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Introduction

This report presents the findings of the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), the recognized accrediting body for public health schools and programs, regarding the Public Health Program at the University of Missouri - Columbia. The report assesses the program’s compliance with the Accreditation Criteria for Public Health Programs, amended June 2005. This accreditation review included the conduct of a self-study process by program constituents, the preparation of a document describing the program and its features in relation to the criteria for accreditation, and a visit in March 2010 by a team of external peer reviewers. During the visit, the team had an opportunity to interview school and university officials, administrators, teaching faculty, students, alumni and community representatives, and to verify information in the self-study document by reviewing materials provided on site in a resource file. The team was afforded full cooperation in its efforts to assess the program and verify the self-study document.

The University of Missouri – Columbia (MU) was established in 1839 in Columbia, Missouri. MU was the first state university in the Louisiana Purchase territory and the first university west of the Mississippi River. MU is a land-grant institution and is also the largest public research university in the state of Missouri. MU is the flagship campus of the four-campus University of Missouri System and offers more than 286 degree programs including 40 online programs. The university is designated as comprehensive doctoral with medical/veterinary by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. MU boasts a diverse student enrollment of over 30,000 students from every county in Missouri, every state in the nation and over 100 countries throughout the world.

The Master of Public Health Program was established in 2007 and welcomed its first class in the fall of that year. The program was designed to address the public health challenges of the state and to meet the need for trained public health professionals specifically in the areas of health promotion and policy and veterinary public health. The program has a unique interdisciplinary structure and faculty are drawn from six academic units across the university: the schools of health professions, medicine, nursing, public affairs and social work, the college of veterinary medicine and the department of statistics. The program has attracted a variety of students from Missouri and other states across the nation and countries such as Uzbekistan, Romania, India, Ghana and Zimbabwe. At the time of the site visit, 26 students had graduated from the program. This is the program’s first accreditation review.
Characteristics of a Public Health Program

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

a. The program 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 program and its faculty shall have the same rights, privileges and status as other professional preparation programs that are components of its parent institution.

c. The program 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 public health program 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 public health program shall maintain an organizational culture that embraces the vision, goals and values common to public health. The program 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 program’s activities.

e. The program 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 program shall offer the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree.

f. The program 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 public health program at University of Missouri – Columbia (MU). MU is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. The program is considered an area program of the Graduate School, which provides general administrative oversight. The program enjoys the same rights and privileges of comparable academic units in the university. The program director is the primary administrator and is assisted by the associate director in the daily administration of the program. The program’s Board of Directors is comprised of the deans of the program’s major collaborating units and provides insight regarding the overall direction of the program. The program has identified four main values to be upheld which include respect, responsibility, discovery and excellence.

Interdisciplinary collaboration is fostered through the program’s structure, which was designed to promote collaboration among participating academic units. The program has worked with its collaborators to create joint-appointments; maximize resources to ensure required courses are offered in accordance with the growing number of students; draft memoranda of understanding between the program and each unit.
The program has adequate physical and financial resources in place to support its degree offerings and to carry out its mission, goals and objectives. The program has developed an overarching research goal and the collaborative structure fosters interdisciplinary research efforts among the faculty. The program recently began to measure faculty participation in service activities during the 2007-2008 academic year; the goal of 80% faculty participation in service has been surpassed and such reporting is now required in annual faculty reviews. The program’s External Advisory Council provides insight to ensure that educational activities are relevant to the public health practice community.

1.0 THE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAM.

1.1 Mission.

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

This criterion is met with commentary. The MPH program has a clearly defined mission statement reflecting that the program incorporates MU’s strengths in veterinary medicine and policy analysis and development and is compatible with the university mission which states, in part, “Scholarship and teaching are daily driven by a sense of public service.” The program’s mission statement is presented below.

The mission of the University of Missouri Master of Public Health Program is to advance the health and well-being of the citizens of Missouri and elsewhere through excellence in teaching, discovery, and service in public health. To harness the unique strengths of the University of Missouri in veterinary medicine and policy analysis and development to address the needs of underserved populations and to prepare public health leaders on the local, state, and national level.

The program’s goals relate to the areas of instruction, research, workforce, governance and planning and evaluation. Objectives are stipulated for each of the major goals. The six goals and 22 objectives contribute reasonable guidance and direction for program development for the next five years. A detailed chart indicates an approach for measuring progress toward achieving most of the stated objectives. The chart specifies targets and dates, the data source/collection schedule, responsible party and action steps.

A concern during the site visit related to the absence of a service goal, as service is one of three major functions expected of accredited programs. Service is referenced in goal two related to curriculum design and instructional activities and again in one of the outcome measures for objective 4.b, but an explicit goal statement with supporting measurable objectives is required to assist the program in attaining its mission. As a consequence, the program had created an External Advisory Council Service
Subcommittee, which has developed a service goal with objectives. The commentary relates to the need for the data collection to begin and for the program to assess whether the objectives are met in the upcoming years.

Strategic planning at MU involves administrators, faculty, students and external advisors. The Executive Faculty Committee provides leadership for the strategic planning process. The Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education approved the MPH program in February 2007, after it had been developed in collaboration with five academic units at MU. During 2008, the MPH Executive Faculty Committee drafted the program’s mission, goals and objectives during two planning retreats. The draft statement was distributed for review and comment to members of the External Advisory Council, which serves an important link with the public health practice community. Administrative staff revised the mission, goals and objectives in line with suggestions by council members. All public health students, the Master of Public Health Graduate Student Association (MPHGSA), faculty serving on MPH Admissions, Curriculum and Internship and Capstone Subcommittees and the Board of Directors were invited to review the revised statement. Based on input from these individuals and bimonthly meetings of the Executive Faculty Committee, the mission, goals and objectives were further refined during academic year 2008-2009 leading to the drafting of proposed amendments and revisions during summer 2009. The mission, goals and objectives are available for review on the program’s website. The Executive Faculty Committee reviews the statements each fall.

During a 2008 strategic planning retreat, the Executive Faculty Committee adopted the four main values of the University of Missouri as program values: respect, responsibility, discovery and excellence, which are operationally defined. The committee noted that the MU values are consistent with key public health values such as social justice, health equity and fairness and support the program’s efforts to respect diversity of students and communities, recognize special needs of vulnerable populations and promote rigor and excellence for professional preparation and research activities. The values are posted on the program website, described in the internship handbook, discussed at the required student orientation and incorporated, reinforced and emphasized in coursework and field placements. Discussions with various stakeholders during the site visit revealed very broad-based support for the program’s educational initiatives which fully embrace these values.

1.2 Evaluation and Planning.

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

This criterion is met with commentary. Members of the administrative staff, including the program director, associate director, field placement coordinator, academic advisor, the administrative associate and one graduate research assistant, provide overall guidance and support for program assessment and
planning. The associate director is responsible for guiding strategic planning, and the program director is responsible for faculty engagement, formal collaborative agreements and academic performance standards. The administrative staff meets weekly to review program performance and address issues. The administrative staff reports program performance and related recommendations to the Executive Faculty Committee, characterized as the primary leadership body for the program.

Overall, the administrative staff have significant roles in guiding the program in alignment with its mission, goals and objectives; and the Executive Faculty Committee is responsible for oversight of planning and evaluative functions and providing broad-based leadership for the program to achieve consistency with CEPH accreditation criteria. Executive Faculty Committee decisions are recorded in a permanent record of decisions which is open for review by others, creating a transparent atmosphere of trust and collegiality.

In addition, the Curriculum and Internship and Capstone Subcommittees, which include student representatives, plus the Admissions Subcommittee make recommendations directly to the Executive Faculty Committee. Students are encouraged to contribute to program improvement both individually and also through the student association. The Executive Faculty Committee, which meets bimonthly, examines the program’s mission, goals, objectives and values each fall and reviews proposals for substantive program changes prior to consideration by the Board of Directors, which has approval authority. The External Advisory Council, linking the program to the practice community, is consulted periodically and meets at least annually on the MU campus to provide planning and evaluative input.

The program director serves as a member of the university’s Strategic Planning and Resource Advisory Council, the Health Sciences Executive Group, the Council of Research Administrators and chairs the MU Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation subcommittee. These involvements position him for guiding evaluation and planning at the program level based on his direct working knowledge of planning and evaluation processes at the university level.

Although the MU program has a very brief history, evaluation and planning activities are leading to program improvements. These changes include: merging two emphasis areas to create the health promotion and policy emphasis area; establishing a capstone course in spring 2009; forming the Master of Public Health Graduate Student Association; revising the research methods course to include more training on using actual data sets prior to field placement; and creating voluntary e-portfolios to exhibit examples of best work products allowing measurement of student progress toward competency assessment. The program’s recruitment and outreach plan for underserved areas reveals a carefully planned effort to meet public health workforce needs and to address one of the objectives for goal one.
Outcome measures include 36 targets established in relation to the 22 program objectives. In addition, the data source/collection schedule, responsible party and action steps are listed for each target. As a new program, only two data points are available for 12 measures, making it challenging to interpret trends. Of the nine measures with three data points, about one-third are trending in the right direction for the stated targets. Another seven measures appear to be trending in the right direction, but data for 2009-2010 are not yet available. Success is particularly noticeable for outcomes related to minority enrollment, students entering with professional experience, introduction of program and emphasis area competencies though the curriculum, and meeting the minimum number of faculty for each emphasis area. The data reveal a decline over three years in the number of enrolled MPH students from underserved areas of Missouri.

The commentary relates to a finding that about one-third of the 36 outcome measures do not allow for quantifiable measurement of progress. For example, some of the targets listed for certain objectives (2.a, 2.c, 3.d, 4.b) and all measures relating to goal six indicate process activities and are not measurable as stated. Rather, they are based on perceived need for policy or procedural actions, which results in a dichotomous response that either the policy is in place or under development. Other targets, such as for objectives (3.c, 5.b and 5.d), indicate only that a measure should increase but do not specify by how much. Also, the target number listed for objective 1.a does not appear to be as meaningful as a stated percentage because enrollment is not capped. Objectives should be specific, measureable, action-oriented, realistic and time bound. Because data points are limited due to newness of the program, some assessments are made without an appropriate degree of certainty.

The second area of commentary relates to the failure to report data for the requested minimum program performance measures regarding resources for each of the last three years, recognizing that data points are limited in some cases to two years. The target for institutional expenditures per FTE students is identified as $5500; the target for increasing student financial support is identified as 30% of the students by 2013; and extramural funding for service or training as a percent of total budget is set at 5% through 2013. A target is not established for research dollars per FTE faculty with the explanation that this outcome measure is perceived as not appropriate for the program because research dollars are reported in the home departments of faculty members and not in the program’s budget. Extramural funding for the program derived from providing service or training activities also appears to be of minor importance. Also, outcome measures for criteria 4.1 and 4.3 are not clearly specified. Without identifying reasonable yet challenging targets and assembling data relevant to each target annually, the program will not be able to clearly determine if progress is being achieved or portray trend lines which are essential for planning and advocacy purposes.
The program leadership uses CEPH criteria to guide planning and implementation of the new program. Stakeholders internal and external to the university were involved in the design of the program's curriculum and infrastructure. Key planning retreats in 2008 led to the statement of mission, goals, objectives and values. Competencies were selected initially based on those developed by the Association of Schools of Public Health and by the Council on Linkages and subsequently refined to reflect MU's strengths in policy and communications. Students, faculty, the External Advisory Council, the student association and program committees were invited to comment on the competencies.

Preparation for developing the self-study document included an on-site CEPH consultation meeting in March 2008, participation by two administrative staff in the CEPH Accreditation Orientation Workshop during summer 2008 and a second consultation meeting of the program director and associate director with CEPH in May 2009. The five members and one graduate research assistant comprising the administrative staff organized the self-study materials and data and drafted the narrative. During the year of assembling the self-study document, each program committee was charged with reviewing committee process and procedures against four questions related to: data adequacy, other measures which should be required, implementation of planning and evaluation tasks and involvement of the appropriate stakeholders. The preliminary self-study document was disseminated widely for review by attachment to email and hard copies were available for student review. Stakeholders meeting with the site visit team described the process as very open and indicated that their feedback was actively solicited and incorporated in the document.

1.3 Institutional Environment.

The program shall be an integral part of an accredited institution of higher education.

This criterion is met. The Master of Public Health graduate program is one of over 265 degree programs offered by the University of Missouri (MU), a higher educational institution continuously serving the public in the region for over 170 years. It is located at the primary and largest campus of the four in the University of Missouri system, and has an enrollment of more than 30,000 students. The institution draws students not only from all counties in the state, but also all states in the union and more than 100 countries worldwide, ensuring a mixture of backgrounds and cultures in the educational setting. Moreover, MU affords a great academic opportunity for multidisciplinary cross-fertilization in public health by virtue of co-located advanced degree programs in law, nursing, medicine and veterinary medicine, among others.

MU is accredited regionally by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools Higher Learning Commission. In addition, eight other accrediting organizations have approved educational programs in other schools, colleges, and departments that comprise the MU system and collaborate with the MPH program. These accrediting agencies are listed in the self-study document.
Organizationally, the masters program is designated as an “area program” within the graduate school of the university. The Graduate School oversees over 90 degree-granting graduate programs. The program has close collaborative relationships and shares some faculty and course offerings with five other schools within the graduate school, as well as two colleges and one academic center.

Reporting and accountability are well-delineated for MPH program. The program director functions in a manner that is equivalent to a department chair in the university. Faculty in the program report directly to him, and as a director of an area program in the graduate school, he reports directly to the dean of the graduate school. The dean is also a member of a board of directors of the program that includes deans and chairs of the collaborating schools, colleges and departments. The dean reports to the provost of the local campus of the university, who is responsible to the chancellor. The chancellor in turn reports to the overall president of the UM system. An organizational chart of this structure is depicted in Figure 1 below.

Discussions on site with the deputy provost, dean of the graduate school and university budget director revealed a high degree of regard for the organizational and interpersonal skills of the MPH program director as well as firm support for the interdisciplinary conceptual framework of the program itself. The program director meets at least twice monthly with the dean, who describes the process of development of the MPH program as a “well-oiled” machine. University officials from the chancellor on down view the MPH program as a “cultural change” in the way education and research will be done now and in the future of the university system. It is widely considered as a model for other planned interdisciplinary collaborations on the campus. Academic leadership looks at the new programs which combine faculty interest with job market opportunities for graduating students as a winning paradigm, and multidisciplinary programs with their cross-cutting broad applicability are viewed as most likely to succeed.
Figure 1. University of Missouri – Columbia Organizational Structure
The MPH program director has full autonomy regarding the internal organization of the program, names and titles, with input by the executive faculty committee within the program.

The program director initiates recruitment of faculty, often in collaboration with departmental chairs or directors in other schools or colleges in the university when joint appointments are considered. As examples, the director of the school of social work has a doctoral degree in public health and has been very supportive of the MPH program during the developmental phase as in sharing teaching faculty. Joint appointments are required for tenure-track faculty, since the MPH program is an area program and not a department, although it does recruit and hire non-tenure track faculty. Two of the newest social work faculty were both recruited and hired with dedicated interests in teaching in the MPH program. In these cases, faculty viewed availability of a joint appointment in the MPH program as a positive recruiting factor. The nursing school, school of medicine, and veterinary college also share faculty as do other departments. The board of directors, consisting of deans from the various schools uniformly supports the MPH program and views it as a positive addition to the university and opportunity to collaborate. One board of director member noted that there was much transparency in the academic community and few, if any, “turf wars.”

The dean of the graduate school approves faculty recruitment and the MPH program has full input into the process of both recruitment and selection. Faculty advancement occurs in accordance with policy defined by the provost and is based on recommendations by a committee of promotion and tenure. It includes input from annual evaluations by the program director and the chair of the collaborating department (if a joint appointment). Academic standards are set by the graduate faculty senate, which also forwards significant changes involving degree programs through the university system. Minor changes to the MPH curriculum rest with its established curriculum committee.

1.4 Organization and Administration.

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

This criterion is met. The program is considered an “area program” of the graduate school, and this designation provides the administrative umbrella for its relevant activities. The program has a unique collaborative structure with several units throughout the university. The major collaborating units of the program are as follows: the schools of health professions, medicine, nursing, public affairs, and social work, the department of statistics and the college of veterinary medicine. The program director is the chief administrator for the program. The associate director assists in the daily administration of the program and reports directly to the program director. The remainder of the administrative staff consists of the field placement coordinator, academic advisor, administrative associate and the graduate research
assistant, all of whom report to the associate director. The administrative staff has weekly meetings which provide an opportunity to monitor student progress and programmatic development. Additional oversight for the program is provided by the Executive Faculty Committee, which is the policy-making body for the program. The Executive Faculty Committee, comprised of program faculty, the administrative staff and a representative from the Master of Public Health Graduate Student Association, makes decisions regarding curriculum, practicum requirements and student advising. The committee is chaired by the program director and has three standing subcommittees: admissions, curriculum and internship and capstone committees. The organizational structure of the program is depicted in Figure 2.

The graduate school provides oversight and guidance as it relates to the matriculation and graduation of all MU graduate students. The dean also serves on the MPH Board of Directors. The Board of Directors for the MPH program is comprised of the dean’s of the program’s major collaborating units and provides input and oversight regarding the overall direction of the program including reviewing and approving any major changes in structure or emphasis. The program also has an external advisory council primarily composed of external stakeholders who are members of state and local public health agencies, nonprofit organizations and alumni. The external advisory council provides guidance regarding the curriculum and its relevance to public health practice; works to strengthen the relationship between the program and the public health practice community; and ensures that best practices are incorporated into the selecting, training and placement of students upon graduation.

The MPH program was designed to promote interdisciplinary collaboration through its major contributing units. Program administration has taken several steps to ensure cohesion of the program and to promote open communication among students, faculty and staff. The program has collaborated with two of its units – the school of social work and the college of veterinary medicine, to recruit and hire tenure-track faculty jointly appointed to the program. Memoranda of agreement were also developed between each unit and the program outlining roles, duties and obligations. Program faculty collaborate on research and service activities involving students in several of these efforts. Furthermore, it is clear in discussions with students and faculty that the interdisciplinary nature of the program is considered a unique strength and is highly valued. The Board of Directors echoed this sentiment in a meeting with the site visit team by stating that MU was a collaborative campus and barriers in setting up joint programs are fairly nonexistent.
Figure 2. UM-Columbia MPH Program Organizational Structure
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The site visit team had the opportunity to meet with the members of the Board of Directors who were extremely supportive of the efforts and continuing the relationships outlined in the formal agreements between their respective schools and the MPH program. They praised the leadership of the program director and stated that he is instrumental in ensuring the success of the program given its uniquely collaborative structure. Additionally, the Board noted that the administrative staff for the program is extremely competent and an added strength of the program.

1.5 Governance.

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

This criterion is met. Governance of the MPH program is clearly documented. Detailed by-laws concerning faculty rights, ethics, responsibilities and authority are published and available to faculty via internet posting on the university website. Admissions criteria, academic standards and policies for students are provided in the form of comprehensive student handbooks that are updated regularly.

All committees have student representation except the admissions committee; however the admissions committee reports to the executive faculty committee which does include a student representative. Student representatives on each committee are elected by the school’s student organization, the Master of Public Health Graduate Student Association (MPHGSA). During the site visit interviews, current students expressed satisfaction with their involvement and input into the governance process.

An external advisory council, consisting of several prominent members of the local and state public health professional community and other non-governmental organizations active in public health, also provides recommendations to the program director and faculty executive committee. In addition, any substantive changes in degree programs or policies that warrant higher review in the university system may be submitted to either the Board of Curators or the Coordinating Board for Higher Education as indicated. The merger of two previous emphasis areas of the degree program into the single emphasis area of health promotion and policy is a recent example.

The Executive Faculty Committee of the program has responsibility for general program policy and planning with the assistance of its sub-committees. The governance structure includes an executive faculty committee which approves actions and recommendations of sub-committees on admissions, curriculum, and the internship and capstone committee. The Executive Faculty Committee consists of the program director, all core and collaborating faculty teaching in the MPH graduate degree and certificate programs, and a student representative, for a total of sixteen current members. The committee meets bi-monthly. Responsibilities of this committee include:
• Policy development and approval
• Curriculum oversight
• Competency development and management
• Budget development
• Short and long-term strategic planning
• Direction of the CEPH self-study

Sub-committees reporting to the faculty executive committee are empowered to develop and suggest programmatic changes and actions. These include the admissions, curriculum and internship and capstone committees.

The Admissions Committee has three members and consists of the program director and two faculty members from each of the two emphasis areas in the MPH program. The committee follows guidelines of the executive faculty committee to make decisions on admittance of individual applicants to the program.

The Curriculum Committee is drawn from nine of the faculty teaching courses offered in the MPH program as well as one student member. This subcommittee is responsible for proposing, evaluating and approving elective courses in addition to reviewing and revising existing course offerings. It also develops the core competencies for the program and determines how the curriculum addresses those competencies.

The last structural subcommittee is the Internship and Capstone Committee, which has seven members including a student representative. The field placement coordinator is a member of this committee. This committee reviews student internship experiences in terms of their integration with capstone courses as well as how they contribute to progress towards the MPH program competencies. It also is involved in development of the student competency self-assessment and updating the internship handbook.

Several MPH faculty also participate in a substantial number of university-level committees. Service within the larger academic community is broad and varied.

Students have formed two student organizations, the MPHGSA and Mizzou Public Health. The former organization selects the student representatives on programmatic committees and sub-committees and participates from a student perspective in the CEPH accreditation process, while the latter group concentrates on service activities promoting public health. Membership in Mizzou Public Health is also open to undergraduates in the university.
Graduate students provide feedback and evaluation of courses and the program through an annual student survey, which is published in a yearly report to stakeholders. Information from this survey is also utilized for programmatic and curricular review by the appropriate committees.

1.6 Resources.

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

This criterion is met with commentary. The university’s primary sources of funding support are state appropriations, student tuition and fees and cost-sharing from grants and contract awards. Effective with fiscal year 2007, the University of Missouri committed $543,924 in institutional funds over a five-year period to assist the newly-created MPH program in becoming operational. The funds enabled recruitment of faculty to address the administrative, teaching, research and service needs of the program. The program director annually negotiates funding support with the dean of the graduate school and the MU budget office director using a five-year forward projection. During this developmental time frame, revenue from tuition and fees generated by the MPH program are tracked to demonstrate the potential enrollment growth. The MU budget director reported that the program was meeting projections and was cash flow positive based on enrollment. The MPH program will operate on this budget model through 2011. By that time, the program may be able to reliably predict income, costs and annual adjustments in funding and most likely will convert to the standard university budget model. The university budget model allocates financial resources using an established budgeted amount as base with annual negotiations focused on incremental requests to cover salary raises and approved searches for new personnel.

The program receives an apportionment of funds from the university’s MU Direct office based on the number of distance and nontraditional students enrolled in MPH courses offered in a distance-mediated format. The revenue sharing is 55% to the program and 45% to the Office of the Provost, which is a very promising revenue stream. Indirect cost recovery money from grants and contracts is distributed by formula with the Office of Research retaining 75% of the facilities and administrative dollars and 25% allocated as research incentive funds. Of the 25%, 15% goes to the responsible principal investigator’s department for administering the project and the balance is distributed according to credit-sharing arrangements established at the time of proposal submission. A director of development for the graduate school has responsibilities for fund-raising for the program. The External Advisory Council also is expected to contribute to fund-raising efforts by identifying potential development prospects.

Under the guidance of the dean of the graduate school, the program director manages the budget and all expenditures for the program with input provided by the administrative staff and the Executive Faculty Committee. The administrative associate provides fiscal support by preparing accounting forms, reconciling purchase card statements, monitoring accounts and expenses and preparing reports related to the budget.
The self-study provides three years of budget information along with projections for fiscal year 2010. The program’s budget supports salaries of the administrative staff, one full-time faculty member and 25-40% of the salary for three additional core faculty who have joint appointments. The program budget also provides student support for a graduate research assistant. Stipends of $1000 are provided to each of two emphasis area directors. The program transfers funds to collaborating academic units who teach courses or course sections required by the MPH curriculum that are above and beyond the collaborating department’s usual course offerings. Program expenditures have increased each year of operations. Revenues exceeded expenses for FY 2007-2009, but revenues appear to be approximately 17% below expenses projected for FY 2010. The program budget reports only one grant, which provides 25% salary funding for one full-time faculty member. Other grant and contract revenue generated by the program’s core faculty is reported by their home departments. Table 1 reflects the program budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10 (Projections)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU Direct Revenues</td>
<td>$28,930.60</td>
<td>$42,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funds*</td>
<td>$114,377.00</td>
<td>$407,574.00</td>
<td>$294,435.00</td>
<td>$294,435.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Contracts</td>
<td>$12,329.00</td>
<td>$21,136.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>$405.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10 (Projections)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$9,835.25</td>
<td>$72,541.92</td>
<td>$126,723.09</td>
<td>$259,568.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$33,338.62</td>
<td>$112,033.69</td>
<td>$121,452.90</td>
<td>$120,931.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$11,118.41</td>
<td>$25,098.15</td>
<td>$31,339.17</td>
<td>$33,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$2,677.36</td>
<td>$7,983.60</td>
<td>$5,498.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>$12,611.75</td>
<td>$12,583.00</td>
<td>$12,372.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University Funds represent planned institutional support in recognition of tuition and fees generated by the program. Excess tuition and fee revenues are retained by central administration and are provided to the program as needed.

After the program combined and condensed its emphasis areas, the number of core faculty supporting the health promotion and policy emphasis area meets the CEPH standard for adequacy of faculty over the past three years. The veterinary public health emphasis area came into compliance in academic year 2009-2010 by identifying three core faculty. One core faculty member was reported in the first year and two in the second year of the veterinary public health emphasis area. Each core faculty member contributes at least 50% of full-time equivalence (FTE) to the program ranging from 0.65 to 1.0 FTE for health promotion and policy and 0.77 to 0.95 FTE for veterinary public health. For those faculty employed
by MU in advance of the creation of the MPH program, their appointments remain in the original department and they are provided courtesy co-appointments with the program.

The program defines full-time students as those enrolled in nine credit hours per semester and calculates the student FTE by dividing total credit hours for fall and spring semesters by 18. Full-time core faculty are those contributing at least 0.50 FTE to the program. Faculty FTE calculations are weighted as follows: 0.15 for each core course taught, 0.10 for participation on the Executive Faculty Committee, 0.05 for participation on subcommittees, 0.25 for serving as program director, 0.10 for serving as emphasis area director, 0.05 for serving as advisor to students and variable percent for research time as estimated by each individual faculty member.

The commentary relates to the need to maintain a reasonable student to core faculty ratio (SFR) of around 10 in order to ensure high quality teaching and learning. Over the three years of reported data, SFRs for health promotion and policy have increased from 7.5 to 11.2 largely due to a 130% increase from 29 to 67 FTE students and only modest increases in FTE core faculty. For veterinary public health, the SFRs have improved from 7.1 to 3.9 due to tripling of the core faculty FTE percentage. One new faculty hire in veterinary public health is anticipated for 2011-2012, and the search has received approval from the provost. However, budget projections are also assuming a 55% growth in head count student enrollment from 88 in spring 2010 to 136 students by 2011-2012 with approximately 70% of the students projected for the health promotion and policy emphasis area. Considering this growth potential, the objective target of a minimum of four core faculty in each emphasis area by 2013 appears to be set too low for the health promotion and policy emphasis area. If resources do not permit additional expansion of core faculty for this emphasis area, the program may need to closely manage its growth through the admissions process. The program indicates that a search for an additional faculty member for health promotion and policy is in the development stage. Adding to the challenge of meeting future faculty expansion needs is the issue of oversubscribed courses, especially in epidemiology. Students report that class size needs to be reduced, in order to provide more time for interaction with the course instructor and to enhance the quality of classroom discussions.

Program administration includes the program director, who also is associate dean of the School of Health Professions, dedicating 0.65 FTE to the MPH program. His executive staff assistant additionally provides administrative support to the MPH program. A half-time associate director supervises the full-time academic advisor, the full-time administrative associate and the 0.25 FTE field placement coordinator who also has 0.45 FTE teaching responsibilities.

The program is located on the eight floor of Lewis Hall which has four faculty and staff offices, a reception area/office, a graduate research assistant office, a student work room with three computer work stations,
and a dedicated seminar/conference room. The program director’s office is on the fifth floor of Lewis Hall which has a conference room that is shared by the program. Faculty with courtesy appointments have offices in their home departments. Courses and meetings are scheduled across campus. Fund-raising will be underway in the next year for a new, dedicated building for the combined use of Schools of Nursing and Health Professions, which will include space to meet MPH program needs. Groundbreaking is anticipated to begin in eight to 10 years. Current space appears to be adequate to meet the needs of the faculty, staff and students.

Wet laboratory space is available to veterinary public health students in the College of Veterinary Medicine. Other lab space which may be needed is available in the home department of the course instructors.

All core faculty and staff have desktop computers and printers. The program has one laptop for sharing as needed. The student workroom on eighth floor of Lewis Hall has three computers for student use. Students have electronic identification to access computing resources across campus including the School of Health Professions computer lab, Ellis Library with 103 computer workstations and Memorial Union with 25 computers, four Apple Intel iMacs and several printers. Similar resources are found within the Arts and Sciences Building, the Gaines/Oldham Black Culture Center, the Engineering Building, the Stanley Multimedia Center, and Thomas and Nell Lafferre Hall. The IT helpdesk is available to assist students with technical questions anywhere on campus.

Ellis Library, the main library on the MU campus, contains the principal resources for research in the social sciences, humanities and basic sciences. Six additional branch libraries hold most of the material pertaining to health sciences, veterinary medicine and four other disciplines less related to public health. The holdings of the main library, branches and two off-site storage facilities include over three million volumes and six million microforms. The libraries provide access to Internet or electronic journal articles via proxy server. As a matter of policy, the university subscribes to Internet rather than print editions. Articles from journals to which MU does not subscribe are available via interlibrary loan, and usually are delivered digitally as PDF documents. Students are able to access Internet journals, eBooks and databases from anywhere in the world. Faculty and students report that the library has the capability to support graduate study and research.

Community resource persons and public health practitioners engage in guest lecturing and providing field placements for the program. Student interns and preceptors complete field practicum placement agreements that are formally approved by the MU Business Services Office. The Columbia/Boone County Health Department and the state Department of Health and Senior Services provided strong letters of support for creating the MPH program and their support continues by arranging field
placements. Professionals from each of these organizations serve as course instructors. On campus, cooperation across university departments is formalized through memoranda of understanding, providing benefits to the collaborative approach promoted by the MPH program. Through these mechanisms, MPH students are hired as research assistants on grant-funded public health projects in several academic units.

The program’s collaborative partners contribute in-kind support to the program including teaching courses for MPH students or adapting courses to meet the needs of public health students, serving on program committees, involving students in faculty research, involving students in public health related service projects, serving as advisors and engaging in field placements with students.

2.0 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS.

2.1 Master of Public Health Degree.

The program shall offer instructional programs reflecting its stated mission and goals, leading to the Master of Public Health (MPH) or equivalent professional masters degree. The program may offer a generalist MPH degree or an MPH with areas of specialization. The program, depending upon how it defines the unit of accreditation, may offer other degrees, professional and academic, if consistent with its mission and resources.

This criterion is met. The program offers an MPH degree in two emphasis areas: health promotion and policy and veterinary public health. In addition, the program offers two joint degrees: DVM/MPH and an MPH/MPA. Until fall 2009, the program offered three emphasis areas: health promotion and disease prevention, public health policy and administration and veterinary public health. Table 2 below presents the program’s current degree offerings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Degrees Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masters Degrees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion and Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Degrees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVM/MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH/MPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program submitted a formal request to merge the health promotion and disease prevention and public health policy and administration emphasis areas into the health promotion and policy emphasis area in the second year of the program. The change was proposed for the following reasons: 1) strong collaboration between the schools of nursing, public affairs and social work and the center for health policy allows for the program to draw on its strengths in the area of health promotion and policy; 2) the emphasis area change avoids duplicating the focus of the master of health administration offered by the department of health management and informatics; and 3) the program has adequate faculty for two
concentration areas and can better support these areas, keeping low student/faculty ratios. Fifteen students chose to remain in their original emphasis areas after the merge. Eleven will graduate by fall 2011, according to their plans of study, while the graduation dates for the remaining four have yet to be determined.

The program’s emphasis areas are well-developed with appropriate advanced-level courses for graduate education. Required courses for each of the program’s emphasis areas were embedded in the listing of core courses, however program administration provided clarification and the site visit team was able to determine that each emphasis area had a distinct curriculum over and above the core. The specific requirements for each emphasis area are depicted in the tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Required Courses – Health Promotion and Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 7952 Research Methods in Public Health – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE 8120 Community-Based Public Health Interventions – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB_AF 8170 Public Policy Processes and Strategies – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE 8130 Developing and Evaluating Public Health Programs – 3 credits <strong>OR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC_WK 8953 Evaluative Research in Social Work – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 7150 Principles of Public Health – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Required Courses – Veterinary Public Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V_M_S 8431 Research Methods and Data Analysis – 2 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional &gt; 7000 STAT class – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_PBIO 8458 Veterinary Public Health – 2 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 8620 Epidemiology of Zoonoses and Emerging Infections – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE 8120 Community-Based Public Health Interventions – 3 credits <strong>OR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE 8130 Developing and Evaluating Public Health Programs – 3 credits <strong>OR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC_WK 8953 Evaluative Research in Social Work – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 7150 Principles of Public Health – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site visit team inquired about the types of students enrolled in the veterinary public health emphasis area and the job outlook for these individuals upon completing the program. The stand-alone MPH in veterinary public health has significantly more enrolled students than the dual DVM/MPH degree program. Program administrators and faculty informed the site visit team that students in the stand-alone veterinary medicine degree program include students who plan to later apply to veterinary school, individuals with science backgrounds, as well as students who already possessed veterinary medicine degrees and wanted to gain additional training in public health to enhance their knowledge base. Upon completion of the program, veterinary public health graduates may find employment in state and local health departments working in epidemiology, animal control and disaster preparedness as well as working at pharmaceutical companies meeting with veterinarians discussing the latest pharmaceuticals for veterinary practice.
2.2 Program Length.

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

This criterion is met. The MPH degree, depending on emphasis area and whether or not the student is enrolled in a joint degree program, requires 42-45 credit hours for completion. The university has defined one semester credit hour as a minimum of 750 minutes of direct contact for lectures, discussions or similar instructional approaches. Laboratory, studio or equivalent experiences follow the formula of one semester credit hour being equal to 1,500 minutes of direct contact. Most MPH courses are three-credit hour courses meeting once weekly.

Applicants may submit a request to have up to eight hours of graduate course credit transferred to the MPH program from another institution. The program director and the emphasis area director review any syllabi and grades and both must approve the student's request. Additional input may be sought from faculty from other disciplines to assess the appropriateness and rigor of the course. Students earning concurrent graduate degrees at MU along with the MPH, even if the student is not enrolled in one of the designated joint degrees, may petition to share courses between the two programs. The approval process follows the same guidelines as the aforementioned process to transfer credits and must be approved by the program director and the emphasis area director. Regardless of the amount of shared credit or waived courses, completion of the MPH degree must meet or exceed 42 semester hours. No students have graduated from the program earning fewer than 42-45 credit hours.

2.3 Public Health Core Knowledge.

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

This criterion is met. The program requires students to complete a course in each of the five core areas of public health knowledge: biostatistics, epidemiology, environmental health sciences, social and behavioral sciences and health services administration. The program also requires students in each emphasis area to take a course in research methods (P_HLTH 7952 – Health Promotion and Policy or V_M_S 8431 – Veterinary Public Health) and Principles of Public Health (P_HLTH 7150). Depending on the emphasis area, students may choose from a list of courses or take a combination of courses to fulfill the core requirements. Core requirements for the program, by emphasis area, are illustrated in the tables below.

During the site visit, the team thoroughly reviewed the syllabi for each core course to determine whether or not the appropriate breadth and depth related to each core area was covered. Upon reviewing these documents, it was determined that the core courses offered by the program are appropriate for graduate education in public health. The site visit team noted in its review of the syllabi for the program’s courses
that there was significant variation in the structure and completeness of syllabi from instructor to instructor, even when teaching the same course and depending on which of the program’s major units offered the course. For example, some syllabi did not explicitly list competencies associated with the area of knowledge while others included learning objectives and competencies. There were also syllabi that were fairly incomplete and did not list the required homework for the semester. The program would benefit from developing a syllabus template that consistently ensures that students are completely aware of the expectations and competencies to be attained upon completion of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. MPH Core Curriculum – Health Promotion and Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 7020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 7410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 8150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 8920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH_PR 7300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_C_MD 8420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. MPH Core Curriculum – Veterinary Public Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 7020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 7070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 7410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 8150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 8920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH_PR 7300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_PBIO 8455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Practical Skills.

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

This criterion is met. The program requires all students to complete an internship as part of the curriculum. The internship may not be waived, and students engaged in public health work as part of
regular employment or as a graduate research assistant must identify a separate internship with specific learning goals to receive credit. For students in both emphasis areas, the internship is a 360 contact hour experience that is awarded six credit hours upon successful completion. DVM/MPH students are required to complete a four-credit hour internship consisting of 240 contact hours.

All students attend a student orientation during the semester in which they begin the placement. Students are introduced to the field placement coordinator and are informed of the prerequisites, expectations and processes associated with the internship. The field placement coordinator is available to assist students in identifying potential placement sites within the state of Missouri. If a student wants to complete a placement outside of Missouri or internationally, he or she may seek out the potential placement site independently but may refer to the field placement coordinator for assistance. The field placement coordinator works closely with the faculty advisor and the academic advisor in coordinating the internship.

Students are permitted to enroll in the public health internship (P_HLTH 8980) to begin the placement once they have completed 21 credit hours. Students with advanced clinical and/or public health work experience may be permitted to begin the placement earlier at the discretion of their faculty advisor. In such cases, students are scheduled to complete 21 credit hours the semester in which they begin the internship. Students are encouraged to review the Master of Public Health Internship Handbook which outlines the process and contains all of the required documentation.

The academic advisor incorporates the internship into the student’s plan of study. The faculty advisor, assigned to the student during the first semester, provides advice and guidance regarding potential internship sites. Students complete the Student Competencies Self-Assessment which helps the faculty advisor to identify MPH program competencies on which to focus during the internship. The faculty advisor approves the student’s statement of purpose which includes the specific objectives for the internship, competencies to be addressed and timeframe. If additional technical guidance, such as obtaining IRB approval, is needed, the faculty advisor provides direction.

Preceptors at the placement agency facilitate the internship requirements and the student meeting the competencies associated with the placement. When contacted by students regarding potential placement at their agency, the preceptor must develop a clearly outlined project including orientation activities, a description of resources available to students and an outline of the type of end report expected. While there are no specific qualifications set by the program for preceptors, the field placement coordinator ensures that each preceptor has the experience and/or academic training to provide guidance and oversight to the student appropriate for a graduate-level internship. Program administrators expressed that they have been flexible in considering preceptor qualifications, though the preceptor must always
have the position and experience necessary to offer supervisory guidance and mentoring to students placed under them. Preceptors also complete an internship progress report halfway through the internship and provide a final evaluation at the end. Agencies used by the program for the internship requirement include: the MU Rape Education Office, Detroit Department of Health and Wellness Promotion, State of Missouri – MoHealthNet Division, Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services and the USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

In discussions with members of the public health community, many of whom serve as preceptors for students, the site visit team noted that preceptors were pleased with the performance of MPH students stating that many provided services that filled immediate programmatic needs. Students were viewed as professional and energetic; however, some preceptors noted that students would benefit from more of an emphasis on quantitative skills.

2.5 Culminating Experience.

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

This criterion is met. The culminating experience method for the MPH program most widely used, regardless of emphasis area, is the capstone. Each emphasis area has its own capstone course requiring students to employ skills and content acquired throughout the course of study. The capstone course for students in the health promotion and policy emphasis area (P_HLTH 8970) is currently taught by a secondary faculty member who serves as the chief of the Bureau of Genetics and Healthy Childhood at the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services. The course provides students with a foundation in grant-writing and program design and requires that students develop a grant appropriate for submission to an identified funding agency at the end of the course. The opportunity to work with a team on a capstone project allows students to develop and build on the professional and interdisciplinary skills learned during the internship placement. In fall 2009, the Executive Faculty Committee approved guidelines for an individual capstone for students in the health promotion and policy emphasis area, but students have not yet enrolled.

The veterinary public health capstone (P_HLTH 8971) requires students to complete a project which may consist of a comprehensive evaluation of a veterinary public health intervention, a proposal for a new intervention, an analysis of policy efforts related to veterinary public health or related topics. Students may elect to complete a group project or an individual project. Like health promotion and policy individual capstone projects, the faculty advisor must approve a student to undertake an individual project and agree to provide direct supervision for the student.

Although no students to date have selected this option, the program does allow students to complete a thesis as the culminating experience. The graduate school provides the guidelines for completing a
thesis and the public health faculty will provide advisement throughout the process. Students have primarily been interested in more practical applications of competencies, but increasing numbers of students have expressed interest in research and continuing their public health education at the doctoral level, indicating that this option may be used in the future. In a meeting with students on site, at least one student indicated that she would be pursuing the thesis option for the culminating experience and would apply to a doctoral program using the research from her thesis as the platform for her doctoral research.

2.6 Required Competencies.

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

This criterion is met. Core public health competencies are defined for the five areas of knowledge basic to public health plus a sixth area of communication. The 84 competencies are organized by four domains defined by program values. Approximately 40% of the competencies use the verbs “describe, understand or apply” which are considered to involve lower-order thinking according to widely-accepted taxonomy related to analysis of learning situations. The program reports that students have opportunities to develop the competencies though the combined experiences afforded by the curriculum, internship and capstone.

A matrix identifies courses providing experiences through which students are expected to develop and strengthen core public health competencies. Core course instructors are asked to identify the degree to which competencies are addressed in their courses. Suggested faculty responses are identified as introduced, reinforced or emphasized, but these terms are not operationally defined which makes consistent responses somewhat less likely. A bar chart indicates that 100% of the competencies for all six areas are introduced in the core courses. A second bar chart, combining responses of reinforced or emphasized, reveals 73% for environmental health, 93% each for epidemiology and health policy and management with the other three areas reported at 100%. When new courses are added to the curriculum, instructors are asked to complete the matrix. Faculty report that syllabi for courses taught by different instructors are exchanged and examined against the competencies, which they viewed as very helpful for instructional guidance.

Specific to the two emphasis areas, seven competencies are identified for health promotion and policy and eight are identified for veterinary public health. The emphasis area competencies are included in a matrix citing courses that provide the relevant experiences. In addition, nine cross-cutting competencies are identified which relate to professionalism, cultural competence and ethics. The internship experience is expected to offer opportunities for students to develop one or more of the cross-cutting competencies.
Drawing on the ASPH Competency Project and competencies advanced by the Council of Linkages, the Executive Faculty Committee and administrative staff defined core competencies that appeared appropriate to the MU program, its curriculum and values. The selection, modification and drafting of competencies occurred during two planning retreat in 2008. Feedback from the External Advisory Council, Board of Directors, students, members of program subcommittees not represented on the Executive Faculty Committee and the student association was solicited and incorporated in the final version of the competencies. The competencies are posted on the MPH program website and included in the student and internship handbooks. Instructors were asked to review the course-competencies matrix and assess the level of competency inclusion in their courses, using responses of introduced, reinforced or emphasized. The 15 competencies related to the two emphasis areas were developed by the emphasis area directors in consultation with other faculty and the administrative staff.

The Curriculum Subcommittee reviews the competencies and the results of student self-assessments of competencies in making adjustments to the curriculum and approving elective courses. The student self-assessments occur at program entry, pre-internship, and pre-graduation using a sub-set of 19 competencies and inviting responses of no experience, aware, knowledgeable, or proficient. Also an open-ended opportunity is provided for comments or suggestions. Students report that identifying competencies offers a practical way to connect course learning experiences with skills needed for the work environment. For internships, competencies are to be incorporated as appropriate in internship learning goals and addressed in preceptor evaluations of the intern's performance. For the final field paper, the student is required to reflect on how the internship experience informed his/her individual development of one or more cross-cutting competencies. The Internship and Capstone Subcommittee reviews the matrices, self-assessments and preceptor evaluations to make recommendations for the capstone experience and to refine internship requirements. Program faculty indicate that updating the matrix is an ongoing process, which will incorporate the views and experiences of program graduates.

Periodic assessment of the changing needs of public health practice is accomplished through annual discussions at the Annual Stakeholder’s Meeting with the External Advisory Council, which represents public health agencies in Kansas City, Columbia and Jefferson City. The Curriculum Committee secures information by reviewing preceptor evaluations and examining student self-assessments of competencies and course-specific information related to addressing competencies. An annual alumni survey, which occurs six months following graduation, provides information regarding perceived adequacy of the graduate training and success with securing employment. The first annual career panel featuring area public health practice professionals representing all three levels of government and the private sector was held in spring 2009. The discussion, attended by both students and faculty, included practical advice regarding employment applications, changing needs of public health employers and identified skill sets emphasized by employers.
2.7 Assessment Procedures.

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

This criterion is met. The program uses the following processes to assess student attainment of competencies: faculty evaluations of students, preceptor evaluations of students during field placements, student self-evaluations and grades and coursework. Students also have the option of developing a portfolio of work completed throughout the course of the program and the program faculty is currently considering making this a requirement for the program.

Faculty members assign coursework and test students on their mastery of the competencies associated with the course. Competency-related objectives are addressed in the learning goals for the field placement, and preceptors are asked to assess student progress towards these goals as part of the final evaluation. The Student Self-Assessment is completed three times over the course of the student’s degree program: in the initial semester of the program, at the internship orientation and as part of the capstone before graduation. The program reviews the results of the self-assessments in aggregate to track the results over time and measure them against other competency information generated.

The program has implemented a system of prerequisites to increase the likelihood of student success. Students are required to take biostatistics before epidemiology, which has proven to ensure success in the latter course. Additionally, students must complete 21 hours before beginning the internship which includes all courses in core public health knowledge, a research methods course and the principles of public health course.

The program has graduated two classes since its inception in 2007. Graduation rates, based on students who were eligible for graduation, are as follows: 100% for 2007-08 (one student) and 85% for 2008-2009 (17 graduates). The program has projected a graduation rate of 87% for the 2009-10 academic year (20 graduates) based on current student plans of study. Job placement rates are also favorable for the program and were reported as follows: 100% for 2007-08 and 82.4% for 2008-09. Projections for the 2009-10 academic year are to be determined.

The program administered the annual alumni survey to its first significant graduation class in December 2009. The response rate was over 50% with 13 of 17 graduates responding. Alumni as a whole gave the program a rating of 3.69 on a scale of 1-5 for its role in their career development and more than half expressed that they were interested in assisting the program in the future as a mentor, guest speaker, mock interviewer or employer.
2.8 Academic Degrees.

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

This criterion is not applicable.

2.9 Doctoral Degrees.

The program may offer doctoral degree programs, if consistent with its mission and resources.

This criterion is not applicable.

2.10 Joint Degrees.

If the program 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 met. The MPH program offers two joint degrees: a doctor of veterinary medicine/masters of public health (DVM/MPH) and a masters of public health/masters of public affairs (MPH/MPA). Students choosing the DVM/MPH enroll in the veterinary public health emphasis area while students choosing the MPH/MPA enroll in the health promotion and policy emphasis area.

Joint DVM/MPH students complete 19 hours of public health courses which include a course in each of the five core areas of public health and a four-credit, 240 contact hour internship and 23 shared credit hours in addition to the 132.5 credits required for the attainment of the veterinary medicine degree. Shared courses are depicted in Table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. DVM/MPH Shared Courses (23 credit hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 8971 Veterinary Public Health Capstone – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_BSCI 8509 Veterinary Toxicology – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_M_S 8431 Research Methods and Data Analysis – 2 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_PBIO 8454 Veterinary Virology – 2 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_PBIO 8455 Veterinary Epidemiology – 2 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_PBIO 8457 Parasitology – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_PBIO 8458 Veterinary Public Health – 2 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_PBIO 8552 Veterinary Bacteriology I – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_PBIO 8553 Veterinary Bacteriology II – 3 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint MPH/MPA students complete 18 hours of public health courses including a course in each of the five core areas of public health and a principles of public health course. MPH/MPA student also must complete an internship which is shared between the two degree programs. Shared courses include 24 credits of coursework. In addition, joint MPH/MPA students complete 18 hours of public affairs courses. Shared courses for this joint degree program are depicted in Table 8 below.
Table 8. MPH/MPA Shared Courses (24 credit hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLTH_PR 7300</td>
<td>Health Care in the US – 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 8970</td>
<td>Public Health Capstone – 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_HLTH 8980</td>
<td>Public Health Internship – 6 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB_AF 8181</td>
<td>Research Methods/Inquiry Public Affairs II – 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB_AF 8210</td>
<td>Ethics, Democracy and Public Service – 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB_AF 8420</td>
<td>Public Policy Design, Evaluation and Implementation – 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB_AF 8530</td>
<td>Strategic Planning/Performance Measurement – 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB_AF 8520</td>
<td>HR Management and Development in the Public and Nonprofit Sector – 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB_AF 8530</td>
<td>Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement – 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB_AF 8720</td>
<td>Financial Management in the Public and Nonprofit Sector – 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR two courses selected from the following options:

- PUB_AF 8520 HR Management and Development in the Public and Nonprofit Sector – 3 credits
- PUB_AF 8530 Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement – 3 credits
- PUB_AF 8720 Financial Management in the Public and Nonprofit Sector – 3 credits

The graduate school sets the university guidelines for credit sharing which the program adheres to. Program administration ensures that students do not complete the MPH portion of the degree for less than 42 credit hours. The program director is responsible for negotiating with other degree programs to determine what courses would be appropriate to overlap and determines course appropriateness to the field of public health. Students do not receive a choice of electives, as their electives get replaced by prescribed courses. Program administration stated that a proposal to undertake a joint MD/MPH degree would likely be developed within the next two years. According to comments from the faculty and administrators, a joint MPH/MSW program would be ideal, given the close involvement of the school of social work with the MPH program, but the number of credits required for the two masters degrees presents concern in allowing students to finish in a timely manner. The program is continuing to explore avenues to implement this as a joint degree.

2.11 Distance Education or Executive Degree Programs.

If the program offers degree programs using formats or methods other than students attending regular on-site course sessions spread over a standard term, these degree programs must a) be consistent with the mission of the program and within the program’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 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 program offers distance education or executive degree programs, it must provide needed support for these programs, including administrative, travel, communication, and student services. The program must have an ongoing program to evaluate the academic effectiveness of the format, to assess teaching and learning methodologies and to systematically use this information to stimulate program improvements.

This criterion is not applicable.
3.0 CREATION, APPLICATION AND ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE.

3.1 Research.

The program 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. Program faculty and students are engaged in research. The formally-stated research goal is “to create a focal point for public health discovery in the areas of policy development, veterinary public health, and health promotion by supporting a high-quality research agenda that encourages student involvement and enhances the skills, knowledge, and expertise of the existing public health workforce.” Discovery is one of the four stipulated values guiding the program, which emphasizes the value of “promoting and supporting innovative, interdisciplinary discovery that is a unique strength of the discipline of public health.” The program’s collaborative structure encourages interdisciplinary research activities. The development of the MPH program involved MU faculty members with a record of successful research in public health, which established a strong foundation for an active public health research mission.

The university supports research through the University of Missouri System Research Board and the MU Research Council, which enable both junior and senior faculty members to apply for research leave and financial support. A faculty grant writing institute is sponsored by MU’s Office of Research to assist faculty in developing extramural grant proposals. Faculty incentive grants and faculty development awards are available to support research endeavors. Most tenure-home departments of MPH faculty provide seed grants to support faculty research projects.

Consistent with university research expectations of faculty, evaluation of research and scholarly activities is included in annual faculty performance reviews and in tenure and promotion reviews. Although significant variability exists across academic units, the typical division of FTE for tenure-track faculty is 40% for research.

Faculty are actively conducting community-based research projects. One example involves an assessment of health status and needs of rural women over age 50 in Missouri which is supported by a Missouri Foundation for Health grant. Another example is research focused on developing a pragmatic approach for clinic use of Medline Plus-selected websites via “health information prescriptions.” A third example is a program-based grant from the US Department of Health and Human Services which provides research funding for identification, intervention and service provision for victims of human trafficking in Central Missouri. Regarding the campus community, a pre- and post-test intervention study of impacts on sexual attitudes and behavior of university students resulting from the placement of condom machines in residence halls was conducted with the MU Student Health Center.
Research funding for the past three years reveals $1,511,601 for 2007-2008, $2,438,591 for 2008-2009 and $686,431 for 2009-2010, averaging $1,545,541 per year. With grants data for the third year incomplete at the time of the site visit, the average funding per year most likely will be increased. A total of 29 grants are reported with 13 MPH faculty serving as principal investigator (PI) or Co-PI. Of the 13 faculty, six are core faculty presently and one was core faculty in 2007-2008. Funded projects involving the three tenure-track core faculty members with joint appointments are not listed, but this is to be expected in view of their recent employment, two in fall 2008 and one in fall 2009.

Measures used to evaluate the success of research activities include targets of 75% of core faculty having external funding for research, 25% of funded research projects being interdisciplinary, 50% of core faculty engaging students in research and 90% of core faculty achieving at least one peer-reviewed publication per year. For the first two years of the program, data are trending in the right direction for core faculty with external funding for research; data on interdisciplinary projects was not presented. For the remaining two measures, the program achieved the targets by 2008-2009.

Forty percent of the core faculty in 2007-2008 and 67% of the core faculty in 2008-2009 engaged students in research. Sixteen of the 29 funded faculty research projects over three years include student participation. As of fall 2009, 11 MPH students have served as graduate research assistants with the Center for Health Policy. Student internship experiences also provide opportunities to participate in research and to develop research papers. The program initiated a fall semester seminar series based on faculty research areas, which was implemented in 2008 and 2009. A faculty member teaches the seminar based on his/her public health research interests. Student roles in research include: conducting literature searches and reviews, assisting with development and testing of data collection tools, conducting interviews and focus groups, participating in needs assessments, conducting data analyses and drafting sections for final reports. Students report that they are encouraged and assisted by the faculty to engage in research.

3.2 Service.

The program 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. Through the external advisory council and the internship field placement program, strong linkages with state and local governmental public health agencies are in place. These internships provide students with both applied public health experience and service opportunity. Agencies include, for example, the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services and the Department of Social Services as well as other non-governmental public health organizations. Internship placements in a wide variety of settings are available and include both in state, out of state, and international experiences. A number of internship preceptors remarked on the positive contributions students made to their
organization’s work product. These additional manpower resources in many cases enabled completion of public health activities that might otherwise have remained undone.

Tenure track faculty is also expected to contribute professional service to the larger community. Since MPH faculty in the tenure track hold joint appointments, service contributions are measured according to the proportion of FTE they contribute in the program. Though measurement of faculty participation only formally began in the 2007-2008 school year, it has increased from an initial measure of 60% to 89% participation in 2008-2009. This exceeds the program goal of 80% faculty participation in service. The program now queries faculty annually on-line for this metric.

Community groups with which faculty and students have been involved include the MedZou Clinic (an on-campus free clinic), the “One World, One Health, One Medicine” forum, the Center for Health Policy annual health policy summit, local county health departments (including, for example, a multidisciplinary discussion of cryptosporidium infections), collaborations with the Missouri Association of Local Public Health Agencies, the One Read program at the local public library (involving a novel about tuberculosis patients), and the Health Environment Policy Initiative.

Many individual faculty also serve on a variety of commissions and boards, ranging from the local university to surrounding county public health agencies, regional entities, and even the governing council of the American Public Health Association.

Students are also actively involved in service to the community in addition to that integral to the substantial contribution they make through their internship placements. In the annual student survey, 56% of students rated opportunities for service as good to outstanding. Through the Mizzou Public Health club, students in the 2008-2009 academic year participated in a flu vaccination awareness campaign, an on-campus health and wellness information fair, and promotion of national public health week activities.

3.3 Workforce Development.

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

This criterion is met with commentary. During the initial stages of planning and development of the program, a formal needs assessment was done of enrollment potential. The needs assessment included a web-based survey of current MU students and working healthcare professionals in the state. Almost 10% of students surveyed said they were “very likely” to enroll if the program were offered, with another 25% responding “likely”. Among healthcare professionals already in the workforce, the proportions increased to 24% for “very likely” and over half (54%) responded they were “likely” to enroll within the next two years if the program became a reality.
The program notes that continuing education has not been a priority during its first three years of existence. However, one of the collaborating centers for the program hosts a health policy summit sponsoring continuing medical education in which the program has been a participant. The program hopes to take advantage of this and other opportunities in the future to offer continuing education credits to active public health and other healthcare professionals.

The program does offer a graduate certificate in public health in part as an outreach to working professionals who might be interested in pursuing advanced training in the discipline but find it difficult to attend classes full-time. This certificate offering facilitates participation by non-traditional students by making courses available in the evening and online. In addition, the program has modified its usual application process to allow students hoping to earn the certificate the chance to first demonstrate their academic ability by direct entry into basic coursework without having taking the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) or submitting essays or letters of reference. The MPH program noted during the on-site interviews that the main rationale for omitting the GRE was due to concerns this test would be too much of an obstacle for working professionals remote from their initial undergraduate training, but interested in gaining advanced education in public health. Developers and planners of the MPH program at MU said they modeled this approach after a process at an accredited college of public health. The certificate may be awarded after completion of only four courses, selected from among three of the five designated core courses of the MPH degree plus one selected elective course. Students maintaining a grade of B or better in all courses taken or attempted (not simply a cumulative GPA of 3.0) may be directly admitted into the MPH degree program by approval of the admissions committee. This alternate admission pathway was cited during the on-site visit as one that was attractive to many students enrolled at MU. This appears to have been an effective recruitment tool, with 52 students enrolled in the graduate certificate program as of the current semester. Notably, of these 52 students, 22 (42%) are currently employed and 11 (21%) are working healthcare professionals.

The commentary relates to the current structure of the certificate program, specifically how it serves as a pipeline to the MPH program. Though relaxed standards may facilitate entry of non-traditional students, other safeguards ensuring the quality and eventual success of matriculating students may still be desirable. Also, CEPH designates the core courses in the MPH program as those teaching the common required competencies in public health. These would seem to be the starting point for any certificate, though the structure of the current MU certificate as a “sampler” of public health is understandable. However, if this is intended to supply a basic skill set for “real-world value” in applied public health as stated, the program might consider making the certificate a more consistent product.
The program additionally set for itself goals by 2013 of achieving 50% of those admitted to both certificate and the MPH degree already working or experienced in public health, and reaching out to underserved areas of Missouri with 15% of applicants from these areas.

4.0 FACULTY, STAFF AND STUDENTS.

4.1 Faculty Qualifications.

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

This criterion is met. Faculty members at MU are identified as “core” if their teaching, committee service and advising for the MPH program plus their public health-focused research and service activities equal or exceed 50% of their effort at MU. The program lists a program director and nine full-time faculty members meeting this definition in two areas of emphasis, with seven supporting the health promotion and policy emphasis area and three supporting the veterinary public health emphasis area. Of these, three are tenured, four are tenure-track and three are non-tenure-track. The three tenured and one tenure-track faculty are housed in collaborating departments and hold formal courtesy appointments with the MPH program. Three tenure-track faculty members have tenure homes in collaborating departments with formal joint appointments with the MPH program, which pays 25-40% of their salaries. As an area program assigned to the graduate school, tenure-track lines are not available to the program. The program pays a percentage of salaries for two non-tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure-track status is used by the university for those who are individually focused on teaching, research or clinical activities.

A non-tenure-track faculty member serving as field placement coordinator is the only core faculty member without a doctoral degree. Three core faculty have graduate degrees from CEPH-accredited schools of public health and all have degrees highly relevant to public health. Six faculty are recognized as having past employment or practical experience in public health. With the exception of biostatistics and environmental health, which are taught by secondary faculty, core faculty members provide instruction for the remaining three areas of knowledge basic to public health.

Other faculty supporting the program include 12 whose time commitment to the program falls below the 50% criterion and one faculty member who has a 100% time commitment to the program but by definition is not considered core faculty because of non-involvement in advising, governance and administrative activities. Two adjunct faculty, including one from the practice community, are hired on a course-by-course basis. The program reports a goal of hiring at least one additional core faculty member with social science expertise to minimize use of adjuncts.
Core and secondary faculty provide learning opportunities for students based on their personal research and service involvements; and public health practitioners contribute to the program as guest speakers and internship preceptors. Representatives from the Columbia/Boone County Department of Public Health and Human Services, the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services and the Missouri Association of Local Public Health Agencies engage with the faculty and students on a regular basis.

In general, the self-study document reveals that measurements are important for the number of core faculty per emphasis area and for faculty performance related to meeting teaching, research and service responsibilities. With regard to teaching performance, student evaluations, an annual student survey and formal evaluation of teaching by administrators are suggested as sources for data collection, but targets and data for the past three years are not revealed.

With regard to research, program targets are 75% of core faculty will have external funding for research and 90% will have peer-reviewed publications each year. The program appears to be making progress for the first two years of outcomes revealing 40% and 56% respectively for research funding. The outcomes for peer-reviewed publications are very close to the target with 80% and 89% reported. Eighty percent of core faculty engaging in service is the established target for public health-oriented community service. Outcome data regarding service for the first two years of the program cite 60% and 89% respectively of the core faculty contributing to service activities.

### 4.2 Faculty Policies and Procedures

The program 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. The *MU Faculty Handbook* addresses faculty rules and regulations promulgated by the Office of the Provost. These include policies, procedures and expectations governing recruitment, hiring, promotion, tenure, probationary periods for faculty and workload policy. The information is available on the website of the Office of the Provost. Other sources include the MU Recruitment and Selection Guidelines and Procedures and the Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure which are available online.

The university supports faculty development opportunities through a variety of programs. The Big 12 Faculty Fellowship Program, available to tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty who have held appointments for at least six years, offers support for travel to member institutions to exchange ideas and research. Faculty development awards of up to $3500 are awarded twice annually to tenure-track or non-tenure-track faculty to assist with gaining certification, learning new software, improving teaching, developing a new course, initiating a specific research project and other activities. Start-up funds to initiate research or professional development projects are awarded preferentially to junior faculty through
the Mizzou Alumni Association faculty incentive grants. The Wakonse Conference on College Teaching seeks to improve teaching and is open to participation by tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. One of the core faculty for public health has served for 18 years as a principal staff member of the Wakonse Conference. Another core faculty member participated as a Wakonse fellow in spring 2009. The faculty grant writing institute, sponsored by MU’s Office of Research, assists faculty in developing extramural grant proposals. One of the core public health faculty attended the institute during summer 2009.

The home department chair annually evaluates faculty performance, regardless of the faculty appointment type. The review is based on the faculty member’s annual report of activities and accomplishments, a self-evaluation and student evaluations. Beginning spring 2010, faculty will submit information using an online annual faculty form which requests details on teaching, university service, community service, research funding, publications, presentations, professional group memberships and includes space for open-ended comments and suggestions. The MPH program director shares evaluation responsibilities and negotiates merit raises with the collaborating department’s chairperson of the three tenure-track and one non-tenure-track core faculty members who have joint appointments. For faculty without formal joint appointments, the program director reviews their contributions to the field of public health and to the program in order to make informed decisions about extending courtesy appointments with the program.

A promotion and tenure committee in each department makes recommendations to the department chair. For those with joint appointments with the program, the director is involved in the promotion and tenure review process as a non-voting participant with the department faculty to share input and observations. In addition, the program director submits an independent evaluation letter to be included in the dossier that is forwarded to the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee. Subsequently, the dossier is reviewed by the dean, the provost or vice chancellor for academic affairs and the chancellor, who is assisted by a campus-wide Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The deputy provost indicates that discussions among the campus leadership are underway to determine how the promotion and tenure process should handle interdisciplinary situations for faculty with joint appointments, which he believes will require a cultural shift. A post-tenure review of tenured faculty is conducted on a five year cycle by the department chair and dean. For those program faculty with courtesy appointments, the chair of the collaborating department is responsible for the tenure and promotion process. In these cases, the program director will make decisions regarding an extension of the courtesy appointments.

Students anonymously evaluate each course using a standardized end-of-course evaluation form regarding teaching effectiveness, course content, organization and quality of the experience. The form seeks ratings to 24 detailed questions and requests some general information about the student evaluator. With only two exceptions, the sample of course ratings reviewed by the site visit team were
consistently favorable. In addition, peer evaluators visit classes for those seeking tenure and promotion and develop a report which is submitted as part of the dossier. The program director and associate director review all course evaluations with the P_HLTH designation. The program director evaluates all public health core courses and provides suggestions for instructional improvement to faculty members directly or in collaboration with the home department chair. Instructors seeking to add courses to the approved elective course listing are asked to include questions on their formal course evaluations regarding the relevance of the proposed elective to public health. Responses to the questions are reviewed by the program’s Curriculum Subcommittee. Students completing an internship evaluate the learning experience, the site placement and the preceptor. One additional source of information is the annual student survey which asks students to rate teaching quality in each of the five core areas of public health knowledge.

Community service is expected of faculty and is considered in the tenure and promotion process, along with service to the university and to the profession according to MU Rules and Regulations. Service is not weighted as a criterion for promotion and tenure and the amount of service will vary by academic unit. Teaching and scholarship are the primary criteria for determining promotion and tenure recommendations and service is not a substitute for either of these two criteria. Additionally, the faculty member is expected to characterize the impact and quality of his/her service contributions and provide evidence that one’s efforts and judgment are held in high regard.

4.3 Faculty and Staff Diversity.

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

This criterion is met. Females represent 60% of the core faculty and 48% of the total faculty. Among the 10 core faculty members for spring 2010, there is one African American male, one Asian/Pacific Islander male, six Caucasian females and two Caucasian males. Other, secondary faculty members include three Asian/Pacific Islander females, three Asian/Pacific Islander males, three Caucasian females and six Caucasian males. Approximately 20% of the core faculty and 40% of the secondary faculty are members of racial minority groups. The two full-time staff members include one Hispanic/Latino female and one Caucasian female. One additional part-time staff member is Caucasian female. According to information in the 2009-2010 Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, demographic distribution for Missouri’s population is 3.2% Hispanic, 0.5% Native American, 1.5% Asian, 11.5% Black, and 85% White.

University policies uphold the principles of equal employment opportunity and nondiscrimination. The MU Equity Office works with faculty, staff and students to ensure fair and equitable treatment. The Chancellor’s Diversity Initiative financially supports the hiring of new minority faculty members. Diversity initiative funding enabled recruitment and employment of one of the veterinary public health faculty
members. Another program which is part of the Chancellor’s Diversity Initiative is *You in Mizzou*, which promotes learning about diversity and equal opportunity issues that pertain to faculty, staff and students. The administrative staff view diversity as a recruitment priority. Of four individuals recruited as core faculty during the program’s second and third years, two are women and the other two are minorities.

As previously described, the university supports faculty development through start-up funds, the faculty fellowship program, faculty development awards, training in grant writing and guidance for improving teaching. Several steps to expand diversity are planned at the program-level. The program’s recruitment materials will highlight the emerging partnership with Health Literacy Missouri and also faculty research on health disparities. The summer planning retreat will include a presentation by the MU Equity Office manager on best practices in hiring. Guidance by the Association of American Colleges and Universities on Diversifying the Faculty will be incorporated in future searches with a target of hiring two additional minority faculty by 2013.

The MU Chancellor’s Diversity Initiative sets the tone by encouraging the university community to “cultivate a welcoming environment for all members of the community; reflect the diversity of the state by encouraging the participation of all who are qualified; and help faculty, staff, and students, through education and example, to live productively and peacefully in an increasingly diverse society and world.” In promoting an environment supportive of diversity, the program established objectives to recruit students for each entering class who represent racial or ethnic minorities and to increase the number of students who reside in underserved areas of Missouri with 2013 targets of 20% and 15% respectively. The target for racial and ethnic minority enrollment was achieved in 2009-2010. The academic advisor participates in student recruiting events frequently attended by a high number of minority students. The program emphasizes the inclusion of diverse perspectives and diversity when scheduling career panelists, for recruiting members to serve on the External Advisory Council and for employing adjunct instructors.

Outcome targets for achieving a diverse faculty and staff are not specific, although the program indicates a target of hiring two additional minority faculty members by 2013. Data for core faculty and staff are reported for each of the three years, revealing the percent of women and percent of minorities, but it is not clear that an analysis regarding diversity improvement has been conducted and that planning efforts are formalized. The program reports that recruiting faculty from collaborating departments for courtesy appointments has been less successful for increasing diversity compared to recruiting new faculty to the university.
4.4 Student Recruitment and Admissions.

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

This criterion is met with commentary. The program has an active and varied program of recruitment utilizing multiple venues, including mailed brochures, job fairs, association with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services, website information, introductory public health courses at the undergraduate level, and press releases in the local community and on campus.

Admissions policies and procedures for the degree program are standard and well defined. Requirements include transcripts, a personal essay, a résumé, letters of reference, a GRE report or other qualifying exams for advanced degrees, a baccalaureate degree with a GPA of at least 3.0 for the last 60 hours of course work, and an initial TOEFL report for students for whom English is a second language. Conditional acceptance may be granted to candidates not meeting these standards contingent on maintenance of a 3.0 GPA after enrollment and initial coursework. The admissions committee may also waive qualifying exams for students who have already successfully completed or are currently enrolled in another advanced graduate professional degree.

Access to information, such as application and degree requirements, the MPH student handbook, and descriptions of curriculum offerings as well as profiles of current students, is readily available on the program website. All information on the website appears up-to-date and informative for prospective students.

Quantitative information on applicants, acceptances and enrollment is provided in the self-study document. Applications and enrollment appeared to be highest at the inception of the program at the beginning of the 2007-2008 academic year in three of the four specialty areas or degree programs. This may have reflected pent-up demand. One program offered, the dual degree MPH/MPA, has not had any students apply over the three year period. Speculation by faculty during on-site interviews is that the additional course requirements have possibly been a disincentive for prospective students.

For the active specialty areas, in 2007-2008 for health promotion and policy, 70 students applied, 61 accepted (87%), and 42 enrolled (69%). Thirteen applied in veterinary public health, all were accepted and 10 enrolled (77%). In the case of the DVM/MPH dual degree program, six students applied and all were accepted and enrolled (100%). In the following two years for which the program provided data, applicants decreased in each category but the totals are fairly stable from year to year after the initial demand was met. As an example, the number of applicants to the health promotion and policy track remained similar each academic year, with 51 in 2008-2009 and 48 in 2009-2010. Veterinary public
health applicants diminished to four for both admission cycles. Only 20 of 36 (56%) applicants accepted into health promotion and policy enrolled in 2008-2009, but that rose slightly to 26 of 35 (74%) in 2009-2010. Only one DVM/MPH student applied and was accepted in 2008-2009. None applied in the current academic year.

A table provided in the self-study illustrates student FTE by academic year and concentration. The predominance of student FTE for the health promotion and policy emphasis area likely reflects the wider perceived utility and applicability of this degree in the public health arena as opposed to the veterinary public health degree.

Recruitment goal metrics designed to evaluate success in recruiting quality students involve first, recruitment of applicants for whom 75 (a metric established by the Graduate School) have a GPA of 3.0 or greater for the last 60 credit hours of undergraduate work. Second, all students transferring to the MPH degree program from the certificate program will achieve at least a “B” in each course completed to earn the certificate.

The second measure is set as a more rigorous standard than simply achievement of a 3.0 GPA to ensure that students entering the MPH degree program through the alternate pathway of the certificate program are more likely to be successful. To date, 100% have met this criterion, though no data were provided in the self-study on subsequent performance. However, the program website for the current academic year shows the average GPA for degree vs. certificate students being 3.8/3.55 for spring 2009 and 3.78/3.58 for fall 2009 semesters. These figures demonstrate a slightly lower mean GPA for the certificate group compared to students admitted through the usual process. However, it represents an apparent overall successful transition so far for these students.

The commentary relates to issues relating to the remediation of grades and the advancement criteria of graduate certificate students into the degree program. Since academic policy allows remediation of a “C” grade to potentially increase the grade to a “B” or above, faculty have not yet addressed whether such students would still be allowed to pursue direct admission to the MPH degree program. Acceptance of lower performing students might represent a risk to successful degree completion.

Additional commentary relates to the graduate certificate program itself serving as an alternate entry pathway into the MPH degree for individuals without professional work experience. During on-site interviews, students related that the certificate program was attractive to many students as a means of gaining entry to the MPH without taking the GRE. The intended target group for the graduate certificate appears to be working professionals who are several years past their initial professional training, not recent undergraduates lacking experience. The usual admission process might be preferred for the latter
group, since it is a more validated method of predicting success. The self-study document indicates that 75% of certificate students currently pursue the MPH. Subsequent completion of the MPH degree should continue to be monitored and reported for this alternate means of admission to the program.

4.5 Student Diversity.

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

This criterion is met. The program has specific targets and plans for achieving diversity in its student body, including a goal of 20% racial/ethnic minorities in those enrolled by 2013. Additional self-defined diversity goals the program sets for itself include recruitment of 15% of its class from residents of underserved areas of the state, with 50% also enrolling as experienced and/or actively employed public health workers.

The self-study states that the MU graduate school has a central mission of diversity. Access to the graduate school website provides a link describing in detail elements of the chancellors diversity initiative, (http://diversity.missouri.edu/) and includes a calendar of events and links to information. The program has collaborated with two avenues available on campus to recruit minority students, the McNair Scholars Program and the Thurgood Marshall Fellowship. The program has also visited select colleges, universities and high schools in Missouri for the purpose of targeted minority recruitment. Additional students have been recruited from among international students, including five from Zimbabwe.

Rural underserved student recruitment and workforce recruitment is mainly facilitated through affiliations with the Department of Health and Social Services and the Missouri Public Health Association as well as Missouri Association of Local Public Health Agencies.

A table provided in the self-study provides the demographic characteristics of students enrolled for the previous three years. Similar to many public health programs, women constitute the majority of those applying, accepted and subsequently enrolled to the program. Over the three year period, 77% of enrollees were women. African-Americans represented 6% of the class in 2007-2008, 8% in 2008-2009, and 7% in 2009-2010. Corresponding figures for Hispanics are 4%, 2%, and 0%. Overall ethnic/minority proportions of enrolled students for these three academic years are 16%, 14% and 15% if only US citizens were counted. These figures approach the programs stated goal of 20% and exceed it when international students are included, increasing to 33%, 37%, and 33% respectively. For self-defined diversity goals for the identical periods, residents of underserved areas of the state represent 8%, 4%, and 4% of students, while public health workforce representation are 30%, 40%, and 43%. The latter outcomes are approaching the goal of 50%.
4.6 Advising and Career Counseling.

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

This criterion is met. The program provides formal student orientations at two essential stages of education for the students, first as incoming new students at the start of their coursework and secondly just prior to beginning the internship experience. In addition, two detailed handbooks describing each phase of education are made available to students. These documents are also available on the program’s website at http://publichealth.missouri.edu.

Each student is assigned an academic advisor and required to meet with that advisor early in their pursuit of the degree to develop an individualized educational plan. Faculty advisors must approve any electives not found on the approved course list. Depending on the faculty role, number of advisees assigned to a faculty member varied widely, from one or two students to as many as 15 per faculty member. When questioned, faculty reported this to be a manageable load, and for the most part, students reported a positive experience with advisors. Additional advisement is available to the students prior to the internship experience with the field placement coordinator.

Career advisement received increased emphasis in spring 2009 through the introduction of a career panel activity that invited several public health potential employers to meet with interested students. The program also encourages and allows students to post résumés on the program website.

Students may relay programmatic concerns directly to administrative staff and core faculty, or through student representatives on the executive faculty committee or subcommittee. Students generally felt they had adequate access through these channels.

Students also participate in an annual student survey through which they are able to anonymously address any component of the academic program. In aggregate results of these surveys 13/19 (68%) respondents felt academic advisement was good to outstanding. Students and recent alumni were somewhat less satisfied with career counseling advice, with a small majority 11/19 (58%) reporting good to outstanding experiences and about a fifth (4/19) reporting poor guidance. Of four alumni attending the on site visit interview session, three had found employment, all as a result of their internship opportunity. One student who had not yet found a job post-graduation expressed disappointment in the degree of career counseling and assistance afforded her.
Monday, March 8, 2010

8:00 am  Meeting with Administrative Staff
Kristofer Hagglund, Program Director
Lise Saffran, Associate Director
Deb Hume, Assistant Teaching Professor
Lynelle Phillips, Field Placement Coordinator
Eliana Jeanetta, Academic Advisor
Katherine Kirkpatrick, Administrative Associate

9:00 am  Meeting with Executive Faculty Committee
Brenda Beernsten
Kristopher Hagglund (departed at 10 am)
Michael Hosokawa
Deb Hume (departed at 10 am)
Julie Kapp
Vickie Osborne
Lindsay Parsons (student representative)
Patrick Pithua
Margie Sable
Lise Saffran (departed at 10 am)
Loren Schultz
Paul Speckman

10:45 am  Break

11:00 am  Meeting with Administrative Staff and Emphasis Area Directors
Kristofer Hagglund
Lise Saffran
Kay Libbus
Lynelle Phillips
Loren Schultz

12:00 pm  Lunch with Students
Lindsay Parsons
Chris Irvin
John Ebene
Christina Dolbashian
Alex Sable-Smith
Jessica Allhoff
Nameer Al Mardini
Mario Rudolph
Awatef Ben Ramadan
Aditi Bandyopadhyay
Deborah Gerhart
Katie Eggerman
Elizabeth Drobnick-Smith
Doris C. Agwu
Emily Ann Martin
Petronella Hove
Gvantsa Khizanishvili

1:30 pm  Break
1:45 pm  Meeting with Program Secondary Faculty
Sharmini Rogers
Suh Won Lee
Youngju Pak
Michael Diamond
Michael Hosokawa
Jane McElroy
Margie Sable

2:30 pm  Meeting with Alumni, External Advisory Council, Preceptors and Employers
Sarah Patrick
Linda Cooperstock
Ryan Krull
Jenny Dills
Hailey Hartman
Nancie McAnahugh
Mary Hoskins
Drew Pratt
Bert Malone
Dana Hughes
Glenda Miller
Nicholas Butler
Ioana Staiculescu

3:45 pm  Resource Files Review

5:00 pm  Adjourn to Executive Session and Dinner

Tuesday, March 9, 2010

8:30 am  Meeting with University Officials
Ken Dean, Deputy Provost
George Justice, Dean, Graduate School
Tim Rooney, MU Budget Director

9:15 am  Meeting with MPH Program Board of Directors
John Dodam, Chair, Department of Veterinary Medicine and Surgery
Stephen Jorgensen, Dean, College of Human Environmental Sciences
George Justice, Dean, Graduate School
Judith Miller, Dean, School of Nursing
Richard Oliver, Dean, School of Health Professions
Grant Savage, Chair Department of Health Management and Informatics

11:00 am  Executive Session/Lunch

1:30 pm  Exit Interview