To: Deborah Meyer and Gillian Ice  
From: UCC Programs Committee  
Date: Nov. 13, 2014  
RE: Master’s in Global Health (MGH)

In response to the recently submitted Program Development Plan for Master of Global Health, the UCC Programs Committee and offers the following feedback for your consideration. We look forward to the Full Proposal.

A. Overall Program Structure:

1. Length to complete requirements

Clarify the envisaged duration of the program? Since dual degree students are allowed, must a student finish within 24 months, 36 months, etc of being admitted to the MGH?

2. Placement of MGH with other units

Although it is mentioned that the MGH will interact with the MPH, this may benefit from additional information, particularly how those 2 programs will maintain their own specific areas (particularly since the MPH is due to be modified).

3. Consultation and support from other areas of the University

It may be worthwhile to consult with faculty in the Scripps College of Communication who study health communication and who are invested in scholarly global initiatives

B. Courses and the Curriculum:

1. Research Methods Course

It is the only core course that can be taken from any other unit. This weakens the core because of the diversity of form and content in such courses. Rather, if a shared baseline understanding of research design, analytic methods, etc. is desirable in an MGH graduate then a special research methods course, one focused on approaches, tools, etc. typically encountered in global health studies, would be critical for student success. Alternatively, if there is a course being offered that already addresses those methods, please identify it or minimally describe the required competencies.

2. Electives

What are the criteria (if any) that will guide the approval of electives into a cohesive set, and who will approve the students program plan?

Page 2 includes statements to the effect that “Students will learn and work on interprofessional teams. . . Throughout their program they will utilize interprofessional, team-based approaches . . .” Perhaps the full proposal can clarify how what appears to be one of the hallmarks of this proposed program will be (or not) restricted to the core courses and will be (or not) included in the electives?
3. Linking activities to curricular goals

The overall rationale (point #4) was well written and convincing! In the abstract, it’s hard to argue for the need for such a program. However, there was a bit more difficulty in describing how the specific goals would be met. The core competencies listed in Appendix 2 were excellent. However, it’s not clear how the core course requirements would meet these competencies. Can the authors provide more specification on which courses will meet which of the competencies and how. Another column or two in this table could provide this information efficiently.

Given the emphasis on a team-based approach as well as the interdisciplinary nature of the program, how will it be possible for students to learn this through online courses? Wouldn’t learning about teams involve some interactive component within the core courses? At a minimum, could there be a way to encourage this approach through live video interactions of groups of individuals from different disciplines and to have this occur within a core course? The use of video feeds (Skype) for advising is helpful, but might there be a way to engage group discussion and teaching of team-building using similar technology?

4. Assessment of learning outcomes

Again, the student competencies in Appendix 2 are excellent. Because program review will require an assessment of learning outcomes, the full proposal should include a preliminary plan for that assessment.

C. People

1. Students

Will there be any criteria to choose students? Given the interest, they may get more than the 15 they plan to accept per cohort.

Clarify the need for the statement (p. 4) re international students “who will return to their home countries.” This isn’t typically what happens so why put this in writing? Speaking of foreign students being a key component of the MGH, since not all MGH students will be dual degree student will there be no graduate assistantships offered? Further, since the core will be online, does the program allow for foreign students to initiate and complete some courses from overseas before coming to campus? I can see how this option would pose some challenges at the OU end but will be financially more viable for underserved overseas students.

2. Underrepresented Groups

Looking forward at the requirements for the full proposal in this area speak toward a greater emphasis on enrollment and retention of traditional underrepresented groups in Ohio and the U.S., not an international student population.

3. Faculty / Admin Support

This should include updated CVs, and those of faculty mentioned as possible participant. A list of faculty that might serve as instructors or field mentors for could be also included.
Clarify the admin support dedicated (regardless of FTE) to running the MGH.

Two additional faculty are budgeted. Are these separate positions from the two unfilled positions that have already been approved? Can there be clarification of the responsibilities of the new faculty and how much they will be linked directly to the new program?

D. Conclusion & Final Comments:

Pay close attention to RACGS Guidelines. The proposal is 6 pages and guidelines clearly state “no more than five pages.”

We support moving this interesting program forward!