REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

To University of California, San Francisco

October 13-14, 2010

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

WASC Chair:
Edward D. Miller, Dean of the Medical Faculty
CEO, Johns Hopkins Medicine
John Hopkins University, Baltimore

WASC Assistant Chair/Team Editor:
Lisa M. Beardsley, Director of Education
Adventist Accrediting Association
General Conference World Headquarters

WASC Members:
Samuel J. Agronow, Director
Office of Institutional Research, Saint Mary's College of California

Sue Piper Duckles, Professor Emeritus
School of Medicine, University of California, Irvine

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

John O. White, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Capital Development
Capital Planning & Space Management
University of California, Merced

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 Core Commitments 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

Contents

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit

<u>Background information</u>

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 2,900 students. The University employs 19,000 FTE and 21,900 people. Degrees offered include the DDS, MD, PhD, PharmD, DPT, 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). Sue Desmond-Hellman joined UCSF as Chancellor in August 2009.

UCSF traces its historical roots to Toland Medical Center which opened in San Francisco in 1864. The UCSF campus was established in 1873, when the Toland Medical College and the California College of Pharmacy affiliated with the University of California. 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.

<u>Recent accreditation history</u>

The Institutional Proposal was approved by WASC in July 2007. The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) Report was submitted December 2008 with a CPR visit February

2009. The CPR Team report was approved by the WASC Commission in June 2009. The

Education Effectiveness Review Report (EER) included appendices and data exhibits on a flash

drive, with references available on the web.

The purpose of this visit was to consider the data and evidence supporting the claims made

by UCSF in the EER Report. The University consists of multiple sites (Parnassus, Laurel

Heights, 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 substantive changes or special or follow-up visits in conjunction with the CPR or

EER visit.

B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the

Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

Educational Effectiveness Review outcomes

Two members of the EER team also served for the CPR visit. They provided some continuity

between the CPR and EER visits, and a basis for judging progress made in the interval. The EER

Report intended to show that the mission of "advancing health worldwide" is "actualized within

each of The Schools, the Graduate Division, and the Medical Center." (p. 49). It presented many

indicators of a rich learning environment, student learning outcomes, and diversity. The Proposal

and Report were aligned around these three themes: learning environment, student learning

outcomes, and diversity. Embedded within the themes, UCSF provided narrative and evidence of

addressing the Commission recommendations. The institution made clear and measurable

progress between the time of the Proposal, CPR and the EER. Overall, the well-planned and

steady progress made to implement the Proposal is a strong indicator of UCSF's commitment to engage in serious self-review and improvement.

The EER Report was consistent with the Proposal, as approved by the Proposal Review Committee. While not one of the three themes or recommended by the WASC Commission, the report concluded with a description of new enhancements to Student Services. These included technology enhancements, web support, graduate student health insurance program, Mission Bay Student Resource Center, and a description of support for career planning and district partnerships. Although not specifically related to the themes, this section did demonstrate the ongoing commitment of UCSF to provide students with a variety of support services despite a significant reduction in state funds provided to the campus. The team notes that the campus created an endowment from the sale of broadcast spectrum and designated the funds for maintaining and enhancing classroom technology. The EER Report also provided an update on the progress made in the Institutional Research area.

Quality of the Educational Effectiveness Review Report

The report was received on a timely basis and was complete. It was organized well and clearly written and presented. The visiting team judged it to accurately portray the condition of UCSF. There was ample evidence of broad involvement in the review process and report preparation. This was achieved through the work of regular standing committees of the University, as well as through the WASC self-study process. A WASC Accreditation Steering Committee developed the report itself, with participation by administrators, faculty, staff, a postdoctoral scholar and a student leader.

Foundational elements are in place or being developed (e.g., the Teaching and Learning Center) to gather additional and more embedded evidence of educational effectiveness. The

report generally presented the use of evidence by school rather than across disciplines and schools. Institutional research functions are emerging. The supporting appendices did not provide compelling evidence of capacity to generate and make effective use of data across the institution.

Data and evidence in the report and appendices did support claims of a serious commitment to realization of the three themes, and an unusually high degree of communication, collegiality and willingness to collaborate. The professional programs generated and used authentic direct and indirect measures of student learning outcomes. Interprofessional education has yet to mature so that outcomes in this area could be used to improve systems of quality, student learning, and faculty development. The Report reflected that the self-review led to a greater understanding of effectiveness, gave more focus to addressing the Core Commitment to educational effectiveness, and stimulated campus-wide dialogue around the themes and Core Commitments.

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

The EER Report clearly set forth each major recommendation of the CPR team report and the Commission action letter following the CPR. The report provided a brief description and varying degrees of analysis of evidence to show how the institution responded. This team report will follow the same format as used in the UCSF EER Report.

There were no issues trailing from previous visits other than the CPR visit. Two major concerns that the CPR visiting team had were resolved by the time of the EER visit: funds frozen by the State had been released to UCSF and construction of the TLC that was restarted in 2010 was well underway, and the new Chancellor was appointed in August 2009.

Three themes were outlined in the UCSF proposal and CPR report, and were further matured

in the EER report. These themes were learning environment, learning outcomes, and diversity.

The WASC Commission made recommendations in the areas of learning outcomes, diversity,

technology and institutional research. As is typically the case in health professions education, the

schools generate and use a variety of direct and indirect measures of student learning (national

board scores, observations and patient ratings of clinical performance). However, the institution

does not make public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level (CFR 1.2),

and much of such data appears to reside in the respective schools. This is just one indicator of the

emerging capacity and staffing for institutional-level research. Other indicators will be described

in the final section of this report.

While the EER (and CPR) Report addressed three themes, it did so as in the context of the

overall development plan of UCSF. The institution has launched a three-year major effort to

formally update its 1997 Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) as required on a periodic basis

by The Regents of the University of California. The LRDP addresses land use, physical planning

and environmental issues and impact on the campus and adjacent communities. It is a public

process and document. The previous LRDP focused on 1) redevelopment/renovation of existing

facilities at Parnassus and Mt. Zion and 2) establishment of Mission Bay campus.

There was much evidence of outstanding preparation for the Background Report. It was

informed by e.g., the Fiscal and Economic Impact Report; Historic Buildings Survey; Physical

Design Framework; Existing Facilities Inventory; and Individual School Strategic Plans. An

LRDP Oversight Committee was convened, with involvement by campus and medical center

leadership. Subcommittees were formed for major programmatic areas: 1) research and

instructional space; and 2) clinical space needs.

The need and drivers for the LRDP Update to 2030 were clearly articulated. They include accelerated growth at Mission Bay (in less than ten years, five research buildings have been constructed and a sixth building is in planning; development includes mixed-use housing project with 2005 occupancy, Community Center, childcare). Other drivers noted include:

- o Facilities Constraints - Seismic Facilities compliance (e.g., the Moffitt facility will continue to be used for inpatient beds in the intermediate term)
- o Enrollment trends (and will examine whether the institution wants to grow. Growth is also predicated upon additional resources from the State)
- o Sustainability (transportation management, reduction of carbon footprint, climate action plan – all being positioned in conjunction with the LRDP update)

Foresight for important issues was demonstrated. The LRDP Update will tackle new issues such as:

- o Seismic Program will have specific recommendations and respond to mandatory compliance legislation
- o Plan for Leased Space and property acquisition
- o Role of Private-Public Partnerships
- o Space solutions to align with academic program needs (demonstrating integrated planning)
- o Recommendations to Chancellor for academic program configuration across UCSF sites

The process demonstrated broad-based participation by internal stakeholders (Academic Senate; Schools and Divisions: Medical Center: and campus administration) along with external stakeholders (Foundation; community; city). Evidence of this included establishment of LRDP

Oversight Committee with Co-Chairs (faculty and hospital) and establishment to sub-committees

to address: 1) research and teaching space; 2) clinical space; and 3) others as needed. Community

information sessions are currently underway to gain community input. Evidence included the

LRDP Flowchart 8/3/10 that demonstrated the work plan and schedule to develop and deliver

LRDP recommendations to the Chancellor. Potential challenges have been identified, including

"red flag" issues" with clear plan to address challenges early in the process.

The team commends the administration for initiating a comprehensive update to its Long

Range Development Plan, which includes a clear work plan and schedule for the planning

process; environmental process; and community participation and evidence of a strong

commitment to include the Chancellor's Vision, academic planning efforts and sustainability.

D. Resource Management

The team found evidence of a "healthy" financial position including new revenue sources,

from Foundation contribution to operations, reserves, and increased Gift Support despite

challenging economic times. The Operational Efficiency Program will include creation of

Faculty Service Centers for administrative support. Strategy for success includes introduction of

new Service-Level Agreements (SLA), which communicates and describes service levels. These

should help establish and manage reasonable expectations for faculty and other concerned

parties. Work remains to implement SLA and Data Warehouse for data analysis. Institutional

research functions are an emerging ability to analyze data and create "dashboard" indicators for

management.

An example of effective and transparent communication with staff and faculty, is a July 1,

2010 email/web posting for the campus community that provided an update on current budget

and operational initiatives and how administration was reducing the financial impact on schools

for FY 2010-11. It went on to outline five *Operational Excellence* initiatives, overseen by

committees and administration, to achieve savings and improved services in Human Resources,

Financial Processes and Reporting, Research Administration, Information Technology and

Research Funding.

With this background to the high level of planning and alignment of resources, it is evident

that the themes selected for focus have emerged from robust planning processes. The plans have

been matured through input by key stakeholders, including the community of which UCSF is an

organic part.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE

STANDARDS

Theme 1: Learning Environment

**WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 1: 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 interprofessional 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.**

A. Mature the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC)

The team found a positive learning environment with members of the community actively

engaged in program development. The report highlighted the TLC as an example of the

collaborative nature of the institution, and of a collective desire to maximize use of space in a

synergistic manner, transcending parochial interests.

The TLC is a campus-wide initiative to develop a learning environment that is enhanced by

technology. Opening of the center is scheduled for January 2011. A tour of the nearly-completed

facility revealed a thoughtfully designed, highly flexible space to greatly enhance student

learning. An Operations Committee will oversee centralized services, including network

infrastructure, facilities, information technology and human resources. Other components include a Simulation and Clinical Skills Facility, classrooms, and a Technology Commons. Each physical component is cleverly designed to maximize flexibility and provide a variety of learning configurations, including objective structured clinical examinations for both individuals and interdisciplinary teams.

A detailed business plan dated July 1, 2010 demonstrates considerable progress in developing the TLC. The five-year business plan details how the TLC will support the campus strategic plan in the areas of education, innovation and collaboration. Key success measures are delineated, including targeted metrics for each program within the TLC. These demonstrate thoughtful planning to ensure appropriate use of common resources. The five-year financial plan included existing and new funding sources. A special request to the campus for new funding to operate the TLC has been approved. Strategy for further development of the TLC will require additional fundraising. Some major prospects have already been identified and fundraising strategies are being developed. Notably missing from the business plan is potential revenue from the medical center. Prospective use of the TLC by the medical center was dismissed because at the planning stage "we asked them and they weren't interested."

Overall, extraordinary progress has been made in maturing this facility, and administrators, faculty as well as students look forward with excitement to the upcoming opening and the opportunity to develop new components of the curriculum, including interprofessional learning. The visiting team was favorably impressed with the thoughtful, effective design of the Center. While clinical performance centers are increasingly common in health professions education, this one has been careful designed so that the space can be re-configured relatively easily to accommodate small or large group learning using IT, models, or other clinical material. It was designed to minimize high cost renovations in the future, and thereby result in long-term use and

adaptive re-use of the facility. It can be used by multiple programs and users with an ability to apply/test new technologies and equipment into the future.

The project employs numerous features of sustainable design as evidenced by: use of LEED rating and certification program; re-use of materials (e.g., salvaged wood to tie in with the rest of the library); energy conserving HVAC and lighting equipment; natural day-lighting and selection of materials/finishes. It was evident that extensive thought was put into selection of innovative design solutions such as flexible grid ceiling systems in a virtual procedure room and the use of high quality, space-efficient moveable partitions to reconfigure space easily with automatic adjustment of A/V and advanced lighting systems.

It was reported to the WASC team that the institution is transitioning from the project planning committee to an operational and implementation committee. Institutional representatives acknowledged that it still needs to decide on final reporting relationships, assignment of ownership of the space (programmatically), and a business model to benefit from revenue from medical center users. This will need to be finalized and communicated prior to opening of the facility, which is expected to occur during December 2010 or January 2011.

The team commends the deans, librarians, technology staff, faculty, program and project team members, and administration for developing a thoughtfully-designed, environmentally friendly and flexible learning environment in the TLC to enhance student learning and assessment, to pilot new technologies and procedures, and provide opportunities for interprofessional education, together with identifying metrics for evaluating success of learning and to promote interprofessional education.

B. Engage all stakeholders in achieving the interprofessional goals
(Revised CRFs 2.3, 2.7; CFR 4.8)

Based on a 2008 report outlining progress and future goals for interprofessional education, a cross-school Curriculum Working Group was launched in spring 2010 to plan short and longer-term education programming for the TLC. Meetings with the campus leadership, leaders of each school and faculty make it clear that the goal of increasing interprofessional education is one that is embraced enthusiastically by all stakeholders. As one approach, an Instructional Grants Program now requires proposals to involve collaborators from two or more schools and some of the projects that have been funded involve use of TLC resources. Opening of the TLC will provide many opportunities for enhancing the curriculum in this area. It is too early to determine that interprofessional goals have been achieved.

It was not apparent to the team that the medical center plays an active role on the educational team. The team recommends the administration strengthen a synergistic partnership between the medical center and the academic enterprise.

C. Realize research potential on learning outcomes
(Revised CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.7; CFR 2.9)

The issue of documenting effectiveness of interprofessional learning was explored in the EER proposal but was not adequately addressed in the business plan for the TLC. However, administrators and faculty enthusiastically welcomed the suggestion that the business plan should include research projects to disseminate curricular innovations involving use of the TLC. In particular, results of innovations in interprofessional education may be particularly appropriate for wider dissemination. Nevertheless, some efforts are already underway. Faculty in the School of Nursing are considering ways to assess outcomes using various learning activities, which may be a first attempt to document through research the impact that simulation and interprofessional learning activities have on learning outcomes and patient care.

WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 2: 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.

A new CIO was appointed to oversee Information Technology Services (formerly Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems) and the team found optimism about stronger IT functionality to support education and research in the future. Some progress has already been made as described in the following sections A through D. Given the condition of current facilities and services, the pace of developments within the TLC, and demonstrated responsiveness to student needs for flexible and technology-enhanced learning environments, the team is confident that UCSF will realize its plans in this area.

A. Institutional technology initiatives for fiscal year 2009-2010
Since the CPR visit, the Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE) was funded for one year, to provide a platform for "learner-centered environments and collaborative activities" such as ePortfolios, virtual microscopy, and a curriculum management system (revised CFRs 3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 4.1, 4.2). A second initiative was to fund a content capture and delivery system for 11 classrooms and for portable units. Students can review the captured content on the web or their laptops, providing flexibility and asynchronous learning resources. Wireless connections were added for all Parnassus classrooms in 2009.

B. Priorities for educational technology improvements 2010-2015
Ongoing funding has been approved for Content Capture, CLE operations and upgrades, TLC operations, and a central IT help desk. The Education Systems Advisory Committee Strategic Plan provided guidance in establishing these as priorities.

C. Campus IT Initiatives that support Education
A task force is being assembled by the new CIO. Among other services, a campus-wide IT Help desk is planned to serve students and trainees starting in 2011. In addition to priorities

identified by the new CIO, a working group will be charged to consider how to use the electronic

medical record as part of the TLC experience. This was considered to be essential given the

unevenness of exposure and training that students currently have with electronic medical records,

and the plan of the Medical Center to implement use of electronic records next year (Revised

CFR 3.4).

D. Changes to Library in an Educational Technology Environment

Much attention and resources have gone toward construction of the TLC. It was reported

to the team that the Library is also working on expanding to unstaffed 24/7 student access for a

portion of the Parnassus Library by early 2011 (Revised CFR 3.6).

**WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 3: Contribute to the generalizable
knowledge through the development of rigorous design and assessment of its many
initiatives, thereby learning from our own best practices and contributing to the literature
in health professions education.**

A. Contributions of UCSF Faculty, Staff and Students to the Scholarship of Teaching

It is clear from the EER Report and submitted appendices that a considerable amount of

scholarly work related to best educational practices (reflected by publications in scholarly

journals, presentations and workshops) is produced at UCSF by faculty, staff and students.

Noteworthy activities include efforts in the School of Dentistry to disseminate information about

its integrated dental curriculum to other institutions; competitively awarded seed funding in the

School of Medicine for faculty proposals to carry out educational research; and the Haile T.

Debas Academy of Medical Educators. Faculty in the School of Nursing developed curriculum

modules focused on increasing diversity-related content; these have been widely shared and

published. Similarly, with support from the NIH, the School of Pharmacy developed a tobacco

cessation training program which has been widely disseminated in the United States and around

the world. These are excellent examples of efforts at UCSF to transmit local experiences to other

institutions. Given other innovative programs currently underway at UCSF, such as the TLC and

interprofessional education initiatives, the team encourages leadership and faculty to incorporate

explicit plans for assessment and wide dissemination of results as an integral part of all new

educational and curricular initiatives.

Theme 2: Student Learning Outcomes

WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 4: Employ indirect methods (such as student surveys) as well as direct measures of student learning outcomes. Data from these assessments need to be collected, used in planning and resource allocation, and used to effect change. Continue to define global learning outcomes that distinguish a UCSF graduate irrespective of discipline.

A. Direct and indirect methods of measuring student learning.
Success in meeting this recommendation is reported by School and varies by School. Based

on the institution's report, data exhibits, and discussions with the team during the EER visit, it

was evident to the team that in general, the collection and analysis of student learning outcomes,

and most importantly, their use in program/curriculum improvement was taking place throughout

the University but by School. The amount of specific evidence for program improvement varied

by School. It would have been desirable to have more examples available for review. The team

observed that in the:

o School of Dentistry has identified competencies (CFR 1.2) and data are being collected

(CFR 2.10, 4.1, 4.4). Data are used for program improvement. It did not appear that

indirect measures were being collected.

o School of Medicine uses multiple measures of all types, including licensure exams,

clinical performance exam results, and surveys of students, alumni and staff (residency

program directors). Benchmarks have been established for competency domains (CFR

1.2, 2.10, 4.1, 4.8) and for clinical skills, with reference to other medical schools in

California. Students are evaluated according to benchmarks. Programs are also evaluated according to benchmarks, and it appears data is being used to evaluate/change educational programs (CFR 1.2, 4.3, 4.4).

o School of Nursing uses multiple measures, including course evaluations, disaggregation of administrative data, exam results, and surveys of students, alumni and employers (CFR 2.10, 4.8). There is strong evidence that data are used for program improvements of various kinds (CFR 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

o School of Pharmacy (like the School of Nursing) has collected a variety of direct and indirect measures of student learning and, moreover is using them for program improvement (CFR 2.10). There is use of clinical data, examination data, survey data (of a variety of constituents), and disaggregated admission and graduation data. Of all schools at UCSF, School of Pharmacy data appeared to be the most extensive and influential for program outcomes (CFR 1.2, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8).

o Graduate Division (excluding School of Nursing) is going in the right direction with data collection by implementing use of rubrics and exit/alumni surveys to assess outcomes (CFR 2.10). Based on a presentation to the team, it appears this data collection has moved beyond the "pilot" phase and more importantly, is being used for program improvement as required by the EER (2.10, 4.1). Dissertations and other research projects are also being employed to assess learning by doctoral students, but it was not clear to the team how these were being examined for program improvement (CFR 2.4, 2.8, 2.9). The team examined a sample of graduate program review reports. The team notes with concern the variable amount of data examined in program review processes from department to department. For example, the BMS Graduate program review (November 2009) and the TETRAD Graduate Program (April 2009) used a considerable amount of

input and outcome data that were used effectively by the external reviewers. However, for the program review in the Chemistry and Chemical Biology Graduate Program (March 2008), it appeared that external reviewers were provided with some basic statistics on retention and admissions, but neither tables nor details on statistics and trends over time upon which to make their judgments.

The team recommends a standard be developed for the data elements to be provided to all program review teams. This "data standard" should include statistics on admission, diversity, retention, time-to-degree, and learning outcome assessments, for multiple years (CFR 4.4).

B. Define global learning outcomes that distinguish a UCSF graduate

Since the CPR visit, the team noted agreement among the Schools on the need to develop measures of "knowledge" and "professionalism" as global outcomes across the university, with Nursing and Medicine in the lead in citing indicators of what this would look like in their respective professions. The EER Report indicated that these "outcomes are measured very specifically in each of the professional Schools and the Graduate Division and characterize a general expectation of every graduate." Preliminary plans and measures of the outcomes were presented in Appendix 17 for the School of Pharmacy. But for the EER visit, this needs to have gone well beyond the planning stages for the University as a whole.

The team commends the deans for evidence of assessment of professionalism in the professional programs, as part of a culture that values ethics. Work remains to demonstrate use of student learning outcomes leading to cycles of improvement institution-wide, particularly with the global learning outcomes. The Vice Chancellor of Student Academic Affairs will champion this across the institution.

The team recommends that the faculty develop common metrics for the two global outcomes of "knowledge" and "professionalism" of graduates across all programs, and in the context of interprofessional education.

<u>C. Identify the extent to which there is a need for alternative teaching Strategies</u>
Interviews with students and others during the visit indicated that a variety of teaching strategies were available (beyond the lecture modality) (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.10, 4.3, 4.8).

<u>D. Develop a demonstration of direct assessments of student performance through examination of students' work products and documented assessment of students' performance of a relevant task.</u>

The professional schools (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy) examine many direct assessments such as demonstration of clinical skills and ability to apply knowledge in clinical settings (CFR 2.2, 2.4). In the professional schools there is clear evidence that these assessments are being used to improve student learning and for program improvement (CFR 2.4, 4.6). For the Graduate Division, it was reported to the team that qualifying examination and dissertation products assess learning (including the "global" learning outcomes of "professionalism" and "knowledge") (CFR 2.3, 2.4). The Graduate Division provided the team with a table delineating the various methodologies employed. Discussion about these methodologies with the team supported that a variety of relevant graduate student learning is directly assessed. In the judgment of the team, these direct assessments are relevant and appropriate.

<u>E. Continue to foster a culture of interprofessional education</u>

Introduction of (and planning for expanded) structured interprofessional interaction is an example of an innovative learning strategy to promote professionalism in learning to work with diverse healthcare teams. There was also evidence that assessments of learning strategies were being used for program improvement.

F. Continue to identify ways to encourage graduates to pursue academic careers

Each professional school has developed distinct programs to provide learning opportunities outside of the regular curriculum in order to encourage students to pursue academic careers. The School of Dentistry was awarded a T32 Training grant by NIH to develop a combined DDS-Masters in Clinical Research degree track. The School of Medicine Pathways to Discovery Program was developed to foster academic career development among students and residents. This program is open to all UCSF learners. Students in this innovative program can select among several different tracks, and complete a mentored legacy project. A large proportion (most recent data: 22%) of UCSF School of Medicine graduate students pursue academic careers. To encourage the development of nursing faculty, the School of Nursing has developed a three-year course of study with financial support from the Moore Foundation. This will lead to graduation of over 55 new nursing faculty at the end of the program. The School of Pharmacy points to a large number of alumni involved in teaching activity; students in the program are encouraged to teach in a wide variety of programs. Another indicator of preparation for academic careers is that 64% of the School of Pharmacy graduates are placed in residencies. The team found ample evidence that graduates of all UCSF schools are prepared and encouraged to pursue academic careers, and some evidence that they actually do.

WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 5: The Graduate Division must incorporate into the academic degree program review process both student learning

objectives 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 process of the professional degree programs.

Meetings with members of the Academic Senate Graduate Council, Dean of the Graduate Division and other Graduate Division staff and representatives of various graduate programs made it clear that data are gathered through graduate exit surveys and alumni surveys in order to evaluate perceptions of learning outcomes. In addition, each graduate program is reviewed by an outside team every six years. A review of recent graduate program reviews demonstrates both the quality of these reviews and the excellent quality of training in these graduate programs.

The institution is now working on developing learning objectives for all of the Graduate Programs. A set of student learning objectives for the two key benchmarks that must be passed to achieve the doctoral degree, the qualifying examination and dissertation, have been developed, and can be found on the Graduate Division website. Three more specific sets of evaluation rubrics have been developed by the Graduate Division and will be tailored to each program. These are designed to be customized and shared between each primary advisor, committee members and student. At the present time this effort is in a pilot phase, involving three programs; only when the pilot phase is complete will this program be expanded to all UCSF Graduate Programs.

WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 6: Contribute to the generalizable knowledge through the development of rigorous design and assessment of its many initiatives, thereby learning from our own best practices and contributing to the literature in health professions education.

The team found a significant focus on and productivity in "contribution to the literature" in disciplinary knowledge across campus but especially in the Graduate Division (CFR 2.8, 2.9). Contribution to the literature was evidenced by the publication lists provided in program reviews is enormous, and implied through the amount of funded research awarded to UCSF. Evidence

from a recent National Research Council (NRC) report is support for claims by UCSF as being a

leader in research activity.

There is some application of pedagogical assessment for UCSF educational endeavors

and programs themselves (CFR 2.9, 4.3). The Pathways program, frequently referenced in

discussions with the visiting team, along with other mentoring efforts were cited as ways to close

the loop for students learning about the importance of academic scholarship. Work remains to

disseminate pedagogical best practices from the many initiatives and endeavors across the

Schools, and to contribute to the literature in health professions pedagogy.

Theme 3: Diversity

**WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 7: Continue to pursue standard
definitions of demographic data categories, as well as consistent methods for capturing
them such that at students' matriculation in the degree programs, data describing
diversity categories 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.**

Gathering and management of demographic data is necessary to demonstrate

achievement of "keeping pace with, and in some cases surpassing, peer institutions in enrolling a

higher proportion of underrepresented students." The UCSF Academic Demographic System

was developed to track applicant searches, applicant demographics, and current trend

information about existing faculty. The transparency provided by this system is commendable as

it is a necessary foundational step for creating an environment of equity and success for all. The

report clearly states the objectives of this system are to create at UCSF academic placement

goals for underrepresented minorities and women relative to job placement as well as to fulfill

criteria for Affirmative Action/Diversity accomplishments. The results of such a data warehouse

must be available to institutional leadership and key stakeholders within and external to the

institution for the benefits of such data gathering to be evident. As noted earlier, IR functions are

still emerging and seem to be understaffed at UCSF.

WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 8: Communicate 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 toward achieving institutional goals and educational effectiveness.

Many with whom the team met lauded the welcoming environment of diversity and inclusion

at UCSF. Efforts are directed toward an inclusive campus climate/environment and extending it

to recruitment, retention and advancement/career progression. Generally, accomplishments have

been substantial, but vary in depth among the different areas. Evidence of achieving goals in

each area is described more fully below.

A. Environment
In June 2007, UCSF completed a campus-wide Strategic Plan involving both the campus

community and external stakeholders (CFR 4.1, 4.8). Effectiveness of the plan is tracked and

reported annually in Progress Reports. Revisions to the plan are made as needed (Revised CFR

4.4). The vision statement is that "in advancing health worldwide, UCSF will ... build upon its

commitment to diversity," singling out Nurturing Diversity as one of the seven strategic

directions to be undertaken over the next five years (CFR 1.5). The Plan's diversity strategies

include "creating a more diverse campus community, ensuring that UCSF continues to attract the

best and most diverse candidates for all educational programs, and improving diversity among

senior leadership." In addition, other strategic directions in the plan include an emphasis on

diversity.

In Promoting a Supportive Work Environment, the strategic plan provides that to "groom and promote the next generation of UCSF leadership ... special attention must be paid to ensuring diversity among these potential leaders." This emphasizes the use of role models in enhancing diversity in the UCSF community. Toward Educating Future Leaders, the strategic plan states that to "prepare for growth in professional school enrollment. ... (we will) ensure that innovative educational programs that focus on diverse and underserved populations are accessible to more future health care professionals."

This strong institutional statement reflects an extensive process of building consensus. The statement alone clearly outlines a commendable commitment to diversity. The creation of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Diversity (CACAD) (CFR 1.1, 1.3, 1.5) is a major initiative to enhance campus-wide diversity of faculty, students, and trainees. It presumably will direct the completion of the goals set forth in the campus Strategic Plan and the 10-point Diversity Initiative adopted in 2007. Progress from CACAD related to the goals in the Institutional Proposal has been outlined below (CFR 1.5, 3.1).

The ten points are: 1) Implement comprehensive program and diversity webpage; 2) Establish faculty database for conducting faculty searches; 3) Implement best practices for faculty searches; 4) Develop a comprehensive plan for staff recruitment and retention; 5) Develop a comprehensive program promoting diversity among trainees; 6) Develop a preliminary set of proposals on accountability and incentives; 7)Recruit director of academic diversity; 8) Establish coordinated outreach program; 9) Establish school-specific plans; 10) Incorporate recommendations from the Strategic Planning Initiative.

A diverse group of student leaders emphasized their attraction to and comfort with being part of the UCSF community because of its visible commitment to diversity. The student groups reflected a broad sampling to include ethnicity, national origin (e.g. Iranian students' group),

gender, sexual orientation, and first-generation populations. Conspicuously absent was

representation from the African American population. The team understands that students from

diverse backgrounds were invited and strongly encouraged to participate in the WASC visit, and

that student schedules may have affected ability to participate.

The last institutional climate survey was completed in 2004. One key outcome of the

2004 survey was pinpointing disparities between men and women faculty and minimal diversity

in the institutional leadership. Subsequently, a leadership development program was established.

The Leadership Development Program is a critical step in taking diversity to the next level and

incorporates a UCSF-tailored program implemented by the Coro Leadership Program. Faculty

who completed this program hold current leadership roles and attribute their comfort in

interdisciplinary collaboration to the interdisciplinary focus and teamwork fostered in this

program.

The Chancellor and Provost co-chair the institutional Campus Climate and Culture

Committee consisting of leaders in this area from all the schools – particularly the Advisory

Committees on Diversity in each school. The involvement by top leadership has clearly

propelled attention to diversity and inclusion and affirmed this to be a prominent focus at UCSF.

Leadership acknowledged the need to update this assessment. Current discussion revolves

around the benefits of using another internally-generated assessment tool rather than to wait to

use a tool currently under development in the University of California Office of the President

that is scheduled to be rolled out to the entire system.

B. Recruitment and Retention

The team found clear consensus among the leaders of the four schools regarding the spirit,

principles, and objectives for achieving diversity at UCSF, with reference to the 10-point

Diversity Initiative. It was unclear in the EER Report who had responsibility for its

implementation. However, discussion with leadership and faculty during the site visit indicated a

sense of shared purpose and responsibility for achieving these diversity goals. Diversity points 4-

6 offer an important opportunity to truly develop a process and attendant incentives that will

ensure enhanced recruitment, career development, and retention of a diverse academic

workforce. The report language is largely reflective of the general human resources approach

seen in most academic institutions and corporations. Experiences in numerous institutions across

the country provide evidence that achieving recruitment numbers of particular underrepresented

groups and even retaining these individuals in the system do not guarantee career success,

advancement and leadership representation.

The Travelling Ambassador Program and the University of California President's

Postdoctoral Fellowship Program both address important recruitment issues. However, they seem

to be focused on the candidate who is already accomplished – a valuable thing – but one who is

probably already being heavily recruited by multiple institutions.

There was a discussion of several pipeline initiatives to nurture the next generation who

would seek careers in science. The Chancellor noted meeting with the Superintendent of the San

Francisco Public Schools to foster development of local partnerships that could only enhance the

pipeline. Increasing data signify a growing lack of socioeconomic diversity in higher education.

A Doctor's Academy pipeline program has been ongoing for some time in Fresno (a lower

income region than San Francisco). It targets middle and high school students. Students in

medicine and pharmacy can elect to fulfill some of their required rotations in Fresno, exposing

them to a different population than would be seen in San Francisco and increasing their visibility

to potential pipeline students there.

Successes have been noted in recruitment of diverse students to UCSF degree programs.

Except for the past two years, substantial drop-off is noted in retaining these students in UCSF

residencies and post-doctoral programs. The administration recognizes this leakage and is trying

to identify strategies to retain their own diverse pool.

When questioned, representatives from the Office of Academic Diversity acknowledged

the disparities among diverse students although diversity has increased in general. It was

reported that the number and proportion of African American, Chicano/Latino and Asian

American students have increased at UCSF in recent years and are among the highest in the

nation relative to comparable health science institutions. Hispanic Business named UCSF the #1

School of Medicine in the nation for Chicano/Latino students in 2010. To support students who

belong to historically underrepresented groups, including underrepresented first generation

college students, UCSF has developed a program to bring in community practitioners.

The EEO/AA Office has access to all discrimination claims and settlements and shares

these trends and details with the UCSF leadership. The goal is to contain the issues within the

institution and use the information gathered to promote institutional change. Usually 60

complaints from approximately 25,000 employees are under evaluation at any one time.

Furthermore, the faculty Senate has an Equal Opportunity Committee that works to ensure

adherence to the principles and objectives of the Diversity Initiative. Plans to establish a new

Ombuds Office in 2011, would be another avenue to resolve such matters).

C. Leadership Development and Advancement
Leaders and decision-makers on campus perform a self-assessment annually to determine

whether they have achieved their outlined goals and to forecast directions for the coming year.

Those going up for promotion are evaluated by the Advancement and Promotion Committee who

have been instructed to pay attention to affirmative action goals.

The Office of Academic Diversity is involved with search efforts throughout the institution,

to monitor pools of candidates being considered for new positions and compare those pools to

the racial/ethnic/gender diversity of the population from which the pool was drawn. Where there

is discrepancy, the search committee is notified. This institutionally-sanctioned process is a

critical foundational step towards enhancing diversity among faculty and is commended.

At the same time, a communications plan was developed to include an annual forum in which the

Chancellor reports to the University and the community. A website and list-serve has been

developed to encourage communication between and among students regarding issues of

diversity. Feedback from this system identified the need to have a centralized office to

coordinate these efforts.

Although not initially evident in the EER Report, discussion revealed a purposeful

program in the Office of Academic Affairs for assigning mentors for junior faculty, and a faculty

mentoring program is in place. A mentoring director promotes identification of a mentoring

facilitator so that greater than 90% have an assigned career mentor. Success as a mentor is

included in the evaluation process for academic promotion. To enhance the overall academic

contribution of the institution, there is monitoring through the promotion process (APT

committee) of whether one's research has addressed issues of diversity throughout one's career.

Specific sessions are offered for minority faculty and first generation students.

Majority groups traditionally acquire mentors and learn to 'read' the institutional

environment much more rapidly and effectively than their underrepresented peers. This is true

for all levels of the academic career ladder. Corporations and businesses have long recognized

the business case for establishing strong mentoring relationships with new recruits early in their

tenure in the business unit. World class academic institutions such as UCSF typically allocate

resources in favor of those most likely to succeed and be most productive as evidenced by

accomplishments that usually have occurred prior to coming to the institution in question. On the

downside, such resource allocation rewards those already successful and thereby contributes to

widening disparities between the 'haves' and 'have nots.' The team recommends that UCSF

consult with experienced mentorship trainers so as to also mentor junior faculty and to allocate

resources and incentives to keep the mentoring program robust and encourage maximal success

for all.

Creation of the position of Director of Academic Diversity was intended to provide a

coordinating focus and monitoring function for the many elements outlined in the Diversity

Initiative. However, the role for the Director outlined in the EER Report describes more of an

HR than an academic role. The team noted that UCSF intends to take a major step forward by

creating a new position of Vice Chancellor of Diversity and Outreach who will serve on the

Chancellor's Executive Cabinet and will report directly to the Chancellor. The Chancellor is

looking from within the campus community to find an exceptional leader who is a member of the

faculty or staff to serve. In collaboration with faculty, staff, and student leaders, the new vice

chancellor will develop and implement a strategic plan – aligned and integrated with the UCSF

mission and strategies – with campus-wide goals on diversity and outreach, focusing on overall

campus climate, recruitment, and retention for students, faculty, and staff and operating within

federal and state legal constraints.

With appointment of a faculty member in this new role, it will be important to clearly outline

the organizational diagram of all leaders identified as responsible for diversity so that

accountability and problem solving can be most efficient. Clear assignments will ensure that

student learning, curricular outcomes and faculty development are appropriately aligned and

addressed in the various pieces of the diversity environment. Senior administrators indicated that

the role of the new Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach is to be the unifying entity for the

widely distributed and unevenly resourced programs throughout the university. Clear lines of

responsibility, authority and monitoring will be needed to achieve operational efficiency as well as tangible success.

Staff reported that support for advancement is uneven and directly relates to the supportive nature of the individual supervisor. Staff interviewed seemed unaware of a central repository of information regarding training and development for staff (although such information is posted at http://ucsfhr.ucsf.edu/index.php/training/). There was only one African American staff member present among the approximately 40 staff (almost all female) who attended the open session with WASC team. Discussion centered on work climate, diversity issues, and staff training and development. The work climate was reported as generally favorable and that UCSF was "a good employer." Many staff present reported career progression and institutional longevity.

Diversity was also reported as generally favorable in terms of ethnic/race and gender balance as low to mid staff levels, less so for the Senior Management Group. A lack of role models or participation in key decision making at top rungs of administration was reported. One person reported barriers due to English as Second Language with suggestion that more ESL courses for staff be made available. Another recommended that system-wide statistics regarding promotions and upward mobility for disadvantaged minorities be posted on University web sites. The team was unable to verify career progression with disaggregated trend data, or whether diversity was supported by progression from the entry to mid-level of institutional employment. The team concurs that tracking such data would support UCSF's stated goal of promoting diversity at UCSF.

Support for staff training and development was available (courses, mentoring, and staff internships, awareness of career "tracks"). The UC Business Officer Institute (BOI) has been well received and appreciated, with recommendation that more staff attend. Awareness of

information, opportunities, and certain staff development programs was variable, with some

reporting the desire for better communication in that regard.

Individuals reported that their experiences differed with respect to actual upward mobility

and supervisor support. A few staff reported lack of supervisor support (e.g. release time) to be

able to attend programs and activities for business reasons. Staff indicated there was a range of

support from very supportive to very little support depending on program (unit) and immediate

supervisor. Some staff asserted that release time was provided for building skills directly related

to one's current position, but less so for more generalized staff development and training where

skills might be gained for "other areas". Several staff suggested that supervisors should receive

more diversity and civility/sensitivity training. One staff member mentioned that health

professions students in some cases also needed similar training about respect and professionalism

directed toward the faculty and patients.

Several staff commented on the success of Council of UC Staff Assemblies (CUCSA) by

providing access and visibility to UC executive management, and Academic Business Officers

Groups (ABOG) for more local issues and increased ability to participate on UCSF committees.

A number of staff described ability and satisfaction with participation in community outreach

and community volunteer programs for disadvantaged groups, such as minority youth. They

applauded institutional outreach to local schools with intention to educate students about

educational and career opportunities at UCSF. The team noted indicators of an inclusive, diverse,

supportive sense of community. Career progression was reportedly possible, supported by

professional/career development, especially where the manager is supportive and views

participation in staff development as furthering the goals of UCSF overall. Centralized data were

unavailable about staff retention over time, and in reference to benchmarks, to support the

testimonials.

The team commends inclusion of staff to help them feel connected to and be able to contribute to achievement of University mission and priorities.

D. Curriculum

Most of the cultural competence curricula that the team reviewed lack substance. The description of dental school requirements suggest learning objectives will be achieved over four years and through material embedded in three courses, but that is not clear. An equally-broad statement with less detail is offered for the School of Nursing. The School of Pharmacy provides the most detailed description of cultural competence offerings, different teaching techniques and intention to apply lessons learned in later clinical experiences. The two lines associated with the School of Medicine provide no evidence of tangible, defined coursework, objectives, or timeline for imparting this important curricular element to UCSF medical students. Learning objectives and competencies have been clearly outlined in a framework for medical students to use when completing a self-assessment for adding to their portfolio. Who/what entity is responsible for ensuring achievement of these curricular goals? It was suggested to the team that oversight for this aspect of training will come within the responsibilities of the new Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach. In this case, the person should be a member of the faculty (rather than staff) to encourage success in promoting and ensuring acquisition of cultural competence skills. It appears that internal candidates being considered for this position could be either faculty or staff. Buy-in from the academy would be dramatically enhanced if the position is filled by a faculty member. Detailed curricula and texts are now available for a number of disciplines for enhanced faculty guidance and student learning (e.g., STFM Core Cultural Competence Curriculum).

Appropriate acknowledgment of those involved in diversity efforts is important and will encourage participation by a wider segment of the University community.

WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 9: Contribute to the generalizeable knowledge through the development of rigorous design and assessment of its many initiatives, thereby learning from our own best practices and contributing to the literature in health professions education.

There are many activities, sponsored by numerous entities to further the goals of diversity across campus. The need for coordination of these activities and enhanced institutional research capacity to measure progress is recognized by administration. These are necessary for the institution to learn from its own best practices, and to contribute to the literature in health professions education with respect to diversity. Work remains to be done in this area as will be elaborated in the next section.

WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation 10: 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.

The team found that "institutional research" function at UCSF is distributed into eleven or more separate units which the institution claims has been effective for their needs (CFR 4.5). These units include the Office of Institutional Research, Student Academic Affairs, Graduate Division Institutional Research/Information Technology, academic human resources, human resources, housing, financial aid, and admission offices and program review staff in each of the Schools. In the team's meetings with senior leadership and staff from many of these units (some of whom had not met each other in person before), the visiting team concurred that this structure did meet the needs of each of these areas. The specialized nature of the information collected and demands for analysis of these data at the school level support use of a distributed model.

Best practice in institutional research is for analysis approaches to be shared among constituencies with common interests and there was evidence of this at UCSF. For example, the School admissions staff described how they had made the switch to holistic review of

applications, using data to show that the new holistic systems improved diversity without

sacrificing the academic quality of the students. The holistic system was piloted in the School of

Medicine, then after evaluation, expanded to other Schools.

This said, the Office of Institutional Research, Student Academic Affairs Office appeared

to be positioned to emerge as the "primary" institutional research unit, becoming the central

location for institutional research information, and for student data analysis. However, the team

noted barriers within the institution that need to be removed in order for this office to gain access

to student data records. Student records from financial aid, housing, and from the Schools

(learning outcomes) should be shared with the central office. For example, access by the Office

of Institutional Research, Student Academic Affairs to data collected by the Graduate Division

Institutional Research/Information Technology, is especially important in relation to time-to-

degree, the Survey of Earned Doctorates, and other exit surveys.

The team also strongly encourages efforts by UCSF to adopt the Decision Support System

for student data being developed by the University of California, Office of the President (UCOP)

(CFR 3.7, 4.8). This will provide a data warehouse with consistent definitions for several types

of student data (admission, enrollment, financial aid, retention, and graduation), enabling

benchmarking with health science programs at other UC campuses. Another benefit to use of the

UCOP data warehouse by UCSF is access to other types of non-student data, including most

importantly, human resources and budget. Human resource data is being collected in the UCOP

data warehouse.

The team recommends that the Office of Institutional Research, Student Academic Affairs in

consultation with other relevant campus constituencies, continue efforts already underway to

develop university-wide assessments of student outcomes such as a student experience survey (a

modification of the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey-UCUES) and a

campus climate survey for students, faculty, and staff (CFR 4.8). Most importantly, we expect

this office to work with faculty to develop common instruments for evaluating the two global

learning outcomes "knowledge" and "professionalism" especially in the assessment of the

interprofessional education efforts (CFR 2.4). University-wide assessments of this type are a key

function of a centralized office of institutional research.

One concern that was confirmed during the team's visit was the absence of comparative data

on the University's public website in a centralized location related to retention, graduation rates,

time-to-degree, and statistics on learning outcomes (CFR 1.2). Selection of the data to disclose

should be in accordance with WASC report, *Student Achievement at the Institutional and Degree*

Level: G*uidance on Disclosing Data to External Audiences*[1]. The team recommends that this

student level data be displayed with other student statistics on the Office of Institutional

Research, Student Academic Affairs website (http://oir.ucsf.edu/) and made accessible from the

University's home page.

While greater centralization of some of the institutional research functions is desirable, based

on team observations of the specialized functions of these individual units, the team wishes to

reiterate that a centralized institutional research office clearly cannot easily replace, nor should it

necessarily replace in the current arrangement with the work going on in these units for their

constituencies in Schools, Human Resources, housing, etc. However, it would be highly

desirable for the many entities performing institutional research to work together to better

understand what each does, to discuss data definitions, best practices, and most importantly, to

better understand their own data (CFR 4.2). During the team's meeting with many of the units

who perform the institutional research function it was observed that meetings of this type had not

taken place in the past. Later in the day, when staff retention rates over time and disaggregated

by ethnicity (as a measure of diversity) was requested by the team, it became apparent that

though the data was provided in a rapid manner it was incomplete and had not been studied by

the institution to determine whether these rates were good or bad, and improving over time or not

(something the team was also trying to determine). Discussion of issues of this type both by

those performing the institutional research function, and more broadly by others with interest

within the organization is highly desirable (CFR 4.3).

In a meeting with senior leadership, it was clear to the entire team that some senior leaders

did not understand the term "institutional research", though they did understand, minus the

terminology, what information was provided from institutional research units, its utilization, and

its importance to the organization in guiding decisions (CFR 4.1). A few in senior leadership

expressed the sentiment that in an organization with a relatively small number of schools with

similar functions, it was relatively easy to gather the type of information provided by

institutional research units in a less formal manner and via a single source. It was also stated that

that the conduit of institutional research, of all types, to senior leadership had been and would

continue to be through the office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Academic Affairs, and thus,

the Office of Institutional Research, Student Academic Affairs. This further argues for the

importance of this centralized office to the institution. To the extent the Office of Institutional

Research, Student Academic Affairs, becomes the coordinating body for the collection and

analysis of student outcomes, and the campus's institutional research function in general, the

team observed, that at 1.5 FTE this office is understaffed (CFR 3.7, 4.5).

E. Institution's Systems for Enhancing Educational Effectiveness & Student Learning
The institution's overall system of quality assurance and improvement is based within

each school where they have demonstrated effectiveness for student learning outcomes in

---

[1] http://www.wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms/Task_Force_Report_on_1.2__Transparency___Accountability_.pdf

general. The emerging centralized institutional research function would be able to address the

recommendations made in the team report, to demonstrate attainment of diversity goals and the

two global learning outcomes. Work remains to demonstrate attainment of inteprofessional

educational goals. The TLC and expanded IT infrastructure will certainly enrich the learning

environment, enable direct and authentic assessment of student learning, and permit greater

flexibility in teaching and learning. Since UCSF is small and focused, and has a strong track

record of exemplary outcomes, the team has reason to believe that its proposed efforts are

sustainable, and will be used for improvement on a continuous basis. There is a strong cultural

value of striving for excellence at UCSF and available data (funded research, board pass rates)

demonstrate alignment with goals and outcomes. The University has also demonstrated the

ability to plan and secure resources (faculty, researchers, funds, facilities) to achieve the goals it

sets for itself. It has appropriate governance, many standing committees and a variety of support

services to carry forward the intentions and aspirations of the University. Development of a

robust IR core as a central entity outside of the schools is counter-cultural in the profession-

oriented environment of UCSF. That notwithstanding, the team has no reservations about

UCSF's capacity to continue achieving its goals for student success into the future (CFR 2.1).

The challenge—not insurmountable, will be for it to be more transparent and systematic in

demonstrating how data about student learning is used to improve learning (CFR 2.6, 2.7).

F. Student Success

Theme 2 (Student Learning Outcomes) addressed student success. Deficiencies were noted

with respect to reporting the outcomes beyond the school level, and institutional research

capacity in general.

G. Program Review

Program Review (especially for Graduates programs where there is no external accreditation)

was addressed with Theme 2 and institutional research (WASC Recommendation 10).

SECTION III. SUMMARY, MAJOR FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Institution's Fulfillment of Intended Outcomes for the Review

The institution made reasonable progress toward fulfillment of intended outcomes for the complete comprehensive review, as proposed in its Proposal and CPR Report. The entire review process appears to have made a positive impact on the institution, bringing about greater focus and collaboration among the Schools. Greater use of data was expected in the EER stage, but was limited by deficiencies noted earlier.

B. Value and Effectiveness of the Review

The Proposal, CPR and EER Reports and review stages all demonstrated decided progress towards achieving the educational objectives UCSF sets for itself. The quality of communication was clear and honest. Documentation, evidence, and observations made during the site visit were supportive of assertions, although incomplete in ways noted in this report.

The team report provides suggestions and recommendations in the body of the report. Major commendations and recommendations are described next, along with relevant CFRs.

C. Major Recommendations from both CPR and EER

There is much to commend at UCSF. The relatively small size and focus has contributed to a high-performance learning organization as evidenced by the quality of its funded research, contributions to health and healing regionally and globally, and in the quality of its faculty, students and graduates.

The team commends:

1. The administration for initiating a comprehensive update to its Long Range Development Plan, which includes a clear work plan and schedule for the planning process; environmental process; and community participation and evidence of a strong

commitment to include the Chancellor's Vision, academic planning efforts and
sustainability (CFR 3.5, 3.8, 4.1, 4.2).

2. The deans for evidence of assessment of professionalism in the professional programs, as
   part of a culture that values ethics. Work remains to demonstrate use of student learning
   outcomes leading to cycles of improvement institution-wide, particularly with the global
   learning outcomes. The Vice Chancellor of Student Academic Affairs will champion this
   across the institution (CFR 2.6, 2.7).

3. The deans, librarians, technology staff, faculty, program and project team members, and
   administration for developing a thoughtfully-designed, environmentally friendly and
   flexible learning environment in the TLC to enhance student learning and assessment, to
   pilot new technologies and procedures, and provide opportunities for interprofessional
   education, together with identifying metrics for evaluating success of learning and to
   promote interprofessional education (CFR 2.5, 2.10, 3.6).

4. The administration and deans for communicating institutional goals, as evidenced by
   wide-spread buy in and enthusiastic support up and down the organization for the
   Chancellor's five priorities, which are indicators of clear communication and
   transparency about institutional goals (CFR 1.3, 4.6).

5. The Chancellor and senior leadership in administration and research centers for
   productive relationships resulting in revenue from industry partnerships and philanthropy
   that has strengthened institutional self-sufficiency, and buffered fluctuations in external
   funding and the economy in general. Administration will need to monitor that industry
   relations not distort priorities and the educational enterprise (CFR 1.6, 3.5).

The team recommends:

1. That the administration prioritize resources so as to mature the IT infrastructure, noting that an integrated vision has been cast for supporting both the clinical and academic environment (CFR 3.6, 3.7).

2. *That the administration, deans, and the Office of Institutional Research mature integrated IR reporting, make more student-based data available centrally, in order to leverage the power of integrated planning and demonstrate and monitor educational effectiveness (CFR 4.5).* We encourage the university to make public on its website in a central location student statistics related to retention, graduation rates, time-to-degree, and learning outcomes in accordance with WASC CFR 1.2 (see *Guidance on Disclosing Data to External Audiences).*

3. That the faculty develop common metrics for the two global outcomes of "knowledge" and "professionalism" of graduates across all programs, and in the context of interprofessional education (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.4).

4. That the administration strengthen a synergistic partnership between the medical center and the academic enterprise. It was not apparent to the team that the medical center plays an active role on the educational team (CFR 4.8).