REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

For

Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR) of
Accreditation

To: University of California San Francisco

Date of Visit: October 28-30, 2020 (Virtually)

Team Roster

Chair: Mark Schlissel, President
University of Michigan

Assistant Chair: Jillian Kinzie, Associate Director, Center for Postsecondary
Research
Indiana University Bloomington

Team Member: Marie Chisholm-Burns
Dean Admin-College of Pharmacy; Professor Surgery- General
University of Tennessee Health Science Center

Team Member: Robyn Nelson
Dean, College of Nursing West Coast University

Team Member: Douglas Gross Senior Lecturer
University of California, Davis

WSCUC Liaison: Mark Goor, Vice President WASC Senior College and
University Commission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

IA. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

UCSF is one of the world's great biomedical research institutions. It is also a graduate and professional level university, although the research and clinical care enterprise dwarfs the educational component. Based on two distinct but similarly-sized campuses about four miles (20-30 minutes) apart in San Francisco, UCSF has highly ranked Schools of Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Nursing as well as a Physical Therapy program and Graduate Division, with a total of about 3,200 degree-seeking students. In addition, there are vast numbers of other trainees on the two campuses including about 1,100 postdoctoral fellows, and 1,600 Residents (in Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmacy). Only about 1% of UCSF's $7.1B budget comes from tuition and about 2% from the State. The vast majority of funds are provided by clinical revenue (61%) and grants and contracts (21%). UCSF is the nation's largest public recipient of NIH funding and has been so for the past seven years.

In the decade since its last accreditation, growth of the institution has been dramatic, mainly at its Mission Bay campus which has tripled in size. It has done a good job promoting diversity amongst its students, with 64% being women and 23% under-represented minorities. Nearly the entire leadership of the university has turned over in the past decade, one exception being the former Medical School Dean, Dr. Sam Hawgood, who now serves a Chancellor (the overall campus leader). Senior leadership has grown with the addition of five new Vice Chancellor portfolios and several other campus level executives. There is also a new system president, Dr. Michael Drake, a physician and former UCSF faculty member, who was president of Ohio State University and Chancellor of UC-Irvine. UCSF is likely to benefit from system leadership that is familiar with and understands academic medical centers.

There are two new Ph.D. programs and five new master's programs spread across the campus units. Both the Medical School and the Pharmacy School have totally revamped their curricula. The new

medical school curriculum features a heightened focus on working in interprofessional teams along with a focus on seven MD competencies--patient care, medical knowledge, practice-based learning and improvement, interpersonal and communication skills, professionalism, systems-based practice, and interprofessional collaboration. It features a capstone experience called "career launch", which includes a scholarly project in alignment with the student's career goals. The medical curriculum also features each student being assigned a "coach" to serve as mentor throughout all four years. The PharmD program has recast itself with a focus on "scientific thinking", as well as a capstone discovery project in a relevant field anywhere across the institution. In its 2014 interim report, UCSF highlighted the development of a centralized institutional research infrastructure; the use of data to assess learning; work to enhance IT; and a commitment to continue their emphasis on diversity initiatives. One of the results of increasing capacity in institutional research is the thematic pathway project that is the focus of this accreditation—post-graduation career outcomes.

UCSF's institutional values are represented by the acronym PRIDE-- professionalism, respect, integrity, diversity and excellence. The work to diversify its academic community and to create an inclusive environment for research and teaching is led by a Vice Chancellor who has been in her position for a decade. Goals in this area include: to build a broadly diverse faculty, student, trainee, and staff community; to nurture a culture that is welcoming and supportive; and to engage diverse ideas for the provision of culturally competent education, discovery, and patient care. Their work involves outreach and pipeline programs, an office aimed at the prevention of harassment and discrimination, and resource centers focused on LGBTQ and multicultural support. Diversity goals inform their faculty recruitment process and search committees undergo unconscious bias training. They also take advantage of the Chancellor's Postdoctoral Scholars program which provides pathways to the faculty for underrepresented scholars. Despite sincere efforts and a major investment of people and resources,

progress diversifying the student body has been limited. Another area that might benefit from intense effort is the climate around gender in the medical school and hospitals. This is a nationwide challenge in which UCSF could be a leader because of their institutional values and high profile.

The past decade has also seen an increased focus on programs to enhance student success, especially for those who are experiencing difficulty. UCSF launched a student success center and a web site that captures a full range of student support offices and activities including services for students with disabilities, student health and counseling, academic support, career development, financial services, housing, fitness and recreation and other areas. In recognition of the growing needs for the support of mental health, there is now a Director of Mental Health Services and counseling staffing levels that exceed recommended ratios. Finally, in recognition of the extremely high cost of housing, UCSF currently subsidizes student rents and is building several large new residence halls that will be available at below market rents. This is less important now, during the COVID-19 pandemic, when rents have decreased significantly in San Francisco. They also provide access to a food bank to promote fresh and healthy eating and diminish food insecurity. All of these changes are important and valuable additions from the student perspective.

Despite being a graduate research university, UCSF has shown an admirable commitment to serve the broader San Francisco community through engagement with its K-12 school system. The thirty-year-old Science and Health Education Partnership involves 200 UCSF volunteers each year bringing hands-on science lessons to classrooms throughout the city. They also host a Bay Area Science Festival each year, attended by ~75,000 people.

UCSF's success at fundraising has helped fuel its growth. The institution devoted $200M of a $500M gift from the Diller Foundation to an endowment to support professional degree students and the

medical school raised an additional $100M for scholarships. Overall, a recently completed campaign raised over $6B. UCSF benefits greatly in this regard from its location in the Bay area.

IB. Description of the Team's Review Process

Members of the team began their evaluation work by reading the UCSF Institutional Report and a variety of documents linked in the documents provided by the institution. The team analyzed the materials available and everyone completed worksheets to summarize information including strengths, weaknesses, and specific questions for further inquiry relative to the WSCUC Components and Standards. The chair had separate discussions with the Chancellor and the system President prior to the Site Review, and one of our members visited the Mission Bay campus. Once compiled, these worksheets and meetings helped the whole team focus on critical elements of UCSF's Institutional Report in preparation for the team call and the virtual Site Review. The team reviewed the visit schedule and assigned teams members to specific interview sessions. A final draft visit schedule was prepared by UCSF's Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and sent to the team prior to the remote visit. A confidential email account was established to allow for greater participation from the campus community and to receive any information that might be deemed sensitive. It was monitored by the assistant chair and, ultimately, shared with all of the team members.

The remote Accreditation Visit began with a team executive planning session on Tuesday October 27, 2020 at which the team reviewed the final visit schedule and identified specific questions to be pursued during each group or individual meeting. The campus visit started on Wednesday, October 28, 2019. During the next two days, the team met via Zoom with a range of constituencies and individuals and learned a lot more about the institution, its organizational structure, its values, and the faculty, staff and students. The visit ended on October 30, 2020 with a private meeting between the team chair and chancellor followed by a public exit meeting during which the final commendations and

recommendations were read. The team was grateful for UCSFs responsiveness to our requests and to organizing a smooth remote visit.

It was clear to our team that UCSF conducted a thorough and thoughtful internal review with input from key constituencies. The team recognizes and affirms the hard work that UCSF put into their report and in responding to our requests for additional documents or adjustments to the schedule. As a result of this review and remote visit, our team has come to understand UCSF's mission, progress and future directions. Despite the challenges of the format, the visit team was treated with great virtual hospitality and received outstanding support. All those we visited with were respectful of the accreditation process and candid in their answers to our questions.

IC. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

UCSF's Institutional Report is a comprehensive and well-written document. The quality and scope of evidence and the description of the institutions' engagement with their review process are excellent. What was missing from UCSF's outline of the past decade was the description of an underlying strategy that might have explained the focus of its broad institutional growth. There is clarity on overall institutional goals, however, including: innovating health care approaches for the world's most vulnerable populations, training the next generation of doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, physical therapists, and scientists; supporting elementary and high school education; and translating scientific discoveries into better health for everyone. UCSF is known as a highly collaborative place to teach and do research. This helps them overcome the fact that they are split between two campuses and many schools. What it is challenged by is the absence of the intellectual breadth of a great research university. Biomedical research has increasingly benefited from important contributions from what are known as the "convergent disciplines" -- engineering, physics, mathematics, statistics, chemistry and an array of social sciences. Faculty at UCSF have to develop these types of collaborations outside of their

university. Fortunately, they benefit from UC-Berkeley and Stanford being nearby. Berkeley and UCSF actually share joint programs in bioengineering, medical anthropology and translational medicine.

One would have liked to see more in the case statement about how UCSF integrates its two campuses from an educational perspective. No doubt the approach relies on technology, but how well does it work and how do students on one campus benefit from the breadth of learning opportunities on the other campus? How much redundancy is there in class offerings and to what extent does the university feel and function like a single community, or two campuses linked by a shared bureaucracy? The team explored these issues during the visit and determined from multiple comments by administrators, faculty, staff and students that the two campuses are well-integrated and individuals based at one feel a part of the whole. There is a strong sense of community.

UCSF's choice of theme for this TRP report grew out of its work to enhance institutional research capacity, data analytics infrastructure, and the initiation of a consortium of public and private research universities called the Coalition for Next Generation Life Science. Founded by Johns Hopkins University President Ron Daniels, the goal of this effort in transparency is to help aspiring graduate students and postdoctoral fellows understand and compare the differences in outcomes between training programs in the life sciences. UCSF was one of ten founding university members. In addition to being valuable for applicants, each institution's data can also be used to probe the match between what the faculty believe they are training their students to do and what they actually end up doing with their careers. This may lead either to an adjustment in curriculum to optimize success in the pathways their students are known to follow, or to change the nature of their programs and who they admit to better match what future roles the faculty hope their students will fill in society. These more inwardly focused aspects of this data project do not as yet appear to have been effectively mined. Various deans' pointed

out that they had been on target to have data and analyses before this visit, but they were derailed by the pandemic.

The institution began preparing for this review in April of 2018 developing a process that involved a large steering committee consisting of administrators, faculty, staff and students from all parts of the institution and led by the Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Affairs. She is also the dean of the Graduate Division. As hoped for, the process of developing their case for reaccreditation resulted in the sharing of best practices across the institution and also helped individual programs with their own professional accreditation renewals.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS
Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

UCSF's last WASC accreditation, completed in March 2011, produced an action letter requesting that the institution provide an interim report in 2014 and focus on four areas for improvement: 1) Building Institutional Research Infrastructure; 2) Assessing Learning and Using Data; 3) Enhancing Information Technology; and 4) Continuing Diversity Initiatives.

In response, the university reorganized a number of separate units to form a coherent and greatly strengthened Office of Institutional Research. The result was better access and collaboration across the many datasets and sources necessary for strategic leadership and self-evaluation. The structural change enhanced collaboration with public affairs, development, alumni relations and the budget office. In addition, the ability of the Office of Diversity and Outreach to take a more data driven approach to its work was enhanced.

A related mandate was to improve the campus' IT infrastructure. In response, the campus integrated IT across its clinical and academic operations and appointed a single CIO, providing a level of synergy and robustness that neither entity had on its own. They went on to develop an IT roadmap to

guide investments, and more recently, established an IT Governance Committee to coordinate strategic investments and assure a focus on Educational Technology. Like many institutions, the past decade has seen increased investments in cybersecurity, wireless network infrastructure, cloud-based collaboration tools, and an enhanced identity management system. In addition, they are developing a shared data warehouse that allows individual units to merge data from various sources to guide decision-making. Investments have also been made in cloud computing, high-performance computing and data visualization. However, during the visit the team learned that the various academic units participating in data collection for this TPR did not utilize a common data depository. The team encourages UCSF to establish a common data depository.

In response to the mandate to improve learning assessment, the campus implemented a "comprehensive plan for graduate program review" in 2013. This process involves a self-study which captures relevant data, an external review committee, and an evaluation by the Graduate Council. This is quite similar to processes used at many other research intensive universities.

Finally, UCSF has continued to invest in diversity, equity, and inclusion as described in detail, above. In response to the 2010 review, they consolidated diversity efforts into a new Office of Diversity and Outreach that coordinates efforts across the whole campus and promotes best practices. They also implemented a structured mentoring program for faculty from underrepresented groups and an analogous program for staff. Recruitment of diverse faculty has been enhanced by additional focus on search committee practices, including unconscious bias, and a requirement that all faculty job candidates include a statement about their contributions to diversity in their application materials. In addition, they began pipeline programs at the high school and college levels to help build the population of diverse students with interest in the biomedical and health sciences. Within the curriculum, student activism led to a curriculum review process with the goal of eliminating microaggressions and stereotyping.

In sum, UCSF has made a good faith and effective effort to respond to requests made during the 2011 review, and has continued their commitment in these areas long after their 2014 Interim Report. The data infrastructure and program review elements helped give rise to the TPR theme of career outcomes.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

UCSF did a thorough job assessing compliance with the Standards and federal requirements and completing the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI). The IEEI is intended to provide assurance that every degree program has in place a system for assessing, tracking, and improving the learning of its students. UCSF's collaborative approach among the vice and associate deans for education and academic programs in all Schools and the Graduate Division to completing the Standards Review, the Compliance worksheets and the IEEI forms show that the review was undertaken thoughtfully. The involvement of key faculty, the vice chancellor of student academic affairs, Title IX officer, vice chancellor of diversity and outreach, among others, reflects an inclusive process incorporating perspectives throughout the university.

The IEEI worksheet was widely shared and discussed to collectively determine what was learned and to identify common issues worthy of improving. In fact, the IEEI dovetailed nicely with the work done by several programs for their professional accreditations. The process itself seemed to sharpen compliance with policies and standards, and confirmed that UCSF has the resources necessary to carry out its mission to educate and graduate students in the health professions and life sciences. UCSF has clearly demonstrated institutional capacity as the only institution within the University of California system dedicated solely to graduate education in the health professions and life sciences. In addition, UCSF has demonstrated compliance with all four federal requirements: credit hour policy and program length, marketing and recruitment, student complaints policy, and transfer credit policy. The team's

review of UCSF's IEEI report and the WASC team's evaluation are included in the appendices of this report (See appendix A1 and A2).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UCSF has provided evidence of compliance with all four of the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation and has demonstrated a strong commitment to use of the Standards consistently. The sections below describe the results of the team's review of each Standard.

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

UCSF has a clearly defined, distinctive and longstanding mission. The institution, Schools, Graduate Division and Department of Physical Therapy have published mission statements and established educational objectives aligned with those purposes (CFR 1.1, 1.2). The institution has a clear and explicit sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparency, and autonomy. The institution has published policies on academic freedom (CFR 1.3) and ensures that it operates with appropriate autonomy (CFR 1.5).

A particular strength is the campus-wide leadership in building diversity in all aspects of UCSF mission and UCSF's "PRIDE" values, and Principles of Community among other evidence of its commitment to diversity (CFR 1.4). UCSF is committed to recruiting and retaining a diverse student population (CFR 1.4); programs have invested time and resources to ensure equity and inclusion in all facets of program curriculum and administration, and specific examples, including the equity review of students selected into the Alpha Omega Alpha (AOA) honor medical society, and the expansion of academic enrichment activities, career development and planning, and peer mentorship enrichment programs for underrepresented minority students, demonstrate UCSF's commitment to improving equity and inclusion within its educational programs. However, while UCSF has myriad programs and efforts

in place, and profound motivation for diversification, a more strategic focus is recommended to achieve the institution's goals for faculty and student diversity. UCSF has unique opportunities given its structure and mission to strengthen current outreach and recruitment efforts for faculty and student diversity, in particular, increasing diversity in department chairs and key leadership roles. In addition, as a graduate and professional degree-granting institution the institution is clearly invested in pipeline programs, and would be wise to leverage partnerships with Minority-Serving Institutions (HBCUs, HSIs, and AANAPISI's) to expand opportunity. Relatedly, the Thematic Pathway provided a new opportunity to focus on career outcomes and equity (CFR 1.4). Accessible and clear policies and codes of conduct, and integrity in implementation and fair responses to grievances are well-documented (CFR 1.6, 1.7). UCSF displays honest communication regarding accreditation status (CFR 1.8).

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1. However, the team recommends that UCSF build a more strategic focus to achieve the institution's goals for student and faculty diversity (CFR 1.4).

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

UCSF has established educational goals through core functions of the institution in a reflective and analytical way. As indicated above, UCSF's inclusive review process made extensive use of the Review under the Standards worksheet for considering evidence of achievement of standards and CFRs. Coherent curricular philosophy, and rigorous and meaningful external program reviews and professional accreditation reviews affirm that the degree programs are tied to mission and meet the requirements set by their respective disciplines (CFRs 2.2b, 2.7. 2.11). Career outcomes data are essential to the maintenance of program review (CFR 2.7) including evidence from external constituencies (employers) that programs are providing the relevant educational experiences for career success. Data on time to

degree, graduation rates, and licensure exam pass rates confirmed the success of UCSF students in completing their programs of study (CFRs 1.2, 2.10). UCSF relies on student input on a doctoral exit survey to assess educational quality and specifically, what students found most and least helpful about the faculty, to guide program and instructional improvement (CFR 2.10). Syllabi and curriculum committees confirmed the representation of student learning outcomes (CFRs 2.3, 2.4). Sample assessment reports provided evidence of student achievement of stated learning and program outcomes (CFR 2.6) and example program reviews demonstrated systematic and reflective program reviews (CFR 2.7).

Expectations for scholarship and creative activity for students and faculty are articulated and promoted (CFR's 2.8, 2.9). Student support programs and clear and complete advising information are components of student services (CFR 2.11, 2.12, 2.13). Yet, UCSF's decision to pursue a thematic review of career outcomes revealed a need for information about student success and outcomes. The institution understands the need for transparency of career trajectories and post UCSF employment. In addition, the assessment of the upgrades to the student experience, including information about the effectiveness of cost of living supports for students and new campus housing needs seem under-developed. Discussions during the visit satisfied the team that UCSF has a holistic approach and is meeting student demand, but these student priorities deserve to be routinely assessed for their effectiveness. Furthermore, it is evident that UCSF is working to enhance need-based scholarships to diminish inequities. In sum, as in UCSF's candid self-appraisal, the team affirms that areas for growth include continued emphasis and assessment of supports to students through cost of living supplements, approaches to addressing food insecurity and other upgrades to student life and support. More information about graduate career trajectories and outcomes (disaggregated by racial-ethnic groups), are

important issues for continuous monitoring. The team also supports UCSF's interest in involving alumni in the assessment of educational programs and the student experience.

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

UCSF supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and an effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These elements help promote the achievement of institutional purpose and create a high-quality environment for learning. Policies and procedures pertaining to employment relationships are documented and significant initiatives are outlined, including the Center for Faculty Educators, Campus Council on Faculty Life and professional staff development programs, to support faculty and staff (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3). Fiscal, physical and information resources are in place and aligned with educational purposes and objectives (CFRs 3.4, 3.5). Organizational decision making is reasonable, and the use of strongly vetted University of California system-wide policies and procedures is a particular strength in this standard (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10).

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 3.

Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

UCSF engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. Processes of quality assurance and recent expansion of institutional research capacity has enhanced the institutions strategic visioning and use of institutional inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, plan, and improve

quality and effectiveness (CFR 4.1, 4.2). Dashboards and student services satisfaction surveys have helped guide improvements (CFR 4.2). The culture of evidence-based practice provides a strong curricular and evaluation foundation in all degree programs (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.5).

UCSFs Institutional Report revealed some challenges with the institutional learning and improvement related standards, specifically in relation to making progress on the institution's career trajectory theme (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6 and 4.7). The report discussed that the project is enjoying strong support and results seem to be meaningful to the institution. However, data collection, the identification of metrics and benchmarks, and analysis have advanced slowly. During the visit, the team learned more about the significant variability and challenges to the intended plan to create common taxonomies, data collection approaches, data warehousing, and what contributed to these challenges. Given UCSFs commitment to its chosen theme of tracking career and graduate outcomes, it is vital that the institution accelerate efforts in data collection and analysis, particularly in the professional schools, shifting energy to using data to generate insights leading to program improvement. It was also clear to the team that the connections between the Thematic Pathway data can also be used to help strengthen and support efforts to diversify the overall institution and specific academic fields, in particular with regard to UCSF's mission to address health care disparities.

During the visit the team learned more about the mechanisms and data systems to advance and sustain data collection, interpretation, and use of results emerging from the Thematic Pathway project. It seems that the common database (Education Data Warehouse) for career outcomes has been set up, but Schools are currently relying on their own data systems, and have not yet populated the common database. In addition to establishing a common database, it is also important to develop a strategy and to dedicate resources to ensure that the career outcomes data being generated will be used to drive ongoing collaboration between OCPD and the Office of Diversity and Outreach, and each of the Schools and

Graduate Division (CFR 4.3; 4.4). Therefore, the team recommends that UCSF establish a common data repository (Education Data Warehouse) for career outcomes for all Schools and the Graduate Division. In addition, the team recommends that UCSF take greater advantage of the school and program accreditation evidence that is regularly collected, and to seek more input from alumni, including information about their job choices, career satisfaction, employment in underserved communities, and how the graduates are meeting workforce needs and addressing challenges that have curricular implications. Finally, the team learned about several school and program data collection efforts focused on interview and focus groups that could contribute to data collection efforts and at the same time provide opportunities for meaningful outreach to alumni.

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4. Yet, the team identified three recommendations in relation to this standard and the institution's achievement of its Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

Component 8: Institution-specific Theme-Tracking and Reporting Career Outcomes

The theme-based approach to reaffirmation of accreditation offered UCSF the opportunity for campus-wide engagement in a quality improvement process. The institution intended to gain insight into career trajectories on an annual basis for graduates in the life sciences and health professions, in order to provide transparency for prospective and current students and guidance for faculty and administrators in support of program improvement and innovation. Career outcomes are an important indicator of the effectiveness of UCSF's educational programs. The institution demonstrated a unified commitment to continuous quality improvement through the thematic program review.

Alignment with the Standards and CFRs

The institution-specific theme of tracking and reporting career outcomes aligns specifically with two CFRs from Standard 1, Defining Institutional Purpose and Ensuring Educational Objectives. CFR 1.2 calls for the institution to regularly generate, evaluate and make public data about student achievement. The career outcomes data will enable UCSF to ensure that its educational objectives result in successful career engagement. CFR 1.4 speaks to the WSCUC commitment to diversity, which will be met as the career outcomes data will be sortable by gender and underrepresented minority status. This information will hold the university accountable to providing equal preparation for career opportunities and experiences to the increasingly diverse student population.

Career outcomes data are essential to meeting Standard 2, Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions. Program review (CFR 2.7) and retention and graduation data (CFR 2.10) will be informed by the evidence from employers affirming the career success of UCSF graduates, and enable the institution to add another critical dimension for benchmarking against current program aspirations and those of peer institutions. CFR 2.12 addresses that students should receive complete and relevant information regarding academic requirements, and the theme intends to provide transparency regarding career outcomes which will be an important addition to marketing materials. CFR 2.13 speaks to career counseling and placement, and the thematic data will support the development of relevant and meaningful co-curricular programming by the Office of Career and Professional Development.

The theme chosen by UCSF is most applicable to Standard 4, Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement. CFR 4.1 calls for the institution to collect, analyze, and interpret data which tracks learning results and CFR 4.2 addresses the importance of institutional research capacity and effectiveness. It appears IR expansion began in 2015, well before the TPR. The institution proposed to collect comparable data from the healthcare programs, however, found significant variability and challenges to an intended "one size fits all" plan. CFR 4.3

affirms the importance of leadership commitment at all levels to institutional improvement based on data, which was evident in the thematic approach. CFR 4.5 expects appropriate stakeholders (alumni, employers, students) to participate in the assessment of educational programs.

The TPR complemented the on-going institutional efforts to use data to assess student achievement, adding feedback from a broader group of stakeholders to determine alignment of the graduate programs with workforce needs. Lastly, CFR 4.7 requires the institution to consider changes that may impact or should be considered when planning new programs and allocating resources. As a leading institution of higher education, the tracking and reporting career outcomes theme chosen by UCSF was intended to align external changes with internal planning, program development, and resource allocation. The thematic approach to re-accreditation supported the institution's desire to support curricular innovations as they prepare the next generation of leaders.

Design and Approach to Investigate the Theme

The theme emerged from the Graduate Division in early 2010 following the WSCUC reaccreditation emphasis on learning outcomes, which measured the success of the PhD curricula in preparing graduates for job placement. There was no question that students were engaged in scholarly activities, however, the PhD program was not addressing the institutional focus on meeting the workforce and professional demands of the communities served. As the academic leaders contemplated job placement, the results from the 2012 NIH biomedical workforce report were released, confirming that biomedical PhDs were gainfully employed, with only a minority in tenured/tenure-track faculty positions. The report recommended that biomedical graduate programs should prepare students for a greater range of careers and openly communicate the career outcomes to potential students. UCSF anticipated faculty might disregard the national data as not representative of UCSF alumni, however, a pilot study revealed comparable results for the institution. In 2013 the institution received a Broadening

Experiences in Scientific Training grant to develop and implement a career exploration program for biomedical trainees. Pilot results mirrored the NIH data; post-doctoral scholars were finding employment outside the halls of the academy. UCSF believed their mission was to prepare the workforce, however, they needed to understand how the educational system needed to change. The institution hypothesized students would benefit from career and professional development as part of the curriculum.

A partnership with Johns Hopkins in 2017, the WSCUC announcement of the TPR, and data from a retrospective study of post-doctoral scholars from 2002-2017 served as the boost to pursue the expansion of a career tracking and reporting system for all degree programs at UCSF. Initially the institution intended to have a standardized set of alumni career outcomes; develop a taxonomy applicable to all professional degree programs; and implement a technical structure for data collection, storage and reporting. The institution learned that no single career taxonomy could capture the pathways of graduates from five different professional degrees. A set of common data elements (20 different pieces of information) were handed off to the university Education Data Council who determined the data collection tools, and data input interfaces.

The institution attempted to align the career outcomes tracking process and quality improvement efforts within each degree program. There were different needs for career outcomes data, what to collect, how to analyze, and how to present information. The institution focused on designing a dedicated organizational protocol and display platform to enable the programs to use the data for continuous curricular and co-curricular improvement. The intent of the TPR was to promote significant institutional engagement and improvement in the collection and reporting of the career outcomes of graduates across all programs for up to 15 years. There was a thoughtful process for identifying the theme and an impressive degree of involvement and commitment of all programs to explore the data.

The thematic program review was an exemplar of interprofessional collaboration, an important shared institutional interest and value.

<u>Evidence and Thematic Analysis</u>

UCSF's chosen theme originated from conversations in 2010 regarding what were meaningful learning outcomes to measure the success of PhD curricula, focusing on the question of job placement. A retrospective study of the career outcomes of PhD graduates between 1997 and 2006 was conducted. As previously presented, the data prompted discussion about the role of career and professional development in graduate education. Another pilot study of the career outcomes of UCSF post-doctoral scholars who graduated 2000-2013 was completed, and concluded these scholars were finding employment outside the halls of the academy. It appears that the accomplishments largely focused on the methodology, data collection and plans for dissemination of the results from the retrospective studies of the career outcomes for the PhD and post-doctoral scholars completed in 2018.

The TPR proposed a consistent and reproducible methodology to ensure data could be updated annually. The institution successfully built programming interfaces between Human Resources and the database system where career outcomes data are recorded; developed workflow for internet searches for career outcomes; incorporated an audit process to ensure accuracy and consistency in data classification; and projected human and financial resources needed to support the annual updating of the data. An attempt was made to develop a system of tracking outcomes for five (5) non-nursing master's programs. Aggregation of the data were not possible. UCSF presented the PhD data at two town halls in January 2020. Career outcomes data for the PhD and post-doctoral graduates resulted in the addition of four (4) co-curricular courses that are intended to support career and professional development, e.g., Preparing for a Faculty Career and Graduate Student Internships for Career Exploration and Professional Development. The career outcomes data also appear to have facilitated a culture change among

graduate faculty in terms of improving the mentoring of students and post-doctoral scholars. Faculty have become more enthusiastic about providing time and space for trainees to engage in career exploration and professional development activities. Faculty are now expected to participate in at least one mentor development workshop each year if they have students in their lab. The importance of mentorship and coaching was articulated across programs and degrees by faculty, current students, and alums.

The institution reported that in 2019 the professional degree programs of dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, and physical therapy were engaged in decision-making regarding the methodology and taxonomy to use, considering the structure and frequency for data collection and analysis, and how to disseminate the career outcomes data. The professional degree programs are professionally accredited, and already provide aggregate data in accordance with accreditation requirements. The career outcomes data may inform more fully the information of interest to the professional accreditors. The career outcomes metrics have the potential to provide students with professional development resources, improve the focus of educational programs, determine the extent to which graduates are practicing in underserved communities, and whether UCSF is meeting workforce demands. The institution should consider moving beyond quantitative metrics, and collect appropriate qualitative data.

Thematic Conclusions and Challenges

The institution concluded that there were significant differences among the degree programs, to the extent that a single methodology for tracking outcomes was not possible. Rather the university empowered each program to develop an individual plan that best suited the needs of the students and the educational mission of the program. Programs chose different approaches for the collection and storage of data. This was described as allowing flexibility based on organizational structure. However, the institution is encouraged to use a common data repository to better enable collaboration between career

services, diversity and outreach, and the schools and programs. Implementation of the theme required trained individuals to collect, analyze, and update the career outcomes on an annual basis. Adequacy of staff trained to carry out the thematic initiative was a challenge and appears to have been implemented differently in each program and delayed collection and publishing of any career outcomes on the institutional dashboard. Dedicated resources to ensure the career outcomes data are being generated, collected, and stored, and will support student success, and quality improvement.

The team appreciated the efforts of the institution to explore the tracking of career outcomes to align the mission with graduation achievement. However, it is concerning that no analysis of data outside of the graduate division work, which concluded in 2018, was completed and implementation of the theme was delayed. There was evidence of a thoughtful process to identify the theme and engagement of all units and senior university and college leadership. The team would like to have seen a greater discussion on potential curriculum changes that might have supported the desired career outcomes for the health professions. The career taxonomy categories appeared to be basic information for each of the healthcare fields, not as advanced as might have been expected. The institution needs to accelerate the efforts in data collection and analysis, particularly in the professional schools.

In sum, the plan for investigation of the theme was redirected from a single methodology for outcomes tracking to individual program approaches, contributing to challenges with data definitions, collection and data storage. Balancing the need and desire for a more robust data collection and analysis approach was a budget and personnel challenge. The five (5) healthcare programs did not collect, analyze or post data by the time of submission of the institutional report, and only background work was completed. The five (5) programs appear prepared to implement data collection, aggregation, and posting of data with the graduating classes of 2020; publicizing the results in early 2021. The goals and outcomes described in the Theme Submission Guide were only achieved for the PhD programs. Once

fully implemented, the thematic pathway data will strengthen and support institutional efforts to embed

diversity throughout the campus culture, which is important to minimizing healthcare disparities locally,

nationally, and globally; and to the identity and contributions of UCSF.

Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

UCSF presented evidence of thoughtful reflection and ideas about plans for improvement. Yet,

several issues emerged from the institution's investigation of the theme. During the attempt to create a

single methodology for outcomes tracking, it became clear that there were significant differences in

curricula, licensure requirements, and post-graduation career trajectories in each of the major programs

at UCSF. This necessitated that each program develop a plan specifically suited to its educational

mission. The UCSF Career Outcomes/Education Data Warehouse (EDW) working group was

established to develop the metrics for each of the five professional degree programs, and the Education

Data Council was tasked with the collection, standardization, and verification of career outcomes data.

These data were then shared with UCSF leadership and faculty councils to apply to quality improvement

efforts within each degree program. A second issue that emerged from the investigation of the theme

was the identification of trained individuals to conduct the work. This was accomplished differently in

different programs, with some new hires, some assigning work to existing qualified staff, and some

assigning work to faculty with specific expertise in career outcomes and data collection.

The team's evaluation of the TPR focuses on the strong collaborative efforts that emerged from

the initial decisions on how to move forward with data collection and analysis. UCSF involved highly

trained professional staff and administrators in the design of data collection and analysis and developed

robust data collection and storage systems. In response to the issues that emerged during the

investigation of the theme, UCSF developed program-specific data collection and analysis schemes. All

of this was done with a strong sense of transparency. Although some staff involved in the process had

other responsibilities, staffing support to accomplish the data collection and analysis seemed adequate. Some programs used faculty as opposed to specifically trained staff. However, UCSF's efforts to insure these faculty had adequate time to devote to this large effort, in addition to their pre-existing professional responsibilities, were not clarified.

UCSF's institutional report broadly described the achievement of original goals and outcomes described in the Theme Submission Guide. UCSF has met its goal of providing information about PhD alumni's jobs at zero, five, 10, and 15 years post-graduation, starting with the cohort that entered in 1996, and for all postdoctoral scholars who separated from the university starting in 2011. These data sets are now updated annually. This has produced methodologies that were published in 2019 in CBE—Life Sciences Education as "A Tool Kit for Tracking Career Outcomes of Biomedical PhD Students and Postdoctoral Scholars", allowing these to be reproduced at other institutions. By the due date for the report, all data had not been collected, analyzed, and posted for the five professional degree programs. This will begin starting with the graduating classes of 2020. UCSF is co-leading the Coalition for Next Generation Life Science, serving as a national leader in the movement to provide greater access to data on student outcomes.

The team concluded that UCSF has done an excellent job achieving the goals for graduate (PhD and postdoctoral) programs. This includes the publication of methodology for PhD and postdoctoral career trajectory tracking so that other institutions can replicate this process. However, there has been limited progress in the five professional degree programs. This is understandable given the need to develop five different specific protocols. However, this is critical because professional students account for more than 2/3 of the students at UCSF. Plans to achieve the goals for professional students are currently underway, but will require a strong commitment by all stakeholders to apply the successful

approaches used by the Graduate Division to all five professional school programs. This is addressed in the team's recommendations.

UCSF outlined a series of next steps to achieve its goals for career outcomes. Professional degree programs will finalize data collection and analysis and apply findings to adjust didactic curricula, gauge the success of diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts; and improve co-curricular programming and counseling. UCSF recognizes the need to proceed with Theme goals for the five professional degree programs. Moving forward is highly feasible given progress made in PhD and postdoctoral programs. In addition to career trajectories, data on career satisfaction is quite important to help inform potential students about career choices. Plans to collect this data were not included in the initial report, and it seems that this was not considered for inclusion in data collection by either the Graduate Division or any of the professional schools. Faculty and administrators were amenable to doing so, and this has been included in the team's recommendations.

The data set proposed for MD graduates is more limited than for the other professional degree programs. It could include things like percent of students involved in global health, with a teaching component to their practice, practice location (urban, suburban, rural), outpatient vs inpatient practice, and percent board certified. Although not specified in UCSF's Institutional Report, many of the stakeholders were aware of the need for this data and seem committed to including it in ongoing work on the Theme. This has also been included in the team's recommendations.

UCSF's institutional report did not discuss the possibility that faculty may be reluctant to change their pedagogical approaches based on the results of these studies. However, faculty, especially at prestigious institutions, may feel that what they are doing currently is best. UCSF's plans to avoid this situation include continued collaborative efforts at disseminating the results of the data collection and

analysis to all stakeholders, and a commitment by administrative leadership to inform and support faculty in appropriate revisions and additions to their curriculum.

The fact that UCSF is continuing as a co-leader of the Coalition for Next Generation Life Science will provide strong impetus for continuing progress. Institution-wide activities that will sustain or increase awareness and support of these efforts include continued strong collaborative efforts, comprehensive dissemination of the data and analysis, funding support for implementing changes, and a general acceptance by all stakeholders that this process is integral to UCSF's sense of its own mission.

A wide range of faculty, administrative, co-curricular and student support units came together for intense focus on UCSF's educational mission. This led to deeper understanding of the needs, responsibilities, challenges, and pleasures of running a diverse set of graduate and professional degree programs. Given the large diversity of programs, faculty, staff and administrators at UCSF, the process of going through the TPR has created a strong sense of collaboration between a wide variety of units. The inclusion of co-curricular and student support units in the process has added to this collaborative process. However, the stated changes expected as a result of the TPR are somewhat vague. In follow-up, specific examples of changes in, for example, the "needs, responsibilities, challenges, and pleasures of running a diverse set of graduate and professional degree programs", will be expected during subsequent review processes. Most administrators, faculty, staff and students seemed to recognize that UCSF has a strong sense of institutional identity as a world leader in biomedical research and training. However, they also understand there are areas for expanding its view of itself in influencing and populating the healthcare world outside of academic settings.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

UCSF has conducted a thorough internal review and examination of their chosen theme to fulfill the intended outcomes of a WSCUC Thematic Pathway Review. The team recognizes

the challenges introduced in this new remote review process and appreciates UCSF for being pioneers in the Thematic Pathway to Reaffirmation. The institution's comprehensive approach to produce an Institutional Report, to provide the team additional evidence, and to ensure a wide range of faculty, staff and student participation in the remote visit, reflects the institution's commitment to standards and more importantly, to strengthening educational effectiveness. This closing section discusses the team's commendations and recommendations.

Commendations

The team commends the University of California San Francisco (UCSF) for the following:

1. Maintaining stable finances in a challenging era through an outstanding comprehensive fundraising campaign that exceeded its initial goal, the rapid reactivation of non-COVID-19 clinical care, and continued great success garnering research grants.

2. An impressive degree of collaboration and broad buy-in on the institution's Thematic Pathway project and a shared sense of how the project can inform improvements. The thematic project is also credited with providing a productive space for interprofessional collaboration, another shared institutional interest.

3. Demonstrating a unified commitment to being data-informed and to undertaking continuous quality improvement. Schools and administrative units are keen to use data about their graduates' experiences and outcomes to shape program offerings and to influence mentoring, curriculum, and services.

4. Encouraging and supporting faculty expertise to drive the Thematic Pathway project data collection goals, outcomes, and use of results.

5. Modernizing the curriculum through a comprehensive and on-going approach that focuses on workforce and professional needs, and will be influenced by the outcome measures of the Theme.

6. Seamlessly integrating the Mission Bay and Parnassus campuses through the provision of equivalent resources, services, support programming and staff.

7. Supporting student success by investing resources, funds and staff to provide a range of student support services including coaching and other longitudinal mentoring programs, internships for doctoral students, financial assistance, integrated primary care and mental health, subsidized housing, and food pantries.

Recommendations:

The team has identified the following four recommendations to focus UCSF's ongoing efforts:

1. Accelerate efforts in data collection and analysis, particularly in the professional schools, shifting energy to using data to generate insights leading to program improvement. Most importantly, specify how the Thematic Pathways data can be used to help strengthen and support efforts to diversify the overall institution and specific academic fields, and with regard to UCSF's mission to address health care disparities (CFRs 4.1; 4.3).

2. Utilize a common data repository (Education Data Warehouse) for career outcomes for all Schools and the Graduate Division. In addition, develop a strategy and dedicate resources to ensure that the career outcomes data being generated will be used to drive ongoing collaboration between the Office of Career and Professional Development, the Office of Diversity and Outreach and each of the Schools and Graduate Division (CFRs 4.3; 4.4).

3. Capture data from school and program accreditation requirements and alumni surveys where relevant, related to job choice, career satisfaction, employment in underserved communities, and how the graduates are meeting workforce needs and addressing challenges that have curricular implications. In addition, move beyond numeric metrics and collect qualitative data as appropriate (CFRs 4.3; 4.4; 4.6, 4.7)

4. Implement a more strategic focus, relying on performance indicators and outcomes in all programs (schools, units), to achieve the institution's overarching goals for faculty and student diversity. It is apparent that the University has outstanding, committed and qualified personnel dedicated to equity and diversity, and invests in a large number and impressive array of pipeline and recruitment programs. Since equity and diversity must be embedded throughout the campus culture to be successful, the entire university would benefit from clear data on the effectiveness of individual approaches. The institution must prioritize investments that can be demonstrated to increase diversity of students, faculty, department chairs and other campus leaders as well as continue to leverage relationships with the state university system and HBCUs and HSIs (CFR 1.4).

Appendix A1: Federal Compliance Forms

OVERVIEW There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal regulations affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

      1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
      2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
      3 – Student Complaints Form
      4 – Transfer Credit Policy Form

During the visit, teams complete these four forms and add them as an appendix to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

(1)The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-

(i)It reviews the institution's-

      (A)Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and

      (B)The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and

(ii)Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.

(2)In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use samplingor other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or (2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Credit Hour Policy.

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

Rev 03/2015

1 - Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X YES ❒ NO
	If so, where is the policy located? https://senate.ucsf.edu/course-actions/course-forms-and-deadlines#units
	Comments: The UCSF Committee on Courses of Instruction implements a UC systemwide Academic Senate policy, in Senate Regulation 760, prescribing the value of a course in units as it relates to hours of work by the student.
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X YES ❒ NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: The Committee on Courses of Instruction reviews unit assignments when new courses are approved and when instructors submit major changes to courses. In addition, schools and programs periodically review courses, including units, and submit change requests to the Committee on Courses of Instruction.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: The Office of the Registrar's Schedule of Classes appears here: https://saa.ucsf.edu/courseschedule/ In some cases, the professional schools provide detailed course schedules directly to students because those courses sometimes do not follow a traditional or predictable meeting pattern (such as MWF 10-11 AM). Nonetheless, these schedules clearly indicate meeting hours.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 4
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Online
	What degree level(s)? ❒ AA/AS ❒ BA/BS X MA X Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? 1. Health Administration and Interprofessional Leadership 2. Global Health Sciences PhD
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Resource consulted: Senate Course Review System.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 5
	What kinds of courses? Independent study, clinical
	What degree level(s)?　❒AA/AS　❒ BA/BS　X MA　X Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Bioengineering PhD, Medicine MD; Global Health Sciences MS
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Per UC systemwide Academic Senate policy, in Senate Regulation 760, prescribing the value of a course in units as it relates to hours of work by the student, all courses allot units based on the same formula: 30 hours of activity = 1 quarter unit. Resource consulted: Senate Course Review System.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 2
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? MS and PhD
	What degree level(s)?　❒ AA/AS　❒ BA/BS X MA X Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? 1. Oral and Craniofacial Sciences MS; 2. Biophysics PhD
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Resource consulted: Graduate Division program statistics: https://graduate.ucsf.edu/program-statistics.

Review Completed By: Doug Carlson Date: July 17, 2020

2- Marketing and Recruitment Review Form

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? X YES ❏ NO
	Comments: UCSF's merit-based compensation system considers multiple performance factors, including overall campus goals, for each employee. The system is consistent with the HEA.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? X YES ❏ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? X YES ❏ NO
	Comments: Programs that follow a fixed curriculum provide the time to degree in admissions and program websites. The university also publishes PhD time to degree statistics. The university provides cost of attendance information at the Student Financial Aid website and via school admissions websites.
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? X YES ❏ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? X YES ❏ NO
	Comments: UCSF's theme for this review is to measure career outcomes. UCSF already publishes career outcomes data for PhD programs. Students in professional programs generally obtain employment in their respective field (dentistry for DDS students, medicine for MD students, etc.). In addition, the Office of Career and Professional Development advises students on career paths and opportunities.

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Doug Carlson Date: July 17, 2020

3 - Student Complaints Review Form

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? X YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? YES If so, where? SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY General Feedback Procedures Complaints Related to Accreditation Standards (CODA) Academic Grading Appeals Procedure SCHOOL OF MEDICINE Student Mistreatment Policy Grade Appeals Policy Supporting a Fair Environment (SAFE) On the webpage for the SOM Deans, as well as the page for the Student Experience Team, the school includes this statement and link: Connect directly with any of our deans if you have concerns or questions about the School of Medicine and your educational experience at UCSF. During Foundations 1 (the first 18 months of the medicine curriculum), the school offers regular monthly feedback forums where students can attend and provide feedback about the curriculum. (The school does not provide this opportunity during Foundations 2 and Career Launch because students are in rotations and not able to attend forums easily.) The Education Deans also hold monthly Dean's "coffee hours" where one of them on a monthly rotating basis is available in the Student Center for conversation, concerns, or visits with any student. In addition, student feedback can also be raised to the administration through various committees:

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
	1. Associated Students in the School of Medicine (ASSM) is an elected student government. The students in this group meet monthly with the education deans, faculty, and staff administrators to represent student concerns, advocate for student interests, and voice student needs. 2. Students are represented at most levels of the Curriculum Governance structure. They provide feedback, represent student voices and perspective, and bring forward student concerns in all areas of medical education. There are also other ad hoc ways in which the school receives student complaints: - Students report to their Coaches (faculty mentor) - Students report to their academic advisor (staff person) - Student report to faculty instructor/resident - Student report to peer In these cases, the student either is referred to the associate dean for students, or the person hearing from the student contacts the associate dean. SCHOOL OF PHARMACY https://sds.ucsf.edu/appeals-grievances GRADUATE DIVISION AND SCHOOL OF NURSING https://graduate.ucsf.edu/code-conduct-and-integrity-research CAMPUS Student Privacy Complaint Process Academic Senate Student Grievance in Academic Affairs Discrimination, Retaliation, and Harassment Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Disability SYSTEMWIDE UC Student Complaint Process
	Comments:

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? X YES ❏ NO If so, please describe briefly: Please see the section above.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ❏ NO
	Comments: Please see the section above.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? X YES ❏ NO If so, where? Each unit that manages a complaint process maintains records.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? X YES ❏ NO If so, please describe briefly: Each unit that manages a complaint process tracks and monitors complaints. Due to the varied and often decentralized nature of the complaint process, the university does not maintain a central repository of complaints.
	Comments:

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Doug Carlson Date: July 17, 2020

4 - Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? ❏ YES X NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? ❏ YES ❏ NO If so, where?
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? ❏ YES ❏ NO
	Comments: UCSF admits only graduate and professional students and does not accept transfer credit.

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

   (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

   (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Doug Carlson
Date: July 17, 2020

Appendix A2: REVIEW OF UCSF IEEI REPORT

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) Report

UCSF is commended for a highly collaborative effort in documenting how they met the federal requirements of the IEEI. This involved input from vice and associate deans for education and academic programs from all the schools, the vice chancellor of Student Academic Affairs, the registrar and assistant vice chancellor for student information, the vice provost of academic affairs, the vice chancellor of diversity and outreach, the Title IX officer, the director of the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD), the university librarian, the assistant vice chancellor for academic information management, the chief the chief financial officer, the vice chancellor of University Development and Alumni Relations, and the associate chancellor. This provided excellent coverage of all UCSF programs and dovetailed well with the work done by several programs for their professional accreditations.

Credit Hour and Program Length

Credit hours determination is strongly vetted and assigned according to well-established system-wide University of California Academic Senate policies. The report reviewed a large variety of degree programs, all of which have a high completion rate. The program length for each of the five professional degree programs have clearly identified criteria for academic progress, promotion and graduation. Program lengths are consistent, transparent and easily accessible to current and prospective students. Although the time to completion of the PhD degree has decreased over the past 12 years, it is still 5.75 years. This is close to the national average. There appears to be a fairly large range of completion times in the various disciplines, and completion data according to program is available in an interactive dashboard.

Marketing and Recruitment

UCSF has very transparent data on cost of attendance, time to degree, graduation rates and pass rates on licensing exams. Career outcomes data is beginning to be available for PhD students and will continue to accumulate as a result of the TPR work. There is currently minimal career outcomes data for professional students. Specific career trajectories of professional students with respect to practice setting, specialization vs primary care, research vs clinical practice, board certification and career and job satisfaction should be included in the data collection process (linked to the team's recommendation #3). Although UCSF's efforts in building diversity in all aspects of the UCSF mission are supported by the Office of Diversity and Outreach (ODO), the recruitment strategy for underrepresented minority students could be described more clearly.

Student Complaints

UCSF has multiple avenues for students to depending on the specifics of the complaint. There are appropriate avenues for academic grievances, discrimination and harassment, equal opportunity and disability complaints. The process is timely and thorough. Students are represented on Curricular Government committees. The limited student feedback during Foundations 2 and Career Launch segments of the School of Medicine curriculum, however the students interviewed during the site visit, from all Schools and the Graduate Division, uniformly stated that there are effective avenues for reporting grievances that are readily available and that faculty and administrators are responsive to any such grievances.

Transfer Policy

UCSF does not accept transfer credit because all of their programs are graduate or professional. However, graduate students coming to UCSF for a PhD program who already hold

a Master's degree in the same discipline are given credit for coursework completed for their

Master's degree.

Appendix B Off-Campus Locations Review

Mission Bay Report Overview

University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) was founded in 1864. Since then it has grown into a distinctly urban institution with facilities throughout San Francisco and beyond. UCSF consists of two main campuses: Parnassus Heights (the oldest campus) and Mission Bay (which opened in 2003 as a result of Parnassus being restricted by growth due to space limitations). This briefing focuses on Mission Bay.

Mission Bay campus has approximately 3.2 million square feet of building space and is growing. Buildings include ten research and education facilities. Mission Bay campus began with graduate students and research scientists with laboratories, and quickly evolved. Currently, Mission Bay also houses UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay, which includes both inpatient and outpatient facilities, and provides training sites for health professional students. Additionally, Mission Bay is the home for: administrative operations for the Graduate Division and the Chancellor's Office; the Rutter Center, which houses a conference and fitness center and Student Health and Counseling Services; on campus housing; numerous eateries; and a childcare center. Highlights of the off-campus locations include:

- The Parnassus Heights campus is located in a residential neighborhood near Golden Gate Park. Physical space constraints and a mandated cap on square footage have limited expansion of the Parnassus Heights campus.

- UCSF's need to expand coincided with the city of San Francisco's master plan in the late 1990s to develop underused industrial land into a biotechnology hub and thus bring jobs to San Francisco.

- Mission Bay has grown into a thriving biotechnology district, anchored by UCSF's Mission Bay campus. UCSF opened its first building in 2003. The UCSF campus now

has 10 research and education buildings plus the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay. The hospital focuses on cancer, women, and children. Additional outpatient specialty areas include precision cancer, psychiatry, and orthopedics.

- Most on-campus housing for students, residents, fellows, and postdocs is located at Mission Bay, with 1,026 units designed to house 1,827 people. In contrast, in the Parnassus Heights area, UCSF offers 227 units to house 633 people.

- In addition to UCSF and private laboratory and office buildings in Mission Bay, the neighborhood is home to many private apartment buildings and Chase Center, the new home of the NBA's Golden State Warriors.

- UCSF Mission Bay hosts a large conference center, which has become a frequent meeting site for the UC Board of Regents.

- Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights are co-equal campuses of UCSF, each one fully integrated into the university's missions of education, research, and patient care. No distinction between the campuses exists for governance or finance.

- The UCSF Chancellor's Office relocated from Parnassus Heights to Mission Bay. However, the executive vice chancellor and provost remains at Parnassus Heights.

- A 25-minute shuttle ride separates the two campuses. Faculty, staff, and students travel back and forth for meetings, classes, and patient care. For large events, such as campus-wide public faculty lectures or training sessions for staff, organizers make every effort to include participants at the other campus through desktop webinars and video conferencing including, on some occasions, opening a large classroom at the remote location to host participants and ensuring that remote participants can ask questions.

It is noteworthy as to how the Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay campuses complement each other. In particular, student services are integrated and functioning well between campuses. The team supports UCSF's commitment to invest in updates to the Parnassus facilities over the next decade now that Mission Bay is built out.

Several portions of UCSF's graduate program are administratively based at Mission Bay, and most of the faculty and students in these programs are at Mission Bay (Table 1, Off-Campus Locations Review-Team Report). Student learning is assessed through graded coursework and assessment in programs between the two campuses is considered comparable, given assessment of professional program students differs in structure and nature from graduate students. Nonetheless, graduation rates are excellent, with 10-year PhD graduation rate for Mission Bay programs greater than 85%. Quality Assurance Processes are in place and well established. This was further discussed during interviews with faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Further supporting the importance and quality of this campus are USCF's theme for this Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (examining career outcomes of students after graduation) and the large portion of graduate studies occurring on the Mission Bay campus.

Faculty FTE at Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights are considered to be roughly equal. Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights are well integrated, and it was confirmed via interview meetings with faculty, student services, administrators, and students that the fit and mission are working well. Mission Bay is well connected to the institution, and is not considered a separate campus but rather an extension of one campus, UCSF. The quality of learning on both campuses is comparable, and UCSF appropriately uses each campus to distinctively utilize all resources available to provide the best student experience including excellent and dynamic student support services that have evolved to meet the challenges of COVID-19.

TABLE 1. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT

Institution: University of California San Francisco (USCF), Mission Bay
Type of Visit: Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Marie Chisholm-Burns, PharmD, MPH, MBA
Date/s of review: September-October 2020

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed[1]. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. *Site Name and Address*

   Mission Bay
   550 16th Street
   San Francisco CA 94143

2. *Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)*

   The following programs are administratively based at Mission Bay, and most of the faculty and students in these programs are at Mission Bay. Nevertheless, students and faculty in programs not listed here may, in fact, be located at Mission Bay.

   Mission Bay (PhD unless otherwise indicated)
   Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (Tetrad)
   Cell Biology (Tetrad)
   Genetics (Tetrad)
   Bioengineering (joint with UC Berkeley)
   Biological and Medical Informatics
   Biophysics
   Chemistry and Chemical Biology
   Epidemiology and Translational Science
   Neuroscience
   Pharmaceutical Sciences and Pharmacogenomics
   Rehabilitation Science
   Global Health Sciences
   Total PhD Enrollment in Fall 2019: 540

   Translational Medicine MTM
   Global Health Sciences MS
   Clinical Research MAS

---

[1] See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

Biomedical Imaging MS (also China Basin)
Total Master's Enrollment in Fall 2019: 109

(PhD Programs to Move to Mission Bay in 2020)
History of Health Sciences
Medical Anthropology
Sociology
Total Enrollment in Fall 2019: 40

Faculty FTE at Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights are roughly equivalent.

3. *Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)*

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	• UCSF opened its first building at Mission Bay in 2003 and has expanded the campus ever since. Mission Bay was in full operation at the time of the last WSCUC review in 2010 and is not recently approved.	Follow-up with the four interviews confirmed this.
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	• Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights are co-equal campuses that, together, comprise one university. • Many campus administrative units, including the Chancellor's Office, are located at Mission Bay. • Governance and resource allocation occur based on programmatic needs irrespective of location.	Follow-up with the four interviews confirmed this.
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students	• Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights are equal parts of one university. Students, staff, and faculty regularly travel between the two campuses for meetings, classes, and patient care. • The Graduate Division, which is based at Mission Bay, holds an annual fall welcoming barbecue at Mission Bay for graduate students in all programs at both campuses.	Follow-up with the four interviews confirmed this.

into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	• Special graduate student events such as "Grad Slam" often are held at Mission Bay and simulcast in a classroom at Parnassus Heights. • Campus-wide events such as public lectures normally are held at one campus and simulcast to the other campus or live streamed on the Internet. • The lecture capture system installed in many classrooms on both campuses allows for live streaming of courses and other presentations.	
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	• Mission Bay has 34 general assignment classrooms, most equipped with audiovisual systems and many ready with A/V integration for Zoom meetings or video conferencing. Educational Technology Services manages the classroom technology and scheduling for both Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights and has technical support staff stationed at both locations. • Governance and resource allocation for Mission Bay are fully integrated into campus processes.	Follow-up with the four interviews confirmed this.
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	• Although the main library is located at Parnassus Heights, the library operates two facilities at Mission Bay, providing students study space, access to computers, and book and journal delivery. Librarians teach classes and offer consultations on both campuses. • The Office of Career and Professional Development provides equivalent in-person advising at Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights and programmatic offerings tailored to the student populations uniquely concentrated on each campus. • Student Health and Counseling Services operates full-service clinics at Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights. • Graduate students typically receive advising from staff and faculty in their program. For the programs based at Mission Bay, most of these individuals have offices at Mission Bay. • Campus IT provides the same level of support for network operations and WiFi at Mission Bay and at Parnassus Heights.	Follow-up with the four interviews confirmed this. Students living on the Mission Bay campus provided great insight and confirmed the integration of the two campuses.

	• The International Students and Scholars Office is located at Mission Bay. • The Housing Office is located at Mission Bay. • A modern fitness center serves students at Mission Bay. • The Mission Bay campus offers dining options to students.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	• In the graduate programs, full-time faculty teach most courses. Through departmental governance, the faculty at Mission Bay oversee the programs located at Mission Bay. Also, faculty from both campuses participate in the course approval process and the governance of programs on both campuses through Academic Senate committees.	Follow-up with the four interviews confirmed this.
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	• At both Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights, the Graduate Division and the Graduate Council oversee the academic programs. The Graduate Division and Graduate Council conduct periodic external reviews of programs. (For programs whose students are funded by NIH T32 training grants, the NIH review process substitutes for external reviews.) • The Academic Senate Committee on Courses of Instruction, which consists of faculty members from both locations, approves all new courses and changes to existing courses. • UCSF's doctoral training programs in biology (mostly located at Mission Bay) placed sixth overall in the 2019 *US New and World Report* rankings, with five specialty programs placing in the top five. UCSF was first in immunology/infectious disease and in molecular biology; third in neuroscience/neurobiology; fourth in cell	Follow-up with the four interviews confirmed this.

	biology; and fifth in biochemistry/biophysics/structural biology.	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	• The 10-year PhD graduation rate for PhD programs at Mission Bay is 87.8%. These programs are basic sciences. Three additional basic sciences PhD programs are at Parnassus Heights, but only two have existed long enough to calculate a 10-year graduation rate. The average PhD graduation rate for these two programs is 80.4%. If the non-basic-sciences PhD program is added to the Parnassus Heights calculation, the 10-year PhD graduation rate is 81.8%. (PhD students who graduate with a terminal master's degree are not included in these percentages.) • For the non-clinical master's programs, the completion rate is 91.4% for the four programs at Mission Bay and 81.9% for the one program that is online. The clinical master's programs are at Parnassus Heights. • UCSF does not calculate retention rates, since this calculation is meaningful for undergraduate programs. • [Additional statistical information](#) is available.	Follow-up with the four interviews confirmed this.
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	• Student learning is assessed through graded coursework. For PhD programs, the programs assess graded coursework in year 1 and then carefully monitor progression through the PhD with thesis committee meetings and annual review by Executive Committees. Program administrators track participation in other requirements such as seminars and research presentations. • Assessment in programs at Mission Bay is comparable to assessment in programs at Parnassus Heights, although assessment of students in professional programs differs from assessment in master's and PhD programs.	Follow-up with the four interviews confirmed this.

| *Quality Assurance Processes:* How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8) | • The programs on both campuses conduct course evaluations.
• Graduate programs on both campuses receive periodic external reviews. The Graduate Division and Graduate Council conduct periodic external reviews of programs. (For programs whose students are funded by NIH T32 training grants, the NIH review process substitutes for external reviews.) The frequency for reviews is every five years for basic science PhD programs, eight years for social science PhD programs, five years for one-year master's programs, and eight years for two-year master's programs.
• UCSF's theme for this Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation examines career outcomes of students after graduation. The career outcomes data demonstrate that Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights provide comparable educational effectiveness. | Follow-up with selected interviews confirmed this. |

Appendix C Distance Education Review

University of California San Francisco offers two programs through a distance education modality—the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP), which is administratively under the School of Nursing, and the Master of Science – Healthcare Administration and Interprofessional Leadership (MS-HAIL), one of 24 programs in the Graduate Division, with budget over-sight and faculty appointments through the School of Nursing.   Both programs are self-support. Delivering these programs through distance education is consistent with the mission of the university to advance healthcare world-wide through graduate-level education in the life sciences and health profession. The online modality enables the institution to go beyond San Francisco, and offers students flexibility, diversity, and an opportunity to build upon their current role.

A Zoom interview was held with the directors of the two distance education programs. The MS-HAIL program was begun in 2013 admitting 12-15 students twice a year. The co-directors had only been in their position for 8 weeks. Co-directors reported approximately 74% of the students admitted in 2018 graduated.   The DNP program began in 2018 and admits one cohort of 10-12 students annually. There are plans to admit two cohorts annually in 2021. Ninety percent (90%) of the first cohort graduated in December 2019.

The programs are housed on the Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE) which is Moodle. The courses are backed up through Amazon web-services housed in Arizona and Virginia. The admission process includes an assessment of the student's affinity for online instruction, followed by an on-campus orientation which includes modules to prepare for online instruction. Both distance education programs have subsequent on-site intensives, which serve to integrate the distance education student into the culture of the institution. The DNP program holds synchronous weekly meetings in the evening—same day and time every week. The MS-HAIL has synchronous office hours. One course in each program (N263.14 Improving Health Outcomes Through Quality Improvement and Patient Safety and MHA 201 Leadership: Forces of Change) was reviewed as delivered on the learning management system. Faculty shared the student and faculty views of the courses in Moodle. Course shells were easy to navigate with links that were intuitive. Syllabi reviewed on the online platform included Q&A on the learning management system, an orientation to the Moodle platform, links to the Learning Technology Support, Technology Hub, Student IT Support, UCSF Service Desk, and the UCSF library. Each student is assigned an advisor on admission to support their educational experience.

Faculty in the DNP program have joint appointments in the School of Nursing, while MS-HAIL faculty are essentially all adjunct. The job description for a faculty position in the online programs requires experience with the online modality, either as a student or faculty. Instructional Design prepares faculty to teach along with required workshops. The faculty determine the curriculum and work with an Instructional Designer, who is assigned to the program, to determine the most effective delivery of the content. End of course evaluations are completed by students, and are reviewed quarterly and annually. Any minor or major curriculum changes in these programs are reviewed by the Academic Senate Committee on Courses of Instruction.

Student learning is evaluated through discussion posts, modules, position papers, Zoom conference participation, quizzes, and a quality improvement project needed in their place of employment. The DNP course had a graph which depicted the student engagement by date.

The leadership of each program confirmed adequate faculty, instructional support, and enrollments sufficient to sustain the program. The learning platform was conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students. Program expectations and signature assessments reflected graduate level competencies.

Distance Education Review-Team Report

Institution: University of California San Francisco

Type of Visit: Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation

Name of reviewer: Robyn M Nelson

Date/s of review: 9/11/2020 and 9/18/2020

1. Programs, administrators/faculty interviewed, and courses reviewed (please list)

    Program – Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

    Directors - Jyu-Lin Chen – Professor and Director, DNP

    Annette Carley – Clinical Professor and Associate Director, DNP

    Marianne Hultgren – Assistant Clinical Professor DNP Program

    Faculty – Marianne Hultgren, Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor

    Course – N263.14 Improving Health Outcomes Through Quality Improvement and Patient Safety

Program – Master of Science – Healthcare Administration and Interprofessional Leadership (MS-HAIL)

Directors - Lisa Lommel – Clinical Professor and Interim Co-Director, MS-HAIL

Marianne Hultgren – Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor

Faculty - Jarmin Yeh – Faculty, MS-HAIL

Course – MHA 201 – Leadership: Forces of Change

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

UCSF offers two online degree programs offered using the Learning Management System Moodle.

Doctor of Nursing Practice (Doctoral level) began in April 2018, admitting one cohort of 10-12 annually—planning to move to two cohorts annually in 2021. Current enrollment 31. Program is 7 quarters. Students come to UCSF campus for 3 on-site intensives—beginning orientation, mid-point (start of quarter 5) and the final quarter for the capstone presentation. There is a synchronous weekly meeting in the evening—same day and time every week. Program under the School of Nursing. Professionally accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education. The faculty are a mix of full-time and part-time appointments.

MS in Healthcare Administration and Interprofessional Leadership (Master's level) which began in 2013. Program is 4 quarters; admitting two cohorts per year of 12-15 with a capacity of 20; at the time of the review, the program had 31 students (including 10 on leave). Students must be employed in the field to support the capstone project. Students have three on-site intensives—2-day orientation; launch of capstone project during 2nd quarter, and final quarter culminating project presentation. Only office hours are synchronous, with review sessions available. Program is one of about 24 programs in the Graduate Division, with budget and faculty appointments through the School of Nursing. Program intended to be seen as an interprofessional education program, not a nursing program. Not professionally accredited. Considering accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education (CAHME). All faculty are adjunct, and several have additional appointments in the School of Nursing" to add appropriate context.

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
Zoom Interview with Director and Associate Director of the DNP, and Co-Directors of the MS-HAIL, who have only been in their positions 8 weeks.

Reviewed one DNP course (N263.14) with faculty member Marianne Hultgren, and one MS-HAIL course (MHA 201) with faculty member Jarmin Yeh. Faculty shared faculty and student views of courses in Moodle. Copy of syllabi for N263.14, and screen shots of MHA 201 provided following Moodle review.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	Over-arching mission is the advancement of healthcare world-wide through "…graduate-level education in the life sciences and health professions…." (UCSF website); institution devoted to serving the public, going beyond San Francisco. Delivering programs through distance education is consistent with the Mission. The modality offers flexibility, diversity, and allows the student to build upon their current role.\n\nThe distance education programs are self-support.	
Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Both distance education programs include on-campus orientations, and subsequent on-site intensives, with campus presentations of the capstone project where the student's family, and other program faculty and students are invited to attend.	
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	Courses are housed on what the campus calls the Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE) which is Moodle. IT Help Desk is available 24/7. Courses are backed up through Amazon web-services housed in Arizona and Virginia.	

Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	Onsite orientation includes modules to prepare for online instruction. Admission process also looks at student's affinity for online instruction. Syllabi reviewed included CLE Q&A and orientation modules and videos, e.g. Learning Online, Orientation to Moodle, Practice Forums). Syllabi also included links to Learning Technology Support, School of Nursing Technology Hub, Student IT Support, UCSF Service Desk, and UCSF Library. Students are assigned a faculty advisor on admission.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	MS-HAIL faculty are all adjunct except for Professor Yeh who provided a review of her course. She is 40% MS-HAIL and 60% in the Social and Behavioral Sciences program. DNP faculty have joint appointments between departments in the School of Nursing and are a mix of full and part time. Also, one faculty with program co-director role is 100% dedicated to the DNP. No faculty are 100% dedicated to MS-HAIL. Faculty JD includes experience in online education either as a student or faculty. Instructional Design prepares faculty to teach and there are workshops available.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and	Faculty determine the curriculum and work with an Instructional Designer to	

courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	determine the most effective delivery of the content. End of course evaluations are completed by students and reviewed by the course faculty quarterly and annually. Programs follow the 3 class hours per credit.	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	MS-HAIL reports graduation rates in 2018-2019 of 74% (N=53). DNP has only had one class graduate in December 2019 (N=13) with >90% completion. Post-graduation survey will be sent December 2020.	
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	Courses have multiple approaches to evaluating students; more than just discussion posts, e.g. modules, microsystem position paper, Zoom Conference Participation, final white paper, quizzes. There is a graph available in the course syllabus to see student engagement in the course. Both programs guide the students to select a project of need in their place of employment.	
Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	Essentially all students select a quality improvement project at their place of employment. A site representative is a member of the project team. A project agreement is completed. No contract is required.	

Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	Reviewed the Office of Institutional Research dashboard which provides 5 year trends by school, degree and program, as well as demographic data. Modality not noted. Academic Senate has a Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI) which processes minor and major curriculum changes.	

Rev 3/2015