

**K-State MPH Faculty Advisory Council Minutes  
April 3, 2013 – Union Room 202**

<b>Members Present:</b>	Canter, Cates, Chapes, Heinrich, Larson, Mailey, McElroy, Montelone, Nutsch, Renter, Rosenkranz, van der Merwe, Wang
<b>Not Present:</b>	Blair, Fung, Haub, Kastner, Kelly (Proxy Cates), Sanderson (Proxy Larson)
<b>Guests</b>	None
<b>MPH Office Staff and MPH Students:</b>	Choma, Stevenson

- Dr. Cates called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM. There was a quorum present.
- **Approval of minutes**  
The minutes from the January 11, 2013 meeting were approved.
- **Old Business**
  - Dr. Cates reminded the group that in their plans of work, their commitment to the MPH program needed to be document and discussed with their department head. The College of Arts and Sciences does not use plans of work but agreed to document their commitment to the MPH program.
  - Dr. Cates reminded the Curriculum Committee that the entire curriculum for Food Safety/Biosecurity, plus MPH 720 and MPH 818, need to be reviewed by November 1, 2013. Curriculum committee members for this cycle are: Kastner, Larson, McElroy, Nutsch and Rosenkranz.
- **Discussion / Action Items Program Related Items**
  - There was a lengthy discussion concerning the review, revalidation and/or change of admission requirements along with the use of GRE scores. (Attachment 1)  
Generally it was felt that the GRE adds additional information, especially for students with GPAs close to or below 3.0. Before the new GRE test, a score of 1000 was suggested in some of our recruiting materials, but that suggestion has long been removed and no suggested score is now listed. It was moved, seconded and passed (with one abstaining) that we include the requirement for GRE scores, list no suggested minimum for the GRE, drop the GRE waiver for significant public health experience, and allow the following waivers for an applicant that:
    1. Has a graduate degree, such as a Master of Science or PhD;
    2. Has a graduate professional degree, such as an MD, DDS, or DVM; or
    3. Is already in the Graduate Certificate for Public Health Core Concepts program and has completed at least 9 semester credit hours from the required core courses with at least a 3.25 cumulative graduate Grade Point Average on those hours.
All other admissions requirements will remain the same.
  - The field experience report requirements for students completing a thesis and/or master's report were reviewed. (Attachment 2) The group agreed that the separate oral and written report requirements for field experience were clear and appropriate, as documented in the MPH Graduate Student Handbook and on our website. The rest of the discussion centered on the length and format of the field experience report, when compared with a thesis.

**K-State MPH Faculty Advisory Council Minutes**  
**April 3, 2013 – Union Room 202**

It was noted that there is no required length listed but students look at K-REx and make comparisons. Expectations of the end product(s) of the field experience are listed in the Field Experience Agreement, which is filled out before the student starts their field experience. At the conclusion of the field experience, the MPH Graduate Handbook states (12.12.1) that: "Each student will provide an oral and a written report for each field experience, and the format is at the discretion of the supervisory committee."

The outcome of the discussion was a suggestion that a report template for the field experience report be developed as a guideline for students to use in the absence of direction from their major professor and/or committee.

- The accreditation timeline (Attachment 3) was reviewed and discussed. The self-study document is completed and Dr. Cates asked the Faculty Advisory Council to review it one more time before April 10 and pay particular attention to section 1.7 – Faculty Resources. It will then be forwarded to the Executive Council for their final review and then forwarded to the Provost on or before April 24th. It will go to CEPH reviewers on or before May 24, 2013. During the summer, we anticipate responding to their requests for more information and clarification from the CEPH preliminary reviewers.

The group discussed possible times to conduct a Mock Site Visit before the scheduled site visit of October 27-29, 2013. The group decided that one month before the site visit would be a good time, in late September. The Mock Site Visit will be held in the same place as the Site Visit (Mara Conference Center in Trotter Hall).

The council's major involvement with the accreditation team would be on Monday, October 28, as listed on the draft Site Visit Itinerary. It was pointed out that a group comprised of employers of our graduates would be difficult to put together and currently is included in the group Alumni and Community Representatives. The suggestion was made that possibly some could be included in a conference call.

Dr. Cates asked the group to review Attachment 4 which is a list of general questions for the site accreditation team. Members of the council that have participated in other accreditations, either as site visitors or organizations being reviewed, suggested that talking points be prepared for the different groups and individuals that would meet with the site team.

- The council discussed future meetings. It was determined that there would be no meeting in May and that the next meeting would be sometime in August when those that are on 9-month appointments would be back for the fall semester (generally 1 week before classes start).

Ms. Stevenson will compile a list of everyone's fall teaching schedule and send a poll for the best time to meet in the fall. The council liked meeting at the Union because it is more centrally located for everyone and requested that the meetings be rotated between main campus and the veterinary complex.

- **Meeting adjourned** at noon
- **Next Meeting:** TBA – sometime in August 2013

**K-State MPH Faculty Advisory Council Minutes  
April 3, 2013 – Union Room 202**

• **Action Items**

<b>#</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
1	Post approved minutes from January 2013 on MPH website and K-State online	MPH Program Office
2	Update website and MPH Graduate Handbook to reflect the GRE score waivers.	MPH Program Office
3	Compile rejection letter paragraphs sent to unsuccessful applicants and provide to council members	MPH Program Office
4	Develop basic template for written field experience report	MPH Program Office
5	Develop “talking points” for individuals/groups meeting with accreditation team.	MPH Program Office
6	Collect fall teaching schedules from FAC members.	MPH Program Office

## Attachments

### Attachment 1. GRE Program History

#### Information on Admissions of MPH degree students (as of February 1, 2013)

Emphasis Area	Applications	GRE Waived	
FSB	12	2	17%
IDZ	120	30	25%
PHN	24	4	17%
PHPA	24	3	13%
All MPH	180	39	22%
Status of Student	Applications	GRE Waived	
Graduate	75	16	21%
Active	94	21	22%
Inactive	11	2	18%

Emphasis Area	GRE (V + Q) (Old Scale)		GRE Verbal (Old Scale)		GRE Quantitative (Old Scale)		Entrance GPA	
	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean
FSB	870 - 1260	1020	270 - 590	418	430 - 730	602	2.6 - 4.0	3.27
IDZ	630 - 1370	1065	230 - 730	467	310 - 740	598	2.3 - 4.0	3.35
PHN	610 - 1440	1084	300 - 710	484	310 - 770	600	2.69 - 4.0	3.41
PHPA	840 - 1240	997	350 - 520	438	390 - 720	559	2.3 - 4.0	3.25
All MPH	610 - 1440	1054	230 - 730	461	310 - 770	593	2.3 - 4.0	3.33
Graduates	700 - 1360	1054	270 - 730	457	380 - 770	597	2.3 - 4.0	3.3
Active	610 - 1440	1054	230 - 710	465	310 - 740	588	2.3 - 4.0	3.36
Inactive	870 - 1360	1064	370 - 610	461	470 - 750	603	2.8 - 3.95	3.3

#### From Testing Agency - Conversion Chart

GRE Scores	% Rank	Old Scale	New Scale
<b>Verbal</b>	99	800	170
	89	640	162
	80	590	159
	69	540	156
	57	500	153
	49	470	151
	40	440	149
	32	410	147
	21	370	144
	10	320	140
	1	240	131
<b>Quantitative</b>	94	800	166
	90	790	164
	81	760	160
	71	730	157
	60	690	154
	48	650	151
	39	620	149
	27	560	146
	20	520	144
	11	450	141
	5	370	138
	1	270	134

### Attachment 2. Review field experience report requirements for students completing a thesis and/or master's report from MPH Graduate Handbook

#### 12.11 *Culminating Experience Requirements and Guidelines*

A culminating experience is one that requires a student to synthesize and integrate knowledge acquired in coursework and other learning experiences and to apply theory and principles in a situation that approximates some aspect of profession practice. It must be used as a means by which faculty judge whether the student has mastered the body of knowledge and can demonstrate proficiency in the required competencies.

All MPH degree students at Kansas State University must complete a culminating experience, chosen from three main possibilities with the assistance and advice of their major professor, supervisory committee members and the MPH Program Director. The options available are explained below:

##### 12.11.1.1 Field Experience and Capstone Project Presentation and Oral Defense

In this option, during the final semester, the student presents oral and written reports from the field experience and associated capstone project to his/her graduate supervisory committee members and other invited guests. The supervisory committee members will assess required knowledge and competencies during and after the presentation.

##### 12.11.1.2 Public Health Research Thesis Presentation with Oral Defense

In this option, during the final semester, the student presents an oral report and written thesis from their original research investigation of a public health problem or topic to his/her graduate supervisory committee members and other invited guests. ***In addition, the student must complete a written field experience report.*** Depending on the expectations of the supervisory committee, the student's oral presentation may include details related to both the thesis research and their field experience at the same time. The supervisory committee members will assess required knowledge and competencies during and after the presentation.

##### 12.11.1.3 Master's Report Presentation and Oral Defense

In this option, during the final semester, the student presents oral and written reports related to their individual work on a public health-related topic in addition to an oral and written reports about their field experience, to his/her graduate supervisory committee members and other invited guests. The supervisory committee members will assess knowledge and competencies during and after the presentation.

#### 12.12 *Written and Oral Report Guidelines*

The written and oral reports provided in a student's culminating experience should address how each of the MPH core competencies and emphasis area competencies were used or met in the culminating/capstone experience. All reports should be submitted to the major advisor and graduate supervisory committee, and the MPH Program director.

##### 12.12.1 Field Experience Report

Each student will provide an oral and a written report for each field experience, and the format is at the discretion of the supervisory committee. If a capstone project is included as part of the field experience, the written and oral reports for that project may be combined with the field experience report.

## Attachments

For those students completing a thesis or Master's Report separate from the field experience, there must be a separate field experience report, although the oral reports may be combined at the discretion of the supervisory committee.

Once the product is presented as an oral presentation and in its final form with all the changes requested by the student's graduate committee, an electronic copy of the field experience report (preferable in Word) and slide presentation (preferable in PowerPoint) should be given to the MPH Program office. The program office will be responsible to place a copy of the report and slides in the MPH section of e-repository (K-Rex).

### 12.12.2 Thesis

A thesis must meet all formatting and submission guidelines of the university and Graduate School. In addition, a separate written field experience report must be submitted, meeting program guidelines of 12.12.1.; however, at the discretion of the supervisory committee, the oral reports may combine aspects of both the thesis and the field experience.

### 12.12.3 Master's Report

A Master's Report must meet all formatting and submission guidelines of the university and Graduate School. In addition, a separate written field experience report must be submitted, meeting program guidelines of 12.12.1.; however, at the discretion of the supervisory committee, the oral reports may combine aspects of both the Master's Report and the field experience.

***Bottom line: the oral and written report requirements for the field experience are separate from and in addition to the requirements of the thesis, but the presentations can be combined in some way, according to what each supervisory committee wants. Once the committee approves of everything, we would like to post the reports from the field experience, and of course, the Grad School gets the thesis.***

## Attachments

### Attachment 3: CEPH Accreditation Timeline

1. Preliminary Self-Study Document
  - a. Draft compiled ✓
  - b. Reviews / Revisions
    - i. Faculty Advisory Council ✓
    - ii. Executive Council ✓
    - iii. MPH Faculty ✓
    - iv. Public ✓
  - c. Final Revisions (complete before April 8<sup>th</sup>)
  - d. Final Review
    - i. Faculty Advisory Council (complete before April 15<sup>th</sup>)
    - ii. Executive Council (complete before April 30<sup>th</sup>)
  - e. Submission to Provost (before May 3<sup>rd</sup>)
  - f. Submission to CEPH Reviewers (before May 24<sup>th</sup>)
2. Final Self-Study Document
  - a. Response to CEPH questions / recommendations
  - b. Submission according to their deadline (most likely before mid-August)
3. Mock Site Visit
  - a. Time to be determined (late September / early October?)
  - b. Place: same as Site Visit (Mara Conference Center, Trotter)
4. Site Visit
  - a. Three Visitors
  - b. October 27-29, 2013
  - c. Groups to meet with site visitors (approximately 1 hour each)
    - i. Provost
    - ii. Deans
    - iii. Department Heads
    - iv. Program Staff
    - v. Primary Faculty
    - vi. Students (Lunch on Monday)
    - vii. Other MPH Faculty
    - viii. Graduates / Preceptors
  - d. Draft Agenda:

## Attachments

### **Kansas State University MPH Program Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) Site Visit October 27-29, 2013**

#### **Sunday, October 27, 2013**

Open           Arrival of Site Visit Team to Hotel  
*Holiday Inn Manhattan*  
*Anderson Avenue, Manhattan, KS*

6:00 pm       Executive Session of Site Visit Team

7:00 pm       Site Visit Team Dinner  
*Houlihans*

#### **Monday, October 28, 2013**

8:15 am Site Visit Team Hotel Pickup  
*Mike Cates will pick them up and deliver them to Anderson Hall*

8:30 am Introductory Visit with University Provost  
*Dr. April Mason*  
*Anderson Hall*  
*Mike Cates will transport them from Anderson Hall to College of Veterinary Medicine*

9:00 am Site Team Set-up and Request for Additional Documents  
*Mara Center, College of Veterinary Medicine*

9:15 am Executive Session of Team

10:00 am      Meet with MPH Program Board of Directors  
*Mike Cates – Program Director*  
*John Floros – Agriculture*  
*Peter Dorhout – Arts & Sciences*  
*TBD – Human Ecology*  
*Ralph Richardson – Veterinary Medicine*  
*Carol Shanklin – Graduate School*

10:45 am      Break

11:00 am      Meet with MPH Program Executive Council  
*Mike Cates, DVM, MPH – Program Director*  
*Ken Odde – Animal Sciences and Industry*  
*M.M. Chengappa, PhD – Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology*  
*Bonnie Rush – Clinical Sciences*  
*Mark Haub – Human Nutrition*  
*David Dzewaltowski – Kinesiology*  
*Jeannie Sneed – Hospitality Management and Dietetics*  
*James Neill – Statistics*  
*Brian Spooner – Biology*

11:45 am      Break

12:00 pm      Lunch with MPH Students



## Attachments

12:45 pm	Break
1:00 pm	Meet with MPH Primary Faculty <i>Abbey Nutsch</i> <i>Justin Kastner</i> <i>Daniel Fung</i> <i>Dave Renter</i> <i>Deon van der Merwe</i> <i>Stephen Chapes</i> <i>Ric Rosenkranz</i> <i>Mark Haub</i> <i>George Wang</i> <i>David Dzewaltowski</i> <i>Mary McElroy</i> <i>Katie Heinrich</i> <i>Emily Mailey</i> <i>Brandon Irwin</i>
1:45 pm	Break
2:00 pm	Meet with other MPH Faculty <i>Bob Larson, Deb Canter, Mike Sanderson, Beth Montelone, Others</i>
2:45 pm	Break
3:00 pm	Meet with Alumni and Community Representatives <i>Dr. Paul Benne, Ginny Barnard, Katy Vaughan, Others?</i>
3:45 pm	Break
4:00 pm	Resource File Review and Executive Session
5:00 pm	Adjourn and Return to Hotel

### **Tuesday, October 29, 2013**

8:00 am	Executive Session at Hotel
9:15 am	Hotel pickup and transportation to Anderson Hall
9:30 am	Meet with University President and Provost
10:00 am	Return to College of Veterinary Medicine and Break
10:30 am	Executive Session and Report Preparation
11:30 am	Working Lunch
12:30 pm	Exit Interview with Program Director and Board of Directors <i>Cates, Floros, Dorhout, Richardson, Shanklin, Human Ecology Dean</i>
1:30 pm	Team Departs

## Attachments

### Attachment 4. General guidance for site visitors: Questions to pursue with specific constituencies

This is intended as a *very general* guide and reference for generating ideas. Each site visit team must focus on those areas that the self-study and information gathered on-site reveals to be most relevant. Many questions should be pursued with multiple constituencies, and each program or school's unique structure may require addressing questions to different groups than those indicted below. For each question, the criterion to which the question is most generally related is indicated, but the list is not exhaustive.

#### Program/school officials (deans/directors)

- How were the mission, goals and objectives developed? (1.1)
- When were they revised, and what processes are in place for future revisions? (1.1)
- How often does strategic planning take place, and through what means? (1.2)
- How do you collect and analyze data? (1.2)
- How are evaluation data used in planning? Operationally, how are changes made? (1.2)
- How often are student course evaluations reviewed, by whom, and what happens to the information? (1.2)
- Who has authority over budget, and how does the budget process work? (1.4)
- Who has authority to authorize faculty searches? (1.4)
- Describe the governance system. For example, who advises program leaders in various areas and how? (1.5)
- How do program faculty get involved in governance at the program, department and/or university level? (1.5)
- What is your assessment of current resources? The immediate future resource outlook? (1.6)
- Clarify faculty resources—# of dedicated faculty per track. (1.7)
- How were the programmatic and track-specific competencies developed? (2.6)
- When were they revised, and what processes are in place for future revisions? (2.6)
- What specific resources do you dedicate to your distance education and executive degree programs (eg, technology, travel, student services)? (2.12 programs & 2.14 schools)
- Describe how the program has planned and organized its service activities. (3.2)
- How does a faculty search work from initiation to hire? (4.1)
- Who has promotion and tenure authority, and how does it work? (4.2)
- How are research, teaching, and CEPH-defined (not university committee) service examined/weighed? (4.2)
- Discuss efforts to achieve a diverse faculty. (1.8)
- Discuss efforts to achieve a diverse student body. (1.8)
- Describe student advising. (4.4)
- Describe career advising. (4.4)

#### Faculty (general)

- How do program faculty get involved in governance at the program, department and/or university level? (1.5)
- What is your assessment of current resources? The immediate future resource outlook? (1.6)
- Describe the process of supervising student practice placements.
  - How do students select a specific site? (2.4)
  - What are your interactions with the preceptor? (2.4)
- What, if any, ongoing supervision is there for the student while the placement is ongoing? (2.4)
- Describe the process of developing learning objectives for courses you teach. (2.6)
- Describe the process of supervising student culminating projects. (2.5)
- How do you assess students in your course? How does the program/track assess students? (2.7)
- How does evaluation of student practica work? (2.7)
- For those teaching in distance learning/executive degree formats: Describe how student advising works. Describe policies or procedures that support teaching and/or any technologies used in these programs. (2.12 programs & 2.14 schools)
- For those teaching in distance learning/executive degree formats: How do you assess student learning and attainment of the specified competencies in these programs? (2.12 programs & 2.14 schools)
- For those teaching in distance learning/executive degree formats: How do you evaluate the success of your curriculum for students pursuing the degree through distance education or executive formats? (2.12 programs & 2.14 schools)
- Talk about research: who are the funders, how does community-based research work, how do partnerships with other agencies/institutions work? (3.1)
- Describe the program's support for individual faculty research. (3.1)
- Describe student involvement in research. (3.1)

## Attachments

- Talk about service: what types of things do faculty do, how does the program support participation? (3.2)
- Describe the role of service/public health practice in the tenure and promotions process. (3.2)
- Talk about workforce development: what types of things do faculty do, how does the program support participation? (3.3)
- Describe the tenure and promotions process. (4.2)
- Describe faculty development tools: mentoring, startup incentives, ability to access skill development courses, support for travel to conferences, teaching skills development, etc. (4.2)
- Describe student advising. (4.4)
- Describe career advising for students. (4.4)
- How were the mission, goals and objectives developed? (1.1)
- When were they revised, and what processes are in place for future revisions? (1.1)
- How often does strategic planning take place, and through what means? (1.2)
- How are community members, students, and other constituencies involved in planning/evaluation? (1.2)
- How do you collect and analyze data? (1.2)
- How are evaluation data used in planning? Operationally, how are changes made? (1.2)
- How often are ongoing courses (eg, core courses) reviewed, and through what means? (1.2)
- How often are student course evaluations reviewed, and what happens to the information? (1.2)
- Is there a review process for course-level learning objectives, and how does it work? (2.6)
- Is there a process for tracking how courses support programmatic and track-specific competencies, and how does it work? (2.6)
- Is there a process to review/update competencies, and how does it work? (2.6)
- What mechanisms ensure that all academic degree students are versed in epidemiology and introduced to other public health topics? (2.9 programs & 2.11 schools)
- How does credit sharing work for joint/dual degrees? (2.11 programs & 2.13 schools)
- Are there special procedures or policies relating to development of curriculum for distance learning/executive degree coursework? (2.12 programs & 2.14 schools)

## Students

- Why are you here today? (1.2)
- Are you familiar with the self-study? If so, what interactions have you had with the process? (1.2)
- How does the program/school respond to student feedback? (1.2)
- How do you give feedback? (1.5)
- Describe the practice placement.
  - How do you select a site? (2.4)
  - What is the role of your faculty advisor throughout the process? (2.4)
  - How are you assessed work? (2.4)
- Why did you choose this program? (4.4)
- Describe advisement. (4.4)
- Describe career advisement. (4.4)
- What are the program's/school's best points?
- What would you like to see changed/what could make the program/school stronger?

## Alumni

- Why are you here today? (1.2)
- Are you familiar with the self-study? If so, what interactions have you had with the process? (1.2)
- What means are there for you to provide feedback now? (1.2)
- If applicable, how has the program/school responded to your feedback as an alum? (1.2)
- How well do you feel prepared by the program/school for what you're doing? (2.5)
- What are you currently doing? (2.6)
- What areas could the program strengthen that might strengthen your preparation for practice/further education? (2.6)
- Why did you choose this program? (4.4)
- Describe advisement. (4.4)
- Describe career advisement. (4.4)
- What are the program's/school's best points?
- What would you like to see changed/what could make the program/school stronger?

## Attachments

### Employers of graduates/Student preceptors

- Are you familiar with the self-study? If so, what interactions have you had with the process? (1.2)
- Does the program/school solicit feedback from you? If so, describe. (1.2)
- If applicable, how has the program/school responded to your feedback? (1.2)
- For preceptors: describe the process.
  - How did you become involved as a preceptor? (2.4)
  - What contact do you have with students' faculty advisors? (2.4)
- What is your role in evaluation? (2.4)
- In what areas do you think that the program/school has room for growth to better serve workforce needs? (2.6)
- How is the program/school perceived in your field/in the community?
- What do you see as the program/school's specific strengths?

### Community representatives

- Are you familiar with the self-study? If so, what interactions have you had with the process? (1.2)
- Does the program/school solicit feedback from you? If so, describe. (1.2)
- If applicable, how has the program/school responded to your feedback? (1.2)
- Describe the operations of the community advisory board, if applicable.
  - What did the program/school describe as your role? (1.5)
  - What do you see as your role? (1.5)
  - How often do you meet? (1.5)
  - Who sets the agenda? (1.5)
  - What goes on at meetings? (1.5)
- What is the nature of your relationship with the program/school? (3.2)
- Describe the frequency of your interactions with the program/school. (3.2)
- How is the program/school perceived in your field/in the community?
- What do you see as the program/school's specific strengths?
- In what areas do you think that the program/school has room for growth to better serve workforce needs?

### University officials (presidents/provosts)

- Discuss vision/goals for the program/school. (1.1)
- Discuss public health's role/value in the broader institutional context. (1.4)
- Discuss resource issues (particularly specific areas of concern highlighted by other constituencies). (1.6)
- Discuss efforts to achieve a diverse faculty/staff. (1.8)
- Discuss efforts to achieve a diverse student body. (1.8)