REVIEW FOR ACCREDITATION

OF THE

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

AT

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC HEALTH

SITE VISIT DATES:
February 17-19, 2014

SITE VISIT TEAM:
J. Jackson Barnette, MA, PhD, Chair
Mary Helen Smith, MPH, CPH, RS, REHS
Phillip L. Williams, PhD

SITE VISIT COORDINATOR:
Mollie Mulvanity, MPH

Table of Contents

Introduction

This report presents the findings of the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) regarding the San Diego State University (SDSU) Graduate School of Public Health (GSPH). The report assesses the school's compliance with the *Accreditation Criteria for Schools of Public Health, amended June 2011.* This accreditation review included the conduct of a self-study process by school constituents, the preparation of a document describing the school and its features in relation to the criteria for accreditation, and a visit in February 2014 by a team of external peer reviewers. During the visit, the team had an opportunity to interview school and university officials, administrators, teaching faculty, students, alumni and community representatives and to verify information in the self-study document by reviewing materials provided in a resource file. The team was afforded full cooperation in its efforts to assess the school and verify the self-study document.

SDSU is a state university that enrolls over 33,000 students, approximately 5,000 of whom are graduate students and employs approximately 5,500 faculty and staff. The university is a unit of the 23-campus California State University (CSU) System. SDSU is designated as a Hispanic-serving institution.

The university includes eight colleges, addressing engineering, education, business administration, arts and letters, sciences, professional studies and fine arts, extended studies and health and human services. The GSPH is located in the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS), which also houses four other schools: School of Exercise and Nutritional Science; School of Speech, Language and Hearing; School of Nursing; and School of Social Work. A director leads the GSPH, and the director reports to the CHHS dean. The GSPH is divided into four divisions: epidemiology and biometry, environmental health, health promotion and behavioral science and health management and policy. A faculty member serves as the director of each division. The school also houses a number of interdisciplinary centers that focus on research and service.

The GSPH has been accredited by CEPH since 1982. The most recent review occurred in 2007, and the Council awarded a seven year term of accreditation, with required interim reporting over the next two years on ten issues. The Council accepted the school's interim reports in 2008 and 2009. Annual interim reports have been required since 2009, relating to the school's establishment of a third doctoral program and to issues related to the school's annual reports. As of 2013, all interim reports had been accepted as evidence of successful resolution of the identified issues.

Characteristics of a School of Public Health

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These characteristics are generally evident in SDSU's GSPH. The school is located in a regionally-accredited university. The school has the same rights and privileges as other professional schools, but it shares comparable organizational status with other health professions disciplines, rather than other professional schools such as engineering and education. The school is housed in the College of Health and Human Services, along with four other health sciences disciplines. The university does not have a school of medicine.

The school's faculty are trained in a variety of disciplines, and the relatively small faculty size and collaborative culture ensure that the environment supports interdisciplinary communication. The school's degree programs are organized with an ecological perspective, and the many connections with public health practitioners and local community member ensure that the school fosters the development of professional public health concepts and values. The school has clearly defined a mission, goals and objectives that establish a focused public health mission.

The school has adequate resources to offer the MPH degree in the five core areas of public health knowledge and doctoral degrees in three areas. The university is legislatively barred from offering PhD degrees, so the doctoral degrees are offered through a partnership with the University of California, San Diego.

The school has invested effort into establishing evaluation and planning systems, and, despite relatively limited administrative staff support, the school maintains data to track its progress in achieving its objectives.

1.0 THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

1.1 Mission.

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

This criterion is met. The program's mission and vision are as follows: The mission of the GSPH is to improve population health and well-being by building a diverse public health workforce to meet the needs of current and future communities. Through the provision of high-quality education, research and service, our graduates will emerge equipped with the knowledge and skills necessary to solve complex public health problems and assume positions of leadership in a wide variety of settings. Our vision is for the GSPH to become the premier academic resource for public health education, research, and evidence-based practice.

In fulfilling its mission, the GSPH is committed to the following core values:
- Excellence in teaching, research, and service;
- Discovery of new knowledge;
- Diversity in students, faculty, and staff;
- Professional and personal integrity;
- Advancement of social justice for all;
- Evidence-based practice; and
- Preparation of a public health workforce that share these values.

The self-study presents goals and objectives that relate to instruction, research and service and lists measures for the objectives. Most of these are in the form of quantitative indicators with specific targeted values, though some lacked this level of specificity.

Site visitors noted that there were no goals or objectives that directly related to the unique aspects of the school, based on its location and populations. SDSU is uniquely positioned to work with Hispanic populations in Southern California and with populations across the border in Mexico. However, on-site discussions indicated that the school's commitment to the local service area permeates almost all of the school's programs and activities. School stakeholders have not found it necessary to amend the guiding statements, since the regional commitment is already so deeply embedded in all of the school's activities.

Faculty reviewed the 2006 mission, goals and objectives at the fall 2011 annual faculty retreat. The goal of this review was to ensure that the GSPH was appropriately positioned as a hub of public health training, research and practice in San Diego and the greater Southern California border region. Faculty members used the retreat's division breakout sessions to develop detailed comments and suggestions for revision. Next, school leaders appointed an ad hoc Committee for Mission, Goals, Vision, and Values in January 2012. The charge to this committee was to review the comments from the fall 2011 retreat; suggest changes; develop a draft of each and a new value statement; and present those changes to the entire faculty at the first spring faculty meeting. The committee consisted of one faculty member from each division plus the associate director for academic affairs. The director worked to ensure that the mission, goals, objectives, values and vision were consistent with the university's strategic plan. Faculty members engaged in open discussion during the spring meeting and also had the opportunity to provide specific comments after the group discussion. The committee made additional revisions to the draft, based on these processes, and then sent a final draft to all faculty members via email for a final vote of approval. The new mission, vision, and value statements were accepted unanimously at the May 2012 faculty meeting.

The mission, vision, value statement, goals, and instructional objectives are posted on the GSPH website for all students, faculty, administrators, prospective students, preceptors and employers to see. The mission, goals and objectives are also presented to the Advisory Board for comment whenever changes to them are proposed. The current draft was reviewed by the Advisory Board in fall 2012. The mission, goals and objectives are to be reviewed as needed, or on a three to five year schedule.

1.2 Evaluation and Planning.

The school shall have an explicit process for monitoring and evaluating its overall efforts against its mission, goals and objectives; for assessing the school's effectiveness in serving its various constituencies; and for using evaluation results in ongoing planning and decision making to achieve its mission. As part of the evaluation process, the school must conduct an analytical self-study that analyzes performance against the accreditation criteria.

This criterion is met. The GSPH identifies an extensive evaluation system used to ensure strong and effective educational courses, training and field experiences, research opportunities and community service. The process is continuous and includes faculty, staff, students and community members. The evaluation plan appropriately identifies a responsible party for each system and a schedule that includes at least annual review of all data. Evaluation efforts include the following:

- 23 general components and systems combining a variety of evaluation processes and/or databases to monitor overall effectiveness;
- two systems used to evaluate faculty coursework and tenure status;
- five systems that evaluate student applications, status, field placement, culminating experiences, and activity, service, and performance;

- one system to monitor preceptor performance;
- four systems that combine evaluation measures and databases to monitor the curriculum; and
- five systems to measure research efforts.

The school maintains and monitors multiple qualitative and quantitative systems to effectively determine if it is attaining targeted outcome measures for each goal and objective. For example, the school tracks student results on the Certified in Public Health (CPH) examination. Responsible faculty and staff de-identify and consolidate student exit survey results, compiling data at the school level and by division. Student faculty evaluations provide Likert-based quantitative analyses of learning objectives. Employer surveys and focus groups provide qualitative evaluation of student preparation. Faculty activity reports contain data used to track mentoring, research and service. Program of study reports track students' progress toward graduation. The field placement database provides a seamless online ability for preceptors to provide qualitative and quantitative feedback on student performance.

The GSPH involves the divisions and faculty extensively in the implementation of the evaluation tools and databases for planning including participation in instructional goal revisions, curriculum changes and development of curricular "road maps." In the past three years, the school has conducted a total of two focus groups and three employer surveys. The divisions conduct their own surveys/focus groups and submit reports to the school wide Performance and Evaluation Committee. The GSPH director reviews summaries of all of the results and discusses findings at individual division meetings or at the annual retreat.

In January 2012, the director convened an ad hoc committee to develop and review materials for the self-study. The initial process included revisions to the GSPH's mission, vision and goals, and the development of a statement of core values, as described in Criterion 1.1. In the fall of 2012, during the annual retreat, each division made changes to its instructional objectives (which correspond to CEPH's required concentration-specific competencies), aligned the course learning objectives with instructional objectives and updated the "road maps" that guide student degree progress. The ad hoc committee identified the need for continuous monitoring of student progress and degree completion and created two systems for those purposes: the current student database and the student portfolio.

The self-study was a collaborative effort, which involved a variety of school constituents including the director, associate directors, coordinators, division heads and staff members. The provost and dean of the CHHS were supportive and helpful with constructive comments. During the site visit, reviewers did not find evidence that a wide range of community and alumni stakeholders participated in the self-study. However, the GSPH Advisory Board, comprised of community partners, alumni and employers met in 2013 and provided feedback that was subsequently incorporated into the self-study. A retired dean of an accredited school of public health reviewed the study for completeness, level of analysis and readability. The Student Council participated in creating the resource file and writing information about student events

and activities, and school leaders asked the Student Council president to share the self-study document with students.

The GSPH self-study described a comprehensive system of evaluation and data bases used to analyze the school's current outcome measures. The participants appropriately acknowledged the organization's strengths and identified the need for additional funding to support the extensive data collection and monitoring components. Future plans include creative ways to monitor and link data systems to reduce duplicate work.

1.3 Institutional Environment.

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

This criterion is met with commentary. SDSU is a state university that enrolls over 32,000 students. The university is a unit of the 23-campus California State University System. SDSU is accredited by the Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. SDSU is also approved to train veterans under the G.I. Bill. In addition, SDSU has programmatic accreditation through a variety of specialized and professional accrediting agencies.

The president oversees the entire university. Eight colleges, including the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) are located under Academic Affairs, reporting to the provost. The GSPH is located in the CHHS. The CHHS, headed by a dean, includes five schools: GSPH; School of Exercise and Nutritional Science; School of Speech, Language and Hearing; School of Nursing; and School of Social Work.

The five schools that make up the CHHS are each headed by a "director," who reports to the dean of the CHHS. The dean in turn reports to the provost. Directors have access to the provost through appointments, provost office hours and regularly scheduled meetings with all the directors on campus. The school directors, like the deans, have access to the president's office as well, when appropriate. When collaborating with another college, the directors deal directly with other deans or directors. The budget and approval of all aspects of GSPH'S operations (curricula, faculty hiring, promotion and tenure, etc.) go through the dean of CHHS. CHHS also provides centralized administrative support for many student and faculty services. For example, CHHS maintains an information technology group to support computer hardware and software issues for all of the CHHS schools and provides grant budget support to CHHS faculty. These are functions that would, otherwise, be vested in and funded by the GSPH. The indirect cost return generated by the GSPH faculty is returned to CHHS. The decision on the amount of these funds are given to the GSPH is made by the CHHS dean. The general consensus is that the CHHS dean has been fair in distributing these funds.

The GSPH has the same autonomy as some other professional schools at SDSU, eg, nursing, and it has the same autonomy as other CHHS schools. However, it does not have the same independence as all standalone schools at SDSU, eg, engineering, education, business. All of these schools are headed by deans who report directly to the provost. SDSU does not house a school of medicine.

The commentary relates to the school's organization and level of autonomy, which limits GSPH control of some areas such as the return of indirect funds and inserts additional levels of required approval for curricula, faculty promotion and tenure, etc. This organizational arrangement does not prevent the GSPH from performing its basic duties and fulfilling its defined mission.

1.4 Organization and Administration.

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

This criterion is met. Roles of administrators in both the CHHS and the GSPH are well defined and appear to be effective in supporting the GSPH's activities. The GSPH director is supported by four associate directors with responsibility for the following areas: academic affairs, public health practice, student affairs and global and border health. All GSPH faculty are appointed to one of four divisions: epidemiology and biometry, health promotion and behavioral science, health management and policy and environmental health. A division head leads each of these units, and divisions serve as a primary venue for curricular development and evaluation. The GSPH also has faculty members who serve in the following leadership roles: graduate advisor, undergraduate program director and coordinator of each of the three doctoral programs. Finally, the GSPH houses six interdisciplinary centers that focus primarily on research and/or service. A GSPH faculty member leads each center. Because of the GSPH faculty's small size, a number of faculty members assume multiple leadership roles.

The school benefits from a regular schedule of meetings that bring together faculty across disciplines, and this structure facilitates interdisciplinary collaboration and communication. There is a GSPH Cabinet that consists of all division heads, doctoral program coordinators and associate directors. Cabinet meetings provide a format for discussion of issues that cross disciplines, to work out policies for scheduling and course sequencing and to coordinate any other activities that are cross-disciplinary. Because of these informal faculty interactions, faculty have developed projects that cross disciplines, such as measuring air quality as part of an ongoing epidemiological health study in Mexico. Also, the full CHHS faculty meets twice a semester. GSPH faculty know their college colleagues and their activities. This has facilitated coordination of research projects with nursing faculty, and it has potential for increased interdisciplinary collaboration. The school's centers provide additional structure to support interdisciplinary work, since nearly all centers draw on faculty from different divisions, and most involve

significant collaboration with external stakeholders, including SDSU colleagues outside of the school, as well as community members and public health practitioners.

1.5 Governance.

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

This criterion is met. The school has four standing committees, which handle the school's ongoing operations: Personnel, Curriculum, Performance and Evaluation and Student Affairs and Alumni. The school also has recently convened ad hoc committees to address specific issues: Core Courses, Undergraduate, Computers/Distance Learning, Lab Resources and Global Health.

The Personnel Committee includes three tenured faculty elected by the faculty as a whole, and one staff member supports the committee. This committee makes tenure and promotion recommendations for tenure-track faculty, which are forwarded to the CHHS Personnel Committee and the director. This committee also maintains guidelines and procedures for appointment of adjunct faculty.

The Curriculum Committee advises the director about curricular proposals and recommendations from the GSPH divisions. It includes one faculty member from each division, appointed by the director and one appointed student member, as well as a staff member. Proposals for curricular changes must subsequently be approved by the CHHS and SDSU curriculum committees.

The Performance and Evaluation Committee organizes the school's evaluation efforts. This committee plans for data collection, reviews data and makes recommendations to the director based on results. The committee includes director-appointed members from each of the divisions. The committee also includes one student and two staff members.

The Student Affairs and Alumni Committee makes decisions on student scholarships and awards. It also works with the admissions coordinator by monitoring recruitment and admissions policies and reviewing summary data from these processes. Finally, this committee is responsible for developing policies for monitoring student progress toward graduation. The committee includes one appointed member from each division, two staff members and one student member.

Though all of these committees are defined in the school's bylaws and are consistently populated with members, most of the school's substantive work is accomplished in regular meetings of the full faculty, faculty retreats and meetings of the Cabinet, which consists of the director, associate directors, division heads and director of the Institute of Public Health (IPH). Site visitors reviewed minutes from these

meetings and verified the range and depth of discussion of substantive curricular and administrative topics.

The ad hoc committees have typically focused on specific curricular and policy issues. For example, the Core Course Committee has worked to ensure course alignment with competencies, and the Global Health Committee has worked to ensure a global health perspective throughout the curriculum, including in internship experiences. The Undergraduate Committee has focused on academic policy issues, including ensuring appropriate limits on undergraduate admissions to keep pace with available resources, in concert with university policy. Most committees include appointed members from each department, as well as student and staff participation. The Laboratory Committee included faculty from environmental health only, since this is the area to which the issues were most relevant.

The full faculty votes on all changes to school policies, and school policies must align with the university's collective bargaining agreement (CBA). The Performance and Evaluation Committee leads the school's planning and evaluation efforts, though the director, associate director, Cabinet and, ultimately, the full faculty are involved in reviewing significant data and recommending revisions to policies or practices when warranted.

The director, rather than any specific committee, is responsible for allocating the school's budget, which is provided to the school by the CHHS dean, but the director maintains an "open-book" policy regarding the budget, so it is open to review at all times.

Some school faculty participate on CHHS and SDSU-level committees. All such committees are populated by elections at the CHHS or university level, in which all college or university faculty vote. The school does not have representatives on all CHHS committees, since most CHHS committees have three members, and there are five schools (including the GSPH) in CHHS. School faculty serve on the CHHS Personnel and Research and Scholarly Activity Committees. Two school faculty members serve on the university-wide Institutional Review Board and Environment and Safety Committee. One school faculty member serves on the university's Faculty Senate.

The Advisory Committee includes alumni and employers from government agencies, non-profit agencies and private-sector companies, including area biotechnology companies. This committee meets annually and has provided detailed and rich feedback to the director. The school has also built in time for Advisory Committee members to mingle with faculty during their meetings, and this has fostered several new efforts to collaborate on research or other projects.

Students serve as members on most of the school committees and have voting rights when they serve. The school also has a Student Council, the GPHS-SC. This group includes a board of directors with four officers, a representative from each of the five MPH concentration areas and a doctoral student representative. The council has recently implemented a mentorship program that allows first-year students to serve in leadership roles alongside more advanced students. The council has been very active, sponsoring several charity and fundraising events, and the events have been popular and well attended. The council has also raised money to sponsor student attendance at the California Public Health Association meeting in San Francisco, and two students participated in a leadership institute at that meeting. The group has planned a spring 2014 event that will bring alumni and employers to campus to allow networking opportunities for current students.

Site visitors learned from undergraduate students that there is a Students for Public Health Club aimed at students in the bachelor's degree programs. They have plans to work more closely with the Student Council in the future. Former members indicated that they had instituted a "points" system in which students track the number of community and public service events they participate in, and those with sufficient points receive a certificate or a special cord to wear with their graduation cap and gown.

Finally, there is an Alumni Association that seeks to network graduating public health professionals, provide opportunities for current students and alumni to expand their public health opportunities and assist with fundraising, as appropriate. MPH faculty were very positive and thankful about the role alumni played in providing field placement sites and employment opportunities.

1.6 Fiscal Resources.

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

This criterion is met with commentary. The GSPH receives funds from a variety of sources including tuition and fees, direct state appropriations, university funds, grants/contracts, indirect cost recovery and gifts and endowments. Table 1 presents the school's budget. Since the last accreditation cycle, the national economic downturn resulted in a reduction in state appropriations and university funds, but this situation has improved in the last two years. The reduction in state support resulted in the GSPH having to make several difficult choices, including the elimination of academic programs. Also, faculty have been very successful in securing external contracts and grants, and, despite an increasingly challenging funding environment, this amount has trended upward. The school's increase in extramural funding has resulted in the nearly doubling of indirect cost recovery funds from 2006-2007 to 2012-2013.

The self-study defines two targeted outcome measures in the area of financial resources and currently does not meet either one. The first target aims for a return to the 2008-2009 level of state funding

(including funding for two new faculty positions), and the second target aims for a return to the 2008-2009 level of student support. While the school's state funding has been increasing and is currently at 90% of the 2008-2009 level, student support remains very low, at 37% of the 2008-2009 level.

Site visitors' on-site discussions and analysis of documents seems to indicate that state funding is currently stable, and contract/grant activity is strong. Although the program has not met its self-defined outcomes to return to pre-recession funding in several areas, current resources appear minimally adequate to support for the school's basic functions.

The commentary relates to the need for continuing attention to increase financial resources. Though trends are positive and school faculty and leaders were optimistic about the potential for improvement, faculty and leaders' discussions with site visitors also indicated that the school needs additional funding for students, additional faculty and additional staff to sustain existing programs and to build for the future. As the economy improves and state funding increases, the school must continue to expend effort to reinstate lost funding. The GSPH appears to currently accomplish a great deal with limited resources. Although minimum resources are available, school leaders must continue to be attentive to sustainability.

Table 1. Sources of Funds and Expenditures by Major Category, 2007 to 2013

	Year1 06/07	Year 2 07/08	Year 3 08/09	Year 4 09/10	Year 5 10/11	Year 6 11/12	Year 7 12/13
Source of Funds							
Tuition & Fees	$1,234,272	$1,428,480	$1,535,280	$1,455,720	$1,177,560	$1,211,400	$1,271,760
State Appropriation	$2,886,077	$2,965,803	$3,385,909	$3,042,702	$3,278,742	$3,172,223	$3,034,752
University Funds	$296,623	$112,085	$375,000	$460,000	$482,910	$104,210	$245,200
Grants/Contracts	$10,476,747	$15,334,749	$16,468,607	$12,633,925	$23,242,940	$18,460,471	$16,267,727
Indirect Cost Recovery	$489,081	$579,505	$627,809	$742,934	$740,215	$930,297	$873,524
Endowment	$23,863	$4,095	$14,675	$23,091	$21,035	$25,516	$24,519
Gifts	$151,203	$660,133	$29,674	$66,253	$13,500	$16,375	$6,925
Total	$15,557,866	$21,084,850	$22,436,954	$18,424,625	$28,956,902	$23,920,492	$21,724,407
Expenditures							
Faculty Salaries & Benefits	$3,334,586	$3,523,517	$4,000,547	$3,682,829	$3,615,803	$3,514,832	$3,444,765
Staff Salaries & Benefits	$442,357	$485,967	$489,909	$487,585	$441,514	$434,071	$435,574
Operations	$639,913	$457,163	$825,406	$947,742	$1,001,408	$796,047	$899,838
Travel	$7,842	$12,187	$11,045	$11,948	$21,372	$15,478	$25,292
Student Support	$218,560	$272,545	$242,813	$119,993	$138,667	$136,406	$101,872
PI Supplement	$279,756	$346,412	$367,338	$467,681	$467,661	$536,191	$528,599
Total	$4,923,014	$5,097,791	$5,937,058	$5,717,778	$5,686,425	$5,433,025	$5,435,940

1.7 Faculty and Other Resources.

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

This criterion is met with commentary. The GSPH has maintained 29-31 faculty members over the past three years, despite a challenging economic period for the State of California in general and the CSU system in particular. Currently, the school is recruiting three new faculty lines, one in each of the following disciplines: global health, health policy and health promotion. Also, the school plans to request additional faculty in the next recruiting cycle.

The complement of core faculty meets the minimum requirements needed to sustain the curricular requirements for each core area for the MPH as well as for the three areas offering doctoral degrees (epidemiology, health behavior and global health). 2013 faculty totals, by core area, are as follow: six in epidemiology, three in biometry, five in environmental health, five in health management and policy and 11 in health promotion and behavioral science. Student-faculty ratios (SFR) by primary faculty vary considerably by area, ranging from 1.4 in biometry to 18.7 in epidemiology. With non-primary faculty included, all areas have an SFR of nine or lower. In order to grow doctoral programs even slightly, faculty indicate that they would require additional faculty within each area, as well as additional assistantship funds, as discussed in Criterion 1.6.

Some core faculty also support the school's large undergraduate program. The range of duties performed by the dedicated undergraduate faculty is impressive. One faculty member (the undergraduate director), supported by graduate assistants, provides academic advisement and field placement for an enrollment of approximately 400 students, while also teaching undergraduate courses. Site visitors' initial concerns about the viability of this arrangement were consistently addressed by faculty, students and alumni, all of whom described outstanding support and academic advising, as well as regular access to the undergraduate advisor.

The school currently has four full-time staff who provide administrative support to all school administrators and faculty. During the financial crisis, two of the school's six staff support members left their positions. The school is currently recruiting a laboratory support staff member to replace one of the two lost positions, and the other previous administrative position has not been replaced. In addition to school-based staff, the CHHS provides staffing for functions such as information technology. The GSPH staff appears to be dedicated and capable, but the school operates with a low number of staff FTE.

The university provides all needed classroom space. The GSPH has 2,612 square feet of public health environmental laboratory space that the self-study indicates is well-equipped. Research space is provided by the SDSU Research Foundation and is located off campus. The GSPH pays for the maintenance of

research space from indirect cost recovery funds. All faculty and staff have office space and individual computers.

The commentary relates to the need for additional computer support. Although computer services are provided in the SDSU library, students who met with site visitors expressed a strong desire for better access to computers within the school. Students reported that computers in GSPH were not available after 4:00 pm, that access to a printer has been limited; that school-based computers were not always maintained or updated; that computers did not always have the needed statistical software (eg, SAS, SPSS); and, as a result, few functional computers are available, other than the centralized campus laboratory, which, while large and well-maintained, is shared with all SDSU undergraduate and graduate students. The issue described to site visitors was a wish for better public health-specific computer space that could serve as a meeting and networking location as well as fulfilling computing needs.

The university library is large, with over two million monographs and bound periodicals and over four million microforms. The facility is open 24-hours per day and has over 700 computers with internet access. Although this space is available, the students would prefer to use computers within GSPH.

The GSPH has identified three outcomes to measure the adequacy of resources. The first aims to achieve an SFR of eight or lower for epidemiology; the SFR currently stands at 9.2. The other two measures relate to on-campus faculty and office space. The school has achieved one of the two measures but has made little progress over the last two years to meeting the other.

1.8 Diversity.

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

This criterion is met. The school's mission and core values support diversity. The mission explicitly prioritizes "building a diverse public health workforce," and values include diversity in students, faculty, and staff; and advancement of social justice for all.

The GSPH identifies its diversity targets in terms of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, American Indian race and female gender, based on the general population of San Diego County. The school prioritizes Hispanic populations due to the school's close proximity to the Mexican border and the school's emphasis on border health research. The Native American focus stems from the desire to develop future Native American researchers and increase interest in public heath careers through the school's Native American Research Center. Finally, the school targets female gender due to the drive for increased female representation in graduate and professional degree programs and the need to prepare women for future leadership roles in academia and practice. Table 2 provides summary data for targeted areas.

Table 2. Diversity Data				
Category	Target*	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Female graduate students	>50%	76.5%	75.7%	74%
Female undergraduate students	>50%	82%	82%	81%
Female faculty	>50%	53%	55%	63%
Hispanic/Latino graduate students	>30%	18.3%	19.4%	20.2%
Hispanic/Latino undergraduate students	>30%	25%	26%	29%
Hispanic/Latino faculty	>30%	18%	18%	23%
Hispanic/Latino staff	>30%	25%	25%	25%
Native American graduate students	>1%	0.3%	1%	0.6%

*Targets set based on SANDAG's 2010 American Community Survey distribution in San Diego County

San Diego County demographics provide the basis for target levels of females (50%) and Hispanics (30%). In 2012-2013, females comprised 63% of the staff, 81% of the undergraduate enrollment, and 74% of the graduate enrollment, exceeding the local population's gender distribution. Progress in achieving the ethnicity target (Hispanic/Latino) has continued as the school focuses on recruitment and retention efforts.

The GSPH subscribes to SDSU's policies concerning diversity, cultural competency and creation of a climate free of harassment and discrimination. The university provides extensive resources to enhance cultural awareness including websites, online resources, workshops and committees, specifically, the Committee on Diversity Equity and Outreach. The university's Division of Student Affairs and Office of Intercultural Relations/Cross-Cultural Center also provide programming that aims to foster cultural diversity and understanding. Finally, the school is guided by three critical areas listed in the university's Strategic Plan for Diversity: to increase the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students, to increase the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty and staff and to build cultural competence in all students.

The university's plan further specifies a goal to increase the recruitment and retention of African-American students, particularly males. Site visitors discussed this university priority with school leaders, since the school's diversity plan does not explicitly align with this aspect of university-wide efforts. Discussion indicated that the school made a reasonable, conscious decision to prioritize other populations at present due to limited resources and opportunities, focusing instead on areas in which the school has substantial existing research and community partnerships at present.

In the future, when hiring is possible, the GSPH intends to follow the university's Office of Diversity Equity guidelines regarding recruitment and hiring of staff. The Office of Employee Relations is an integral part of the process and ensures that all candidates are properly vetted. The school identifies two outcome measures to evaluate the GSPH's compliance with the university's policy as it pertains to faculty: adherence to the Office of Diversity Equity recommendations pertaining to faculty searches and a quantifiable increase in diverse faculty.

The self-study and on-site discussions identified numerous curricular, service and research efforts that foster cultural competency, particularly in terms of the school's identified targets. Work with diverse populations appears to be woven into nearly all of the school's activities and curricula. One specific example of curricular recognition of diversity is the school's partnership with the university's Latin American Studies program. Based on division faculty members' perceptions of need and interest, the school created a joint degree program with the MPH, a program that requires extensive language proficiency and fieldwork with Latin American populations.

2.0 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS.

2.1 Degree Offerings.

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

This criterion is met. Table 3 presents the school's degree offerings. The school offers the MPH in each of the five core public health knowledge areas and offers doctoral degrees in three areas of concentration, as required. The school offers joint degree options that allow students to complete an MA in Latin American Studies or an MSW in Social Work alongside the MPH. Each MPH concentration defines an appropriate scope of coursework for the discipline.

The MPH in Global Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Management was discontinued in 2010, based on the school's strategic decision to focus its resources on the required degrees in core disciplines in a time of constrained resources. Faculty members who met with site visitors noted that enrollment in this concentration was limited, and all enrolled students have now graduated. Faculty emphasized the fact that the school continues to offer elective coursework and practice experiences in this area of practice, which they cite as important.

The school has also discontinued its MS in Toxicology. This degree program stopped accepting students in 2011, and only two students remain in the program. Based on the data provided in the self-study, these students will reach the maximum allowable time to graduation in 2016.

Table 3. Instructional Matrix		
	Academic	Professional
Bachelor's Degrees		
Health Sciences/Public Health	BS	
Master's Degrees		
Biometry		MPH
Epidemiology		MPH
Environmental Health Sciences		MPH
Toxicology*	MS	
Health Promotion and Behavioral Science		MPH
Health Management and Policy		MPH
Global Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Relief*		MPH
Doctoral Degrees		
Epidemiology	PhD	
Health Promotion and Behavioral Science	PhD	
Global Health	PhD	
Joint Degrees		
Latin American Studies/Public Health		MPH-MA
Social Work/Public Health		MPH-MSW

* Degree has been discontinued and is no longer accepting new students.

2.2 Program Length.

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

This criterion is met. All MPH degrees require the completion of 51 semester-credit hours. The university defines one semester-credit as 15 hours of in-class work and approximately two hours of out-of-class work for every hour in class. The school has not conferred any degrees for fewer than 51 semester-credit hours.

2.3 Public Health Core Knowledge.

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

This criterion is met. All MPH students complete five courses that address the public health core knowledge areas. No waivers of core public health courses are available. Students concentrating in health management and policy and health promotion and behavioral science are required to take more intensive core courses to prepare them for advanced coursework in those areas. Review of the course syllabi indicate that the core courses provide adequate coverage of public health core knowledge. The school routinely reviews core course content to ensure that students receive adequate training and develop competencies related to the core knowledge areas. Table 4 presents the school's required coursework in core knowledge areas.

Table 4. Required Courses Addressing Public Health Core Knowledge Areas		
Core Knowledge Area	**Course Number & Title**	**Credits**
Biostatistics	PH 602 Biostatistics	3
Epidemiology	PH 601 Epidemiology	3
Environmental Health Sciences	PH 604 Environmental Determinants of Human Health	3
Social & Behavioral Sciences	PH 603 Behavioral and Social Science in Public Health Or	3
	PH 661 Theoretical Foundations of Health Promotion	3
	and PH 662 Motivating Health Behavior (majors only)	3
Health Services Administration	PH 605 Health Services Administration Or	3
	PH 641 Introduction to Health Services (majors only)	3

2.4 Practical Skills.

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

This criterion is met. All MPH students are required to complete a field practice experience in a community setting that involves exposure to diverse community groups, public health professionals and the populations they serve. The field placement is intended to integrate classroom knowledge and experience with public health practice. According to the field placement handbook, students should demonstrate knowledge, skills and competencies and be able to: distinguish what public health is and is not; distinguish public health from personal health care; demonstrate knowledge of the organizations public health interventions or risk assessments; demonstrate ability to apply principles and methods of the MPH curriculum to a community, workplace, or public health environment including application of intervention/risk assessment strategies used to address public health determinants at the individual, group, community or population level; develop leadership skills and ability to interact with diverse populations; and recognize professional and ethical standards of behavior.

At a minimum, the field experience consists of three units (180 hours) but can be as much as 12 credit units (720 hours) with faculty advisor approval.

A comprehensive field practice manual is available online to guide students through the process. The manual is thorough in describing the field placement purpose, learning objectives and competencies; defining roles and responsibilities; providing specific guidance on site selection; and defining the process for course registration, timelines, professional liability insurance requirements, site qualifications and evaluation mechanisms. Students work with their regular faculty advisor to define desired areas of skill development.

The field practice manual clearly defines the learning objectives and competencies for field placement activities. Once the site is selected, the student completes and follows the field practice planning sheet, which defines tasks and learning objectives and requires advisor approval. The field placement form requires students to develop individualized SMART learning objectives that relate to competencies.

Each division is responsible for cultivating field placement opportunities. The school has well established, rigorous criteria for the field placement preceptors to ensure the work location, environment, tasks and responsibilities are relevant and appropriate for the student's core concentration. The work elements must include meaningful tasks, applications of public health principles and core knowledge, an overall understanding of public health and a tangible work document that reflects the student's experience. The school provides online resources to preceptors and agencies that desire to be an approved field placement site. The GSPH field practice coordinator (a staff position) maintains the database and works with each division to ensure that formal service learning agreements and professional liability insurance coverage are in place.

The self-study documents a wide variety of opportunities across all disciplines. Recent sites include the American Lung Association, various offices of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Chicano Federation, the YMCA, Kaiser Permanente the San Diego Health Department and local hospitals and clinics.

Upon completion of the field experience, both the student and the preceptor complete online evaluations. The faculty advisor is responsible for assigning the student grade.

There is no allowance for students to waive the field practice requirement. For those students with previous public health experience or who are currently working in a public health setting, field work completed at the current work location must be significantly different than their experience in their current position. These situations must be approved by the field practice coordinator and the faculty advisor.

One of the school's defined objectives relates to student satisfaction with the field experience. The school's target is that 70% of students rate field training as good or excellent. The last three years of data indicate lower levels of satisfaction with the field experience: 58%, 65% and 64%. Site visitors discussed this issue with multiple groups, including school leaders, faculty, students and alumni. All constituents expressed surprise at the low satisfaction results. Some faculty suggested that the result is a measurement error, based on imprecise wording of the question. Some students suggested that those who did not actively work with their advisors to investigate and pursue a practice that is a good "fit" might have had less positive experiences. None of the narrative responses to satisfaction surveys provide

context for the low satisfaction scores, and informal attempts to find additional context have not produced any actionable steps.

The school's future plans include a collaboration with the Institute of Public Health, one of the school's funded centers, to analyze field placement forms and evaluations, assess the current types of field activities available and recommend more uniform high quality placement opportunities for all students. The analysis will also focus on students' preparation for field practice. If analysis indicates that students are lacking skills and abilities necessary to successfully complete the field practicum, the results will guide a process to develop additional training to ensure the student is ready to meet the partner agencies' needs.

<div align="center">

2.5 Culminating Experience.

</div>

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

This criterion is met. The culminating experience for MPH students varies by concentration. Each MPH concentration offers a Plan A (thesis option) or a Plan B (non-thesis). All of the activities are designed to allow students to demonstrate integration of skills across the curriculum in addressing a public health problem or issue, and all of the options require some oral defense component.

The school requires all joint degree students to complete Plan A, and standalone MPH students in all concentrations can choose Plan A.

Plan B, for students in environmental health and epidemiology, requires preparation of a manuscript for publication. For students in the other three concentrations, there are two Plan B options, one of which is a comprehensive exam. The other Plan B options are as follow: publishable manuscript (biometry), consulting project (health management and policy) and systematic literature review (health promotion and behavioral science).

Most students in biometry, environmental health and epidemiology complete Plan A. Most students in health management and policy complete Plan B. Students' choices are more evenly balanced in health promotion and behavioral science, though the majority of Plan B students in this concentration choose the comprehensive examination.

The Graduate Bulletin provides a list of policies and procedures, including guidelines for thesis committee membership. Each concentration has developed additional written guidance for Plan B options.

Site visitors' review of sample student work and conversations with faculty, students and alumni support the notion of the culminating experience as a requirement that draws on student learning from across the curriculum. Faculty were able to discuss the means through which this occurs in the various options. Some faculty noted that the availability of multiple options requires a considerable investment of faculty time, but faculty believe that the options are worth preserving in order to meet individual student needs, though, in four of the five concentrations, students tend to overwhelmingly choose one option over the other.

2.6 Required Competencies.

For each degree program and area of specialization within each program identified in the instructional matrix, there shall be clearly stated competencies that guide the development of degree programs. The school must identify competencies for graduate professional public health, other professional and academic degree programs and specializations at all levels (bachelor's, master's and doctoral).

This criterion is met. The school defines an appropriate set of learning outcomes for the bachelor's degree and lists the required courses that address each learning outcome. The school defines a set of seven "instructional objectives" for the MPH, and these objectives are stated in a way that defines what the school will do, rather than what students will know and be able to do. The list includes the following: "To provide students with multiple opportunities to develop writing and speaking skills, presentation skills, and teamwork skills," and "To provide students with the experience to review science-based literature, synthesize its content, and apply evidence-base practices in the community." Two objectives relate to specific content: "To provide students with core knowledge and competencies in the five areas of public health: epidemiology, statistics, environmental health, health services administration, and the behavioral and social sciences. (ASPPH MPH competencies)" and "Each student will pursue one of the five core areas of Public Health in-depth completing the required credits for an MPH degree as outlined for each of the five disciplines."

The school provided an additional matrix, which listed the full set of approximately 80 core and cross-cutting competencies, as defined by the Association of Schools and Programs in Public Health. This matrix indexed each of the MPH core courses to the core and cross-cutting competencies. The matrix reviewed by site visitors revealed inconsistencies in coverage, with not all offerings of a single core class addressing the same competencies. The matrix also indicated that some of the listed competencies were not covered at all. After the site visit, the school provided an updated matrix, which identifies competencies associated with the current offerings of all core courses and reconciles differences between courses. In addition, the updated list condenses the cross-cutting competencies to include only those competencies that are relevant to the GSPH's mission and current curriculum.

The school defines competencies for each MPH concentration. These sets are well-defined, and the school has mapped them to specific assignments in required concentration courses. This allows for ongoing monitoring of trends in students' competency attainment in addition to serving to track individual students' paths to attaining the concentration competencies. These lists are much more streamlined than the core list, and faculty members' confidence that they can assess each student's competency attainment in the concentrations is much more developed than it is in the MPH core.

The school also defines competencies for each of the PhD programs. These are also mapped to specific experiences in required courses. While a number of the doctoral competencies describe knowledge and skills typically associated with lower degree levels (eg, "understand"), when read as a complete set, the competencies describe an appropriately advanced set of knowledge and skills.

The school has posted all competencies on its website, though site visitors had difficulty navigating the website and accessing information at various points during the review process. All syllabi clearly list specific and measurable learning objectives. In some cases, the syllabus also indicates the competencies to which the learning objectives map.

Students who met with site visitors were readily familiar with the concept of competencies and with the competencies themselves. They indicated that many faculty go over the competencies at the beginning of courses, and students must examine the competencies again when they are preparing for their practice experiences.

The school has engaged in robust discussions in the last two academic years about competency development and mapping, and evaluation data, both formal and informal, from students, alumni, employers and Advisory Board members have informed the discussions. The school plans to continue to use multiple inputs to inform competency discussions, which primarily take place annually at faculty retreats.

2.7 Assessment Procedures.

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

This criterion is met. The school requires graduate students to maintain a 3.0, and, within the concentrations, faculty have mapped concentration-specific competencies to specific assignments or elements in required coursework. This ensures that all students completing the required coursework are assessed at least once on each concentration-specific competency (graduate degrees) or learning outcome (undergraduate degrees). Although the mapping of the school's intended set of competencies

for core course learning is incomplete, as discussed in Criterion 2.6, each core class has assessment opportunities structured around specific and clearly-stated learning objectives.

During the site visit, faculty explained the ways in which they ensure that the practice experience and culminating experience serve as opportunities to assess students' competency attainment. Students are required to list specific competencies that relate to their proposed work plan when submitting paperwork to gain approval to begin the practice experience. Faculty who met with site visitors described a rigorous review process and noted that they have rejected students' initial proposals when the planned scope of work does not seem to support the needed competency development. Faculty advisors play a similarly central role in ensuring that the culminating experience is planned and executed in a way that requires students to demonstrate integration of competencies from across the curriculum.

The school defines a seven-year time to graduation for graduate students. The graduation rate for MPH students who entered in 2006 (the most recent group of students to reach the maximum time to graduation) is 73%. Nearly all of the subsequent cohorts (students entering between 2007 and 2010) have already passed a 70% graduation rate, even though they have not yet reached the maximum time to graduation. This demonstrates the school's recent successes in reducing attrition and facilitating steady progress toward graduation.

PhD students are also allowed a maximum time of seven years for degree completion. Of PhD students who entered in 2006, 90% have graduated. The 2007 cohort is poised to attain a graduation rate of 64% if all remaining students complete as scheduled, and subsequent cohorts also appear to be on target to meet or surpass the threshold defined in this criterion.

Graduation rates for bachelor's degree students are particularly strong. Because of university and school procedures, the school does not begin tracking majors until they have completed the necessary prerequisite coursework with appropriate grades for admission into the major. This means that tracking to graduation typically begins in students' third year of enrollment (for non-transfer students). All baccalaureate graduation rates since 2007 have been above the threshold required by this criterion, and numbers have improved over time. Nearly all cohorts have reached well over 90% graduation if counted on a three-year timeline after admission to the major.

The school also tracks job placement at six months post-graduation. Despite the fact that this interval is shorter than the one-year tracking period required by the criteria, all degree programs show greater than 80% employment or enrollment in further education at six months post-graduation.

The school tracks student success in passing the Certified in Public Health (CPH) credentialing examination. Twenty-seven students have taken the CPH exam, and all have passed.

The school has primarily collected qualitative data from alumni and employers on graduates' abilities to perform needed competencies in a practice setting. Overall results have been very positive, indicating that employers are pleased with graduates' preparation and skills. The school has already taken steps to address some areas that employers suggested would benefit from additional skill-building, such as written and oral communication.

2.8 Other Graduate Professional Degrees.

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

This criterion is not applicable.

2.9 Bachelor's Degrees in Public Health.

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

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

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

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

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

This criterion is met. The undergraduate program provides comprehensive baccalaureate-level training in public health to over 400 students. Undergraduate enrollment is stable with ±100 students entering each academic year. The program requires that all students complete basic coursework in the five core areas of public health, with one or more courses specifically dedicated to each knowledge area. Upper-level course work is required in a broad range of public health areas, and the school offers ample elective

courses. The program requires a field placement as a critical component of the curriculum. The school has identified qualified faculty members, including some adjunct faculty, to teach required and elective courses.

Currently, the undergraduate degree is designated as a BS in Health Sciences. The school plans to change the degree to a BS in Public Health, though this change is still proceeding through required channels.

Undergraduate students who met with site visitors expressed uniform appreciation for the committed support provided by the principal undergraduate lecturer. This individual appears to fulfill many duties exceptionally well, including advising all undergraduates, coordinating all undergraduate field placement and teaching undergraduate classes. All these duties appear to be performed in an efficient manner with limited support.

2.10 Other Bachelor's Degrees.

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

This criterion is not applicable.

2.11 Academic Degrees.

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

This criterion is met with commentary. The school's academic degrees include the following: MS in Toxicology (which is being phased out) and PhD degrees in epidemiology, health promotion and global health. The PhD degrees are offered as joint degrees by SDSU and University of California San Diego (UCSD). This partnership was developed because universities in the CSU system are not allowed to grant PhD degrees, but universities in the UC system can.

Most of the students entering the joint PhD have MPH degrees. If they do not have an MPH from a CEPH-accredited school or program, incoming doctoral students are required to take all of the MPH core courses with credits not counted toward the PhD. Thus, all students in the joint PhD programs have foundational knowledge in epidemiology and the four other core areas.

For a broad introduction to public health, the school also offers a course labeled Public Health Doctoral Lecture Series, which is taught by UCSD faculty from the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine. This course lasts for three semesters with two credit-hours per semester. The course description indicates that the series "is designed to promote critical thinking about current public health issues as well as professional skills and personal development... Throughout the three quarters, the course is designed

to address professional skill building and to facilitate interaction between students and experts across disciplines in public health". A representative from each of the three doctoral tracks plans the topics and facilitates delivery of this course. One presentation per semester is a "legends lecture" from a well-established public health or health sciences professional, and the series is largely focused on providing information about careers in public health.

The self-study acknowledges the lack of general public health content in the MS in Toxicology; and GSPH has opted not to add this content to this degree, since the degree is being phased out. If current students graduate as scheduled, the self-study indicates that 13 graduates over the last five years will have completed an academic degree without obtaining a broad introduction to public health. In the future, however, no students completing an academic master's degree at GSPH will complete their degree without obtaining the required broad introduction to public health.

2.12 Doctoral Degrees.

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

This criterion is met. SDSU is not approved to independently offer PhD degrees and, in order to do so, it must team with another university. The GSPH offers three doctoral programs in conjunction with UCSD. The PhD is in Public Health with a track in one of three fields: epidemiology, health promotion or global health (which draws on multiple core knowledge areas, including environmental health and health management and policy).

Site visitors reviewed student transcripts, and they clearly identify that this is a joint program between the two universities. Also, the specific concentration of the doctoral degree is clearly stated on each transcript. The diploma shows the names of both universities.

The program is directed by faculty from both universities, and admission decisions are made jointly. All changes to curriculum require approval from both institutions. All student doctoral committees and qualifying exams are jointly administered. From all discussions, the program appeared to be jointly operated with equal representation from both universities. This arrangement has been in place for many years, and nearly 50 students have completed one of the three tracks.

Internal review of the program by SDSU has suggested that this joint arrangement between the GSPH and UCSD School of Medicine should be used as a model for others at SDSU to develop joint doctoral programs. The degree programs appear to be truly integrated between the two universities and each capitalizes on the strengths of both campuses.

Currently, there are 21 students in epidemiology, 24 students in health promotion and 24 students in global health. The yield on accepted students is strong (50-78%), but the number accepted of those applying is low (19% in epidemiology, 20% in Health Promotion and 25% in Global Health). The programs may need to be better promoted to attract more qualified applicants. Additional support for graduate students also may assist in improving the applicant pool. Faculty indicated that the most effective way to grow the doctoral enrollment would be to have more faculty in each of the three areas offering doctoral degrees, since establishing a faculty "match" is a consideration in each individual's admission.

The GSPH appears to have the ability to offer these degrees independently but is not allowed to do so by the California Legislature. Students benefit from the resources available at UCSD and, as a result, faculty and students perceive that the degrees are "stronger" through this joint approach. However, the approach is not flawless, and the joint offering presents some challenges. The two universities are located approximately 20 miles apart. SDSU operates on a semester system, while UCSD operates on a quarter system. The website and admissions process can be difficult to understand. Ultimately, however, the arrangement has resulted in successful graduates who have obtained positions in academia or advanced practice.

2.13 Joint Degrees.

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

This criterion is met. The school offers two joint degree programs, MPH-MSW and MPH-MA (Latin American Studies). Both require students to complete all MPH didactic requirements. The limited credit sharing occurs through the practice experience for MPH-MSW students. Students complete the second of two required MSW practice placements in a setting appropriate for public health (government agency, non-profit, clinic, etc.) performing tasks that align with both disciplines competencies. Some MPH-MSW students voluntarily choose to do an extra MPH internship to further strengthen their practice skills, since most students in this degree program tend to be very professionally focused. Advisors from both disciplines oversee the full plan of study.

For students in the MPH-MA, the limited credit sharing occurs in electives. Some Latin American Studies electives are among those that would be acceptable for any MPH student, so joint degree students may strategically choose these classes for electives toward the public health degree. Similarly, the Latin American Studies program allows some public health required and elective courses to satisfy its degree requirements. Faculty advisors from both disciplines are actively involved, and they explained that degree plans are highly individualized and customized.

2.14 Distance Education or Executive Degree Programs.

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

This criterion is not applicable.

3.0 CREATION, APPLICATION AND ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE.

3.1 Research.

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

This criterion is met. The school's research funding has totaled $16.8 million in 2010-11, $12.8 million in 2011-12 and $11.5 million for 2012-13. The school has exceeded its target of $10 million per year and has achieved this level of funding with a relatively small faculty complement.

Site visitors discussed the decreasing trend, and, in addition to reductions across the funding environment, faculty cited the school's distribution of junior faculty who were just getting started developing a research agenda and seeking funding and changes in NIH funding to focus on more clinical priorities. Faculty also noted that a great deal of collaborative research, conducted with UCSD, was not reported in the self-study, since the research was administered, including collection and use of indirect costs, through UCSD. Faculty also highlighted collaborations with other CHHS faculty, particularly with the School of Social Work, which recently hired two epidemiologists who graduated from the school's PhD program.

SDSU provides support for obtaining and managing funded research activities. This is managed through the SDSU Research Foundation (SDSURF), a non-profit auxiliary organization that provides support for all faculty members who are writing and submitting proposals for external funding. Each faculty member is assigned a contact person at the foundation who assists with developing budgets, obtaining required documentation, formatting the proposal and finally submitting the proposal to the funding agency. Prior to final proposal submission, the GSPH director reviews all proposals for space or funding commitments,

and after approval forwards the proposals to the CHHS dean who forwards them to SDSURF for final preparation and submission. If the proposal is funded, the principal investigator works with SDSURF grants management staff, who perform valuable services by tracking budgets and expenditures, leasing research space and associated equipment, assisting in hiring staff and performing other tasks critical to the proper management of the project. In addition, a portion of the indirect funds are returned to the principal investigator for project support and development. SDSURF offers an array of workshops on grant and contract management as well as other types of training for faculty.

Recently SDSURF instituted a policy of not processing proposals for projects that do not pay full indirect costs. This is problematic for the GSPH, since many community-based projects do not provide full indirect cost recovery, limiting some funding possibilities and possibly reducing the school's reputation for involvement with local constituencies. This is also problematic since most of the governments in the region contract out many services, some of which provide research opportunities, and local and regional governmental grants and contracts do not pay full indirect costs. At the site visit, this was discussed a great deal. Site visitors learned that SDSURF is being flexible with enforcing this policy. While they prefer to see a minimum recovery of at least 15%, they are willing to process proposals with less if they clearly relate to the school's mission. In these cases, they prefer to see costs built into the budgets that cover some direct costs, such as for space. If, in the future, the SDSURF follows through on the policy of not processing proposals that do not include full indirect cost recovery, this may make it difficult for the GSPH to meet its goals relating to conducting community-based research.

In support of research, SDSU has established committees for the protection of human subjects and protection of animals. When necessary, proposals are reviewed by these committees. Students who conduct research (primarily through thesis projects) go through the same ethical review process.

Areas of recognized research focus include tobacco use and prevention, cross-cultural research in health behaviors, international health projects, childhood obesity (activity and diet focused), and cancer prevention and control.

Faculty in the GSPH present strong evidence of work with different cultures and different languages, putting the school in a positive position for conducting international research beyond working with immediate border communities. Research collaborations are in place with institutions in Mexico City, the school of public health in Cuernavaca, Mexico and universities in Ethiopia and Vietnam. Expanding other research collaborations is clearly a priority. Another aspect of research that was an evident strength to site visitors was the nexus of research and service activities and how doing one often relates to doing the other.

To increase research capabilities for junior faculty, the GSPH operates a summer boot camp for junior faculty called PRIDE, which focuses on training young Hispanic/Latino faculty to be principal investigators. PRIDE attracts participants from all over the country.

The university has a newly appointed vice president for research. He has undertaken initiatives to fund new hires with high potential for conducting externally funded research, increasing cross-disciplinary research and reducing "silo thinking" across the university. The university has also begun experimenting with hiring faculty who are not 100% funded by state dollars. Historically, the university has not allowed hiring of faculty who are expected to raise a portion of their salary through external funds, but the school is among the SDSU units with early interest in such hiring. Also, the school is involved in university and college-level discussions of a research track for faculty. However, there are possible issues that need to be worked out related to the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Faculty can buy out teaching time with research funding, and there are appear to be many community members who want to and are available to serve in adjunct teaching roles. Faculty indicated that laboratory space and equipment were more than adequate. The SDSURF provides laboratory space, and the state provides substantial support for equipment from lottery-generated funds.

From undergraduates through PhD, GSPH students are actively involved in research. Students who met with site visitors indicated that these are excellent experiences, and community partners clearly recognized the value of students in extending the school's ability to assist community agencies. Some students are paid through SDSURF and some include tuition reduction, but much of the student involvement is unpaid. The self-study indicates that approximately 80% of funded projects include student participation. In the team's meeting with students, an informal show of hands validated this figure. Students were excited about their research opportunities and thankful to have them. Undergraduates gain exposure to research through a course: PH295, Public Health Research. Some students indicated that they had taken on projects as service activities after funding had ceased.

The GSPH has four outcome measures of research activities: at least 70% of primary faculty publish at least two peer-reviewed publications per year; total publications per primary faculty member will average two per year; total extramural funding will exceed $10 million per year; and 80% of funded research will include student participation. The school has met all of its targets in the most recent year of reporting and expects funding levels and productivity to increase as junior faculty progress as researchers.

Eighty-four percent of funded projects are community based. The school has formal research agreements in place with a variety of governmental and non-profit agencies, including the California Department of

Public Health, California Rural Legal Assistance, Kaiser Permanente Medical Center, the San Diego Unified School District and the Salvation Army.

3.2 Service.

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

This criterion is met. The GSPH fosters community service at the local, state, national and international level to assist communities in achieving their public health goals. The Institute of Public Health (IPH) operates as a unit of the GSPH emphasizing the development and implementation of evidence-based practices and provides a key component to the school's success with community-based outreach and training. IPH also provides a significant amount of extramurally-funded community research, service-oriented activities, and community collaborations. As stated in the IPH's annual report, the community-based approach focuses on five key areas: community evaluations, translation of evidenced based public health practices, dissemination and implementation research and professional education and training (both in-person and online).

SDSU fully supports and expects faculty members to be active in professional, volunteer and consultative capacities. University polices enhance opportunities for faculty service-oriented activities by fully supporting active participation in professional organizations, holding offices in relevant community organizations, building partnerships with governmental boards or commissions, conducting educational seminars and lectures for community groups and providing consultation and testimony on applicable legislation. Faculty contribute to local community service via unfunded activities such as serving on boards, working with San Diego area schools, providing lectures and presentations to local organizations and participating in local foundations. Community service is a critical component and recognized when making decisions concerning retention, tenure and promotion within the university.

The self-study provides a table that quantifies faculty activities. Based on revised documents received during the site visit, data indicates that 65% of the faculty are engaged in local community-related service activities, 70% are engaged in national service and 26% are involved in international service.

Students are active in service activities, primarily through the GSPH Student Council, which plans and promotes a variety of opportunities.

The self-study states, "In addition over six million dollars have been generated in service activities each of the past three years". This funding is attributed to a community-based Women's Infant and Children Supplemental Nutrition Program. The school's contract to administer this service presents a unique

31

opportunity for applied research in health promotion and behavioral science while providing a core public health service.

GSPH identifies accurately documenting the amount of faculty service as a challenge. The school would benefit by standardizing and fully developing a quantitative analysis of student service activities, in particular.

3.3 Workforce Development.

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

This criterion is met. The GSPH has excellent programs and services to provide workforce training throughout the community.

The California/Nevada Public Health Training Center (PHTC), a HRSA-funded training center in which the school is a partner, links public health workers and researchers with opportunities for specialized training. The PHTC regularly assesses workforce training needs through a variety of data collection and analysis opportunities. During 2012-2013, the PHTC conducted eight in-person training events and conferences concerning student internships, collaborative projects and online training development and assisted approximately 3000 individuals (over 12,000 person-hours). The PHTC is slated to lose its funding due to nationwide decreases. During the site visit, faculty associated with the center indicated that, to date, training has been free, and a new model such as fee-for-service may be necessary in the future.

The IPH provides outreach to physicians, community clinicians and community members. The IPH uses active and passive assessment processes, such as analyzing data obtained at meetings of community groups and organizations and then developing targeted training programs; utilizing information gathered during staff interactions with community members who are attending functions and/or presenting; and receiving direct solicitation for training on specific topics from community members and organizations. In 2012-2013, IPH held four events, which served approximately seventy-five individuals on topics such as data entry and database use, data entry forms, health impact assessment and survey administration.

The school's total funded continuing education activity totaled $1.4 million in 2012-13, with $646,571 from the PHTC and $718,652 for two projects: *Mentoring Diverse Students in Health Disparities Research* and *Investing in America's Future: Latinos in Health Disparity Research*.

The GSPH's Advisory Board provides input on workforce development needs. Several members are governmental officials who serve in managerial and supervisory roles. Advisory Board members have requested specific training activities for their own employees, and faculty who work with these organizations bring back additional ideas generated by the community.

The final options for workforce development includes SDSU's "Open University" system and the school's new certificate program. The Open University system is supported by the College of Extended Studies. Students who register through this mechanism do not have to apply to or be enrolled at the university but can take classes alongside matriculated students. These courses are typically offered at 4 pm or later to allow easy access to working professional and non-degree students. The school's certificate program was approved in the fall of 2013 and is designed to provide training in core public health disciplines. In preparation, the school has videotaped lectures from its Public Health 101 course. In the spring of 2014, the school plans to continue its work to develop a complete curriculum in an online format.

4.0 FACULTY, STAFF AND STUDENTS.

4.1 Faculty Qualifications.

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

This criterion is met. The GSPH has 31 full-time faculty. The primary faculty, together with adjunct, part-time and secondary faculty, has training and expertise in diverse disciplines and is qualified to support the school's academic and professional programs and its research and service activities. All faculty have academic training in public health-related areas, and faculty members' record of securing external grant support and providing service to the community further demonstrate the quality of the faculty complement. Faculty are very productive, especially in the research area, with average annual research funding of over $600,000 per primary faculty member. The school has attained all of its self-defined targets for faculty qualifications.

Students expressed their respect for faculty and appreciation for their accessibility. Multiple stakeholders indicated that faculty members were well-connected professionally within the community. Community partners echoed what was heard from the students and cited several examples of faculty assistance with specific projects.

4.2 Faculty Policies and Procedures.

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

This criterion is met. The SDSU Faculty Handbook, produced by the Faculty Affairs Office, provides information on university-wide faculty policies. Faculty recruitment procedures are detailed in CHHS policies, and reappointment, tenure and promotion definitions and procedures are detailed in Collective Bargaining Agreement, which is negotiated between university administration and the California Faculty

Association. The policies and procedures reviewed by site visitors appear sound and are readily available on the GSPH and SDSU websites.

The faculty tracks are: tenure track, non-tenure track and adjunct (non-paid) faculty. Ranks include: lecturer for non-tenure track, and assistant professor, associate professor and professor for tenured and tenure-track faculty. A research track has been proposed, but needs to be assessed relative to collective bargaining policies and procedures. There are no clinical-track faculty.

Recruitment of new tenure-track faculty is conducted by search committees composed of tenured faculty who are elected by GSPH faculty. The director of the Office of Diversity & Equity meets with the committee during the initiation of the search and assists in identifying sources for publicizing the position for qualified minority and female candidates. The search committee solicits comments from other faculty members and students. Once a successful candidate is identified, the search committee makes a recommendation to the GSPH director. Upon the agreement of the director, the recommendation is forwarded to the CHHS dean and the provost. Once an offer is made to an individual for employment, a decision on rank and tenure requires a recommendation by the GSPH Personnel Committee.

For non-tenure track (lecturer) faculty, when a candidate for a lecturer position is identified and approved by the GSPH director in consultation with the division head, staff members process a contract and Academic Transaction Form (ATF). These forms are attached to a copy of the applicant's curriculum vita and submitted to the CHHS dean. An initial appointment can be for one semester or, if the hiring commences in the fall, one year. The university offers a New Lecturers Orientation in electronic format, including presentations on university regulations, student services and teaching and learning strategies. Non-tenure track faculty can hold only a lecturer, not professorial, rank.

All faculty members must meet common academic standards for promotion and tenure. Appropriate evidence of scholarly productivity is necessary, as is excellence in teaching and service to the university and community. Governance documents for the school, college and university specify the procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure. Recommendations regarding tenure or promotion are initiated by the school's Personnel Committee and forwarded to the GSPH director. The director forwards a recommendation to the CHHS Personnel Committee and dean. From CHHS the recommendations move to the university Tenure and Promotion Committee, then to the provost, who forwards it to the university president for final approval.

All non-tenured, tenure-track (probationary) faculty members must prepare an updated Personnel Data Summary (PDS) for review. The PDS is a highly structured and expanded curriculum vitae submitted annually by non-tenured faculty in early fall. This detailed document is further supplemented by a physical

portfolio ("One-of-a-Kind" file) that includes reprints, student course evaluations, course syllabi and grant proposals.

The PDS and "One-of-a-Kind" File are reviewed to determine competency or excellence of performance in three major areas: teaching effectiveness as assessed by student and peer review of teaching activities; research and professional development as measured by publications and grant activity; and service as measured by community activities and service to the GSPH, CHHS, and university. These materials are reviewed by three peer committees: the GSPH Personnel Committee, the CHHS Personnel Committee, and the University Personnel Committee. They are also reviewed by the GSPH director, the CHHS dean, the provost and the president. Comments from each of these reviews are made available to probationary faculty to guide their subsequent performance.

In addition to evaluation of probationary faculty, all tenured faculty members are reviewed every five years. This process requires the GSPH Personnel Committee to review current curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations and peer-reviews of in-class performance. The CSU post-tenure review system does not currently have rewards or sanctions that could potentially result in improvement in research, teaching or service.

Lecturers (both full- and part-time) are reviewed on an annual basis. Evaluation of full-time and part-time lecturers is conducted by the division heads, the GSPH Personnel Committee and the director. Student evaluations are the main source of information. Positive evaluations are necessary for consideration of continued employment.

All non-tenure track faculty members receive a yearly periodic evaluation. When one-year lecturers apply for reappointment, they have the contractual right to careful consideration. There is a body of arbitration decisions commenting upon the meaning of careful consideration, therefore the school must provide evidence that all previous periodic evaluations were carefully considered and the hiring decision was based on a reasoned assessment of the candidate's performance.

Students complete a standardized questionnaire to evaluate course conduct, content, relevance and the instructor's teaching effectiveness. Students complete the standardized form on-line at their convenience during the last two weeks of the semester. The course evaluation data are provided on-line for faculty members to review and are printed to include in their "One-of-a-Kind" file for formal review. The evaluation data tabulations and written comments are available for review by the director, division heads and Personnel Committee members.

There are other uses of this standardized evaluation data. Individual faculty members use these evaluations to improve course content. Aggregate data are used by the divisions and the GSPH Curriculum Committee in the review process for proposals to modify, add or delete courses from the school's curriculum. The course rating consists of questions about course content, design, and usefulness. Data from student evaluations for the past six semesters indicate an average rating of the course, the instructor, and overall of above 4 and a 5-point scale.

There are a number of mechanisms or programs in place to facilitate faculty development. New faculty members have an entire year of "assigned time" in the first year of their appointment so that they may begin to frame their research agenda. In addition, there is the President's Fund that sponsors research for junior faculty or for faculty wishing to explore a new area of research. These awards are competitive.

Faculty members in the GSPH have a teaching load of two courses per semester. The university has put substantial dollars into making each classroom "smart" with updated technology. They back this up with ongoing seminars from the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), which offers two to three seminars for faculty each month on how to use this technology to their best advantage.

Each seven years, tenured faculty members are eligible for a sabbatical. The sabbatical is at full pay for one semester or for an academic year at half salary. The sabbatical request must include a plan on how that time will be used to improve knowledge, conduct research, write manuscripts, or build collaboration with other institutions.

The CHHS provides some funds for travel by junior faculty members who have a presentation accepted at a national meeting and the GSPH has some limited funds for this type of travel as well.

4.3 Student Recruitment and Admissions.

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

This criterion is met. The school has policies and procedures in place designed to recruit and admit qualified candidates to both graduate and undergraduate programs. The GSPH website contains information and tools about the academic divisions, faculty, degrees and programs, admission recruitment, curriculum requirements, graduate and undergraduate bulletins and the school's research centers. The process is enhanced by the use of the centralized application service for public health (SOPHAS).

The school utilizes a variety of recruitment activities, including recruitment fairs, informational mailings, professional meetings and contact with undergraduate career and placement counselors. Recruitment efforts involve many school personnel including division heads, the Student Affairs Committee, the school admissions coordinator, graduate advisors and faculty. Targeted graduate recruitment efforts include identification of potential students from underrepresented and disadvantaged groups, solicitations to health professionals with a previous degree, exhibitions at professional conferences and participation at local and state professional career fairs. The school also recruits students from within the university student body via personal referrals from faculty and students and by active engagement of students already involved in undergraduate health professions.

The self-study provides detailed information about the admissions process. Minimum requirements for admission to all graduate programs include an appropriate grade point average, minimum score on the graduate record exam (GRE), written personal statement of public health career goals upon completion of the degree, letters of recommendation and pre-requisite education.

Internal admission to the undergraduate public health major is subject to the university's policy for declaring an undergraduate degree. The undergraduate health sciences/public health degree does not allow direct entry and declaration into public health degree. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the school received 'impacted' status allowing the school to apply additional criteria/requirements in order to select the most highly qualified candidates. Although students may declare a public health pre-major, they must meet minimum standards before official acceptance into the major.

During the site visit, PhD program coordinators provided a detailed description of the doctoral program admission process. During the most recent recruitment cycle, students could apply through either SDSU or UCSD. The applications were reviewed by a joint Advisory Committee. Once admitted, tuition and all administrative functions are managed thru SDSU support staff. The school is undertaking actions to streamline the admissions process across both universities.

There continues to be increasing demand and interest in the schools doctoral, master and bachelor degrees. The GSPH is close to meeting its targeted acceptance rate (50%) and has sustained enrollment rates between 32% and 39% during the 2010-11 to 2012-13 reporting period. Total enrollment in the bachelor program increased from 355 to 405, but due to the rigorous requirements for undergraduate entry into the public health degree, approximately 50% of students who want to major in public health are not accepted.

Most students in the GSPH are full-time students. The graduate record examination (GRE) scores and undergraduate and graduate grade point averages (GPAs) are used as measurable objectives to evaluate

success in enrolling a qualified student body, and the program has exceeded its targets. The GSPH continues to grow and attract qualified students despite recent periods of budget uncertainty and tuition increases.

4.4 Advising and Career Counseling.

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

This criterion is met. Undergraduate advising is conducted by the director of undergraduate studies and her staff, using student advising forms as a guide. All faculty members are engaged in advising master's degree and doctoral students. Master's student advising tools include the school's Blackboard site and the curriculum road maps. Doctoral students receive course planning assistance from an Advisory Committee comprised of faculty members from both SDSU and UCSD. Once doctoral students select a dissertation topic, the Dissertation Committee advises and mentors the student through graduation.

The GSPH utilizes the SDSU's career counseling center as its primary source for employment opportunities and career options. The university has multiple programs covering career services and career counseling, including an online portal for identifying and pursuing employment opportunities, internship and employment opportunity listings, career fairs and on-campus interviews and a career resource room.

At the school level, students seek public health career assistance from their advisors, other professors and/or preceptors. Job and field placement opportunities are distributed through the school's listserv and posted on the school's internal website. In response to past low career advisement numbers, several divisions have implemented changes to "help students understand potential career paths in their chosen area and how to effectively present themselves to prospective employers". The changes are listed below:

- The Health Promotion Division has added mock interviews, resume writing and practitioner panel discussion activities to the fall semester's required curriculum and leadership, budgeting and conflict resolution trainings to the spring semester's required curriculum.
- The Health Management and Policy Division added course core content on budgeting and human resources and an elective, professional development one-credit course designed to improve understanding and orientation of health care management.

Undergraduate exit survey data, presented in Table 5, shows that a substantial number of students are satisfied with career advising with a ranking of 68% for academic year 2012-2013.

Table 5. Summary of Survey Results for the BS Program (Percent reporting good or excellent)	
Overall quality of:	
Educational experience	74 (95%)
Course advising	77 (99%)
Required courses	64 (82%)
Electives	66 (85%)
Career advising	53 (68%)
Field training	60 (77%)

Exit survey data for master's student satisfaction, presented in Table 6, reflects low or decreasing satisfaction numbers, with only 23% rating career advising as good or excellent.

Table 6. Summary of Exit Survey Results for the Master's Programs (Percent reporting good or excellent)			
Overall quality of:	**2010-11**	**2011-12**	**2012-13**
Educational experience	69 (72%)	80 (75%)	66 (73%)
Course advising	40 (47%)	63 (59%)	51 (57%)
Core courses	75 (77%)	83 (78%)	67 (74%)
Concentration courses	81 (83%)	90 (85%)	72 (80%)
Research opportunities	59 (65%)	65 (61%)	53 (59%)
Thesis advising	54 (61%)	67 (63%)	54 (60%)
Career advising	18 (23%)	36 (34%)	21 (23%)
Field training	58 (64%)	69 (65%)	52 (58%)

To further analyze the low satisfaction scores, the school revised the exit survey by adding a question on current employment status to differentiate between students seeking employment compared to students that were already employed or students who were pursuing further education.

Site visitors discussed this extensively and learned that students are assisted by faculty for course work mapping, thesis and culminating experiences and professional development assistance, as well as impromptu meetings after class, through e-mails or Skype. Faculty suggested possible low satisfaction ratings were due to measurement error, poorly worded exit survey questions and the variation across divisions when some students have unpaid internships, and unrealistic expectations that the faculty are going to 'find' the student a job as opposed to just advising.

Students reinforced this information stating that they feel connected to the staff and faculty. They indicated that faculty and staff are helpful and supportive with career advice and job opportunities; information on internships and research opportunities are distributed through e-mail, support is provided for the internship development; and professional development series and lecturers provide opportunities to interact with the alumni and community, which can lead to internship or employment opportunities. In

response to site visitor's inquiries about possible reasons for the low exit survey ratings, one student stated that students also need to take personal responsibility to make sure that they are obtaining the services they need.

The GSPH's last self-study comments that a better system is needed to capture the impromptu advising activities that occur when students engage faculty, and the school has implemented an online system to "capture" faculty interactions with students. Faculty acknowledge that they do not always take time to enter data on every interaction, and the quantitative data does not explain exit survey results. After site discussion, it appears the school would benefit by developing a better qualitative system to capture students' responses to questions about their experience, while minimizing measurement errors.

Agenda

**COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC HEALTH
ACCREDITATION SITE VISIT**

**San Diego State University
Graduate School of Public Health
February 17 – 19, 2014**

February 17, 2014

8:30 am	<u>Site Visit Team Request for Additional Documents</u> Carol Macera, PhD, Associate Director for Academic Affairs, GSPH Ms. Lee Shealy, Administrative Support Coordinator, GSPH
8:45 am	<u>Team Resource File Review</u>
9:30 am	<u>Meeting with Core Leadership Team</u> Carleen H. Stoskopf, ScD, MS, Professor and Director, GSPH Carol Macera, PhD, Professor and Associate Director for Academic Affairs, GSPH Suzanne Lindsay, PhD, MPH, MSW, Associate Professor and Associate Director for Practice, Director of the Institute of Public Health, GSPH Thomas Novotny, MD, MPH, Professor and Associate Director for Border and Global Health, GSPH Penelope (Jenny) Quintana, PhD, MPH, Associate Professor and Graduate Advisor, GSPH Virginia Kreisworth, PhD, Lecturer and Undergraduate Division Head, GSPH John Pierce, PhD, Professor and Joint Doctoral Programs Director, UCSD
10:45 am	<u>Break</u>
11:00 am	<u>Meeting with Self-Study Committee</u> Carleen H. Stoskopf, ScD, MS, Professor and Director, GSPH Carol Macera, PhD, MPH, Professor and Associate Director for Academic Affairs, GSPH Eunha Hoh, PhD, Associate Professor, GSPH Hector Lemus, DrPH, Assistant Professor, GSPH Mrs. Brenda Fass-Holmes, Coordinator for Admissions and Student Affairs, GSPH Ms. Lee Shealy, Administrative Assistant, GSPH Mrs. Jacqueline Walker, Administrative Assistant, GSPH Ms. Erin Roberts, MPH student and President of the GSPH Student Council
11:45 am	<u>Break</u>
12:00 pm	<u>Lunch with Students</u> Erin Roberts, MPH student, President of the GSPH Student Council Madeline Cross, MPH student, Student Council Elhaum Rezaii, MPH student, Student Council Julie Bergmann, PhD student (GH) Sophie Georghiou, PhD student (GH) Anthony Davis, PhD student (EPI) Jennifer Sanchez, PhD student (HB) Nicolas Lopez-Galvez, MPH student, EH Veronica Areaga, MPH student, EH Kiet Nguyen, MPH student, EH Marisa Alvarez, MPH student, HPBS Christina Olson, MPH student, HPBS Natalie Svistoonoff, MPH student, HPBS Rosemarie Saldana, MPH student, BS graduate, HPBS Kimberly De Vera, MPH student, EPI Azieb Ermias, MPH student, EPI Lindsay Grant, MPH student, EPI Tenaya Siva, MPH student, EPI Douglas Daley, MPH student, HMP Chris Rossio, MPH student, HMP Nora Bota, MPH student, HMP Emily Ackerman, MPH student, HMP Alla'a Ali, MPH student, HMP Alyssa Earley, Undergraduate PH Catherine Fegan, Undergraduate PH
1:30 pm	<u>Break</u>

1:45 pm	Meeting with Instructional Programs Group 1: The MPH Program
	Stephanie Brodine, MD, MPH, Professor and Chair of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, GSPH
	John Alcaraz, PhD, Associate Professor of Biostatistics, GSPH
	Hala Madanat, PhD, Associate Professor and Chair of Health Promotion and Behavioral Science, GSPH
	Karen Ferran, PhD, Lecturer, Biostatistics, GSPH
	Richard Gersberg, PhD, Professor and Chair of Environmental Health, GSPH
	Tracy Finlayson, PhD, Associate Professor and Chair of Health Management and Policy, GSPH
	Jong-Deuk (J.D.) Baek, PhD, DrPH, Assistant Professor in Health Management and Policy, GSPH
	Penelope (Jenny) Quintana, PhD, MPH, Graduate Advisor and Associate Professor in Environmental Health, GSPH
	Gregory Talavera MD, MPH, Professor in Health Promotion and Behavioral Science and Coordinator of the MPH/MA in Latin American Studies, GSPH
	Thomas Packard DSW, Professor in Social Work (MPH/MSW)
	Robert Seidman, PhD, Associate Professor in Health Management and Policy, GSPH

| 3:00 pm | Break |

| 3:15 pm | Team Executive Session and Resource File Review |

| 5:00 pm | Adjourn |

February 18, 2014

8:30 am	Meeting with Faculty Related to Research, Service, Workforce Development
	Guadalupe (Suchi) Ayala, PhD, MPH, Professor in Health Promotion and Behavioral Science and Co-Director of the San Diego Prevention Research Center and the Institute for Behavioral and Community Health (IBACH), GSPH
	Suzanne Lindsay, PhD, MPH, MSW, Associate Professor in Epidemiology and Director of the Institute of Public Health, GSPH
	Gregory Talavera, MD, MPH, Professor in Health Promotion and Behavioral Science, and Co-Director of the Institute for Behavioral and Community Health (IBACH); Director of the Center of Excellence in Latino Health, GSPH
	Eunha Hoh, PhD, Associate Professor in Environmental Health, GSPH
	Thomas Novotny, MD, MPH, Professor and Co-Director of the PhD in Global Health, GSPH
	Zohir Chowdhury, PhD, Associate Professor in Environmental Health, GSPH
	Elva Arredondo, PhD, Associate Professor in Health Promotion and Behavioral Science and Co-Director of the PhD program in Health Behavior, GSPH
	Tracy Finlayson, PhD, Associate Professor and Chair of Health Management and Policy, GSPH
	Melbourne Hovell, PhD, MPH, Distinguished Professor in Health Promotion and Behavioral Science and Director of the Center for Behavioral and Community Health, GSPH
	John Elder, PhD, MPH, Distinguished Professor in Health Promotion and Behavioral Science and Co-Director of the San Diego Prevention Research Center, GSPH
	Stephanie Brodine, MD, MPH, Professor and Chair in Epidemiology and Director of the Native American Research Center and the Navy Health Research Center, GSPH
	Robert Seidman, PhD, Associate Professor in Health Management and Policy and Director of the California / Nevada Public Health Training Center, GSPH
	Richard Shaffer, PhD, MPH, Professor in Epidemiology and Co-Director of the PhD program in Epidemiology, GSPH and the Navy Health Research Center (PEPFAR)

| 9:30 am | Break |

9:45 am	Meeting with Instructional Programs Group 2: PhD programs and the BS program
	Richard Shaffer, PhD, MPH, Professor and Co-Director of the PhD in Epidemiology (SDSU)
	Gail Laughlin, PhD, Co-Director of the PhD in Epidemiology (UCSD)
	Elva Arredondo, PhD, Associate Professor and Co-Director of the PhD in Health Behavior (SDSU)
	David Strong, PhD, Co-Director of the PhD in Health Behavioral (UCSD)
	Thomas Novotny, MD, MPH, Professor and Co-Director of the PhD in Global Health (SDSU)
	Kimberly Brouwer, PhD, Co-Director of the PhD in Global Health (UCSD)
	Virginia Kreisworth, PhD, Lecturer and Division Head of the BS Program, GSPH
	Robert Seidman, PhD, Associate Professor, GSPH
	Christine Holub, PhD, Research Assistant Professor, GSPH
	Jong-Deuk (J.D.) Baek, PhD, DrPH, Assistant Professor, GSPH
	Richard Shaffer, PhD, MPH, Professor, GSPH

| 11:15 am | Break |

11:30 am	Lunch with Alumni and Community Stakeholders
	Nick Macchione, MHA, FACHE, Director of the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency (SDCHHSA)
	Chris Gonaver, MPH, Alumnus, City of San Diego, Director of Environmental Services.

Mary Parra, MPH, Alumnus, Advisory Board,
Steve O'Kane, Executive Director of the Council of Community Clinics, Advisory Board member
Charles Matthews, Associate Director of the SDCHHSA, in charge of the Northern and Central Regions
Bud Beck, MD, Advisory Board member
Karma Bass, MPH, Vice President of Via Healthcare Consulting
Jason Cook, Senior Director, Scripps Memorial Hospital
Gary Fybel, Chief Executive, Senior Vice President, Scripps Memorial Hospital, La Jolla
Jack Miller, Director of Environmental Services, County of San Diego
David Flores, Casa Familiar, Inc.
Elena Quintanar, Community Health Promotion Specialist, County of San Diego
Connie Lafuente, Outreach Coordinator, California Office of Binational Border Health
Maria Reyes, MD, MPH, Director of California Programs, Project Concern Inc.
Karl Van Orden, Scientific Director, Naval Health Research Center
Miguel Fraga, MD, Professor, Community Medicine, Universidad Autonoma de Baja California, Mexico (UABC)
Daniel Calac, MD, Medical Director, Indian Health Council Inc.
Gary Erbeck, MPH, Past Director, Department of Environmental Health, County of San Diego
Gary Pierce, PacificGMP
Andrea Skorepa, Casa Familiar, Inc
Wilma Wooten, MD, MPH, Public Health Officer, Director of Public Health, San Diego County Health and Human Services

12:45 pm   Break

1:00 pm   Meeting with Leadership of University
             Dr. Edith Benkov, Vice President for Faculty Affairs, SDSU (1:00 to 1:30)
             Dr. Marilyn Newhoff, Dean, College of Health and Human Services (1:40 to 2:15)

2:15 pm   Break & Resource File Review

3:15 pm   Meeting with Faculty Related to Faculty Issues, Student Recruitment, Advising
             Guadalupe (Suchi) Ayala, PhD, MPH, Professor and Chair of the Personnel Committee (Retention, Tenure, and Promotion)
             Stephanie Brodine, MD, MPH, Professor and Chair in Epidemiology
             Richard Gersberg, PhD, Professor and member of the Personnel Committee
             Penelope (Jenny) Quintana, PhD, MPH, Associate Professor and Graduate Director
             Hala Madanat, PhD, Associate Professor and Chair of the Student Affairs Committee
             Ms. Brenda Fass-Holmes, Coordinator of Admissions and Student Affairs

4:15 pm   Executive Session & Resource File Review

5:45 pm   Adjourn

February 19, 2014

9:00 am   Executive Session and Report Preparation

12:30 pm   Exit Interview