Addressing the 2008 Revisions to the CFRs

******* TABLE A *******

> Revised CFR 1.2 (1/3): The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels.

Self Assessment:

1. Does the institution have educational objectives at all three levels indicated in the CFR (institution, program, and course)? Have goals or expectations for achievement of these objectives been established? Where are these objectives and indicators published?

- Yes. Please see the essays on Learning Environment (Sections C and D), Student Learning Outcomes (Sections A, D E and F, the discussion of knowledge and professionalism in particular), and Institutional Research (including learning outcomes on course forms), and well as New Enhancements to Student Services. As noted in the narrative, in most cases, objectives and indicators are available online; in some instances, they are still in the process of development.

> Revised CFR 1.2 (2/3): The institution has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning.

Self-Assessment

1. Does the institution have a systematic process for measuring student achievement?
- The process for both graduate academic and graduate professional programs is described in the column labeled (3) in Data Exhibits 7.1a & 7.1b.

2. Does this system or process include analysis of data on retention and completion?
- Yes – please see Appendix 33).

3. Does it include processes for summative assessment of student learning?
- Yes. Please see the columns labeled (5) and (6) in Data Exhibit 8.1.

> Revised CFR 1.2 (3/3: The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.

Self-Assessment

1. Does the institution publish data on retention and graduation rates? Student learning outcomes? Where?
- Retention and graduation rates are typically very high for graduate professional programs, and this is true for UCSF (see Appendix 33), but this data is regarded as proprietary to the Schools

and is not made public by the campus. While attrition in graduate academic programs is higher, UCSF's graduation rate is significantly greater than the national average (Appendix 33). The time to degree for PhD students as well as Ten Year PhD Completion Rates for all UC campuses are Indicators 33 and 34 in Section 5 of the May 10 UC Accountability Report, available as a PDF at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/ .

- Almost all student learning outcomes for both the graduate academic and graduate professional programs are now online (see Data Exhibits 7.1a and 7.1b).

Revised CFR 1.9: The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution

---

Self-Assessment
1. Does the institution keep WASC informed about important changes? Is there a process and assigned responsibility for ensuring that this reporting is done?
- Yes. Please see narrative following WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 10 in the Institutional Research essay.

Revised GUIDELINE for 2.2b: Institutions offering graduate-level programs demonstrate sufficient resources and structures to sustain these programs and create a graduate-level academic culture.

Self-Assessment

1. If applicable: Are master's and doctoral programs adequately supported with the full array of resources expected for graduate-level study, including qualified faculty with appropriate workload levels, support for advising and theses/ dissertations, library and research? Is there a "culture" that is expected for graduate study, e.g., scholarly and intellectual engagement among faculty and students?
- Yes. Please see in particular the narrative under WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendations 1, 4, 5 and 6.

Revised CFR 2.3: The institution's student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated at the course, program and, as appropriate, institutional level.

Self-Assessment
1. Have student learning outcomes been established for courses and programs? Have standards been established for the attainment of these SLOs?
- Course level – The Registrar keeps copies of approved course forms, and the Academic Senate's Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI) does as well, but these archives are not public. Please see the discussion of course forms in the latter part of the Institutional Research essay.

- Program level – Please see Data Exhibits 7.1a and 7.1b, the narrative under WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendations 1 and 5, and the essay on Student Learning Outcomes.

2. If appropriate to the institution, have institution-wide outcomes been established, e.g., for all undergraduate degrees?
- Yes. Please see narrative under WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendations 1 and 4.

3. Where are outcomes and expectations for attainment found?
- Each of the professional schools and the Graduate Division have a 'graduation requirements' page.
  Dentistry: http://dentistry.ucsf.edu/students/handbook-professionalism.html
  Medicine: http://medschool.ucsf.edu/curriculum/policies/index.aspx
  Nursing (MS): http://nurseweb.ucsf.edu/www/ps-ms.htm
  Pharmacy: http://pharmacy.ucsf.edu/pharmd/curr/reqs/
  Grad Div: http://graduate.ucsf.edu/content/current-students

---

Revised CFR 2.7: All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.

Self-Assessment
1. Is there a regular cycle of program review that includes assessment of student learning and analyses of retention and completion?
- Yes. Each of the Schools have full and detailed evaluations of their programs that take place during their affirmation of accreditation (see Data Exhibit 7.1b, column (6)), and the Graduate Division performs a review of each graduate academic program every five years (please see narrative under WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 5 and Data Exhibit 7.1a). Review is also a component of campus-wide programs, such as interprofessional teaching and learning (please see Section B under WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 1 as well as Appendix 5). Assessment of student learning is also discussed in the responses to WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendations 4 and 6. Please see Appendix 33 for an overview of graduate degree completion.

2. Is program review conducted on schedule and as intended?
- Yes. Please see Data Exhibits 7.1a and 7.1b. Note that three graduate academic programs requested extensions of their review which were granted by the Dean, and that they are all scheduled for review soon.

3. Does it also include, where relevant to the discipline, results of licensing and placement?

- Yes. Please see Data Exhibit 8.1.

4. Where are completed program reviews maintained?
- Program reviews for the graduate academic programs are kept on file at the Graduate Division, and each program has a file of their own reviews. Accreditation reviews of the professional programs are kept by the Schools. The Chancellor's Office also receives a copy of all reports from graduate and professional program accrediting agencies and keeps these on file.

> Revised CFR 2.8 GUIDELINE: Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.

Self-Assessment
1. How do policies and practices on promotion and tenure address scholarship that relates to teaching and learning? Is this kind of scholarship valued and encouraged by the institution?
- Please see Section C under WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 1, as well as the responses to WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 3 and 6 and Section E under WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 4.
- As noted under WASC Commission's Recommendation 7, the 2009 Annual Call from Academic Affairs recommends that contributions to interprofessional education be reflected in the Chair's promotion and tenure letters - see http://acpers.ucsf.edu/acapers/downloads/annualcall2010.pdf, page 3)

> Revised CFR 2.10: The institution collects and analyzes student data disaggregated by demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and campus climate to support student success.

Self-Assessment

1. Does the institution have a system for collecting and analyzing data about students?
- Yes. Please see responses to WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendations 4, 5, 7 and 10, particularly the latter.

2. Are data on retention, graduation, time to completion, and other measures of student achievement, analyzed in disaggregated form by various categories so that the institution can understand how different groups of students are performing and are experiencing their education?
- Yes, at both the School/program level and at the campus level. Please see responses to WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendations 4, 5, 7 and 10.

3. Is the institution surveying students and analyzing the resulting data on satisfaction and climate? What are the results? How are they used?

- Yes. Campus Life Services has an annual survey of student satisfaction with the services that they provide, and Student Health and Counseling Services does regular surveys of student satisfaction with health services, and recently participated in a patient satisfaction survey through the American College Health Association, which will provide data that can be compared at a national level. A UCSF campus climate survey is planned for fall, 2010, and an all-UC survey expected later in year. All these survey are or will be used to identify and address any student concerns and issues that surface.

Revised CFR 2.11: Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and assesses its co-curricular programs.

Self-Assessment

1. Does the institution have student support services that are appropriate to its mission, its programs, and the needs of the students it serves?
2. Are these programs regularly assessed to determine their effectiveness? By whom and how often? How are results of assessment used.
- Yes. The Office of Student Life (http://osl.ucsf.edu/), which include the Student Activity Center, Synapse (the student newspaper), the Office of Career and Professional Development, and the student governments – the Associated Students of UCSF for graduate professional students, and the Graduate Students Association) is charged with the development and oversight of co-curricular programs for the campus, and performs regular assessment of all their programs. The Millberry Fitness & Recreation Center on the Parnassus campus and the Bakar Fitness & Recreation Center at Mission Bay regularly evaluate their offerings, as do the Outdoor Programs, the Recreational Sports program, and the Performing Arts Clubs. Other co-curricular opportunities include student outreach programs such as the Science & Health Education Partnership and the UCSF Homeless Dental Clinic, both of which include an assessment component.

Revised CFR 3.2 GUIDELINE: The institution systematically engages full-time non-tenure track, adjunct, and part-time faculty in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.

Self-Assessment

1. Does the institution include adjunct, part-time, and non-tenure-track full-time faculty members in academic processes that affect student learning?
- UCSF includes adjunct, part-time, and non-tenure-track full-time faculty members in academic processes that affect student learning, however the degree and type of involvement depends on the faculty series and other factors.

2. What are the relevant institutional policies and practices that address their roles in the academic life of the institution?

- The institutional policies and practices that address their roles in the academic life of the institution appear on the Academic Affairs' 'Appointment/Advancement' webpage at http://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu/acapers/appointments.php.

3. How are they involved in assessing student work? In carrying out program-level assessment? In conducting program review?

- Non-tenure track faculty are regularly involved in assessing student work, with program-level assessment, and with program review.

4. Are they provided professional development to improve teaching and learning?

- Yes. For SOM faculty, see http://medschool.ucsf.edu/workshops/index.aspx/ and http://medschool.ucsf.edu/teachingscholars/); faculty from other Schools may participate if space is available. For information on classes given by the Library's Center for Instructional Technology, see http://cit.ucsf.edu/ . This topic is also addressed in the response to WASC Commission's Recommendation 3, in Sections D and E under WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 4, and in the essay on Diversity.

Revised CFR 3.3: Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives.

Self-Assessment

1. Are new faculty members provided with appropriate orientation?

- Yes. There are extensive resources for new faculty - see http://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu/general/newfaculty.php

---

Revised CFR 3.4: GUIDELINE: The institution provides training and support for faculty members teaching by means of technology-mediated instruction.

Self-Assessment

1. If online or other modes of distance education are used to deliver programs and courses or to enhance or replace face-to-face instruction, are faculty members provided with training?

- Yes. Please see the responses to WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendations 1 and 2 in the Learning Environment essay,

2. Are they provided with technology support? How? When? How often? What does this consist of? Is it effective?

- Yes. ETS/Classroom support is provided for all faculty (http://edtech.ucsf.edu/), and CLE training is available for all faculty (more detail is available in Sections A, B and C of the response to WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 2, in the response to the WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 3, and in Appendix 6.

Revised CFR 3.5: The institution has a history of financial stability, unqualified independent financial audits and has resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability…. If an institution has an accumulated deficit, it has realistic plans to eliminate the deficit.

Self-Assessment

1. Is the institution operating within its operating revenues and budgets? Is there an accumulated deficit or a pattern of operating deficits? If so, what are plans to address deficits? What are the trends? How soon will any accumulated deficits be eliminated?
- Yes. Full details can be obtained on UCSF's Budget and Resources Management pages at http://brm.ucsf.edu/finance/9830-DSY.html. As per our Annual Reports to WASC, we do not have a deficit.

2. Are annual independent financial audits conducted? Have the audits and related management letters identified any practices or patterns that need to be addressed? If so, how and when are these areas being addressed? Is the institution financially sustainable now and for the future?
- Yes, independent audits are conducted through the Systemwise office (see http://www.ucop.edu/finance/), and there are no areas that need need to be addressed.
- The campus is financially sustainable now and in the near future. For details regarding the immediate budget solution and the initiative to address long-term solutions (Operation Excellence'), please see the report from the Senior Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration at http://budget.ucsf.edu/stories/ucsf-senior-vice-chancellor-issues-budget-update/

Revised CFR 3.6: The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. These information resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes.

Self-Assessment

1. Are information resources and related support and facilities aligned with the educational objectives? Aligned with student learning outcomes? Do they support and enhance student learning? How? Are they adequate to meet the needs of the faculty and students?

- The UCSF Library and Center for Knowledge Management (http://www.library.ucsf.edu/) is one of the major medical libraries in the UC system, providing access to extensive physical and electronic information resources, and houses the Center for Instructional Technology (CIT) that supports UCSF's Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE). Support is provided for research software licensing, database and literature searches, and other research and reference services.
- Academic Research Systems (http://ctsi.ucsf.edu/informatics) is responsible for resources such as MyResearch@UCSF (secure data hosting), the Health Records Data Service, the Integrated Data Repository, Bioinformatics Data Analysis, and other key services as well.
- The Computer Graphics Laboratory at Mission Bay runs the Sequence Analysis and Consulting Service, an essential service for protein analysis.
  These resources, along with the fast, stable, and constantly improving network infrastructure provided by campus Information Technology Services are the essential infrastructure underlying the high-quality research and clinical training that take place at UCSF.

Revised CFR 3.8: GUIDELINE: The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority, which are reflected in an organization chart.

Self-Assessment

1. Does the institution have clear job descriptions? Lines of reporting and responsibility? Is there an organizational chart that reflects the structure of the organization? Is this structure well understood within the institution?
- Yes. Lines of reporting and responsibility are clear throughout the campus organizational structure, are reflected in organizational charts at each level, and are well understood by the campus community. The top-level organization chart is online at http://www.ucsf.edu/chancellor/sites/ucsf.edu.chancellor/files/files/charts/admincampus-pages.pdf
- Job descriptions exist at all levels. In fact, due to changes in top level leadership, the job descriptions for senior management have recently been revised, and organizational charts have been updated.

Revised CFR 3.9: GUIDELINE: The governing body regularly engages in self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.

Self-Assessment

1. Does the governing board engage in orientation, self-assessment, and development? Is this work designed to enhance the functioning of the board? When and how is it done? Is there any evidence of its value or impact?

- Yes. UC President Yudof leads the evaluation of the Chancellors, and our Chancellor leads the evaluation of her direct reports.

Revised CFR 3.10: The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibility is to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management

---

Self-Assessment

1. Does the institution have a full-time CEO/president/chancellor? Does the institution have a full-time CFO? How is the administration of the institution organized?
- Yes, we have a full-time Chancellor and a full-time CFO. The organization of the administration is outlined in the campus level organizational charts at http://chancellor.ucsf.edu/admincampus-pages.pdf

2. Are there a sufficient number of qualified administrators to ensure that the institution is operated effectively? Is the leadership effective? Is the institution well managed? How do you know?
- Yes. Please see the short description of UCSF efforts to achieve fiscal strength and operational efficiency on the Chancellor's webpage at http://www.ucsf.edu/chancellor/priorities/about-business-priority-0 as well a news article on her campus community Town Hall on achieving "Operational Excellence" at http://today.ucsf.edu/stories/chancellor-shares-plans-for-achieving-operational-excellence/ . The Operational Excellence Work Group report can be found at http://budget.ucsf.edu/stories/ucsf-releases-operational-excellence-work-group-report-supporting-documents/

Revised CFR 3.11: GUIDELINE: The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of the faculty.

Self-Assessment

1. Does the institution have a charter or other document that sets forth the roles, rights and responsibilities of the faculty? Is the faculty role clear? Is the faculty vested with sufficient authority over academic programs and policies?
- Yes. The Faculty Handbook and the Academic Personnel Manual – both are linked at http://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu/general/handbooks.php - and the Bylaws, Regulations, etc. of the Academic Senate – see http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-bylaws/index.html .

Revised CFR 4.4: The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

Self-Assessment

1. What are the institution's quality assurance processes? Do they exist at the institutional level and at other administrative levels? Does the institution have clear, published policies in the areas designated? Are they understood and followed? Do quality assurance processes assess not only capacity but effectiveness? If so, how? Are data, findings and results tracked over time to ascertain trends? Has the institution and units within it established benchmarks based on comparable institutions' performance? Are the results of the quality assurance processes used to make improvements? How does this work?

- Yes. At the institutional level (as noted in CPR 3.10 above), UCSF is currently engaged in a review of its operational efficiency, and education is one of the Chancellor's five key priorities for the campus (see http://www.ucsf.edu/chancellor/priorities/about-education-priority-0). As noted in the essay on Institutional Research, there is a multi-step review process for any new graduate program, which is described in detail in the Compendium. As described in the Academic Senate bylaws (http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-bylaws/index.html0), new curricula require the approval of the School's Educational Policy Committee and Faculty Council as well as the School faculty as a whole before the proposal moves to the Academic Senate's Educational Policy Committee for their consideration. Each of the professional Schools conducts periodic internal program reviews as well as external reviews, including programmatic accreditation. Graduate program review is described in the response to the WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 10. All of these processes include assessment of effectiveness, use of data from external sources, and longitudinal review of data, with the overarching intent being the improvement of instruction. Except for the approval of new curricula, all of the above include elements of critical external review.

Revised CFR 4.5: The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and objectives. Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included in the institutional research function is the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the research function and the suitability and usefulness of data.

Self- Assessment

1. What is the capacity of the institution to conduct institutional research? How is IR conducted and by whom? Is there a description of this function that is published or widely understood at

the institution? Is the IR function adequately resourced to meet the needs of the institution? What data are collected and analyzed? To whom are they disseminated and how often? Is there a "culture of evidence," i.e., is evidence used in making decisions and improvements? How is the IR function used to support the assessment of student learning assessment processes? Is the IR function evaluated periodically? Are new data collected and analyzed when needed?

- Please see the essay on Institutional Research and the OIR web page at http://oir.ucsf.edu/ . Reporting is made on an annual, quarterly, and ad-hoc basis to a wide variety of constituents, including campus units and individuals, the UC Office of the President, and (via UCOP), to the state legislature and the US Department of Education. Assessment of student learning takes place at the School, Divisional and departmental level, institutional-level assessment (e.g., campus climate) is the responsibility of the OIR. Reestablishment of the OIR included a critical evaluation of the campus need for data and analysis, particularly with respect to providing evidence for institutional effectiveness (IE), and included identifying the context for assessment of IE, the key variables for measuring IE, data collection strategies for measuring these variables, and strategies for communicating information on IE. IR function will be re-evaluated in conjunction with the Director's attendance at the Association for Institutional Research Annual Forum, where he is a member of the subcommittee on Graduate Education Data of the Higher Education Policy Committee; the WASC Academic Resource Conference, where he is the convener of the Graduate Academic Programs SIG; and the California Association for Institutional Research, where he is the UCSF representative at the UC Segment meeting. The Director of the OIR is also a member of the Functional Oversight Group for the Decision Support System being developed by UCOP

***** TABLE B *****

Our response to this required coverage is embedded in and threaded through the EER narrative. We are using this opportunity to provide additional information.

Student Success I: required for CPR but not for EER.

Student Success II: Further development of student success efforts. Based on the findings of the institution and the team at the CPR review, the institution will be expected to further its analysis of student success, deepening its analysis of its own and comparative data on graduation and retention rates, year-to-year attrition, campus climate surveys, etc.

- Attrition is very low and retention and completion are very high (95% overall) for all the graduate professional programs (Appendix 33). A pilot 'Left without a degree' analysis of students leaving graduate academic study did not find any indications that the gender or race/ethnicity of the student was associated with a decision to change degree objective to a Masters (from a PhD) or to leave school. Further analysis is needed, and the possibility of gathering more data from the Leave of Absence/Withdrawal petition is under consideration. One surprising finding was that a substantial number of MEPN-MS students leave the program after their MEPN year to practice as RNs; the admissions policies of the MEPN year appear to make this an attractive option for students who want a fast track to a credential. Indicator 32 of the UC 2010 Accountability Report (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/) show UCSF as having the longest time to PhD degree of all UC campuses, a statistic which is not in agreement with local data; the basis for this needs to be better understood. Student success has been promoted by several significant enhancements to student services as well.

Program Review: An analysis of the effectiveness of the Program Review Process. Institutions should analyze the effectiveness of the program review process, including its emphasis on the achievement of the program's learning outcomes. It is expected that the process will be sufficiently implanted for the institution and the team to sample current program review reports (self-studies, external review reports) to assess the impact of the program review process and alignment with the institution's quality improvement efforts and academic planning and budgeting.

- The graduate program review process, which is discussed in detail in the essay on Institutional Research, is well-established and is taken seriously by all graduate programs. Please see Internet Citations 40-42. Sample program review reports will be available for the team onsite.

Sustainability of Effectiveness Plans: A plan, methods, and schedule for assessment of learning outcomes beyond the Educational Effectiveness Review.

- At the institutional level, our new Chancellor has made clear that education is one of her top priorities, and thus we look forward to the further development of the learning environment, including attention to learning outcomes. The ongoing assessment of learning outcomes is well-established in all the graduate professional programs, and constitutes an essential element of their ongoing accreditation. Substantial momentum now exists within the Graduate Division (with the strong support of the Graduate Council) to have rubrics for the learning outcomes of each graduate program developed. At the course level, the Academic Senate's Committee on Courses of Instruction is now requiring that learning outcomes be set out on new course proposals, and is interested in providing assistance to instructors to enable this.