), thesis and defense (MS) or dissertation and defense (PhD) that allow faculty to assess the totality of students’ learning and skill acquisition through a major project or experience.

The first concern relates to graduation rates. The school tracks graduation rates and are presented by cohort in a method that shows how many students attained degrees within the maximum time allowed for degree completion. The school has only met the required threshold for master’s degrees once (2008 cohort). The academic masters programs met the 70% threshold twice (2006 and 2009 cohorts). Though the student numbers in the PhD programs are low, the 60% threshold is not met in any of the cohorts. No mention is made in the self-study or during the site visit discussions as to what is being done to increase graduation rates, beyond the challenges of a substantial proportion of part-time students.

The second concern relates to the lack of consistent measures, beyond course completion, to verify student achievement of competencies beyond program outcomes. The practice experience, for MPH students, presents an opportunity for students to define specific learning objectives that relate to overall competencies, and the faculty, preceptor and student self-assessments included in the practicum process provide multiple opportunities for stakeholders to assess whether students have attained defined objectives. However, because of the way in which the practicum and its evaluation tools are structured, the assessment does not focus on student competence. The planning and assessment of the experience do not reference specific competencies nor do they explicitly link the individual objectives on which preceptors rate students to competencies.

The third concern relates to the fact that the school has not implemented the proper tools to incorporate feedback from employers and alumni that relate to student achievement. The school has conducted a very limited alumni and employer survey which achieved a very low rate that provides some basic
information on alumni employment settings and job duties. Alumni data can inform the school on which skills it is teaching well and in which areas it might better prepare students for the workforce. Employers can provide another data stream on skills needed in the workforce that can help the school tailor its training and education to workforce needs. The school has worked with the university to maintain an alumni database. However, they only have contact information for 33% of their alumni. The school will conduct periodic surveys of their alumni beginning in 2012-13. The survey will gather information about alumni employment and additional education. A survey of employers is under development to gather information from employers about graduates’ readiness upon entering the workforce.

2.8 Other Graduate Professional Degrees.

If the school offers curricula for graduate 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 not applicable.

2.9 Bachelor’s Degrees in Public Health.

If the school offers baccalaureate public health degrees, they shall include the following elements:

Required Coursework in Public Health Core Knowledge: students must complete courses that provide a basic understanding of the five core public health knowledge areas defined in Criterion 2.1, including one course that focuses on epidemiology. Collectively, this coursework should be at least the equivalent of 12 semester-credit hours.

Elective Public Health Coursework: in addition to the required public health core knowledge courses, students must complete additional public health-related courses. Public health-related courses may include those addressing social, economic, quantitative, geographic, educational and other issues that impact the health of populations and health disparities within and across populations.

Capstone Experience: students must complete an experience that provides opportunities to apply public health principles outside of a typical classroom setting and builds on public health coursework. This experience should be at least equivalent to three semester-credit hours or sufficient to satisfy the typical capstone requirement for a bachelor’s degree at the parent university. The experience may be tailored to students’ expected post-baccalaureate goals (eg, graduate and/or professional school, entry-level employment), and a variety of experiences that meet university requirements may be appropriate. Acceptable capstone experiences might include one or more of the following: internship, service-learning project, senior seminar, portfolio project, research paper or honors thesis.

The required public health core coursework and capstone experience must be taught (in the case of coursework) and supervised (in the case of capstone experiences) by faculty documented in Criteria 4.1.a and 4.1.b.

This criterion is partially met. The school plans to enroll students in both bachelor of arts (BA) and bachelor of science (BS) public health degrees in fall 2013, as noted in Criterion 2.1.
BA students must successfully complete 11 public health courses for a total of 25 credits. In addition to the 25 credits of required public health courses, BA students complete two selective courses for a total of 31 credits. These selective courses are in the areas of health behavior/promotion and environmental and occupational health. BA students complete 25 credit hours of open electives.

BS students must successfully complete 13 public health courses for a total of 29 credits. In addition to the 29 credits of required public health courses, BS students complete six selective courses for a total of 47 credits. These selective courses are in the areas of health behavior/promotion, environmental and occupational health, public health and administration, ethics, economics and a quantitative course. BS students complete nine credit hours of open electives.

All bachelor’s degree students must complete a capstone experience also called the culminating undergraduate experience (CUE) for a total of eight credits. Students must complete four public health seminars worth one credit each where student teams research, analyze and present current public health issues based on Healthy People 2020, the three core functions and the ten essential services of public health. Students also complete the senior thesis worth four credits. Students have two options for the thesis: (1) a year long field experience that addresses a relevant public health problem in the community where they receive mentorship in the field experience or (2) a year long authentic library-based research project, addressing a public health problem of the student’s choice.

Students who complete the field experience are required to keep a journal, write a reflection paper and give a final presentation to faculty and peers. Students who complete the research project are required to complete a research paper and presentation to faculty and peers. All students receive feedback and mentoring throughout their year-long capstone experiences which results in both written and oral products that can be reviewed and evaluated.

The first concern relates to the approval status of the undergraduate degree proposal. Site visitors learned that the internal approvals were completed by the administration and the proposal was successfully reviewed by the Council on Postsecondary Education, Commonwealth of Kentucky and returned to the University of Louisville. The undergraduate proposal was then submitted to the Faculty Senate Finance Committee and Faculty Senate Academic Committee. Three concerns resulted from this review: (1) availability of funding to support the degree; (2) job market projections for the degree; and (3) details and plan for faculty reallocation to teach in the undergraduate program. Due to the three concerns that were identified the proposal has been deferred for further needed approvals until the new dean of the school arrives and has sufficient time to review the proposal and address the three concerns listed above. Site visitors learned that SACS has been notified of the proposed undergraduate degree. School leaders
voiced a hope that the review process will move forward in a timely fashion once the new dean arrives and that fall 2013 enrollment will be able to occur as planned.

The second concern relates to faculty and staff resources for the undergraduate degree. At the time of the site visit, a full faculty complement and appropriate staff were not in place to provide teaching and staff support to the undergraduate degree. Site visitors learned that the dean of the school will meet after the site visit with the chairs to discuss how research time may be re-allocated to undergraduate teaching time. Site visitors also learned that the individual who had been previously identified as the director of the undergraduate program would no longer be available to function in this capacity due to the need for research time as a faculty member. The dean of the school shared that his office will provide the funding to hire a director of the undergraduate program and that the current plan would be to hire an MPH graduate of the school to serve in this staff position.

The third concern relates to the identification and allotment of classroom space for the undergraduate program. At the time of the site visit exact classroom space at either the undergraduate university location or school location had not been established. Site visitors learned that transportation is a concern for students if classes are held at the school location due to the reliance on public bus schedules.

The fourth concern relates to the structure and stage of course development of the core public health courses. The current course structure utilizes a large number of classes to deliver the five core foundation knowledge areas. Also, the class structure contains a large number of classes that are designed to cover material from up to four core knowledge areas in one course. The current course structure does identify class options that individually present epidemiology knowledge. However, the course structure does not indicate coverage of environmental health sciences. Also, the current course structure does not include a course or courses that provide sufficient exposure and learning experiences for the health services administration core knowledge area. The current course information also refers to existing courses in health behavior, environmental health and health management at the undergraduate level which do not exist at this time.

The final concern relates to the undergraduate culminating experience. The current proposal provides students two options to complete this requirement. However, at the time of the site visit, faculty had not identified a plan to identify potential sites for undergraduate field experiences. The site visit team learned from school leadership that there is concern for the burden that undergraduate field experiences will assert on organizations and agencies that are already hosting MPH students.
2.10 Other Bachelor’s Degrees.

If the school offers baccalaureate degrees in fields other than public health, students pursuing them must be grounded in basic public health knowledge.

This criterion is not applicable.

2.11 Academic Degrees.

If the school also offers curricula for graduate 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 school offers academic degrees at the master’s and doctoral levels. Specifically, the school offers the MS in biostatistics/decision science and in epidemiology, the MSc in clinical investigation sciences and the PhD in biostatistics and in public health sciences, the latter including four concentrations with separate curricula.

The school indicates that students in all academic programs are required to take PHEP-501 Introduction to Epidemiology or PHCI-611 Introduction to Clinical Epidemiology. The two MS programs do not require PHEB-501 explicitly, but both clearly contain substantial epidemiology content. Students in three concentrations of the PhD in public health sciences take PHEP-602 Epidemiologic Methods (environmental Health) or PHEP-618 (epidemiology and health management), while students in the health promotion concentration have two epidemiology courses listed as options for research methods course with a note that at least one epidemiology course is required if not taken as part of masters training.

Each academic program has an appropriate culminating experience. The MS students must complete a thesis, while the PhD students complete a dissertation. MSc in clinical investigative sciences students can complete either a thesis or a professional paper, as a culminating experience.

The concern relates to the broad introduction to public health for the academic programs. The school indicates that all students in the MS and PhD programs will take PHMS-650-04, beginning fall 2013. The self-study clearly indicates that students in the MSc in clinical investigative sciences will not be required to take this course. In addition, while trying to validate the curricular change, the PHMS-650 requirement could not be documented for any program since the curricular change was not yet official. However, faculty suggested that they anticipated that few students will need the course because of other content in the curriculum or a prior degree. The school must document whether the current course work provides a broad introduction to public health. If not, PHMS-650-04 or an appropriate course must be added as a required or prerequisite course with explicit policies for waivers.
2.12 Doctoral Degrees.

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

This criterion is partially met. The school offers the PhD in biostatistics and in public health sciences, with the latter having separate concentrations in environmental health, epidemiology, health management and health promotion. Although there are four concentrations in the PhD in public health sciences, there seems to be no commonality across the program concentrations or sufficient breadth or depth within three of the four concentrations.

Financial support of doctoral students is variable across departments. Most doctoral students in biostatistics and environmental health have financial support, but very few students in health management and health promotion are supported. The lack of funding is cited as a barrier to timely degree completion because of the necessity of outside employment.

The concern relates to the lack of substantive course work for three of the degree programs. Only the PhD in health promotion appears well-developed and comprehensive. The remaining three do not demonstrate sufficient content to prepare specialists in any of these areas. Each has many seminars and directed readings and few courses within the discipline, most of which appear to be master’s-level courses. The health management concentration is slightly more robust but also includes a series of master’s level courses and a series of seminars rather than discipline-specific coursework.

2.13 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 partially met. The school offers three degrees joint with the MPH: MD/MPH, Bachelors/MPH and MUP/MPH. In addition, the school offers the MD/MSc and the PhD/MS in applied and industrial mathematics and biostatistics or decision science.

Students in the MD/MPH and the Bachelors/MPH programs must complete the full requirements of both degree programs. As the BA and BS programs in public health evolve, students with a public health background can take the five courses in the public health core for both undergraduate and graduate credit by completing the graduate level requirements for each course. Students in these programs can choose any concentration area of the MPH.

Students in the MD/MSc program complete a total of five years of study. MD/MSc students begin the MSc coursework after completing one year of clinical training (the third year of medical school). Joint degree students spend the fall and spring semesters of their fourth year and the summer and fall
semesters of their fifth year completing the MSc coursework. They complete their professional paper/thesis for the MSc degree and their clinical rotations for the MD degree in the spring semester of their fifth year.

Students in the PhD/MS program must apply and be accepted by both the Department of Mathematics and the Biostatistics-Decision Science Program. PhD/MS students complete all non-overlapping core courses for both the PhD in applied and industrial mathematics and the MS in biostatistics-decision science, as well as the requirements for either the decision science or biostatistics concentration within the biostatistics-decision science program. Students complete a single internship, technical report, qualifying examination and dissertation requirements in order to complete the PhD/MS program.

Two concerns relate to the MUP/MPH. The first concern is the use of an undefined concentration in urban planning. From the self-study material, the site visitors noted that a student could not complete any of the MPH concentrations with the available hours. On site, faculty indicated that these joint degree students did not choose from the existing six concentration areas; rather, they completed what was called the public health and urban planning concentration. This concentration is only available to those students in the joint degree program. However, there is no documentation of this concentration. The most explicit listing is PLAN-623 Environmental Policy and Natural Hazards, PHPH - 630 Geographic Information Systems in Public Health and three electives; this listing does not have the specificity of the other concentrations. Students in the joint program students complete the MPH core of 15 hours in the course disciplines and eight hours in courses addressing cross-cutting competencies, so the concern is specifically about the concentration area.

The second concern is that there is no listing of competencies or mapping of those competencies to the curriculum for MPH concentration in urban planning.

The interpretation of this criterion states that the required curriculum of the public health component of any joint degree must be comparable to the curriculum in the separate public health degree. Thus the joint degree must reflect an approved curriculum. However, the school is allowed to limit choice of that concentration to students who are in the joint degree program; that is, the concentration comparable to other concentration has to be approved but it does not have to be accessible to MPH students who are not in the joint degree. The school is also reminded that students must meet the same requirements for the capstone course and the various deadlines and deliverables for the practicum experiences as all MPH students.
2.14 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 learning methods and to systematically use this information to stimulate program improvements. The school must have processes in place through which it establishes that the student who registers in a distance education or correspondence education course or degree is the same student who participates in and completes the course and degree and receives academic credit.

This criterion is not applicable.

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. The school has developed an active research program that shows relevance to important issues in public health and supports the active involvement of faculty and students in research. There are two community-based projects funded by NIOSH. There are cross departmental as well as cross-university collaborations. Twenty-nine million dollars in research funding is reported from 2009-2012, with a broad range of awards from a few thousand dollars to $13 million for an NIH project called the National Children’s Health Study, Jefferson County. The school has a goal for total dollar amount of grants by 2015 of $5 million.

From 2009 to 2012, total amount of education/training funding was $802,489. There was a high of $272,082 in 2011; this amount has dropped to $73,185 in 2012. The largest current funding is $59,000 for a telehealth project. In 2010 and 2011, the largest amount was $135,000 from the Susan G. Komen Foundation for Disparities in Breast Cancer training in epidemiology.

The university has well-developed policies and procedures under the direction of the Office of the Executive Vice President for Research and Innovation, to deal with such matters as financial conflict of interest, ethical review, intellectual property, research misconduct, technology transfer and grant processing and administration. Onsite, the faculty expressed satisfaction with staff support and infrastructure for grant preparation and submission. The Office of the President offers a variety of intramural research grants. The SPHIS has a Research Committee chaired by the associate dean for
research that helps develop school policies and procedures and to aid in researcher training and networking. The SPHIS has office staffed by two trained individuals to assist investigators in grant development, preparation, and submission. This office is the point of contact with the central Offices of Sponsored Programs. The Department of Bioinformatics and Biostatistics supports a statistical consulting center, providing fee-for-service consulting. Faculty shared with site visitors their satisfaction with research infrastructure support during grant proposal activities and post reward activities.

Research is supported by additional activities. The dean’s office supports conference travel for faculty. One objective is to increase the number of publications and presentations by 10% per year as the faculty grows. Another objective is to increase funding by 10% per year. Monthly research meetings are held to encourage faculty, staff and student involvement. These meetings are on a wide range of topics.

Collaborations are encouraged with research done by state and local agencies, for example, the Louisville Metro Department of Health, the Kentucky Office of Refugees/Catholic Charities of Louisville, the Northern Kentucky Health Department, and the Kentucky Department of Education.

Six outcome measures are stated for the development of research, along with a continued commitment to adding a new faculty research position each year, travel funding, and monthly research incubation meetings.

Students are involved in research and there is scholarship and fellowship funding support for this involvement. Grant-funded students have risen from eight in 2010 to 16 in 2012. SPHIS-funded tuition scholarships are also available. Students participate in research incubation meetings; one to two students per year have presented at these meetings. Students are encouraged and have been active in presenting to the Kentucky and the American Public Health Association. Students are encouraged to participate in the annual Research! Louisville celebration of health related research at the university. Many SPHIS students have won awards at this event.

### 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. Service is a foundation principle for the University of Louisville system as a whole, and it clearly represents a foundation of the SPHIS. Expectations and value associated with both student and faculty support for the profession and for service and outreach to communities is unmistakable.

Two examples of particular note that demonstrate the school’s success in public service are as follow: 1) In 2009, SPHIS partnered with Louisville Metro Department of Public Health and Wellness and the City of Louisville and helped vaccinate over 19,000 people in two days against the H1N1 virus and 2) the SPHIS
working with community partners established in 2009 a Farmer’s Market and continues to help with its operation in downtown Louisville.

The Community and Professional Service Committee oversees professional service activities of the SPHIS faculty. Service is a valued consideration for promotion and merit increases for faculty. A comprehensive list of professional activities that faculty list in their service record are detailed in the self-study. These activities range from the community to international level.

During the site visit meeting with the current students and alumni, both groups stated there were numerous opportunities for service activities both locally and throughout the state. The service activities of the SPHIS students are tracked and submitted to the Office of Community Engagement. Starting in the fall of 2012 the students will input their service activities into a web-based system.

3.3 Workforce Development.

The school shall engage in activities other than its offering of degree programs that support the professional development of the public health workforce.

This criterion is met. The SPHIS is in regular contact with the Commissioner of the Kentucky Department of Health to understand the needs of the public health work force. New initiatives are being developed with the other school of public health and two public health programs in Kentucky to form a Kentucky Public Health Institute (KPHI). The school is collaborating with other state schools and programs of public health to conduct a comprehensive state-wide workforce development survey. A survey of Kentucky public health workers (1311 people responded) was performed by the Kentucky and Appalachia Public Health Heath Training Center and the results of the assessment needs were published in three reports.

The majority of the focus on workforce development by the SPHIS is on continuing education. The Center for Health Preparedness (CHHP) has provided training to “thousands of individuals” focusing on pandemic preparedness. The CHHP also works closely with the Medical Reserve Corp to provide training. These trainings are accomplished through the University of Louisville Office of Continuing Education. A list of the courses was provided in the self-study.

Efforts are on-going to engage the public health work force with a one-year certificate program (16 hour) program in clinical research, epidemiology and statistics training (CREST). On average, 15 students are enrolled in this program every year. During the discussion with community stakeholders, several individuals mentioned that the state and local public health workforce would benefit by the creation of distance-learning programs within the SPHIS.

A concise table in the self-study document outlined workforce development offerings supported by the CHHP.
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, practice experience and research and instructional competence, is able to fully support the school’s mission, goals and objectives.

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

As of August 2012, the school had 40.7 faculty FTE, including 14 tenured, 9 tenure-track and 18 term–track faculty. Term faculty are full-time faculty without tenure for a stipulated contract period not to exceed three years. Upon initial review of the self-study document, the site visit team was concerned that the school had a disproportionate number of term-track faculty. However, on site, the team learned that much of the hiring completed in 2005 when the school was initially established was for term appointments. While some of these faculty have converted to tenure-track positions, some stay in term appointments; administrators assured the team that these faculty were a stable part of the faculty complement and that most have responsibilities similar to tenure-track faculty. Current and projected hiring will likely focus more on tenure-track positions. Hiring has slowed in the last two to three years because of the economy, but the school has hired 16 new faculty since the last self-study for a net gain of 10 faculty. The school also works with a variety of part-time and voluntary faculty.

All current faculty have a terminal doctoral degree. Of the current faculty, 11 have MD degrees and 18 have either an MPH or a degree from an accredited school of public health. The training of faculty in several departments reflects the school’s stated broad interpretation of public health, including anthropology, sociology, urban and public affairs and psychology. In particular, faculty with specific training or interest in some aspect of bioinformatics are found in several departments.

The school provided multiple examples of non-academic professional experience of faculty in a variety of public and private settings. Current community activities include working with the Kentucky Health Information Exchange Coordinating Council and serving as health director for the Louisville Metro Government.

The school identifies five outcome measures to evaluate its faculty complement. Four measures relate to research productivity: number of grants and contracts, number of faculty on funded research, number of refereed publications and number of refereed presentations at national/international meetings; the school has exceeded these targets in all years. The final goal of 100% faculty with a terminal degree is met.
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. Two primary documents include published policies for faculty recruitment, appointment, promotion and tenure: the university *Redbook* is maintained by the Office of the University Provost as the basic governance document of the university and the school’s Policy for Promotion, Appointment, and Tenure and for Periodic Review. These documents are easily available to all faculty on the university provost’s website and the school’s sharepoint site. The school document has not been updated since 2002, but the associate dean for faculty affairs is currently at the initial stages of a review and revision.

Primary faculty are either tenure-track or term-track, with ranks of professor, associate professor and assistant professor within each track. School procedures also allow for a one-year probationary appointment as instructor that is not commonly used. There are clear procedures for annual review, pre-tenure review, tenure and promotion. The procedures allow for promotion of tenure-track and term-track faculty. Faculty are allowed to make one change between tenure-track and term-track with appropriate approvals described in university policies. Tenure and promotion for tenured/tenure-eligible faculty require approval of the vice president for health affairs and provost. Promotion of term-track faculty is approved within the school. The annual review and possible performance-based salary increases are based on each faculty member’s annual work plan describing the distribution of workload among research, teaching and service.

Faculty are encouraged to take advantage of external professional development activities; this is one option for use of research infrastructure funds (RIF). Activities within the university include research workshops, the annual “Celebration of Teaching and Learning” sponsored by the University of Louisville Delphi Center and NIH grant-writing workshops. The school also works with the Delphi Center to sponsor a series of teaching workshops specifically for the SPHIS faculty. Of particular note for the teaching mission of the school is a series of activities targeted toward part-time faculty. Currently department chairs have primary responsibility to mentor junior faculty in their respective departments. Junior faculty noted with willingness of senior faculty to review draft grant documents and to provide similar support.

4.3 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 SPHIS has identified a set of activities designed to recruit students who are likely to be successful in the school’s degree programs. Recruitment activities include advertising in a wide array of media, personal networking through faculty and staff, participation in recruitment fairs at events throughout Kentucky and targeted recruitment of high-school, community college, undergraduate and graduate students at the university. Departments also develop individually-tailored recruitment plans that draw on student ambassadors and on faculty/staff relationship-building with applicants during the application process.

All graduate school applications through SOPHAS are centralized through the University of Louisville School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate School. The SPHIS Office of Academic and Student Affairs track the SOPHAS applications and works with the applicants to complete the SOPHAS application process and the required forms for admission into graduate work at University of Louisville. The Academic and Student Affairs Office also tracks students that are accepted but do not attend to determine trends or issues with the admission process. Faculty for each master’s/doctoral degree track establishes their admission criteria, which were listed in the self-study. All graduate school students are required to submit three letters of recommendation, a statement of purpose, transcripts and GRE scores. International applicants must provide additional documentation including verification of English language proficiency.

4.4 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. An MPH advising team consisting of ten faculty members, two selected by each of the five department chairs, handle the academic advising of MPH students during their first year. Each student is assigned an advisor who makes contact with them before classes begin. Advising of the students is tracked within departments electronically with forms, notes and appointments. The self-study states that the students meet regularly (twice a semester) with their advisor to assess the student’s academic progress and address any problems or concerns.

The current students and alumni were very complimentary of the school, the staff and a majority of the faculty. They mentioned numerous times that faculty will help students outside of the classroom to understand the concepts taught in the classroom, help locate practice sites and help students with job placements.

The Career Development Center on the main campus coordinates the career counseling services for student, faculty, alumni and staff; a liaison has been specifically assigned to the SPHIS. Even though surveys generally rate the university career services as above average to excellent, comments from the students and alumni during the site visit indicated that the Career Development Center is not very helpful.
and has very few public health job leads. Stakeholders also indicated that the career center “does not really understand public health.” Based on this feedback, the school will arrange meetings with the Career Development Center staff to assure they have the latest information on potential sources of employment for public health graduates.
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