1. HISTORY AND CONTEXT OF DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM:

As described in the program’s QER, the Center for Demography and Population Health (CDPH) was organized in 1967 by faculty from the Departments of Sociology and Economics as the Population and Manpower Research Center. In 1973, the Center was reconstituted to focus more specifically on Demography and integrated into the College of Social Sciences’ Institute for Social Research (ISR) as the Center for the Study of Population. The Center became an autonomous unit within the College with faculty lines and administrative staff. By 1995, however, faculty lines had been shifted out of the Center into academic departments within the College. In 2003, the CDPH adopted its current name to reflect its expanding research focus. This expansion, spurred by the arrival of new Sociology faculty members with interests in social epidemiology and physical and mental health, anticipated the increasing overlap between the fields of Demography and Public Health.

CDPH is administered by a director who is appointed by the Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy at the recommendation of the faculty Associates. The current director is an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology, the departmental home of the two previous directors. Past directors have included professors in Economics and Sociology. The director supervises 1.4 staff positions supported by the state budget. A full-time senior grants specialist, whose primary responsibility is to assist College faculty in submitting grant applications and managing awards, also fills the position of office manager for CDPH. An OPS staff member works 16 hours per week and serves as office assistant and program assistant to the director, managing graduate student admissions; assisting with student recruitment; managing course schedules and program-related correspondence; and maintaining student records. The director also supervises the Master of Science in Demography degree program, entailing both student-centered tasks (e.g., student recruitment, coordination of admissions, and student advising) and program-centered tasks (e.g., curriculum evaluation and review).

The academic program leading to the Master of Science in Demography (MSD) has been in continuous operation since 1984. Originally a two academic year program with assistantships and tuition waivers, the MSD program was changed following the last QER to a single calendar year, and student financial support was dropped until last year, when a single tuition waiver was made available by the College. Students in the program are trained as Applied Demographers in preparation for jobs requiring advanced skills in data analysis and data management.

The MSD curriculum at FSU is interdisciplinary, with required courses offered through multiple departments in the College (Economics, Geography, Sociology, Urban & Regional Planning) and some approved electives offered by outside departments (e.g., Statistics). Even without a single departmental “home,” the curricular focus is clearly demographic, with a strong emphasis on the real world application of analytic skills. Students complete a minimum of 18 credit-hours of data analysis and statistics courses covering demographic data sources, creating and manipulating complex data sets, demographic techniques, including life table construction and population projections, data mapping with GIS, and applied regression analysis.
The MSD is also offered as part of a joint program with the Department of Urban & Regional Planning that was developed since the last QER. Leading to a joint Master of Science in Planning (MSP) and MSD, the program requires a total of 66 credit hours, 33 in Demography and another 33 hours in Planning. Students complete 21 credit hours of planning core classes, 12-15 credit hours of courses in a planning specialization, 24 credit hours of demography core classes, a number of elective classes, and three credit hours of capstone coursework in either discipline. Students also complete a 400 hour planning internship. This joint program has been successful and has three graduates to date.

2. STUDENT BODY: ENROLLMENT, RETENTION, AND GRADUATION

2.1 Graduate Student Numbers and Quality

The number of students enrolled in the MS-Demography program has dropped in the period 2009 to 2013 (shown in Table 10-1 reproduced from the QER). The decrease in enrollments reflects a decrease in applications in recent years. Possible reasons for this decrease include improvement in employment prospects for recent college graduates as the economy has improved and public concern about student loans, which is particularly salient for the MSD program because students are entirely self-funded. Shrinking cohort size is a concern as departments may cancel courses that have insufficient students to “make” (typically fewer than 6), and small cohorts threaten the Program’s ability to offer the required courses in demographic techniques, which typically attract only a few students from other programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Initial cohort size</th>
<th>Left program</th>
<th>On-time completions</th>
<th>Graduated 1 semester late</th>
<th>2 or more semesters late</th>
<th>In dual/joint degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10-1. Number of enrolled students who leave without graduating, graduate on-time, and graduate late, 2009-2014.

Indicators of overall student quality are displayed in Table E-2 (reproduced from the QER). Both these data and discussions with the Demography program faculty indicate no concerns with the quality of the students in the program.
2.2 Graduate Student Recruitment

Students learned about the Demography program primarily through (i) information posted on the undergraduate course websites of Center faculty members; (ii) personal encouragement by a Center faculty member in undergraduate classes; (iii) the social networks of alumni; and (iv) the Center’s website, http://popcenter.fsu.edu. This approach reflects that in the United States demography is almost exclusively studied in interdisciplinary graduate programs. As a result there are no undergraduate demography majors, and virtually no undergraduate courses in the field. This severely limits the avenues for recruiting MS students, making word of mouth and online advertising especially important. In the past year, the College has provided resources for student recruitment, including a brochure and a graduate recruitment open house. In Spring 2013, the College agreed to provide financial support to two meritorious members of the incoming cohort to incentivize enrollment.

2.3 Graduate Student Retention

The evidence from the QER and conversations with students indicate that retention is not a problem. Between 2009 and 2013, four students left the program: two students for academic reasons, one for family-related reasons, and one for unspecified reasons. The program has an over 90% completion rate. This rate reflects, in part, the small size of the program. Because faculty and students know each other, faculty members tend to be vested in student success and students are able to receive individualized help. In addition, small cohorts allow for a good deal of interaction between the CDPH director and students and between the director and faculty, so few students “fall through the cracks.”

2.4 Graduate Student Ethnic and Gender Diversity

Over the most recent five-year period, women have comprised 53% of enrolled students on average. Enrolled students are predominantly non-Hispanic White, with a five-year average of 77% and no clear trends in changing demographics of the student body. The racial/ethnic composition of enrolled students reflects the racial/ethnic composition of the applicant pool, and is in line with national trends in the discipline.

3. PLACEMENT INFORMATION AND OTHER INDICATORS OF THE QUALITY OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAM.
3.0 Student Job Placement

Data from the QER indicate that one of the Demography program’s greatest strengths is the placement of its graduates in relevant, quality positions that are a good fit to their professional training. From 2009-2013, 40 students graduated with the MS-Demography, excluding those in the joint MSP/MSD program, and 69% secured an “in-field” job, as indicated by job title (e.g., data analyst, statistician), place of employment (e.g., state government agency), or job duties (e.g., the Management Analyst for American Airlines is responsible for customer forecasting). A smaller share (15%) of alumni matriculated into another educational program, typically a doctoral program although one student obtained his certification as a Pharmacist and another obtained a Master’s degree in planning. About 10% found non-field employment (e.g., high school teacher), while 5% have been lost to follow-up.

This high rate of in-field placement reflects employers’ demands for employees with a demography skill set and two key characteristics of the program. First, students are encouraged to seek out summer internships and virtually all students who do so are hired shortly after (and sometimes, before) graduation, either into jobs in the agency in which they interned or through connections made during their internship. Second, students are encouraged to attend professional conferences in order to network with potential employers and most attend two annual meetings: of the Southern Demographic Association (SDA) in the fall and the Population Association of America (PAA) in the spring. To support their efforts to find internships and jobs, the program requires enrollment in a Professional Development Seminar in the fall semester, where students are coached in job search techniques, résumé construction, successful interviewing, appropriate dress and manners, and professional networking.

3.1. Comment on the numbers of students (particularly doctoral students) who publish their research and make presentations at meetings or make presentations/exhibitions or publish their creative activities. Describe any other indicators of student quality and success such as student awards, students obtaining fellowships or grants, etc.

While the program has no doctoral students, the evidence indicates that the master’s students are engaged in their professional association. Most students participate in the annual demography conferences, and some work closely with professors on applied project work and the occasional scholarly publication.

3.2 What do current and former students say of the program’s quality?

In tandem with the outside reviewer, the GPC subcommittee spoke at some length with current students in the program. Overall they report being well-served by the program, expertly advised by the Director, and with coursework that for the most part is challenging and perceived to be relevant. Among the notable strengths identified by the current students were (i) close interaction with a caring faculty, (ii) a Director that works hard and cares about the students, (iii) excellent computer and software resources, (iv) a strong sense of community within the program. When probed for concerns, the students identified many of the usual suspects, including (i) a desire for greater financial aid, (ii) less “academic” coursework, (iii) greater flexibility in the curriculum. None of these concerns were perceived to be major issues, but rather reflect the desire of students in programs to have greater resources and greater choices in their coursework.
The GPC subcommittee was unable to speak with graduates of the program, and the data in the QER on alumni attitudes towards the program is limited.

3.3. For doctoral programs comment on the quality of the student’s dissertations.

Not applicable.

3.4. What is the external reviewer’s assessment of the program’s quality?

Overall, outside reviewer Dr. John Iceland was quite positive about the Demography program. Among his key findings regarding program quality were:

“The Master of Science in Demography (MSD) is a highly functioning program with very good placements. After a decline in enrollments for a couple of years, the program has rebounded this year in part through effective recruitment of FSU undergraduates.”

4. CURRICULUM

The Demography curriculum must remain responsive to the current needs of potential employers, yielding graduates with intermediate-level ability to code in at least two statistical software packages; facility with internet based utilities to create, download, and manipulate large, complex datasets; advanced capabilities in Excel; and a working knowledge of ArcGIS. Candidates for the MSD attain these skills by completing a minimum of 18 credit-hours of data analysis and statistics courses—more than the 15 hours needed to qualify as a statistician in federal government jobs. Required quantitative coursework (and software) includes:

- a two-course sequence covering the sources and management of demographic data, as well as basic and advanced techniques of demographic analysis (Excel and R, Stata, or SAS);
- a course in forecasting and population projections (Excel);
- a GIS course (ArcGIS);
- a basic statistics course (Stata or SPSS); and
- an applied regression course (Stata).

An ongoing challenge is maintaining the curriculum’s analytic currency within the constraints of a one year program: adding new courses without cutting still-relevant courses. Since the 2006 QER, Demography has cut the number of electives (to one) and seminars (to two) to make room in the curriculum for the two course sequence in demographic techniques and the applied regression course.

Two additional changes since 2006 are the Master’s Research Paper practicum (DEM 5972), added in 2009, and the Professional Development seminar (DEM 5935), introduced in 2011. The practicum, offered every summer, helps students complete the required research paper in a single semester, by framing the process as a series of weekly assignments. The structure provided by the practicum has improved time to degree completion, allowing students to participate in paid professional internships while simultaneously completing an independent research paper. The “Pro-Sem” is a zero credit hour seminar where students learn the “soft skills” necessary for professional success including networking, dress and manners, résumé preparation, and interviewing.

4.1. Are there difficulties in course scheduling and availability?
The MSD curriculum is interdisciplinary, with required courses offered through multiple departments in the College and some approved electives offered by outside departments (e.g., Statistics). The MSD program does not schedule its own courses except for the research practicum and Pro-Sem; however, it is necessary to be sure that the scheduling of departmental courses is such that MSD students are able to take all their required courses each semester. Departments in the College have been generous in accommodating their course scheduling to the needs of the MSD students. However, the availability of seats in some courses is a concern. GIS courses, for example, are scheduled in a lab with a limited number of seats and MSD students can be shut out. There is an inherent tension between departments’ ability to accommodate MSD students and the size of MSD cohorts: The larger the cohort, the more difficult it is to ensure that courses required for the degree are available to all students each year.

*Are there an undue number of cross-listed courses (undergraduate versus graduate or masters versus doctoral)?*

The evidence indicates this is not a concern. MSD students are generally taking courses aimed at other graduate students in the College.

*Are course enrollments appropriate?*

With MSD cohorts of at least 8 students, enrollments are generally not a problem. In addition, MSD students typically participate in courses that have a built-in audience within the home unit. Departments benefit when MSD students help their courses “make” and the College benefits because the program increases enrollments in courses that are required for other degree programs.

*Are there bottlenecks in the program?*

The primary bottleneck in this one year program is the Summer term during which as many as fifteen students are seeking to complete their capstone paper. These papers must be read by at least two CDPH faculty, many of whom are only partially funded during the Summer term and/or are traveling in support of their research work.

*Are students able to find appropriate thesis or dissertation directors?*

There is no evidence to suggest this is a problem, and current students made no mention of this as an issue. However, were the program to regularly bring in 15-20 students the capstone load would be problematic. The QER documents indicate that the MSD target enrollment is 12 students each year. This seems appropriate given the modest resource base available to the program.

4.2 *Comment on the distinction between the various graduate degrees offered by the department, are the degrees sufficiently distinct?*

There is only one Demography degree.
4.3 How are students advised? Are advising loads appropriate? Does the program have a graduate student handbook and is the handbook adequate?

The Center director bears primary responsibility for student advising. Advising begins with a CDPH orientation, scheduled just prior to the start of the Fall semester. The first half hour is a “meet and greet” where the incoming cohort are introduced to the CDPH faculty Associates, staff, and each other. Faculty and staff then leave, and the Center director reviews with the new students the CDPH graduate student handbook, Center routines and norms, and the Fall course schedule. The director meets with each student on an individual basis after orientation about course schedules and at the end of the Fall and Spring semesters to review progress in the program. Students are encouraged to meet with the director at any time to discuss academic problems, programmatic concerns, or personal issues impacting their performance. The advantage of this approach is that it minimizes the advising load for the Center faculty. On the downside, this approach places a substantial burden on the CDPH Director, as they serve as the primary advisor for all students.

There is a CDPH handbook and it seems adequate for meeting the needs of the Demography students.

4.4 Do the students understand how to navigate through the program and what do current and former students say about the curriculum?

Current students report being well-advised, and that they are provided a clear understanding of the requirements of the degree program. This is to be expected as this is a one year program, with a very clear sequence of courses and limited curricular options for students within the 33 hour degree envelope.

The GPC subcommittee was unable to speak with graduates of the program, and the data in the QER on alumni attitudes towards their advising experience is limited.

5. Professional Preparation of the Students

5.1 Describe what the program does to prepare the students for their professional roles whether they are academic or nonacademic, research or teaching. If students in the program are supported as teaching assistants, what is done to prepare them for their teaching role?

The program does a fine job of preparing its students for a professional career in the field of Demography. This is reflected in the applied orientation of the curriculum, the internship experience, and the capstone paper requirement. The program has enhanced its curriculum since the last QER to ensure adequate professional preparation. In 2011, the program implemented a zero-credit Professional Development Seminar which meets weekly during the Fall semester, as noted above. In addition, a highlight of professional preparation is attending professional meetings. In October, students attend the annual meetings of the Southern Demographic Association, a small and student-friendly venue in which students first try out their new professional skills and gain confidence. By that point in the program, Pro-Sem has helped them develop résumé, present “elevator speeches” and business cards (supplied by CDPH), dress appropriately, and even meet and greet in a professional setting. At SDA, students attend sessions, meet MSD alumni, and participate in “pre-interviews” with Census Bureau staff. In the Spring, students attend the annual meetings of the Population Association of America, attended by 1,200-1,500 academic and applied demographers. Here,
students interview for summer internships and jobs, and network with potential employers at receptions and between sessions.

5.2 Describe how the program addresses the issue of scholarly integrity and professional standards and practices. Are such issues dealt with formally in a seminar or colloquium?

As described in Section 5.1, the program does a fine job of preparing its students for a professional career in the field of Demography.

6. FACULTY AND INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL (at all graduate levels)
Are there sufficient numbers of faculty to offer all elements of the curriculum? If there are gaps does the department/program have a plan for dealing with them? Comment on faculty teaching loads. Has the number of faculty grown or shrunk in the last five years and are there anticipated changes in the size of the faculty?

As of Fall 2014, CDPH has 11 tenured or tenure-track faculty and one part-time Research Faculty member, the director of the Applied Demographics Studio. Center faculty are drawn from three departments: Economics (1), Sociology (8), and Urban & Regional Planning (2). The relative representation of these three departments has shifted rather dramatically over the past decade. Most notably the representation of Sociology has grown, as that department has taken advantage of College efforts to increase its ties to the College of Medicine and create a program leading to the Master’s degree in Public Health. The representation of Economics has declined, as demographically-oriented faculty members have left and the Economics department has not hired new faculty with demographic interests. The Center has experienced substantial turnover in personnel since the last QER and a shift in research focus as well as a changing balance of departmental representation in recent years.

7. RESOURCES AND ADMINISTRATION (The below are only considered to the extent that they affect academic quality, in the judgment of the subcommittee)

1. Departmental governance – General characterization of method and evolution, but only as these affect academic quality.

During the prior QER, the Center was encouraged to establish an elected Executive Committee, which is advisory to the Director on all matters of policy and implementation. This committee was indeed established and it serves as the Admissions Committee and the Curriculum Committee for the MS-Demography program. Additionally, at that time the master’s curriculum was restructured in response to issues raised in the GPC review, and admissions procedures were standardized and the program established the use of two-faculty supervisory committees for master’s papers and compiled a graduate student handbook.

While the program has established an Exec Committee, discussions with the CDPH Director and the CDPH faculty revealed that there are not regular meetings, even annual meetings, of the CDPH faculty. Governance is largely at the hands of the Director, who is doing a fine job and remains supported by the CDPH faculty.
Given this, CDPH faculty report a continued lack of “centeredness”, in which faculty occupy the same physical space but largely operate as independent scholars with different levels of interest in and commitment to the Demography program. This is largely attributed to the arrangement in which faculty lines are associated with departments and not CDPH. As a result, there is a tension in which CDPH faculty allegiances are first to their home departments and only secondarily to the Center. The CDPH Director has no say in faculty annual evaluations or merit pay allocations. As a result, participation by CDPH faculty in Center activities is achieved primarily through the goodwill of the faculty and/or cajoling by the CDPH Director.

2. Budget – General evolution, adequacy and management, but only as it bears on the issue of academic quality.

The program has limited discretionary resources, with no teaching or research assistantships. In its previous iteration as a two academic year degree program, Demography controlled several assistantships and tuition waivers. However, after the most recent QER the MSD program was changed to a single calendar year and student financial support was dropped. In 2013-2014 the Demography program received a single tuition waiver from the College, split to support two students pursuing their MSD.

The program does support graduate student travel to the annual meetings of the Population Association of America and the Southern Demographic Association. In 2013-2014 the support totaled $600 per student, with funds coming from the Center’s centrally allocated funds.

As a center within the College, CDPH is expected to generate substantial contract & grant activity to promote faculty research, support graduate students, and provide funds (through SRAD) that can be used to fund Center activities and initiatives. Since the most recent QER the Center has not seen much contract and grant activity by its faculty. Over the five-year period from 2009 to 2013, CDPH faculty submitted a total of eleven applications to federal agencies, and only one application was funded (although the PI left FSU for another university before the award was made). Note that a ~10% success rate is typical for proposals submitted to the federal agencies that fund research in the Center’s areas of interest.

Discussions with the CDPH Director and faculty indicate that this lack of funded activity is a shared concern, and all understand that this contributes to the Center’s lack of discretionary resources. This lack of activity is attributed to several things:

1. A dearth of senior, “big money” scholars who regularly and successfully obtain outside funding. The program at one time had faculty like this, but these individuals are no longer at FSU due to retirements and departures for other universities.
2. A lack of resources and incentives to support the development of large, complicated, multi-disciplinary research proposals.
3. Due to the low success rates in this field and a lack of credit for unsuccessful research proposals, faculty believe that their time is better spent on scholarly outputs like articles, books, and chapters.

3. Library and information resources

The QER and conversations with students yielded no concerns about library and information resources.
4. **Equipment and other moveable resources** – e.g. laboratory material, recording equipment or other items relevant to the field in question.

Students in the MSD program are provided a desktop computer with direct internet connections. These are HP Business Desktops with Intel I7 Core processors, networked to two shared HP LaserJet P3010 printers. Each computer runs MS Windows and Office 2010 and is equipped with Stata, SPSS, and SAS.

Information technology is sufficient for program needs. All faculty have computers and office printers, and some have laptops which the Center has been able to replace on an as-needed basis, through the state budget or through a University-funded technology budget administered by the College. The Center purchases licenses for Stata, SPSS, SAS, ArcGIS, and other software requested by faculty. IT support, including computer purchase recommendations, setup, connectivity problems, and software installation, is provided by the College’s IT staff.

5. **Building and space resources**

CDPH occupies the east side of the sixth floor of Bellamy. This compact area comprises about 5,000 square feet and was last renovated in 2003. The space includes 16 offices occupied by CDPH faculty Associates, doctoral students working with faculty Associates, emeriti faculty, and visiting international scholars (four over the past 24 months); two rooms of carrels for MS-Demography students and for graduate students in the College who need secure access to the Add Health data; the Center library and reading room; a supply room; and the main Center office, which houses the director’s office and one staff office. The space is sufficient for current faculty, staff, and students. However, any growth in the faculty could displace doctoral students and/or impinge on the ability of the Center to provide space to international scholars.

In addition, the Center coordinates with the Askew School of Public Administration, which occupies the west side of Bellamy’s sixth floor, in the operation of two additional rooms: a 500-square foot computer laboratory with 20 networked machines, a podium with computer and multimedia controls; and a 300- square foot conference room that seats 20 persons.

Students in the MSD program have individual carrels in one of two shared offices in the Center, which provides shelves for books, a locked storage area, and a desktop computer with direct internet connections. Students have key-card access to their office space at night and on weekends and holidays.

Space was not raised as a concern during meetings with faculty and students.
8. Summary ANALYSIS
Discuss the main areas of strength and weakness in the graduate program(s) and the factors that seem to explain these observations.

Major Strengths
In the QER, the program identifies its core strengths as:
1. A strong Master’s of Demography program, with strong students and an applied curriculum that prepares these students for high-quality employment opportunities, which it helps them secure;
2. A collegial faculty that generates substantial scholarly output and are visible within their respective disciplines;
3. A commitment by the CDPH faculty to serve MSD students and ensure they are well-advised and graduate on-time.

The GPC subcommittee and the external reviewer validated these strengths, and believe that the MSD program has a very strong foundation for continued success. The evidence indicates that since the last QER the program has made improvements to its advising structure and its approach to ensuring adequate professional preparation for its students, despite limited resources and despite the transition to a one year degree program. The program is led well by its Director, the CDPH faculty have a clear affinity for the program and each other, and the students seem very happy with their experiences in the program.

Major Weaknesses
In the QER, the program identifies its primary weaknesses as:
1. A lack of contract and grant activity with a Center that is intended to generate substantial outside funding to support some of its costs;
2. A lack of “centeredness”, which has yielded a setting of productive individual scholars, but very little shared intellectual output and a lack of attention to duties and activities that make centers like this successful.

The GPC subcommittee and the external reviewer validated these weaknesses, and would add the following:
3. A lack of local, discretionary resources to support student enrollments and Center activities;
4. Limited staffing available to support Center activities and the Demography program, which leads to substantial administrative work by the CDPH Director on things like admissions, advising, and reporting;
5. A lack of authority by the Center Director to ensure commitment by CDPH faculty to attend to their Center and Demography program responsibilities.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS ---

1. To promote “centeredness” and enhance connections between the CDPH faculty, the Center should have at least one required meeting of the Center faculty per semester to assess program performance, seek opportunities for collaborations, discuss progress, etc.

2. The CDPH should strongly consider developing and adopting a strategic plan that at minimum updates the vision for the Center, identifies a desired size for the CDPH faculty
and identifies the desired departmental mix for these faculty, articulates the current and desired research emphases of the faculty, and describes the goals and enrollment targets of the MSD program. This plan should be developed with input from CDPH faculty, students, and alumni, chairs of affected COSSPP units, and the Dean.

3. To the extent that it is consistent with the mission and priorities of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy and the University, CDPH should receive additional funding for a dedicated full-time staff person to serve the Center and MSD program.

4. To the extent that it is consistent with the mission and priorities of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy and the University, the Center should establish a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the College that requires line units to hire faculty to work in and support the Center with the goal of bringing units in alignment with the faculty mix outlined in the CDPH strategic plan. This MOU would establish the priority to address Center needs in the event that existing CDPH faculty are no longer at FSU or their research interests take them away from work in the Center.

5. To the extent that it is consistent with the mission and priorities of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy and the University, the CDPH Director should be afforded an opportunity to provide input to the annual evaluations prepared by the home unit Department Chair for faculty affiliated with the Center. This input should take the form of a narrative assessment of the faculty member’s contributions to the Center during the current year under review.

6. To the extent that it is consistent with the mission and priorities of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy and the University, the Center should receive additional financial aid funding in the form of an increased tuition waiver allocation sufficient to support at least four in-state students and OPS funds to support at least two graduate assistants.

7. To the extent that it is consistent with the mission and priorities of the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy and the University, the Center and College should explore ways to provide seed funding to help faculty pursue funded research opportunities.

8. The GPC Subcommittee recommends that the program be continued.