UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF GLOBAL HEALTH

August 14, 2015

- TO: David L. Eaton, Vice Provost and Dean Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning The Graduate School
- FROM: Judith N. Wasserheit, MD, MPH, Chair, Department of Global Health Stephen Gloyd, MD, MPH, Associate Chair for Education and Curriculum, Department of Global Health

RE: Response to Academic Program Review - Department of Global Health

First of all, we would like to thank Dean Eaton, Associate Dean Aanerud, David Canfield-Budde, and staff of the Graduate School for their support of the Academic Program Review (APR) process. We also want to thank the members of the review committee for their thorough and insightful assessment of the four academic programs under review (our Undergraduate Minor, MPH, PhD, and Graduate Certificate programs). We were especially pleased by the unanimous recommendation that these programs continue for the maximum ten-year period without further review. Furthermore, the specific recommendations, some of which addressed issues beyond our academic programs, were both relevant and helpful. The following are our responses to each of the recommendations.

DGH responses to specific recommendations of the Review Committee

Each of the committee's eight recommendations are stated in full (in italics), followed by our response:

1. It is the Review Committee's understanding that there is no formal written strategic plan for the Department. We believe that it is important for the Department to undertake a strategic planning process, with special consideration of a plan for growth vs consolidation (i.e. topical diversification, expanding beyond HIV-AIDS) and financial planning. The strategic plan should allow for opportunistic growth, but should use the intelligence of what is available for growth areas, and focus on faculty strengths and projected student demand. We were not given detailed financial data and did not review the financial status of the Department. Nevertheless, from informal discussions we are of the impression that there is some concern. A strategic plan that includes a hard financial analysis of program needs, revenue sources, and teaching and research implications is essential so there is a funding strategy to match the pedagogical strategy. The plan should be achievable.

Response: A strategic planning retreat will occur on November 2, 2015. Department of Global Health (DGH) faculty, staff, and students will examine together where we are, where we want to go in the next five years, and how we plan to get there. Ruth Johnston, UW Associate Vice President, Organizational Excellence and Sustainability; Chief of Staff, Planning & Management; and an Associate Vice Provost will facilitate this day-long retreat. Financial planning is an important aspect of the retreat. In preparation for the retreat, DGH leadership

UW SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Office of the Chair • Box 357965 Harris Hydraulics Building, 1705 NE Pacific Street Seattle, WA 98195-7965

TEL 206-685-1894 • FAX 206-685-8519 • EMAIL: jwasserh@u.washington.edu Executive Assistant: Aleta Elliott • <u>aletae@u.washington.edu</u> www.globalhealth.washington.edu presented the overall financial status of the department to faculty and staff to set the stage for deeper discussions regarding how to achieve financial sustainability. The overall objective was to provide a clear understanding of basic budget structure and realities. This included discussion of general money flow and review of terminology (ABB, GOF-both School of Medicine (SOM) and School of Public Health (SPH), RCR, tuition waivers), revenue trends and past expenditures. We sought to demystify the basic architecture of financial flows, as well as illustrate financial trends to date, make projections for the future, and discuss the information necessary to assess the impact of doing things differently going forward.

In preparation for the November 2, 2015 retreat, to complement the financial analysis and plan, DGH leadership launched three workgroups to inform and develop recommendations for strategies in the following areas: 1) to improve administrative efficiency of academic programs, assessing models of staff reorganization and implementing LEAN processes, 2) to develop transparent, fair, and sustainable methods of compensating faculty for teaching, mentoring, and grant writing – that align with the values and goals of the DGH and are also financially sustainable, 3) to increase revenue. Finally, we are developing a SWOT analysis of the DGH as a background document for our strategic planning effort. As of August 2015, all of these workgroups and the SWOT analysis are underway. Addressing these issues in the context of financial sustainability, we expect the strategic plan to be a timely, wide ranging, and highly productive effort that will guide the next 3-5 years of the department's development.

2. It does not appear that the Department is reaping the full potential benefits of such a distinguished Advisory Board. The Review Committee recommends that the Board be reconfigured to be more development oriented and to use their extensive knowledge and practical experience in the donor community to substantially enhance the development efforts of the School and Department.

Response: We have begun the process of reconfiguring our External Advisory Board (EAB) along the lines of this recommendation. DGH is establishing a separate Community Development Board (CDB) with liaison membership linking it to our EAB. We are working closely with Advancement from both SOM and SPH on these efforts. We will be soliciting our CDB members for more direct involvement in long term advancement strategies and fund-raising. Discussion regarding how this will function will be a major topic of our next EAB meeting in mid-November, and at the initial scheduled CDB meeting.

3. Staff were very passionate about their work and appreciated their working environment. The Review Committee heard from the students that they were likewise highly appreciative of the staff. The students indicated that there could be some improvement in student services and data systems. They were particularly concerned about data systems for alumni, but also for identifying local opportunities that support the MPH and other students with practicum and internship opportunities. The Review Committee recommends that the Department think strategically about how to better match the supply of student skills and desires for work experience with the market needing and wanting these skills. It was proposed that it might be advantageous to require that students be required to bid on internships.

Response: We are continually trying to improve our student services, including data systems for alumni, current students, and prospective students. During the past two years, we have greatly improved our tracking of alumni, and have nearly completed a comprehensive survey on our MPH alumni that we plan to use for future planning to ensure that students get the kinds of skills that they need in their careers. We also hope to publish the results of the survey. Our alumni tracking will not only provide information regarding how our DGH can provide an education that fits their careers, but also will provide an active network for sharing ideas and opportunities.

We are also studying our student services models, and comparing them to other major global health programs to learn from best practices. Our new DGH website has been designed to improve the student experience, with clearer and more accessible information regarding student (and faculty) services, responsibilities, and

opportunities. The website will help make potential internships more visible to potentially interested students, and provide transparency in the process of obtaining them. The UW DGH staff spearheaded (with staff from Johns Hopkins University) special Student Services Staff Workshops in the past two years at the annual Consortium of Universities for Global Health (CUGH) conference. Each of these workshops gave us new ideas about how our staff can best serve our students.

We are working on ways to improve matching our MPH students to practicum and thesis opportunities for our students, and job opportunities for our graduates. One option for matching is the START program, a joint program of the DGH and Department of Epidemiology in which students (with UW faculty supervision) are awarded research assistantships to perform specific work products for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Students already bid for opportunities in this program. In the past year, the program has increased its transparency and outreach regarding potential opportunities and in the application process. DGH leadership has initiated discussions with Boston Scientific Corporation to provide similar opportunities for students. This model of providing products to key players in global health is likely to be expanded in the future, with major learning and career benefits to UW students.

Regarding bidding on internships, students already apply for, and are selected on a competitive basis, for travel grants, the START program, and other internships and opportunities. Teaching assistantships are all posted clearly and selections are made based on clear criteria. While some faculty provide research assistantships to students who have been promised these opportunities as an incentive to matriculate, other opportunities are posted and selected in an open process.

4. The Review Committee sensed that more can be done to take advantage of in-country partnerships and think of those as a strength. We recommend that you exploit in-country relationships and the DGH ground presence with industry and others looking for reliable, trusted in-country partners. Consider this as a base for study abroad. To the extent possible, continue and deepen these relationships and the network of overseas alum and research partners that are a hallmark of the DGH faculty efforts.

Response: Our partnerships are considered the cornerstone of our efforts overseas. Nearly all of our research, service, and educational work overseas is conducted with institutional partners in those countries. We agree that we can expand these partnerships further to include study abroad and meaningful opportunities for reciprocity for students and faculty training, and will continue to deepen the relationships and network of alumni. This is one of the objectives of our alumni program, discussed under our response to recommendation #2.

We are exploring an expansion of undergraduate global health study abroad programs, utilizing the UW system in place for supporting such an endeavor. Traditionally, our partners have hosted graduate students, medical students, and clinical trainees in medicine and nursing, and we are working to expand these opportunities to partners who have not yet hosted students and trainees. One current example is Naivasha, Kenya, which is primarily a training site for medical and clinically-oriented students. We will assess establishing similar supported training and study abroad opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students in locations like Naivasha, where we have longstanding ties. Another example is Lima, Peru, where we are pursuing a joint degree program with Universidad Peruano Cayetano Heredia.

Undergraduate study abroad programs involve planning and hosting groups of 15-25 students abroad and present new challenges for the Department. However, there is administrative support for these programs, teaming with our Global Health Resource Center and the Office of Global Affairs study abroad office. In addition, the UW and Department have extensive experience in providing support for travel preparation and emergency management. Resources for administrative coordination abroad and compensation for mentors will be considered, as well as reciprocity for students and trainees from our international partner sites. Creating a study abroad experience with our partners would also benefit students as we consider development of an undergraduate major in global health, opening up opportunities for capstone projects and language study.

5. The Review Committee believes the Department could benefit from better "packaging of the product the DGH offers". It might be beneficial to think about this from the donor and employer perspective. What do they want to see in our graduates in the way of training and experience? Are we teaching the right things to the people most likely to use the skill sets effectively? We might be able to better package what we can offer with the market demand. For example, the Pathobiology PhD Program is a very strong and highly regarded multidisciplinary program that functions independently within the DGH. It may be advantageous for the Department to emphasize the complimentary nature of that program, and encourage a more integrated package approach in their informational and recruiting material.

Response: We believe that reassessment of "packaging of the product DGH offers" is an excellent recommendation, and we are already moving to identify priority areas. In the past we have talked to donors and employers regarding the kinds of training and experience they need in their employees. Several years ago, we interviewed 22 global health leaders in private, public, non-profit, and multi-lateral sectors to assess the competencies that they said they needed now, and what they thought they would need over the next several decades (Pfeiffer, et al. *Academic Medicine* 2013; Vol. 88 (1):131-136.) We have attempted to revise and enhance our curriculum to address these competencies. We need to continue to assess the needed competencies (with alumni and employer surveys, as mentioned above) and continually revise our educational experiences accordingly.

We have already begun to package our 'product' more effectively. We have had (and will continue to have) discussions with our local partners in the Seattle area to communicate the expertise of our students, staff, and faculty – and will expand our discussions to a broader community of potential "buyers" of our product. As mentioned above, we are currently working with Boston Scientific Corporation to develop mutually beneficial work that can provide opportunities for students and faculty. We also expect that the ongoing SPH MPH 'revitalization' efforts will provide a broader array of skills among our MPH students that meet the needs of needs of global health employers.

6. Regarding growth. The Review Committee recommends caution in continuing to grow as rapidly as the Department has since its inception. The newly-instituted budgeting system (ABB) rewards multiple large classes (which are generally undergraduate classes). This is not a model consistent with the training and mentoring of graduate students. Individual one-on-one mentoring is a major strength among all the departments in the SPH, and should not be lost due to revenue–driven changes. Growth and expansion to undergraduate education should not be at the expense of the quality of the existing DGH degree programs. These and other issues (e.g., class size, classroom availability, are the four programs evaluated here all viable in the longer term, are there positions available for DGH graduates) should be considered in conjunction with strategic planning efforts.

Response: We agree that DGH needs to be very careful about expanding our academic (and other programs). We are assessing all options for revenues and expenses so that we can be clear regarding where we can obtain the revenue necessary to preserve selected small classes and one-on-one mentorship. We are attempting to develop a healthy mix of larger undergraduate classes that can help make smaller graduate classes financially viable. Given the popularity of large undergraduate global health courses, we hope to use ABB as a positive tool to do this. To date, classroom size and availability has not been a problem. However, new active learning teaching methods will encourage us (and the UW) to develop more active learning classroom options. We also agree that individual mentorship - to graduate and undergraduate students alike – is extremely important, and are in the process of creating compensation mechanisms that support these values, as discussed above.

Regarding positions and/or employment for graduates: Our alumni surveys are telling us that our graduates are doing well, with high levels of employment within the first year after graduation. Thus, we believe that there is a continuing need to produce graduates in global health. Tracking our students in the Global Health Minor is more difficult, and we will need to be creative to assess how the minor contributes to their post-graduate activities. Clearly, global health is viewed as an important intellectual sphere of knowledge, and can contribute to better graduate programs and jobs in a broad range of disciplines, as well as improved global citizenship.

7. The diversity in the DGH's MPH and PhD programs is applauded and is a major reason graduate students choose the Department. The maintenance of the balance between US and international students should be of the highest priority, despite University financial challenges. Many would consider it the moral responsibility of a great university to provide educational opportunities to the future leaders of resource-poor countries.

Response: We agree that the balance of US and international students is a huge priority, not only as a moral responsibility, but to ensure that our program includes the wide array of people, ideas, and experiences so important for what we believe are truly excellent global health academic programs. We will redouble our efforts to maintain and expand our special programs that fund our foreign students, including our Fogarty Fellows, Fulbright Fellows, and other students with whom our faculty have had productive collaborations. We will continue to provide tuition waivers to selected foreign students, but with great care to ensure that these waivers are used in a manner that supports our partnerships, our collaborative activities, and supports national institutions in the countries from which these students come. Additional support from the UW would be complementary and greatly enhance these efforts which enrich the learning environment for the entire university.

8. To date, faculty have not been compensated for mentoring individual students. The Review Committee recommends that this practice be re-evaluated at this time. This is a central aspect of the degree programs and is a significant factor in the high quality of the degree programs.

Response: As stated earlier in the response to recommendation #1, we are currently in the process of examining our faculty compensation, and will likely begin a system of direct compensation for mentoring students. We agree that individual mentoring is a central aspect of and important to the quality of our degree programs, especially the MPH and PhD degrees. Compensation for mentoring will also demonstrate the value we place on mentoring. We believe that the faculty will support and agree to implement a mechanism to compensate faculty for mentoring.

Again, we are grateful for the time and energy devoted to this review, and trust that our responses to your recommendations are not only acceptable to the Graduate School and the review committee, but will provide mechanisms to improve the quality and sustainability of our academic programs.

University of Washington Department of Global Health Program Review Committee Report Site Visit: April 16-17, 2015 Date of Report: May 19, 2015 <u>Program Review Committee Members</u>:
<u>Scott Davis</u>, Professor, UW Department of Epidemiology (Review Committee Chair)
<u>C. Leigh Anderson</u>, Professor, UW Evans School of Public Affairs
<u>Warren D. Johnson</u>, Professor and Director, Center for Global Health, Weill Cornell Medical College
<u>Maurizio Vecchione</u>, Sr. Vice President of Global Good & Research, Intellectual Ventures