

C2. Faculty Resources

The school 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.

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.

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.

- 1) *A table demonstrating the adequacy of the school's instructional faculty resources in the format of Template C2-1.*

Template C2-1

	FIRST DEGREE LEVEL			SECOND DEGREE LEVEL	THIRD DEGREE LEVEL	ADDITIONAL FACULTY ⁺
CONCENTRATION	PIF 1	PIF 2	FACULTY 3	PIF 4	PIF 5	
Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics						
Biostatistics	H. Hoffman 1.0	A. Elmi 1.0	A. Ciarleglio 1.0			PIF: 5 Non-PIF: 4
MPH						
Health Data Science, Biostatistics	A. Elmi 1.0	G. Diao 1.0	T. Hamasaki 1.0	K. Crandall 1.0		PIF: 1 Non-PIF: 5
MS PhD						
Health Data Science, Bioinformatics	K. Crandall 1.0	M. Perez- Losada 1.0	G. Rahnavard 1.0	T. Hamasaki 1.0		PIF: 2 Non-PIF: 4
MS PhD						
Health Data Science	G. Diao 1.0	M. Perez- Losada 1.0	G. Rahnavard 1.0			PIF: 4 Non-PIF: 1
BS						
Schoolwide Programs (Public Health Generalist)						
Public Health	E. Gray 1.0	M. Ulfers 1.0	S. Wilenksy 1.0			PIF: 12 Non-PIF: 16
BS						
Public Health Generalist	G. Gray 1.0	C. Heminger 1.0	P. Shin 1.0	G. Migliaccio 1.0		PIF: 13 Non-PIF: 139
MPH@GW DrPH						

George Washington University, Milken Institute School of Public Health

Department of Environmental and Occupational Health						
Environmental Health Science and Policy	K. Applebaum 1.0	P. LaPuma 1.0	L. Price 1.0			PIF: 6 Non-PIF: 6
MPH						
Global Environmental Health	J. Kuiper 1.0	R. Canales 1.0	C. Liu 1.0			PIF: 2 Non-PIF: 1
MPH						
Environmental Health	K. Applebaum 1.0	L. Price 1.0	D. Michaels 1.0			PIF: 0 Non-PIF: 3
PhD						
Climate and Health	S. Anenberg 1.0	G. George 1.0	P. LaPuma 1.0			PIF: 2 Non-PIF: 8
MPH@GW						
Department of Epidemiology						
Epidemiology	H. Young 1.0	M. Magnus 1.0	S. Cleary 1.0	S. Quinlan 1.0		PIF: 12 Non-PIF: 19
MPH, MS PhD						
Public Health Microbiology and Emerging Infectious Diseases	M. Ghosh 1.0	I. Kuo 1.0	J. Jordan 1.0			PIF: 11 Non-PIF: 6
MS						
Department of Exercise and Nutrition Sciences						
Physical Activity in Public Health	L. DiPietro 1.0	J. Satchek-Ward 1.0	M. Barberio 1.0			PIF: 6 Non-PIF: 2
MPH						
Public Health Nutrition	K. Lora 1.0	K. Robien 1.0	R. van Dam 1.0			PIF: 4 Non-PIF: 2

George Washington University, Milken Institute School of Public Health

Department of Global Health						
Global Health Epi and Disease Control	C. Mores 1.0	E. Smith 1.0	J. Tielsch 1.0			PIF: 2 Non-PIF: 4
MPH						
Global Health Program Design, Monitoring and Eval	S. Baird 1.0	J. Muz 1.0	J. Sandburg 1.0			PIF: 3 Non-PIF: 6
MPH						
Global Health	J. Tielsch 1.0	S. Frehywot 1.0	C. Mores 1.0			PIF: 3 Non-PIF: 1
MPH@GW						
Global Health Policy	C. Santos-Burgoa 1.0	W. Munar 1.0	C. Arsenault 1.0			PIF: 3 Non-PIF: 3
MPH						
Humanitarian Health	R. Asgary 1.0	A. Richards 1.0	C. Santos-Burgoa 1.0			PIF: 2 Non-PIF: 3
MPH						
Global Public Health Sciences	N. Kumar 1.0	S. Baird 1.0	W. Munar 1.0			PIF: 5 Non-PIF: 6
PhD						
Department of Health Policy and Management						
Health Policy	L. Cartwright-Smith 1.0	L. Ku 1.0	A. Vichare 1.0	A. Marcus 1.0		PIF: 21 Non-PIF: 21
MPH PhD						
Health Informatics and Analytics	P. McTaggart 1.0	P. Pittman 1.0	L. Helmchen 1.0			PIF: 13 Non-PIF: 7
MPH@GW						

George Washington University, Milken Institute School of Public Health

Department of Prevention and Community Health						
Community-Oriented Primary Care	T. Taggart 1.0	D. Conserve 1.0	D. Kerrigan 1.0			PIF: 4 Non-PIF: 7
MPH						
Health Promotion	J. Bingenheimer 1.0	M. Edberg 1.0	C. Berg 1.0			PIF: 6 Non-PIF: 10
MPH						
Maternal and Child Health	A. Vyas 1.0	K. McDonnell 1.0	M. Ruiz 1.0			PIF: 3 Non-PIF: 5
MPH						
Public Health Communication and Marketing	K. Ndiaye 1.0	W.D. Evans 1.0	L. Abrams 1.0			PIF: 5 Non-PIF: 0
MPH						
Social and Behavioral Sciences in Public Health	J. Bingenheimer 1.0	M. Napolitano 1.0	Y. Wang 1.0			PIF: 7 Non-PIF: 1
PhD						
Women, Youth and Children	N. Nagaraj 1.0	A. Vyas 1.0	K. McDonnell 1.0			PIF: 2 Non-PIF: 1
MPH@GW						

TOTALS:

Named PIF	71
Total PIF	128
Non-PIF	200

- 2) *All primary instructional faculty, by definition, are allocated 1.0 FTE. Schools must explain the method for calculating FTE for any non-primary instructional faculty presented in C2-1.*

FTE calculations are outlined in the *General GWSPH Faculty Guidelines for Academic and Service Activities* (see ERF > Criteria C > C2.2: Faculty FTE). FTE calculations vary based on program and course credits. Departments are responsible for calculating FTEs. DrPH@GW FTE calculations are still under development.

Faculty	MPH@GW	MHA@GW	Residential Programs
Full-Time	.05 FTE for course directors per credit .01 FTE for section leads per credit	.02 FTE for course directors per credit + 0.05 FTE annual coverage for coordination .01 FTE for MHA Immersions per credit	.05 FTE per credit hour (minimum expected enrollment of 8) .035 FTE per credit hour for co-teaching (minimum expected enrollment of 15-20)
Part-Time	.05 FTE per section lead per credit hour	.10 FTE for 5-credit course .08 FTE for a 4-credit course .05 FTE for a 3-credit course .02 FTE for MHA Immersions 1 and 4 .03 FTE for MHA Immersions 2 and 3	0.05 FTE per credit hour

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

Part-time faculty salaries are paid based on the per credit rates in the Collective Bargaining Agreement rather than on FTEs (see ERF > Criterion A > Criterion A1 > A1.3: Bylaws-Policy Documents).

- 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 and career counseling			
Degree level	Average	Min	Max
Bachelor's			
Staff ²⁸	143	135	150
PIF	20	1	130
Master's			
Staff (GWSPH Career Services)	861	861	861
Staff (Departmental)	26	23	30
Staff (Online) ²⁹	254	244	264
PIF	25	1	67
Doctoral			
Staff (GWSPH Career Services)	75	75	75
DrPH PIF	3	1	6
PhD PIF	6	1	22
PhD Non-PIF ³⁰	22	22	22

Advising in MPH integrative experience			
	Average	Min	Max
Residential MPH			
PIF	2	1	8
Non-PIF	1	1	2
MPH@GW			
PIF	10	10	10
Non-PIF	10	8	19
Supervision/Advising of bachelor's cumulative or experiential activity			
	Average	Min	Max
BS, Public Health			
PUBH 4140W	21	19	23

Mentoring/primary advising on thesis, dissertation or DrPH integrative project			
Degree	Average	Min	Max
DrPH			
PIF	2	1	4

²⁸ Undergraduate students have access to the University Career Center for career counseling. These numbers have been excluded from the above table. The staff numbers represented in the table are for the GWSPH professional staff academic advisors.

²⁹ Online master's students (MPH@GW and MHA@GW) have a professional staff academic advisor.

³⁰ There is a single non-PIF faculty member in the Department of Epidemiology who has an active role in advising PhD students.

PhD			
	PIF	2	1
	Non-PIF	1	1
MS			
	PIF	3	1
	Non-PIF	1	1

See ERF > Criterion C > Criterion C2 > C2.4: Temp C2-2 Advising.

5) *Quantitative data on student perceptions of the following for the most recent year. Schools should only present data on public health degrees and concentrations.*

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

Data on student perceptions of class size and its relation to quality of learning are collected in course evaluations which are disseminated in the final weeks of each term. The data points highlighted below are all five-point Likert scale questions where a score of 5 indicates the greatest agreement or positive sentiment toward the statement. Data were separated by course level so courses with numbers less than 6,000 are at the undergraduate level and courses with numbers at 6,000 or greater are at the graduate level.

Question	Course Level	2023 Average (N)
Class size was conducive to my learning.	Undergraduate	4.5 (1,587)
	Graduate	4.6 (1,587)
Classroom space was adequate for the needs of the course.	Undergraduate	4.6 (5,005)
	Graduate	4.6 (5,005)

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

Data on student perceptions of faculty availability are collected on the Graduation Survey. Undergraduate and graduate students receive a different survey and as a result answered slightly different questions. Both questions were Likert scale, where a higher score indicates the greatest agreement or positive sentiment toward the statement.

Question	Degree	2020-2021 Average (N)	2021-2022 Average (N)	2022-2023 Average (N)
Satisfaction with out-of-class availability of faculty (4-pt scale)	BS	3.4 (12)	3.5 (148)	3.4 (148)
Accessibility of faculty outside of class (5-pt scale)	MPH	3.9 (30)	3.9 (441)	3.9 (409)
	MS	N/A	4.1 (22)	3.4 (19)
	MHA	N/A	4.0 (82)	4.0 (50)
	PhD	4.3 (4)	4.3 (6)	4.5 (6)
	DrPH	4.4 (5)	4.6 (7)	3.6 (9)

6) *Qualitative data on student perceptions of class size and availability of faculty. Only present data on public health degrees and concentrations.*

Recent comments from course evaluations related to class size were mixed, ranging from the class size being too small to being too large. These comments also spanned degree level and courses. Interestingly, most students who commented on class size did so because they felt that size influenced class discussions (e.g., calls to increase class size because discussion was lacking; calls to decrease class size because the large class prohibited everyone from participating in discussion; class size was conducive to participation and robust discussions). One graduate during the Alum Interviews mentioned that she specifically chose GWSPH because it offered small class sizes, a feature that was important to her and her learning style.

In the Graduation Survey, perceptions of faculty availability were mixed. Some graduate students felt that most professors were approachable and departments created a sense of community. Other students wished they had a more personal connection with their professors or that faculty availability outside of class were transparent. The COVID-19 pandemic influenced many of the perceptions of undergraduate students as they felt the pandemic overshadowed their undergraduate experiences.

See ERF > Criterion C > Criterion C2 > C2.6: Student percep_qual.

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

Strengths

- GWSPH is proud of the robustness of our faculty's practice, service, teaching and research experiences. Students appreciate learning from faculty about these experiences. Our faculty resources are sufficient to meet the instructional needs of the school.
- Recently, GWSPH received a [\\$6 million endowment](#) from Michael and Lori Milken to fund two public health professorships, one of which honors the Dean. The Lynn R. Goldman Professorship and the Michael and Lori Milken Professorship will provide support for two faculty positions.
- GWSPH offers a first-year experience course for BS in Public Health students led by GWSPH faculty, who guide discussions and support students' connections with other faculty.
- The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in faculty offering virtual office hours, which continue to this day, as many students prefer online meetings. Most faculty and staff also offer in-person meetings to students if interested.

Challenges

- Graduate students raised concerns about faculty availability for academic advising and career mentoring. A component of this may be due to the time delay between faculty leaving and faculty replacements, which leaves a gap in service. Additionally, the survey does not specify the academic advisor as the assigned one from GWSPH. Students may be answering this question with non-GWSPH faculty or informal advisors in mind.
- Faculty turnover is a reality. The university controls approval of faculty lines, including tenure/tenure track lines; when faculty depart, this centralized control can lead to time delays with the hiring of new faculty causing stress and gaps for students and faculty.

Future Plans

- While undergraduate students are assigned a professional academic advisor, a more concerted effort will be made at orientation to encourage students to reach out to faculty for general advising and mentorship.

- TEAM Milken plans to expand its mentoring processes and promote mentoring from upper-level BS students (juniors and seniors) for lower-level BS students (first-years and sophomores).
- GWSPH is reviewing the data regarding faculty availability for graduate students outside the classrooms to develop a plan to improve accessibility.
- In new faculty hires and in management of faculty, GWSPH is seeking to employ efforts to reduce faculty turnover (e.g., retention bonuses, counter-offers when faculty are being recruited away, increasing faculty morale through mentoring and other efforts to achieve stability).