COMMUNICATION FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS, Chair

TO: Farid Chehab, PhD
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Request for Additional Information – UCSF Proposal for a Master’s of Science Degree in Global Health Sciences

DATE: March 6, 2007

In an effort to address your request to expedite the review of the proposal for a Master’s of Science Degree in Global Health Sciences, the Executive Committee considered the proposal at its meeting on Monday, March 5, 2007 in lieu of the Senate’s Coordinating Committee, which will not meet again until April 17, 2007.

As you know, the members of the Executive Committee expressed an overall sentiment of enthusiasm and support for the development of degree programs for the Global Health Sciences. However, after careful review and lengthy discussion of the proposal and appendices with you and Graduate Council member Elizabeth Watkins, the Executive Committee unanimously agreed that it could not recommend support for this new degree program without clarification and additional information related to a number of areas in the proposal. Additionally, because funding for this new degree program was an area of concern, the Executive Committee also referred the proposal to the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget for concurrent review and comment.

In order to further consider this proposed new Master’s of Science Degree, the Executive Committee requests that you provide the following additional information/clarification in writing by Friday, April 4, 2007 so that the Executive Committee can re-consider this matter at its meeting on April 9, 2007. We also invite and encourage attendance from the Global Health Sciences at the April 9 meeting to answer any additional questions that may arise in consideration of the additional information.

Additional Information/Clarification Requested:

1. Identification of the scholarly outcome for students completing the one-year Master’s of Science Degree in Global Health Sciences, and consideration given to a thesis or publication of a paper in a refereed journal in order to complete the program.
2. The proposal states that it is training leaders, can you elaborate more on what that entails.
3. Additional clarification regarding the reference to funding in connection with ACGME.
4. Additional information regarding funding, if more information is available.
If you have any questions or need additional information, please don’t hesitate to contact me or Tamara Maimon, Director at 476-3808 or tmaimon@senate.ucsf.edu. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Deborah Greenspan, Chair
Executive Committee

cc: All Executive Committee Members
    Elizabeth Watkins
    Asst. Dean Karen Nelson
April 2, 2007

Deborah Greenspan, D.Sc., BDS
Chair, UCSF Division of the Academic Senate

RE: UCSF Proposal for a Master’s of Science Degree in Global Health Sciences

Dear Deborah:

In reference to your letter of March 6, 2007, I am forwarding you with a letter from Haile Debas addressing the concerns raised by the Executive Committee at its last meeting. As a result, GHS has slightly modified the proposal and their latest April 2007 version of the proposed Program is attached. In addition, GHS has provided a detailed 5-year budget that I am also including with this letter. Please feel free to share this confidential information with members of the Executive Committee.

As you know, the Graduate Council has reviewed this proposal and after meeting with leaders of the Program, we unanimously voted to endorse it. We believe that the MS program in GHS represents a new direction for the University of California and UCSF will be proud to have taken the lead on it.

If you have questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Farid Chehab, Ph.D.
Chair, Graduate Council
Professor of Laboratory Medicine
March 28, 2007

Farid Chehab, Ph.D.
Chair, Graduate Council
Box 0134

Re: Response to Communication from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

Dear Farid:

I am grateful for the thoughtful and expedited review by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of the proposal for a Master’s of Science Degree in Global Health Sciences, dated March 6, 2007. I am pleased to submit a revised version of the proposal for reconsideration and to address the specific points outlined in the communication to the Graduate Council. I plan to attend the Executive Committee meeting on April 9, 2007, with members of the GHS curriculum development group to discuss our response.

The Executive Committee listed four specific areas needing additional clarification. These are addressed below with referenced proposal page numbers, if applicable:

1. Identification of the scholarly outcome for students completing the one-year Master’s of Science Degree in Global Health Sciences, and consideration given to a thesis or publication of a paper in a refereed journal in order to complete the program.

Section 2.7 (p. 29) was modified to clarify more specifically the two components of the capstone requirement, which is the Comprehensive Examination, composed of the written report and oral presentation. We believe it is not realistic to require the written component be a published paper, given the one year time frame for the MS and the required time for field work. Likewise, a one year program would be of insufficient duration to expect a formal thesis project to be completed. Scoring sheets for the Qualifying and Comprehensive Examinations (Appendix 8) have been added to ensure consistency and to clarify the program competencies to be evaluated by the examining committee. The committee is composed of the student’s mentor, one course leader, and one faculty member from the Graduate Group who will evaluate both the Qualifying and Comprehensive Examinations. The examining committee must achieve consensus to recommend students for graduation. Evaluation criteria and scoring sheets are modeled after the Masters in Nursing Comprehensive Examination Scoring system.
2. Training leaders

Participants in this program will be selected for their leadership potential and prior experience in global health. Examples of potential applicants include health sciences students who have already undertaken significant international work, such as participating in the global health Area of Concentration or Global Health Clinical Scholars Program at UCSF, working for a non-governmental organization (NGO,) or serving in the Peace Corps. Students will engage in unique multidisciplinary training that will continue to build leadership and teamwork skills necessary to solve the problems discussed in the seminars and didactic portions of the courses. Leadership skills in global health have been delineated as one of the cross-cutting themes of the curriculum and we have clarified how leadership skills will be assessed. This emphasis supports the program goal that graduates will develop global health leadership skills. (pp 23, 25, 27)

3. Additional clarification regarding the reference to funding in connection with ACGME

No students will receive stipend support for the MS. This policy is consistent with the Masters of Advanced Studies in Clinical Research Program. However, Residents who enroll in the MS program while concurrently participating in a Residency Program-associated Fellowship approved by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) will continue to receive the appropriate fellowship stipend funding provided by their residency program. These students will not receive any additional funding from the program. (p. 52)

4. Additional information regarding funding

Global Health Sciences is aggressively pursuing private gifts and foundation grants to support the development of the program. Our goal is to obtain sufficient resources so that by the time the program is ready to start, a significant portion of student costs will be offset by grants and gifts and a scholarship fund will be in place. While I am encouraged by the potential for this funding stream, these funds are not yet in hand. Our ability to obtain funding has a circular dimension to it in that we can not obtain funds until the program has been approved. Understandably, the academic review process seeks confirmation that the program will be supported. However, when presenting the program to donors they will naturally seek assurances that their funds will be directed to an approved program that has a high probability of success. These two expectations pose a challenge in sequencing; a challenge that we expect can be overcome if the academic review continues in parallel with our efforts to assure that the funding flow begins. The proposed start of the program is sixteen months away and in that time we expect that the resources needed for the program will be in place. I encourage the committee to support the continuing review of the program with the understanding that final approval will not be possible until the resource questions have been resolved and the budget approved.
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I appreciate your continued support and leadership in representing the MS Program and trust these clarifications will answer the Academic Senate’s concerns. Please let me know if there are additional questions I or the curriculum development committee may answer prior the April 9th meeting.

Yours sincerely,

Haile T. Debas, M.D.
Executive Director
Maurice Galante Distinguished Professor of Surgery
hdebas@globalhealth.ucsf.edu

HTD:tn:cs:lk

cc:    Academic Senate Executive Committee Members
       Academic Senate Chair Deborah Greenspan
       Assistant Dean Karen Nelson
       Education Coordinator Thomas Novotny
       Director Chuck Smukler
       Graduate Council Member Elizabeth Watkins
       Professor John Ziegler

Attachment:    Graduate Group and MS Proposal with Appendices
COMMUNICATION FROM THE SUBCOMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET
Jack Rodnick, MD, Chair

April 3, 2007

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
UCSF Academic Senate Chair
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Comments to the Proposed Master’s Degree in Global Health Sciences

Dear Chair Greenspan,

Jack Rodnick, Norman Oppenheimer, and Patricia Robertson comprised the Subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Reviewing the Proposed Master’s Degree Program in Global Health Sciences. The Subcommittee reviewed the documents provided and offers these observations and comments to the Executive Committee:

Budgetary Concerns

1. The budget outlined in the spreadsheet is optimistic but reasonable and the Subcommittee believes it could support the program as described (20 to 30 students for one year in a 36 unit course of study). The core courses do not depend on donated/volunteer time of faculty coordinators. The paid “mentorship” director is unique and appreciated.

2. The financial issue of start-up funds is not adequately presented. While the program is designed to be self-supporting once started, there is a clear need for significant funding beforehand to begin operations. The amount and source of these funds need to be addressed as well as the schedule for their payback. This repayment should be listed as an operating expense of the program.

3. The cost to the student of approximately $30,000 arises from the cost analysis in the spreadsheet, however, this fee is more than double that of comparable programs; e.g., Master’s of Public Health at $13,000. Have there been any surveys to establish that students will be attracted to such a program at this price? It is not a trivial concern to ask if this program will attract students at this level of education who already carry a significant debt burden. Has there been any analysis as to the market for the students who graduate from this program? The utility of the program for students from developing nations is obvious; however, the fee structure is not conducive for their participation, especially when factoring in the living expenses for one year in the Bay Area. In order to lower their costs, further fund-raising will be required.

4. The program does not depend on state support. The proposal notes that “it would be prudent to allow for the possibility of proposing state support for the MS program some time in the future.” However it is unclear why the proposal does not explicitly state why it would or would not aggressively pursue state support or FTEs. There may be some financial or contractual reasons against seeking FTEs, but these are
not explained. A formal plan to request state faculty FTE might be prudent as it is questionable if such a world-class program can be sustainable at this tuition level and without core UC funds.

**Fundraising and Financial Aid**

1. The program will require outside funds (1) to provide educational opportunities to a more diverse group of students and (2) to eventually expand to include a graduate program. While the “catch-22” of soliciting funds for a new program is appreciated, one can gauge the potential for fundraising by looking at the fundraising experience of the current programs in Global Health Sciences. What has been the success of the GHS in attracting these kinds of funds? In order for the Master’s program to decrease its expenses it must provide endowed chairs and income from funds to support students. The Subcommittee estimates a minimum of $3 to 5 million as a reasonable goal.

2. In lieu of fundraising, the spreadsheet analysis does not appear to contain any “return-to-aid” funding in the fees being charged to the students. The absence of any financial aid will greatly limit the diversity of participating students.

**Enrollment**

1. At least initially, the program appears to rely on recruiting from the local student pool. As such it represents an add-on to the existing medical education at UCSF. It is hoped that in the long-run the program can compete with other programs and attract new students to participate.

2. However, the application does not fully elaborate on the difference between this program and a MPH with an international health emphasis. How will it recruit the best and the brightest against other top international health programs located at the University of Washington, Johns Hopkins, Harvard, or the London School of Tropical Medicine? *Why would students want to come to UCSF’s program?*

On a separate but related issue, the Subcommittee notes that in recent years there has been a proliferation of Self-Supporting Programs (SSPs) on campus. The Subcommittee suggests that the time has come to set guidelines for their development. The Academic Senate may want to consider this issue in the Committee on Educational Policy, or the Chancellor may want to consider charging a task force with this issue next year.

This Subcommittee of Academic Planning and Budget appreciates the opportunity to review this proposal and hopes that its opinions and observations are beneficial to the deliberations of the Executive Committee.

Sincerely,

**The Subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Reviewing the Proposed Master’s Degree Program in Global Health Sciences**

Patricia Robertson, MD, Chair, Committee Academic Planning and Budget
Jack Rodnick, MD, Vice Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, Member, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget