**Joint MPH/BSPH Program Committee**

**Minutes: 5/8/2019**

**GRH 2006; 9:30 – 11:30 p.m.**

Present: Gardner, Ding, Rust, Eagle, Farrell, Macy, Watkins, Lartey, Kim

Meeting called to order by Gardner

Eagle/Ding motion to approve April minutes. Unanimously approved.

Gardner gave MPH report. Stating that there is a trend of students switching from the MPH program to other programs due to OPT, Gardner suggested that there be a mechanism or policy so that we are not “cannibalizing” one another’s students. Gardner shared that this could impact CEPH accreditation, as it affects our graduation rates. In an effort to combat this trend, a focus this summer will be finding out what it will take to get the MPH program classified as a STEM program.

Gardner also pointed out that evaluations from EMHA students in the online required core MPH courses are lower than MPH students. We are able to track that since we have separate, but cross-listed, sections. It was suggested that this may be because the EMHA students don’t see the relevancy of the MP courses to their program of study. However, having separate sections to be used by other programs wouldn’t be an adequate solution as the sections would need to have the same objectives, criteria, etc. in the case that a student takes the course and then switches to the MPH program. The core courses must be standard for all of our students, so we can’t take the chance that students would switch and not get the core material or competency assessments. Further, Farrell stated that the process for getting new courses is becoming increasingly stringent, as they do not want to have multiple classes that teach the same things. Macy seconded this statement, citing CAPE issues.

The group then looked at the CEPH Compliance Survey Summary, linked in the agenda, that shows competency attainment for all accredited MPH programs, and to point out how far CEPH reviewer drill down. Gardner emphasized that we need to be efficient through the university’s criteria, while meeting accreditation requirements. She also expressed concern about being very thorough in the case that CEPH looks extra close at our next self-study (as our last was not the best).

Gardner emphasized that the course-level competency assessments must be the same within the same core courses. Lartey stated that faculty have the responsibility to align syllabi, assessments, and competencies when teaching a course with other faculty (where the two+ faculty are teaching different sections). Gardner emphasized that having differing approaches is fine but that common core objectives and assessments are necessary. (An example of Gardner and Ding teaching Epidemiology was brought up as they use the same materials to teach different sections.) The communication and alignment necessary becomes challenging with other programs’ faculty and adjuncts are teaching core courses. For this reason, Gardner stated it is in our and students’ best interests in keeping things as simple as possible with staffing, especially with core courses.

Gardner continued with the MPH report, bringing up workload equity and looking critically at our courses. Our *curriculum* was revised for accreditation purposes, but many of our courses have not been. Gardner asked if there were electives that could be combined or if there were skills, especially those that stakeholders bring up, that are missing in our course objectives. These skills include some motivational interviewing (Macy), SAS, and Access (Farrell and Rust). Gardner posed this challenge: think about ways in which we can create more efficient courses to support our curriculum/competencies as well as the skills that stakeholders are identifying. Further, in conversations with stakeholders, ask them what skills or trends they see that students need to learn, and record their suggestions to later share. We can use these casual conversations to demonstrate compliance with accreditation criteria.

Lartey gave the BSPH report. An opportunity has been identified within the undergraduate program: it is a challenge to link students from their academic world to their career fields, in part because they do not interview well. This semester, Lartey built interviewing practice into her course(s). She utilized career services for this. Now, she, along with other department faculty/staff are planning a fall Undergraduate Advancement Seminar that will motivate students and teach them valuable skills for their life after undergraduate studies. This may include showing graduate opportunities and what graduate school looks like, a motivational speaker, and a few graduate students to speak about their experiences. Currently, they are planning a 2 hour program on a Friday. The planning will take place more this summer, but they need one more person from our program to have a full committee. Eagle volunteered.

Gardner suggested talking to Lucy Juett, as AHEC does work with interview prep, and reaching out the communications programs. Lartey said Juett may help in getting speakers, and Catherine Malin is an option for a speaker as she knows the campus and program well. Macy suggested Holly Paine in the communications programs as a connection.

Lartey also brought up that non-BSPH students in her PH381 class have commented that it is the only class they have had to present in all school year. This could also be an opportunity to look into and share with other programs.

For Advisory and Community Advisory updates, Watkins handed out a printed version of her, Eagle, and Lartey’s work on the policy and procedures for the committees. Gardner requested electronic form as well; Watkins will email out once changes are made. Watkins, Eagle, and Lartey have identified potential names for the core advisory committee. Gardner asked that the names wait until there is a formal policy written out about who makes up the core advisory committee, concerned about what the group would look like after members changed. Some ideas that were discussed include someone from each of the following groups: alumni, state-level health department, local health departments (especially those with whom we partner), community organizations, etc. By stating where we want the people to come from, we can keep the group diverse as far as what agencies they come from. Further, Gardner brought up the diversity initiative that includes ability status, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, etc., and reiterated that we want the core advisory committee to reflect the population of Kentucky. Farrell added in that “underserved populations” in the diversity goals also includes rural populations. Farrell recommended that someone from the Kentucky Rural Health Association (current director Tina McCormick) be included in the core advisory committee. Gardner also recommended Todd Cheever and Jason Cummins. Gardner also stressed that the community advisory committee will not be looking at curriculum; they will be focusing on networking and informing us on emerging trends/needed skills. That group could also include students and other GrAPE partners. The core advisory committee would be informing curriculum more directly. The policy and procedures should include exactly what both committees will be looking at. Eagle, along with Watkins and Lartey, will revise the document and send it out once it reflects these changes.

Gardner thanked Watkins and Macy for already turning in their Faculty Annual Report. Other faculty should turn theirs into Gardner via email as soon as possible. To see what each question on the report is aligned to within CEPH accreditation, see the shared drive. (S:\DEPT-SHARED-CHHS-PH\MPH - BSPH Master Folder\Assessment\Current Assessment Tools & Codebook)

Rust pulled up the Excel document and summary course attachment from the agenda. Gardner began discussing these documents and what they mean. Watkins asked why Gary English isn’t in the MPH/BSPH monthly meetings. Gardner explained that, according to CEPH criterion, English is considered supporting faculty; however, meetings are open so he and others are welcome to attend.

Gardner stated that the goal of looking at the Excel document and summary course attachment is to work it out so that everyone can teach what they like to teach and are qualified to teach while also considering workload equity and student success. Gardner said she is trying to be transparent in how we are staffing courses. Ultimately, though, we will have to fill the courses, with the first priority being core courses. In regards to hiring another instructor, Gardner stated that the budget is available for it, but other conversations are still taking place to make sure it is the best move for the department.

Lartey brought up that some conversations are taking place, based on last meeting, about courses in the books that have not been taught in a few semesters. Gardner asked if we should focus on the undergraduate program, as it does not have to be modeled after the MPH program and isn’t tied to the five core model. One concern Gardner brought up is that none of the BSPH courses have the words “public health” in the course name. Lartey argued that while she isn’t against it, changing the course name would not change the course or curriculum. Gardner asked if, on the work day, we want to focus on this program solely or if we want to split the work day between the two programs. Lartey commented that splitting the work day would make more sense. Gardner asked for everyone to look critically over both programs over the summer so that the work day would be successful.

Gardner stressed the move to work less as program silos, and that everyone should be involved in both programs. It was brought up that some faculty do not know the undergraduate program enough to support it as they should, and others may feel the same about the graduate program. Farrell asked that all faculty be kept in the loop, even if it does not directly pertain to them. Gardner stated the focus has historically been on the MPH program because CEPH used to only accredit graduate programs. It has probably continued to be so because accreditation requirements are more stringent for MPH.

It was decided that we will look critically at the programs on our summer work day; Gardner asked that everyone come to the work day with ideas on how we can restructure to make both programs more efficient and well-rounded. According to our accreditors, we have met the competencies requirements, but there is always room to improve. Macy asked if the suggestion of the group is to hold off on developing materials for the spring if courses could be changing or restructured. Watkins stressed that she would not develop her material for PH580 over the summer if it was going to significantly change. She emphasized a worry that it would be a waste of time to develop materials if the course would be re-developed soon.

The group looked at the meeting schedule for the next academic year. The meetings are currently scheduled the second Wednesday of the month. The one in April may be adjusted due to KPHA activities and conference. Lartey suggested that the last meetings of the semester be tentative because of finals week and busy schedules. Gardner said that we could easily cancel those meetings instead of marking them as tentative.

Gardner asked if we should look at restructuring PHUGAS. According to student surveys, students don’t feel as if they have time to be involved. Macy stated that this same issue has been brought up with KPHA students.

Gardner reminded the group that the hooding and awards ceremony will take place Saturday, May 11 at 1pm.

Gardner asked for volunteers to be second readers for summer ILEs. Farrell and Ding volunteered.

Farrell thanked everyone for replying to his email.

Motion to adjourn made by Eagle. Seconded by Ding. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned.