



REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

to the University of California, San Francisco

February 18-20, 2009

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Capacity and Preparatory Review

WASC Chair

Joseph D. Bloom, Dean Emeritus, School of Medicine
Professor Emeritus, Department of Psychiatry
Oregon Health Sciences University

WASC Assistant Chair/Team Editor:

Lisa M. Beardsley, Executive Secretary, Adventist Accrediting Association

WASC Members:

Gary C. Matthews, Vice Chancellor, Resource Management and Planning
University of California, San Diego

Klara K. Papp, Director, Center for the Advancement of Medical Learning
School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University

Jeannette E. South-Paul
Professor and Chair, Department of Family Medicine
University of Pittsburgh - Pittsburgh Campus

Kelly E. Wahl
Principal Institutional Research Analyst, Office of Analysis & Information Management
University of California, Los Angeles

WASC Staff:

Richard Winn, Associate Director

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution under the WASC Commission Standards and the Core Commitment for Institutional Capacity and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

Table of Contents

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	3
A. Description of Institution and Visit	3
B. The CPR Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor	4
C. Response to Previous Commission Issues	5
SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS	6
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives	6
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	7
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability	9
<i>Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources and Use of the Balanced Scorecard</i>	11
<i>Resource Allocation and Budget Planning</i>	12
<i>Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes</i>	14
<i>Evidence of Campus-wide Engagement</i>	16
<i>Institutional Research (CFR 4.5)</i>	17
<i>Analyses Promoting Improvement</i>	19
THEMES SELECTED FOR CPR REPORT	22
Theme 1: Learning Environment	22
Theme 2: Student Learning Outcomes	24
<i>Strategy 1. Fostering a culture of inter-professional education</i>	24
<i>Strategy 2. Identifying ways to encourage graduates to pursue academic careers</i>	26
Theme 3: Diversity	27
SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29
Recommendations	31
SECTION IV. PREPARATION FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW ...	34

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit

The University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) is the only campus in the 10-campus UC system that is exclusively devoted to the health sciences. It enrolls about 3,000 students from California, other states in the US and 77 other countries. Between the University and the academic medical center, it employs an active workforce of 20,000 faculty and staff. Degrees offered include the DDS, MD, PhD, PharmD, MS, and combinations of those degrees, including a concurrent DDS/MBA with the University of San Francisco.

The UC system is governed by a 26-member Board of Regents (CFR 3.9). UCSF Chancellor J. Michael Bishop, MD has announced a June 30, 2009, retirement and a search process is expected to result in a recommendation to the May meeting of the Board of Regents.

UCSF traces its historical roots to Toland Medical Center which opened in San Francisco in 1864. Toland joined the University of California in 1873 and schools of dentistry and pharmacy were added. A School of Nursing was added in 1939 and the Graduate Division in 1961 for academic and professional fields in the health sciences. It was renamed the University of California San Francisco in 1970 and has operated as an independent UC campus since then. UCSF was granted initial accreditation by WASC in 1976. Accreditation was reaffirmed in 1981, 1986, and 1999. With the advent of the new model of accreditation, the Commission canceled the Fifth-Year Report, set the Preparatory review for spring 2009, and the Educational Effectiveness Review for spring 2010, the latter of which was rescheduled to fall 2010. An MS in Global Health Sciences was approved in September 2008.

The Institutional Proposal was approved by WASC in July 2007. The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) Report was submitted December 2008. The purpose of this visit was

to consider the data and evidence supporting the claims made by UCSF in the CPR Report and to assess readiness to proceed with the schedule for the Educational Effectiveness Review. The University consists of multiple sites (Parnassus, Laurel Heights, since 2005 Mission Bay, and many smaller sites in San Francisco and Fresno) with three core clinical teaching facilities (UCSF Medical Center, San Francisco VA Medical Center, and San Francisco General Hospital). No distance education or off-campus programs were reported nor were there any special or follow-up visits in conjunction with the CPR visit.

B. The CPR Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor

The CPR Report included reflective essays on three themes that were introduced in the Institutional Proposal: the learning environment, learning outcomes, and diversity. The Report included a concluding essay focused on the institutional approach to the Educational Effectiveness Review. The team found that the institution's CPR Report was aligned with the themes and plans set forth in its Proposal. In the second essay on student learning outcomes, UCSF reported on the creation of a campus task force to develop and support inter-professional academic and co-curricular activities. Systematic assessment of current efforts that foster interaction among health care providers was undertaken as evidenced by the Catalogue of Inter-professional and Co-curricular Activities and a list of available offerings (Appendix 10).

The CPR Report demonstrated continuity of engagement with key issues identified by the previous visiting team and the Commission. Appendices provided evidence that the institution is able to disaggregate data by demographics and program of study. Overall, the report was responsive and substantial in addressing areas of focus.

C. Response to Previous Commission Issues

The June 9, 1999, letter written by UCSF three months after the last site visit and one month before the Commission meeting addressed areas of strength and concern that were identified in the team report of March 2-5, 1999. That letter was a model of timeliness, comprehension of issues, tone, and commitment to address the “challenges facing the campus that need special focus, planning attention, and resources.”

Concerns identified in the Commission letter of July 6, 1999, were reasonably addressed in the May 2007 Institutional Proposal. The CPR Report itself focused on the three themes identified in the Institutional Proposal. The CPR Report and appendices on a flash drive were received in early December, around two months before the visit, according to the expected timeline. Where a recommendation was not met (e.g., pertaining to the UCSF-Stanford merger), the reason was given in the Institutional Proposal.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS

This section of the report evaluates institutional capacity under the Standards and then according to the themes selected by UCSF.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The CPR Report closely follows the seven elements of the UCSF Strategic Plan (*Advancing Health Worldwide*) that was adopted in 2007. As stated in these documents and confirmed in the site visit, both were developed in a participatory fashion with the various elements of the UCSF community (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9). These documents and the site visit confirm that UCSF has a clear sense of institutional purpose that is visibly supported by institutional leaders at all levels. Although there is now a fast-track search for a new chancellor, institutional goals are clearly supported by the current chancellor and executive vice chancellor. The site visit confirmed that senior leadership at the level of chancellor associate staff and deans were actively involved in the formulation of the Strategic Plan and the CPR Report (CFR 1.3).

UCSF demonstrated a very high degree of integrity in its commitment to academic freedom for the academic community (CFR 1.4). A primary commitment to the education of all its students was apparent (CFR 1.6). This commitment is wholehearted. The institution appears to have made strong commitments to student support in all aspects of student life (CFR 1.7).

Planning for diversity formed a large part of UCSF's Strategic Plan and its CPR Report and will be discussed in more detail later in this team report under Theme 3 (CFR 1.5). UCSF demonstrated extraordinary commitment to the WASC evaluation process by cooperating in all aspects of the review from the preparation of the CPR Report, to responsiveness with

arrangements for the site visit, to the very timely production of documents for site visitors to review, and to participation in the review process by a very large number of faculty, staff and students. The site visit team commends the University for their honest and open communication and for undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor (CFR 1.9).

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

The educational programs of UCSF are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree-level awarded and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.3). Each school identifies learning objectives and measurement of achievement through published institutional objectives (Appendix 2c). These appear aligned with professional standards of each school; for example, the competencies identified by medicine and pharmacy reflect and are consistent with the accreditation standards and guidelines set forth by their respective professional organizations (LCME, ACGME and ACPE, respectively). The School of Dentistry defined competencies that were approved by faculty council in February 2003. The School of Nursing has well-articulated objectives; however, their source and approval processes were not specified in Appendix 2c.

Expectations for student learning are least articulated for the Graduate Division, except in terms of passing scores in courses taken and attainment of benchmarks such as passing qualifying examination and adequate dissertation defense. The team did not find that the Graduate Division had identified institutional objectives that might apply to all its graduates, nor that it could articulate important outcomes that all graduates ought to attain (CFR 2.4).

For the capacity review, the WASC review team reviewed concordance between the measurement of achievement through published educational objectives (Appendix 2c page 4-9

and CFR 1.2, 2.4) and the extent to which learning outcomes are measured (CFR 2.5, 2.6 and Appendix 2c pages 10-11—Outcomes table and the updated information provided onsite and after the visit). The outcomes table lists an array of assessment methods that are used by each school. In some cases these are rather loosely related to assessment methods used to measure learning outcomes in pages 4-9. For example, the objectives to "Demonstrate commitment to a nursing perspective; that is, internalization of the values, traditions, and obligations of the professional"; and "Identification with and commitment to the profession's function in the larger society." are "... measured using a variety of methods, including return clinical demonstration, faculty observations, testing (paper & pencil; online testing), student projects, class assignments & papers; clinical, teaching, and research residencies and practica." The measures described are not mapped to specific goals nor were criteria for acceptable performance indicated. In the absence of a tighter connection between these two tables, the team was unable to see the grounding of assurance that objectives are achieved or that graduates of each school do not obtain degrees until they meet these institutional objectives.

Along these same lines, in some cases, national licensing exams are listed as the measure of attainment of institutional objectives. Though important benchmarks, they are minimum competency measures that should not be cited exclusive of other indicators established by the institution itself. The team did not find that each school provided evidence of their graduates' achievement of specific institutional objectives and SLOs in more tangible and measurable ways other than through descriptive statistics from national licensing examinations or from their students' achieving passing marks in required coursework (CFR 2.3, 2.6, 2.7).

The CPR Report states that "reputation and ranking places UCSF high on the selectivity list," and thus recruitment and retention of students are much less difficult to monitor than it is

for undergraduate institutions. Nevertheless, the campus offers a wide array of support services to students and has invested considerably to ensure that students succeed. Members of the WASC team met with the staff in Student Services and Student Life, and affirmed their dedication to the high-achieving students at UCSF. The WASC review team commends this dedicated staff for their responsiveness to student concerns, their support of diverse students' needs, and their focus on ensuring the effectiveness of their efforts through assessment and reflection (CFR 2.13).

Lecture is still used to a large extent in the Schools of Dentistry and Pharmacy, and in the Graduate Division, according to the "Analysis of Course Offerings: Catalogue of teaching strategies and resources beyond textbooks" (Table in Appendix 2c, pp. 15-17). The School of Nursing did not identify any options on this table beyond text books, and the WASC team notes the apparent void of other options (CFR 2.10, 2.12). Unclear to the team was the extent to which there is assessment of students' incoming characteristics and need for alternative teaching strategies beyond the dominant mode of classroom lectures (with some notable exceptions) and the extent to which student input is solicited and informs decisions involving instructional methods within each school (CFR 2.10). In such a selective and high-achieving environment, students may be reticent to voice needs for alternative learning modalities, and it was not apparent that there was feedback or reflection by the institution in this regard.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

The quality of interaction with faculty, post docs and students during the site visit was extremely positive and participants were forthcoming. Most of the faculty and staff have been

with the University for many years and their longevity clearly provided a level of consistency and continuity that sustains and promotes attainment of educational objectives (CFR 3.1, 3.2). Although generally supportive, some of the staff that the WASC visiting team spoke with indicated they felt as though they were “second-class citizens” compared to faculty. This raised questions about underdeveloped capacity in the staff ranks that could be better leveraged to contribute to an optimal learning environment (Theme 1). However, most faculty, staff and students were collaborating to ensure ongoing and future advancement of teaching and learning.

Participants interviewed by the team were informed about issues (such as impact of the economy on the budget) and openly voiced concerns or made suggestions for improvement. Most were generally positive about the institution, with specific recommendations such as the need for enhanced IT support at all levels. There was noticeable camaraderie and willingness to collaborate to ensure institutional success.

Basic IT and electronic systems and resources were in place (CFR 3.6) to support HR functions such as posting vacancies and promoting its diverse workforce (<http://www.ucsfhealth.org/adult/jobs/index.html>) and to meet federal requirements such as reporting for the *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Survey Data*. IPEDS is the core postsecondary education data collection program for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and includes nine surveys (covering student, personnel and financial data) by which data are collected during three separate periods. Analysts in Information Resources and Communications Data Warehouse and Corporate Systems unit coordinate all responses for the ten campuses and the Office of the President. Copies of recent submissions were provided to the team (UCOP: <http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/uwnews/stat/ipeds.html>).

Each spring, Information Resources and Communications publishes the Statistical Summary of Students and Staff, which summarizes data supplied by all campuses and serves as the official record of student enrollment at the University of California (UCOP: <http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/uwnews/stat/welcome.html>)

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources and Use of the Balanced Scorecard

In 2005 UCSF elected to adopt the Balanced Scorecard model developed by Norton and Kaplan at Harvard Business School. This useful, multidimensional model helps management provide oversight for most facets of operations while focusing on the vision of where an operation is heading and meaningful goals for attaining that vision. Financial and Administrative Services use the Balanced Scorecard as its strategic tool for departmental reporting. The Scorecard allows departments to track progress in four areas: Customer Service, Financial Performance, Internal Processes, and Learning and Growth. It also provides a vehicle to target areas identified for improvement and effectiveness (<http://fas.ucsf.edu/FAS/bsc.html>).

The Capital Programs & Facilities Management Report (dated 11/2008, p. 9) states that the “Balanced Scorecard is a strategy tool used by the departments reporting up to Financial & Administrative Services (FAS)” (<http://www.cpfm.ucsf.edu/gts.pdf>).

Current and archived scorecards are available online by year from 2005-06 for Campus Life Services (<http://cas.ucsf.edu/balancedscorecard/reports.html>) and Human Resources (<http://fas.ucsf.edu/FAS/3024-DSY/version/default/part/AttachmentData/data>; <http://fas.ucsf.edu/FAS/3032-DSY/version/default/part/AttachmentData/data>). Current FAS measures can be found at <http://fas.ucsf.edu/FAS/home/3014-DSY.html>.

Advancing Health Worldwide, A Strategic Plan for the University of California San Francisco is available online (<http://strategy.ucsf.edu/contents/ucsf-strategic-plan/>). The plan provides a vision for the future as well as functions as a community organizing tool. Familiarity of those interviewed with its aims indicates that it has successfully engaged many on campus and contributed to development of shared ownership of future goals and aspirations of the University.

Resource Allocation and Budget Planning

The institution embraces a collegial review of resource allocation and ensures campus-wide involvement in the process (e.g., online campus letter advising Budget Review process at <http://budget.ucsf.edu/stories/executive-budget-committee-approves-principles-appoints-work-groups1/>). The institution embraces a transparent budgetary process that includes Academic Senate input and routinely scheduled interaction with Campus Fiscal Officers at the highest level of the organization (CFR 3.5, 3.8).

Philanthropy

The institution has an enviable track record of philanthropy. In 2007- 08 the University raised \$366,068,018, making it number 14 nationwide in fund-raising activity (<http://chronicle.com>, Section: Money & Management). On December 17, 2008, it was announced that “The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation is donating \$25 million to UCSF's stem cell program, one of the largest and most comprehensive programs of its kind in the United States. The gift will go toward construction of a headquarters for the program on the Parnassus campus, enabling scientists to continue their groundbreaking advances in identifying strategies to treat a wide range of diseases.”

The success of the Mission Bay campus demonstrates the capacity of UCSF to use resources effectively and with vision.

Network and Infrastructure

Efforts to enhance technology for administrative, academic and clinical operations (CFR 3.6) are outlined in the Strategic Plan. The institution has taken steps to strengthen the University's core networking infrastructure and technology resources campus-wide through a proposed per capita funding model by which users share costs equally via a monthly user fee over a five-year period. By the time of the visit, a business case for the funding model had been presented to the Executive Budget Committee, the Academic Planning and Budget Subcommittee and the School of Medicine department chairs. Other presentations are planned. A Data Network Recharge Committee had been established to further review the proposal and is expected to submit its recommendation to the Executive Committee by spring 2009.

Management Information Reporting System

As of July 7, 2008, UCSF's Resource Management, Planning and Allocation Steering Committee began work to upgrade to a new management information reporting and budgeting system. Cognos, a business intelligence software company, has proposed a UC-wide plan to:

- provide a data warehouse repository of major campus data;
- homogenize information retrieval and orchestration tools to accommodate the gamut of skill levels among University employees;
- clarify and simplify the budget submission and approval system; and

- establish common data and definitions to facilitate campus-wide reporting.

The institution's information technology resources provide support for basic educational purposes and for key academic and administrative functions (CFR 3.6). During the visit many of those interviewed commented on improvements made over the last several years while still expressing the desire for improved computing and information services across the campus at all levels. In particular, those who move between the academic, clinical, and research enterprises expressed frustration with the fragmented computing "silos" that require them to use multiple passwords and, even then, not gain access to data in one part of the institution from another part.

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

The institution has clearly defined roles as depicted on its organizational chart (CFR 3.8). There are planned changes in leadership over the next 18 months and yet many challenges must be addressed during the period of transition. The team encourages senior leadership to press forward and use this time to reflect upon and develop enhanced structures designed to address the economic and leadership realities that face the institution.

The institution has an independent governing board that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer (CFR 3.9). The UC Board of Regents, in concert with the UC Office of the President, facilitates this process. The roles of each of those components need clarification. The UC office of the President has experienced major restructuring and staff reduction and the Regents have grappled with becoming less transactional in their oversight and more focused on strategic interactions with the State to ensure sustained funding provided to the system.

UCSF has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibility is to the institution (CFR 3.10). In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management. Changes in senior leadership are underway as noted earlier, the executive vice chancellor and provost (one position) and other members of the senior administrative team will need to take up additional leadership and management responsibilities during the search period and subsequent transition. Interviews with the senior management team, including the deans, indicated cohesion as a team and willingness to work together as outlined by the University Strategic Plan.

The position of Dean of Medicine is currently vacant and shall remain so until a new chancellor is identified. The interim VC for Finance and Administration replaced the Senior VC for Finance and Administration who retired in July 2008. Both positions had been filled by the incumbents from 1994 (executive VC) and 1998 (chancellor). The leadership provided to the institution during a period of expansion will need to be carried forward, and will require careful assessment of the personalities and skill sets required to ensure ongoing success of the institution into the future. It is no small matter to replace a chancellor who has the stature of the incumbent, especially given the challenges of the current fiscal crisis, the ongoing pressure to secure the desired increases in philanthropy, and the necessity to offer a salary commensurate with the high cost of living in San Francisco.

The institution's faculty exercise effective academic leadership and act consistently to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution's educational purposes and character (CFR 3.12). Likewise, the faculty Senate is both active and visible. Faculty routinely participate in decision making and serve on critical planning committees of the

institution. Shared governance was observed as an apparent, positive and integral component of campus culture (CFR 3.13). The current Chair of the UC System-wide Faculty Senate is a member of the UCSF Medical School faculty. She is also the Faculty Advisor and member of the UC Board of Regents.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Evidence of Campus-wide Engagement

Charged with a wide range of tasks, constituents from across UCSF have come together to participate effectively in the planning processes of the institution, per the strategies stated in the CPR Report (CFR 4.1). From across campus, faculty, administrators, and students have been consulted in projects ranging from developing the UCSF Teaching and Learning Center now under construction in the Campus Library on Parnassus, to plans for the education space at Mission Bay (CFR 4.2). Updates to the space Master Plan -- part of the next Long-Range Development Plan -- demonstrate campus engagement with the institution's planning processes and the value of revising such plans on an ongoing basis. At a meeting that the visiting team had with the executive leadership, the deans described an atmosphere of collegiality and collaboration that included inviting the deans of other schools on campus to the School of Medicine's leadership retreat (CFR 4.1)

The learning environment theme (Theme 1) focused on UCSF's quest for "optimal support systems and organizational structures needed to sustain and promote excellence in teaching and learning." The planning processes described in the CPR Report probed educational needs by involving key stakeholders on campus in taskforces and work groups (such as the Content Capture and Delivery Work Group), and these committees set priorities and

recommended courses of action regarding campus resources (CFR 4.1, 4.2). The institution's capacity for real improvement has been richly expanded through such involvement of the faculty, administration, and students and holds promise for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) Report.

Furthermore, engagement with the WASC accreditation process has resulted in campus constituents making recommendations for improvements in institutional capacity that range from effective data collection and use to the promotion of opportunities for inter-professional education (Appendix 3 of the CPR Report). When it comes to strategic planning and how the various strategies in the CPR Report will be evaluated for success, however, formal reliance on qualitative and quantitative data and analyses seems to be in the initial stages of development (CFR 4.3). Particular reports and analyses of student learning outcomes have yet to be explicitly mapped to decisions made and actions taken regarding the three themes. For example, specific measures of the effectiveness of the Teaching and Learning Center have yet to be defined – and the use of such measures must be in place by the EER visit to substantiate UCSF's commitment to learning and improvement articulated in Standard 4.

Institutional Research (CFR 4.5)

At the time of the last WASC site visit (1999), there was a “new” Office of Institutional Research, and the institution stated that this office was needed to “continue to support the integration and scope of institutional research at UCSF.” [UCSF response letter to team report, dated June 1999] The office was cited in the team report as producing “invaluable” and “continuously updated” data. In Appendix 3 of the CPR Report, however, the Office of Institutional Research is described as “reconstituted” in response to an action necessary in the work plan informing the learning environment theme (p. 2). This “newly-reconstituted” Office

of Institutional Research is establishing baseline definitions -- such as standard ethnic categories for reporting consistency -- and determining data-gathering timelines and procedures. A variety of professionals participate in the operation, ranging from staff in the Graduate Division to programmers partially assigned to the Office of Institutional Research. The group successfully created data exhibits for this CPR Report and participates in all campus efforts to enhance the capacity of UCSF's student information system as well as to increase the quality and quantity of its local data resources. When called upon for ad hoc reporting, these institutional researchers have responded promptly to diverse requests such as for a brief campus profile for candidates in the chancellor search that is underway, or for a summary of the PhD time-to-degree report for the WASC visiting team. The Institutional Research Office staff deserve commendation for their hard work and resourcefulness given some of the recent disruptions in this office.

The institutional research office has been charged with reporting and analyzing data to support decision making and institutional improvement, and these data must be produced efficiently and effectively for their successful application to management practice. The CPR Report described future reports as being produced "annually" by the Office of Institutional Research to "create and maintain dashboard indicators of progress on priorities set by the strategic plan," but such management tools have yet to be developed. At this point, the office provides reports that are descriptive, but the Student Academic Affairs division plans to move the office towards providing interpretive and analytical reports as well. It was unclear what resources have been allocated to build the office in that direction, not only to serve those necessary functions but also to support other stated functions such as the assessment of student learning, preparation of accreditation materials for the various schools, and support of recent efforts by the University of California Office of the President to demonstrate "accountability"

and greater “transparency.” Given the recent re-establishment of this office on campus, a review of the office’s “research function and the suitability and usefulness of [its] data” (CFR 4.5) has been scheduled into the regular five-year review cycle of areas within Student Academic Affairs and is listed to receive its turn three years after the CPR visit.

The institution states: “We are committed to streamlining and enhancing our data collection mechanisms to help our accreditation processes.” The essential data collected to support such processes, such as retention and graduation rate data, are supplied by the institutional researchers on campus in the Graduate Division and could be calculated by the central Office of Institutional Research instead if appropriate resources were made available. Data important for establishing best practices in institutional planning are neither centrally created nor maintained even though many individuals are engaged in institutional research on campus. However, they have other time-intensive responsibilities in their primary positions. Steps toward expansion of the institutional research function include updating the Office of Institutional Research’s website for reporting findings, and administering to all students a survey regarding campus climate/satisfaction.

Analyses Promoting Improvement

Quality assurance processes are well developed at UCSF in the areas of Student Life and Student Services. The success of various programs is assessed through multiple measures, using both qualitative and quantitative research methods. Indicators are channeled into management decisions as well as to the student-governed Registration Fee Committee for their annual review. By way of academic division-based advocacy of student services on campus -- i.e., referrals from deans and other academic administrators -- these student life and student services programs have

been validated as a vital component in the institution's commitment to support its students and to maintain stellar retention rates (CFR 4.4, 4.6).

Program review and program approval processes embody quality assurance systems that are well-established by the Academic Senate (CFR 4.4). The academic degree programs in the Graduate Division undergo this review instead of an accreditation process similar to those for the first professional degree programs. However, the program review process has yet to require student learning outcomes data as is required by external accreditors for the dental, medical, nursing, or pharmacy degrees. Instead, effectiveness and outcomes data are limited to narratives and simple tables describing the dissertations defended; how student "progress" is assessed; student involvement in program planning; employment outcomes; along with rudimentary calculations of several summary statistics. Detailed data articulating student learning outcomes or objectives are not solicited in the review process, and no evidence is provided to describe quality assurance processes or program enhancement in response to assessed student performance.

The assessment of effectiveness is implemented more fully in the professional degree programs, in the form of articulated learning objectives and relevant data points collected as indicators of educational effectiveness (Exhibits 7.1 and 8.1). The visiting team met with faculty involved in departmental assessment processes, and faculty in the School of Medicine, for example, were able to describe "closed loops" of course improvement in response to student performance on various assessments (e.g., taking an accurate and complete patient history).

Surveys are administered to students frequently to evaluate the programs within the various schools across campus, but such an indirect assessment method (students self-reporting their experiences on surveys) can only provide part of the data considered necessary for best

practice in program improvement. Still needed across all programs and seemingly absent in some academic areas at UCSF are direct assessments of performance through examination of students' work products or through documented assessment of students' performance of a relevant task. Direct assessment is not taking place uniformly throughout the institution's academic programs.

Furthermore, for the non-professional programs, it was unclear how conclusions drawn by management and student-performance oversight committees regarding specific change is a result of the various assessment reports. In many areas, as described in Exhibit 7.1, the faculty are informed of whether students met performance expectations after reports are cycled upward through committees and management. Systematic and campus-wide documentation as to how these conclusions change curriculum is absent, and thus questions remain as to how student performance findings are translated into action. In the EER Report, evidence that such assessment processes are operating will need to be documented. Also needed is evidence of continuous and systematic efforts to incorporate what the institution has learned about itself into how the institution takes action in response to quality indicators (CFR 4.6, 4.7).

THEMES SELECTED FOR CPR REPORT

Theme 1: Learning Environment

The team found a very positive learning environment with members of the community engaged in strategic planning and program development. They exuded a sense of ownership and pride in the organization and indicated that their voices are heard and their input was included in the outcomes.

The Mission Bay campus is a positive addition to the institution and has been designed to promote collaboration and collegial interaction. Laboratory spaces were often referenced as the model of best practices in their design. The team noted their functionality as well as the way the architectural design fosters interdisciplinary collaboration and creativity (e.g., through designated space for interaction such as seating/meeting areas around floor landings and the use of artwork).

The building of the Community Center and provision of housing at that site within the first phase of construction are clear evidences of institutional commitment to its faculty, students, staff, and even the surrounding community, who can swim laps or scale the climbing wall at the well-equipped Bakar Fitness & Recreation Center.

A minimum of 1% of the total for capital projects is utilized for the introduction of public art, some of which is related to biomedical themes. The current collection enriches the campus and reflects its people and community in harmony with the physical and built environment.

The success of the learning environment at Mission Bay attests to outstanding planning and coordination with the local community and planning professionals. It transformed a decaying part of the city into a vibrant focal point for research, education, and quality of life for those based there. The Parnassus campus greatly benefited from the development of Mission Bay as it decompressed space constraints that have existed at Parnassus for many years.

The Center for Learning and Teaching is a noteworthy example of the collaborative nature of the community and their collective desire to maximize the use of that precious commodity “SPACE” in a manner that transcends parochial interests to achieve synergy and a greater sense of what UCSF is and strives to be.

On the Parnassus campus, years of reductions in the Operations and Maintenance budgets have taken their toll with increased deferred maintenance requiring much needed funding. As buildings continue to age, the need escalates. The need to maintain and operate at multiple sites further compounds the complexity of providing these services.

While the team used no “white glove” test, there were obvious examples showing the level of care provided to the campus despite challenges of running a distributed campus system. Random areas were inspected for dust and debris in the library, and they were spotless. The general cleanliness and care of University areas reflects an outstanding ability of Facilities Management to do much with little. Their contribution to the creation of an environment conducive to learning must not be overlooked.

A host of seminars by renowned scientists is open for anyone to attend in person or by teleconference at various campus locations. Collaboration is an attribute of the culture of UCSF, with a spirit of openness and interest in new ideas expressed by many. Graduate students serve on different committees and indicated that leadership is accessible and interested in hearing their ideas. They reported they were valued as members of the community and see that things are changing as a consequence of their suggestions. Campus leadership is described by students to be transparent and honest. For instance, graduate students expressed appreciation that they heard from the chancellor about how budget cuts would affect them before the news hit the papers.

Theme 2: Student Learning Outcomes

UCSF seeks to distinguish itself in the accreditation process by:

- fostering a culture of inter-professional education, and
- identifying ways to encourage its graduates to pursue academic careers.

Strategy 1. Fostering a culture of inter-professional education

UCSF faculties define inter-professional education (IPE) as “formal, planned occasions when two or more professions learn with, from, and about each other to improve collaboration and the quality of care” (Appendix 8). Though inter-professional practice is rapidly replacing the model where each profession works in isolation to serve the needs of the patient, the barriers and challenges to IPE are formidable and readily acknowledged in the CPR Report (Appendix 8 III. Barriers to Expanding Inter-professional Education at UCSF). To identify and address these barriers, a campus task force, IPETF, was convened six years ago, consisting of faculties from each of UCSF’s professional schools to develop and support inter-professional academic and co-curricular activities. This task force has made significant progress and is to be commended. They instituted an inter-professional day held annually since September 2006 that is nothing short of remarkable. Students’ perceptions of the program are very favorable as evidenced by ratings, on average, of 4.3; 4.2 in 2006; 2007 respectively [on a scale of 1-5] (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.4). In addition, IPETF supported an interprofessional lunchtime elective seminar series on learning skills, and recruited an inter-professional group of faculty to participate in the Program for Educators in the Health Professions who developed video modules on patient communication that may be incorporated into the core curricula at all UCSF professional schools.

These programs are commendable and advance educational objectives of IPE within curricula of all professional schools by identifying common ground upon which to build sustainable opportunities for IPE (CFR 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 4.6, 4.8).

The faculty and deans established specific assessments and effectiveness indicators for IPE goals and strategies, including assessments of learner perceptions as well as direct measures of learning outcomes (though not global ones). They plan to capture data through these assessments; use the data in planning and resource allocation; and thereby effect change.

IPETF organized a compilation of the Catalogue of Inter-professional Co-Curricular Activities in the summer of 2008 (Appendix 10). The electives listed in the catalogue enable students in all schools to avail themselves of opportunities for IPE across campus. Beyond cataloging activities across schools, the task force also established the need to assess learning outcomes for students in the professional schools (CFR 2.4, 2.7, 2.8, 2.10). In assessing the outcomes for students, it will be important to keep in mind the distinction made in Appendix 8 between “inter-professional education” and “multidisciplinary education” where students simply learn the same content in the same course without interacting to learn with and from each other about the other’s role.

Logistical barriers are among the obstacles to inter-professional education; they are significant but not insurmountable. The team commends UCSF for its creation of an online course schedule and for establishing a campus academic calendar through the work of the Campus Academic Calendar Committee. Starting in the 2009-10 academic year, Monday afternoons will be available campus-wide for scheduling IPE activities. While making the time available removes a significant obstacle for IPE, it will be important to identify learner needs, create curricula to meet those needs, evaluate learners and the curricula to sustain the momentum

in IPE, as well as define and measure endpoints for success/benefit of IPE/ IPP (e.g. learners, faculty, patients, institution) (CFR 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 4.6, 4.8).

The Teaching and Learning Center is being designed to support IPE. This is one of the primary places on campus where inter-professional education initiatives will be realized. The visiting WASC team recognizes the enthusiastic core of faculty including librarians, educational technology support services, and professional schools for collaborating to design the Center for Teaching and Learning to fulfill the vision for IPE. We also commend the sending of a team of faculty members, one from each school, to participate in the Harvard-Macy Health Professions Educators Program, where they designed a project around inter-professional education and an inter-professional curriculum that may serve as a prototype for others working collaboratively within the Center for Teaching and Learning. Support for inter-professional education was voiced at the highest levels of leadership at UCSF and is a cornerstone of the strategic plan of the institution published in 2007. In addition, it serves as a central thesis for both Essays 1 and 2 in the CPR Report. The Center for Teaching and Learning has great potential to facilitate and study best practices and outcomes for inter-professional education.

Strategy 2. Identifying ways to encourage graduates to pursue academic careers

The professional schools recognize “the impending problem of growing the health sciences education faculty and replacing them as they retire” (Data exhibit 4.4). Each school has a well-articulated plan to identify the next generation of faculty and encourage students to consider careers in academia. Numerous programs have been identified and cataloged campus-wide and by each school to prepare students for academic careers in Appendix 11 (CFR 2.9, 2.10). Further, an important initiative, though not specifically mentioned in Essay 2 but highly pertinent to it, is the extensive effort at recruitment and retention at UCSF (CFR 3.1, 3.2). A

remarkable and extensive faculty mentoring program documented 873 faculty altogether from the four professional schools (Exhibit Book 2 shown during the WASC visit). In all, 24 were reported in dentistry, 786 in medicine, 35 in nursing, and 28 in pharmacy. The coordinated effort to pair faculty in a formal mentoring program is to be applauded.

Theme 3: Diversity

UCSF is commended for making significant progress towards broadly embracing the goal of diversity across the institution. The focus is consistent with WASC standards for integrity (CFR 1.5), expectations for student learning (CFS 2.3), scholarship and curricular innovation (CFR 2.8), and having sufficient number of qualified and diverse faculty (CFR 3.2). UCSF has incorporated diversity into its strategic plan, and there is ample evidence of interest and involvement by multiple groups in different schools within the institution.

Community engagement is a key element for accommodating the diverse groups who constitute the University's stakeholders. Given that the University has 150 programs addressing diversity throughout the region, the diversity theme helps unify these programs and links with the community. The University Community Partnerships Program has a tradition of community engagement and may offer a foundation to champion this area.

Pursuing a shared definition and goals for diversity and cultural competence will provide a clear framework for refining attainment of this institutional goal. Standard definitions were used among the schools except for the School of Medicine (which uses specific data obtained from the national common application form and must use those diversity designations). Various agencies use different definitions – one group separates Taiwanese and Chinese; some count Filipinos as Asians and others count them as a unique group; many respondents indicate 'other',

while others refuse to indicate gender. There is a need for establishing a consistent framework for documenting race and ethnicity as one aspect of culture within the University.

The Institutional Research program has diligently monitored race and ethnicity in recruiting, hiring, etc. among students and faculty to ensure the University can demonstrate compliance to receive federal funding. Proposition 209 allows the monitoring of all things required to prevent the UC institution from losing federal funding. UCSF has just completed a new affirmative action plan to assure ongoing compliance with these guidelines.

The Greenlining Institute found UCSF to be the most diverse in student enrollment, and consistently so, among the UC schools of medicine. The faculty mentoring program incorporates deliberate selection of participants that involves deans and department chairs. It involves the UCSF Coro Leaders Program that is 60% female and 30% people of color. The leadership has determined that diversity should be owned by the entire faculty rather than just be the responsibility of a single campus-wide office that focuses on issues of diversity. There are key individual champions of resources for the disabled and national leadership in groups regarding the well-being of the LGBT community. In addition, the University plans to examine geographic distribution and those who represent the first-generation in higher education. The new staff leadership institute and academy will pay attention to diversity. In addition, information regarding resources for disabled students will be enhanced as a result of the appointment of a new director of disability support and other types of support such as for study skills.

Furthermore, there is now a state initiative called the *Troops to College Initiative* – at highest level of the President and the Regents – to be as welcoming as possible to veterans. There are now approximately 20 veterans on the campus with plans to conduct focus groups with the veterans to establish a national Webinar for providing services to veterans.

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The team found much to praise at UCSF. The team commends:

1. The administration for a strategic plan that has engaged the community and the campus at every level, and that is helping to sustain focus through a period of transitions in leadership. The team found that the CPR Report aligned with the Strategic Plan and that its vision was shared by many.
2. The administration for its success in securing significant external funding for campus development.
3. The administration for development of the Mission Bay Campus that revitalized an underutilized part of the city and created an academic presence. The design of the research facilities and community center will help to secure the future for UCSF as a great research university. Use of technology in the classroom enriches the learning environment and increases access to learning resources across a distributed campus. The addition of affordable student housing has fostered a sense of community among students and removed a barrier to a world-renowned health center for bright students and post-doctoral students.
4. The librarians, educational technology support services, schools, and an enthusiastic core of faculty for collaborating to design the Center for Teaching and Learning. The Center has the potential to facilitate, study and document best practices and outcomes for inter-professional education, such as exercises and curricular development designed around the interprofessional project undertaken by four faculty who attended the Harvard-Macy Health Professions Educators Program. Practices such as employing second-year PT

students as teaching assistants in the first-year medical student anatomy lab also facilitate inter-professional teamwork.

5. The staff engaged in institutional research for their effort to amass a central collection of data from disparate sources that lack consistent standards and definitions.
6. The participants in the WASC accreditation process for their enthusiasm for UCSF. Their commitment to reflection through the Proposal and CPR Report has yielded palpable benefits in bringing the institution current in its strategic planning and in planning supporting activities.
7. The vice provost for student academic affairs, administration, and those on the WASC accreditation steering committee members for demonstrating responsiveness and institutional capacity by providing additional information that was requested before and during the visit. This speaks well to institutional capacity to obtain the information needed to answer question about educational effectiveness.
8. The administration, deans, and faculty for creating a rich interdisciplinary environment conducive to research and study. Graduate students (and post docs) reported appreciation for a “good advising system” and “excellent mentors” for career advising. In addition, they commended leadership provided by the Office of Career and Professional Development within Student Academic Affairs and by the Graduate Division for their advocacy, mentoring, and career advising.
9. The staff in Student Services and Student Life, and affirms their dedication to the high-achieving students at UCSF, their responsiveness to student concerns, their support of

diverse students' needs, and their focus on ensuring the effectiveness of their efforts through assessment and reflection (CFR 2.12, 2.13).

10. The faculty and administration for a significant commitment to supporting diversity as evidenced by the large number of individuals and groups involved and programs offered (some 150 programs across campus).

Recommendations

With a focus on readiness for the Educational Effectiveness Review, the team recommends that:

1. The administration, librarians, educational technology support services and the professional schools mature the Center for Teaching and Learning by clarifying governance and operational support for the Center including technical support; engage all stakeholders in achieving the inter-professional goals of the center; realize research potential on learning outcomes; and identify student learning projects and outcomes. In order to ensure sustainability, leadership of the Center must develop a business plan and identify how to fund operations, particularly in this climate of financial uncertainty (CFR 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8).
2. The administration continue development of and communicate plans for a viable integrated information technology infrastructure, such that the academic, healthcare, and administrative enterprises can be better served by stable, secure, and coordinated information resources and state-of-the-art learning tools. Communication of planned enhancements to facilities and services is vital. Projected upgrades to information technology require clear outreach and community-wide input and awareness of phased installation. Marketing of the proposed fee structure should be targeted and focused to

ensure the support of senior leadership, with the EVC tasking appropriate staff to facilitate the process (3.6, 3.7).

3. The administration provide resources to establish and appropriately staff the institutional research office on a permanent basis, and create a central data resource at its disposal such as a data warehouse extracted from the student information system, to enable consistent and effective support for campus data reporting and analytical needs (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.5).
4. The faculty and deans build upon work already done to establish specific assessments and effectiveness indicators for the strategies articulated in the themed essays. These will include indirect methods (such as student surveys) as well as direct measures of student learning outcomes (CFR 2.3, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5). Data from these assessments need to be collected, used in planning and resource allocation, and used to effect change. Efforts should continue to define global learning outcomes that distinguish a UCSF graduate irrespective of discipline, e.g., ability to work in inter-professional teams, cultural competence in professional practice, or what is meant by the “academically-minded” and “open-minded” health care professional/research scientist (CFR 2.6, 2.7, 4.7, 4.8).
5. The Graduate Council, the Dean of the Graduate Division, and faculty incorporate into the academic degree program review process both student learning outcomes together with appropriately aligned assessments and the use of these assessments in program improvement, in much the same way that such assessments inform the accreditation processes of the professional degree programs (CFR 2.2, 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.7).
6. The registrar’s office and deans of admissions continue to pursue standard definitions of demographic categories, as well as consistent methods for capturing them such that at

students' matriculation in the degree programs, data describing diversity categories, such as ethnicity, are stored at the greatest level of detail that can provide useful data for subsequent re-tabulation of categories or disaggregation of data for various reporting and analytical purposes (CFR 3.7, 4.3, 4.5).

7. The faculty and administration contribute to generalizable knowledge through the development of rigorous design and assessment of its many initiatives, thereby learning from its own best practices and contributing to the literature in health professions education (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7).
8. The faculty and administration communicate a shared definition, consistent framework and the metrics used to measure what is meant by diversity that would include cultural competency in graduates who demonstrate they are “advancing health worldwide.” This definition will provide the institutional research metrics to demonstrate progress towards achieving institutional goals and educational effectiveness. It is recognized that as a federal contractor, UCSF has to collect and report affirmative action data, but beyond this requirement, the team found a lack of consensus about goals and benchmarks (4.3, 4.5, 4.7).

SECTION IV. PREPARATION FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

The team found ample data and evidence in support of alignment of the CPR Report, Institutional Proposal, Strategic Plan, and awareness of their aims and themes by administration, faculty, students, and staff. Examination of physical facilities and resources provided tangible evidence of institutional capacity to achieve core commitments to learning, teaching, research, and patient care. The WASC review process involved the campus at multiple levels and there was evidence that the process of reflection led to a greater understanding of capacity and identified needs for further development. The team found cohesiveness regarding the general themes.

Work remains to focus on aspects of diversity to measure and what might be the global learning outcomes for a UCSF graduate regardless of program of study. Formal reliance on qualitative and quantitative data and analyses seem to be in the initial stages of development. The explicit mapping of learning outcomes and attainment of the three themes needs to be linked with management tools and means for monitoring and effecting change. The team recommends more systematic and direct assessments of student performance through examination of student work products or performance of a relevant task. How findings are translated into action will also need to be documented in the EER Report.

Institutional research functions and information technology systems provide rudimentary support, and the team endorses investment and development in these areas in preparation for the EER Report. Because retention and graduation rates are high with such a selective student pool, the team commends efforts by UCSF to challenge itself in the more daring and difficult-to-measure goals of producing a diversity of graduates who are effective members of inter-professional teams, culturally-competent, and “academically-minded” clinicians, scientists and

future faculty. The team affirms what the institution is doing to meet its own expectations, and provides recommendations so that it will be able to demonstrate success in the next phase of the WASC review process.

APPENDICES [if applicable]

Report on off-campus and distance education programs: N/A

Report on substantive change-related issues: N/A

Compliance audit: N/A



Student Academic Affairs
Office of the Vice Provost

Joseph I. Castro, Ph.D.
Vice Provost

500 Parnassus Avenue
Millberry Union, 200 West
San Francisco, CA 94143-0244
tel: 415/502-7786
Fax: 415/476-9690
email: joseph.castro@ucsf.edu

May 22, 2009

Ralph A. Wolff
President and Executive Director
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
985 Atlantic Ave Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Ralph,

Thank you for assembling an excellent WASC team for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) site visit on February 18-20, 2009. Our students, postdoctoral scholars, faculty, administrators and staff appreciated the opportunity to engage with the WASC team.

I write to acknowledge the receipt of the final report and to share some brief comments about its content. We appreciate the thorough and positive findings in the CPR report. Our campus WASC Accreditation Steering Committee has reviewed the report carefully and has already begun to lead our planning for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER). We will continue to use the WASC accreditation process to challenge ourselves to further enhance the quality of our educational programs and infrastructure.

Please find below some specific comments on the CPR report:

Learning Environment

On page 7 of the WASC team report, the following assessment is offered, "The educational programs of UCSF are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree-level awarded and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered." We appreciate the support for each of our programs and the faculty-to-student ratios. However, we consider them baselines from which to build as resources allow. We strive to recruit, mentor and retain the most talented and diverse faculty to educate our students, conduct research, and provide quality patient care.

On page 9 of the WASC team report, it states, "Unclear to the team was the extent to which schools assess students incoming characteristics and need

for alternative teaching strategies beyond the dominant mode of delivering material through classroom lectures (with some notable exceptions) and the extent to which student input is solicited and informs decisions involving instructional methods within each school (CFR 2.10).” The Educational Systems Advisory Committee (ESAC) Strategic Plan was included in our report’s appendices and makes note of several areas where technological tools are used by faculty in educating our students. Of specific note are the improvements to creating innovative and collaborative learning environments, providing leading edge informational tools and educational technology infrastructure, delivering exceptional service to support learners, faculty, and staff, and evaluating educational technology.

In addition, the planned Teaching and Learning Center will significantly enhance our educational infrastructure with a new, state-of-the-art clinical skills, simulation, and telemedicine training center. The four professional schools, the Library, and Student Academic Affairs have collaborated on the plans for the new Center. The design incorporates new tools and technologies for educating future health professionals and scientists while supporting a culture of interdisciplinary and interprofessional learning programs for our students and trainees. The construction of the Center is a high priority for UCSF. Although this project is currently on hold due to the state’s fiscal crisis, we will continue to advocate for funding to complete it as soon as possible.

Student Learning Outcomes

We believe that UCSF can improve in connecting the academic curriculum and licensure requirements to specified learning outcomes. Of prime importance is the answer to the question: “What skills beyond academic and licensure requirements should a student demonstrate?” We understand that the WASC team has challenged us to improve upon this connection. The WASC Accreditation Steering Committee will take the lead in formulating our plans in this important area.

Diversity

On page 18 of the CPR, it states, “This ‘newly-reconstituted’ Office of Institutional Research is establishing baseline definitions – such as standard ethnic categories for reporting consistency – and determining data-gathering timelines and procedures.” Fortunately, the UC Office of the President released last month their guidance on the new standards that UCSF and the other nine campuses will use for collection of student race and ethnicity data. We will incorporate these standards, along with those that are required by professional accreditation bodies, in our EER report next year.

New Chancellor

Susan Desmond-Hellmann was recently named Chancellor of UCSF by the UC Board of Regents. Dr. Desmond-Hellmann is a physician, pioneering cancer researcher and biotechnology industry executive who most recently served as president of product development for Genentech. The campus community looks forward to her August 3 start date.

In closing, it is important to note that the global financial crisis has had a severe negative impact on the California economy and the state's financial support for the University of California. We anticipate additional budget reductions in 2009-10 because of the state's growing budget deficit. While we remain committed to enhancing our efforts in each of the three focus areas, we will do so within the economic constraints of the times. As UCSF's Accreditation Liaison Officer, I will remain in close touch with our WASC Liaison, Richard Winn, on this and other related matters. Dr. Winn has provided exemplary support and assistance throughout the accreditation process.

Thank you for your continued support of UCSF. We look forward to discussing the CPR report during the Commission meeting on June 17.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joseph I. Castro". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Joseph I. Castro, Ph.D
Vice Provost – Student Academic Affairs
WASC Accreditation Liaison Officer

CC: Chancellor Bishop
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Washington