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**Gaining our BSPH Focus: Transitioning from Bouquet to Single Flower**

Joanne Chopak-Foss, PhD, Associate Professor/Program Director BSPH, Department of Community Health Behavior & Education; Joseph Telfair, DrPH, MSW, MPH, Dual Department Chair and Professor, Department of Community Health and Department of Environmental Health Sciences; Monica Brister, MS, Academic Advisor - Georgia Southern University Jian-Ping Hsu College of Public Health

Many undergraduate programs in public health/health education and promotion have their foundation in the Certified Health Education Specialist (CHES) competencies. For many years, these programs have been training the future public health workforce—without calling it Public Health. Degree names range from a Bachelor of Science in: Health Science, Community Health, Community Health Education, and the like. Several of these programs have undergone significant transitions in the past two years, specifically, logistical transition—from one academic unit to another, degree name changes, and curriculum revisions in which coursework aligns more closely with current public health competencies for undergraduate education. These transitions represent trends in the field: the publication of guidelines for stand-alone BSPH or otherwise named programs and the incorporation of a major professional association (American Association for Health Education) into another professional association (SOPHE) directly aligns to these trends.

This presentation will describe the transition of one such program, a Bachelor of Science in Health Science, previously housed with a "bouquet" of other health-related programs: Exercise Science, Athletic Training, Nutrition, Health/PE teacher education and Sport Management in a College of Health and Human Sciences, to a "single flower" Bachelor of Science in Public Health in a College of Public Health. Specifically we will discuss: the challenges, resolutions and implications of: a) changing the name of the degree including marketing strategies for attracting new majors; b) advisement; c) curriculum reorganization; and d) incorporating current faculty with primary responsibilities for teaching in the graduate program to teach undergraduates.

We will share our lessons learned and best practices for achieving transition success.
'Circling' the Disciplinary Wagons: Using Guiding Principles to develop an undergraduate public health program

Dina Kurz, MHSA, Director, Distributed Learning, Office of Academic Affairs; Gary Harper, PhD, MPH, Professor, Health Behavior and Health Education; Jane Banaszak-Holl, PhD, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs; Jillian McConville, BS, Office of Undergraduate Education - University of Michigan School of Public Health

The creation of an undergraduate program at the University of Michigan School of Public Health (U-M SPH) is altering the fabric of the School beyond crafting a new curriculum. While the U-M SPH has primarily only taught undergraduates for decades in its graduate courses, specific undergraduate courses addressing general knowledge of public health have been offered over the past six years. These courses, ranging from introducing the field of public health through the lens of health and society to understanding the challenges in behavioral and social science for health professionals, have proven widely popular with U-M undergraduates. The enthusiasm of these students for the field motivated the leadership of the School to propose a new degree program, enrolling juniors for two years of study in a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree. The recently approved Undergraduate Program in Public Health (UPPH) has led the faculty on an unexpected cross-cultural endeavor bringing together the six disciplines of the field to develop a shared vision of undergraduate education and to define a mission, guiding principles, and curriculum structure based in that vision. This oral presentation will present the key processes used and major challenges faced in identifying program and course learning outcomes and core course curriculum undergirding a liberal arts and sciences public health undergraduate education.

Highlights of the presentation will include a discussion of the benefits of a multi-year development plan for the Program, detailing barriers and milestones from Year 1 (needs assessment and proposal approval) and Year 2 (program development). For example, in Year 1 each department defined opportunities and challenges to implementing an undergraduate program which were then shared across the departments to help build a united vision for the program. Additional steps in the process for gaining faculty buy-in for an interdisciplinary undergraduate program in a flagship school of public health will be detailed, including the role of early investment in a shared philosophical understanding for the program. This took the form of Guiding Principles - Cultural Humility, Interdisciplinary Focus, Responsibly Educated Citizenry, Creating Leaders in Their Field, Liberal Education, and Engaged Learning (CIRCLE) - which along with the mission and vision statements communicate a concise picture of the UPPH to a wide variety of internal and external stakeholders. Gathering the school faculty together across the disciplines remains a continuing growth opportunity for U-M SPH. Faculty champions in each department have participated in regular planning meetings and are instrumental in fostering the culture change within the U-M SPH. Regardless, discipline-specific conflicts have and will continue to emerge as the U-M SPH departmental structure adapts to a shared educational endeavor. Strategies devised to address these conflicts and keep the Program true to its CIRCLE will be discussed.
Examining Compensation for Teaching in Among Primarily Research Faculty

Suzanne Judd, PhD, MPH, Associate Professor and Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Education, UAB School of Public Health

One challenge facing many Schools of Public Health when considering adopting an undergraduate program is determining how faculty will be compensated for the additional course work. Many faculty in Schools of Public Health are heavily leveraged with grant funding to execute either public health practice programs or conduct research. As such, they are familiar with models in which compensation is tied to percent effort as is required in reporting of federal grants but are not familiar with course releases or teaching loads than many Liberal Arts schools. At the UAB School of Public Health, we were faced with these same challenges. We also had the additional challenge that our funding model is school based rather than university based, therefore, hiring outside instructors is much more challenging. We began the process by surveying the other schools within the university to determine how teaching compensation is handled. We found that most schools operate under a 3-3-2 model meaning 3 courses in the spring, 3 in the fall and 2 in the summer. This means a full time 12 month faculty is expected to teach 8 undergraduate courses throughout the year to be considered to have a full load. We took this model and transferred it on to our percent effort model. We decided that teaching an undergraduate course would count for 12.5% salary coverage. We were careful not to use the word effort as we did not want to confuse faculty about how many hours of teaching might go into a course. The model has been widely received by our faculty within the school and there are plans to consider adopting it to the graduate program as well. The final hurdle we had to overcome was the handling of adjunct professors. Many of the schools on campus paid $3500 or less for adjunct courses. We wanted to apply our same model to indicate the value placed on teaching. We therefore decided on using 12.5% of the median Assistant Professor salary in the School of Public Health. We were deliberate with this decision in that we wanted to maintain similar expectations across adjunct and full time faculty.