Teaching & Learning Task Force Recommendations (Draft)

Introduction

The SPH2020 Teaching & Learning Task Force (T&L) was constituted by the Dean in February 2011 with the charge to address the following (slightly paraphrased) questions:

- How should we teach, and how will our students learn in 2020?
- How can we best balance the need to meet ASPH (and other) competency requirements and our desire to innovate beyond those requirements?
- How do we cultivate a faculty environment where innovation is supported?
- How do we integrate practitioners into the curriculum? How do we become more global in our educational programs and processes?
- What research exists to document the value of an idea?
- What is the competition doing?
- Who are the subject matter leaders, and are they internal or external? If external, do we have a relationship when them?

The Task Force (T&L), as eventually structured into subgroups, addressed most of these questions except the final two points, for which additional research/information-gathering is required.

Task Force Membership

The T&L consisted of 15 members, representing all SPH departments, critical staff functions (IIS; department administration; central administrative staff), and two student representatives. Following early deliberations, three working subgroups were established, with membership as follows:

1. Teaching & Learning Experience (T&LE) Subgroup:
   Steve Cole, EPID (Subgroup Leader); Jerry Calleson, IIS; Amy Herring, BIOS; William Vizuete, ESE
2. **Curriculum Subgroup:**
   Diane Calleson, PHLP (Subgroup Leader); Penny Gordon-Larsen, NUTR; Laura Linnan, HBHE; Ilene Speizer, MCH

3. **Culture, Leadership and Organization (CLO) Subgroup (Deferred¹)**:
   Karl Umble, NCIPH (Subgroup Leader); Evie McKee, BIOS; Felicia Mebane, Asst Dean for Students, HPM; Anna Maria Siega-Riz, Assoc Dean for Acad Affairs, EPID and NUTR

**Rationale for the Teaching & Learning Task Force²**

The education landscape is changing in profound ways, driven in large part by the convergence of three forces:

- Student needs and expectations,
- Technology, and
- Challenges to traditional funding of education and research.

The SPH must question underlying assumptions about who we are and how we acquire, validate and provide knowledge and training. As a public institution, we must shape our culture in ways that support a balanced emphasis on education, research and service. We must foster innovation in our structures and processes while preserving traditional principles and values. The risk of inaction in the volatile world we live in could be rapid obsolescence and non-competitiveness as an institution.

In the areas of teaching and learning, we must recognize that the educational foundations that have survived for so long—“bricks-and-mortar” residential institutions and lecture format pedagogy—are rapidly giving way to online education and hybrid approaches radically different from traditional pedagogy. Although no one can say what teaching and learning will be like in the year 2020 and beyond, the emergence of “blended” education requiring alternatives and flexibility in terms of physical space, pedagogical approaches, and concepts related to interaction seem inevitable.

**Discovery Process**

The T&L met initially three times to (1) clarify the charge; (2) identify stakeholders; and (3) identify teaching and learning themes to address. Appendix 1 contains the conceptualized SPH2020 Stakeholder and Theme “maps.”

---

¹ Activity on this subgroup was deferred. Still–active members of this subgroup participated actively in other subgroups: Siega-Riz with Curriculum, and McKee on T&LE.

² The literature and research on the changing landscape for higher education is extensive and ongoing, with new material appearing regularly. The Educause Initiative and related conferences are an excellent source of current information ([http://www.educause.edu/](http://www.educause.edu/)). The TF also compiled a substantial bibliography, which, although very informative, will require regular “maintenance” to stay up-to-date and relevant.
The identified T&L themes were then put into a survey in which T&L members first prioritized themes and then indicated their preferences on which to focus. From this process, three subgroups were established: Teaching & Learning Experience; Curriculum; and Culture/Organization/Leadership. Remarkably, T&L members’ preferences nearly perfectly lined up with prioritized themes. With two members of one subgroup having to drop out of T&L participation, activity only continued on two of the subgroups. Deliberations by the Culture/Leadership/Organization (CLO) subgroup were deferred. However, CLO issues were touched on in other subgroups.

**Findings and Prioritization**

Development, elaboration and finalization of recommendations by the two active subgroups resulted in a total of nine recommendations—five from the T&LE Subgroup, and four from the Curriculum Subgroup. The full T&L was then asked to do a forced-rank prioritization of all nine recommendations, regardless of their origin. The bar graph that follows shows the results of the rank ordering:

### Bar Graph

**Please rank the relative priority of the task force recommendations from both the Curriculum [Cur] and Teaching & Learning Environment [T&L] subgroups.**

1. Enhance technology & applications for teaching & learning [T&L] 6.78
2. Identify, encourage and reward quality teaching [T&L] 5.5
3. Redesign learning spaces to enhance the learning experience [T&L] 5.76
4. Enhance research & for teaching relationships with other organizations 5.41
5. Create an integrated curriculum for the core courses [Cur] 5.25
6. Create an adaptable & tailored curriculum to meet the needs of all 4.88
7. Identify and support faculty who are early adopters of curriculum innovations 3.86
8. Develop a "partnered students" award [T&L] 3.78
9. Integrate and showcase excellence in PH practice (locally & globally) 3.5

---

3 Another, not unexpected but very positive, outcome of the T&L Task Force was faculty from departments across the school interacting productively on a common area of interest, and getting to know each other better. The connections will continue.
The T&L decided to focus on only the top four prioritized recommendations for immediate consideration by the Dean’s Council. The T&L feels strongly, however, that all the recommendations are worthy of further investigation, and those without significant resource requirements should be implemented regardless of prioritization. Given the rank ordering, focusing on the top four recommendations reflects the relative scarcity of SPH resources.

**Recommended Plan**

The top four prioritized recommendations are as follows:

1. Enhance technology and applications for teaching and learning;
2. Identify, encourage, and reward quality teaching and mentoring;
3. Redesign teaching spaces to enhance the learning experience; and
4. Enhance research and/or teaching relationships with other organizations globally.

Details on the impact, benefits, implementation, timeline, resource requirements, and metrics for each of the prioritized recommendations are provided in the tables below for the prioritized recommendations. Details on the full set of recommendations are included in Appendix 2 for the T&LE Subgroup, and in Appendix 3 for the Curriculum Subgroup.

**Prioritized Recommendation #1: Enhance technology and applications for teaching and learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Enhancing and maintaining SPH reputation and capabilities in research and teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (tangible and intangible)</td>
<td>Efficiency of teaching; increased options and approaches; better preparation of students for rapid technological changes affecting the work world. Technological applications could also decrease the needs for physical (“bricks-and-mortar”) space, as well as increase the teaching capacity of instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>1. Develop a computing cloud-based academic site for most, if not all, lectures/discussions and materials. Lectures/discussions could be automatically recorded and posted to the site after permission is granted by the instructor, with only minimal effort required of the instructor to ensure this happens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Give students/alumni “life-long Onyen access” (possibly for annual fee rolled into an SPH alumni association fee) to help to keep alumni engaged in the SPH educational mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Require students to arrive on campus with technology needed to be successful in a cutting-edge technological environment, e.g. (in current terms) have portable computing devices, “smart-phones”, i-clickers and/or tablets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Widen coverage of the UNC-1 wireless network around the expanding university “village.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResourceRequirements</td>
<td>Highly variable and could be expensive in terms of hardware. Care in investments necessary; possibly needs to be coordinated with larger UNC initiatives. Software apps and approaches not very difficult or expensive, and innovation and “pilot tests” should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics for Success</td>
<td>Regional and national rankings and mentions of being on the technological “cutting-edge.” Instructor and student satisfaction. Staying “ahead of the curve” for at least half of the incoming classes (i.e. introducing them to technologies, both hardware and software, with which they are not yet familiar).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Risks of Inaction | • Creeping institutional obsolescence  
• Loss of capabilities and relevance  
• Loss of innovative, early-adopter faculty  
• Student boredom and apathy |

**Prioritized Recommendation #2: Identify, encourage, and reward quality teaching and mentoring (e.g. elevate its importance in tenure and promotion decisions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>The impact of such an action would include clear strengthening of the School’s view of teaching. The pairing of successful teachers with junior colleagues of great potential will provide for the next generation of great Carolina public health professors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Benefits (tangible and intangible) | • Encourages excellence in teaching and mentoring through appropriate rewards and recognition  
• Promotes future teaching innovations |
| Implementation Plan | 1. Reward quality teaching. A central point of teaching quality is for instructors to bring state-of-the-art science straight into the classroom and emphasize research-based teaching. Teaching awards should be tailored to distinct categories, such as “large” and “small” class sizes. For instance, the teaching award winner is relieved of 10% effort from the School for the following year to further enhance their teaching. In addition the winner gets to identify (perhaps in concert with their chair) a junior colleague who also receives 10% effort to work as a team to further develop and pass on teaching skills. Coordinate awards with tenure and promotions decisions.  
2. Foster team teaching  
3. Encourage one-on-one mentoring, in particular related to research (e.g. “apprenticeships”) |
Timeline | In conjunction with existing award cycle and ongoing
---|---
Resource Requirements | The costs of such a program, implemented only to 1 class size, are 20% effort / year likely split across a senior and junior faculty member or about $30k / year.
Metrics for Success | Prompt and systematic evaluation of teaching by students and peer faculty. We recommend that course evaluations by students be required before a grade can be conferred.
Risks of Inaction | • Loss of faculty  
• Loss of knowledge  
• Student dissatisfaction  
• Lower school rankings among peer institutions

Prioritized Recommendation #3: Teaching spaces should be redesigned to enhance the teaching and learning experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Potential Impact | • Would support multiple pedagogies/approaches to academic activities.  
• Moves the School to a new level of innovation and allows leveraging of state-of-the-art technologies |
| Benefits (tangible and intangible) | • Improved efficiency of instruction  
• Improved student satisfaction  
• Improved instructor satisfaction  
• Improved communications  
• Deepens interaction between faculty and students  
• Assist in faculty and student recruitment |
| Implementation Plan | 1. Thoughtful placement of projector screens and multiple large whiteboards to facilitate projection of prepared slides in concert with interactively-drawn figures  
2. Moderate-sized rooms (for 12-20 people) with 4-6 person movable tables to enhance small-group discussion, as well as more traditional lecture-based rooms  
3. Moderate- and large-sized rooms (for 12-100 people) that capture “at a switch” all the audio, video, and whiteboard data presented in the lecture. This lecture and supporting data could be uploaded to a “cloud” so that local and global students can re-access classroom interactions at any time. Contrary to conventional recorded lectures that are frozen and recycled, these captured lectures will be easy to keep timely since they are remade each year.  
4. Anticipate the use of reversed distance learning, where we bring global
5. Additional open collaborative/cafe-type space, interior and (shaded) exterior will help to facilitate collaborative efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Initially implement in 24-36 months with annual review and reinvestments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Requirements</td>
<td>~$50K per classroom (dependent on size and configuration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Metrics for Success | • Number of instructors that request classroom  
                          • Student satisfaction from class evaluations (new item)  
                          • Faculty satisfaction                                    |
| Risks of Inaction  | • Becoming obsolete  
                          • Loss of faculty  
                          • Loss of students                                               |

Prioritized Recommendation #4: Enhance research and/or teaching relationships with other organizations globally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Potential Impact      | • Increase contact/collaboration with large research networks.  
                          • Develop the nexus of new large research networks.                                |
| Benefits (tangible and intangible) | • Improved reputation  
                          • Increased revenue from collaborative research                                       |
| Implementation Plan   | 1. Deepen research and educational partnership(s) with high-quality non-US “sister” academic institutions (e.g. China, India, South Africa). This could include distance education as well as two-way summer or semester research experiences for students. Convene a task force to inventory current partnerships and investigate new School-level opportunities.  
                          2. Formalize research experiences with industry and government partners (e.g. “Maymester” internships). Pilot with (3) $20K grants.  
                          3. Explore the development of an industry-academic collaboration award to provide incentive to (sometimes shunned) industry collaborations. |
| Timeline              | 12-18 months of task force activity                                                                                                    |
| Resource Requirements | $25K to cover travel for the task force during its inventory; $60K to seed pilots                                                          |
| Metrics for Success   | • Proposal with a plan for collaborations, including necessary resources                                                              |
• Final report with number of and location of collaborations
• Student/faculty satisfaction surveys

Risks of Inaction
• Become disconnected with other academic institutions
• Lost opportunities for partnership and commensurate revenue

Estimates of Resource Requirements and Return on Investment

Order-of-magnitude estimates of resource requirements and return are presented for the full set of recommendations in the table below. The four prioritized recommendations are listed first, followed by the other T&L subgroup recommendations, in the order they were prioritized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T&amp;L Recommendation</th>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Return^4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhance technology and applications for teaching and learning</td>
<td>$ $ $</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify, encourage, and reward quality teaching and mentoring</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>++ ++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Redesign teaching spaces to enhance the learning experience</td>
<td>$ $ $</td>
<td>+ ++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enhance research and/or teaching relationships with other organizations globally</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>++ ++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an integrated curriculum for the core courses</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>+ ++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an adaptable and tailored curriculum to meet the needs of all levels of learners</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>+ ++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and support faculty who are early adopters of curriculum innovations</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>++ ++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^4 “Return” in terms of Teaching & Learning initiatives is in terms of improved student performance, student and instructor satisfaction, School reputation, and increased applications/enrollment, rather than financial return.
Develop a “partnered students” award

Integrate and showcase excellence in public health practice from local and global perspective in the SPH curriculum

Teaching and Learning Recommendations – The Risks

There are, of course, numerous risks inherent in any initiative or investment. The T&L subgroups addressed the first and most obvious risk—*Inaction*—in the recommendation templates. That is, “What might happen if we fail to act (on this recommendation) in a timely manner?”

Other risks that should be considered, evaluated, and quantified to the extent possible include the following:

**Market Risk:** What are the market risks? Competition? Risk factors affecting revenue sources?

**Implementation Risk:** What risk is SPH taking on implementation? Faculty inability to deliver? Key faculty transfer? Global partner risk? Who would be harmed if the initiative fails? Students? Research partners? Other UNC school partners?

**Financial Risk:** What financial risks exist? How much start-up or seed capital is required before we know if the idea or recommendation will work?

**Political Risk:** What political risk exists if the initiative fails to materialize as projected? What stakeholder will be impacted by a failure? How?

Finally, strategies or mitigating factors to address these potential risks would need to be specified.

Next Steps

In order to bring any of these recommendations to fruition and pay-off, the T&L recognizes that a substantial number of questions still need to be addressed. These include:

1. Define the scale of the recommendation in terms of impact; e.g. how many students, faculty, or other stakeholders will be (favorably) affected?
2. Define specific objectives and a strategy for each recommendation, including a timeline with milestones.
3. Specify resource requirements—start-up and steady state, in a quantifiable manner that can be appropriately included in the SPH budget and planning cycle. Both human as well as fiscal resources should be considered.\(^5\)

4. Creatively consider and propose ways to address resource requirements—both human and financial—in order to realize the goals of the objective. These could include, for example, collaboration, public-private partnerships, foundation or government funding, special fund-raising, etc. Are their ways that initiatives that would arise from recommendations could be monetized or commercialized?

**Conclusion**

The T&L hopes that one or more of the prioritized recommendations will be put forth for further analysis and implementation. It is clear from the above “Next Steps”, however, that substantial work still needs to be done by an implementation group that can effectively devote time, expertise, and follow–up for this area so very important to the School of Public Health, 2020.

\(^5\) Useful and appropriate queries and templates are available as part of the SPH2020 planning process.
Appendix 1: Stakeholder Map and Teaching and Learning Themes

Appendix Figure 1-1: SPH2020 Teaching and Learning Stakeholders Map

[Diagram showing the stakeholders map for SPH2020 teaching and learning, including categories such as SPH Faculty, Post Doctoral, Students, Alumni and Employers, Donors, Field/Practice Partners, Academic Partners - UNC Departments & Schools, Vendors, Peer Institutions, External Academic Partners, Informed, Involved, and Need Involvement on Task Force.]
Appendix Figure 1-2: SPH2020 Teaching and Learning Themes

SPH 2020 Teaching and Learning Themes

- Teaching
  - Improving and sustaining instructional quality
    - Contemplative educational model
  - Cross-departmental
    - SPH
    - Cross-school
    - UNC
  - Cross-institutional/cross-organizational
    - Globally
  - Re-evaluating boundaries in SPH
    - Undergraduate
    - Master's
    - Doctoral
  - Cross-degree programs
  - Hybrid distance/residential models
    - Total distance models (e.g., HPM Exec Masters Program)
  - Leveraging new technology
    - Training philosophy
  - Emerging educational models
    - Customized vs. Standardized
    - Competencies
    - Accreditation requirements
  - Advising/mentoring
    - Competencies
    - Accreditation requirements
  - Student-centeredness in SPH
    - Refocus teaching on current and emerging public health issues
      - In-class vs. out-of-class learning experiences
      - Diversity sensitivity

- Learning
  - Optimize experience
    - Customized vs. Standardized
  - Pursue mutually beneficial and sustainable partnerships for internships, practica, networking, research

- Technology

- Globalization
  - Positioning SPH as a global entity
  - Statewide
    - Nationally
    - Globally
Appendix 2: Teaching and Learning Experience (T&L E) Subgroup
Full Set of Recommendations

Recommendation #1: Develop a partnered students award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Innovative and valuable cross-department collaborations in integrative public health science. Would foster an environment of cross-department collaboration from the bottom-up (instead of trying to encourage it from the top-down).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (tangible and intangible)</td>
<td>Cross-department collaboration evolving to an organizational/institutional SPH model without silos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Develop an annual partnered students award, a semester-long research assistantship provided to a pairing of two students from different SPH departments to encourage cross-department collaborative self-directed research experiences. A faculty sponsor is required from each department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Timeline                   | • Immediate and annual  
                               • Develop protocol in a semester |
| Resource Requirements      | $48K per year per student (out-of-state). Maximum would be approximately $100K per year and the minimum would be closer to $35K (assuming two in-state students)  
                               Potential cost of travel for presentation (~$2-5K) |
| Metrics for Success        | • Number of applications (increasing annually)  
                               • Number of qualified applications  
                               •Submitted manuscripts and/or posters |
| Risks of Inaction          | • Continuation of departmental silos  
                               • Lack of collaboration |

Recommendation #2: Teaching spaces should be redesigned to enhance the teaching and learning experience (T&LE Subgroup)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>• Would support multiple pedagogies/approaches to academic activities. Moves the School to a new level of innovation and allows leveraging of state-of-the-art technologies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits (tangible and intangible)

- Improved efficiency of instruction
- Improved student satisfaction
- Improved instructor satisfaction
- Improved communications
- Deepens interaction between faculty and students
- Assist in faculty and student recruitment

Implementation Plan

1. Thoughtful placement of projector screens and multiple large whiteboards to facilitate the projection of prepared slides in concert with interactively drawn figures.
2. Moderate-sized rooms (for 12-20 people) with 4-6 person movable tables to enhance small-group discussion, as well as more traditional lecture based rooms.
3. Moderate- and large-sized rooms (for 12-100 people) that capture “at a switch” all the audio, video, and whiteboard data presented in the lecture. This lecture and supporting data could be uploaded to a “cloud” so that local and global students can re-access classroom interactions at any time. Contrary to conventional recorded lectures that are frozen and recycled, these captured lectures will be easy to keep timely since they are remade each year.
4. Anticipate the use of “reversed distance learning”, where we bring global experts into our educational environment virtually yet seamlessly.
5. Additional open collaborative/cafe-type space, interior and (shaded) exterior will help to underwrite collaborative efforts.

Timeline

To implement initially in 24-36 months with annual review and reinvestments

Resource Requirements

~$50K per classroom (dependent on size and configuration)

Metrics for Success

- Number of instructors that request classroom
- Student Satisfaction from class evaluations (new item)
- Faculty Satisfaction

Risks of Inaction

- Becoming obsolete
- Loss of faculty
- Loss of students

Recommendation #3: Identify, encourage, and reward quality teaching, e.g. elevate its importance in tenure and promotion decisions (T&LE Subgroup)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>The impact of such an action would include a clear strengthening of the School’s view of teaching. The pairing of successful teachers with junior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
colleagues of great potential will provide for the next generation of great Carolina public health professors.

| Benefits (tangible and intangible) | • Promotes mentoring  
| • Promotes future teaching innovations  
| • Rewards excellence in teaching |

| Implementation Plan | 1. Reward quality teaching. A central point of teaching quality is for instructors to bring state-of-the-art science straight into the classroom and emphasize “research-based teaching.” Teaching awards should be tailored to distinct categories, such as “large” and “small” class sizes. For instance, the teaching award winner is relieved of 10% effort from the school for the following year to further enhance their teaching, in addition the winner gets to identify (perhaps in concert with their chair) a junior colleague who also receives 10% effort to work as a team to further develop and pass on teaching skills. Coordinate awards with tenure and promotions decisions.  
| 2. Foster team teaching. |

| Timeline | In conjunction with existing award cycle |

| Resource Requirements | The costs of such a program, implemented only to 1 class size, are 20% effort / year likely split across a senior and junior faculty member or about $30k / year. |

| Metrics for Success | Prompt and systematic evaluation of teaching, by students and peer faculty. We recommend that course evaluations by students be required before a grade can be conferred. |

| Risks of Inaction | • Loss of faculty  
| • Loss of knowledge |

**Recommendation #4: Enhance research and/or teaching relationships with other organizations globally (T&LE Subgroup)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Potential Impact | • Increases contact/collaboration with large research networks.  
| • Develop the nexus of new large research networks. |

| Benefits (tangible and intangible) | • Improved reputation  
| • Increased revenue from collaborative research |

| Implementation Plan | 1. Deepen research and educational partnership(s) with high-quality non-US ‘sister’ academic institutions (e.g. China, India, South Africa). This could include distance education as well as two-way summer or |
semester research experiences for students. Convene a task force to inventory current partnerships and investigate new opportunities at the school level.
2. Formalize research experiences with industry and government partners (e.g. “Maymester” internships). Pilot with 3 $20K grants.
3. Explore the development of an industry-academic collaboration award to provide incentive to (sometimes shunned) industry collaborations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>12-18 months of task force activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Requirements</td>
<td>$25K to cover travel for the task force during its inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60K to seed pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics for Success</td>
<td>Proposal with a plan for collaborations, including necessary resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final report with number of and location of collaborations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student/faculty satisfaction surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks of Inaction</td>
<td>Become disconnected with other academic institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lost opportunities for partnership and commensurate revenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation #5: Enhance technology and applications for teaching and learning (T&LE Subgroup)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Enhancing and maintaining SPH reputation and capabilities in research and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (tangible and intangible)</td>
<td>Efficiency of teaching; increased options and approaches; better preparation of the students for the rapid technological changes affecting the work world. Technological applications could also decrease the needs for physical (“bricks-and-mortar”) space, as well as increase the teaching capacity of instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>1. Develop a computing cloud-based academic site for most, if not all, lectures/discussions and materials. Lectures/discussions could be automatically recorded and posted to the site after permission is granted by the instructor, with only minimal effort required of the instructor to ensure this happens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Give students/alumni “life-long Onyen access” (possibly for annual fee rolled into an SPH alumni association fee) in order to help to keep alumni engaged in the SPH educational mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Require students to arrive on campus with the technology needed to be successful in a cutting-edge technological environment, e.g. (in current terms) have portable computing devices, “smart-phones”, i-clickers and/or tablets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                            | 4. Widen coverage of the UNC-1 wireless network around the expanding ...............
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Timeline</strong></th>
<th>Immediate and ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Highly variable and could be expensive in terms of hardware. Care in investments necessary; possibly needs to be coordinated with larger UNC initiatives. Software apps and approaches not very difficult or expensive, and innovation and “pilot tests” should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metrics for Success</strong></td>
<td>Regional and national rankings and mentions of being on the technological “cutting-edge.” Instructor and student satisfaction. Staying “ahead of the curve” for at least half of the incoming classes (i.e. introducing them to technologies, both hardware and software, with which they are not yet familiar).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Risks of Inaction** | • Creeping institutional obsolescence  
• Loss of capabilities and relevance  
• Loss of innovative, early-adopter faculty  
• Student boredom and apathy |
## Appendix 3: Curriculum Subgroup
### Full Set of Recommendations

#### Recommendation #1: Create an integrated curriculum for the core courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Potential Impact     | • This important change in the School’s core curriculum will challenge students to learn and apply required public health competencies with a greater emphasis on problem-solving and critical thinking to address current, real-world, globally-relevant public health problems.  
• Faculty who teach within integrated curriculum have both opportunities for synergy (better quality teaching and more expertise brought to the classroom) and for efficiency (better use of time/resources).  
• The initiative is consistent with the new Academic Plan for UNC. |
| Benefits (tangible and intangible) | • New Curriculum Mastery of ASPH competencies; improved student satisfaction with core courses; enhanced problem solving; be a leader among ASPH schools of public health by having integrated curriculum.  
• Innovative teaching methods raises the bar for all teaching in the School  
• Integrated, less silo-based, more cohesive and interdisciplinary approach with real-world application (Please see recommendation #6 on tailored curriculum.). |
| Implementation Plan | 1. Pilot test the introduction to public health course; evaluate results; create a team of instructors with content expertise and who are early adopters. Then, improve courses using data to guide changes.  
2. Examine core courses to identify opportunities for re-structuring and making them more integrated.  
3. Take action on recommendation #2 (e.g. identify and support faculty who can be early adopters of curriculum innovations).  
4. Identify and recruit a teaching pool of practice-based professionals to help with integrated curriculum.  
5. Set aside a 2-hour block of non-SPH course time each semester for overarching seminars/lectures that students could attend in lieu of classes. Individualized monitoring would be used to ensure attendance. Class participation also could be done via web-based dissemination during class time. |
| Timeline             | • **Spring Semester 2012**: Implement initial “What is Public Health?” course and offer again in Fall (2012). Online course to be developed May-August, 2012.  
• **January 2012**: Begin to identify interested, available adjunct faculty and pool of practice-based professionals to help with integrated curriculum.  
• **Fall 2012**: Begin development of integrated core curriculum and |
continue through Fall 2014.

Resource Requirements

- **People:** Associate Dean Academic Affairs; Faculty – Core PH areas; PHLP Faculty; other interested adjunct faculty/health practitioners
- **Financial:** Innovation Funds from University Provost Office (we have award-$300K over 3 years); TA support for any new courses
- **Other Support:** Teaching workshops hosted by faculty TBD.
- **Environment:** Need classrooms with adequate space and technology to accommodate new teaching methods

Metrics for Success

- Student course evaluations
- Assessment of ASPH core competencies pre/post course participation
- Monitor changes in success rates on national certification exams over time (e.g. NCBPHE exam)

Risks of Inaction

- Lose ranking as a key leader among public health schools
- Potentially lower scores on NCBPHE exam
- Fall behind on training of future public health workforce, which includes integrated approaches
- Non-compliance with the new academic plan for the university

Recommendation #2: Identify and support faculty who are early adopters of curriculum innovations (Curriculum Subgroup)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Enables faculty to focus on creating current and relevant public health content, case studies, and other active learning methods to energize students to engage in problem solving and critical thinking on key public health topics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Benefits (tangible and intangible) | • Faculty will be motivated to teach using innovative technology and current teaching methods.  
• Students will benefit from enhanced teaching methods and have increased evaluation scores and better satisfaction with coursework.  
• Keeps the School in line with the new Academic Plan for the university. |
| Implementation Plan          | Departments provide input into the development and implementation of the integrated curriculum by identifying faculty and engaging them to become “early adopters” of the integrated curriculum.  
1. Faculty will self-identify or be recommended by others as “early adopters.”  
2. Create teaching and learning website to enable faculty to learn about teaching methods and other active learning approaches.  
3. Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence will offer faculty workshops in departmental and School-wide meetings. |
4. Orientation for new faculty will share resources for Teaching and Learning.
5. Promote Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence among TAs.
6. APC committee will be charged with being proactive in identifying speakers, workshops, and other support for new innovations on teaching and learning.
7. Conduct a rigorous evaluation focused on completeness, relevance and timelines of curriculum revisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Immediate – some of these steps are currently under consideration or in process as part of the ongoing efforts undertaken by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Resource Requirements | • Support for faculty time, educators, and online instructional staff.  
• **People:** Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Dept Chairs, APC members, interested faculty members, and teaching assistants  
• **Support:** Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning  
• **Financial:** Existing grant secured from Provost’s Office; need additional resources for website development. Once Provost’s funds are gone, need ongoing resources to maintain these efforts. We also need incentives for getting early adopters on board.  
• **Resources:** Online instructional equipment/materials available to faculty |
| Metrics for Success | • The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will report to Dean’s Council every six months, and at an annual School-wide faculty and staff meeting  
• Potential metrics:  
  ✓ Use of use of innovation resource website and/or # of hits on website  
  ✓ Attendance at webinars/tutorials  
  ✓ General trends on course evaluations about use of new technology/new methods  
  ✓ Number of faculty new adopters that participate/modify their courses by year  
  ✓ Number of participants at seminars |
| Risks of Inaction | • If we don’t get faculty on board, we won’t have an integrated curriculum.  
• We could lose ranking as a key leader among public health schools  
• Potentially lower scores on student competency exams  
• Fall behind on training of future of public health workforce which includes integrated approaches |
# Recommendation #3: Integrate and showcase excellence in public health practice from local and global perspective in the SPH curriculum (Curriculum Subgroup)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Become the leading SPH in the nation with an integrated, cutting-edge, real-world public health research and practice curriculum—with both domestic and global possibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (tangible and intangible)</td>
<td>To maximize student exposure to organizations and people, we will identify, orient and integrate selected public health practitioners (including alumni, adjunct faculty members, visiting global scholars, and doctoral students) into the curriculum as teachers, facilitators, and guest lecturers. New networks will create new opportunities for practice and better work experiences and better service to the State.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementation Plan | • We recommend creating a teaching “pool” of practice-based national and international professionals to be included in a searchable database for School-wide use in the curriculum.  
• Via APC committee—each department will need to: (1) help select/recommend practice-based national and international professionals to be in the “pool” and (2) identify a plan that describes how they will integrate these individuals into their curriculum.  
• Develop an orientation for professionals to the mission of the UNC Gillings School of Global PH, focusing on our aim for improving practice-based learning.  
• Consider offering privileges to professionals who are selected into this “pool” (e.g. can we give them access to library services).  
• Produce stories of practitioner involvement in the curriculum could be showcased on the SPH social media and the website. |
| Timeline | Immediate |
| Resource Requirements | • **Funds:** To develop searchable database; and parking for adjuncts, other instructors, practice professionals  
• **People:** IIS staff to help develop searchable database and work with faculty to enable practitioners to participate in real time (ex. Skype or other web conferencing); interested adjuncts, practitioners and other instructors |
| Metrics for Success | • Number of practitioners who are invited and accept the invitation to join the “pool.”  
• Number who teach courses, guest lecture and/or mentor students in other ways.  
• Evaluations by students and faculty of guest “lecturers” |
| Risks of Inaction | • We could lose ranking as a key leader among public health schools, particularly as a training program with a unique strength in practice-
based learning

- Potentially lower scores on student competency exams
- Fall behind on training of future of public health workforce which includes integrated approaches

**Recommendation #4: Create an adaptable and tailored curriculum to meet the needs of all levels of learners (Curriculum Subgroup)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>The School attracts students from many different disciplines and types of training programs. We teach and mentor students who are relatively new to public health as well as highly trained, experienced and skilled practitioners who are returning to further their education. Thus, we propose that each department explore how to create a flexible and tailored curriculum for all levels of learners and for students seeking interdisciplinary educational opportunities. The goal here is to meet students at their current level of knowledge, skill and understanding of public health, make sure they master core competencies, and allow them the opportunity to create a tailored course of study while they are at the SPH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (tangible and intangible)</td>
<td>For the advanced/experienced learner, this may involve “placing out” of some courses (or segments of courses) and allowing them to be challenged with more advanced study and mentoring. Students, for example, could be excused from some segments of courses and create a tailored plan that may involve attending a lecture series or becoming involved in other field based courses. For students new to public health, it is likely that the “What is Public Health?” course and the proposed integrated curriculum will provide them with a strong foundation from which to begin their training. Education is advancing in part, by tailoring learning approaches to individuals to maximize their learning styles and skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementation Plan | 1. Develop a list of competencies where a student could demonstrate how they met the most basic competencies, but also develop a list of activities for mastery and beyond.  
2. Develop screening tools to assess incoming students and screen students upon entry re: core competencies.  
3. Match students with course opportunities that personalize their learning based on needs/interests/experience.  
4. Develop individualized monitoring tools of student progress so that course segments, field activities, and practice-based experiences can become formal components of the curriculum. |
| Timeline | Two-year period from decision to implementation |
| Resource | • Identify an education or adult learning expert to set up a screener or |
### Requirements

- assessment tool so that incoming students can assess baseline knowledge and use those results to tailor a learning experience.
  - We will need faculty training and information to support this idea
  - **People**: Consultant with Center for Excellence Teaching and Learning; Recruit a pilot SPH department willing to try this approach.
  - **Funds**: Consultant to help with development of tools and how to approach this process with students.

### Metrics for Success

- Pre/post and perhaps mid-course assessment of competencies
- Student interviews (mid-program and exit)
- Faculty interviews
- Consider a pilot department to test this overall approach with their core curriculum.

### Risks of Inaction

- Missed opportunity to lead and maximize student expertise and skills and public health trajectory
- Lose students who are looking for cutting edge, innovative, and tailored educational experience
- Lose ranking as a key leader among schools of public health