C1. Fiscal Resources (SPH and PHP)

The school or program has financial resources adequate to fulfill its stated mission and goals. Financial support is adequate to sustain all core functions, including offering coursework and other elements necessary to support the full array of degrees and ongoing operations.

Required documentation:

1) **Describe the school or program's budget processes, including all sources of funding. This description addresses the following, as applicable:**

The University of Miami operates under a June 1st to May 31st fiscal year. The Graduate Programs budget is part of the budget for the Department and follows the budget policy and preparation schedule of the Miller School of Medicine. The process starts in December each year when Graduate Programs staff submit a budget to the Department's Finance Office indicating projected expenses for each program. The Department budget is refined based on the Miller School of Medicine Budget Guidelines and the Graduate Programs budget is discussed within this context. Once the Department budget is approved by the Medical School Dean, the budget is incorporated into the overall budget for the Miller School of Medicine and submitted to the University's central administration for eventual approval by the University of Miami Board of Trustees. The Department and Graduate Programs funding comes from five sources: tuition revenue, direct funding from grants and contracts, indirect funding from grants and contracts, gifts, and Miller School of Medicine funding to support the department educational program's mission.

   a. **Briefly describe how the school or program pays for faculty salaries. For example, are faculty salaries fully guaranteed, or are faculty expected to raise funds to support salaries? If this varies by individual or appointment type, indicate this and provide examples. For programs, if faculty salaries are paid by an entity other than the program (such as a department or college), explain.**

The funding expectations for faculty depend on their appointment type. Tenure and tenure-earning faculty are required to fund their salaries with research, education, and other external sources of funding. The University of Miami Miller School of Medicine (UMMSOM) faculty compensation plan requires tenure and tenure-earning faculty to secure a minimum of 65% (maximum of 95%) of their salary through research. The Department provides 5% protected time to all tenure and tenure-earning faculty who submit grants as a principal or multi-principal investigator. This 5% is institutional policy and accounts for faculty grant writing. Department operations fund this 5%. Adherence to the faculty compensation plan generates a bonus for faculty who successfully meet the criteria stipulated in the policy. The Department bonus performance metrics are reviewed and monitored yearly by the Department Executive Committee.

The Department research and educator track faculty are required to fund their salaries at 95% with research, education, and other external sources. Individual faculty performance is evaluated annually by the corresponding Division Director and the Department Chair. Feedback on performance, goals, and development is provided in writing to each faculty.

   b. **Briefly describe how the school or program requests and/or obtains additional faculty or staff (additional = not replacements for individuals who left). If multiple models are possible, indicate this and provide examples.**

For additional faculty hires, the department prepares a business plan indicating the revenues and expenses associated with the requested hire and presents it to the Joint Operations Leadership Team (JOLT), appointed by the UHealth board, for review based on the medical school's mission and vision. The JOLT recommends position approval/denial to the Dean of the Miller School of Medicine. The Dean makes the final decision on approval/denial for all requests for additional faculty.

For additional staff hires, a request is also submitted to the JOLT for review based on the medical school's mission and vision. The JOLT recommends position approval/denial to the Office of Human

Resources. The Office of Human Resources submits the request, with documentation, to the Associate Dean for Finance of the Miller School of Medicine for fiscal approval.

    c. Describe how the school or program funds the following:
        i. Operational costs (schools and programs define "operational" in their own contexts; definition must be included in the response)

Operational costs are any expenses related to the operations of the Graduate Programs that do not fall under compensation, student support, and travel. Examples of such costs are software to support recruitment and engagement of candidates, software to support student and alumni engagement and networking, facilities costs, supplies, and equipment. These costs are funded by tuition revenue as well as departmental support.

        ii. Student support, including scholarships, support for student conference travel, support for student activities, etc.

These costs are funded by tuition, gifts, grants, and departmental support.

        iii. Faculty development expenses, including travel support. If this varies by individual or appointment type, indicate this and provide examples.

These costs are funded by tuition, grants, and departmental support and applied to all faculty.

    d. In general terms, describe how the school or program requests and/or obtains additional funds for operational costs, student support and faculty development expenses.

Each year the Graduate Programs submits a budget to the Department, which is included in the Department's overall budget request to the Miller School of Medicine. If there were any operational costs that could not be covered by the Department's operational budget, (has not happened to date), the Department could (if needed) request the funds from the Miller School of Medicine, with the Medical School Dean as the ultimate approver.

    e. Explain how tuition and fees paid by students are returned to the school or program. If the school or program receives a share rather than the full amount, explain, in general terms, how the share returned is determined. If the school or program's funding is allocated in a way that does not bear a relationship to tuition and fees generated, indicate this and explain.

The MPH and MS programs generate tuition revenue according to the University of Miami cost per credit formula. The Miller School of Medicine retains 30% of all tuition revenue generated, with 70% of these funds returned to the Department. This is the standard model across the Miller School of Medicine. Student fees are collected by the University and are primarily used to fund central student support services (i.e., libraries, student health center, wellness center). The Graduate Programs does not receive any portion of student fees collected by the University.

    f. Explain how indirect costs associated with grants and contracts are returned to the school or program and/or individual faculty members. If the school or program and its faculty do not receive funding through this mechanism, explain.

The Miller School of Medicine retains 25% of indirect costs (F&A generated) from grants and contracts, while 75% is returned to the Department. This is the standard model across the Miller School of Medicine. The Miller School of Medicine faculty compensation plan allows a return to the department of 5-10% of the total department indirect costs generated if the following requirement is met: generate at least 65% of faculty compensation for research time by sources outside the Miller School of Medicine.

If the school or program is a multi-partner unit sponsored by two or more universities (as defined in Criteria A2), the responses must make clear the financial contributions of each sponsoring university to the overall school or program budget. The description must explain how tuition and other income is shared, including indirect cost returns for research generated by public health school or program faculty appointed at any institution. (self-study document)

This section of the criterion is not applicable to the Graduate Programs in Public Health.

2) **A clearly formulated school or program budget statement in the format of Template C1-1, showing sources of all available funds and expenditures by major categories, for the last five years.**
   PHP only: If a program does not typically have a separate budget, it must present one of the following:

   - **A budget statement for the organizational unit that houses the program's budget in the format of Template C1-1 AND an accompanying table, also in Template C1-1 format, that estimates program income and expenditures, line by line, with accompanying narrative explaining the basis for the estimate (e.g., approximately 20% of the department's salary funds support the program).**

   - **A table that accurately depicts the funding controlled by the program. For example, if the program's only direct allocation is funds for operations and student support, the budget table would address those categories only. A narrative must accompany the table and explain the reasoning for including/excluding categories of income and expenditures.**

Template C1-1.

Source of Funds and Expenditures by Major Category, 2017 – 2021					
	2016 - 2017 (FY17)	2017 - 2018 (FY18)	2018 - 2019 (FY19)	2019 - 2020 (FY20)	2020 - 2021 (FY21)
Source of Funds					
Tuition and Fees	$5,457,211	$5,011,239	$4,727,965	$4,779,055	$5,978,245
State Appropriation	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000
University Funds	$342,000	$342,000	$354,000	$366,000	$381,600
Grants/Contracts	$175,968	$307,330	$217,821	$140,168	$77,279
Indirect Cost Recovery	$21,116	$23,880	$26,295	$16,793	$3,499
Gifts	$120,518	$10,000	$11,000	$6,876	$26,911
TOTAL	**$6,266,813**	**$5,844,449**	**$5,487,045**	**$5,458,891**	**$6,617,534**
Expenditures					
Faculty Salaries and Benefits	$2,903,540	$2,967,619	$2,816,966	$2,803,172	$2,711,428
Staff Salaries and Benefits	$1,265,536	$1,136,971	$1,160,828	$1,208,093	$1,181,603
Operations	$429,711	$529,336	$583,121	$352,837	$405,925
Travel	$142,644	$121,166	$170,873	$89,298	$0
Student Support	$1,243,304	$1,137,148	$1,229,676	$1,334,622	$1,859,889
Other (Space)	$249,501	$255,195	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$6,234,237**	**$6,147,437**	**$5,961,464**	**$5,788,023**	**$6,158,846**

> **If the program is a multi-partner unit sponsored by two or more universities (as defined in Criteria A2), the budget statement must make clear the financial contributions of each sponsoring university to the overall program budget. (self-study document)**

This section of the criterion is not applicable to the Graduate Programs in Public Health.

3) If applicable, assess strengths and weaknesses related to this criterion and plans for improvement in this area. (self-study document)

Strengths: The Graduate Programs are fiscally strong. Investment in the MPH and MSPH scholarship program began in 2020 - 2021, with up to 25% of tuition costs covered per student. This investment has increased enrollment (quality, quantity, and diversity of students), allowing our program cost to better align with other large competitor schools and programs. Increased departmental investment in advising, program advertisement, social media and communications, and software systems specifically tailored for graduate programs management and student/alumni resources has also contributed to increased enrollment.

Weaknesses: Continue negotiations for additional space including classrooms and PhD student space.

Plans for Improvement:
- Develop online opportunities for practitioners (i.e., certificates, professional development, continuing education, expand BEAM certificate).
- Expand philanthropic support, including plans to work with the Miller School of Medicine Development/Advancement Office to create a targeted development plan across all degree programs.
- Invest additional funds in our students through tuition scholarship funding and travel awards.
- Implementation of a new resiliency scholarship program (full tuition scholarship award)
- Invest in faculty training opportunities to enhance instructional capabilities and innovative course delivery.
- Continue to support graduate programs staff professional development and create opportunities for career advancement
- Seek additional contiguous space to expand offices for PhD students

C2. Faculty Resources

The school or program has adequate faculty, including primary instructional faculty and non-primary instructional faculty, to fulfill its stated mission and goals. This support is adequate to sustain all core functions, including offering coursework and advising students. The stability of resources is a factor in evaluating resource adequacy.

Primary instructional faculty, as defined in these criteria, provide the basis for initial levels of review of the adequacy of a school or program's resources.

This criterion employs a three-step review (outlined in C2-A through C2-C) in assessing adequacy of faculty resources.

<u>Definitions</u>

PHP only: Primary instructional faculty must meet ALL THREE requirements outlined below:

- **Employed full-time as faculty members at the home institution/university. The program uses the university's definition of full-time".**

- **Have regular responsibility for instruction in the program as a component of employment. Individuals whose sole instructional responsibility is advising individual doctoral or research students do not meet CEPH's definition of primary instructional faculty.**

- **Spend a majority of time/effort (i.e., 0.50 FTE or greater) on activities associated with the program, including instruction. Research and service effort should also be included in the FTE allocated to the program if the research or service projects impact the program and its students. The program defines FTE allocations consistently and transparently and can clearly account for all time, effort and instructional or other responsibilities spent on degree programs outside the unit of accreditation.**

<u>C2-A. Minimum faculty requirements by accreditation unit (SPH and PHP)</u>

  Schools employ, at a minimum, 21 primary instructional faculty.

  Programs employ, at a minimum, three primary instructional faculty.

<u>C2-B. Minimum faculty requirements by range of offerings (SPH and PHP)</u>

Students' access to a range of intellectual perspectives and to breadth of thought in their chosen fields of study is an important component of quality, as is faculty access to colleagues with shared interests and expertise.

To provide this basic breadth and range and to assure quality, schools and programs employ at a minimum, three faculty members per concentration area for the first degree level offered.

Each additional degree level in a concentration requires the addition of one faculty member. Thus, a concentration area that solely offers master's degrees requires three faculty members. A concentration offering bachelor's and master's degrees OR master's and doctoral degrees requires four faculty members. A concentration with bachelor's, master's and doctoral-level degrees requires a minimum of five faculty members.

Additional definitions and specifications for these faculty requirements differ between schools and programs, due to the differing appointment and resource structures in these organizational units. Definitions and specifications are as follows:
<u>PHP</u>

Programs that meet the requirements associated with schools in C2-A (i.e., programs that have 21 or more primary instructional faculty dedicated solely to the program (i.e., 1.0 FTE) may opt to follow the definitions listed above for school faculty.

For all other programs, the three faculty per concentration for the first degree level include the following:

- **Two primary instructional faculty members**
  - **These individuals may count toward the two faculty (or additional faculty required for adding a degree level) in one additional concentration ONLY IF they are allocated to the program at 1.0 FTE and are not shared with other educational programs. Primary instructional faculty who are dedicated to the program at FTE between 0.50 and 0.99 may only count toward the required faculty members in a single concentration.**

- **One additional faculty member of any type (faculty from another university unit, adjunct faculty, part-time faculty or primary instructional faculty associated with another concentration area). The additional faculty required for additional degree levels must be primary instructional faculty.**

All identified faculty must have regular instructional responsibility in the area. Individuals who perform research in a given area but do not have some regular expectations for instruction cannot serve as one of the three to five listed members.

SPH and PHP

All identified faculty must be qualified to provide instruction in the concentration area, as defined in Criterion E1.

Criterion E assesses an individual's qualifications vis-à-vis his or her association with a concentration, degree level and type of degree (e.g., professional or academic).

In multi-partner schools and programs (i.e., institutions responding to Criterion A2), faculty may be drawn from any of the participating institutions to demonstrate compliance with this aspect of the criteria.

C2-C. Faculty resource adequacy, beyond minimum eligibility (SPH and PHP)

In addition to meeting the minimum quantitative standards above, the size of the school or program's faculty complement is appropriate for the size of the student body and supports and encourages effective, regular and substantive student-faculty interactions.

The school or program documents the adequacy of the faculty complement through multiple quantitative and qualitative measures, including the following: advising ratios; availability of faculty to supervise MPH integrative learning experiences and doctoral students' final projects; and data on student perceptions of class size and faculty availability.

Required documentation:

1) A table demonstrating the adequacy of the program's instructional faculty resources in the format of Template C2-1. (self-study document)

Template C2-1.

CONCENTRATION	FIRST DEGREE LEVEL			SECOND DEGREE LEVEL	ADDITIONAL FACULTY
	PIF 1	PIF 2	FACULTY 3	PIF 4	
BIOSTATISTICS MS PhD	Tulay Koru-Sengul 1.0	Daniel Diaz 1.0	Raymond Balise 0.60	Hemant Ishwaran 1.0	PIF: 7 Non-PIF: 4
CLIMATE AND HEALTH MS	Naresh Kumar 1.0	John Beier 1.0	Brian Soden 0.55		PIF: 1 Non-PIF: 4
EPIDEMIOLOGY PhD	WayWay Hlaing 1.0	Paulo Pinheiro 1.0	Jennifer Hu 0.85		PIF: 2 Non PIF: 3
GENERALIST MPH and MSPH	Viviana Horigian 1.0	James Shultz 1.0	David Lee 1.0		PIF: 3 Non-PIF: 9
PREVENTION SCIENCE & COMMUNITY HEALTH MS PhD	Eric Brown 1.0	Sara St. George 1.0	Tatiana Perrino 1.0	Mariano Kanamori 0.65	PIF: 2 Non-PIF: 3
PUBLIC HEALTH PHYSICIAN MPH/MD	Shirin Shafazand 1.0	Alberto Caban-Martinez 1.0	Kathryn McCollister 1.0		PIF: 0 Non-PIF: 12

TOTALS:

Named PIF	20
Total PIF	35
Non-PIF	35

2) Explain the method for calculating FTE for faculty in the templates and evidence of the calculation method's implementation. Programs must present calculation methods for primary instructional and non-primary instructional faculty. (self-study document)

Primary instructional faculty are employed full-time as faculty members at the University of Miami and have regular responsibility for instruction in the Graduate Programs, with a majority of time/effort (0.50 FTE or greater), on activities associated with the program. Non-primary faculty include full-time university faculty, or faculty with secondary appointments, who provide less than 0.50 FTE to the Graduate Programs and voluntary faculty.

Faculty FTE calculations, for primary and non-primary faculty, are weighted as follows:

Instruction
0.20 FTE = Teaching per core/required course
0.15 FTE = Teaching per elective course
0.10 FTE = Office hours per core course taught
0.05 FTE = Office hours per elective course taught

Committee Service
0.10 FTE = Committee membership per committee (committees specific to Graduate Programs)
0.10 FTE = Increment for serving as committee chair per committee

Program Administration
0.50 FTE = Graduate Programs Director and Degree Program Directors

Public Health Service to Graduate Programs via Student Groups
0.10 FTE = Service to support student organizations/student government (e.g., Public Health Student Association, Delta Omega)

Advising
0.25 FTE = Academic and Capstone faculty advisors, assigned (MPH and MDMPH)
0.25 FTE = Academic and thesis advisors, assigned (MS)
0.05 – 0.15 FTE = Other faculty advising

Research Mentorship
0.10 FTE = Student mentorship (per PhD dissertation committee, MS thesis committee reader, independent study)

3) If applicable, provide a narrative explanation that supplements reviewers' understanding of data in the templates. (self-study document)

Not applicable.

4) Data on the following for the most recent year in the format of Template C2-2. See Template C2-2 for additional definitions and parameters.

Template C2-2.

General Advising 2020 - 2021			
Degree Level	**Average**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
Master's	10	2	28
Doctoral	15	12	19

For the master's degrees, the academic faculty advisors include both primary faculty (n = 18, average is 9 students) and non-primary faculty (n = 20, average is 10 students). For the doctoral programs in biostatistics, epidemiology, and prevention science and community health, the program director (primary faculty) serves as the academic faculty advisor for the length of the program.

Advising in MPH Integrative Experience 2020 - 2021			
Degree Level	**Average**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
Master's	5	1	15

Based on registration/enrollment of EPH 680 and 682 for the 2020 - 2021 academic year (MPH and MD/MPH). Advising for the integrated learning experience occurs both before and during enrollment.

Mentoring/Advising on Thesis and Dissertation (MS and PhD) 2020 - 2021			
Degree Level	**Average**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
Master's (MS)	3	1	11
Doctoral (PhD)	3	1	6

Each degree program assigns a faculty advisor to each student upon entry to the Graduate Programs. The faculty advisor must approve registration, course additions, and withdrawals, assuring regular contact between advisors and advisees. Faculty advisors have electronic access to student records (FileMaker) to track and support academic progress. The FileMaker management system serves as a student portfolio for each enrolled student, permitting both faculty and Graduate Programs staff to add information, documents, and progress notes for each advising encounter and program milestone reached. The Graduate Programs staff do not serve as assigned advisors but provide informal advising to all students throughout each degree program.

For the master's degrees (MPH and MS), faculty advisors provide guidance and assistance with selecting practice experiences/sites, integrating learning experiences, and completing the thesis. Faculty advisors are required to document, evaluate and assess work products and required documents from these experiences.

Additional information on advising is provided in Criterion H1.

5) Quantitative data on student perceptions of the following for the most recent year:

   a. Class size and its relation to quality of learning (e.g. The class size was conducive to my learning)

Students provide feedback on class size and its relation to quality of learning on two separate survey instruments: the mid-semester course evaluation (fall and spring semesters each academic year) and the student satisfaction survey (for exiting students). The mid-semester course evaluation includes the question/ratings statement "*The class size is appropriate and helpful to the way I learn*". Student responses are a Likert scale (1= strongly disagree – 5= strongly agree). The student satisfaction survey includes the question/ratings statement "*Class size in relation to the quality of learning*". Student responses are a Likert scale (1= excellent – 5= poor).   Data for the 2020 - 2021 academic year and 2020 calendar year are provided below.

Mid-Semester Course Evaluations 2020 - 2021	Master's		Doctoral	
Percentage of students who agree or strongly agree that "Class size is appropriate and helpful to the way I learn."				
	%	Mean	%	Mean
Fall 2020	83%	4.42	90%	4.37
Spring 2021	76%	4.27	96%	4.69

Likert scale, 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree

Student Satisfaction Survey	"Excellent" to "Good", 2020
Class size, in relation to the quality of learning	96%

Likert scale: 1= excellent, 2= very good, 3= good, 4= fair, 5= poor

Class size in relation to quality of learning was not included in the satisfaction survey prior to 2020.

b. Availability of faculty (i.e., Likert scale of 1-5, with 5 as very satisfied)

Students provide feedback on availability of faculty on two separate survey instruments, the end-of-semester course evaluation (fall, spring and summer semesters each academic year) and the student satisfaction survey (for exiting students). The end-of-semester course evaluation includes the question/ratings statement "*The faculty instructor is accessible and approachable*". Student responses are a Likert scale (1= strongly disagree – 5= strongly agree). The student satisfaction survey includes the question/ratings statements "*Availability of faculty*" and "*Faculty advisor was readily available*". Student responses are a Likert scale.   Data for the 2020 - 2021 academic year and 2018 – 2020 calendar years are provided below.

End of Semester Course Evaluations 2020 - 2021	Master's		Doctoral	
Percentage of students who agree or strongly agree that "the (faculty) instructor is accessible and approachable."				
	%	Mean	%	Mean
Fall 2020	92%	4.6	100%	4.7
Spring 2021	86%	4.5	100%	4.8

Likert scale, 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree

Student Satisfaction Survey	"Excellent" to "Good", 2018	"Excellent" to "Good", 2019	"Excellent" to "Good", 2020,
Accessibility of faculty	89%	95%	100%

Likert scale, 1= excellent, 2= very good, 3= good, 4= fair, 5= poor

Student Satisfaction Survey	"Strongly Agree" or "Agree", 2018	"Strongly Agree" or "Agree", 2019	"Strongly Agree" or "Agree", 2020
Faculty advisor was readily available	84%	89%	81%

Likert scale, 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree

Summary data reports for the satisfaction survey are available as ERF C2.5.

6) Qualitative data on student perceptions of class size and availability of faculty (summary in the self-study and full results/back-up documentation in the electronic resources file)

Masters and doctoral students have the opportunity to respond with open text commentary to the question "*The class size is appropriate and helpful to the way I learn*" on the mid-semester evaluation. This question/comment section was added to the survey starting Fall 2020. Data provided are from the academic year 2020 - 2021 (Fall 2020 and Spring 2021). The responses below are representative of student feedback.

> *"Small class size equals more discussions; I really like that the class size is smaller because I get to know my classmates better."* (EPH 679 Learning Collaboratory)

> *"The classes can be bigger, wish more students signed up for the course for better discussion. Zoom makes people shy and not want to speak."* (EPH 650 Health Economics Evaluation and Policy)

> *"Class size was small but that wasn't an issue."* (EPH 646 Climate and Health) (Masters)

> *"It is a very large class, it makes it good for group projects."* (EPH 641 Integrated Aspects of Environmental Health)

> *"Good class size and classmate interaction."* (EPH 600 Introduction to the Science and Practice of Public Health)

> "*Great class size for the number of required presentations and participants*." (*EPH 600 Introduction to the Science and Practice of Public Health*)

Masters and doctoral students have the opportunity to respond with open text commentary to the question "*The (faculty) instructor is approachable and accessible*" on the end-of semester evaluation. Data provided are from the academic year 2020 - 2021 (Fall 2020 and Spring 2021). The sample responses below are representative of student feedback.

> *"[faculty instructor] is always more than willing to meet after class or anytime during the day to discuss the homework and tips and where to improve." (BST 625 Statistical Computing)*

> *"I really appreciate how [faculty instructor] is accessible, she is extremely friendly and fair. All my emails were answered promptly with several thoughtful points and extra valuable insight." (EPH 731 Developing Interventions)*

> *"Always accessible and stretches her schedule to fit the needs of students, always answering our questions and willing to help." (EPH 621 Fundamentals of Epidemiology)*

> *"[faculty instructor] emailed me back within 30 minutes every time I reached out and met with me personally when I needed it. [faculty instructor] was great at answering questions and always willing to help out students." (EPH 603 Medical Biostatistics)*

> *"[faculty instructor] makes herself extremely available and is very quick about responding to emails, [faculty instructor] offered to meet with me outside of class hours on various occasions to help me make progress with my research idea/proposal." (EPH 651 Research Methods)*

> *"[faculty instructor] made this clear since the first class and repeated every single one, how we could ask, talk, call in case we needed it." (EPH 656 Qualitative Research Methods)*

Summary data reports for the mid-semester and end-of-semester course evaluations are available in ERF C2.6.

7) If applicable, assess strengths and weaknesses related to this criterion and plans for improvement in this area. (self-study document)

Strengths: The Graduate Programs has sufficient faculty to meet the advising needs of students. The advising ratios and maximum number of students per faculty, as show in Template C2-2, are favorable and allow faculty to guide students on a personal basis as needed by each student. Based on the quantitative and qualitative feedback from students, the class sizes in the Graduate Programs are generally supportive of quality of learning, and faculty are available to meet with students.

Weaknesses: The advising load per faculty member varies, and with the growth of the degree programs, additional faculty will be needed each year to serve as advisors.

Plans for Improvement: Continue to recruit primary and non-primary faculty advisors to serve Graduate Programs students.

C3. Staff and Other Personnel (SPH and PHP)

The school or program has staff and other personnel adequate to fulfill its stated mission and goals. The stability of resources is a factor in evaluating resource adequacy.

"Staff" are defined as individuals who do not have faculty appointments and for whom staff work is their primary function. "Other personnel" includes students who perform work that supports the program's instructional and administrative needs (e.g., individuals who enroll first as students and then obtain graduate assistant or other positions at the university are classified as "other personnel" while individuals hired into staff positions who later opt to complete coursework or degrees are classified as "staff").

Required documentation:

1) A table defining the number of the school or program's staff support for the year in which the site visit will take place by role or function in the format of Template C3-1. Designate any staff resources that are shared with other units outside the unit of accreditation. (self-study document)

Template C3-1.

Staff	Role/Function	FTE
Not Shared, Graduate Programs		
Begona Rovira	Academic Affairs	1.0
Heather Rose	Accreditation/Evaluation	1.0
Carlen Duncombe	Student Affairs	1.0
Megan Garber	Career Services	1.0
Rosa Verdeja	Academic Affairs	1.0
Andria Williams	Admissions	1.0
Ginelle Bou Nassar	Admissions	1.0
Derek Williams	Student Affairs	1.0
Renita Revere	Student Affairs	1.0
Niara Williams	Other Personnel/Student	0.20
Joba Odediran	Other Personnel/Student	0.20
Daniel Dilone	Other Personnel/Student	0.20
Isabella Zamora	Other Personnel/Student	0.20
Alessandra Maggioni	Other Personnel/Student	0.20
Vanessa Morales	Other Personnel/Student	0.20
Shared, Department		
Margarita Jimenez	Strategic Planning/Operations	0.40
Orlando Garcia	Information Technology	0.35
Jessica Carbajal	Finance/Administration	0.40
Josie Lopez	Human Resources/Faculty Affairs	0.30
Pilar Ramirez	Administrative Support	0.15
Laura Gutierrez	Finance/Administration	0.10
Catherine Tunnell	Administrative Support	0.15
Veronica Bustabad	Marketing/Communication	0.20
Cinthia Herrera	Research Post Award	0.10

2) Provide a narrative description, which may be supported by data if applicable, of the contributions of other personnel. (self-study document)

The other personnel in the program are part-time student employees hired as graduate assistants to support program operations. Master's level students serving in these positions work in the areas of admissions/recruitment, data management, capstone project, accreditation, career services/professional development and event management. Work hours are up to 20 hours per week per position, paid hourly. Graduate Programs staff members serve as direct supervisors.

3) Provide narrative and/or data that support the assertion that the school or program's staff and other personnel support is sufficient or not sufficient. (self-study document)

Graduating students are asked to complete the satisfaction survey at the conclusion of their last semester in their degree program. The survey is administered online and takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. The survey allows students an opportunity to rate their level of satisfaction in several areas of the Graduate Programs, including education/instruction, academic advising, career counseling, program administration support and resources. Open response questions are also included, which allows students to provide more focused and detailed feedback. The student satisfaction survey includes two question/ratings statements on program staff.   Students are asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement. Overall, students were satisfied with program staff service in the Graduate Programs. Data for the calendar years 2018 – 2020 are provided below.

> For the 2018 graduates (MPH, MSPH, MS and PhD), the response rate was 28% for the satisfaction survey (n = 20 of 71 graduates). This includes 17 master's level responses (MPH, MSPH and MS) and 3 doctoral responses (biostatistics and epidemiology).

> For the 2019 graduates (MPH, MSPH, MS and PhD), the response rate was 32% for the satisfaction survey (n = 23 of 71 graduates). This includes 20 master's level responses (MPH, MSPH and MS) and 3 doctoral responses (epidemiology and prevention science and community health).

> For the 2020 graduates (MPH, MSPH, MS and PhD), the response rate was 44% for the satisfaction survey (n = 28 of 63 graduates). This includes 25 master's level responses (MPH, MSPH and MS) and 3 doctoral responses (biostatistics and prevention science and community health).

Student Satisfaction Survey	"Strongly Agree" or "Agree", 2018	"Strongly Agree" or "Agree", 2019	"Strongly Agree" or "Agree", 2020
Graduate Programs staff were responsive and respectful	n/a	n/a	93%
Administration was available to discuss issues and solve problems	83%	79%	93%

Likert scale: 1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= neutral, 4= disagree, 5= strongly disagree

"*Graduate Programs staff were responsive and respectful*" was not included in the satisfaction survey prior to 2020.

4) If applicable, assess strengths and weaknesses related to this criterion and plans for improvement in this area. (self-study document)

Strengths: The current level of staffing and other personnel support meet the core administrative needs of the program. Students rely on and appreciate the program staff who are experienced, knowledgeable and supportive.

Weaknesses: Program staff positions have not kept pace with the expansion of degree program offerings and increases in student enrollment. A community engagement staff position has remained vacant since Fall 2019. Current staff are maximized in effort.

Plans for Improvement: As the program continues to realize its plans to increase the number of students and number of degree programs, additional dedicated staff positions will be necessary to support this growth.

C4. Physical Resources (SPH and PHP)

The school or program has physical resources adequate to fulfill its stated mission and goals and to support instructional programs. Physical resources include faculty and staff office space, classroom space, student shared space and laboratories, as applicable.

Required documentation:

1) **Briefly describe, with data as applicable, the following. (Note: square footage is not required unless specifically relevant to the program's narrative.)**

   - **Faculty office space**
   - **Staff office space**
   - **Classrooms**
   - **Shared student space**
   - **Laboratories, if applicable to public health degree program offerings**

The Department of Public Health Sciences provides adequate physical resources to support instructional programs. The Graduate Programs is located in the Don Soffer Clinical Research Center (DSCRC), formerly the Clinical Research Building (CRB). Space allocation data specific to the Graduate Programs are provided in the following table. This space includes faculty and staff offices on the 9th and 10th floors in the DSCRC, instructional space, two student lounges and common space available for student use. The 9th and 10th floors in the DSCRC include ample conference room/meeting space, shared kitchens, file rooms/storage and dedicated rooms for mail and photocopy equipment.

Location	Square Footage
Faculty Offices: DSCRC 9th and 10th floors	5,263
Staff Offices: DSCRC 9th and 10th floors	1,737
Small Classroom: DSCRC 995	667
Large Classroom: DSCRC 989	1,040
Student Computer Lab: DSCRC 994	506
Student Lounge (Masters): DSCRC 904	253
Student Lounge (Doctoral): DSCRC 932A	510
Common Space for Student Use: DSCRC 9th and 10th floors (includes kitchen/break rooms and dedicated student desk areas)	1,686

All faculty and staff have dedicated office space with individually assigned computer equipment. Graduate assistants and other student employees have assigned workspaces in larger common areas (cubicle stations). The Graduate Programs maintains two classrooms and a student computer lab dedicated to our programs' use. The large classroom can seat 55 students and contains a fully equipped lecture podium with a computer/monitor, DVD player, Apple TV, gooseneck microphone for the podium with 4 handheld microphones and a lavalier microphone, and an overhead document camera. The classroom has a Promethean 85" touch-screen TV operated from the classroom podium with a Crestron touch-screen control. The classroom also contains a large portable whiteboard and two additional television/projection screens. The small classroom can seat 30 students and contains a similar lecture podium, a Promethean touch-screen TV set-up similar to the large classroom, with only one TV screen and one wall-mounted whiteboard, an overhead document camera, gooseneck microphone on the podium and a lavalier microphone. The desks in both classrooms provide power outlets for students to power/charge their laptops/tablets.

The computer lab has 15 computers for student use. Each computer has the necessary software installed to assist students with their homework/studies (e.g., Microsoft Office suite, statistical software packages). The computer lab also has 7 television screens with a VGA and HDMI connection, permitting faculty, TA's or other students to connect a laptop and share screens during instruction. The computer lab is also equipped with a printer for students. With the remote learning format for the majority of our Fall 2020 – Summer 2021 course offerings, a virtual computer lab was added as a resource, so students have 24/7 access to necessary software without the requirement of coming to campus.

The Graduate Programs 9th floor space includes two designated areas for students to study, collaborate and rest between classes. The master's student lounge area includes a large desk for use by multiple students, wall-mounted whiteboards and a television with an Apple TV and HDMI connectivity for collaboration. It also has a comfortable seating area. The doctoral student lounge area includes individual desks assigned to 1st year PhD students and has wall-mounted whiteboards, a television for collaborating, and a comfortable seating area.

The entrance-lobby areas on the 9th and 10th floors feature multimedia screens, which display information about faculty and student research and achievements, and announcements of upcoming department and program events. Each lobby area has ample couch seating with power charging capabilities. Faculty, staff and students have access to two common kitchen areas (9th floor and 10th floor) with table seating, a high-top seating area with power connections, and a television streaming live news coverage.

Select faculty from the Department utilize medical campus laboratory space, housed in the Papanicolaou Building, the Fox Building, the Rosenstiel Medical Sciences Building, and the HIV Surveillance Program, housed in the Elliott Building.

2) **Provide narrative and/or data that support the assertion that the physical space is sufficient or not sufficient. (self-study document)**

For the Graduate Programs, office space, classroom space and shared student space is adequate, but maximized for current program size. Program faculty and staff have private offices in the DSCRC, shared offices are available for visiting faculty, and student spaces (classrooms, lab, lounge and workspace) are utilized by students in all degree programs.

Graduate Programs space is assessed by the students in the student satisfaction survey: Classroom space, computer lab space and student lounge/study space. Overall, students were satisfied with the physical space. Data for the calendar years 2018 – 2020 are provided below.

Student Satisfaction Survey	"Excellent" to "Good", 2018	"Excellent" to "Good", 2019	"Excellent" to "Good", 2020
Classroom space (e.g., sufficient desk space, adjustable seating, ample electrical outlets)	100%	100%	96%
Student computer lab (e.g., computers, printer, and printing supplies available)	69%	95%	96%
Student lounge/study space	87%	95%	88%

Likert scale: 1= excellent, 2= very good, 3= good, 4= fair, 5= poor

3) If applicable, assess strengths and weaknesses related to this criterion and plans for improvement in this area.

Strengths: Overall, dedicated physical resources are adequate to meet program needs at the current level of enrollment. Available classroom space is sufficient. Larger classroom space (auditorium space) is available in the DSCRC Gordon Center (1st floor), in a limited capacity.

Weaknesses: Larger classroom space in the DSCRC is shared throughout the Miller School of Medicine. It is available for one-time events but is limited for recurring class schedule use. Current classroom and computer lab space is maximized and does not allow for future program growth.

Plans for Improvement: Expand the doctoral student lounge space from 10 to 15 desk stations, include computers at each workstation and provide dedicated desk space in the lounge for students beyond the first year of study who cannot secure dedicated workspace within a faculty mentor's research work area. Secure additional classroom space in DSCRC with a recurring schedule.

C5. Information and Technology Resources (SPH and PHP)

The school or program has information and technology resources adequate to fulfill its stated mission and goals and to support instructional programs. Information and technology resources include library resources, student access to hardware and software (including access to specific software or other technology required for instructional programs), faculty access to hardware and software (including access to specific software required for the instructional programs offered) and technical assistance for students and faculty.

Required documentation:

1) **Briefly describe, with data if applicable, the following:**
   - **library resources and support available for students and faculty**

The Louis Calder Memorial Library, http://cader.med.miami.edu/, is the largest library on the medical campus. The Calder Library offers electronic remote access (e-books, e-journals, e-databases), software training, resource guides, reference services and interlibrary loan services. Professional librarians are on staff to assist faculty and students with information needs. In addition to Calder Library's extensive book and journal volumes in its print collection, the library subscribes to over 14,000 electronic journals, several thousand electronic books and over 150 databases, most of which can be accessed remotely by UM students, faculty and staff. The Calder Library facility includes an electronic classroom for training, with over 50 computers for faculty, staff and student use.

On the Coral Gables campus, students can access the Richter Library, which has collections in the arts, humanities, social sciences and sciences, as well as being a Federal Government Depository. Additional libraries at the University include the Library of Ophthalmology, the Law Library, the Music Library, the Architecture Reference Library and the Marine Science Library.

   - **student access to hardware and software (including access to specific software or other technology required for instructional programs)**

Students have access to computer facilities on the medical campus and the Coral Gables campus. The Graduate Programs maintains a dedicated computer lab for student use in DSCRC 994, adjacent to the small classroom. The lab includes 15 computer stations and one network printer. Software installed at each station includes Microsoft Office 365 (Excel, Word, PowerPoint), SPSS, SAS University Edition, STATA, R, R Studio, NCSS/PASS, M*plus* and internet access. Due to COVID-19 and the move to online course instruction, the Graduate Programs has created a Virtual Computer Lab (VCL) for students to continue access to the physical computer lab resources (use of all software) while working/studying off-campus.

Additional medical campus resources include the Calder Medical Library with an Electronic Classroom and Learning Resource Center that is available for instruction to faculty, staff and students with computers. The Calder library offers workshops and tutorials in PubMed, ArcGIS, NVivo, Python, RefWorks, Scopus, R, SPSS, Tableau and REDCap.

The University provides students access (free of charge) to download software through site licenses. The available software includes Adobe Creative Cloud Suite, EndNote, Microsoft Office 365, Microsoft Teams, Zoom, NVivo, Qualtrics, SAS and SPSS. For course instruction, faculty utilize Blackboard for each offered graduate course and students have access to this resource once enrolled in coursework each semester (includes course syllabi, course documents, assignments, tests, examinations, chat/group functions). The Graduate Programs maintains group Blackboard pages, including a One-Stop-Shop resource section and new student orientation information.

- **faculty access to hardware and software (including access to specific software or other technology required for instructional programs)**

Department faculty have access to the same library of software and other resources outlined above for students. In addition, software requested for specific research and teaching needs are typically provided by the department. Each faculty member is provided with a dedicated desktop office computer or laptop sufficient to provide for their greatest anticipated computing needs and equipment and software are provided for maintaining computing endeavors while traveling.

- **technical assistance available for students and faculty**

Information technology support services are available to faculty and students through the dedicated Departmental UHealth IT Systems Analyst. Students may also access IT services through the Student Technology Help Desk.

The Departmental UHealth IT Systems Analyst provides support for all Department of Public Health Sciences faculty, staff and students. Some of the services provided include (but are not limited to):

- Technical assistance and support with computer hardware and software for students
- Technical assistance and support with departmental computer equipment for faculty, staff and students
- Software support for faculty and staff
- Technical assistance and maintenance with classroom A/V and computer equipment
- Purchasing of computer hardware and software for faculty and staff
- Assistance with training, support and hosting of online meetings (i.e., Zoom and MS Teams)
- Technical support of computer lab (and now the VCL) with hardware and software
- Maintenance of the departmental website information relevant to student information and accomplishments, faculty research and events happening within the department for faculty, staff and students
- Maintenance of the multimedia displays in the department facilities with current and relevant information
- Guidance and consultation on new software and hardware available to facilitate innovation throughout the Department and Graduate Programs
- Creation of servers as needed for faculty research; and server and software support

2) **Provide narrative and/or data that support the assertion that information and technology resources are sufficient or not sufficient.**

For the Graduate Programs, the information and technology resources available to faculty, staff and students are sufficient. The Calder Medical Library facility and remote access, in addition to information facilities on the Coral Gables campus, are more than adequate to meet the needs of faculty, staff and students. Dedicated department IT Systems Analyst services are utilized by faculty, staff and students

Information technology services are assessed by the students in the student satisfaction survey. Students indicate a high level of satisfaction with department/program information technology services.

Student Satisfaction Survey	"Strongly Agree" or "Agree", 2020
Information Technology (IT) services were accessible and prompt	93%

Likert scale: 1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= neutral, 4= disagree, 5= strongly disagree

IT services were not included in the satisfaction survey prior 2020.

3) If applicable, assess strengths and weaknesses related to this criterion and plans for improvement in this area.

Strengths: The current university infrastructure for library information and technology resources is cost-effective, with shared resources and library and technology expertise. Dedicated in-house IT support for the Graduate Programs and the Department, is a strength.

Weaknesses: No significant weaknesses are noted.

Plans for Improvement: Continued communication with library, department and program staff to ensure that emerging technology needs can be met. Include dedicated department IT support staff in discussions of program improvements that may require a modification or expansion of IT infrastructure.