Health Services COPHP Program

Faculty Handbook

University of Washington
School of Public Health
Department of Health Services

Always use the most recently updated version of the handbook, available online at the COPHP website:
https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/file/download/c398be014351faf2403d2868b271026a057d512e703663e19f74edcde83eb412?inline=1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

WELCOME

Welcome to the COPHP Program in Health Services Faculty Handbook! We hope you will find this a useful resource in your work as a COPHP faculty member.

Changes to the Handbook are tracked in the "Handbook Updates" section in the Appendix.

Please contact the Student Services Counselor (uwcophp@uw.edu) with questions about this document.

ABOUT THIS HANDBOOK

Websites

Web URLs in this document were current as of Autumn 2015. However, web URLs are subject to change without notice. If you discover a broken link, please inform the Student Services Counselor at uwcophp@uw.edu.

Leadership and Staff

Throughout this document, COPHP Program and Department leadership and staff are referred to by title, rather than by name. The following table provides the names and contact information for these individuals as of Autumn 2015:

Title	Name	Email	Phone	Office
Program Director	Dr. Amy Hagopian	hagopian@uw.edu	206-616-4989	H-690E
Program Manager	Kitty Andert	kitander@uw.edu	206-616-2926	H690B
Student Services Counselor	Lauren Brackenbury	uwcophp@uw.edu	206-616-2979	H672B
Program Coordinator	Suman Chhabra	hscoord@uw.edu	206 616-8097	H690A
Marketing and Recruitment Specialist	Dorian Varga	dvarga@uw.edu	206-616-1397	H690H
Graduate Student Assistant (Marketing/Recruitment)	Lee Hicks	cophp@uw.edu	206-685-0888	H690J
Health Services Department Chair	Dr. Jeff Harris	jh7@uw.edu	206-616-8113	H680
Health Services Department Administrator	Jo Gallaugher	jogal@uw.edu	206-616-2928	H680

Detailed information about staff roles is provided in the "Administration" section, below.

Faculty

For a list of all COPHP faculty, please visit http://www.mphpublichealthpractice.uw.edu/overview/faculty/

For current contact information and faculty profiles, please visit the Department of Health Services faculty web pages at http://depts.washington.edu/hserv/faculty/, or link to faculty pages from the COPHP program listings above.

COPHP – A Brief History

> **To educate public health problem solvers who will be innovators and change agents in communities, government agencies, and health sector organizations.**
>
> *-Stated program goal from the July 2000 proposal to create a Master of Public Health degree in Community-Oriented Public Health Practice*

The Community-Oriented Public Health Practice (COPHP) MPH degree program was conceptualized in early 2000 by a few committed faculty interested in exploring new ways of teaching and training students for careers in public health practice. Traditional MPH degree programs at UW and across the country emphasize research skills, discipline-based teaching, and quantitative research approaches to public health, and these faculty members recognized a growing demand for the school to educate master's students who could work effectively in community and public health practice settings at the local, state and national level. To quote from the 1999 report on the *Demonstrating Excellence in Academic Public Health Practice* from the Associated Schools of Public Health,

> The field of public health, both in practice and in academia, is experiencing enormous challenges…The new environment for public health requires that scholarship be redefined to include… practice-based research, teaching, and service.

In response to this growing demand for public health practitioners, Fred Connell, Aaron Katz, Jack Thompson and Steven Gloyd met over beer and burritos at local eatery Agua Verde to begin brainstorming for a new MPH program at UW. In July of 2000, they submitted a proposal to the School of Public Health to create a new MPH program utilizing a case- and problem-based pedagogical approach with the explicit goal of training public health problem solvers, innovators and change agents.

The SPH funded the proposal, and the next year and a half was spent composing the competencies and learning objectives, recruiting and consulting with a community advisory board, recruiting and training faculty in problem-based learning, and writing the case-based curriculum. The first cohort of 12 COPHP students was admitted for the 2002-2003 schoolyear. In each subsequent year, the program has continued to evolve through its integrated student evaluation component. To date, there have been 184 COPHP graduates, with 47 more poised to graduate by 2017.

COPHP graduates have gone on to work in a variety of fields, from local, state, and national government health agencies to global non-profits and foundations. The success of early classes of COPHP graduates has garnered great respect and demand for current and future graduates in the local public health practice community.

COPHP AND THE ROLE OF RACISM IN PUBLIC HEALTH

The people of the Community Oriented Public Health Practice MPH have made a commitment to transform our educational program. Embedded in a large Department in a large School in a large public University in the United States, we recognize the magnitude of an effort to overcome generations of institutional racism.

Since our first cohort entered in the fall of 2002, our program has been influenced and shaped not only by the faculty leadership, but also by the values and priorities of our students. Over the years, student cohorts have increasingly recognized the role of systemic and structural racism in undermining the public's health. Our 2013 entering class was particularly engaged, and formed a COPHP entity called "Committee on Oppression and Racism in Education" (CORE), which maintains a blog here. CORE members organized a collective to move the program toward anti-racist practice and analysis.

In response to a CORE request, we staged our first two-day Undoing Institutional Racism workshop in fall 2014, sponsored by the People's Institute Northwest for Survival and Beyond. UIR workshops typically include about 40 people, with facilitators who help us understand the history and purposes of racism, connections between racism and poverty, and how racism is perpetuated through power dynamics in our institutions. For the last two years, every single first-year student has spent a full weekend participating in the training, along with a number of faculty and staff.

After that first workshop, faculty and CORE students strategized about next steps. We decided to first change a number of ways in which we frame and portray the problems of power, privilege and racism in public health work. To this end, we:

- Revised the admission process to include CORE participation and criteria.
- Added an anti-racism commitment statement to our course syllabi.
- Added classroom climate questions to our student course evaluations.
- Committed to annual Undoing Institutional Racism trainings for all program participants.
- Created space for CORE at regular faculty meetings and faculty retreats.
- Employed CORE students and graduates to review cases to ensure they didn't carry implicit bias.

For example, at the last faculty retreat, we invited CORE students to create an exercise to illustrate how microaggressions play out in the classroom, and help faculty work through how to manage those.

CORE students have been actively engaged in the Seattle community, joining the Black Lives Matter movement and working with EPIC (End the Prison Industrial Complex) to stop the new Seattle/King County youth jail construction.

The School of Public Health has now appointed two COPHP alumni (Ariel Hart and Jenn Hagedorn) to teach an all-school class during fall, winter and spring quarters for graduate and undergraduate students, "Racism and Public Health."

FEE-BASED PROGRAMS

Fee-based educational programs, such as COPHP, are those in which all costs (administration, faculty, facilities, etc.) are funded entirely by student tuition, with no funding coming from the state of Washington.

Differences between state-funded and fee-based programs are described on the UW Registrar's Fee-based Programs FAQ: http://depts.washington.edu/registra/students/feeBasedFAQ.php

In addition, students in fee-based programs are not eligible for certain programs, including the (unfunded) State employee tuition exemption program.

Historical Context

The University of Washington has long had fee-based educational programs. Until the Great Recession, however, these programs were few and targeted specific audiences. But the Recession led the state Legislature (and legislatures across the country) to cut funding for public colleges and universities: Since 2008, Washington State cut higher education funding by 38% (compared with a national average of 25%); the University of Washington alone lost 50% of its state funding between 2009 and 2012.

These significant cuts required UW departments and schools to reduce expenditures on their state budgets, and one solution was to shift whole teaching programs from state funding to a fee basis. That is, rather than state taxpayers supporting most of the cost of a university degree, the burden is shifted to student-paid tuition. The Department of Health Services made this shift with COPHP in 2010 (other DHS degree programs that are fee-based include all Master of Health Administration programs and the Executive MPH). The result is that all costs for COPHP – administration, faculty, facilities, etc. – are funded entirely by student tuition.

Tuition for fee-based programs is set by the program (in consultation with the respective department). In some cases, tuition rates may be higher than "state-funded" programs, but not always. Fee-based financing also limits student access to important benefits available to students of state-funded programs. For example, a fee-based student is not able to garner a full tuition waiver from an RA/TA or GA position at the University. We will speak more about this process below; however, you should be aware of other differences to being a fee-based student. In 2013 COPHP students and faculty compiled a document of these differences that is listed in the appendix. The Department of Health Services has also developed a document in the appendix that explains the administrative services breakdown for fee-based programs. For more information about fee-based programs, see this website set up by the university registrar's office. If you have questions about funding your fee-based education, please contact the COPHP Student Services Counselor directly.

The University of Washington now has 96 programs operating under the fee-based model. COPHP students and staff have been leaders in the fight against higher education cuts and in bringing the inequities faced by fee-based students to the school administration. We urge you as incoming students to continue to keep this issue visible in our academic community. One of our core values at COPHP is eliminating health and economic inequities – and access to higher education is a critical social determinant of both.

FACULTY JOB DESCRIPTION

Faculty duties are listed briefly below, and discussed throughout this handbook.

Faculty Duties	Handbook Section
1. Teach an assigned course alongside one or two other faculty teaching the same course that quarter.	
• Coordinate and collaborate with your fellow block instructors to decide on cases for the block. • Write or co-write cases for the course (following the usual protocols), or updating previous cases, including the learning objectives (LOs). With the assistance of staff, post your case on the web and bring paper copies to class. • Write instruction notes for the case in case you need a sub and to coordinate with the other instructors in the block.	Section 5 – Writing PBL Cases
• Prepare a syllabus with your fellow faculty.	Section 9 – Appendix
• Convey first day information regarding course expectations, posting times, and classroom safety issues (evacuation, etc.). • Read student posts in the hours between posting and class time, and utilize them as a platform for discussion and teaching in class sessions. • Coach student facilitators to build their skills; coordinate with them prior to the class session for which they are responsible to brief them on what's coming up. • It would lovely to co-host (with your fellow course faculty) an end-of-block social event for students	Section 4 – PBL Facilitation
• Participate in seminar organizing with selected students and/or the faculty teaching other blocks within your quarter. Occasionally attend seminars (although if you are the faculty of record for the seminar during your quarter, you should attend them all and maybe teach some sessions).	Section 4 – PBL Facilitation
• Provide timely feedback on student postings and group participation. • Calculate student grades and submit them in a timely manner.	Section 6 – Giving Students Feedback
2. Advise students • Take one or two first year students as an advisee • Serve as a capstone advisor to one or two students (and grade their capstones)	Section 8 – Advising and Mentorship
• *Full disclosure*: The Department policy is to pay only HServ core faculty for advising capstone students (3 points); furthermore, NO faculty, regardless of home department, are separately compensated for serving as first year advisors.	Appendix
3. Attend faculty meetings	
• Regularly monthly faculty meetings • Annual June retreat	Section 2 – Administration

• Meetings among faculty for your block	
• Social events: Winter holiday party, spring brunch, etc.	
4. Participate in admissions process • Interview prospective students throughout fall quarter (it tapers off considerably after that). • Welcome prospective students to observe your class (usually fall quarter, but may happen any time of the year). • Read your assigned admissions packets and rate candidates. • Meet as a member of the admissions committee (generally twice, January and February). • Call admitted students to welcome them to the COPHP program.	Admissions
5. Participate in student orientation and admitted students day • In late September, participate in "welcome to COPHP" activities (faculty orientation panel, happy hour social). • In March or April, participate in "we hope you'll accept our offer of admission" activities (faculty panel, happy hour social).	
6. Participate in peer review • Open your class to a bi-annual review by another faculty member. • Conduct peer review of a fellow faculty member's class once every other year.	
7. Provide your faculty profile for the webpage. Each summer, send any updates to the Student Services Counselor.	
8. In the course of your ongoing relationships with graduated students, keep us posted on their new information regarding employment changes for our alumni database.	

TERMINOLOGY

The COPHP program has a unique teaching format, and some of the terminology we use may be unfamiliar. This brief list is intended to help orient new faculty to some of the more commonly used terms:

- *COPHP*: Community-Oriented Public Health Practice program
- *HSERV*: Department of Health Services, the School of Public Health (SPH) Department in which the COPHP Program is administratively housed
- *Problem-based learning (PBL)*: the knowledge that students develop by deconstructing, understanding, and resolving problems
- *Block*: the COPHP term "block" is synonymous with the UW word "course" – it designates the totality of lettered sections comprising a single numbered HSERV course (e.g., HSERV 531: Population Health, sections A, B, and C). Faculty instructors within a block coordinate their teaching efforts. There are 5 blocks in COPHP: Population Health (HSERV 531), Community Development (HSERV 532), Analytic Methods (HSERV 533), Health Promotion (HSERV 535), and Environmental Health (HSERV 534).
- *Case*: an original narrative written by COPHP faculty which poses a realistic and relevant problem involving a public health issue. Through answering the cases, students are challenged to discover and accomplish the curriculum's core learning objectives (LOs).
- *Learning objectives (LOs):* are specific learning goals for students which address broad public health concepts and are reinforced throughout a given case. This handbook distinguishes between student-identified and faculty-identified LOs. Faculty-identified LOs are the LOs faculty design as part of the case-writing process. These are not provided to students at the start of the case, rather, as part of working the case, students must identify what they believe the learning objectives are for a given case.

These concepts are discussed more extensively in the sections that follow.

SECTION 2 – ADMINISTRATION

COMMUNICATION

Websites

Health Services COPHP Program:	http://www.mphpublichealthpractice.uw.edu/
COPHP Faculty Portal:	https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/uwcophp/23769/
Canvas Teaching Site:	https://canvas.uw.edu
Health Services Department:	http://depts.washington.edu/hserv/
School of Public Health:	http://www.sph.washington.edu/
UW Graduate School:	http://www.grad.washington.edu/

Calendar

UW Academic Calendar	http://www.washington.edu/students/reg/calendar.html
COPHP Google Calendar	http://www.mphpublichealthpractice.uw.edu/resources/calendar/

Email

All COPHP faculty must have a University of Washington email account. If you have another email system you prefer to use, please make sure to forward all of your UW email to your other account.

Email Lists

COPHP Faculty	cophp_fac@uw.edu
First-year COPHP Students	e-15_cophp@uw.edu
Second-year COPHP Students	e-14_cophp@uw.edu
COPHP Alumni	cophp_alum@uw.edu

NOTE: Email sent to these lists will also be sent to the Program Director, Program Manager and Student Services Counselor. You can send email only to the lists to which you are subscribed.

STAFF SUPPORT

It can be puzzling to know who is doing what in the H-wing, especially if your day job is elsewhere! The below table clarifies who does what on our staff team, and who you, as faculty, can go to for support in delivering your courses for 2015-2016.

Title	Name	Roles	Email	Phone	Office
Student Services Counselor	Lauren Brackenbury	• First point of contact for all students and faculty for general questions and support relating to COPHP program, except where noted otherwise • Day-to-day student services support and advising (e.g., registration, funding, tutoring, program requirements, etc.) • Applications/admissions and Accepted Applicant Visit Days • Administrative support for Capstone Presentation and graduation events • Administrative support for faculty meetings and annual retreat • Administrative support for alumni tracking and communications	uwcophp@uw.edu	206-616-2979	H672B
Program Coordinator	Suman Chhabra	• Canvas course websites – initial set-up and ongoing support, including one-on-one training for faculty as needed • For off-campus faculty, copying cases for your sections • Room reservations, including one-off requests for course breakouts • Parking passes • [Betsy McGrath provides back-up support for Suman when she is on leave – hsinfo@uw.edu]	hscoord@uw.edu	206 616-8097	H690A
Graduate Student Assistant	Lee Hicks	• Support for prospective students • Support for marketing and student recruitment, in collaboration with Dorian	cophp@uw.edu	206-685-0888	H690J
Marketing and Recruitment Specialist	Dorian Varga	• Shares prospective student advising with Lee • Shares marketing and student recruitment with Lee	dvarga@uw.edu	206-616-1397	H690H
Program Manager	Kitty Andert	Supervises Lauren Brackenbury and Suman Chhabra, manages program policies & procedures, manages annual operating budget.	kitander@uw.edu	206-616-2926	H690B

If you are unsure whom to contact for a given request, please contact the Program Manager first, and we will direct your questions as necessary.

PROGRAM GOVERNANCE

Program Director

The Program Director is responsible for the overall direction of the program and its committees, day-to-day supervision of students, mentorship supervision, and curriculum and student affairs.

Responsibilities

- Assign incoming students to mentors
- Assist students with finding academic aids that fit their learning style
- Assist students with finding funding (e.g. RAs, TAs, and traineeships)
- Meet with students regularly
- Advise students regarding curriculum
- Assist with choice of a thesis topic
- Socialize the student into health services
- Help the student balance school, work, and home life
- Help define career goals
- Aid in the job search and write letters of recommendation

History

- 2013-Present: Amy Hagopian
- 2009-2013: Peter House
- 2006-2009: Bud Nicola
- 2001-2006: Fred Connell

Faculty Governance

The COPHP faculty meet to set overall program competencies and policies, review student progress, and provide leadership for strategic planning for the program. Faculty meetings are chaired by the Program Director and occur monthly. The faculty are responsible for curriculum development and review and oversight of student affairs. All curriculum changes and student and peer course evaluations are also reviewed at the faculty meetings.

Student Inclusion in Governance

The Admissions Committee includes a student member, and some students are elected to School or University committees. In addition, students are actively involved in recruitment and outreach locally and nationally. The atmosphere between students and faculty has supported informal discussion of program issues that are then brought to the appropriate committee for discussion.

FACULTY MEETINGS

The COPHP faculty meet once a month to share updates on current student projects, plans for future quarters or blocks, and other program-related information. The meetings are facilitated by the Program Director. Faculty are encouraged to let the Director know in advance of the next meeting if there are any agenda additions.

ANNUAL FACULTY RETREAT

At the conclusion of each year, the faculty get together for a day-long retreat to debrief on the year, review the information collected in the student evaluations for that year, and begin to discuss changes to the upcoming school year. These meetings usually take place within a month of the last day of Spring quarter classes.

ADMISSIONS

Admissions Committee

All COPHP faculty are members of the Admissions Committee, which oversees the recruitment and admissions process and allocates merit-based funding to students. The committee is chaired by the Program Director and meets in January, February, and March.

Applicant Fit

COPHP seeks applicants with a minimum of 2 years of post-college work experience, and we suggest that current undergraduate students consider this carefully before applying. The PBL method works best and is most rewarding for students when each has a greater array of personal and professional experiences to draw from in the collaborative small-group learning environment.

Criteria to consider when rating applicants:

- **Resume:** Extent and significance of work history, volunteer experience, and life experience
- **Goal Statement ("Personal Statement"):** Clear goals, describes how experience led to current goals, is well-written, describes how an MPH will help them, and why he or she chose COPHP
- **Statement of Personal History ("Diversity Statement"):** Does the candidate signal insights on his or her experiences and role in the world, including the role of privilege? *This is the first year we've required this of all applicants.*
- **Faculty and GSA interviews:** Evidence the candidate understands what PBL is about and that they would be a good fit
- **References:** Strength of 3 letters, preferably one academic, one work-related. Is there evidence he or she would be a good member of a small and intense working team for two years?
- **Transcript:** Demonstrated ability to do academic work? Grades (especially the last year or two of undergrad), liberal arts preparation, some math or statistics.
- **GRE:** GRE scores should be viewed in a holistic context. If they're very high or low, it probably signals something. If very low, transcript weighs more highly.
- The UW requirements for TOEFL and other English language proficiency tests are here

We will give preference to:

- Applicants whose work, volunteer, and life experiences are strong and highly relevant to public health practice (generally at least two years post-BA).
- Applicants who contribute to a well-balanced class.

Prospective applicants are encouraged to research and learn as much as they can about the COPHP program before applying. They are encouraged to thoroughly review the COPHP website and speak with the current Program Coordinator and/or other current students before applying. Students are also encouraged to set up an interview with a current faculty member either before or shortly after submitting an application. Faculty complete a Prospective Student Interview Form that asks for information about the prospective applicant's experiences and strengths, and for an assessment of the applicant's fit with the rigors and approach of the Program.

We strongly recommend prospective applicants visit Seattle to observe a PBL class in person before accepting an offer of admission, to make sure that students are fully aware of the unique aspects of COPHP's PBL model.

Additional admissions information is available on the website: http://www.mphpublichealthpractice.uw.edu/admissions/.

Timeline

The dates listed below timeline is for the 2016-2017 school year. These dates may vary from year to year but provide a reasonable estimate for what to generally expect.

Application Deadline	**Application Preparation**	**Applicant Materials Available for Review Online**	**Applicant Ratings Due**	**Admissions Meeting**	**Initial Round of Notifying Accepted and Denied Applicants**	**Applicant Decision Due**
Tues, Dec 1 (Early Decision)	Dec 2 – Dec 15	Wed, Dec 16	Sun, Jan 3 by 5pm	Wed, Jan 6 3-5:30pm @ H679	Jan 7	Feb 15
Fri, Jan 15 (Regular Decision)	Jan 16 – Jan 28	Fri, Jan 29	Mon, Feb 15 by 5pm	Wed, Feb 17 3-5:30pm @ H679	Feb 18	April 1
Tues, March 1 (Space-Available Basis)	March 2 – March 13	Mon, March 14	Sun, March 27 by 5pm	Wed, Mar 30 3-5:30pm @ H679	Mar 31	April 15

SECTION 3 – PBL BASICS

WHY PBL?

Problem-based learning (PBL) is the knowledge that students develop by deconstructing, understanding, and resolving problems (Gordon, 2001). In COPHP, these problems are presented through cases designed by the faculty to cover core community-based public health competencies. Problem-based learning in the COPHP program requires students to tap into their prior knowledge, work and life experiences while in the classroom, helping to foster adaptability and a familiarity with many other aspects and domains of public health. In a PBL setting, we are all learners and we are all teachers.

The rationale for the PBL approach in COPHP is to help develop future public health practitioners who are self-directed, lifelong learners. The PBL process does this by inculcating students with the:

- interest and enthusiasm to acquire and use new information and knowledge in a rapidly changing world
- ability to analyze problems and assess one's own capacity to solve problems, including identifying specific areas where learning is needed
- ability to acquire new information and apply it appropriately
- communication and interpersonal skills of listening, inquiry, and educating others
- ability to work effectively in teams with diverse backgrounds and expertise

Here (https://vimeo.com/128462566) is a wonderful 11-minute video about the "learning pit" that we find captures the reason to teach via PBL.

KEY FEATURES OF PBL

The PBL learning process challenges students to derive meaning from the subject matter, as opposed to simply collecting and reciting facts (Rhem 1998). This is done via the following key PBL features:

- Contextualized problems and situations
- Reiterative process
- Facilitated process
- Learner-centered and learner-driven (as opposed to teacher-centered and teacher-directed)
- Small group-orientation

These core components require students to explore the dynamics of group work and independent investigation, thereby achieving greater comprehension and faster, more reliable research skills (Freeman et al., 2014).

Contextualized Problems and Situations

In PBL, *problem-based* refers to the use of realistic and relevant situations involving a public health issue. Faculty craft these situations into cases which are designed to stimulate and motivate learning by tapping into our natural desire to understand and solve the problems that confront us. Through answering the cases, students are challenged to discover and accomplish the curriculum's core learning objectives.

The problem-solving process in COPHP involves students working collaboratively to:

- Extract available data from the case ("Know")
- Identify how students' prior knowledge and experience can be applied to the case to help interpret the data or problem ("Think")
- Decipher what additional data and research is needed to complete the case ("Need to know")

Reiterative Process

The PBL process is also *reiterative*, which means that after completing the "know," "think," and "need to know" phases, and after coming up with individual tasks for research and investigation, students go out and acquire the necessary information to complete their tasks, writing up a five-page paper of their findings that they post to the course's Canvas webpage. Students are expected to read each other's posts before the next class. When they meet again, they revisit the problem in the case and incorporate the new knowledge from the posts into how they solve the case's problem.

Facilitated Process

Starting in the 3rd or 4th week of the first year, students facilitate their own small groups, and often the role of facilitator changes with each new day or case. The specific roles of the facilitator are agreed upon by group consensus in the beginning of each quarter, but ideally include the following elements:

- Maintaining the focus on learning
- Guiding the learning process
- Ensuring rigorous critical thinking
- Moderating the participation of each student, challenging each to step-up or step-back as appropriate for the success of the group's learning and the health of the group dynamic

Faculty and student facilitation is discussed in-depth in "Section 4 – PBL Facilitation," below.

Learner-Centered and Learner-Driven

In COPHP, students are responsible for working as a group to determine their own learning needs, what points are most important to pursue, and how to pursue them. See "Principles of Adult Learning," below.

Faculty do not interject in the process or guide the students in any one direction. This "hands off" approach represents a significant departure from the role of faculty in traditional didactic courses, and is discussed in greater depth in "Section 4 – PBL Facilitation," below.

Small Group Settings

The process of PBL takes place in small group settings. The COPHP program aims to admit 24 students in each new incoming cohort, which is then divided into three groups of 8 students. Students stay with these smaller groups for the entire quarter, a technique which encourages them to develop their own group dynamic and learning process. This method also mimics the modern professional work environment, which stresses teamwork and the ability to work effectively and efficiently in small groups.

PRINCIPLES OF ADULT LEARNING

Malcolm Knowles is considered the contemporary father of adult learning theory and human resource development; his groundbreaking *The adult learner* written in 1973 is now in its sixth edition. Knowles' work builds on that of American pragmatist educators John Dewey and Eduard Lindeman, particularly the latter who wrote explicitly and frequently on adult learning. Perhaps Knowles' greatest contribution to the field is also the greatest departure from traditional childhood learning theory, or pedagogy. Adults are not empty vessels that can be loaded up with new information, as many educators view young children to be. Instead, adults have a lifetime of experience and knowledge to draw upon and for adults to make sense of and use new information it needs to be related to the warehouse of knowledge and experience adults already have (Knowles, et.al, 2005; Lieb, 1991).

Knowles argued that pedagogy, as a word and a concept, was insufficient as the basis for adult education. Roughly translated from Greek, pedagogy means instructor or educator of children. Knowles advocated for a different term, andragogy, as *andra-* means adult in Greek (Knowles, et. al, 2005). Knowles highlights many key distinctions in both the underlying assumptions and the actual processes that differentiate pedagogy and andragogy, as can be seen in the table below (recreated from Knowles, 1974).

Knowles' key distinctions between pedagogy and andragogy		
	Pedagogy	Andragogy
ASSUMPTIONS		
Self concept	Dependency	Increasing self-directiveness
Experience	Of little worth	Learners are rich resource for learning
Readiness	Biological development, social pressure	Developmental tasks of social roles
Time perspective	Postponed application	Immediate application
Orientation to learning	Subject centered	Problem centered
PROCESSES		
Climate	Authority-oriented, formal, competitive	Mutuality, collaborative, respectful, informal
Planning	By teacher	Mechanism for mutual planning
Diagnosis of needs	By teacher	Mutual self-diagnosis
Formulation of objectives	By teacher	Mutual negotiation
Design	Logic of subject matter; content units	Sequenced in terms of readiness problem units
Activities	Transmittal techniques	Experiential techniques (inquiry)
Evaluation	By teacher	Mutual re-diagnosis of needs, mutual measurement of program

Knowles (1974) describes his model as a process model rather than a traditional content model. In a traditional model the teacher or trainer decides in advance what the content will be, what knowledge or skills will be transmitted, arranges this content into logical units and decides the most appropriate medium for transmitting the content (e.g., via books, movies, lectures, etc.). The trainer or facilitator in a process model, on the other hand, prepares in advance a set of procedures for involving the learners in the process of learning. The process model is concerned with providing procedures and resources for helping learners acquire information, understanding, skills, attitudes and values (Knowles, 2004). Put another way, the teacher's role is to provide the appropriate environment for adults to learn the content that will be useful for them, instead of dictating what content is to be learned and how (Jarvis, 2004).

This different model of learning for adults requires different approaches for educators. Because adults are autonomous and self-directed, there needs to be some freedom to direct themselves in their education (Knowles, 2005). This means that instruction should flow Socratically or interactively instead of didactically (Jarvis, 2004). Therefore teachers must become facilitators, who guide learners to their own knowledge rather than supplying them with facts (Jarvis, 2004; Lieb, 1991). Because adults bring an array of knowledge and experiences, facilitators need to find ways to draw upon those experiences as sources for new learning (Jarvis, 2004). Adults also tend to be rather goal oriented, so it is crucial for facilitators to state the goals and learning objectives early in the course or training program (Lieb, 1991). And yet a balance still needs to be maintained with promoting an environment conducive to self-directed learning. Additionally, adults need to see the relevance in what they are learning, so in cases of work-related training and education, the content needs to be applicable to their work or other responsibilities in life (Jarvis, 2004; Knowles, 2005; Lieb, 1991). Further, facilitators strive to present the theories and concepts that make up the course content in ways that reflect learners' own values and interests (Knowles, 2005; Lieb, 1991).

In addition to creating an interactive process or environment for learning, facilitators or instructors also need to craft their courses to present information and materials that stimulate as many senses as possible in order to increase chances of teaching success (Jarvis, 2004). Jarvis goes on to say that by the time people reach adulthood, their preferred learning styles are pretty well entrenched, and, further, adults use their senses (e.g., audio, visual, etc.) differently in learning different subjects and content. It is also critical that the sessions have opportunities for learners to work with and practice what they are learning as they are learning, as research indicates that retention is directly affected by the amount of practice during learning (Jarrett Thoms, 2001; Jarvis, 2004; Knowles, 2005; Lieb, 1991).

Facilitators or instructors also play a key role in motivating adults to learn. Unlike children, "Adults are not impressed or motivated by gold stars and good report cards. Instead, they want a learning outcome that can be put to use immediately, in concrete, practical, and self-benefiting terms. Adult learners want practical, hands-on training sessions over general, theory-oriented classes." (Jarrett Thoms, 2001). According to Jarvis (1994), if the learner doesn't recognize the need for the information or content, it does not matter what the facilitator or instructor does in terms creating the right environment for learning as Knowles suggest, therefore instructors play a key role in providing the necessary motivation for adults to learn. The learners must be interested in the subject, and has been discussed, interest can be gained from seeing how the learning will relate pragmatically to their jobs and/or help them do their jobs better (Jarvis, 1994). In this way, the best motivators for adult learners are interest and selfish benefit, or as Jarvis says (1994), "If it can be shown the course benefits pragmatically, they will perform better and the benefits will be longer lasting."

In addition to being motivated to learn by seeing how it can be applied, adults are also motivated in the following key ways (from Lieb, 1991):

- Social relationships: when the learning can improve their social relationships or create opportunities to expand networks
- External relationships: when they are acting to comply with expectations of others
- Social welfare: when learning can improve an adult's ability to serve the community
- Personal advancement: when the learning can help achieve higher status on job
- Escape/stimulation: when the learning provides an interesting break from the normal routine
- Cognitive interest: when adults engage in learning for the sake of learning

SECTION 4 – PBL FACILITATION

CLASSROOM TIME MANAGEMENT

Given that the six hours of class time per week is a substantial investment for both students and faculty, it is essential that this time be well-used and that it contribute to student learning. In our experience, the time in the classroom passes rather quickly, as students have lots to get done.

Students use class time for several tasks:

- Analysis of the case
- Developing learning objectives for independent or small group research
- Discussion of research findings
- Problem solving group dynamic issues
- Debriefs of the case and blocks

The role of the facilitator is to manage the classroom time and processes to ensure successful learning by all the students. This aspect of "teaching" under PBL is the piece that sets it apart most radically from other educational strategies, and thus facilitation strategies for both faculty and students will be discussed below.

FACULTY ROLE IN FACILITATION

The Community Oriented Public Health Practice Program works to increase the responsibility of each student for his or her own learning. As such, we encourage the students to take on the role of managing the in-class time, by transitioning from faculty to student facilitators by the 3rd or 4th week of the first year. Typically the students take on leading the discussion, doing the scribing, and keeping track of time.

The purpose of having students take on class-management roles is to allow them to take charge of their own learning and develop the skills of small-group work. However, faculty are responsible for providing group leadership based our subject expertise and our experiences as public health professionals, and the faculty facilitator is ultimately responsible for the success of the classroom sessions. Faculty facilitators must strategically manage the dynamic tension that arises between taking responsibility while still elevating the student role in class.

Principles

Enthusiasm

Job One of the faculty facilitator is to bring enthusiasm to each class session. We model the joy of life-long learning by being curious, intellectual, and humble. We are eager to help the students dig into the cases, and we communicate how much we enjoy working with such interesting and engaged students.

Student leadership

Rule One for faculty facilitators is that we must not impart knowledge to the students during the in-class time: this means no lecturing, and no correcting students when they say inaccurate things or explain concepts poorly. Rather, we probe and ask questions, and we encourage the group to think critically about what is being said.

Holding back on giving information in this way runs counter to what many of us think of as teaching. However, the COPHP philosophy is that if students come to the answers on their own, they are much more likely to remember the information and internalize the concepts. We believe that knowledge won through the struggle to meet the "need to know" is more durable than knowledge received in a lecture hall. So, during class, we bite our tongues and allow the students to make the discoveries, and we wait until the end of a case to "tell" the students things, as needed.

Research shows that adult learners benefit from this style of facilitation: because adults are autonomous and self-directed, there needs to be some freedom to direct themselves in their education (Knowles et al., 2005). Teachers must become facilitators who guide learners to their own knowledge, rather than supplying them with facts (Jarvis, 2004; Lieb, 1991).

Motivating student learning

Facilitators play a key role in motivating students to learn. Adult learners are motivated in the following key ways (from Lieb, 1991):

- Relevance of new knowledge: seeing how it can be applied
- Social relationships: when the learning can improve their social relationships or create opportunities to expand networks
- External relationships: when they are acting to comply with expectations of others
- Social welfare: when learning can improve an adult's ability to serve the community
- Personal advancement: when the learning can help achieve higher status on job
- Escape/stimulation: when the learning provides an interesting break from the normal routine
- Cognitive interest: when adults engage in learning for the sake of learning

FACILITATION STRATEGIES

Overall Approach

Our PBL classes meet twice a week during Autumn, Winter, and Spring quarters. During most of these 30 weeks, students will work a new case every week.

First day of the course

Think well in advance about how you want the first day of class to go: make checklists, plan class activities, and think about how to introduce yourself. See "Sample COPHP Teaching Timeline" in the Appendix, which includes a sample lesson plan, and "Logistics" section below, for information about classroom set-up.

During the first class, allow time for students tell each other about their knowledge and experience in the block's topic area.

Convey first day information regarding course expectations, posting times, and classroom safety issues (evacuation, etc.). Adult learners tend to be goal-oriented, so it is crucial for facilitators to state the goals early in the course (Lieb, 1991). This is a good time to discuss and formulate group norms with your students. You may also wish to ask students to email you specific areas that they would like feedback in – see Trez's helpful tool for in-class tracking (Appendix).

Day 1 of a PBL case

You meet for class with your PBL group of eight or nine students. Students will see the (student version of the) case for the first time in hard copy. It is important for the students to discover the case together, so students are not given an opportunity to read the case before class. (At class time, a Canvas web page for the case also becomes operational.)

One student will read the first page of the case aloud. The students will then discusses the case and identify the learning objectives it raises. Learning objectives as formulated by students can be either in the form of an action statement, or in the form of a research question, depending on the group's or faculty member's preferences. For example, "Describe the ways in which minimum wage legislation can be linked to population health outcomes in the United States over the last 20 years." Alternatively, "In what ways can minimum wage legislation be linked to population health outcomes in the United States over the last 20 years?" A scribe will record these student-generated learning objectives, either on a flip chart or a laptop (the group decides).

Students repeat this process for subsequent pages of the case. At the end of the three-hour class period, the students allocate the student-identified learning objectives. Work with students to determine the posting parameters and times.

Between classes

In the two days before class meets again, students pursue the learning objectives, individually or as part of a teams. This work will involve internet research and may involve research in the library, through interviews or surveys, or by collecting data from public agencies. Students are expected to go to multiple data sources and synthesize this information in a document (or "posting") that will be posted on the Canvas (https://canvas.uw.edu/) webpage set up for the case.

Read student postings in the hours between posting and class time, and utilize them as a platform for discussion and teaching in class sessions. See the Appendix for "Student Case Posting Best-Practices" (guidelines which may be shared with students), and for a helpful evaluation form developed by Gita Krishnaswamy.

When you are prepping your student facilitator for the next day's class, you are free to share the case for that day, perhaps without the faculty's expected LOs (although our general policy is to keep cases as a "surprise" for the rest of the group). Ideally, you'd help the student consider structured exercises for synthesizing the previous day's posts during the first part of the class. The purpose of the student having the next day of the case is so they can thoroughly consider what are the likely LOs to emerge from the case and help guide the discussion in that way.

Day 2 of a PBL case

It is common for PBL sessions to start with a quick ice-breaker exercise, as a non-threatening way to get everyone into the discussion early in the course. Ice-breakers can be as simple as going around the room and having everyone (including the facilitator) answer a question, like "What was your first paying job?" or "What is something memorable about your maternal grandfather?" Agree on a break time for that session.

Next, go around the table and have each student describe their research methods, including where it went well and where it did not. Note where it did not go well, and help students to avoid these mistakes in subsequent cases. See "Common PBL Challenges" section, below.

Then, decide how to use that session's in-class time. There are many different options for how class time may be structured: some student facilitators have led discussions that resulted in diagrammatic portrayals of the case, while others have prepared clever roleplaying exercises.

- Students can often come to consensus on which are the most important things to discuss by doing a little discussion of the questions/concepts and then doing a quick show of hands.
- Another method is to allow one student to take a "lighter" learning objective so that she/he has time to strategize a structure for the class time the next day.

Research indicates that retention is directly affected by the amount of practice during learning, so aim to structure class sessions with opportunities for students to work with and practice what they are learning (Jarrett Thoms, 2001; Jarvis, 2004; Knowles, 2005; Lieb, 1991).

At this time, you may distribute additional parts of the case to discuss, or you may give the students an exercise or assignment due in the following class.

End of case

Bring copies of the faculty facilitator-identified learning objectives (LOs) and go over them with the group, noting where LOs were missed and where they were and were not met. The end of case is a good time to "tell" the students about issues that were not covered in the earlier part of the case.

Finally, critically discuss the case with students, to get feedback on improving the case for the cohort.

End of block

Talk with the group about how the block proceeded, and take notes in order to improve the block for the next time it is taught.

It would be lovely to co-host (with your fellow course faculty) an end-of-block social event for students.

In-Class Tasks

Redirect

The cases often invite research and discussion on topics unrelated to the faculty facilitator-identified learning objectives, and the students need to be directed away from those sidetracks. Keep the learning objectives and overall strategy of the case in mind, note when the discussion gets off track, and move swiftly to correct it.

Probe

Even when students have the correct information, facilitators should ask questions about how the student has come to know the information.

Example questions that facilitators may ask include:

- Can someone (you) summarize the problem?
- Can someone (you) state what we know at this point?
- What are your hypotheses regarding what is going on with this case?
- How do you know that?
- Is the information we (you) have correct? How do you know?
- What information do you need or would you like to have? Can you, could you get it?
- What learning resources did you use?
- Is he/she correct?
- What did he/she just say?
- Does that make sense?
- Really?
- How does (or might) that relate to this case?
- Why do you ask that question?
- Why would you want to know that? Does that question need to be asked?
- Is this (should that be) a new learning objective?
- Does everyone agree that _______________ is a necessary learning objective?
- Are there other learning objectives that should be investigated?
- What else might you want to know?

Source: Department of Medical Education, University of Washington School of Medicine

See Gita's tips for "Facilitating Discussion in PBL," including sample questions, in the Appendix.

Draw on lived experience

From time to time, ask the students to tell about their previous work or knowledge in the areas under discussion. In adult learning, it is important to validate what the individuals bring to the table – this encourages students with extensive life experience who may be developing their academic skills, and it enriches the discussions by incorporating some of the knowledge already in the room (Knowles et.al, 2005; Jarvis, 2004; Lieb, 1991).

However, it is also important to recognize when students consistently contribute personal anecdotes that serve to get the group off track. Asking students to support (or disprove) their anecdotes with evidence or research, or adding their comments to the “need to know” list can be effective in re-focusing the group on the case.

Discussing prior knowledge in class may also serve to discourage students with preexisting knowledge from choosing easy learning objectives for research.

Involve everyone

We strive to have class discussions that include all the students. Techniques for drawing out quiet students include calling on them directly in class, writing them emails that encourage more participation, and, if necessary, scheduling a meeting with them to discuss the situation. If the student is concerned that they do not have interesting or useful things to say, it can help to give them the list of facilitator questions (above), so they can ask questions instead.

Take notes

Take notes on the group dynamic and individual participation, for use in later feedback to the students.

Trez Buckland has developed a helpful tracking form for in-class tracking (see Appendix). To begin using this sheet, ask your students what they would like to work on, and include this at the top of the tracking form.

Common PBL Challenges

- *Book reporting*: When students are discussing the case, it is important to avoid using class time to go around the room and have each student report on their findings from researching the learning objectives – this quickly becomes a series of lectures and gets away from PBL. Instead, have the students discuss the case and only bring their research in where it is relevant and facilitates learning.
- *Choosing easy LOs*: Discourage students from picking LOs that they already know a lot about. While this might make their research easier, they will not learn as much as when they stretch themselves.
- *Emotions*: As students sit together for six hours a week, read each other’s work, and struggle with difficult and sometimes stressful research assignments, they can become very emotional. Be kind and respectful when emotions spill over in class.
- *Blaming the case*: Students will sometimes get frustrated with PBL, and may be tempted to blame the case (e.g., it is poorly written, the facilitation is weak, another section is being given more guidance). Faculty facilitators must balance sticking up for the cases while remaining open to constructive criticism and feedback.
- *Disrespect*: Students often feel personally exposed by the PBL process: they know when they have performed well or poorly, and they know that their classmates know it as well. Inadvertent (or deliberate) snubs or acts of disrespect can rapidly become problems for individuals and for the group. Be on the lookout for this, and move swiftly to nip it in the bud. If necessary, take time in class to deal directly with disrespectful behavior.
- *Cliquishness*: Faculty facilitators should strive to prevent students’ personal friendships from manifesting as exclusive relationships that inhibit the group’s learning.

- *Tardiness*: The group process cannot work well if students straggle in over the first 10 or 15 minutes of each class. As a group, come to agreement about how to handle tardiness. If a student has a standing reason for being late, get that on the table early in the block and develop a strategy for working around it. If a student is habitually late without reason, meet with them to find a solution.

LOGISTICS

- *Room set up*: Setting up the classroom furniture so that the group is in a circle or rectangle is nonhierarchical and allows everyone to make eye-contact during the discussions.
- *Equipment*: Using the Health Services computers and projector in class is an efficient way to take notes "in public" that can then be shared with the full group after class. Flipcharts can be used similarly (although the notes will need to be transcribed). You can reserve a flipchart through Heath Sciences Classroom Services (T-291A, 206-543-6729).
- *Whiteboards*: Bring your own whiteboard pens, as the ones in the rooms are often spent.
- *Snack*: Sharing snacks during class keeps the blood sugar up and is a time-honored way to build community. Be deliberate about this by having the students develop a schedule of who will bring snack, or agree to go potluck for each class.
- *Breaks*: Early in each class, agree on when to take breaks.

STUDENT FACILITATION BEST PRACTICES

This Best Practices guide is designed to help train student facilitators. Familiarize yourself with it, and share it with your students as they step into the role of facilitator.

When it is your turn to facilitate a COPHP PBL class:

1. Have a schedule.
2. Talk to your faculty member in advance to understand that session's goals.
3. Come to class with an agenda and post it on the board.
4. Decide what your leadership style will be.
5. Plan for an ice breaker.
6. Design a synthesizing exercise to debrief the previous day's posts.
7. Draw out the quiet people and tamp down the eager beavers.
8. Have a strategy for when you are running out of time.
9. Decide who will be the scribe.
10. Manage conflict.
11. Organization group projects into specific tasks.
12. Help one another.
13. Remember, being a good group member is as important as being a good leader.

Strong group members:

- Participate actively in discussions, but do not dominate them
- Make thoughtful, constructive contributions to discussions
- Interact directly with others in the group
- Listen carefully to their classmates, and respect their analysis and opinions
- Take an active interest in the learning of others
- Raise new, controversial and subtle points in the discussions
- Challenge, support and/or elaborate on ideas of others
- Assume positive intent
- Are friendly, open, and interested
- Are non-judgmental
- Are competent

- Are good at “being here”
- Are honest but not necessarily frank
- Are trustworthy

SEMINAR

Each quarter, students participate in a weekly seminar to accompany their PBL classes. During the first year, faculty plan the seminars. In second year, students are asked to volunteer to help organize seminars.

The purpose of seminars includes:

1) for first-year students, especially in fall quarter, to acculturate them into COPHP’s various procedures, principles, values and ways of doing things using our PBL approach;
2) to introduce and help students appreciate important public health practice concepts;
3) to build skills that are not addressed in the cases presented for regular course work;
4) to expose students to role models in public health practice; and
5) to supplement cases or course learning when didactic material is the best way to get concepts across.

SECTION 5 – WRITING PBL CASES

INTRODUCTION

The COPHP Program revolves around original PBL cases written entirely by our program faculty. COPHP cases are tested and refined at every PBL session, and may be retired or rewritten to reflect changing times, policies, and the priorities of new facilitators.

Good cases make for engaged students who learn a lot, so we strive to make our cases compelling, thoughtful, and reflective of the real world. Our cases are designed to meet the competencies of the Department of Health Services and the School of Public Health, so we make sure that our cases encourage students to learn what we think they need to know.

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE CASES

Strong PBL cases are:

- **Relevant:** They build on previous cases in the block and the overall curriculum. Adult learners need to see the relevance in what they are learning, so the content needs to be applicable to their work or other responsibilities in life (Jarvis, 2004; Knowles et al., 2005; Lieb, 1991).
- **Concise:** They direct students to LOs, do not send students on unrelated tangents, and include only those assignments that are relevant to the case. They do not try to teach too much.
- **Well-Written:** They are taut, fluid, and clear in their writing, and are free of typos and grammatical errors.
- **Cogent:** They make sense: the story builds within the case, progressing smoothly from one day to the next. They anticipate student postings and the way that the cases will play out in class.
- **Interesting:** They grab the students' attention, creating a compelling need to learn. They tell a story about something real and include real places and events. They keep students engaged in the case until its conclusion. They reflect adult learners' own values and interests (Knowles et al., 2005; Lieb, 1991). They stimulate as many senses as possible in order to increase chances of teaching success (Jarvis, 2004).
- **Challenging:** They describe complex, interesting problems for which there is no single solution. They encourage high-level thinking: deciding, designing, creating, predicting, and analyzing. They marry content with methods.

CASE WRITING PROCESS

Case writing involves the following steps:

1. **Select a faculty lead for the block:** The process of writing a new COPHP case often takes several months. One faculty member for each block should volunteer to take primary responsibility for seeing that all cases for that block are ready to go well in advance of the start of the block.
2. **Choose the learning objectives:** A *learning objective (LO)* is a specific student learning goal which addresses broad public health concepts and is reinforced throughout the case (for example, the ways we measure health status and compare the health of populations). The "right" number of LOs is enough to keep the students engaged and learning, but not so many that they become overwhelmed.

3. **Think of an idea or storyline:** Many cases pull storylines from faculty experiences working with communities, health departments, or other government agencies; others draw from current events (Ebola outbreak). See “Resources for Case Writing,” below.
4. **Start with an outline and create the prose:** Cases may be written in the first, second, or third person. The “leading characters” may be real, fictional, or both.
5. **Engage your co-facilitator for comments and advice**
6. **Create 2 final versions**
   - **Faculty facilitator version:** The facilitator’s version of every case will include notes to help use the case in class, including (at a minimum) the LOs that are linked to each class day. Notes may also include specific instructions for facilitators on how the day should proceed, especially true for the last day of the case, which may include an assignment. Writing instruction notes for the case is also valuable in case you need a sub, and to enable coordination with the other instructors in the block.
   - **Student version:** The student version will not have the facilitator notes or LOs.
7. **Post:** Send the student version of the case to the Program Coordinator (CC the Program Director) for posting.
8. **Revise for next year:** At the end of the case, facilitators should meet to share notes on the strengths and weaknesses of the case, including the students’ evaluations. When the block rolls around again, the old version of the case plus the notes provide a good starting point for the next version.

Resources for Case Writing

- **Your own experience**: Think of times in your work or community services when you learned a lot, or times when you made errors.
- **Community contacts**: Ask your friends in the field about their work, or what things our students should know or know how to do.
- **Former students**: Ask COPHP graduates what kinds of case stories worked best for them.
- **Technical experts**: Ask for data or problems for students to solve.
- **Our current and past cases**: Take a look at our comprehensive and searchable case archive in the Catalyst Faculty Portal.
- **Other case-based educational programs**: Many other programs use case-based learning, and these can provide good examples. However, keep in mind that PBL cases are a special type of case with limited content information, designed to make students learn on their own.
- **Postings on CD:** We have prepared these for a few of the COPHP cohorts, and they provide insights into how students respond to specific learning objectives.

SECTION 6 – GIVING STUDENTS FEEDBACK

Faculty facilitators are responsible for giving written feedback to all students on both individual and group performance. At the beginning of the block, faculty facilitators should clearly inform students how feedback will be provided, and how/if it will correspond to grades.

Faculty are responsible for communicating with students about their standing in the course, and formally filing grades at the end of the course. Some faculty issue points, grades, or check marks (check, check plus, check minus) for each post and for each class facilitation. Others only notify students of their grades on specific assignments. The purpose of grades is a larger philosophical conversation that we have certainly debated at our annual retreats!

Beyond the minimum feedback requirements outlined below, facilitators and students should feel comfortable requesting in-person meetings to discuss specific issues or areas of concern to ensure that student growth and learning is as positive as possible.

INDIVIDUAL FEEDBACK

Consistency across Sections

Faculty facilitators for a given block should discuss and agree upon how they will approach providing feedback, to promote as much consistency (in frequency and focus) as possible between the PBL sections.

Frequency

Each faculty facilitator should discuss with her/his PBL group the frequency with which feedback will be given to each student. Feedback should be frequent enough to allow students to identify areas for improvement and to demonstrate improvement in those areas. Providing feedback only twice a quarter or many weeks after the end of a case being assessed is not adequate. Examples of adequate frequency include every week, at the end of every case, or 4 times per quarter. Year 1 students may need more frequent feedback than Year 2 students.

Focus

Feedback should be challenging and constructive, and should include assessments of both written postings and participation in participation group discussions.

Postings

Feedback on student postings should focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the posting, considering the range and appropriateness of information sources for the assigned LO, organization and clarity, quality of writing, and critical thinking about and synthesis of gathered information. See the Appendix for “Student Case Posting Best-Practices” (guidelines which may be shared with students), and for a helpful evaluation form developed by Gita Krishnaswamy.

Participation

Feedback on participation should assess the student's group facilitation skills, and his or her involvement in dissecting the case, developing LOs, synthesizing and analyzing the information gathered by the group, providing respectful criticism, and supporting each student's involvement. Trez Buckland has developed a helpful tracking form for in-class tracking (see Appendix).

Facilitators should correct misconceptions or inaccuracies in postings and group discussions in a manner that is timely and supportive of the PBL process.

Assignments

Facilitators should also provide each student with written feedback on oral and written assignments, as appropriate for the nature (group vs. individual) of the assignment. This feedback should be written, but can be the product of or supplemented by in-person discussions. See Amy's example rubric for grading assignments (Appendix).

GROUP FEEDBACK

At the beginning of each block, the facilitator and students should agree upon a process for group feedback. This feedback should focus on the extent to which the group is meeting the block's LOs, as well as the effectiveness of group dynamics. Group feedback should be frequent enough to nurture the group learning process and minimize any problems. Students should feel comfortable requesting group feedback from the facilitator.

SECTION 7 – STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

The COPHP program has been designed with an ongoing student evaluation component, in order to stimulate innovation and improvement and ensure that we are meeting our target outcomes and competencies.

QUARTERLY COURSE EVALUATIONS

At the end of each quarter, students are asked to evaluate that quarter's seminar and block courses, as well as the performance of each block's faculty facilitators. CIDR's Karen Friesem (freisem@cidr.washington.edu; 206-543-6591) works with our instructors and the Student Services Counselor to collect and compile these evaluations.

For blocks that cover a full ten weeks, faculty may want to consider conducting mid-quarter one-on-one conversations with each student. Usually these are offered as voluntary check-ins, when students can come talk about their own progress, the climate of the classroom, lingering questions, or even stray into territory like career advice or capstone questions.

EXIT INTERVIEWS

At the end of the year, we hold a group Exit Interview for our graduating students. This feedback is compiled and shared with faculty at the year-end Faculty Retreat, where it is used to generate ideas for improving future cases and blocks.

SECTION 8 – ADVISING AND MENTORSHIP

WHAT IS A MENTOR?

A *mentor* is a trusted counselor or guide who encourages students in their graduate studies, helps students to locate and secure appropriate funding for their study and research, provides a model of what academic life is about, and helps with career planning. Faculty mentors also focus on a student's personal achievements, socialization in health services, and preparation for the workforce.

When students have questions about University and Department policies (like graduation requirements, tuition rules, and registration issues), let them know to contact the Student Services Counselor for this kind of information.

In the COPHP Program, there are opportunities for both formal advising (first-year and capstone advising) and informal mentorship of students and alumni, discussed in detail below. Information about compensation for advising is provided in the Appendix. The following sections will address how to be a successful mentor and advisor across these various domains.

WHY MENTOR?

Mentoring enables graduate students to:

- acquire a body of knowledge and skills.
- develop techniques for networking and collaborating
- gain perspective on how their discipline operates academically, socially, and politically
- acquire a sense of scholarly citizenship by grasping their roles in a larger educational enterprise
- deal more confidently with challenging intellectual work

Mentoring enables faculty members to:

- engage the curiosities and energies of fresh minds
- keep abreast of new research questions, knowledge, paradigms, and techniques
- cultivate collaborators for current or future projects
- identify and train graduate assistants whose work is critical to a research project or course offering
- prepare the next generation of intellectual leaders in the disciplines and in society
- enjoy the personal and professional satisfaction inherent in mentoring relationships

SUCCESSFUL MENTORSHIP

Graduate School Guide

The Graduate School's guide *How to Mentor Graduate Students* (http://www.grad.washington.edu/mentoring/index.htm) provides an excellent overview of how to provide constructive and supportive feedback, engage graduate students in ongoing conversations, demystify graduate school, provide encouragement, foster networks and multiple mentors, look out for students' interests, treat students with respect, and provide a personal touch.

Tips from COPHP Faculty

Methods

- Keep a list of students posted in a handy place and think through the list each week. Is everyone on track? Does someone need a call, a quick email, or a chat over coffee?
- Mix up your contact method – email is easy, but can fail to capture the proper tone of voice for a given situation.
- As you plow through your piles of email and literature, note items that would be of particular interest to each of your students and forward them on with a personalized note.
- Certain students may benefit from more support – note which of your students have limited financial resources, are parents of young children, are employed, or live far from campus.

Tone

- Practice "cultural humility" and demonstrate a genuine interest in learning more about students' varied experiences.
- Be attuned to potential generational differences. One helpful presentation on "Millennials" (the generation born after 1979) is here.
- Remain open to constructive criticism from students about your mentorship style.

Focus

- Help your student learn to take criticism well – this is the hallmark of a mature scholar, valuable employee and potential leader in the field. Ask your student to identify goals for their own scholarship growth and improvement, and ask them where they would like your critiques. Offer constructive criticism when you can, and talk about how you learned to manage criticism.
- Encourage your student to publish, to attend conferences, and to develop a niche area of expertise.

Formal Advising

First-Year Advising

First-year students are assigned to a First-Year Faculty Advisor based on fit with the student's background, skills, or interests.

Roles and responsibilities

First-Year Advisor	First-Year Student
Meet with student advisee before classes begin in the fall	Schedule meetings with your advisor every quarter. The first meeting should take place before classes begin.
Meet with advisee at least once each quarter, preferably before the registration period begins	Let your advisor know about academic interests, professional goals, and personal strengths and challenges
Discuss academic interests, course offerings, practicum opportunities, time management, and the challenges of adjusting to graduate school	Keep your advisor informed about progress and/or problems that arise (both academic and non-academic issues.)
Help student explore Capstone opportunities	Let your advisor know when you'll be doing presentations
Offer support with professional development and career choices	Discuss practicum and capstone opportunities
	If you have concerns about your advisor or wish to change your advisor, please talk with the Program Director or the Student Services Counselor.

Timeline

- **When you get your first-year student assignments:**
  - Drop the students a note and let them know you're looking forward to meeting them and encourage them to set up a time for your first meeting.
  - Review their course selections. Make sure they know about certificate programs, and about the need to plan early. Refer them to the Student Services Counselor for in-depth certificate advising.
- **First week of November:**
  - Check in with your students when it's time to register for Winter quarter classes.
  - Ask how the classes are going this quarter, what they like and don't like. This is an opportunity for you to learn about elective courses, which is valuable to pass on to your other students. Encourage your students to add to the Elective Feedback Spreadsheet.
  - Ask about PBL--which cases do they think are most effective?
  - Where are they struggling? (Finances? Living situation? Transportation to campus? Motivation?)
  - Check in about practicum and capstone planning.
- **Before Winter break:**
  - Check in with your students before you leave campus for the Winter break.

  - Ask what courses they decided to sign up for.
  - Check in on how they plan to spend the break?
  - You will be meeting with the student's practicum site supervisor sometime in December to sign off on the work plan: be sure the work can be completed in six hours a week, and that there is an academic component (not just producing work for the agency) including a literature review on the assigned topic.
- **Winter quarter:**
  - Check in on your student’s performance in the Biostat and Epi cases, which can be challenging for some students.
  - By now, there should be a growing sense of what the capstone will be, especially if it involves summer travel, an application for funding support, or a Human Subjects application.
- **Before Spring break:** check in on Capstone progress.
- **After Spring break:**
  - Welcome your students back from break.
  - Your student should have a capstone plan by the end of Spring quarter. As needed, help your student think about their interests, what they want out of the capstone experience, etc.
  - Check in on how the practicum is going, and whether or not the literature review has been completed yet.
- **End of academic year:**
  - The end of the schoolyear is means lots of changes, which can be stressful. Anticipate that and help students talk through their plans.
  - One faculty member hosts a June dinner for all her assigned students and their spouses/kids, as a way to celebrate the end of the year.

Second-Year Academic and Capstone Advising

Capstone Handbook

The Capstone Handbook provides detailed information about the Capstone project – please refer to it for detailed information. This section of the Faculty Handbook is intended only to focus on the mentoring side of the capstone project.

Capstone advisor selection

During the second year of the program, students will choose an advisor for their Capstone project who is familiar with the Capstone topic and will be able to provide advice on the quality and content of the project. If the selected Capstone advisor is not on the COPHP faculty, students should select an additional advisor from the COPHP program who will support the student and review academic progress throughout the year. Students are asked to inform the Program Director and the Student Services Counselor about their academic advisor.

Roles and responsibilities

Second-Year Advisors	Second-Year Students
Help students select a capstone project and form a capstone committee, as needed.	Schedule regular meetings with your mentor in accordance with your Capstone Project work plan
Meet with advisees regularly in accordance with their Capstone work plans	Keep your advisor informed about progress and/or problems that arise around academic and non-academic issues
Advise students to assure that their Capstone projects have reasonable and appropriate aims that are both rigorous and feasible	Provide your advisors with project updates and report drafts to be evaluated and critiqued
Work with students to develop a schedule of regular meetings to monitor progress, problem-solve around issues, provide advice on project development	Let your advisor know about academic interests, professional goals, and personal strengths and challenges
Assist students in preparing Human Subjects applications (if needed) and completing the online training program for human subjects (http://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/)	
Have principal responsibility for project oversight, ensuring quality, and integrating project tasks with academic work, learning objectives, and students' career objectives	
Review and critique all project deliverables, including proposals, work plans, progress reports, drafts, and final reports	
Assure that grades are submitted each quarter and the committee reaches consensus for assigning a final grade to the Capstone project (Usually, a	

grade of “N” will be given for all but the final quarter. These “N” grades will be replaced automatically when a final grade for the project is submitted.)	
Refer to the Capstone Handbook Appendix for the evaluation forms you will use to evaluate your student’s capstone performance at the end of the year.	
Discuss academic interests, professional development and career choices	

Tips from COPHP faculty

- If you don't know the student’s capstone site advisor, you may wish to take time to meet with that person.
- When you agree on changes to the dimensions of the project, document them in a quick email or, in the case of major changes, ask the student to rewrite the proposal.
- If you think the project could result in publishable findings, help the student write their final report in a publishable format for the intended journal. Discuss co-authorship options.
- Be proactive about contacting students.
- Consult your colleagues for suggestions! If you are worried about a student's progress, you may want to raise the concern at a faculty meeting and seek advice from your colleagues.

INFORMAL MENTORSHIP

In-Class Mentorship

Depending on your class facilitation style, you may wish to share information with your students on various topics (e.g., tips for finding academic literature, obscure grammar rules, ways to strengthen group facilitation skills, how to apply a rubric, how to “cold call” a source). You may want to follow up with individual emails or meetings to help students understand these topics.

During the 5th or 6th week of the quarter, some instructors choose to schedule “check-in” days with 45-minute one-on-one meetings with students. These sessions are a good time to ask students about what they liked/would change about the cases thus far, how the feedback process is working for them, and how the group facilitation is going.

Mentoring Alumni

Alumni look to our faculty for guidance and support in the job search and beyond. The most important obligation COPHP faculty have to our alumni is to write strong letters of recommendation that capture the graduate’s strengths in ways that enhance their prospects with potential employers or academic degree programs. If you feel you cannot write a strong letter of recommendation for a given alum, it is appropriate to decline the request.

APPENDIX

SAMPLE COPHP TEACHING TIMELINE

COMMUNITY-ORIENTED PUBLIC HEALTH PRACTICE PROGRAM
PREPARATION FOR TEACHING

Questions to consider *before* the block starts:

CURRICULUM & PEDAGOGY

- What revisions to cases, instruction, or block structure have been made to address student feedback or other observations from the previous year?
- What methods can you or the student facilitator use to review case learning objectives in a meaningful way?
- What strategies (questioning, facilitator preparation, modeling critical thinking, etc.) will you use to develop the group's self-sufficiency and efficiency in arriving at the intended learning objectives?
- When and how will you document suggestions or your own ideas about revisions to cases or processes for the following year?

EVALUATION & FEEDBACK

- What processes will you use for giving and documenting feedback on student work?
- When will you request mid-course feedback on the block, and in what format?
- When and how will you prepare the student facilitator?
- When and how will you give feedback to the student facilitator?
- How will students know what your expectations are for group projects or other creative assignments (i.e. non-traditional LOs)?

CLASSROOM CULTURE

- How will you assess which PBL skills your students need to develop further and which ones they can deploy confidently?
- What processes will you use to establish or affirm group norms and monitor adherence to group norms?
- How frequently will you give individual and group feedback on participation/class contribution, and in what format?
- When and how will you provide opportunity for students to assess their own class dynamic and/or group processes?
- How will you hold yourself and all students accountable to the program's commitment to anti-racism?

Tasks:

- ❑ Review all cases and facilitator guides (if available)
- ❑ Visit Canvas course website to confirm cases are posted and site is functional
- ❑ Photocopy or ask HSERV staff to copy cases – single sided and collated by page
- ❑ Get your class roster from MyUW
- ❑ Optional: set up a shared Google Drive for class coordination

SAMPLE TIMELINE

Sample Week in COPHP: Population Health, Fall 2015 (Gita)
MONDAY 1. Students submit LOs to Canvas by 6 pm 2. Download LOs from Canvas 3. Read/start reading LOs and record feedback 4. Print copies of Tuesday's case and Friday's case (for the student facilitator) 5. Student facilitator sends draft agenda by 7 pm 6. Read and give feedback on draft agenda by email or phone
TUESDAY 1. Finish reading and recording feedback on LOs 2. Prepare announcements/other items for class 3. Class: Case X, Day 1 Discussion – record observations 4. Class: Case X, Day 2 Reading, mini-LO development, give assignment – record observations 5. Meet with Friday's student facilitator to prep and discuss strategies for peer review of Day 2 assignments (if relevant) 6. Meet with Tuesday's student facilitator to give feedback
WEDNESDAY 1. (Finish reading and recording feedback on LOs) 2. 1:1 meetings with students for mid-block check-ins
THURSDAY 1. Students submit mini LOs and/or Day 2 assignment to Canvas by assigned time 2. Download submissions from Canvas 3. Read/start reading submissions and record feedback 4. Print copies of Friday's case and Tuesday's case (for the student facilitator) 5. Student facilitator sends draft agenda by 7 pm 6. Read and give feedback on draft agenda by email or phone
FRIDAY 1. Finish reading and recording feedback on mini-LOs and/or assignments 2. Prepare announcements/other items for class 3. Class: Case X, Day 2 Assignment Review – record observations 4. Class: Case X, Day 2 Reading, mini-LO development, give assignment – record observations 5. Meet with Tuesday's student facilitator to prep 6. Meet with Friday's student facilitator to give feedback

SAMPLE LESSON PLAN

HSERV531 – Population Health
October 13th Lesson Plan Draft
Case 2 Day 2
Facilitator: Lexie Maister

3:00-3:20 – Icebreaker, ask for notetaker

- During last week's icebreaker, we shared our methods of self-care. A common theme was self-validation – specifically remembering that we are all wonderful and capable.
    - Let's turn to the person on our right, and tell them one important contribution they have in their LO's
        - Ideas: visuals, headings, word choice, structure, references used, providing context for new content, well-worded abstracts, back-to-the-case section…
    - Turn to the person to your left, and tell them one important contribution they bring to the group dynamic
        - Ideas: being aware of the amount of space they use, delegating space, providing content, making sure we're on track with our discussion, asking questions, rewording LO's…

3:20 – 4:35 – Debrief Case 2 Day 1

- Visuals
    - what did people do that were helpful?
    - What were our struggles – technical and otherwise?
    - How will we continue to do this moving forward?
- Recap and evaluate the different ways to do health communication/messaging
    - "Why is Jason in the Hospital?"
    - Sightline reports
    - Other report resources we shared in class – Robert Wood Foundation, Kaiser Family, CDC, Pew
    - Why are we misinformed (Francesca's C1D1 'where we get info' LO)
    - Speeches (Francesca's C1D2 LO on how to write a good speech)
    - Travel (Trecia's C2D1 LO)
- Issues that arise with comparing two areas
- Other cool stuff that comes up from reading LO's/discussion questions!
- Any comments to faculty about the case?

4:35 – 4:45 - BREAK

4:45 – 5:15 Case 2 Day 2

- Read page by page, time for silent reflection

5:15-5:20 – Gita to reveal mystery assignment

5:20-5:50: mini-LO Development – remind everyone that these are 3 pages, informal

- **What power does the media have power over where funding goes? (1)**
- **What media are highlighting American economics inequality? Which ones are tying it to health? (2)**
- "talk is only talk" **– what will we do to improve our "numbers"? How to we enact change? (3)**
- **Can we actually eliminate health inequity in the states? How does the WHO propose we eliminate health inequities in the world? (4)**
- Spokane report "Odds against tomorrow" **–** how education, income, race, and place can affect health outcomes. **– what is the Odds Against Tomorrow report? What can we learn from it? (4)**
- Washington counties workshops about working towards action on the SDOH
- IHME data visualization tool (from Abie seminar) **–** 20 year gap in life expectancy in different census tracts of King County
- **'Health disparaties industry' –** produces all this health data, but the situation is getting worse still
- panel talk **–** Q&A, Americorps volunteer stumped panel by saying **'how do we get this vital info to the populations we're talking about and do it in a way that is accessible and culturally appropriate?' (5)**
- **summary/reviews (6)**
    - **California Newsreel documentary 'Unnatural Causes'?**
    - **'The Raising of America'?**
    - **'IN UTERO' – emotional side of early life**
    - **'The Great Leveller', 'The Divide'**
- **are film screenings a way to "raise awareness within our local communities about health disparities"? (7)**
- people in PH talk to about PH folks, not sharing with citizens
    - **how do we draw 'ordinary citizens' into the PH conversation? Are they ready for it? (8)**
- The Last Straw **–** PH/med student made this game on SDOH to use in med schools
    - **Are there any medical schools in the US that bother to teach their students about structural factors that affect health? (9)**

STUDENT POSTING EVALUATION TEMPLATE

Gita Krishnaswamy developed this helpful template for evaluating student case postings:

Name:
Case:
Day:

Element	Absent (0)	Incomplete (1)	Basic (2)	Appropriate	Distinguished
Required					
Abstract					
Evidence &					
Syntax &					
Sources					

**A new graduate student's writing typically "lives" in Appropriate and "visits" the Distinguished column intermittently, increasing over time. A posting will be considered Appropriate when meeting the description outlined below.*

Required Formatting:
- Includes all required elements of a posting
- Follows font, length, and page formatting requirements

Abstract:
- Brief, incisive summary of the key facts and/or arguments
- Presents why the posting is important and interesting

Evidence & Analysis:
- Includes the best available and sufficient amount of evidence from public health research or other related fields
- Connects or compares diverse points to support the overall argument and learning objective
- Synthesizes ideas from various sources rather than describing or reporting

Syntax & Structure:
- Sentences are composed with mature prose, free of spelling and grammar errors
- Individual paragraphs are well-organized
- Posting as a whole develops a claim in a logical manner, with appropriate transitions
- Layout of text and other posting components facilitates the reader's intake of information

Sources:
- Sources are cited appropriately throughout the posting
- Evidence derived from a sufficient number of reliable sources
- Varied range of sources used, when possible

In-Class Tracking Sheet Template

Trez Buckland developed this helpful template for in-class tracking of student performance and progress:

Amartya: Overall presence; hear all pts of view Questions Explain/facts Challenges Summarizing Supportive/humor Process LOs	**Betty: Too abrupt?** Questions Explain/facts Challenges Summarizing Supportive/humor Process LOs	**Cesar: Stepping up to the process; ask questions; further the discussions** Questions Explain/facts Challenges Summarizing Supportive/humor Process LOs	**Ella: Concise, confident, convincing** Questions Explain/facts Challenges Summarizing Supportive/humor Process LOs
Martin: Contrib. to group process; balance my exp with my opinions Questions Explain/facts Challenges Summarizing Supportive/humor Process LOs	**Merideth: Listen; non-redundant; clear and concise** Questions Explain/facts Challenges Summarizing Supportive/humor Process LOs	**Rosa: not overbearing; constructive criticalness; April** Questions Explain/facts Challenges Summarizing Supportive/humor Process LOs	**Saul: speak strongly, no qualifiers, no tail off** Questions Explain/facts Challenges Summarizing Supportive/humor Process LOs

The bolded text next to each student's name represents his/her self-identified goals for growth. There is space next to each standard heading for the faculty member to tally instances of participation in these areas.

STUDENT CASE POSTING BEST PRACTICES

The COPHP program encourages student case postings to be creative, informative, well-written and engaging. There are several types of posts—some may be in response to a specific assignment (e.g., "write a memo to the director of the health department," or "design a lesson plan for a high school class"), some are to DO something (e.g., put on an event or provide testimony), and some are to gather some information and organize it – these might be thought of as textbook entries.

For the routine case-related posting, this page offers some "best practices" ideas. Without putting too many restrictions on the style and formatting of your postings, there are some generally accepted norms that we have come to appreciate over the years:

1. Postings are about 5 pages of 1.5 spaced 12-point sized font, not including graphics and references.

2. Use page numbers.

3. The file name should follow this convention:

   FirstLastName_CaseName_DAY#_YEAR_short-name, for example:
   AmyHagopian_537.1Ghana_Day1_2014_Ministries-of-Health

4. References should be organized using a bibliography program, such as Mendeley. We recommend a healthy number of references (perhaps a dozen or so) per posting from a variety of types of sources, especially reliable peer-reviewed literature. We also recommend you have conversations with experts, which are referenced as "personal communication," with the date. [Personal Communication via (vehicle of communication). Last Name (of expert) first name, relevant title, date, contact information], for example: Hagopian, Amy, telephone conversation; APHA's International Health Section. 29 Aug 2014. Hagopian@uw.edu 206-616-4989. Could even put the transcript in the appendix.]

5. Each posting should have a header: your name, the course number, the case number, the date.

6. The posting needs a title.

7. Restate your Learning Objective as assigned. If you changed the wording between the assignment and the writing, note that. [eg, "Revised LO: What is the meaning of life? (original LO: what is the reason to get up in the morning?)] There is debate about whether LOs should be formed as research questions or as statements beginning with a verb. Work amongst yourselves to resolve that issue.

8. We recommend an abstract, with 2-3 sentences summarizing your findings and conclusions.

9. The body of the posting often benefits from organization using headers (these can often be in the form of questions). You may want to use bulleted lists (sometimes it's better to number these, so they can be referred to in conversation) and or tables.

10. Please try to avoid passive voice (see: http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/passive-voice/).

11. In conclusion, you might want to note “what COPHP students should take away from this posting” or “remaining questions” or both. “Back to the case” is another well-honored convention that ties the posting’s conclusions back to the LO. This section is meant for analysis of the case and your findings as they relate to the case. This should be a substantive part of your posting. “Remaining questions” is where you would list one or two questions that remain after your research and posting have been completed; this part could serve to spark group discussion around your topic. Generally, postings are not 5 pages of regurgitated information but a good mix of reporting on new information and relating that information to the case in a thoughtful analysis.

12. Have fun. Postings can be in the form of little dramas, can have your voice prominently featured, can take a contrarian point of view, and be otherwise highly personalized.

FACILITATING DISCUSSION IN PBL

In a PBL environment, facilitators interact in intentional, specific ways with students to foster students' self-sufficiency and develop their cognitive and metacognitive skills. Throughout the course, PBL facilitators coach, support, monitor, and model an openness toward and desire to engage in ambiguity and complexity.

TIPS

- ❑ Allow "wait time" (about 4 seconds) after asking questions and be comfortable with silence.
- ❑ Avoid posing questions that have yes/no answers or one-word answers.
- ❑ Avoid the temptation to correct immediately or interrupt. Students can learn by reflecting when and how they get off course.
- ❑ Give *neutral* implicit or explicit feedback during discussion so students don't become conditioned to feedback that affirms the "rightness" of their statements.
- ❑ Probe consistently so that probing is not viewed only as a cue for "wrongness" of statements.
- ❑ Encourage support and justification of ideas using evidence, prior academic knowledge, and life experience.
- ❑ Use implicit and explicit cues to force the conversation to reside among students as much as possible.

Leading and guiding questions can:

PROBE – asks students to explain or analyze a concept further

CHALLENGE – asks students to justify their claim or validate their reasoning

REDIRECT – focuses students on the problem or case at hand instead of tangential issues

MONITOR – helps students understand next steps and processes needed for research or to develop solutions

Sample Question Prompts

Cognitive level questions - *for knowledge, application, comprehension, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, acquiring language, computation, memory, reading, perceiving, solving, etc.*	**Metacognitive and epistemic level questions** - *to monitor one's own learning, develop strategies for learning, and analyze the limits and criteria of knowing*
Why is this important? How does this apply to ... ? How can we relate this to ... ? What evidence do you have to support ... ? If that's true, do you still believe ... ? Can you share your experience with ... ? What part of the case illustrates ... ? Can everyone define ... ? How reliable is ... ? Have you considered ... ? (idea or statement from another student)	Where do you see gaps or ambiguities? How can we learn more about this? Have you accomplished the goal in this case? How could you go about this differently? What degree of certainty ... . Why ...? How does this relate to the case? What is at stake? How do you know ... ? What obstacles do you anticipate? Have you considered ...? (process or strategy)

Characteristics of Four Main Question Types

Questions That Hook

Asked to interest learners around a new topic
May spark curiosity, questions, or debate
Often framed in engaging "kid language"
Asked once or twice, but not revisited

Questions That Lead

Asked to be answered
Have a "correct" answer
Support recall and information finding
Asked once (or until the answer is given)
Require no (or minimal) support

Questions That Guide

Asked to encourage and guide exploration of a topic
Point toward desired knowledge and skill (but not necessarily to a single answer)
May be asked over time (e.g., throughout a unit)
Generally require some explanation and support

Essential Questions

Asked to stimulate ongoing thinking and inquiry
Raise more questions
Spark discussion and debate
Asked and re-asked throughout the unit (and maybe the year)
Demand justification and support
"Answers" may change as understanding deepens

Source: http://www.ascd.org/pu blications/books/109004/chapters/What-Makes-a-Question-Essential%C2%A2 .aspx

EXAMPLE ASSIGNMENT GRADING RUBRIC

COPHP Op-Ed Rubric
Policy Block
November, 2013/ ah
10 points total

Policy memos will be graded by the following rubric.

<u>Amy's Group – Individual Assignment</u>

Because of your expertise in public policy, you have been hired as senior policy adviser to State Commerce Director Brian Bonlender. The Director has expressed concern about the apparent lack of affordable housing for farm workers and has asked you to prepare a 3-page policy brief for him laying out the issue, its consequences, and potential solutions. The brief should make an evidence-based case for why the issue should be a priority for the state. Bonlender needs your brief by 6pm on Sunday, October 24, so he's prepared for a cabinet meeting with Gov. Inslee the next morning.

<u>Aaron's Group – Individual Assignment</u>

Because of your expertise in public policy, you have been hired as senior policy adviser to State Health Secretary John Wiesman. The Secretary has expressed concern about the public health effects of inadequate farm worker housing and has asked you to prepare a 3-page policy brief* for him laying out the issue, its consequences, and potential solutions. The brief should make an evidence-based case for why the issue should be a priority for the state. Wiesman needs your brief by 6pm on Sunday, October 24, so he's prepared for a cabinet meeting with Gov. Inslee the next morning.

Well-written	Follows grammar rules Sentences clear and in active voice Clear and appropriate voice for role as senior policy advisor to official Avoids clichés Uses active verbs Avoids jargon and acronyms	2
Well-reasoned	Uses an argument anyone can follow Uses evidence to support a position Uses effective analogies, if appropriate	2
Focused and clear	Unfolds quickly The main point is immediately clear Not equivocal or hedging, has a clear point of view Opens and closes strongly Has a timely hook The solutions offered are feasible and politically wise	2
Structurally sound	Length as instructed Tightly written, no repetitive or unnecessary words Good title or subject line Ready to submit—appropriate headers, date, name, contact information.	2

	Strong ending with a restatement of the point & desired action	
Voice	Clear and appropriate voice for role as senior policy advisor to official Respectful yet personal, conversational (you know this person) Identifies the counterarguments your boss may face, and refutes them with evidence Has a public health point of view Is not preachy	2
TOTAL		10

INSTRUCTION & ADVISING COMPENSATION OVERVIEW

Instructors with primary "regular" faculty appointments in Health Services

- Instruction of core courses – 12% of annual salary for one section of a full 6-credit course; pro-rated for co-instruction
- Instruction of 1st/2nd year seminars – 2% of annual salary; pro-rated for co-instruction
- Capstone Advising – 3% of annual salary per student for "capstone chair" (paid in year following graduation)

Instructors with primary "regular" faculty appointments in another UW department (Adjunct)

- Instruction of core courses – 12% of annual salary for one section of a full 10-week 6-credit course; pro-rated for co-instruction or shorter course blocks [12% of FTE (annual base salary) equates to 12 "points," per the Department of Health Services compensation system for teaching and advising.]
- Instruction of 1st/2nd year seminars – 2% of annual salary; pro-rated for co-instruction
- Capstone Advising – No compensation per departmental policy

Instructors with "clinical / affiliate" faculty appointments

- Instruction – $1,238 per "point" [Clinical/affiliate faculty teaching a full 10-week 6-credit block receive $14,850 – 75% of the Department's per credit standard due to lower cohort enrollments. This parallels the 12% (points) allocated to "regular" faculty. The full $14,850 is then divided by 12 to determine the per point dollar amount for clinical/affiliate faculty teaching course blocks with fewer credits and points. Calculation by points is more consistent than calculation by credit.]
- Capstone Advising – No compensation per departmental policy

Teaching Subcontracts

- Several COPHP faculty are compensated for their teaching and advising through contracts facilitated between the department, UW Purchasing and Public Health - Seattle & King County.

Instruction by Professional Staff

- Instruction must be paid on a faculty appointment (e.g., clinical, affiliate, part-time lecturer)
- After the third year of fee-based operations, combined FTE of professional staff appointment and instructional appointment may not exceed (be compensated beyond) 100%

Temporary Pay Supplement (TPS) or Excess Compensation (EC)

- Professional staff <u>and</u> regular/adjunct faculty are not eligible for compensation above 100% FTE after the 3rd year of fee-based program operations
- Regardless of state or fee-based operations, professional staff and regular faculty teaching *for-credit* courses are only eligible for TPS as a 1-year exception, requiring Dean and Academic Human Resources (AHR) approval

COPHP Syllabus Construction

Overview

The UW requires faculty to prepare (and share with their students) a syllabus for each course. Please see the SPH Syllabi Guidelines Website (http://sph.washington.edu/gateway/syllabi.asp) for additional information. For the most part, syllabi are creative works, and you are free to put in them what you like.

Checklist

Here is a checklist to help you make sure to cover the basics:

1. Course title
2. Course number
3. Course meeting time & location
4. Quarter, year
5. Facilitators and contact information
6. Description of the course
7. Overall learning objectives for the block
8. Expectations of students
9. Evaluation and grading (proportion of credit for various types of work)
   a. Expectations for written assignments
   b. Expectations for oral assignments
   c. Expectations for in class behaviors
10. Any recommended texts, materials, background reading
11. Disability accommodation statement
12. Academic integrity statement
13. Anti-racism commitment
14. Department of Health Services grading policy: http://depts.washington.edu/hserv/grading

Example Outline

Community-Oriented Public Health Practice
NAME OF Block
Course number: HSERV 5XX
_____ Quarter 20XX

Faculty name
Department
Office location
Phone numbers, including cell
Email
Website

Course description
Here

Course logistics
Meeting times, places

Overall learning objectives for the block
Here (or separately, if you don't want to tip your hand in the syllabus)

Expectations of students (EXAMPLE follows)
Students and facilitators will discuss mutual expectations on the first day of the evaluation and policy block. Briefly, students are expected to:
Participate actively in all class sessions.
Students are expected to contribute to each PBL discussion. We expect contributions to include, at various times: discussion leadership, facilitation, note-taking, active listening, and respectful criticism. We also expect students to be mindful of not dominating discussion and to encourage participation of everyone. By this time in the COPHP program, you are second-year students; this is a good time to be honing your group facilitation skills and we will actively work on that.
If for *extraordinary* reasons, attendance at a class session is not possible, we expect students to inform the facilitator and other group members that they will be absent; make individual arrangements for their assigned work to be covered by another student, and discuss with the facilitator if the learning that took place during that session needs to be "made up" (e.g., by writing a memo summarizing the postings for that session). We have also had success including remote students via skype dial-in.

Complete postings of a high quality and depth for the case.
Posting should be completed by a time before each PBL session that is agreed to by the group and faculty facilitator. We expect each student to read all postings of other group members by class time (as the faculty will) to maximize the exchange and learning during session discussions.

COPHP student postings should:
- Reflect ever-increasing levels of critical thinking.

- Be oriented toward informing in-session discussions, both in content and format (consider good titles, a brief abstract at the beginning, provocative questions or propositions).
- Reveal thoughtfulness about the assigned learning issue – What are its implications? What additional questions does it lead to?
- Be based on and cite appropriate sources of information **–** multiple types, high quality, beyond Google, discussion with "experts."
- Include explicit discussion of how research findings help the group to understand the case.

Grades for the policy and evaluation block will be based on the following numerical system and consistent with the Department of Health Services grading criteria.

A: Problem-based learning behaviors (40%)

1. Participation in group process (20%)
    - *Expected behaviors*: constructive, active, and thoughtful participation in all class sessions, probes and challenges constructively, helps others, clarifies, extends discussion, attends all sessions and comes on time
2. Quality of posted work on learning issues (20%)
    - *Expected behaviors*: complete, clear, accurate, provides adequate depth, uses own words, compares and contrasts, assimilates, synthesizes and evaluates, applies information to the case, attributes and cites appropriately, uses appropriate array of sources, finds definitive sources, posts and annotates key resources/URLs

B. Assignments (60%)

During the policy sequence, you will complete formal writing assignments, both individually and as group products. We ask you to write formal papers not only as a vehicle for you to demonstrate what you are learning, but also because written communication is a critical skill in public policy and advocacy. If you can't get your ideas across well, you are greatly handicapping yourself and the policies, ideas, or actions you support.

We expect, therefore, your papers to be of high quality **–** that is, we expect them to reveal good, critical thinking, be written in clear English, and be free of grammatical and typographical errors. As such, you should expect to write more than one draft, and we encourage you to carefully edit and proofread your work or get someone else to do so.
We hope that for each paper you can say "This is the best work of which I am capable."

All papers/reports should:

- be submitted by the due date noted
- be written in clear language using a minimum of "academese" or "bureaucratese"
- be typed with 12-point font
- be paginated
- have correct spelling and grammar, and
- be of the length assigned (**small** variations are acceptable).

Each group will make three formal group presentations: (1) high school class presentations (for Case 25) on October 17, (2) testimony in support of your APHA resolution concerning Case 26, scheduled for November 7, and (3) a presentation of your speed policy analysis project to Public Health Seattle & King County staff scheduled for December 5.

Oral presentations should:

- be well organized, clear and concise;
- involve each member of the group in a significant role; and
- use PowerPoint, Prezi, or similar computer-based audio-visual program that is clear and easy to understand.

Disability Accommodation

Your experience in this class is important to us, and it is the policy and practice of the University of Washington to create inclusive and accessible learning environments consistent with federal and state law. If you experience barriers based on a disability or temporary health condition, please seek a meeting with DRS to discuss and address them. If you have already established accommodations with DRS, please communicate your approved accommodations to your instructor at your earliest convenience so we can discuss your needs in this course. If you have a letter from Disabled Student Services indicating you have such a disability, please present the letter to the instructor so that we can discuss appropriate accommodations.

Disability Resources for Students (DRS) offers resources and coordinates reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities and/or temporary health conditions. Reasonable accommodations are established through an interactive process between you, your instructor(s) and DRS. If you have not yet established services through DRS, but have a temporary health condition or permanent disability that requires accommodations (this can include but not limited to; mental health, attention-related, learning, vision, hearing, physical or health impacts), you are welcome to contact DRS at 206-543-8924 or uwdrs@uw.edu or disability.uw.edu.

Academic Honesty

Students at the University of Washington (UW) are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic conduct, professional honesty, and personal integrity. The UW School of Public Health (SPH) is committed to upholding standards of academic integrity consistent with the academic and professional communities of which it is a part. Plagiarism, cheating, and other misconduct are serious violations of the University of Washington Student Conduct Code (WAC 478-120). We expect you to know and follow the university's policies on cheating and plagiarism, and the SPH Academic Integrity Policy. Any suspected cases of academic misconduct will be handled according to University of Washington regulations. For more information, see the University of Washington Community Standards and Student Conduct website.

Antiracism Commitment

The UW COPHP program is committed to becoming anti-racist. To that end, each of our courses is an opportunity to demonstrate our intent to be fully inclusive. We strive to overcome systemic racism by creating an environment that reflects community and mutual caring, while we ally with others in combating all forms of social oppression. This is a work in progress, as transformation is rarely a fully-completed project. In this block, we will look for opportunities to improve our performance as we seek to break down institutional racism. This can include case revisions, class interactions, faculty performance, and/or the institutional environment. We encourage students to talk to your faculty member, the program director, and/or submit your comments in the course evaluation form.

Grading policy

COPHP courses follow the Department of Health Services grading policy, available in detail at https://depts.washington.edu/hserv/grading

Suggested resources
XYZ

REFERENCES

- Freeman S, Eddy SL, McDonough M, Smith MK, Okoroafor N, Jordt H, Wenderoth MP (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 111, 8410–8415
- Gordon PR (2001). An introduction to problem-based learning fundamentals for facilitators. Kelliher & Associates, Ltd.
- Jarrett Thoms K (2001). "They're Not Just Big Kids: Motivating Adult Learners." Proceedings of the Annual Mid-South Instructional Technology Conference (6th, Murfreesboro, TN, April 8-10, 2001).
- Jarvis P (2004). Adult Education & Lifelong Learning: Theory and Practice, 3rd edition. London: Routledge-Falmer.
- Knowles MS, Holton EF, Swanson RA (2005). The Adult Learner, Sixth Edition: The Definitive Classic in Adult Education and Human Resource Development. Burlington: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Lieb S (1991). "Principles of Adult Learning," VISION, Fall 1991.
- Rhem J (1998). "Problem-based learning: an introduction." The National Teaching and Learning Forum. 8(1).
- Wilde JB & Schau CG (1991). Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 59.

HANDBOOK UPDATES

- 10/27/15: Student Services Counselor updated handbook in preparation for Autumn 2016
- 2009: Compiled and edited by Josh Fogt, contributions from Fred Connell, Amy Hagopian, Peter House, and Aaron Katz