Remaining Qs from the *ASPPH Presents* CEPH Criteria Rollout Redux Webinar (Nov. 17, 2016)
Answered by CEPH Staff on Nov. 21, 2016

****

Q1. What is the faculty/student ratio you consider for compliance in MPH and PhD program in a public health college?

A1. The Council chose not to include an aggregate student-faculty ratio as a reporting element in the 2016 criteria based on a number of factors. First, there is limited evidence for the correlation between aggregate SFR and quality. More importantly, calculating an aggregate SFR has proven to be inadequate for capturing the complexity of our schools and programs, particularly in terms of interdisciplinary teaching and in terms of teaching across multiple degree levels.

For instance, if a school offers multiple, department-based MPH degrees and a schoolwide bachelor's degree, how do we accurately apportion faculty effort in a way that makes a meaningful aggregate SFR calculation?

Therefore, the 2016 criteria focus on SFR for key "touch points" in the curriculum—advising, supervising integrative learning experiences, etc. At this point, we do not have a target number in mind for these figures. This is partially because these indicators are new to our process, but is largely because our emphasis has shifted to a holistic review. A single data point, such as SFR at key points, will be read alongside other narrative information and data, so that reviewers will be making a holistic assessment of faculty resource adequacy based on multiple inputs.

Q2. Do you divide the faculty/student ratio according to the disciplines of public health, e.g., Epi, EOH, HPDP etc. or you calculate as the whole public health degree for compliance?

A2. See answer #1. For the elements in Template C2-2 (SFRs for advising, ILE supervision, etc.), we request data by degree level. The school or program may choose to stratify further, such as by degree, rather than degree level (e.g., MPH & MS reported separately). We typically would not recommend stratifying by concentration unless it is necessary for explaining trends in the data (e.g., one concentration is an outlier that affects the overall data).

Q3. Can a MPH student do the practicum with faculty of the college and produce a product in the form of report/paper with defined criteria and outlined competencies?

A3. For the applied practice experiences criterion for MPH students (Criterion D5), the student may produce a project for a practice setting under a faculty member's supervision. For example, a faculty member teaching a program evaluation course might pair students with local agencies and lead the students through the course, with students ultimately producing an evaluation for the community agency. In this case, the student must be regularly working/consulting with key agency staff in order to produce a useful evaluation product. The product of this course could be one of the products used to demonstrate competencies for Criterion D5.

An experience conducted solely under faculty supervision, such as a case study or simulation or preparing a manuscript for publication, would not be appropriate for satisfying Criterion D5. The product must arise from significant contact with a practice setting, whether that is structured like a traditional internship or through a series of faculty-led contacts, such as those arising from service learning experiences.

Q4. To submit documentation for a proposed program, that is in the process of being approved by the sister universities, do we submit paper work?

A4. This question appears to relate to a multi-partner school/program. This is a very specific accreditation category, and CEPH currently accredits five multi-partner programs and one multi-partner school. Because of the narrowness of the category, it would be best for the questioner to contact CEPH staff directly.

Q5. Do primary faculty counted towards an MPH need to teach to be considered "teaching" faculty? For example, if a faculty member teaches 1 elective every 3 years, but mentors MPH students and facilitates

non-course-related MPH activities with students, would this person be able to serve as primary faculty for an MPH concentration?

A5. If teaching is a regular component of this individual's responsibilities, ie, if his/her annual evaluations and promotion considerations examine classroom teaching as a key component of performance, we do not define a minimum frequency of course offerings. That said, the accreditation peer review process relies on transparency and good faith on both sides. We would ask the school or program to be clear about its rationale for identifying this individual as a primary instructional faculty member.

Q6. For those schools that have nutrition programs - how does nutrition play into this integrated curriculum?

A6. Each MPH and DrPH concentration must define concentration-specific competencies in Criterion D4, so nutrition-focused concentrations would define the expected scope of nutrition knowledge and skills here.

Nutrition concepts are applicable to many components of the foundational knowledge (D1) and foundational competencies for MPH students (D2). For example, nearly all of the D1 statements in the domain of factors related to human health have nutritional implications, and many of the D2 competencies (eg, #6, #7, #14, #15) could be viewed through a nutrition-focused lens.

Q7. Would a six credit hour internship satisfy the practice requirement for DrPH for a student without a public health background?

A7. We have moved our focus away from the number of hours (either credit hours or contact hours). There are a variety of ways to satisfy Criterion D6, and the Council would expect to see an approach tailored to the student. In this case, the experience for a student without a public health background would likely look different than the experiences structured for DrPH programs that only enroll practicing public health professionals.

Q8. Twitter seems an odd choice because it is not used by everyone - especially in a work situation. Why would you archive there only?

A8. At CEPH, we're excited to expand our social media reach. We are on Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter. One piece of feedback we've regularly heard is that our constituents would like to be able to interact more casually and frequently to share ideas and seek guidance from CEPH staff and each other, outside of webinars and technical assistance sessions. Social media channels are a great way to do that. Twitter is quick and low-impact. It is easy to skim. You can check in as often or as rarely as you wish. We often cross-post in all of our social media channels.

Nearly everything we post on Twitter is also housed on our website. The only exception would be informal snippets—a photo snapshot or quote from a live event, for example. As we expand our available materials, our website becomes larger. This is a good and bad thing—our search box on the home page can help you find materials, and we endeavor to organize the site as logically as possible.

Twitter and other social media channels allow us to highlight new additions to our FAQ documents and lists and allow us to remind followers of upcoming events without reaching spam-like levels of e-mail outreach to our constituents. We will continue to distribute major announcements, our biannual CEPH newsletter and other key materials via e-mail.

Finally, I would note that several of us on CEPH staff are not digital natives. Several of us are new to Twitter and new to using social media in professional settings. Join us as we grow and learn about these increasingly relevant communication channels, and rest assured that our website and e-mails are not going away!

Q9. Our next accreditation site visit is fall 2017 ... based on previous criteria. Then we still submit our implementation report in January 2018. Pretty tight timeline to move from one focus to another in terms of just having a completed a self-study. But this is what is required? Any suggestions for the interface between these two processes.

A9. I would definitely encourage folks in this timeline to contact CEPH staff for some one-on-one advice. There are things that you can do to help bridge the gap between the two activities. For instance, rather than maintaining your current "core competencies" in Criterion 2.6.a, you could use and map the D2 Foundational Competencies in 2.6.a. That will satisfy both sets of criteria, and would "knock out" part of your compliance report during the self-study process. We can work together to identify other possible efficiencies.

Q10. How does CEPH define a supervisor for the BPH in C2-C number 4, letter b required documentation? Is the supervisor meant to be the preceptor for the experiential activity or the academic advisor?

A10. The answer will depend on how your bachelor's degree cumulative/experiential activity is structured. In most cases, the calculation would be based on faculty members rather than preceptors, but we would have to discuss the setup of your experience in order to answer this question accurately. Feel free to reach out to CEPH staff.