

FACULTY

Criterion VIII.A. The school shall have a clearly defined faculty, which, by virtue of its size, multidisciplinary nature, educational preparation, research and teaching competence, and practice experience, is able to fully support the school's mission, goals and objectives.

VIII.A.1 Identification in a table or chart of faculty who support the degree programs offered by the school, indicating at least professorial rank, tenure status, percent time, earned degrees, universities at which degrees were earned, disciplinary area of degree, area of teaching responsibility, area of research interest, and selected demographic data (gender, ethnicity).

The Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health (MEZCOPH) assures broad representation of individuals within the College by including three categories of faculty – Appointed, joint-appointed, and adjunct. Appointed faculty are those who hold their primary appointment in MEZCOPH. These individuals contribute to public health teaching, research/scholarship, and service as their primary responsibilities. For these individuals, MEZCOPH has full responsibility for annual performance reviews, promotion and tenure decisions, compensation, and post-tenure reviews. Tables VIII.A.1-1 and VIII.A.1-2 describe the faculty members who hold a primary faculty appointment by MPH program concentration (Epidemiology MS and PhD faculty are included in the MPH Epidemiology and MPH Biostatistics concentrations). These tables include current faculty members, and those who were part of MEZCOPH during fiscal years 2002 – 2005 but are no longer with the University of Arizona (these individuals do not have a FTE listed). Tables reflecting changes since July 1, 2005 will be provided at the site visit.

Of particular note is the number of primary faculty that are now tenure-eligible/tenured when compared with our previous accreditation review (submitted in December 2002). Due to the infusion of additional permanent dollars into MEZCOPH, there are now a total of 32 tenure-eligible/tenured faculty members (effective August 12, 2005), compared with 11 at the end of 2004. Eight faculty members transferred to tenure-eligible positions with the additional permanent funding provided for fiscal year 2006 (these changes are not yet reflected in Table VIII.A.1-1 since it reflects fiscal years 2002-2005). Furthermore, three faculty recruitments have recently been completed or are in progress. The two in Environmental and Community Health are completed (one Associate Professor, tenure-eligible, Hispanic/Native American female for the Public Health Policy and Management concentration, and one Assistant Professor, tenure-eligible, white female with a strong scientific background in the Environmental and Occupational Health concentration). The third search

is for an Assistant/Associate Professor Epidemiologist (Epidemiology & Biostatistics), with the goal of candidate selection by the end of 2005.

The first step in the process for transfer from non tenure-eligible to tenure-eligible status for current faculty was identification by the division directors, based on faculty qualifications and interest. The criterion was strong potential for eventual success in obtaining tenure. The individuals proposed for transfer provided a statement of purpose that summarized their goals for transferring from a non tenure-eligible to a tenure-eligible position in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The proposed candidates were evaluated by the MEZCOPH Promotion and Tenure Committee. After review by Dean Swanson, the requests were forwarded to the Provost's office for approval.

Joint-appointed faculty are those who contribute to MEZCOPH's mission and programs, but whose primary appointment is within another College at the University of Arizona. Their faculty appointments within MEZCOPH are at the same rank as their primary appointment. These individuals collaborate with MEZCOPH faculty on research and service projects, teach MEZCOPH courses, advise and mentor students, and serve on graduate committees. TABLE VIII.A.1-3 lists the faculty members who have a joint appointment by MPH program concentration, with their home college. All individuals with joint appointments are part of a MEZCOPH division to more effectively allow them to interact with College faculty on research, teaching and service projects. Joint faculty contribute effort to MEZCOPH, in addition to their effort in their home departments. Percent effort for joint-appointed faculty was computed using the following criteria: 10% effort for teaching a course, 5% effort for co-teaching a course, 5% effort for service on MEZCOPH committees, 5% effort for advising, 5% effort for service on master's committees, and 5% effort for service on doctoral committees. Additionally, a few joint-appointed faculty from Arizona State University and Northern Arizona University are still involved in teaching courses and advising MPH students. They also are listed in TABLE VIII.A.1-3.

Adjunct faculty are those individuals who do not have University of Arizona academic appointments, but contribute in a significant way to MEZCOPH's mission and programs. These individuals provide guest lectures in courses, serve as site supervisors for MPH internships, assist MEZCOPH faculty and staff in identifying and addressing community concerns, collaborate in the development of new programs, and provide liaison between the community and MEZCOPH. TABLE VIII.A.1-4 lists the individuals with adjunct faculty appointments.

Academic professionals are individuals within MEZCOPH who do not hold faculty appointments but have expertise in specific areas of public health and contribute significantly to the mission of MEZCOPH. These individuals serve in key administrative positions (such as Director of Information Technology, Director of Public Affairs and Marketing) or play significant roles in research

and community service programs. TABLE VIII.A.1-5 lists these individuals and describes their role within MEZCOPH.

VIII.A-2 *Description of the manner in which the faculty complement integrates perspectives from the field of practice.*

The Community Outreach, Practice and Service goal of MEZCOPH is to foster excellence in public health service and practice globally, nationally and locally. Many of our projects and programs are targeted at border populations, minority groups, and medically underserved populations in the Southwest. Our faculty have extensive ties to the world of public health practice, through collaborations with the Arizona Department of Health Services, county health departments, tribal health departments and border communities. These collaborations have led to multiple case studies and examples that are shared in the classroom. They also have led to the creation of multiple MPH internship projects in existing programs and the development of new programs that provide further opportunities for internships, graduate theses and dissertations. These results are shared with MEZCOPH faculty, staff and students through the MPH Internship Conference, the Epidemiology in Arizona Research Forum, the Public Health Seminar Series, and the Epidemiology Seminar Series.

Several examples will serve to best describe this integration. Dr. Nicolette Teufel-Shone serves as a consultant to the Hualapai and Hopi Tribal Health Departments and teaches the core MPH course in Sociocultural and Behavioral Aspects of Public Health. Dr. Lisa Staten works extensively with border communities as part of our Prevention Research Center and also teaches the core MPH course in Sociocultural and Behavioral Aspects of Public Health. Drs. Jefferey Burgess and Mary Kay O'Rourke have extensive experience in environmental and occupational hazards assessment, and teach the core MPH course in Environmental and Occupational Health. Dr. James Ranger-Moore has extensive collaborative experience with the National Cancer Institute in nicotine and tobacco cessation programs and teaches the core Biostatistics MPH course. Dr. Michael Lebowitz has extensive experience in collaborating with the Environmental Protection Agency and the Arizona Lung Association, and teaches a doctoral seminar for epidemiology students. Dr. Mary Koss works with the International Rescue Committee to document conflict and post-conflict sexual and physical violence, consults on violence prevention programs for perpetrators, and teaches Violence Against Women from a Public Health Perspective. Dr. Joel Meister has championed tobacco-free establishments through his work with the "Clearing the Air Coalition of Pima County" and chairs the MPH Public Health Policy and Management concentration. Through these interactions, faculty and students broaden their understanding of real world issues and solutions to improve the health of individuals in the Southwest.

VIII.A.3 Identification of outcome measures by which the school may judge the qualifications of its faculty complement, along with data regarding the performance of the school against those measures over the last three years.

The qualifications of College faculty are evaluated via a number of mechanisms. Teaching competence (discussed in VIII.B.4) is evaluated using the Teacher-Course Evaluation form provided for campus-wide use by the University of Arizona Office of Assessment and Enrollment Research. Three of the 10 items are used by MEZCOPH to evaluate teaching effectiveness (scale of 1 to 5 with 5 representing the best response):

- What is your overall rating of this instructor’s teaching effectiveness (almost never effective, rarely effective, sometimes effective, usually effective, almost always effective)?
- What is your rating of this instructor compared to other instructors you have had (one of the least effective, less effective than most, about as effective as most, more effective than most, one of the most effective)?
- I was treated with respect in this class (strongly disagree, disagree, uncertain, agree, strongly agree)

The average response on these items for the 2002 – 2003, 2003 – 2004, and 2004 – 2005 academic years is shown in TABLE VIII.A.3-1.

TABLE VIII.A.3-1 Evaluation of Teaching Competence for MEZCOPH Faculty

Academic Year	Number of courses	Median value	% of courses with average score < 3	% of courses with average score between 3 and 3.99	% of courses with average score ≥ 4
Overall Rating of Instructor’s Effectiveness					
2002-2003	55	4.43	1.8	20.0	78.2
2003-2004	51	4.38	3.9	23.5	72.6
2004-2005	65	4.43	0	26.2	73.8
This Instructor’s Effectiveness Compared with Others					
2002-2003	55	4.14	9.1	34.5	56.4
2003-2004	51	4.00	15.7	33.3	51.0
2004-2005	65	4.00	10.8	36.9	52.3
I Was Treated With Respect					
2002-2003	55	4.83	0	3.6	96.4
2003-2004	51	4.73	0	7.8	92.2
2004-2005	65	4.78	0	1.5	98.5

As can be seen, the median value of instructor effectiveness is very high, with only at most two courses per year that have average scores less than 3 (rarely effective) or below. These instructors are mentored on ways to improve their

teaching performance by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or the appropriate Program Chair. Conversely, over 70% of MEZCOPH courses have average scores of 4 (usually effective) or above. The average scores for “*this instructor’s effectiveness compared with others*” are lower, most likely due to several outstanding instructors within MEZCOPH. We are extremely satisfied with the high average scores for respect for students, as this is a core value of the College. Specifically, over 90% of the courses have average scores of 4 (agree) or greater.

The number of research grants and publications in peer-reviewed journals are used as indicators of research productivity. As described in Criterion VI, our research portfolio is diverse, ranging from bench science to community-based research. Grant support and publications also are described in detail in Criterion VI.

Practice competence is best judged by the organizations that seek out collaborations with faculty in MEZCOPH. As described in Criterion VII, multiple organizations at the local, state, tribal and national level regularly collaborate with MEZCOPH faculty. As shown in TABLE VII.6-1, the percentage of faculty and academic professionals involved in community outreach, practice and service has increased from 29% in 2002, to 38% in 2003, to 42% in 2004. The number of projects related to our 4 key areas (eliminating health disparities, building and strengthening collaborations, targeting Arizona Healthy People 2010 goals, public health preparedness) has also increased from 209 in 2002, to 279 in 2003, to 358 in 2004 (TABLE VII.6-3). Finally, competence also is judged by professional recognition at the local, state and national level. As shown in TABLE VII.2-3, during the past three years, faculty and academic professionals reported 1182 professional service activities, including serving as journal editors, grant reviewers, conference coordinators, and performing manuscript reviews.

VIII.A.4 *Assessment of the extent to which this criterion is met.*

The criterion is met.

Strengths

MEZCOPH has assembled a faculty that represents all public health disciplines. Many of these individuals are nationally and internationally known for their research expertise, they are effective teachers, and they provide service at the local, state and national level.

The number of tenure-eligible faculty has more than doubled when compared with the end of 2004. This will lead to far greater stability in the MEZCOPH educational programs.

The faculty FTE in Environmental & Occupational Health, although lower than other concentrations in Table VIII.A-1, has recently been strengthened by the addition of a tenure-eligible assistant professor and an increase in the FTE of an associate professor who transferred to tenure-eligibility effective July 1, 2005.

Weaknesses

None identified.

Criterion VIII.B: The school shall have well defined policies and procedures to recruit, appoint and promote qualified faculty, to evaluate competence and performance of faculty and to support the professional development and advancement of faculty.

VIII.B.1 Inclusion of a faculty handbook or other written document that outlines faculty rules and regulations.

The University of Arizona faculty handbook is available at the following website (copies will be available onsite): <http://w3.arizona.edu/~uhap/>. Faculty of MEZCOPH follow this handbook, as do all UA faculty.

VIII.B.2 Description of provisions for faculty development, including identification of support for faculty categories other than regular full-time appointments.

Faculty development is key to maintaining an active and effective teaching faculty component. Development occurs at the Division level through feedback obtained by the Annual Performance Review Process and through formal and informal mentoring relationships. Promotion and tenure criteria encourage faculty at all levels to be active in professional associations and to attend professional meetings and symposia. These opportunities are available irrespective of tenure-eligible versus non-tenure-eligible status, and for those on reduced FTE appointments. Funding is available at the division level to support faculty attendance at professional conferences, targeted towards junior faculty. For example, in 2004, 21 faculty members made presentations at national meetings and virtually all faculty attended at least one local or national conference.

VIII.B.3 Description of formal procedures for evaluating faculty competence and performance.

Teaching, research/scholarship, and practice competence are evaluated through annual performance reviews, the promotion and tenure process, and post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty. The University of Arizona mandates an annual performance review of all faculty. The performance review documents

include the work plan from the previous year, courses taught, graduate student advising and committee membership, research/scholarship grants funded, research/scholarship grants submitted, publications, scholarly presentations, awards and honors, college and university service, local, state, national and international service. The Office of Information Technology has created an on-line process for the annual performance review, so that the collected data are stored in a searchable database. The faculty member completes the performance review documents on-line and provides a self-ranking on instruction, research, service and administration (if applicable). The documents and an updated curriculum vitae are provided electronically to the division director. Each division has a Peer Review Committee of three or more members that reviews the packets, makes appropriate comments, and provides a ranking on instruction, research, service and administration. All faculty members then meet with their division director to discuss their review, the comments of the Peer Review Committee, and the division director's rankings. The work plan for the next year is finalized at this meeting. The completed annual performance reviews are then forwarded to the Dean's office. In consultation with the division directors, the Dean addresses any problems with faculty performance and also identifies those individuals who have made especially noteworthy contributions to MEZCOPH's programs. MEZCOPH makes annual faculty awards for teaching, research, and service. In addition, MEZCOPH faculty compete successfully for university-wide awards.

An additional means of faculty evaluation is through the promotion and tenure process. MEZCOPH Promotion and Tenure guidelines are included as APPENDIX VIII.B.3-1. Briefly, promotion and tenure guidelines for appointment and promotion formalize achievement expectations for specific ranks. For appointment to Assistant Professor, promise must be demonstrated in the areas of teaching, research and service. Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is achieved by demonstrating documented excellence in teaching and mentoring, providing indicators of a national reputation in scholarly activity, demonstrating leadership and excellence in service to the institution, and service at the regional or national level. Promotion to full Professor is achieved by demonstrating international recognition for scholarly contributions, continued excellence in teaching, a national or international reputation in service, and also a demonstrated leadership role in mentoring junior faculty. Greater program administration responsibility, such as serving as an Associate Dean, Center Director, Program Chair, or Division Director, also is expected of faculty holding this rank.

Tenure-eligible faculty undergo a mid-cycle review to inform their development plan for mentoring and to assure that the candidate is on track to achieve tenure. Presently, a three-year review is mandated, with the final tenure review being conducted no later than the 6th year in rank (formerly two- and four-year reviews were mandated). Upon promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, the typical career progression is evaluation for Promotion to Full Professor with

Tenure no later than the 6th year in rank. All promotion processes for tenure-eligible or tenured individuals are subject to review by the University of Arizona Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Provost's Office.

The MEZCOPH Promotion and Tenure committee also is responsible for the annual post-tenure review process. Briefly, the annual performance review ratings of all tenured faculty are reviewed, with 20% of the tenured faculty selected for an in-depth discussion of their annual performance review documents on a yearly basis. If any deficiencies are noted, a Faculty Development Plan or a Performance Improvement Plan (depending on the extent of the deficiencies) is developed by the faculty member, their Division Director and the Dean. Such plans state goals with monitoring and benchmarks to ensure that the noted deficiencies are rectified within the specified period. To date, all post-tenure reviews conducted by MEZCOPH have resulted in satisfactory or better ratings.

Non-tenure eligible faculty requirements for appointment to rank are identical to those for tenure eligible, except that the expectation for excellence may be in two of the three evaluated areas (i.e., research/scholarship, teaching, service). Non-tenure-eligible faculty undergo review every fifth year for promotion or retention in rank (Assistant Professors) or every sixth year (Associate Professors). Non-tenure eligible appointments or promotions are not reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, but are reviewed at the Provost's Office for integrity of process.

VIII.B.4 Description of student course evaluation process and/or evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Student course evaluations are conducted at the end of each MEZCOPH-sponsored course. The questionnaire is developed and provided for campus-wide use by the University of Arizona Office of Assessment and Enrollment Research. Forms are returned directly to that office by a designated student in a sealed envelope to insure that faculty or College staff do not compromise the confidentiality or integrity of the raw evaluations. The results are forwarded to the faculty member, Division Director, and Program Director after final grades have been completed. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs reviews all course evaluations to determine problem courses or to help remediate instructor difficulties.

As an additional means to evaluate teaching effectiveness, MEZCOPH conducted a mid-semester course evaluation in Spring, 2005 (Criterion IX.D.1). This brief, on-line evaluation form provides anonymous feedback to the instructor, including student comments on how the course could be improved. Students developed the format in consultation with the Assistant Dean for Student Services and Academic Administration. It was pilot-tested for all MEZCOPH courses just after spring break (March 25 – April 1). Student

interest was lower than expected (most likely due to the short time frame for student response). The feedback made recommendations for several courses, but no serious problems were noted.

In addition to this formal evaluation mechanism, informal evaluation occurs at several levels. Many of the MPH core courses are co-taught, which allows built-in feedback between the instructors. Additionally, concentration faculty provide guest lectures or audit particular lectures in a course. This also allows the opportunity for informal evaluation and feedback. Finally, when courses are being taught for the first time, there is substantial exchange between individual instructors and program chairs or division directors based on student feedback.

VIII.B.5 Description of the emphasis given to community service activities in the promotion and tenure process.

As part of the initial development of the MEZCOPH Promotion and Tenure guidelines, extensive discussion was devoted to the role of community service activities. The goal was to insure that all activities consistent with the mission statement performed by MEZCOPH faculty are considered in the Promotion and Tenure process. Outreach and other public manifestations of academic public health practice are forms of scholarship that are particularly important to a land-grant institution. All faculty are expected to demonstrate activity in community service that varies in extent depending on the type of appointment and the individual work plan.

The MEZCOPH Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines were revised in 2003 to better acknowledge and reward efforts in community based public health practice. This revision was needed due to several synergistic factors: 1) the recognition that MEZCOPH is known among ASPH schools as a leader in community based participatory research; 2) the recognition that effective community based participatory research involves activities that often are not “counted” in traditional research oriented promotion and tenure guidelines; and 3) the recognition that other ASPH schools were modifying their guidelines to better reward academic public health practice.

The MEZCOPH Promotion and Tenure Committee received substantial input from the Community Outreach, Practice and Service Committee and faculty from other accredited schools and programs in revising the guidelines. Of particular relevance was the ASPH 1999 definition of academic public health practice as the applied, interdisciplinary pursuit of public health scholarship. In particular, the definition of scholarship was expanded to include activities such as:

- developing, implementing or evaluating community interventions
- applying knowledge to develop or enhance public health practices/

- programs in communities (technical transfer)
- designing or conducting public health surveys
- producing scholarly products of academic public health practice such as technical reports and monographs, as well as other forms of publications

The definition of teaching was expanded to include activities such as:

- organizing, developing and/or teaching public health leadership, educational, training, practice, and/or continuing education courses
- providing public health practice opportunities to students by organizing projects or field experiences in which the students work with or under the supervision of the faculty member
- collaborating with community-based organizations, and/or with local, state or federal policy makers that results in increasing their capacity for instituting and/or sustaining public health programs

The definition of service was expanded to include outreach activities such as:

- participating in regional or national task forces and committees established to set or guide standards of public health practice;
- assisting communities or health agencies to obtain funding for research, program evaluation and/or public health programs;
- developing programmatic or organizational linkages among academic institutions, public health or health care agencies or other community-based organizations for the purpose of addressing a health-related problem or policy;
- organizing outreach efforts to the community-at-large (that enhance public awareness of public health issues);
- dissemination of scholarly findings to the media (i.e., radio, television, printed media);

Multiple iterations of draft guidelines were generated, vetted by various faculty groups, and revised. The final draft version was provided to the faculty in September 2003 for comment, with discussion electronically and at a dedicated faculty meeting. The final revised guidelines were approved by faculty vote on November 12, 2003. To date, the new guidelines have provided better recognition of practice based effort as part of the Annual Performance Review process and clearer review criteria when individuals with a scholarship focus in public health practice are reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Two such individuals were recently recommended for promotion (one to Associate Professor and the other to Professor) based on the revised Promotion and Tenure guidelines.

VIII.B.6 *Assessment of the extent to which this criterion is met.*

This criterion is met.

Strengths

MEZCOPH has well-established procedures for evaluating faculty competence and performance, including evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Community service activities are valued within the Promotion and Tenure Process, as evidenced by the recent revision of our Promotion and Tenure guidelines. Specifically, our definitions of research/scholarship, teaching and service have been expanded to ensure that the efforts of all MEZCOPH faculty are appropriately recognized.

Weaknesses

The on-line process for the annual performance review remains cumbersome, resulting in frustration with the process.

The mid-semester course evaluation pilot did not generate extensive student interest, even though students requested it.

Recommendations

A formal program will be established to aid the 19 former non tenure-eligible faculty who transferred to tenure-eligible positions. Vice Provost Juan Garcia will lead two sessions focused on successful advancement towards achieving promotion and tenure.

Improve the on-line annual performance review process to make it more “user-friendly”.

The time period for student feedback via the mid-semester course evaluation should be expanded to give students greater opportunity to provide input.

Criterion VIII.C: The school shall recruit, retain and promote a diverse faculty, and shall offer equitable opportunities to qualified individuals regardless of age, sex, race, disability, religion or national origin.

VIII.C.1 *Demographic data on the school’s faculty.*

Demographic data regarding the faculty are listed in TABLE VIII.C.1-1. The following table shows the distribution of primary faculty by rank, gender and ethnicity for current MEZCOPH faculty. (Those in TABLE VIII.A.1-1 with FTE listed.)

TABLE VIII.C.1-1 Primary Faculty by Rank, Gender and Ethnicity

Rank	Female						Male					
	Cauc.	Hisp.	Am. Ind.	Black	Asian	Total	Cauc.	Hisp.	Am. Ind.	Black	Asian	Total
Lecturer	2					2	1					1
Assistant Professor	7		2		1	10	1				2	3
Associate Professor	3	1		1	1	7*	5					6
Professor	3					3	9					9
Total	15	1	2	1	2	22*	16		1		2	19

Of the 41 current primary faculty members, 22 (53.7%) are female, 2.4% are Hispanic, 7.3% are Native American, 2.4% are African-American and 9.8% are Asian. One female professor marked by * is Middle Eastern so is included in the totals but not in the body of the table.

The following table shows the distribution of gender and ethnicity for all current faculty members (due to small numbers, this table is not subdivided by rank).

TABLE VIII.C.1-2 Faculty by Gender and Ethnicity

Faculty	Female						Male					
	Cauc.	Hisp.	Am. Ind.	Black	Asian	Total	Cauc.	Hisp.	Am. Ind.	Black	Asian	Total
Primary (U of A)	15	1	2	1	2	22*	16		1		2	19
Joint (ASU and NAU)	3					3	4			1		5
Joint (U of A)	14				1	15	29	5	1		2	37
Adjunct	4	1				5	20	2				22
Total (including ASU, NAU)	36	2	2	1	3	45*	69	7	2	1	4	83
Total (excluding ASU, NAU)	33	2	2	1	3	42*	65	7	2	0	4	78

Joint faculty from ASU and NAU are included in the table above since they are currently involved in student instruction for those students enrolled in the MPH program when the tri-university agreement was dissolved (7/1/04). Once these students graduate, they will no longer be eligible for joint faculty status. Therefore, the totals are given with them and excluding them.

Including the joint and adjunct faculty improves the number of non-Caucasian faculty members, but does not improve the percentage. There are 9 total Hispanic faculty members, 4 American Indian faculty members, 7 Asian faculty members, and 2 Black faculty members (one of which is at ASU). Overall, excluding the ASU and NAU joint faculty, 19% of the female faculty are non-Caucasian, and 17% of the male faculty are non-Caucasian.

MEZCOPH academic/administrative professionals and classified staff add significant diversity to the College. Ten of the 29 (34.5%) academic/administrative professionals shown in Table VIII.A.1-5 are non-Caucasian (5 American Indian, 2 Hispanic, 3 Asian). Fifty-seven of the 111 (51.4%) classified staff are non-Caucasian (16 American Indian, 1 African American, 34 Hispanic, 6 Asian).

VIII.C.2 ***Description of policies and procedures regarding the school's commitment to providing equitable opportunities without regard to age, sex, race, disability, religion or national origin.***

MEZCOPH follows the Arizona Board of Regents policy as an equal opportunity and affirmative action employer. MEZCOPH subscribes to the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Policy recruitment guidelines (OFCCP) as implemented at the University of Arizona in 1998. Federal law requires that the UA provide equal employment opportunity to all, without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability or veteran's status. It is further required by law that we take affirmative action in all employment matters to ensure that our policies and practices are, in fact, non-discriminatory. As a federal contractor this means, among other things, that goals have been established to address any underutilization of women or of minorities. For a detailed description of the University's policy please see the following web address: <http://hr2.hr.arizona.edu/recruit.htm>.

VIII.C.3 ***Identification of outcome measures by which the school may evaluate its success in achieving a demographically diverse faculty complement, along with data regarding the performance of the school against those measures over the last three years.***

Within the state of Arizona, the 2000 U.S. Census reports 50.1% female, and the following ethnic breakdown: 25.3% Hispanic, 5.7% American Indian and Alaska Native, 3.6% Black or African American, and 2.3% Asian. In comparison, MEZCOPH primary faculty are 53.7% female, 2.4% Hispanic, 7.3% Native American, 2.4% African-American and 9.8% Asian. Including joint and adjunct faculty members improves the number of non-Caucasian faculty, but decreases the percentage of non-Caucasian faculty. We recognize that we are

particularly under-represented in Hispanic faculty members compared to Arizona, a situation we are working to rectify. In part, our faculty is less ethnically diverse than the state population as a whole due to larger social processes that historically have discouraged ethnic minorities from seeking higher education. In addition to attempts to improve faculty diversity directly through hiring and faculty development mechanisms, MEZCOPH also is striving to increase the numbers of ethnic minorities who attain professional level degrees by its support of diversity in the undergraduate and graduate program levels (see section IX-B in this document).

To rectify these ethnic discrepancies MEZCOPH has a vigorous means of insuring that recruitment efforts in all faculty searches identify diverse candidates. Final lists must be diverse in terms of both ethnicity and gender. Specific measures will be taken to identify Hispanic and Native American candidates. This will include personal contacts both locally and nationally, as well as announcements in targeted media. Additionally, a development priority is to obtain funding for a Hispanic and a Native American endowed chair. The funding of these endowments should aid in recruiting ethnic minority faculty with interest in MEZCOPH's mission to reduce health disparities in the Southwest.

VIII.C.4 Assessment of the extent to which this criterion is met.

This criterion is met.

Strengths

MEZCOPH recruitment and retention of female faculty members has been very strong.

MEZCOPH has a vigorous means of insuring that recruitment efforts in all faculty searches identify diverse candidates.

As new positions open, MEZCOPH also is effectively recruiting ethnic minority faculty (e.g., recent hire in Environmental and Community Health Division).

Weaknesses

MEZCOPH is particularly under-represented in Hispanic faculty members compared with the state of Arizona.

Although MEZCOPH's percentage of American Indian faculty members mirrors that of the population of the state of Arizona, the number of American Indian faculty members should be increased to allow our students to have appropriate faculty mentors and role models.

Recommendations

Continue and strengthen efforts to identify and successfully recruit diverse faculty, particularly Hispanic and Native American faculty.

Obtain funding for a Hispanic and a Native American endowed chairs.