ANNUAL REPORT
2009-2010

Primary Focus Points for the Year:
• Interdisciplinary/Interprofessional Education
• Education Information Technology including the Library Simulation Center
• Review of Systemwide Issues including UEETF and UC Commission on the Future, Education and Curriculum Working Group

Task Forces, Special Committees, and Sub-Committees:
• Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Steering Committee (Sergio Baranzini)
• Interprofessional Education Task Force (Gail Persily)
• Systemwide Task Force on Long Distance Learning (Peter Loomer)

Issues for Next Year (2010-2011)
• Continuing to develop interprofessional education as a priority for the campus at large.
• Ongoing development and exploration of instructional technology and its connection with interprofessional education.
• Monitor impact of UC policy and budgetary changes on the quality of professional education.

2009-2010 Members
Thomas Kearney, Chair
Peter Loomer, UCEP Representative
Abbey Alkon
Sergio Baranzini
Kurt Giles
Sophia Saeed
Vineeta Singh
Douglas Schmucker
Elisabeth Wilson

Permanent Guests
Sheila Brear, Chair, Committee on Education Policy (Dentistry)
Judy Martin-Holland, Associate Dean, Academic Programs and Diversity Initiatives (Nursing)
Harry Hollander, Chair, Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy (Medicine)
Gail Persily, Director, Education and Public Service (Library)

Number of Meetings: 8
Senate Analyst: Alison Cleaver
Systemwide Business

The Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy took up the following Systemwide issues this year:

**Commission on the Future: Education and Curriculum Work Group**
The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) discussed the proposed priorities at its December meeting and agreed that defining Academic Quality should be foremost, with Educational Effectiveness following. In January 2010, members heard a presentation from UCSF member to the Education and Curriculum Work Group, Dr. Molly Cooke. Committee members provided feedback in the form of a letter to Dr. Cooke with recommendations to insure that graduate and professional school education was being examined as closely as undergraduate education. A key suggestion was the creation of matrices to measure success and determine if educational outcomes have been met; these can be created independently then modified by campus or department. This will be of particular importance to establish a baseline and target benchmarks for achieving a quality education at UC campuses. This will be necessary to gauge the impact of new policies and initiatives promulgated by the commission. The key challenges will be to overcome the compartmentalization of departments and campuses, as well as develop an effective system of incentives and adequate resources to implement recommendations put forth by the commission. (Appendices 1 and 2)

**Task Force on the Initial Recommendations of the Commission on the Future**
The Committee sent a member to the UCSF Task Force focusing on the Initial Recommendations of the Commission on the Future. Initial recommendations came to the task force in late spring 2010, with a turnaround time of less than one month. The task force provided overall feedback to the Commission expressing concern that academic excellence would “take a back seat to fiscal exigencies”, further requesting that the Commission and Working Groups include graduate and professional education as part of their foci, and expressing concern that recommendations “embedded in an economic model… undermine the need and rationale for public support of UC.” (Appendices 3 and 4)

**Task Force on Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness**
The CEP reviewed this report and provided feedback to Chair Fuentes-Afflick. The Task Force had been charged to develop new ways to focus on effectiveness of and accountability for delivering educational outcomes. Overall the committee supported the ideas put forth in the report however had concerns about the burden of implementation and the use of faculty and department time on matters that might already be handled by other campus agencies such as alumni associations. (Appendix 5 and 6)

Divisional Business

This year, the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

**Task Force on Recruiting, Retention, and Promotion**
The CEP discussed the results of the Task Force examining UCSF’s progress in re the recommendations of the Armitage Report (2003). In particular committee members supported the recommendations regarding adjunct faculty, and the notion that going forward, everyone recruited must have due process to insure that if they are doing Senate-level work with an equal level of responsibilities—they should be made into a Senate series or at least considered for such a position. (Appendix 7)

**Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication (COLASC) Letter Regarding Mission Bay Library Space**
Committee members discussed the letter addressing proposed usage and library space requirements at Mission Bay over the next five to ten years. The committee felt it was a critical and basic need. Members thought that as library space was at a premium, it should be reserved for UCSF students and faculty. The
committee supported the letter and proposal with the caveat that COLASC obtain additional qualitative data to bolster its claims of library usage, as development continues. (Appendix 8)

Interdisciplinary/Interprofessional Education

Members continued exploring avenues to promote interdisciplinary/interprofessional (ID/IP) education within existing campus structures, a core part of the UCSF Strategic Plan.

The committee heard a presentation from the members of the Interprofessional Education (IPE) Task Force. This Task Force of Associate Deans was formed in 2003 to “achieve small steps toward greater interdisciplinary education at UCSF.” By definition, its goals are focused on the benefit of IPE. An annual report is given to each school’s Dean for feedback and for the Task Force to receive further direction.

Committee members provided feedback on development of IPE courses that suited all students and not a single discipline, i.e. ethics. CEP members also suggested making IPE work mandatory at some schools and structuring student portfolios to have a required IPE component.

For 2009-2010, the Task Force focused on:
- Creation of IPE metrics and goals
- Held a second IPE Day. This included the creation of an online presence to have students meet and expand the discussion of IPE education.

Other topics related to Interdisciplinary/Interprofessional education at UCSF discussed by CEP included the following:
- For the second year in a row, the Instructional Grant Program (IGP) funding through the Library focused on interprofessional education to be completed during the 2010-2011 academic year. Submission deadline was March 2010. This grant program seeks to address one of the goals of the campus strategic plan: “ensure that students and trainees are immersed in a culture that embraces interdisciplinary, interprofessional and transdisciplinary educational programs.” Two grants will be awarded at a maximum of $18K each. UCSF faculty, students, and staff were invited to apply.

We recognize that some progress has been made towards fostering interprofessional education at UCSF through synchronizing the academic calendar between all schools. However, it is uncertain if the reserved timeslot on Monday afternoons for interdisciplinary courses has been utilized. We suggest that there be proactive advertizing of this opportunity to faculty and students. Furthermore, that quantification of current clerkship and “informal” interprofessional activities be assessed.

Instructional Technology

In 2009-2010, the Committee continued to discuss educational technology. This has been a CEP focus for the past few years. The committee heard regular updates from the Educational Systems Advisory Board (ESAC) and provided feedback to ESAC Chairs on their initial report to the Chancellor. (Appendices 11 and 12)

Committee members received an update from Susan Promes and Jeff Kilmer, Co-Chairs of the Educational Systems Advisory Committee (ESAC) in early spring. They updated the committee on ESAC’s working and strategic plans. Following the March 2010 ESAC meeting, CEP members reviewed and commented on the report to the Chancellor.

In May 2010, Joseph Castro and Doug Carlson, in their capacity as Members of ESAC, attended the meeting to expand on questions raised by CEP members had on the ESAC report. Progress includes:
• Content capture program has received full funding. The intention is to roll out to all eleven big classrooms in Fall 2010. Following that, it will be rolled out to other rooms.
• ESAC was granted an endowment to maintain changes made to the general classrooms. The 2007 initiative focused on improving the fifty-five general-use classrooms but funds weren’t sufficient to sustain improvements over time. Beyond those classrooms, improvements aren’t covered by this endowment.
• Changes made over the past year include classroom scheduling and technology support, and projector or videoconferencing improvements made to key large rooms like Cole Hall.
• Further ideas pending implementation include digital signs outside classrooms so people are aware what is inside each room at a particular time. Also in development, “touch access” signs which will allow people to view availability and reserve a room while on-site.
• Rates for video conferencing were reduced in 2009, and are only charged if the rooms or services used are for non-educational purposes.

Separately, the Committee heard a presentation on the Kanbar Simulation (SIM) Center which will create a centralized learning center where health professional students develop competence in clinical procedures, physical exam skills, communication and team skills, and telemedicine consultation and presentation skills. (Appendix 13)

The committee recognized that a significant disparity exists between schools and departments regarding technology support. The institution should strive for a centralized support system. Our priorities are modernization of classrooms, as well as improved classroom access with the ability to accommodate large numbers of students. Modernization extends from issues of safety and environment with adequate ventilation of laboratories to connectivity and content capture.

Updates from the UCSF Library
The Committee benefitted from regular updates on the UCSF Library by Gail Persily, Director, Education and Public Service, UCSF Library. This academic year, her updates included information about the Library’s conversion of the Hearst Room, which seats about 130 people, into a study room for students. By end of academic year, the room had expanded hours on the weekends. The Library continues to work toward having a bathroom installed in the space so it can someday become 24/7 access.

Update on Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Visit
CEP Member Sergio Baranzini, WASC Representative, and Joseph Castro, Vice Provost, Student Academic Affairs and Special Assistant to the Chancellor updated the committee on the ongoing WASC Accreditation process. The next WASC site visit will be a three-day visit in October 2010. To prepare for that, the UCSF WASC Committee is compiling a report that will be available for feedback in early summer 2010. The report’s focus is methods by which to improve measurement of learning outcomes at UCSF. (Appendices 14 & 15)

Task Forces and Other Committee Service
This year, members of the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy served on the following Academic Senate task forces or other campus committees as representatives of CEP or the Academic Senate. Where possible, the reports from these task forces or committees are linked to or attached to this Annual Report.

• Interprofessional Education Task Force (Gail Persily)
• The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Steering Committee (Sergio Baranzini)

Going Forward
Ongoing issues under review or actions that the Committee will continue into 2009-2010:

- Interdisciplinary and interprofessional education
- Instructional technology
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**Senate Staff:**
Alison Cleaver, Senior Analyst
Alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu; 415/476-3808
Enhancing Throughput and Output

Given the University’s reduced resources, are there ways to get students to degree more efficiently and effectively and thus increase the number of degrees awarded (“output”)?

1. Improve Throughput / Increase Degree Production
   - Should the University offer incentives for students to complete their degrees in four years? What types of incentives could or should be offered?
   - Are there ways to offer gateway courses more efficiently without negatively affecting academic quality?
   - Are there ways to make greater use of a student’s high school senior year in order to increase UC throughput? Can we provide opportunities for high school students to receive college credit or take UC courses prior to full time enrollment?
   - Are there ways to better facilitate community college course articulation? Can the time to degree for transfers be reduced with better alignment between UC and CCC?

2. Curricular Redesign
   - Are there ways to restructure degree requirements (i.e. reducing required units in the major) in order to increase students’ ability to complete coursework in a shorter timeframe or to enhance the quality of their education?
   - Can multi-campus course offerings be increased and can barriers to cross-campus collaboration be eliminated?
   - Can programs be re-designed to make better use of the calendar? Would calendar alignment promote curricular re-design?
   - Should the University require that a student’s first or other academic term be the summer?

3. Increasing Use of Underutilized Capacity (Summer, nights, weekends)
   - Would increased course offerings on nights, weekends, summer, and intersession allow students to move through towards degree completion more quickly?
   - Can existing facilities be used more intensively?
Program Differentiation and Collaboration

Are there ways to extend program breadth and/or achieve efficiencies through cross-campus or multi-campus collaborations? Are there ways to reduce program duplication through greater campus differentiation?

1. Overlap and Specialization
   - What is the scope of degree program offerings at UC campus and what are the primary areas of study at each of the campuses?
   - What are the newly emerging fields of study nationally and internationally and alternatively, are there fields that are waning? What disciplines are needed by society and what disciplines are most in demand by students? Where are the intersections between the two?
   - What are the major campus differences and commonalities? Where are there areas of disciplinary overlap? Are there significant disciplinary gaps that the University should consider in its offerings?
   - What are the areas of campus depth and breadth in terms of disciplines, academic departments, and research centers?
   - Are there particular areas of distinction at each of the campuses in any of the above? Where are there areas of duplication among the campuses?

2. Opportunities for Cross-Campus Collaboration and Campus Distinction
   - Are there opportunities to increase campus curricular collaboration by piloting multi-campus offerings in Washington, D.C., Sacramento, and in the Education Abroad Program?
   - Are there new opportunities for campus-by-campus specialization and developing areas of distinction? What is best process for identifying these opportunities?
   - How can UC use its program review processes to reduce duplication and enhance collaboration?
   - Should UC consider developing a single academic calendar as a means of encouraging cross-campus collaboration?

3. Opportunities for Collaboration with the Other Segments of Higher Education
   - Are there ways in which UC can work with CSU, community colleges, and independent colleges to deliver academic programs more efficiently?
Are there ways to deliver quality education to more students more efficiently and effectively assuming fewer faculty and other resources?

1. **Leveraging the Use of Technology**
   - Are there alternative models for offering instruction to existing student populations that would be more efficient while preserving quality?
   - Should UC consider using online instruction as a means of delivering more of its existing courses in part or in whole?
   - Can technology be used to increase class size and increase efficiency of instructional delivery?

2. **Use of Instructor Resources**
   - Can the mix of instructors (e.g., ladder Rank / lecturer / adjuncts) be altered in ways that would increase efficiency without sacrificing quality in the delivery of instruction? How should this differ by level of instruction (i.e., lower division, upper division, graduate)?
   - Are there new and innovative ways to use graduate students / teaching assistant in instruction that would both increase efficiency and contribute to graduate student education and financial support?
   - What is the most effective type of faculty interaction with students and how to we maximize that to achieve efficiencies in educational delivery?
   - Can more instruction occur simultaneously as part of UC’s research function and is credit being appropriately provided for such hands-on learning?
   - Do we have effective faculty workload policies? Are there ways to be more efficient and effective in having faculty carry out their duties in teaching, research, public service, and university service?
   - Can we utilize cross-departmental instruction for gateway and/or other courses (e.g., engineering faculty teach lower division calculus) as a means to achieve cost savings?
   - Should UC consider reducing the number of instructional days?
### EDUCATION AND CURRICULUM — CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Delivery to New Populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should UC serve new groups of students both as part of our goal to be of service to the state and to develop additional financial and popular support for the University? What are the educational and curricular impacts of offering education to these groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Should UC develop programs to attract specific student markets (e.g., international students)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Should the University offer more terminal or professional master’s degrees and professional doctoral degrees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Would liberalizing policies with respect to part-time enrollment attract new populations of undergraduates unable to undertake full-time enrollment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Should UC offer part-time or weekend attendance to attract more fee-paying mid-career professionals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Should UC offer undergraduate education fully or partially online (e.g., 11th campus proposal)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Should UC utilize distance education or off-campus/regional centers in order to deliver education to rural or inner-city underserved areas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re: Review of the Proposed Priorities for the Education Curriculum Working Group, UC Commission on the Future

Dear Dr. Cooke,

As requested, at the December 9, 2009 meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the Proposed Priorities for the Education Curriculum Working Group, UC Commission on the Future as submitted to you, a Workgroup member, for review and comment.

Upon discussing the five proposed areas of focus, the Committee determined that the highest priority was to define and determine metrics for “Academic Quality.” All other priorities would be determined and flow out of that umbrella definition. Once that educational “landscape” is defined, the Working Group can brainstorm to envision what can be done, and then consider the cost effectiveness of those options.

Further Committee discussion of the Proposed Priorities included the following:

1. For Alternative Modes of Delivering Instruction, the Committee encourages the Workgroup to explore such avenues as “introducing online instruction into the undergraduate curriculum at UC” (pg. 2). It also requested that if the Workgroup were to focus on this topic, it reach out to UCSF to determine the success of such methods, as several of the campus’s Schools already deliver online courses including podcasts. However, the Committee determined that such undergraduate courses should still match the academic quality of and be as effective as in-classroom courses.

2. In examining Strategies for Reducing Time to Degree, the Committee agreed that while all bullet points offered were solid ideas, the overarching goal of developing “a more detailed or refined statement of what the University should hope to achieve by encouraging students to complete their degrees in a more timely fashion” (pg. 3) was paramount. Whatever the outcome, the Committee agreed that developing effective and quality academic programs that matched that “statement” were required.

3. The Committee looked at the Faculty and Use of Instructors focus as something that could be addressed by exploring academic quality. That priority’s “focusing on how we deploy instructors in classrooms and looking toward our long-term needs for faculty renewal and replacement given our current demographic profile” (pg. 3) rests upon the definition of academic quality in the UC system. If that quality is seen as being ‘innovative’ or ‘forward-thinking’ than are the faculty and
the use of instructors innovative and forward-thinking as well? Should more adjunct faculty be used to address cutting-edge topics, or is there sufficient support and incentives “in place to encourage/support faculty to carry out their share of instruction” (pg.4)?

4. For Curriculum/Course-offering Review, the Committee agreed such discussion was premature and as written, too detailed to address bigger picture issues facing UC over the next decade. The language seemed as though it may have been drafted by an administrator. Also, the Committee determined that “a campus’s educational goals” (pg. 4) should be decided upon first, with examination of curriculum or courses coming afterwards. This folded back onto the definition of academic quality foremost, and educational effectiveness, second.

5. On Academic Quality and Educational Effectiveness, the Committee strongly recommended this be the primary topic of exploration for the Workgroup. For reasons stated above, having a clear, concise definition of academic quality would allow all other areas of focus to become more streamlined in their creation and metrics for their success. Even the topic of educational effectiveness should flow out of the definition of academic quality.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the Proposed Priorities, and hope you will find our responses useful. Please do not hesitate to contact Committee on Educational Policy Chair Tom Kearney (pctk@calpoison.org) or Senior Senate Analyst Alison Cleaver (Alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu) if you have questions or would like to discuss these issues further.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Educational Policy

Thomas Kearney, PharmD, Chair
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, Vice Chair
Abbey Alkon, RN, PhD, PNP
Sergio Baranzini, PhD
Kurt Giles, PhD
Vineeta Singh, MD
Douglas Schmucker, PhD
Sophia Saaed, DMD
Elisabeth Wilson, MD, MPH

cc: Elena Fuentes-Afflick, Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
LIST OF WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Size and Shape

- Recommendation 1: Increase the number and proportion of non-resident students at the undergraduate level. (pp. 14-18)
- Recommendation 2: Improve the student transfer function by developing more complete lower-division transfer pathways in high-demand majors. (pp. 19-21)
- Recommendation 3: To improve the student transfer function, enhance the ASSIST website for greater user-friendliness and improved capabilities. (pp. 22-23)
- Recommendation 4: Examine the utility of practice doctorates for allied health professions in terms of national healthcare quality and costs, UC and CSU missions, and the future needs of California residents. (pp. 24-26)
- Recommendation 5: Eliminate administrative redundancies across the UC system and promote efficiencies where possible. (pp. 27-28)

Education and Curriculum

- Recommendation 1: Manage educational resources more effectively and efficiently to (1) increase the proportion of undergraduate students graduating in four years, (2) create a pathway for undergraduate students to complete degrees in three years, (3) make more effective use of faculty resources, and (4) maintain or improve the undergraduate student experience. (pp. 29-35)
- Recommendation 2: Continue timely exploration of online instruction in the undergraduate curriculum, as well as in self-supporting graduate degrees and Extension programs. (pp. 36-39)
- Recommendation 3: Expand use of self-supporting and part-time programs to expand opportunities for a UC education to existing and potential students, working professionals, and underserved communities. (pp. 40-45)
- Recommendation 4: Develop a systemwide academic planning framework that incorporates campus goals within the context of priorities identified for the University as a whole. (pp. 46-48)
- Preliminary Recommendation: The working group seeks UC input on its forthcoming recommendation on quality. (pp. 49-54)

Access and Affordability

- Recommendation 1: Reaffirm UC’s commitment to access for California students. (pp. 55-57)
- Recommendation 2: Reaffirm the University’s commitment to be financially accessible for all undergraduate students admitted to UC. (pp. 58-60)
- Recommendation 3: Reaffirm the University’s commitment to fulfilling graduate education’s role in serving UC’s research enterprise, UC’s teaching mission, and the diverse knowledge and workforce demands of the State and beyond. (pp. 61-63)
- Recommendation 4: Re-establish UC financial aid eligibility for undocumented California high school graduates. (pp. 64-66)
Recommendation 5: Adopt a multi-year fee schedule for each entering cohort of new undergraduate students. (pp. 67-69)

Recommendation 6: Rename the Education Fee and the Professional Degree Fees (but not the Registration Fee) as “tuition.” (pp. 70-72)

Funding Strategies

Recommendation 1: Develop a multiyear advocacy campaign aimed at grass roots opinion leaders throughout the State of California to foster public and political support for the University as a major priority for state funding. (pp. 75-79)

Recommendation 2: Design and implement a system to identify, promote, and adopt the best administrative practices within the UC system. (pp. 80-83)

Recommendation 3: Revise practice and policy on charging indirect cost recovery for non-federally funded research. (pp. 84-85)

Recommendation 4: Improve indirect cost recovery rates with federal agencies. (pp. 86-87)

Recommendation 5: Adopt a multiyear strategy to replace student fees with tuition, generate new revenue to protect academic quality, and strengthen university planning. (pp. 88-91)

Recommendation 6: Increase enrollment of nonresident undergraduates. (pp. 92-94)

Recommendation 7: Advocate for a Pell Augmentation Grant to Institutions (“Pell PLUS”). (pp. 95-100)

Recommendation 8: Examine alternate faculty compensation plans. (pp. 101-102)

Recommendation 9: Allow for the possibility of charging differential tuition by campus, as a means of mitigating potential future enrollment impacts on some campuses. (pp. 103-106)

Research Strategies

Recommendation 1: The University of California must recover a greater share of the costs of research sponsored by outside agencies and make its management of those funds more transparent to ensure accountability to its sponsors and its researchers. (pp. 111-116)

Recommendation 2: UC must ensure continued excellence across a broad spectrum of cutting-edge research. To aid in this effort, UC should (1) prioritize internal funds to support world-class research in disciplines where extramural funding options are limited; (2) motivate the development of large-scale, interdisciplinary, collaborative research projects to capture new funding streams; and (3) augment and enhance opportunities for graduate student research and support wherever possible. (pp. 117-121)

Recommendation 3: Create multicampus, interdisciplinary “UC Grand Challenge Research Initiatives” to realize the enormous potential of UC’s ten campuses and three national laboratories on behalf of the state and the nation. (pp. 122-125)

Recommendation 4: Streamline risk management practices to increase the efficiency of the research enterprise, making optimal use of faculty researchers and administrative staff support. (pp. 126-129)

Recommendation 5: Proactively demonstrate the significant and long-lasting benefits that UC research provides to California and the nation and advocate at the national level for increased and sustained investment in research. (pp. 130-131)
On behalf of the UCSF Academic Senate, please find attached the UCSF Response to Commission on the Future Working Group Recommendations. Should you have any questions regarding this transmittal, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,
Shilpa

Shilpa Patel, JD
Senior Analyst
UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Avenue, MUE 253
San Francisco, CA 94143-0764
tel: (415) 514-2696
fax: (415) 476-9683
spatel@senate.ucsf.edu
http://senate.ucsf.edu
SENATE DIVISION CHAIRS
SYSTEMWIDE SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force

Dear colleagues:

In response to a Senate request, the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force (UEETF) was established and charged with developing procedures for identifying and articulating the educational objectives of UC undergraduate academic programs and with determining methods for evaluating the success of those programs. The enclosed report was produced after intensive analysis and consultation with faculty and administrators on all campuses. It proposes that each UC campus establishes departmentally-specific learning assessment programs with the dual aims of improving undergraduate education and informing the public about learning achievements of UC undergraduates.

For your information, I have enclosed a cover letter in which the Clair Brown, the Chair of UEETF, introduces the report and explains its guiding principles; the report, itself; and a series of appendices.

Although the request for review is being sent to all divisions and systemwide committees, any committee or division may decline to comment if they feel it is not in their purview. If you choose to review this, please send your comments to senatereview@ucop.edu by Monday, January 4, 2010.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Henry C. Powell, Chair
Academic Council
Copy: Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director
Clair Brown, Chair, UEETF
Hillary Baxter, Academic Planning Analyst, UCOP
INTERIM PROVOST LARRY PITTS
Chair, Academic Planning Council

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR CROUGHAN
Vice Chair, Academic Planning Council

Dear Interim Provost Pitts and Chair Croughtan,

In response to a recommendation by the Academic Senate,¹ the Academic Planning Council formed the Undergraduate Education Planning Group (UEPG) in 2007 to advise on the future of undergraduate education, with the ultimate goal “… to make visible the distinctive value of the undergraduate educational experience of UC and to articulate UC’s philosophy and objectives for undergraduate education.” UEPG created two working groups. The first, the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force (UEETF), was charged to develop procedures for identifying and articulating the educational objectives of UC academic programs and methods for evaluating the success of those programs. (The second group, Post Graduate Outcomes Task Force, was charged to make recommendations for tracking UC students after graduation.) Attached to this letter is the final report of the UEETF.

The UEETF was charged specifically with providing “guidance to campuses, particularly academic departments, on ways of developing and communicating learning objectives and student achievement of those objectives.” The UEETF undertook a year of study, analysis, and discussion in developing our recommendations and report. We also engaged with faculty and administrators across UC campuses, and our recommendations build on the UC campuses’ assessment programs.

The product of those efforts is what we are proud to propose as the “UC Way to Educational Effectiveness”: each UC campus establishes departmental learning assessment programs with the dual aims of improving undergraduate education and informing the public about learning achievements of UC undergraduates. This approach, which integrates assessment of student learning and accountability for educational effectiveness, is vital to ensure that UC undergraduates receive a world-class education that prepares them for future success.

Three principles guided the writing of the report: (1) responsibility for assessing student learning resides with the faculty; (2) assessment should be discipline specific and locally (campus) defined, with Senate oversight and participation; and (3) departmental assessment programs must be supported by the required administrative resources and infrastructure for effective implementation. The global higher education reform movement challenges UC faculty to address the call for greater accountability responsibly. While it may not be possible to develop a measure of all the things departments are trying to achieve through instruction, faculty should aim to measure what we can — appropriately, and with the goal of improving undergraduate education.

¹ http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/ac.ucup.ug.edu.tf.0406.pdf
With the unanimous endorsement of the UEETF’s membership, I commend this report to you and the Academic Planning Council for review. It is my hope that the report can be distributed for simultaneous review by the Academic Senate and by the University administration. I would be happy to discuss the report’s findings and the Task Force’s work with all reviewing agencies.

Sincerely,

Clair Brown, Chair
Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force

cc: Members, Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force
Vice Provost Greenstein, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination
Academic Planning Analyst Baxter
UC Way to Educational Effectiveness

A report by
The Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force

Clair Brown, UEETF Chair, UC Berkeley
Mark Appelbaum, UC San Diego
Ramesh Arasasingham, UC Irvine
Michael Brown, UC Santa Barbara
Andres Cuervo, UC Riverside (student representative)
Dennis Hengstler, UC Berkeley
Adrienne Lavine, UCLA
Pat Turner, UC Davis
Keith Williams, UC Davis

University of California
July 2009
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Executive Summary

The Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force (UEETF) strongly believes in assessment of student learning (1) as a means of improving the quality of undergraduate education, and (2) as the basis for communicating to the public the learning outcomes of UC undergraduates.

UEETF believes that responsibility for assessing student learning resides with the faculty; should be discipline specific and locally (campus) defined, with Senate oversight and participation; and supported by the required administrative resources and infrastructure for effective implementation.

UEETF, after careful study of assessment and accountability philosophies and practices, presents for the University community consideration a series of specific recommendations for assessment and accountability. Overall we recommend that each campus have department/program-level undergraduate learning goals assessments to guide program improvements in undergraduate education, and each campus use the department/program-level assessments of student learning to communicate achievement of student learning outcomes to the public.

While the present economic climate may limit substantial investment in the development of new tools and practices, UEETF believes that, even in these austere times, continual progress can be made in implementing assessment at the department/program level. When better times provide more resources for undergraduate education, departments will have their on-going assessment processes to guide them in their innovations of the undergraduate program.

UEETF recognizes that the assessment and accountability programs being developed at UC campuses will require time to implement fully. These activities—developing the assessment process, performing departmental/program assessment, and developing accountability reports—require effective administrative support at the campus and system-wide levels.

Recommendations

1. Each campus should have a learning assessment program in which faculty in every undergraduate major develop discipline-specific learning goals, map goals to the curriculum, and assess majors’ mastery of the learning goals. Learning goals should include skills related to critical thinking, analytical reasoning, written communication, and other discipline-based skills. Departmental assessment processes should be integrated with evaluation processes required by accrediting agencies so that each department has only one assessment program.

2. The process and methods for properly assessing majors’ achievement of the department’s specific learning goals must be embedded in the curriculum (i.e., assessment is done periodically on a sample of assignments such as papers, labs, projects, and exam questions that represent specific learning goals). The assessment process should build on existing departmental resources and structures and provide ongoing feedback to improve the department’s instructional program as well as to modify the learning goals and the assessment process.
3. Academic review of departmental undergraduate programs should include a review of the department’s learning assessment process, including an evaluation of how the results of the assessment of student learning are used to improve the undergraduate program. Campus administrative leaders should incorporate the results of departmental student learning assessment into their strategic planning process.

4. Campus-level development of department-level learning assessment programs should be supported by communication among UC campuses about experiences, materials, and lessons learned. The Academic Senate, UC Office of the President, and other system-wide groups should endorse and support both formal and informal information exchange about learning assessment programs.

5. Standardized tests to measure undergraduate learning, if used, must allow measurement of faculty-developed, curriculum-based learning goals, and the results should provide valid information that can be used to improve the department’s instructional program. The learning goals evaluated by these tests should be appropriate to the major.

6. Campuses should publicly communicate through relevant sources evidence of student and campus educational achievements, including information on every department’s learning assessment program. The information should be user-friendly and available on the UC Undergraduate Campus Profiles websites which should have links to the departmental assessment programs. Information on the learning goals, the evaluation process, and measurement of majors’ achievement of these goals should be included in the public information about the departmental assessment programs.

7. Campuses should consider developing methods of aggregating measures of students’ achievement of departmental learning goals into meaningful, comprehensive public statements about overall undergraduates’ learning achievement. Development and reporting of such aggregated measures is sufficiently complex that campuses should be supported in this effort by UCOP, the system-wide Academic Senate, and campus administrators (e.g., Undergraduate Deans).

8. Because the value of a university education is made manifest in contributions over the graduates’ lifetimes, full assessment of the effectiveness of a UC undergraduate education must include information about what those graduates contribute to their families, communities, and workplaces. UEETF supports the development of a UC exit and alumni survey across campuses.

9. Campus assessment and accountability activities should include the broad array of information on student and campus achievement provided by existing reports, such as the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), the Campus Profiles, and the University’s Accountability Framework. UC should continue to collect information about the overall undergraduate experience to augment information derived from departmentally-based assessments.

10. Given its responsibilities for curriculum and admissions matters, the Academic Senate will be a key player in any activity to develop assessment of and accountability for undergraduate education system-wide.
Introduction

Responding to a recommendation by the Academic Senate, the Academic Planning Council in June 2008 charged the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force (UEETF) with providing “guidance to campuses, particularly academic departments, on ways of developing and communicating learning objectives and student achievement of those objectives.”1 [Appendix 1] UEETF undertook a year of study, analysis, and discussion in developing our recommendations and report. We also engaged with faculty and administrators across UC campuses, and our recommendations build on existing campus assessment programs. These programs are faculty-driven and supported by the Academic Senate.

The product of these efforts is what we are proud to propose as the “UC Way to Educational Effectiveness”: each UC campus establishes departmental learning assessment programs with the dual aims of improving undergraduate education and informing the public about learning achievements of UC undergraduates. This approach, which integrates assessment of student learning and accountability for educational effectiveness, is vital to ensure that UC undergraduates receive a world-class education that prepares them for future success.

Context

UC formed UEETF at a time when national discussion focused, in part as a response to recommendations of the Spellings Commission, on communicating to the public individual institution’s success in educating undergraduate students. In response to conversations at the federal level, accreditation agencies incorporated requirements that colleges and universities report explicitly on the learning outcomes their students were expected to achieve.

Postsecondary associations such as the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLGU)2 and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) developed their own models of public accountability for educational effectiveness, including the use of standardized tests to compare student learning across institutions. Other organizations—the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), for example—took a different approach to learning assessment that did not include standardized tests. As part of our study, UEETF compared these various philosophies and methods of measuring and communicating educational effectiveness.

1 In June 2008, UC Provost Hume and the Undergraduate Education Planning Group, a subcommittee of the Academic Planning Council, formed two task forces: the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force (UEETF), chaired by UC Berkeley Professor Clair Brown; and the Postgraduate Outcomes Task Force, chaired by UCLA Assistant Vice Chancellor Ralph Amos. The latter was charged with recommending “methods by which the campus and the University as a whole can better describe and evaluate the longer term impacts of a UC undergraduate education.” http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/ac.ucpe.ug.edu.tf.0406.pdf

2 Formerly the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges or NASULGC.
Definitions and Approach

UEETF’s recommendations and report are based upon analyses of the literature, the various assessment approaches, national and international discussions (such as those associated with the Bologna Pact) as well as the requirements of accreditation bodies [Appendix 2]. The latter includes the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the regional organization that accredits UC campuses, and ABET, the national organization that accredits postsecondary degree programs in engineering and applied science.

UEETF’s analysis is grounded in the philosophy that good educational practice requires good learning assessment practices. The ultimate goal of the assessment process is to ensure educational effectiveness.

As defined by UEETF and as used in this report, **assessment is an on-going three-stage process that identifies learning goals, measures students’ mastery of the goals, and uses the results to improve instructional programs as well as refine learning goals.** More precisely, the three iterative stages of assessment involve the following activities:

- faculty clearly define and articulate the learning goals for their majors; faculty map those learning goals to the curriculum to demonstrate how students are expected to master the learning goals;

- faculty assess student achievement of learning goals, i.e., faculty directly measure student learning outcomes and provide measurements of students’ achievement of learning goals; and,

- faculty use information derived from the assessment process to improve the instructional program for majors and to refine learning goals.

UEETF’s analysis also takes into consideration the goal of communicating to the public the learning achievements of UC undergraduates. In particular, we are mindful of the UC President's obligation to inform various public constituencies, including those with funding responsibilities, about the educational effectiveness of the University of California.

**UEETF terms this important role accountability, and defines it as a reporting activity to the public that includes the learning achievements of UC undergraduates.**

Furthermore, UEETF believes that accountability must balance the need for concise summaries of UC undergraduate learning achievements with the requirement that measures of student outcomes be meaningful and related to instructional programs and their improvement. Accountability with respect to undergraduate learning is necessarily grounded in assessment, and some learning assessment outcomes can be used for accountability, as we show below.
Organization of the Report

The assessment goal of providing useful feedback about undergraduate instructional programs for the purposes of innovation and improvement as well as the accountability goal of providing meaningful information to the public on undergraduates’ learning achievements dominate both the theory and practice of evaluating student learning outcomes at the college level. They also form the organization of this report.

The report is divided into two major sections, the first addressing student learning assessment and the second addressing educational accountability. The section on learning assessment describes:

- what is being done across UC campuses to implement assessment of student learning outcomes to improve undergraduate education,
- what we have learned so far from the on-going assessment programs, and
- how the programs can be strengthened at the campus level and supported system-wide.

The section on accountability provides:

- analysis of standardized tests of student learning to determine how useful such tests are in improving undergraduate education and in providing information about student learning achievement to the public;
- exploration of how to use information from the learning assessment process for public accountability reporting; and
- description of other information that is or can be communicated to the public about various aspects of undergraduate educational effectiveness.

UEETF recommends that the “UC Way to Educational Effectiveness” is one in which information from the learning assessment process forms the basis of public accountability reporting. This approach will provide accountability to the public through measures of student learning outcomes yielded by assessment processes at the program level on all UC campuses.

UEETF is mindful that educational effectiveness at the undergraduate level incorporates many aspects beyond classroom learning. In addition to evaluating instructional experiences and learning, a comprehensive review of educational effectiveness must include evaluation of how other collegiate experiences prepare students for their many roles in life—in their families, communities, and workplaces. This report focuses on defining and assessing student learning outcomes—activities the faculty deliver and control—as the primary way to evaluate educational effectiveness. This focus is consistent with the UEETF charge. However, because student learning achievements do not occur in a vacuum and a multidimensional array of information is required to provide a full picture, a portion of the report addresses the broader array of information available to evaluate educational effectiveness.
Stakeholders

The assessment process for improving undergraduate education and for providing accountability requires that we determine what is measured and how it is measured, and we identify the stakeholders for the assessment information and the appropriate use of the information by them. The stakeholders comprise many distinct constituents. These include the faculty, chancellors and other administrative leaders, the UC Board of Regents, state legislators, citizens of California, current and prospective students and their parents, donors, accrediting bodies and other organizations (governmental and non-governmental) that have an interest in UC’s educational effectiveness.

With respect to student outcomes, each of these constituents may desire different types of information. Some are interested in students’ learning achievements; others care more about students completing their bachelor’s degrees, perhaps pursuing graduate education or professional training, and making productive contributions to the economy; still others want to understand the cost and value of undergraduate education. We see that even the most basic question, “What information should we provide to the public?” has multiple answers depending on which “public” we mean. UEETF thinks that the information on educational effectiveness should include outcomes considered useful by a broad array of constituents [Appendix 3], and we try to accomplish this in our recommendations.

UEETF hopes this report provides the critical information required to understand our recommendations. Discussion and conclusions are based on a wide range of research and data, and references for these and other supporting materials are provided in the appendices. Our collective hope is that this report proves useful to the University community as a whole and to the State of California.

Section I: Assessment

Summary: Faculty-driven assessment by departments or programs of their majors’ achievement of learning goals is a valuable and essential process for understanding student learning and for strengthening undergraduate curriculum at the program level.

Recommendations:

1. Each campus should have a learning assessment program in which faculty in every undergraduate major develop discipline-specific learning goals, map goals to the curriculum, and assess majors’ mastery of the learning goals. Learning goals should include skills related to critical thinking, analytical reasoning, written communication, and other discipline-based skills. Departmental assessment processes should be integrated with evaluation processes required by accrediting agencies so that each department has only one assessment program.

2. The process and methods for properly assessing majors’ achievement of the department’s specific learning goals must be embedded in the curriculum (i.e., assessment is done periodically on a sample of assignments such as papers, labs,
projects, and exam questions that represent specific learning goals). The assessment process should build on existing departmental resources and structures and provide ongoing feedback to improve the department’s instructional program as well as to modify the learning goals and the assessment process.

3. **Academic review of departmental undergraduate programs should include a review of the department’s learning assessment process, including an evaluation of how the results of the assessment of student learning are used to improve the undergraduate program.** Campus administrative leaders should incorporate the results of departmental student learning assessment into their strategic planning process.

4. **Campus-level development of department-level learning assessment programs should be supported by communication among UC campuses about experiences, materials, and lessons learned.** The Academic Senate, UC Office of the President, and other system-wide groups should endorse and support both formal and informal information exchange about learning assessment programs.

**The Goals and Process**

The goals of the assessment process are to understand how students progress through the major to achieve specific skills and knowledge and to use the evaluation of student learning outcomes to improve the instructional program.

Assessment of learning outcomes is based upon the premise that students learn specific skills and knowledge in their undergraduate programs. Faculty have the responsibility for describing the department’s learning goals, mapping them to the undergraduate curriculum, and assessing the students’ achievement of those goals, i.e., measuring student learning outcomes. Direct assessment of learning goals is done through evaluation of student performance in a sample of specific assignments, such as problem sets, lab assignments, studio projects, written reports or papers, and exam questions.

Several major questions and issues must be addressed in developing an assessment process, and experts have grappled with these issues over a long history. In particular, UEETF addressed the following questions:

- What are learning outcomes? Who defines them? Are they global, generic and related to general education? Or are they specific, curricular and related to the major?
- What type of metrics should be used to evaluate learning? What should be the range of coverage for these measurements? That is, should there be one test for all students or separate evaluation mechanisms by subgroups? Can some students “opt out” and if so, on the basis of what rules? Can there be multiple assessments simultaneously?
- Who is accountable for student learning outcomes (i.e., is it connected to the curriculum and who is responsible for ensuring student learning achievement)? Is there regular review of the results?
- How can the University demonstrate accountability for overall student learning?
Who are the “stakeholders” for information about student learning? Who has access to the data and under what conditions?

**Importance of Context/Discipline in Assessing Performance**

A key question for UEETF was whether assessment of student learning is better practiced within a general context (e.g., assessment of undergraduates on global skills on a national basis without specific links to their majors) or within a disciplinary context. A long-standing debate about which approach is better has not produced a definitive answer. However, **based on the available evidence, UEETF has determined that learning goals that are developed within the context of a discipline provide a richer and more rigorous set of knowledge and skills than learning goals situated in a general context, and thus we focus on assessment at the program level.** A more detailed discussion of the limitations of general standardized testing as a method of assessing student learning, and the limited usefulness of such information in helping to improve a department’s instructional program, is included in the second section dealing with accountability.

The debate over the importance of context in performance evaluation is as old as the development of the formal psychometric methods that undergird most contemporary educational/psychological measurement systems. The fundamental and still unresolved issue is whether valid information about the impact of an instructional program or about the skills of an individual can be gleaned from a static assessment instrument independent of the context in which the instruction was delivered or in which the skills are to be utilized.

Closely related to the practices for learning assessment in undergraduate education are the practices that guide the assessment of learning outcomes in medical and other professional schools. These forms of assessment are far more complicated and nuanced than almost anything that has been proposed for undergraduate assessment. They are always done in the context of a given profession and what is taken to be the mandatory skill set for that profession, including ethical behavior. For many of these areas, the ultimate learning indicator is the percentage of students passing the licensing examinations. It is typical for such assessments to have components that go beyond written answers (e.g., the dental exams requiring production of finished models).

Professional schools also have a long history of performance-based assessment of students (and by implication of the instruction that they receive), including moot court for law students, sophisticated body simulators for practice surgeries by medical students, and full scale project design for those in architecture. Professional assessment both by examination and by performance is always developed in the context of the training. Even in domains with high levels of generalization, such as ethics, assessment is conducted with examples and situations specific to the field of training.

For assessment of undergraduate learning, the issue parallels a long standing debate in writing instruction, which has a large literature associated with it. The fundamental question is whether writing is a general skill that transfers to all areas or writing is something that is taught and needs to be mastered and assessed in context. Many believe that in order for writing to be effective it
has to be consistent with the fairly narrow conventions of a particular field and, by extension, the assessment of the effectiveness of writing instruction must be done within the context of that field. Similar arguments can and have been made in the domain of critical thinking. For example, can critical thinking be assessed in a meaningful and rigorous way independent of knowledge of a particular field—as in general questions that can be understood by all majors—or does critical thinking need to be assessed within the context of a discipline?

This debate continues with both theoretical and empirical arguments. While the literature is quite large and varied and while studies do not provide a single conclusion, UEETF agrees with the following consensus:

- The expression of mastery of learning outcomes, particularly for such “deep learning” outcomes as critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and written communication, is substantially different in different academic domains (Laird, Shoup, and Kuh, 2005).

- Variation in student performance across academic domains (i.e. departments) at any one institution is substantial. For example, Chatman (2007 – p. 1) reports that the UCUES data demonstrate “greater variance among majors within an institution than between equivalent majors across institutions” on a series of academic items.

- For an assessment to be useful for the improvement of undergraduate education (in addition to providing accountability evidence), the assessment must be viewed by the faculty of the unit in which improvement is being sought as being relevant to the instructional program.

- For assessment of institutions to be valid collectively (i.e. aggregated over students and departments), they must be valid at the level of the major (department).

UEETF therefore recommends assessments designed for specific majors. Faculty should define learning goals for the major, map the goals to the curriculum, and directly assess student achievement of the goals. Based upon assessment programs now evolving at UC campuses, UEETF thinks that the learning goals of departments should include discipline-specific critical thinking, analytical reasoning, written communication, and other discipline-based skills. A discipline-specific approach provides a more meaningful assessment of student learning outcomes and is more useful for improving instructional programs than is an assessment method based upon a generic set of learning outcomes evaluated out of context.

**Learning from On-Going Assessment Programs**

Assessment programs under development at UC and other universities, including Virginia and Maryland, demonstrate practices that are effective in developing learning goals and evaluating student learning achievements while minimizing the resources used. Because development of assessment is at a relatively early stage, we do not think that specific programs currently in use necessarily represent “best practices.” Here we highlight ongoing assessment processes—a mix of campus-wide and departmental efforts—aimed at improving undergraduate education, along with other goals such as communicating the process to various stakeholders.
UC Campus Assessment Initiatives and Illustrative Program Activities

Senate-mandated, Department-specific Assessment Process at UC Berkeley
The Berkeley campus is in their second year in a Senate-mandated, faculty-driven, discipline-specific assessment process for each major. Departments have developed learning goals for their majors and mapped the learning goals to the curriculum. Links to each major’s Undergraduate Learning Goals will be available online in summer 2009. In the current phase, departments are developing pilots for direct measures of their students’ performance in achieving these learning goals [Appendix 4].

Improving Critical Thinking and Writing Skills at UC Davis
The Davis campus is working to improve students’ critical thinking and writing skills through a Spencer-Teagle Foundation funded initiative to improve undergraduate student learning and assessment in systematic ways. The campus’s objective is to experiment with new courses and/or new teaching elements/modules that could be incorporated into existing courses. In one curricular pilot, the University Writing Program is partnering with a large department to develop pedagogically-appropriate writing assignments for a large General Education class. The goal of the pilots is to shift to outcomes-based and value-added assessment measures of effectiveness of student learning. Examples of assessment activities include program documents, user/client surveys, collection of course materials and student work, interviews of students and faculty. Evaluation of rubrics and digital archives serves as a centerpiece of this effort.

Student Learning in the Major Initiative at UC Irvine
UC Irvine developed a multi-year plan to assist faculty to guide their departments toward establishing assessment programs for their major. The campus-wide initiative is in its second year and provides workshops, consultations, and assessment grants to Senate faculty to help identify learning goals in the major, to align learning goals to the major’s curriculum, and to assess whether graduating majors were meeting those goals. Each department was requested to provide a progress report on where it is in the assessment process by December 2008 [Appendix 5].

Use of Capstones for Assessment at UCLA
UCLA is using capstone courses for assessing student learning for WASC review. Capstone experiences provide students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery and integration of knowledge and learned abilities within a discipline. UCLA requires departments applying for capstone certification to establish learning outcomes and associated assessment approaches related to capstone experiences. Departments are provided with assistance in achieving this and to that end UCLA has prepared a document, Guidelines for Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes for Undergraduate Majors (currently in draft form) to provide guidance for all majors, whether capstone or not [Appendix 6].

Alignment of Course and Program Outcomes at Merced
As a new campus, UC Merced has had the opportunity to focus on learning even before its first undergraduate class was admitted. Faculty have developed course-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) to support student achievement of program learning outcomes (PLOs) in undergraduate majors and graduate curricula. SLOs are required for new course approval as per
pending Academic Senate policy. They appeared in most fall 2008 and nearly all spring 2009 course syllabi and will be listed in all syllabi hereafter. Alignment of these course outcomes with program outcomes has started and will be refined over time using the results of annual assessments. Furthermore, program outcomes are being mapped onto the institutional principles of general education. This process includes review of links between the campus mission as a “student-centered research university” and the research opportunities and expectations afforded by campus programs. Across all schools and degree levels, the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence is supporting learning outcomes and assessment efforts through workshops and consultations.

**Riverside: Testing and Other Learning Assessments**
Riverside has been involved in significant assessment efforts. One is the piloting of the Collegiate Learning Assessment, a standardized test to measure student critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and written communications skills. The test and Riverside’s experience with it to date are discussed in detail Section II of this report.

Also now underway is an initiative to clearly define, measure and evaluate learning outcomes both for general education requirements and for individual baccalaureate majors as well as graduate programs. As part of this effort, faculty participated in several seminars and workshops to guide outcomes development and identify assessment mechanisms. In November 2008, UCR held a Summit on Learning Outcomes and Assessment which was the official “call to action” for the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS) and the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS). These two colleges have now developed outcomes for nearly all of their respective degree programs. Both outcomes and associated assessments go into a database—the Online Assessment Tracking System (OATS). Assessment specialists are reviewing and providing feedback based on the information generated from OATS. All programs will submit a multi-year assessment plan. For most, the first assessments will occur in 2009-10.

**Assessment Project in UC San Diego’s Department of Psychology**
The Department of Psychology at UCSD is conducting an experiment to determine if it is feasible to assess the degree to which their students (with special emphasis on majors) have achieved mastery of a set of predetermined learning objectives through assessment of their mastery of these objectives within the context of regular course examinations. After agreeing on learning outcomes, based on those adopted by the American Psychological Association, faculty members are determining which courses are most likely to offer opportunities for mastery of the outcomes. Faculty are developing test items keyed to the desired outcomes to embed in end-of-term examinations. [Appendix 7]

**UC Santa Barbara Support for Assessment Development**
The Santa Barbara campus, through its Instructional Development program in the Office of Academic Programs, has sponsored events to focus attention on the benefits and challenges of assessment, and the campus has provided grants to assist faculty in implementing assessment activities. Instructional Development has hosted national experts in assessment, presented findings from pilot studies, sponsored discipline-specific presentations (e.g., Geology, Asian American Studies), and invited participation of faculty from other UC campuses. In addition, learning assessment figures prominently in the institutional proposal for campus accreditation review.
**Student Learning and Reaccreditation at Santa Cruz**

UCSC received its most recent reaffirmation of accreditation in 2005. At this juncture, the campus is embarking on preparations for the next reaccreditation cycle with articulation of educational objectives at the department level as an important focus. Administrators and faculty are actively engaged in activities to move this agenda forward. Both the Undergraduate Dean and members of the faculty participated in a system-wide student learning outcomes workshop held in November 2008. Already select departments engage students in summative learning experiences through capstone requirements for a written thesis or other project.

**Pilots to Integrate Campus-wide Assessment Programs with ABET Evaluations in Engineering Programs at UC Berkeley and UCLA**

At UCLA and Berkeley, the engineering undergraduate degree programs have developed elaborate procedures for satisfying ABET assessment requirements. The program learning outcomes are dictated by ABET, with flexibility to tailor them to the particular program. At UCLA every required course in the curriculum (and every course at Berkeley) is associated with a subset of the program learning outcomes and must provide evidence of student achievement of the learning outcomes. The course instructor devises specific assignments (e.g. final exam questions or projects) in order to evaluate student mastery of the learning outcomes and then provides suggestions for future improvement to the course. In addition, UCLA students fill out surveys giving their opinions as to how well they learned the course topics (as distinct from the learning outcomes).

At UCLA, undergraduate engineering programs require a capstone design course in which majors integrate the knowledge and skills they have acquired throughout the curriculum. Either the ABET assessment or UCLA’s capstone assessment process can be used by the engineering programs to satisfy WASC assessment requirements. At Berkeley a CEE assessment pilot is annually assessing five courses. The instructor evaluates specific student learning outcomes demonstrated by selected course assignments (e.g., laboratory experiences, projects, and examination questions), and determines the extent of student mastery of the outcomes. All upper division courses will be included in the assessment process on a rotating basis. The UCLA and Berkeley experiences will hopefully provide examples of assessment that minimize the burden on faculty and staff resources and provide timely feedback to the programs for improving undergraduate education.

**Assessment Initiatives and Activities at Other Universities and Organizations**

**University of Maryland – Program and Campus-wide Assessment**

At the University of Maryland, goals for student learning have been established in nearly 400 programs and are available on a public website. In addition, UM faculty have written learning goals that span multiple common expectations for all UM undergraduates, including critical thinking and research skills, written and oral communication, science and quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and technological fluency. The campus also provides workshops tailored to the requestor’s needs. Topics cover an overview of learning outcomes assessment and the campus process; establishing student learning outcome goals and objectives; methods for
assessing student learning outcomes; designing rubrics for evaluating student learning outcomes; and utilizing results of student learning outcomes assessment. [https://www.irpa.umd.edu/Assessment/LearningOutcomes/]

**University of Virginia – Using Rubrics for Assessment**
The University of Virginia uses course assignments both for grading and for providing assessment of specific learning goals. The University designed an assessment template that uses rubrics to evaluate student assignments, including items such as papers, key exam questions, essays, or presentations, to measure student mastery of specific learning goals. The instructor applies the relevant rubrics for specific student learning outcomes to a student assignment, and the rubrics are used to assess four levels of competency for mastery of the skills and knowledge described in the learning goals. UVA also sponsored a pilot study of a software product that facilitates on-line interactive grading of student work using rubrics. The completed rubrics can be shared with students to provide detailed feedback on their work. In addition, they are automatically stored in a database, which can be used to aggregate and analyze the data in order to assess student learning. [http://www.web.virginia.edu/iaas/assessment/assessrubrics.htm]

**Association of American Colleges and Universities**
The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has long called for the academy to take responsibility for assessing the quality of student learning in college and has issues a number of reports on the subject. AAC&U has taken the approach that learning outcomes can be stated broadly, with departments and majors developing discipline-specific curriculum and assessment measures that can be aggregated into comprehensive statements about the institution’s educational effectiveness. Their list of “essential learning outcomes” was developed by faculty from member institutions.

AAC&U supports the premise that while outcomes can be stated generally, they must be cultivated and assessed in context. They offer guidance for developing a comprehensive assessment framework and other aspects of the assessment process. Their VALUE Project (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) reflects the philosophy of learning assessment that faculty evaluation of the quality of student work is more meaningful and reliable compared to standardized tests administered to samples of students outside of their required courses. [http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-wi09/pr-wi09_index.cfm]

**Western Association of Schools and Colleges**
The University’s regional accrediting body, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), revised its standards in 2001 and 2008. Each time, among other changes made, there was increased emphasis on student learning and on institutional demonstration of educational effectiveness related to learning. Through its accreditation standards and criteria for review [Appendix 8], WASC requires the following:

- a system of measuring student learning;
- for baccalaureate programs, development of core learning abilities and competencies including, but not limited to, college-level written and oral communication; college-level quantitative skills; information literacy; and the habit of critical analysis of data and argument;
• clear statements of student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment at the course, program and, as appropriate, institutional level;
• sharing of these outcomes and expectations widely and faculty assumption of collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations; and,
• systematic review of all institutional programs that includes analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes.

At UC campuses, the faculty-driven process of developing learning goals for majors in each department is a valuable process for both faculty and students to think about the undergraduate program. Both faculty and students are finding the process to be useful: faculty appreciate the link between evaluation of student mastery and improvement of the undergraduate program; students appreciate how the learning goals reflect both the way in which the curriculum fits together and the higher-order skills and knowledge they are learning.

Observations and Lessons Learned To Date

On-going assessment programs provide guidelines for creating an effective and cost-efficient assessment process. These lessons are not fully developed rules and are offered as insights gained from experience. UC campuses are at different stages in developing department-level assessment programs, and campuses can learn from each other. UEETF supports exploring ways for the Academic Senate and UC Office of the President to facilitate this learning.

Experiences to date provide the following five guidelines for an assessment process that evaluates and improves undergraduate programs on an on-going basis:

• The process of developing and assessing learning goals should be discipline-specific (i.e., for majors), faculty-driven (i.e., developed and implemented by instructors), and owned by departments (i.e., not by campus administration).
  o Review of the department’s assessment process should be a key element of the academic review of a department's undergraduate program.
  o Learning goals across departments include key higher educational goals, such as critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and written communication, as well as other discipline-appropriate skills and knowledge. The learning goals are taught differently according to the discipline, and students’ mastery of many of the goals can be evaluated and measured within the context of the program curriculum. However, students' achievement of some goals, such as lifelong learning skills and using education to help society, are observed after they leave the university.

• The assessment process must be integrated into other evaluation activities, such as WASC and ABET, so that no department has more than one assessment process.
  o The approaches currently being developed at the UC campuses mesh well with the WASC evaluation of student learning outcomes.
The assessment process currently being undertaken for ABET could possibly be streamlined to be more effective as a tool for improving education while at the same time reducing the resources required.

- The process of assessing student learning outcomes should be embedded in the current curriculum in a way that uses existing resources and provides on-going feedback used to improve the undergraduate program.
  - Direct assessment of student learning outcomes requires evaluation of the overall skills and knowledge that majors achieve by the time they graduate. This can be accomplished with assessment of the learning achievements of advanced majors done periodically on a sample of assignments, such as papers, labs, projects, and exam questions that represent specific learning goals. Assessment can include evaluations of capstone assignments or evaluation of assignments in upper division courses on a rotating basis.

- Departments should put their learning goals materials on their web sites so that students, prospective students, and the interested public can learn more about what departments teach in their majors. For example, the web site can state learning goals, map these goals to the curriculum, explain how student learning outcomes are evaluated, and provide examples of student achievement of specific goals through assignments, such as papers, lab reports, problem sets, portfolios, exam questions.

- Assessment requires faculty input into the process at every stage, and the implicit cost of faculty time should be identified, estimated, recognized and supported. Also, evaluation and management of the assessment process requires knowing the resources required, including faculty and staff time, as well as the benefits, including innovations and improvements in undergraduate education and high (or improving) achievement in student learning outcomes.
  - Budget cuts for UC are impacting the ability of the assessment process to implement improvements in undergraduate programs. For example, capstone courses such as thesis seminars and lab-intensive courses are being cut or curtailed in order to teach large lecture and required courses. Implementation and evaluation of the assessment process must realistically take into account the teaching resources available to departments across campuses.

Overall, UEETF sees defining and assessing learning goals for majors and improving undergraduate curriculum as an on-going process, which each department uses to evaluate and improve its undergraduate program and which students use to understand and deepen their learning in the major. The assessment process is intimately linked to the improvement process because it is faculty driven, and faculty are in charge of and responsible for student learning.

Based on the information sharing and collaboration that is already taking place across UC campuses, UEETF thinks that UC system-wide groups, including the Academic Senate, have an
important role to play in supporting the assessment processes across campuses, especially in facilitating the sharing of learning goals materials and experiences across campuses and departments, both formally and informally.

Assessment of learning goals might be aggregated to the campus level with some willingness to aggregate different approaches to learning goals and different types of metrics. However, if these aggregations are made, they should remain specific to the campus and not be used as a comparison of student learning outcomes across campuses. To make such a comparison would require scientific development of a metric that is applied across all campuses and can be controlled for differences in the characteristics of the student bodies and for differences in instructional targets. Such a scientifically developed metric is not available and would be expensive to design and implement. If the University of California is interested in developing a metric that can be used across campuses, UEETF urges UCOP to invest in a carefully designed research and development project that requires all metrics meet specific requirements of validity, reliability, and connection to curriculum, as discussed above. The costs and time required for this type of research project would be large, as would be the costs of implementation. The benefits for undergraduate educational effectiveness relative to the costs of developing and implementing such a metric are not known.

The assessment of undergraduate student learning is part of a much larger picture of the experiences that UC students have and of the enduring value of their UC education and of demonstrating how well the UC system is doing in providing world-class education to California students at a reasonable cost to its citizens.

We discuss both the use of department-specific student learning outcomes and the use of other measures of student experiences and performance next in the Accountability section.

Section II: Accountability

UEETF takes a broad view of accountability and the university’s obligation to demonstrate to the public the learning achievements of UC undergraduates and the educational effectiveness of UC. However, some proponents of accountability have pushed for a narrow approach that provides a single measure of student learning achievement. For this reason, in this section we provide an evaluation of national standardized tests as a method for learning assessment and accountability. Discussion follows on the use of student learning outcomes measurements from the assessment process as an accountability approach, and we then offer a description of other methods of conveying multidimensional information about student learning and achievement to the public.

Standardized Tests and Accountability

Summary: Accountability for undergraduate learning achievement requires providing information to the public that can be appropriately used to evaluate the University of California’s performance in meeting its goals and mission in educating undergraduates. Accountability requires information that is simple for the public to understand, yet broad enough to provide meaningful measures of student experiences and performance, which include departmental
measures of student learning. Measures derived from national standardized tests fail to gauge adequately or to communicate meaningfully the learning that is achieved by UC undergraduates. Accountability related to student learning and achievements is best served by measures derived from the assessment process but includes many dimensions beyond this core. Accordingly, information about those other dimensions is also an important part of accountability to the public.

Recommendation:

5. Standardized tests to measure undergraduate learning, if used, must allow measurement of faculty-developed, curriculum-based learning goals, and the results should provide valid information that can be used to improve the department’s instructional program. The learning goals evaluated by these tests should be appropriate to the major.

Some stakeholders, including government officials and business leaders, desire a single measure of overall student learning achievement to use for higher education accountability. A score on a standardized test of student learning outcomes is often touted as a metric that can be used to evaluate student learning achievement and to capture institutional “value added” to learning. By “value added,” UEETF refers specifically to changes in a student’s capabilities (e.g., critical thinking) attributable to instruction over the course of the student’s undergraduate years.

Several standardized tests are available which purport to provide an overall score of student performance and value added for undergraduates at a given campus that can be compared to other universities, regardless of courses taken, major program selected, or university enrollment characteristics. One widely-used standardized test is the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). The test claims to measure the institutional value added to students’ generalized reasoning and learning skills by assessing samples of incoming freshmen and graduating seniors.

In order to evaluate how well this type of standardized test measures a campus’ student learning performance and to what extent it can be used as a single measure of accountability, UEETF analyzed the CLA. Our analysis revealed strengths as well as many failings of this type of tool when employed for assessment and accountability purposes.

UEETF’s review concluded that there is insufficient information available to demonstrate whether the CLA provides meaningful, valid, and reliable value-added information on student learning that can be compared across campuses. Many questions have been raised about the extent to which this test provides valid and reliable indices of value added (or other formulations of the consequences of college attendance), i.e. whether the CLA is psychometrically sound for the purposes of assessing change. Questions also remain unanswered about what the CLA is actually measuring and the extent to which it evaluates learning beyond a minimal level of general abilities. UEETF is especially concerned that the CLA does not pass the important test of being a useful tool for improving undergraduate education, because the CLA is not linked to the
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3 Validity” concerns whether and to what degree there is evidence to support inferences based on test scores about what is being measured and about their use as a basis for making decisions. “Reliability” concerns whether and to what degree a test assigns numbers (“scores”) to individual qualities in a stable and consistent manner.
Overview of the Collegiate Learning Assessment

The CLA was developed by Council for Aid to Education (CAE) with the RAND Corporation to provide a standardized measure of student skills in critical thinking, analytic reasoning or problem solving, and written communication. The test measures general abilities in these three areas rather than skills or knowledge that are based in disciplinary context. This factor substantially limits the usefulness of these types of tests, particularly with respect to value-added.

By administering the test to samples of incoming freshmen and graduating seniors with scores standardized for students’ SAT exams, the CLA calculates a measure to indicate the institution’s contribution or value added to student learning; the primary unit of analysis is the institution not the student. Tests are administered online and present problems that require students to analyze complex material and provide written responses (not multiple choice answers). The three-hour test has two 90-minute parts, Performance Task and Analytical Writing. Human raters use scoring guides to grade the students’ answers online and computerized scoring is also used.

Under the CLA program, institutions typically test a sample of first year students in the fall and an independent sample of seniors in the spring. (Some institutions elect to conduct longitudinal analyses through repeated assessments of the same sample of students over time, provided they do not drop out, but it is a costly approach). The cross-sectional samples usually include 100 freshmen and 100 seniors. Students participate on a voluntary basis and are randomly assigned a sample of assessment tasks online by the program. Two reports are generated. The first report on the freshmen testing looks at how the entering class compares to CLA participants at other schools (adjusted for SAT or ACT scores). Then, after testing of seniors in the spring, a second report evaluates the school’s value added, again on a comparative basis.

To adjust scores for pre-existing differences among students’ academic abilities across campuses, a mean expected CLA score is computed for the freshmen and for seniors at the school. The expected values are based on (a) the general academic ability of the students prior to matriculation (as measured by SAT or ACT scores) and (b) the typical relationship between SAT or ACT scores and CLA scores across all colleges and universities participating in the CLA program. The difference between the means of how well the freshmen performed relative to the expected CLA score (i.e., residual freshmen score) and of how well the seniors performed relative to the expected CLA score (i.e., residual senior score) is standardized and treated as the institution’s value added estimate. Finally, the three scores (residual freshmen score, residual senior score & value added estimate) are converted to percentile ranks and then performance levels are assigned. The percentile ranks and performance levels are used to compare student performance across institutions.

UC Riverside is the only UC campus that has used the CLA. Results are shown below as an example of how CLA scores are calculated. UC Riverside students performed “above expected value added” when a voluntary sample of 161 freshmen (fall 2005) was compared to a random sample of 92 seniors (spring 2006).
## CLA tests results at UC Riverside 2005-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Value Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean SAT Score</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected CLA Score</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual CLA Score</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (actual - expected) *</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (actual - expected) **</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Level ***</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In scale score points. **In standard errors. ***Performance levels and percentile ranks are: Well above expected (90-99%), above expected (70-89%), at expected (30-69%), below expected (10-29%), and well below expected (0-9%).

**Freshmen:** Based on the average SAT score (1090) of freshmen sampled, the expected average CLA score was 1104, which is above the actual average CLA score of 1083 but is still **within the expected range** ("At expected").

**Seniors:** Based on the average SAT score (1066) of seniors sampled, the expected average CLA score was 1184, which is below the actual average CLA score of 1219, but is still **within the expected range** ("At expected").

**Value Added:** Based on the average SAT scores of freshmen and seniors sampled, the senior average CLA score is expected to be 80 points higher than the freshman average CLA score, and this difference is CLA’s estimate of the expected value added at UC Riverside. In fact, the actual senior average CLA score was 136 points higher than the actual freshman average CLA score, which is **"Above expected value added"**.

---

**Summary of UEETF Analysis of CLA**

Research and analysis of the CLA, as it has been developed and used to date, can be summarized by five major concerns [see Appendix 9]:

---
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• Concerns about usefulness of the scores
  o The nature of the scoring does not convey useful and rich information to the public about what students have learned.
  o Tests are not linked to the students’ disciplines or courses of study, and so scores cannot be used to improve instruction.

• Concerns about validity
  o Description of the standards by which the test’s tasks were developed is not provided.
  o The appropriateness of the selected “broad abilities” for scoring is only broadly justified and lacks a rigorous foundation.
  o Findings are not yet available on validity of inferences, especially with respect to instructional improvement.

• Concerns about reliability
  o Because the student samples are not scientifically representative, the results can vary considerably for an institution depending on the students in the sample.
  o Cross campus differences in sampling methods, differences in student populations, and other variables make comparisons across universities nonscientific and not comparable.

• Concerns about measures of “value added”
  o The measure of value added by an institution is developed as a comparison to other institutions; i.e., it is a relative rather than an absolute score of student achievement.
  o The value added measure does not discriminate between learning that might have occurred generally or as part of the maturation process from learning that occurred from coursework.

• Concerns related to test administration
  o Sampling methodology problems include variability due to demographic characteristics (e.g., academic disciplines, race/ethnicity/gender); stability of scores using a different senior population than those tested as freshmen; and differences in test versions across institutions.
  o Without clear reasons for taking the test, students may not be motivated to participate in the survey if requested, or to give their full effort to the three hour test.

Other Perspectives on the CLA

As with many controversial policies, advocates and critics have conflicting views about the value of standardized tests for assessment. Examples of varying pro and con points of view on the CLA can be found in articles and discussions published on the Inside Higher Education website [http://www.insidehighered.com; e.g., Lederman, 2006, 2008; Banta, 2007. Even colleges who have used and continue to use tests such as the CLA acknowledge that there are many known shortcomings and unknown potentially confounding factors. Moreover, some researchers, such as Banta [http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/01/26/banta], have concluded, “While
standardized tests can be helpful in initiating faculty conversations about assessment, our research casts serious doubt on the validity of using standardized tests of general intellectual skills for assessing individual students, then aggregating their scores for the purpose of comparing institutions.”

Approximately 210 colleges and universities have used CLA since 2002. Since 2005, 30 members of the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC)/CLA Consortium have used CLA and sought to learn from their experiences [http://www.cic.org/projects_services/coops/cla.asp]. In a report, they describe their experiences as having been “challenging in some respects” and “progress has not always taken a straightforward path” (p. 2), yet they have an optimistic outlook, “Through their perseverance, the members of the consortium have begun to demonstrate that the CLA is an effective, helpful, and meaningful tool…” (p. 4). [http://www.cic.org/publications/books_reports/CLAreport.pdf]. In 2007, 47 members of CIC, none of whom are major research universities, extended and expanded the program to go through 2011 with two additional goals: to engage faculty more in the CLA process, and to pair CLA results with other assessment measures, such as NSSE student surveys or portfolio analysis. The addition of information beyond the CLA emphasizes the belief among CIC members that such information would provide more robust diagnostic information to use in targeting areas for improving instruction and student learning.

The California State Universities have been required to administer the CLA, and some campuses have challenged its usefulness. In March 2009, the Academic Senate of California State University, Chico, adopted a resolution that included:

*Whereas*, Data generated by this assessment violates all minimum established thresholds of scientific validity; specifically the threats associated with Mortality, History, Maturation, Instrumentation, Regression, and Selection; and

*Whereas*, With respect to degree programs, local campus assessment professions have been fully engaged in developing a unified effort to measure student learning outcomes expected by accrediting agencies, professional organizations, and the California legislature; and …

*Resolved*, That the Academic Senate of California State University, Chico considers the Cross-Sectional Collegiate Learning Assessment to be an invalid means of determining the quality of a university education, and is therefore of no use in improving the quality of education; …

The full text of the resolution is available at the faculty senate website for CSU Chico. [http://www.csuchico.edu/fs/supporting_docs_as/Mar%2012,%202009/CLA%20Resolution%203-12-09.pdf]

In a statement regarding assessment of learning outcomes and use of such measures as a part of accountability, Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) provided a number of arguments against generalized testing and in favor of more disciplinary-specific methods, stating that “insights point toward a curricular strategy for educational accountability,
rather than a reliance on standardized and generic testing.”

In a similar statement on the use of assessment in higher education, the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE), composed of private colleges and universities, stated its “commitment to self-evaluation” and advocated “locally-based, faculty-driven attempts to define and measure the skills and capacities that each institution emphasizes to meet its educational goals. This approach will be more meaningful, and ultimately more effective, than any nationally standardized test.”

Conclusions About the Use of Standardized Tests for Assessment and Accountability

UEETF’s analysis raised enough questions about the meaning, scope, reliability and validity of the CLA that UEETF could not endorse its use as a means of providing a metric of broad cognitive abilities that has potential for use in improving teaching and learning. At the simplest level, we note that the use of the CLA scores communicates nothing to the public about what students have learned. In addition, we have substantive concerns regarding reliability and validity of the CLA metrics, and the costs of the program. While the preceding discussion has centered on the CLA, we believe similar concerns extend to the use of “general education” tests developed by ACT (CAAP, Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency) and the Educational Testing Service (MAPP, Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress).

UEETF does not recommend the use of the CLA or similar tests as an accountability tool. However, campuses may decide to use standardized tests locally for program improvement purposes, provided such tests can be validly tied to locally-developed learning outcomes that are incorporated into the curriculum. UEETF does not think that UC campuses should be required or encouraged to use standardized tests such as the CLA. UEETF questions their value when used in parallel with other forms of evaluation because of the inappropriate and illusory independence of the assessment from subject matter knowledge, along with the relatively poor evidence of what the scores demonstrate and how the scores can appropriately be used.

UEETF thinks that any generalized statements about student achievement for accountability purposes must be grounded in the departmental assessments described earlier. We recognize that this approach requires faculty development of evaluation metrics at the departmental/program levels, and that these metrics are not developed to be compared across programs, departments or universities. Nevertheless, we think that the ongoing assessment at the department/program level across UC campuses is a superior approach that provides rich and valuable information on student learning, and which can be conveyed in useful forms to the public for accountability purposes as well as used by departments to improve undergraduate education.

Next we explore how to link the locally-derived, faculty-developed assessment process and its metrics to public statements of accountability.
Educational Effectiveness and Institutional Accountability: Measuring Learning Outcomes

Summary: Educational effectiveness requires using discipline-specific assessment results as the primary indicator of student learning outcomes for accountability, along with broader measures of student experiences and performance.

Recommendations:

6. Campuses should publicly communicate evidence of student and campus educational achievements through relevant information sources, including information on every department’s learning assessment program. The information should be user-friendly and available on the UC Undergraduate Campus Profiles websites which should have links to the departmental assessment programs. Information on the learning goals, the evaluation process, and measurement of majors’ achievement of these goals should be included in the public information about the departmental assessment programs.

7. Campuses should consider developing methods of aggregating measures of students’ achievement of departmental learning goals into meaningful, comprehensive public statements about overall undergraduates’ learning achievement. Development and reporting of such aggregated measures is sufficiently complex that campuses should be supported in this effort by UCOP, the system-wide Academic Senate, and campus administrators (e.g., Undergraduate Deans).

Providing institutional accountability through simple transparent measures of institutional performance and using assessment of department’s student learning outcomes to improve undergraduate education are distinct activities and responsibilities. With this distinction in mind, measures from department-level assessments of student learning outcomes can provide the primary accountability information to demonstrate undergraduate student learning. These learning outcomes, along with the broader measures of student performance currently available in the Campus Profiles and UCOP Accountability Framework Report, should be used to indicate UC’s educational effectiveness to the public.

Linking Locally-Derived Assessment Measures with Institutional Accountability

Our suggestions of how measures of learning outcomes can be used for institutional accountability are based on the assessment programs at the UC campuses. In particular, we look at how the direct assessment measures being developed at the department-level (and integrated into WASC and ABET), can be used for accountability purposes.

UEETF recommends that the measures of student learning used for accountability be developed within the context of a discipline, as discussed above. Therefore, no single metric of student achievement can be compared across different departments, campuses or systems. The innate and inescapable heterogeneity of discipline structure, content, and instructional delivery; the heterogeneity of students in majors and across campuses; and the heterogeneity of institutional missions and characteristics prohibit a meaningful standardized approach to assessment of
student learning outcomes. The proper assessment of learning outcomes requires the ability to determine how students respond to a particular curriculum and the ability of that information to modify the instructional program and its delivery.

However, UC campuses have the potential to develop indicators of campus-level learning outcomes, based on department-level assessments of student learning outcomes, and these campus-level indicators can provide valuable metrics for accountability. UEETF encourages campuses, in their ongoing development of department-level assessment programs, to explore ways in which these discipline-specific measures can be aggregated or otherwise summarized into succinct compelling public statements that convey the essence of student learning achievement at that campus.

To our knowledge, no model exists that can be used directly by the UC campuses to aggregate discipline-specific direct assessments of student learning outcomes. Although common higher-learning goals are being assessed across departments on a campus and across campuses, the actual way that the goals are manifested varies across disciplines (and even campuses). The measurement of the mastery of a specific goal (e.g., critical thinking or written communication) has its own characteristics depending on the discipline, and the measurements of student learning are not directly comparable. To aggregate the student learning outcomes across a campus requires the aggregation of different rubrics and different ways of presenting the same skill. Although a method of aggregation can be developed with care and creativity, the interpretation of campus aggregated measures must be done in a way that correctly reflects the diversity of the discipline-specific outcome measures being combined.

The system-wide Academic Senate, especially through the University Committee on Education Policy (UCEP), and the UC Office of the President can facilitate the development of campus-level aggregated measures. They can support these efforts directly with brainstorming meetings and exchange of information across campuses and indirectly with resources to allow such exchanges to occur. Work of Divisional Academic Senates and campus administrators such as Undergraduate Deans would also benefit from system-wide support. On-going resources will also be required for the actual calculation of aggregate measures and the reporting of results to the public.

In addition, UEETF recommends that each UC campus communicate to the public their departments’ measurements of student achievement. This communication can be accomplished in a user-friendly way using the Campus Profiles (discussed below). Profiles can direct the public to departmental descriptions of learning goals as well as assessment processes and can provide measures of student achievement of goals through examples of student work.

In particular, UEETF recommends that departments develop meaningful metrics for higher-order learning goals, such as critical thinking skills, analytical reasoning, and written communication, with these goals being customized to fit each department. There should be the explicit recognition that at UC these higher-order skills are taught within a discipline-specific context. Public information on departmental assessment processes and student learning outcomes will show interested stakeholders what the learning goals are for majors in each department, how the majors’ performance is assessed, and to what extent majors are achieving the learning goals. A
critical benefit of this approach is that this department-level assessment process is linked to on-going curriculum improvements, which is used in the review of academic programs and is being incorporated by WASC into their accreditation reviews of campuses.

The aspiration of some stakeholders to compare student performance across different campuses or universities presents a complex problem that may not have a solution that allows an unbiased or meaningful comparison. Indeed, a growing chorus of experts finds the problem insoluble, even while appreciating current attempts. UEETF does not think that a valid and reliable metric of student performance or a scientifically developed value added metric of such learning (i.e., similar to what the Collegiate Learning Assessment and other approaches claim to measure) is feasible. Although UEETF members appreciate the simplicity and power that a single metric of the university’s value added would provide, responsible accountability requires that such a metric pass the scientific requirements of any metric used by the research community. Because we believe (1) that advanced education and learning, such as practiced at the University of California, is discipline-specific, and (2) that student learning outcomes reflect the instructional program as well as the characteristics of the students and the resources available, UEETF recommends that accountability measures be program- and campus-specific.

Using a Broad Range of Information for Accountability

Summary: Accountability for UC’s educational effectiveness must include information on student experiences and performance outside the classroom. A complete picture of student learning requires a broad array of information, including student and alumni surveys and other information already available.

Recommendations:

8. Because the value of a university education is made manifest in contributions over the graduates’ lifetimes, full assessment of the effectiveness of a UC undergraduate education must include information about what those graduates contribute to their families, communities, and workplaces. UEETF supports the development of a UC exit and alumni survey across campuses.

9. Campus assessment and accountability activities should include the broad array of information on student and campus achievement provided by existing reports, such as the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), the Campus Profiles, and the University’s Accountability Framework. UC should continue to collect information about the overall undergraduate experience to augment information derived from departmentally-based assessments.

Institutional accountability of educational effectiveness must include information on student experiences and performance outside the classroom, where undergraduates also learn and prepare to contribute in their families, communities and work places. A rich and complete picture of student learning requires a multidimensional array of information, which complements and expands the student learning outcome assessments. UEETF thinks that UC accountability to the public must include multiple indicators that permit evaluation of the goals and mission of the UC
system, and below we look at three existing or recommended sets of public information that provide insight into educational effectiveness: 1) Current Reports to the Public; 2) Undergraduate Perceptions of Their Educational Experiences (UCUES); and 3) Perceptions of Graduating Senior and Alumni.

Current Reports to the Public

A vast array of information for accountability is currently provided to various stakeholders of the University of California and is publicly available. This information includes reports in response to: federal agencies, the California State Legislature, and state agencies; UC Regents and campus organizations; professional associations and accrediting agencies; private foundations; news organizations, including college guide books; ad hoc requests for information from state and national commissions, task groups, and committees; and individual requests from prospective students and parents. In addition each campus collects and reports various data related to educational effectiveness to support academic program reviews and internal resource allocation and decision-making processes.

Here we briefly describe two main sources of public information as they relate to Educational Effectiveness: UC Campus Profiles and UC Accountability Framework. Both sources draw upon the UC undergraduate survey (UCUES, described below) and on the Common Data Set (CDS), which UC campuses publish on their web sites. CDS includes data on enrollment, graduation rates, and degrees conferred. [Appendix 10] An example of the Common Data Set can be found at http://planning.ucsc.edu/irps/OFFICE/cds_2008-09.pdf.

UC Undergraduate Campus Profiles

In response to national efforts of public universities to improve public understanding of their goals and activities, each UC campus has created a Campus Profile that is substantially similar in appearance and content to the Voluntary System of Accountability’s (VSA) College Portraits [Appendix 11 provides links to each UC campus profile]. Because VSA requires that standardized test scores (e.g., CLA) be used to report student learning outcomes and because UC campuses plan on reporting discipline-specific learning outcomes instead of standardized test scores, UC does not participate in VSA [Appendix 12].

Following VSA, the Campus Profiles report data on student experience and perceptions, including some items related to learning outcomes. UC Profiles also include other information of interest to prospective students and their parents that are not required by VSA. Examples of the information on the Profiles include:

- undergraduate demographic profile (gender, race/ethnicity, geographic distribution, age)
- admissions and cost-of-attendance information
- retention rates and time to degree
- undergraduate research opportunities
- graduate education
- the research enterprise
- distinguished faculty
In a section on “Other Student Learning Outcomes,” the Campus Profiles report student self-perceptions in various skills as a freshman and as a senior from the UCUES survey. The Profiles typically report results on the following skills and abilities:

- critical thinking skills
- ability to write clearly and effectively
- understanding a specific field of study
- quantitative skills
- understanding of international perspectives
- leadership skills
- interpersonal skills
- self awareness

Each campus provides information on activities in assessing learning goals and other educational effectiveness information. Several campuses have links to their undergraduate student learning initiatives, department assessments of student learning, and WASC accreditation reports. As department-level assessment information becomes available, UEETF recommends that campuses post links to this information.

Information from the Graduating Senior Surveys and Alumni Surveys (see section below) will be added to the UC Profiles when available. UEETF recommends that campuses continue to use the Campus Profiles as the primary site for providing the public with information about student learning achievements, including links to department’s assessment information.

**UC Accountability Framework**

The Accountability Framework (AF) was initiated by President Yudof and presented to the Board of Regents in September 2008. The introduction states the purpose of the AF:

“The framework measures campus and University wide performance in meeting key research, teaching, public service and other goals. It includes an annual report that takes a broad look at access and affordability, student success, research impact and funding, faculty diversity and quality, and other issues. In addition, the framework will include periodic sub-reports that bring specific areas more sharply into focus. Together these reports — all of them made public via the World Wide Web and distributed in printed form to the Board of Regents, the California Legislature and state officials — will provide a clear look at the University that will be used to support:

- transparency and public accountability;
- strategic planning and decision making;
- budgeting, including budget trade-off decisions; and
- management performance evaluation.

In these regards and for these reasons, it is one of the highest priorities of University President Mark Yudof and the University of California Board of Regents.”
[http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/]
The report includes over 100 measures of performance for the UC system and for each campus. Data over time and comparisons with UC’s eight peer campuses (Harvard, Stanford, Yale, MIT, Michigan, Virginia, Illinois, and Buffalo) are also provided when available. AF indicators related to undergraduates include information on [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/]

- undergraduate success
- undergraduate student experience
- undergraduate affordability
- undergraduate access
- undergraduate student profile

Undergraduate success measures include retention/graduation rates, degrees awarded, degree aspirations and post-graduation plans of graduating seniors. Undergraduate Student Experience measures provide UCUES results for seniors that are identical to those listed in the Campus Profiles.

The Accountability Framework acknowledges the limitations of the data and intercampus comparisons. Campus comparisons of measures of student success, such as graduation rates or time to degree, may be useful to the public. However, as discussed above, campus’ discipline-level assessments of student learning outcomes are not comparable across campuses because of the considerable differences in program mix, student bodies, assessment definitions and practices.

Undergraduates’ Perceptions of Their Educational Experience

With the advancement of on-line surveys, and the standardization of survey instruments and administration, campuses now collect and follow student behavior and perceptions from the time of application to several years (or more) after graduation. The UC system began in the mid-1990s to administer enrolled student surveys and alumni surveys across all UC campuses. The success of these efforts led to the development of the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), which is part of the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) Project initiated in 2002 [http://cshe.berkeley.edu/research/seru/]. SERU’s goal is to create information that broadens our understanding of the undergraduate experience and promotes a culture of institutional self-improvement, and creates a group of researchers to study the survey results [http://cshe.berkeley.edu/research/seru/summary.htm]. Although longitudinal research is still fairly limited, major advances in research on changes in UC student perceptions and behaviors will likely occur in the next few years. Integration of student learning outcomes with student perceptions of the educational experience will also be possible.

UCUES is administered on-line at all UC campuses to all undergraduates in the spring every other year and on some campuses every year. Response rates range from 30% to 50%. All students complete the core items and 20-30% of the respondents are randomly selected to complete additional items or modules related to academic engagement, civic engagement, student development, student services, and optional items (wild card module). The core module includes items related to the students’ perceptions of their level of proficiency on various skills and abilities when they started at the campus and currently (e.g., analytical and critical thinking skills, ability to appreciate the fine arts); satisfaction with various aspects of the educational
experience; participation in various academic activities (e.g., assist faculty in research for pay, make classroom presentations, frequency in going to class unprepared); and use of time (e.g. hours spent studying).

Several campuses provide their UCUES results on the web [Appendix 13]. In addition, the UC Campus Profiles and the Accountability Framework report UCUES results for seniors in:

- group learning experiences
- active learning experiences
- perceptions of institutional commitment to student learning and success
- overall student satisfaction
- experiences with diverse groups of people and ideas
- interactions with faculty and staff.

UCUES provides important information to the campuses and the public on UC undergraduate experiences. UEETF encourages UC campus institutional research offices, research centers, and faculty to continue to conduct analytical studies that integrate data from student surveys, assessment of student learning outcomes, and other academic and non-cognitive measurements.

Alumni’s Perceptions of Their Educational Experience

Another important part of assessing the value of an undergraduate education is learning what our graduates do in graduate education, in their jobs and in their contributions to their families and to society. Surveys of undergraduates as they go off to the next stage in their lives, as well as what they are doing in five and ten years, is an important part of assessing the value of their undergraduate education at UC.

Almost all UC campuses administer a graduating senior or career destination survey on an annual basis [Appendix 14]. These surveys tend to be career-oriented and are administered by the campus’ Career Center. They are focused on placement activities rather than student experiences and outcomes. Some UC campuses survey their alumni beyond the first year of graduation. Most alumni surveys are either conducted by individual departments or colleges or by the Alumni Association. Many Colleges of Engineering survey their alumni as part of the ABET accreditation requirements. Many Alumni Associations survey the alumni to receive feedback on marketing and services offered by the Association and typically do not include measures of student learning outcomes or satisfaction items related to their undergraduate experiences.

In 2007, the Association of American University (AAU) presidents and chancellors unanimously approved a resolution calling for AAU institutions to administer a graduating senior survey and an alumni survey to measure student perceptions and outcomes. AAU developed prototype surveys with the goal of promoting comparable data collection across institutions from seniors on their college experience and their immediate post-graduation plans, and to track alumni into their future careers (every five years).

UEETF supports the AAU recommendation that campuses develop an alumni survey that incorporates a set of core items that would allow comparisons across the UC campuses and
among the AAU campuses, and that would be administered immediately upon graduation and after graduation (e.g., 5 years and 10 years post-graduation). UEETF supports the work of the UC system-wide Postgraduate Outcomes Task Force, which may serve as advisory committee to the development of a UC alumni survey by making recommendations for content, survey process and overall data management and administration.

The Path Ahead

Summary: Undergirding all the recommendations in this report is the firm belief that learning assessment is a responsibility of the UC faculty, who are strongly committed to communicating information about undergraduate learning achievements to the public. Because assessment should be part of the instructional process, department-level assessment must be on-going, regardless of the state budgetary climate. Faculty are supported by administrative resources in delivering instruction and must receive required administrative support for assessment activities as well.

Recommendation:

10. Given its responsibilities for curriculum and admissions matters, the Academic Senate must continue to be a key player in any activities to develop assessment of and accountability for undergraduate education system-wide.

The campus-level assessment programs being implemented at UC campuses are a critical process for ensuring educational effectiveness, and that the resulting measures of student learning outcomes are a critical component of accountability to the public of the achievements of UC undergraduates. UEETF believes that accountability can be linked to faculty-driven assessment to inform the public and to improve undergraduate instruction. The recommended “UC Way to Educational Effectiveness” will benefit the University system, the state government, and the citizens of California.
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Charge to Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force

Reporting to the Undergraduate Education Planning Group, a subcommittee of the Academic Planning Council, the Undergraduate Education Effectiveness Task Force is charged with providing guidance to campuses, particularly academic departments, on ways of developing and communicating learning objectives and student achievement of those objectives. This charge derives from the enduring value of UC’s academic culture for quality assurance; from President Dynes’ commitment to include in other accountability measures being developed for UC campuses “student learning information that the public can use to evaluate our educational quality;” and from WASC requirements that expect information on learning outcomes, in a departmental context.

The UEPG believes the locus for educational assessment is the faculty, at the department level, and that the program review process may be the best structure for incorporating explicit expectations and evaluations of student learning. UEPG’s charge to the Task force, within these assumptions, is to provide guidance to faculty that will allow the University to describe for its undergraduate students, their families and interested citizens what specific learning objectives are and what constitutes successful learning in specific courses of study.

- The Task Force shall recommend from best practices it discovers at UC and other institutions effective tools, resources and examples of undergraduate learning expectations and assessment measures that meet UC’s standards of academic quality.
- The Task Force shall recommend ways of using existing practices and structures, such as the program review process, to incorporate explicit learning expectations and assessment measures.
- The Task Force shall suggest ways that divisional Academic Senates, department chairs and Deans might effectively incorporate its recommendations.

Membership shall include department chairs, evaluation specialists, faculty and administrators with experience and commitment to assessing student learning across a range of disciplines, and at least one member of the Undergraduate Education Planning Group. This task force is complementary to the Postgraduate Outcomes Task Force that will concurrently work on developing methods for outcome assessment of educational effectiveness based on the work, activities and accomplishments of UC graduates.

It is expected that the Task Force shall produce its recommendations in easily and widely accessible format, such as web sites. Its work should be completed within the 2008-09 academic year unless its membership finds that the scope of work makes it necessary to extend that deadline.
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# Accountability Measures: Major Users and Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Users and Forms</th>
<th>Voluntary System of Acc'nty (VSA)</th>
<th>UC Accountability Framework</th>
<th>learning outcomes measures</th>
<th>Common Data Set</th>
<th>financial statements</th>
<th>misc state/fed reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Students / Parents</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Students / Parents</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Faculty</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Administrators</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni / Donors</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting Agencies (e.g., WASC)</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Auditors</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations (e.g., AAU)</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State / Local Government / Legislature</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress / Executive Branch</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State / National Commissions</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers/ Institutes</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Campus Faculty (research)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press-Rankings / Publishing Guides</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press - (General)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters / Citizens</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Initiatives and Activities at UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley has developed various assessment procedures related to student outcomes. The primary assessment program for undergraduate learning is the Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative (USLI). This program is integrated with Berkeley’s on-going Academic Program Reviews and WASC accreditation process. Additional information about Berkeley’s undergraduate program and student achievements can be found in the Berkeley Profile and in UCOP’s Accountability Framework. Below we describe these assessment initiatives and activities in detail, and then we provided detailed examples of the Learning Goals Assessment in four departments (Chemistry, Civil Engineering, Economics, and French).

Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative (USLI) at UC Berkeley
http://opa.berkeley.edu/academicprograms/USLIIndex.aspx

Berkeley’s Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative (USLI) is a campus-wide initiative to support departments in establishing educational goals and evaluation procedures for all undergraduate programs. In 2007-09 each department developed learning goals for its undergraduate majors, linked the goals to its curriculum, and posted information online stating the purpose of the major and what graduating seniors are expected to know or to be able to do at the end of their course of study. In 2009-10 departments will develop and implement pilots for assessing specific learning goals in selected courses. The USLI is in keeping with the fundamental principle at Berkeley that the evaluation of student achievement should be locally defined, discipline specific, and faculty driven. Defining and assessing Learning Goals for majors and improving undergraduate curriculum is an on-going process and a critical part of the academic program review.

Senate-Administration Leadership
Oversight is provided by a joint Academic Senate-Administration faculty advisory committee, co-chaired by Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy Representative and Professor of Economics Clair Brown and Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning and Professor of Psychology Christina Maslach. The Faculty Advisory Committee helps the Academic Senate Divisional Council (DIVCO) and the administration set overall policy and goals for the initiative, advises on implementation actions, and provides specific feedback to departments on their learning goals and assessment plans as they are developed. The Office of Teaching and Learning provides support to departments in their USLI efforts through workshops and personalized assistance by a dedicated expert staff member.

Key Milestones
- A joint Academic Senate-Administration Task Force recommends that assessment of undergraduate student learning be part of academic program review. (September 2006)
- DIVCO passes a resolution calling for all departments to establish learning goals and assessment procedures. (June 2007)
• The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) asks the campus to create a model for evaluation of student learning at a research university and to demonstrate evidence of progress by November 2009.
• By Spring 2009, over 85% of the 70 departments and non-departmental undergraduate programs had submitted documentation of learning goals with the others in progress.
• In Summer 2009, departments will post on their websites their undergraduate student learning goals and a description of how they are achieved through the curriculum.

Next Step: Developing Assessment Procedures
The USLI advisory committee has identified the following criteria to guide the assessment phase of the initiative:
• embed assessment in the current curriculum in a way that uses existing resources;
• integrate efforts with professional accreditation assessment activities for those departments that have them (e.g. Engineering disciplines) so that no department has more than one assessment process;
• link review of departmental learning goals and how well they are being achieved to the campus’s regular academic program review process to institutionalize the goal of improving undergraduate programs over time.

Direct assessment of undergraduate programs focuses on the overall skills and knowledge that majors have achieved by the time they graduate. Assessment efforts will focus on a sample of upper division majors, rather than the assessment of individual students’ work as they progress through each of their courses.

We are encouraging departments to begin by piloting small-scale assessment efforts, so that we can begin to discover what works for us as a campus. Here is a brief summary of four department pilots, all of which are in process. Details of the USLI programs programs in these four departments are provided below.

Chemistry

http://chemistry.berkeley.edu/student_info/USLI/

Undergraduate learning in chemistry can be viewed as a cumulative, spiral process as majors advance through the program, with junior- and senior-level courses building on the fundamentals learned in the first two years. Chemistry is exploring an assessment model that incorporates a research-level exercise in upper-division laboratory courses for all majors. Using Chemistry 108 as an example, the following summary describes how these fundamental competencies will be assessed. Note that a holistic approach is taken to the overall assessment; we do not consider it practical, or desirable, to establish a rubric for gauging progress in each individual competence with a single measure. Instead, a series of markers spread across sections of the students’ reports will frame groups of competencies, as described below. Basic competence in five learning goals, including knowledge-based competence and basic lab procedures, will be tested early in the course using introductory experiments, the aim of which is to teach students fundamental
techniques in synthetic inorganic chemistry. Using the *Chemistry 108 Laboratory Report Assessment*, these competencies can be assessed by scores in the Introduction, Experimental Procedure, Discussion, and References sections. More complex experiments will be tackled in the last half of the semester, which require mastery of the following learning goals:

2. Solve problems competently by identifying the essential parts of a problem and formulating a strategy for solving the problem.
5. Understand the objective of the chemical experiment, properly carry out the experiment, and appropriately record and analyze the results.
8. Communicate the concepts and results of their laboratory experiments through effective writing and oral communication skills.

These will be assessed in particular in the Results and Data, Discussion (2 and 5), and Spelling & Style (8) sections of the report assessment rubric developed (see web site). At a minimum, students will be expected to demonstrate mastery at the level of Acceptable in competence areas 1-8 on at least one report. Note that deficient reports may be re-submitted after suitable revision following consultation with the instructor(s).

Civil and Environmental Engineering

http://www.ce.berkeley.edu/undergrad/ugrad_initiative.php

Maintaining ABET accreditation requires a continual assessment of student learning and documentation of how that assessment was used to improve the curriculum. To test an alternative to the current requirement that each instructor provide information each semester on student performance based on assignments, examinations, and student evaluations, CEE will assess selected courses in the upper division curriculum on a rotating basis. This assessment will be undertaken by the Curriculum Committee, which will pick approximately five courses each year to evaluate how student learning objectives identified by the instructors for each course are achieved through homework assignments, laboratory experiences, projects, and examinations. This schedule will cover the whole of the upper division curriculum over the six year cycle of accreditation and will fit in well with campus departmental review cycles. The goal of this pilot process is to find an alternative to a process devised for ABET that is less burdensome on faculty and staff resources and is more timely in providing the department with an assessment on our achievement of desired learning outcomes.

Economics

http://emlab.berkeley.edu/econ/ugrad/ugrad_goals.shtml

In Spring 2009, Economics implemented an assessment pilot that evaluated specific exam questions or written assignments in three selected upper division courses, where the question or assignment had been designated as representing student performance in specific learning goals. Econ did this for three learning goals: critical thinking and written communication (in popular upper division elective), analytical reasoning (in required quantitative methods course), and written communication (in large pilot course that
focuses on writing a short research paper). Note that the outcome does not indicate what students learned in the particular course but is a measure of their cumulative learning.

The instructor in each course designated a grade that demonstrates the minimal mastery expected of Economics majors for the specific learning goal in the assignment. The grades for these assignments were recorded separately along with the distribution of the grades and the minimum grade required to demonstrate proficiency for the goal(s). Given the grade distribution by student SID, the department can sort our majors (from other students) and also sort out our graduating seniors.

The Learning Goals Committee, with input from the Undergraduate Committee and from the instructors who executed the assessment in the three courses, will assess the value of this pilot as a direct measurement of majors’ performance and its value in evaluating and improving undergraduate program. Economics will decide how to revise the pilot and use it to develop an on-going assessment process of upper division courses on a rotating basis. We will also explore how to put selected examples of student work from each of these assessment pilots online to show our majors’ educational performance and achievement of Economics learning goals.

**French**

http://french.berkeley.edu/undergrad/USLI.php

The French Department will offer each semester one or two classes designated as writing-intensive (with a specific focus on improving students' abilities in composition and critical analysis) and one or two others designated as research-oriented (with specific emphasis on crafting research topics and acquiring bibliographical skills). These "research" and "writing"-emphasis designations are not permanently attached to particular courses but can rotate to courses throughout the upper division curriculum. The French Department is developing a pilot portfolio assessment in these special emphasis courses to assess majors' achievement of specific learning goals. Portfolio assessment might then be applied to other courses to determine how well the Department's learning goals are being met generally. The Department is also planning to develop a survey that will ask seniors and recent graduates to reflect on their learning in French.

**Summary**

UC Berkeley is pleased with the progress our departments and programs have made in developing learning goals for their majors. In less than two years, almost all of our undergraduate programs have developed well-articulated learning goals for their majors and have mapped these goals to their curricula. Key campus stakeholders will have easy access to these program-level learning goals via a gateway website that will launch in Summer 2009. We are now turning our attention to the assessment component of the initiative. Programs are working on plans for small-scale evaluation pilots that can be implemented in 2009-10 within the current resource environment. These pilots will provide programs with important information about how well their majors are achieving key learning goals, with a particular focus on higher level skills (e.g. critical thinking,
analytical reasoning, oral/written communication) as they are practiced in a discipline-specific context. We anticipate that the assessment process will be scaled gradually and used to improve undergraduate programs over time. In addition, we have taken important steps to ensure that the goals of the learning goals initiative will be institutionalized in the long-term through the campus's regular academic program review process, as well as through our process for approving new degree programs. We will continue to keep key stakeholders informed about our students' mastery of learning goals and their educational achievements via the Berkeley Profile and other key public websites.

**Academic Program Reviews**

[http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/apr/index.html](http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/apr/index.html)

The Academic Program Review is designed to enhance the educational mission of the University of California, Berkeley, by providing opportunities for programs and departments, and the university as a whole, to assess and improve its teaching and scholarship. Evaluation of student outcomes is an important component of the program reviews.

The campus conducts 7-9 program reviews each year with a goal of conducting a review of each every eight years. As part of the review process [http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/apr/guide/guide_instructional_09.pdf](http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/apr/guide/guide_instructional_09.pdf), the department is asked to conduct a self study addressing a number of questions. Among the questions related to undergraduate student outcomes are:

1) What are the goals or objectives of your undergraduate program (for majors, minors, and non-majors), e.g., as submitted for the Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative? How do you communicate information about your learning goals to your majors and potential majors? How do your specific program requirements and courses help students achieve these goals? Can majors elect from a number of subfields?

2) What constitutes “quality” in undergraduate education in your field? How does your unit assess the quality of your undergraduate program and student outcomes? How does your undergraduate program compare with similar programs a equivalent top-ranked institutions in terms of mission, curriculum, and requirements? What is the unit doing currently to improve its performance?

3) What opportunities are available for your majors for a capstone experience, such as participation in a research project or writing a senior thesis? What proportion of majors complete a capstone experience? How many faculty sponsor independent research projects? How are faculty recognized for directing undergraduate research projects? Does anyone monitor the quality of Independent Studies courses? What are you doing to teach undergraduates to write in the discipline?
4) How are undergraduates advised, both academic advising during their undergraduate years and advising about career and graduate training opportunities after graduation? To what extent and how are faculty involved in advising undergraduates?

5) If time to graduation is longer than desired, what actions are being taken to ensure that students graduate in a timely manner?

Prior to the department’s development of their self study, the Office of Planning and Analysis prepares a narrative of the quantitative and qualitative about the unit. The summary includes information the goals and objectives of the undergraduate major, curriculum offerings, time-to-degree for undergraduates, student satisfaction and self-perceptions of their skills (e.g., critical thinking), and student placement and activities after graduation.

**Accreditation**

http://education.berkeley.edu/accreditation/

UC Berkeley was reaccredited by the Western Association of Colleges and Schools (WASC) in 2004. In our Institutional Proposal to WASC, we identified three broad areas for investigation in the Educational Effectiveness Review: (1) enhancing academic engagement at a large public research university; (2) rethinking the delivery of education; and (3) improving undergraduate program review. In addition various academic programs on campus undergo further accreditation. Many of these accreditation efforts include assessments of student learning outcomes. (e.g. Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) http://www.eecs.berkeley.edu/education/usli/prep.shtml.)
UC Berkeley Undergraduate Profile

http://metrics.vebf.berkeley.edu/Berkeley%20Template.pdf

By our yardstick, UC Berkeley is about the best thing for America we can find. It’s good by all of our measurements.”

— Washington Monthly

The UC Berkeley Undergraduate Profile provides important information to prospective students and their parents to help in their selection of a college. It is also provides relevant information to various stakeholders such as legislatures and the public. The profile is similar to the College Portraits for those campuses participating in the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) Voluntary System of Accountability. Below is a sampling of information included the UC Berkeley Undergraduate Profile:

Program Offering

The ultimate value of a Berkeley undergraduate education is the impact it has on the intellectual and personal lives of students. With offering 108 different undergraduate programs, the unparalleled Berkeley campus environment reinforces people’s connections to one another, and Berkeley research, teaching, and service chart ways for students to give back to society and change the world. (http://opa.berkeley.edu/academicprograms/acadprog.htm)

Student Success

UC Berkeley ranks among the highest public universities with a 6-year freshmen graduation rate of 90%. The average time-to-degree is 4.02 years and 2.01 years for transfers (http://metrics.vebf.berkeley.edu/Berkeley%20Template.pdf)
Placement

Approximately half of UC Berkeley’s baccalaureate degree recipients are employed upon graduation, while approximately 25% are enrolled in a graduate or professional studies program.

Source: [https://career.berkeley.edu/CarDest/CarDest.htm](https://career.berkeley.edu/CarDest/CarDest.htm)

Student Satisfaction and Skill Development

Each year, the Berkeley campus asks all undergraduate students to complete the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). As the name implies, the UCES survey asks students to reflect and comment upon all aspects of the undergraduate experience including student satisfaction and the development of their skills in various areas ([http://uces.berkeley.edu/main/](http://uces.berkeley.edu/main/)). Students express very high satisfaction with their education and improvements in their skills:
Student Satisfaction

92% were satisfied with the value of their education for the price they paid

95% were satisfied with their overall academic experience

94% seniors would choose to attend this institution again

93% of seniors reported that their campus had a strong commitment to undergraduate education

Accountability Framework

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/

In addition to the Undergraduate Profile, the UC Office of the President publishes a variety of statistics and information about Berkeley and the other UC campuses including information on student outcomes. In addition, each campus provides a narrative summary that provides additional information about the campus. Berkeley included a special section on undergraduate student experience (http://opa.berkeley.edu/stratplan/AccountabilityProfile.pdf).
Upper Division Laboratory Courses as an Assessment Tool in Chemistry

One piece of our assessment plan is to engage students in research-level exercises in our upper division laboratory courses (Chemistry 105, 108, and 115). The aim is to use these courses to examine the set of fundamental competencies (knowledge-based, performance/skills-based, and affective) detailed in our USLI outcomes and assessment document and summarized below.

Knowledge-Based Competence
1. Master a broad set of chemical knowledge concerning the fundamentals in the basic areas of the discipline (organic, inorganic, analytical, physical and biological chemistry).

2. Solve problems competently by identifying the essential parts of a problem and formulating a strategy for solving the problem. They will be able to rationally estimate the solution to a problem, apply appropriate techniques to arrive at a solution, test the correctness of the solution, and interpret their results.

3. Use computers in data acquisition and processing and use available software as a tool in data analysis.

4. Employ modern library search tools to locate and retrieve scientific information about a topic, chemical, chemical technique, or an issue relating to chemistry.

Performance/Skills-Based
5. Understand the objective of their chemical experiments, properly carry out the experiments, and appropriately record and analyze the results.

6. Use standard laboratory equipment, modern instrumentation, and classical techniques to carry out experiments.

7. Know and follow the proper procedures and regulations for safe handling and use of chemicals.

8. Communicate the concepts and results of their laboratory experiments through effective writing and oral communication skills.

Affective
9. Successfully pursue their career objectives in advanced education in professional and/or graduate schools, in a scientific career in government or industry, in a teaching career in the school systems, or in a related career following graduation.

Using Chemistry 108 as an example, the following summary describes how these fundamental competencies will be assessed. Note that a holistic approach is taken to the overall assessment; we do not consider it practical – or desirable – to establish a rubric for gauging progress in each individual competence with a single measure. Instead, a series of markers spread across sections of the students’ reports will frame groups of competencies, as described below.
Basic competence in areas 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 will be tested early in the course using introductory experiments, the aim of which is to teach students fundamental techniques in synthetic inorganic chemistry. Using the Chemistry 108 Laboratory Report Assessment (see below), these competencies can be assessed by scores in the Introduction, Experimental Procedure, Discussion, and References sections.

More complex experiments will be tackled in the last half of the semester, where competencies 2, 5, and 8 will come to the fore. These will be assessed in particular in the Results and Data, Discussion (2 and 5), and Spelling & Style (8) sections of the report assessment rubric.

The last competence (9) cannot be assessed directly at this level; however, during lectures and presentations in the course, the subject of career options is discussed.

At a minimum, students will be expected to demonstrate mastery at the level of Acceptable in competence areas 1-8 on at least one report. Note that deficient reports may be re-submitted after suitable revision following consultation with the instructor(s).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Instructor Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good writing; includes reaction mechanism(s); clear, logical structure; good cohesiveness; relevant; well written</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Needs Some Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Good enough; needs improvement in some areas</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Improvements Suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Needs improvement in some areas; some parts redundant</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Improvements Suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Needs improvement in some areas; some parts redundant</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Improvements Suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental entries</td>
<td>Provided or information is incorrect; very little background information</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Poor - no data provided; poor experimental setup</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Poor - no data provided; poor experimental setup</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Poor - no data provided; poor experimental setup</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Poor - no data provided; poor experimental setup</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
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<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
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<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Poor - no data provided; poor experimental setup</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Poor - no data provided; poor experimental setup</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Poor - no data provided; poor experimental setup</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
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<td>Experimental entries</td>
<td>Provided or information is incorrect; very little background information</td>
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<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
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<td>Poor - no data provided; poor experimental setup</td>
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<td>Discussion</td>
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<td>Conclusion</td>
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<td>Conclusion</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental entries</td>
<td>Provided or information is incorrect; very little background information</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Requires Significant Improvement</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Discussion</td>
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<td>Poor - no data provided; poor experimental setup</td>
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Civil and Environmental Engineering Pilot Effort for the Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative

The Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering has prepared its response to the Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative and it is available on the departmental website (http://www.ce.berkeley.edu/undergrad/ugrad_initiative.php). The Department is making every effort to coordinate this initiative with a methodology that accomplishes a self-assessment methodology for external ABET accreditation. A small-scale pilot effort was initiated in 2008-2009 to better understand the process and the mechanics of implementation.

For 2008-2009 the Department’s Curriculum Committee undertook a review of six upper division design courses. The undergraduate major requires the students to select one design course that provides an integration of material covered in prior undergraduate courses and applies that material to actual engineering problems. The level of integration ranges from very detailed application of specific analysis tools in structural engineering design to a broad coverage of all civil and environmental engineering sub-disciplines in projects initiated by student teams. Team work, written reports, and oral presentations are essential components of each design course. The Curriculum Committee received outlines and project descriptions from instructors and reviewed these with faculty members in charge of the courses. There was not sufficient prior notice for the faculty to collect student work from these design courses. The Curriculum Committee noted that courses taught by lecturers provide an important professional context to the courses, but there needed to be continued faculty oversight to monitor the level of work and the coverage of necessary education goals.

Based on this pilot test, the Curriculum Committee is initiating an assessment process summarized in the following flow chart where the Curriculum Committee chooses four to six courses from required or technical elective CEE courses each year for review. The faculty member in charge of each course documents how learning goals for the course were achieved. The course instructor will also discuss what minimum student performance is required to demonstrate the achievement of course goals. The committee will review with the course instructor course goals and survey representative homework assignments, laboratory experiences, projects and examinations that demonstrate the achievement of those goals. This process feeds back to the instructors and provides for an overall assessment of the curriculum on a continuing basis. The Curriculum Committee will report annually on its deliberations to the faculty and to the Advisory Council. The documentation developed in this internal review and will form the basis for future ABET accreditation visits that occur on a six-year cycle.
Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Chair of Civil and Environmental Engineering
James Hunt, ABET Coordinator
Learning Goals for Economics Majors
(Draft in process; this is a living document, Spring 2009)

Economics is the study of how people make choices under conditions of scarcity and the results of those choices for society. Limited resources make tradeoffs necessary for consumers, businesses, and nations. Microeconomics studies how consumers make choices in using their time and spending their income, and how businesses make choices in producing and selling goods and services. Macroeconomics studies the determination of national income, and how it deviates from its potential (full employment) over the business cycle. The important outcomes for the national economy are income and how it is distributed, unemployment, inflation, economic growth, and how well financial markets and international trade are functioning. Economic is important in studying the impact of government policies, ranging from regulatory activities in individual markets to general measures for stabilizing and steering the economy at large. The effect of alternative economic policies on the welfare of the population is a core concern in economics.

Undergraduates should have the following knowledge and skills when they graduate with an Economics Major from UC Berkeley. The Economics Department wants our majors to have knowledge of economics principles with the skills to apply this knowledge in the following ways:

I. Critical Thinking Skills

CT1. Apply economic analysis to evaluate everyday problems.
CT2. Apply economic analysis to evaluate specific policy proposals.
CT3. Compare two or more arguments that have different conclusions to a specific issue or problem.
CT4. Understand the role of assumptions in arguments.

II. Quantitative Reasoning Skills

QT1. Understand how to use empirical evidence to evaluate an economic argument.
QT2. Interpret statistical results.
QT3. Conduct appropriate statistical analysis of data, and explain the statistical problems involved.
QT4. Obtain and/or collect relevant data using specific qualitative and/or quantitative research methods.

III. Problem-Solving Skills

PS1. Solve problems that have clear solutions.
PS2. Propose solutions for problems that do not have clear answers, and indicate under what conditions they may be viable solutions.
IV. Specialized Knowledge and Application of Skills

SP1. In specific content areas (fields) of economics, develop deeper critical and quantitative thinking skills and apply problem-solving skills to complex problems.

V. Communication Skills

CS1. Communicate effectively in written, spoken, and graphical form about specific economic issues.

CS2. Formulate a well-organized written argument that states assumptions and hypotheses, which are supported by evidence.

CS3. Present an economic argument orally.

VI. Lifelong Learning Skills

LL1. Possess a working knowledge of information data bases (e.g., Econ Lit, Nexis-Lexis)

LL2. Know how to locate and use primary data sources (e.g., BLS Household Survey, UN Human Development Index)

LL3. Understand and evaluate current economic events and new economic ideas.

A matrix that shows how majors achieve mastery of the learning goals in the core courses and upper division electives is provided in the appendix below.

Assessment of Learning Goals
(pilots for Spring and Fall 2009)

Mapping Learning Goals to Courses

Each semester instructors of undergraduate courses state on the syllabus the most important learning goals that students develop in the course. The department collects the syllabi and updates the learning goals matrix each semester. The Undergraduate Committee annually reviews the learning goals for courses to ensure consistency and to evaluate how well the curriculum provides adequate opportunity for majors to achieve mastery of all learning goals before graduation.

Pilot Course to Teach Written Communication Skills

In Spring 2009, a pilot course (Econ 196, Topics in Economic Research) was developed and offered to provide upper division students with the opportunity to develop written communication skills in Economics. Econ 196 accommodated approximately 150 students. The course consists of 45 hours of lectures, and students have required weekly readings, from which they choose two topics to write two short papers (12-15 pages). The readings and lectures focus on recent research and policy developments in public finance, labor economics, game theory, experimental economics, behavioral economics, international economics and economic development. The course has a lead instructor, who organizes lectures given by fifteen faculty members in the Economics department, who volunteer their time. The core objective is to expose students to different aspects of research in economics and how it influences policy, and to provide majors with the opportunity to write two papers in economics. Students are assisted in
writing their papers by two graduate student tutors who grade the papers.

Pilot to Directly Assess Specific Learning Goals

In Spring 2009, Economics implemented an assessment pilot that evaluated specific exam questions or written assignments in three selected upper division courses, where a question or assignment had been designated as representing student performance in specific learning goals. Econ did this for three learning goals: critical thinking (in a popular upper division elective), analytical reasoning (in a required quantitative methods course), and written communication (in a large pilot course that focuses on writing a short research paper). Note that the outcome does not indicate what students learned in the particular course but is a measure of their cumulative learning.

The instructor in each course designated a grade that demonstrates the minimal mastery expected of Economics majors for the specific learning goal in the assignment. The grades for these assignments were recorded separately along with the distribution of the grades and the minimum grade required to demonstrate proficiency for the goal(s). Given the grade distribution by student SID, the department can sort out our majors (from other students) and also sort out our graduating seniors.

The Learning Goals Committee, with input from the Undergraduate Committee and from the instructors who executed the assessment in the three courses, will assess the value of this pilot as a direct measurement of majors’ performance and its value in evaluating and improving the undergraduate program. Economics will decide how to revise the pilot and use it to develop an on-going assessment process of upper division courses on a rotating basis. We will also explore how to put selected examples of student work from each of these assessment pilots online to show our majors’ educational performance and achievement of Economics learning goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>100A</th>
<th>100B</th>
<th>100C</th>
<th>100D</th>
<th>100E</th>
<th>100F</th>
<th>100G</th>
<th>100H</th>
<th>100I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro Theory</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Goals for Core Courses:

- Understand economic news
- Primary data sources
- Information databases
- Critical thinking skills
- Quantitative skills
- Problem-solving skills
- Communication skills
- Specialized knowledge in fields
- Oral presentation
- Economic issues
- Communication effectively about
- Specialized knowledge in fields
- Solve problems with clear solution
- Solve problems without clear answer
- Gather or obtain research data
- Conduct statistical analysis
- Interpret results
- Understand the role of empirical evidence in evaluating economic problems
- Role of assumptions
- Compare arguments
- Evaluate policy proposals
- Use economic theory to understand problems
- Understand everyday economics
- 140
- 141
- 14A

Appendix: Learning Goals for Core Courses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 4 Learning Goals for Upper Division Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103  105  110  115  121  122  123  124  125  126  127  128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103  105  110  115  121  122  123  124  125  126  127  128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Knowledge in fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS1: Solve problems with clear solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS2: Solve problems without clear answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Solving Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT1: Conduct statistical analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2: Interpret results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence in evaluating economic problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT3: Use economic theory to understand problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT4: Role of assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT5: Compare arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and evaluate policy proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifelong Learning Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1: Communicate effectively about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2: Formulate and support written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3: Oral presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL1: Information databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL2: Primary data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL3: Understand economic news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Goals for Upper Division Courses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103  105  110  115  121  122  123  124  125  126  127  128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USLI in French Department
Spring 2009 (in progress)

The French Department faculty has articulated learning goals in the French major and suggested pathways to reach those goals. In connection with these goals and pathways, a system of course designation has been introduced to our current major curriculum. These learning goals and the ways to reach them are described in sections I (Learning Goals) and II (Path(s) to Learning Goals). The two types of courses, which are designed to help students 1) focus on their writing skills and 2) develop research skills in French literature and culture, are described in section III (Writing-Intensive and Research-Oriented Courses).

These adjustments do not constitute additional requirements to the French major: they simply articulate the coherency of the course sequence of our existing program.

I – Learning Goals for the French Program:
The faculty in French have articulated these learning goals so that all of our undergraduate majors may better understand what they can learn in their French courses and how they can learn it. It is our hope that this statement of learning goals will not only make our students more aware of what is expected of them, but also more capable of making the best of our program as it now stands.

In the detailed outline below, you will find a copy of the goals that the French Department faculty agreed upon in June 2008. These goals distinguish knowledge (i.e. content) from skills (i.e. specific know-how) and describe what we would like all of our undergraduates in the French major to know and be able to do when they leave the French program.

II – Path(s) to Learning Goals in the French Program:
The detailed outline below also contains a recommended sequence of classes (that we have labeled “path(s) to goals”) that indicates where in the French major program we expect you will best be able to master the various types of knowledge and skills we hope all of our graduating seniors will possess.

This layout of existing classes in French should help you in planning the sequence of classes in our upper division course offerings that will be most beneficial to your learning. We encourage you to study it carefully and to use it, in conjunction with the counseling provided by our staff undergraduate advisor, Carol Dolcini, to map out an academic itinerary that will insure that you acquire the knowledge and skills highlighted in our learning goals.

III – Writing-Intensive and Research-Oriented Courses in the French Program:
Each semester, on a rotating basis, one or two classes in French upper division course offerings will be designated as writing-intensive (with specific emphasis on grammar and composition skills) and one or two others will be designated as research-oriented (with specific emphasis on crafting research topics and acquiring bibliographical skills).
Writing-Intensive Courses

These courses are labeled “W” in our on-line departmental course listings and will offer students the opportunity to perfect composition skills in French and to acquire knowledge in French literature and culture. Writing assignments in these classes will be progressive (from 2-3 pages to 10 pages or more), promote peer-editing, offer ample opportunities for rewrite and emphasize coherency in argument as well as grammatical skills in French.

In the Fall 2008 semester, in addition to all sections of French 102 ("Writing in French"), Professor Sanyal’s French 103A ("Itinéraires du désir") and Professor Blocker's French 117A ("Gens de lettres et gens du monde en France au XVIIe siècle") will be taught as "W" courses.

In the Spring 2009 semester, in addition to all sections of French 102 ("Writing in French"), Professor Smock’s French 120A ("Twentieth Century and Contemporary French Literature") will be taught as a “W” course.

Research-Oriented Courses

These courses are labeled “R” in our on-line departmental course listings and will be taught as introductions to research in French literature and culture. In these courses, professors will work with students to help them learn how to design a research topic. They will also show them how to find books and articles related to their research, how to read, use and cite this material in their papers, and how to design a bibliography on a given subject.

In the Fall 2008 semester, Professor Maslan’s French 121B ("Themes, Genres and Structures : French Theater") and Professor Blocker's French 161A ("Quatre années dans l'histoire littéraire de la France, 1656-1659") will be taught as “R” courses.

In the Spring 2009 semester, Professor Britto’s French 185 ("Literature and Colonialism" and Professor Blocker's French 140B ("The Crafting of the French Philosopher: from Montaigane to Sartre") will be taught as “R” courses.

We strongly recommend that all students in the French major use this new labeling to select their classes according to the type of skills they need to perfect or develop. As a rule of thumb, it is suggested that students take an additional “W” class in the major sequence (beyond the mandatory French 102 class) before enrolling in an “R” class. In addition, students planning to write an honors thesis in French are strongly advised to complete a class labeled “R” prior to enrolling in the Honors sequence (French H195A-H195B.) Finally, it is highly recommended that any student planning to continue their studies at the graduate level (in French or any other discipline) take at least one class labeled “R” before graduating.

We hope that these newly articulated learning objectives and course designations ("W" and "R") will help you excel in our upper division French classes, while making it easier
for you to acquire the knowledge and skills that will accompany you throughout your life in the career(s) you will engage in.

Learning Goals in French

Knowledge

- Attain solid (though not flawless) proficiency in reading, writing, understanding, and speaking French.
- Possess some understanding of the history and sociology of the French language.
- Be aware of a variety of ways in which the histories of French and Francophone literature and culture have traditionally been accounted for within French studies.
- Recognize and understand features of a variety of genres and modes in French and Francophone writing (the novel, poetic forms, short fiction, autobiography, film, etc.), as well as of the vocabulary commonly used to describe them (i.e. narratology, vocabulary of versification or of film studies, etc.).
- Have some familiarity with key rhetorical terms.
- Acquire a basic familiarity with some of the techniques of cultural analysis within French and Francophone studies.
- Be able to articulate specific connections between texts and cultural, artistic, social, and/or political contexts
- Gain an understanding of literature and of other written texts in interdisciplinary and multicultural contexts.
- Be aware of debates about the nature of literature.
- Be widely read in French literature.

Skills

- Develop the ability to interpret and analyze any given text from the French and Francophone domains using a variety of methods, both in isolation and together (such as close reading, linguistic analysis, theoretical analysis, historical and cultural contextualization, etc.)
- Be capable of interpreting culture and cultural artifacts in the French and Francophone domains.
- Formulate a well-organized, well-supported argument both orally and in writing.
- Write essays in standard academic French, using appropriate vocabulary whenever needed to discuss precise examples in specific texts.
- Begin to acquire independent research skills on a given topic or text and know how to make use of secondary sources (for instance: know how to read and analyze a scholarly article or how to compile a bibliography).
- Observe ethical, precise and accurate citation practices in both oral and written work.
Pilot Assessment Planned

The French Department will offer each semester one or two classes designated as writing-intensive (with a specific focus on improving students' abilities in composition and critical analysis) and one or two others designated as research-oriented (with specific emphasis on crafting research topics and acquiring bibliographical skills). These "research" and "writing"-emphasis designations are not permanently attached to particular courses but can rotate to courses throughout the upper division curriculum. The French Department is developing a pilot portfolio assessment in these special emphasis courses to assess majors' achievement of specific learning goals. Portfolio assessment might then be applied to other courses to determine how well the Department's learning goals are being met generally. The Department is also planning to develop a survey that will ask seniors and recent graduates to reflect on their learning in French.
Student Learning in the Major Initiative at UC Irvine

UC Irvine has developed a multi-year plan to assist faculty and staff to identify and assess learning outcomes in the undergraduate majors and to use the results to strengthen student learning. The campus-wide initiative, called the “Student Learning in the Major,” was launched in 2008 and focuses on helping departments identify and assess student learning outcomes for each undergraduate major. The Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE) has taken the lead through its Office of Research & Evaluation (R&E). As part of the initiative, each department was required to provide a progress report by December 2008, on the status of where they are in the process of developing learning goals and a plan for assessing whether graduating majors were meeting those goals. Toward that end, DUE and Academic Affairs has sponsored two rounds of assessment grants to provide one-time funds of up to $10,000 to support Senate faculty to guide their department toward establishing assessment programs for their major.

Here are two examples of two pilots:

Chemistry faculty have identified and itemized a list of student learning outcomes that is desired of all graduating chemistry majors. They have identified the individual courses within the curriculum that develop those outcomes and have aligned course learning outcomes with program learning outcomes. Also, by collaborating with Network and Academic Computing Services, they have set up a system to collect student work products (exams, lab reports, term papers, etc.) in electronic format and saved in virtual spaces as portfolios for instructor (or student) reflection and for development of valid rubrics for assessment of learning outcomes. Portfolios from a random sample of juniors and seniors will be examined and evaluated using the rubrics. Finally, as part of the department’s ongoing assessment plan, a departmental Assessment Committee will be formed to analyze and summarize assessment data and communicate recommendations on how the major could be strengthened to the Chemistry faculty.

Writing instructors have launched a pilot to assess upper-division writing. The three goals for the assessment project were to develop a scoring rubric that could be used to assess writing skills and techniques across academic disciplines, to assess the quality of student writing produced in upper-division writing courses, and to determine whether such student characteristics as first language and transfer vs. high school status impact the quality of student writing. Because the upper-division writing requirement can be fulfilled through a wide array of courses designed and offered by individual academic schools, the rubric for this pilot assessment needed to be broad enough in scope to capture writing skills and techniques that exist across disciplines. Six writing elements emerged as relevant to writing across disciplines; (1) mechanics (grammar, punctuation, etc.), (2) source usage mechanics, (3) organization and structure, (4) audience, (5) familiarity with disciplinary discourse, and (6) critical thinking/analysis. The six writing elements that emerged through the review process appear as four categories within the Upper-Division Writing Assessment Rubric: critical thinking and analysis, use of evidence/research, development and structure, and generic and disciplinary conventions. Four levels of quality, (0) little or no evidence, (1) some evidence, (2) good, and (3) mastery, were defined for each of the writing rubric’s writing categories. A random selection of papers from two upper-division writing courses were collected for use in this pilot assessment study and assessed by six readers, with extensive writing instruction experience.
Use of Capstones for Assessment at UCLA

For its ongoing WASC Review, UCLA chose as one of the three themes, “Shaping Undergraduate Education via the Capstone Experience.” Capstone experiences provide students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery and integration of knowledge and learned abilities within a discipline. UCLA has identified five criteria that define a capstone experience. Major programs that require all students to take a capstone course are certified as “capstone majors.”

Capstone Criteria:
1. The project must require that the student engage in a creative, inquiry-based learning experience that deepens the student’s knowledge and integration of the discipline.
2. The project may be completed individually or by a group of peers, provided each student is given agency; each student’s contribution must be significant, identifiable, and graded.
3. The project must culminate in a tangible product that can be archived (including film, video, etc.) for at least three years by the responsible unit (department or program).
4. The project must be part of an upper-division course or courses totaling at least four units, usually within the curriculum established for the student’s major or minor.
5. Opportunities should be provided for capstones to be shared within a broader community, such as presenting papers at a student forum, posting projects on the web, giving a performance or arranging an exhibit, etc.

Since capstones typically draw broadly on, and bring into focus, the learning outcomes for academic programs, UCLA decided to align its capstone initiative with the articulation of programmatic learning outcomes. Moreover, we recognized that assessing students’ capstone performances also serves usefully as a diagnostic for a program, facilitating the process of curricular review and reform within academic units that have capstones. Therefore, we require departments applying for capstone certification to establish learning outcomes and associated assessment approaches related to capstone experiences.

UCLA’s experience with the first group of capstone majors revealed that departmental faculty can benefit greatly from assistance in articulating learning outcomes and framing their assessment. A document (Guidelines for Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes for Undergraduate Majors, currently in draft form) has been written to provide such guidance for all majors, whether capstone or not. For capstone majors in particular, the Guidelines document provides explicit guidance with the following steps:

- establishing learning outcomes,
- creating an assessment plan that revolves around the capstone project and will support student attainment of those outcomes,
- evaluating capstone products for evidence of student learning,
- reflecting on how assessment findings may inform pedagogical practice and/or curricular planning,
- determining the effectiveness and limitations of the assessment process,
- communicating findings and associated implications with those who are involved with the program, and
- incorporating discussion of the assessment process and findings within the Academic Senate Program Review process.

Further assistance will be provided to departments beyond the Guidelines document; the Center for Educational Assessment and the Office of Instructional Development will work with faculty to set up an appropriate assessment plan and schedule. Departments will receive this help two to three years before their self-review report is due for the Academic Senate Program Review process.

This Appendix draws on documents written by UCLA’s Capstone Workgroup and individuals in the office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education.
Assessment Project in UC San Diego’s Department of Psychology

At UCSD’s Department of Psychology we are conducting an experiment to determine if it is feasible to assess the degree to which our students (with special emphasis on majors) have achieved mastery of a set of predetermined learning objectives through assessment of their mastery of these objectives within the context of regular course examinations. The full description of the process has previously been described and is included in the current documentation of this committee. The key elements, briefly described, are:

1. Determine a set of learning outcomes that are agreed upon by the unit.
2. Determine a set of courses for each agreed upon learning outcome that are highly likely to offer the opportunities for mastery of the specified outcome.
3. Create a set of items (including multiple choice, short answer, essay, etc.) that can be used in regularly scheduled, end of term examinations. These items must be such that they can be directly linked to the learning outcome in the sense that it is highly unlikely that the question would be answered incorrectly if the learning objective had been mastered.
4. Have the faculty member(s) responsible for the course select a set of items that are associated with one or more learning outcome associated with that course (see step 2 above) and are content appropriate to the course to be embedded in final examination.
5. Amass results from repeated testing sessions and estimate the percent of students for each learning objective who fail to demonstrate mastery of the learning objective.
6. Utilize the results of Step 5 for feedback to the undergraduate studies committee in order to plan revisions to the curriculum.

As of January 1, 2009 the Psychology Department has:

1. Agreed to conduct the experiment.
2. Has adopted a formal set of Learning Outcomes (the American Psychological Associations guidelines)
3. The Learning Objectives are being posted to the Department’s Website (in the Undergraduate Education section) as a public statement of the Department’s commitment to these Learning Outcomes.
4. Begun the prioritizing of the order in which the Learning Objectives (of which there are more than a few) will be included for assessment.
5. Begun amassing the item pool which will be needed to conduct the assessment.
WASC
Standards at a Glance

Standard I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes
1.1 Formally approved, appropriate statements of purpose; define values and character
1.2 Clear objectives; indicators of achievement at institutional, program and course level; system to measure student achievement; public data on achievement.
1.3 High performance, responsibility, accountability of leadership system

Integrity
1.4 Academic freedom
1.5 Diversity: policies, programs and practices
1.6 Education as purpose; autonomy
1.7 Truthful representation to students/public; timely completion; fair and equitable policies
1.8 Operational integrity; sound business practices; timely and fair complaint handling; evaluation of performance.
1.9 Honest, open communication with WASC; inform WASC of material matters; follow WASC policies

Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning
2.1 Programs appropriate in content, standards, level; sufficient qualified faculty
2.2 Clearly defined degrees re admission and level of achievement for graduation
   • Undergraduate degree requirements
   • Graduate degree requirements
2.3 Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and expectations for student learning at all levels; reflected in policies, advising, information resources, etc.
2.4 Faculty responsibility for attainment of expectations for student learning
2.5 Students involved in learning and challenged; feedback provided
2.6 Graduates achieve stated levels of attainment; SLOs embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work
2.7 Systematic program review includes SLOs, retention/graduation, external evidence

Scholarship and Creative Activity
2.8 Scholarship, creativity, curricular and instructional innovation valued and supported
2.9 Linkage among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service

Support for Student Learning
2.10 Collection and analysis of disaggregated student data; achievement, satisfaction and climate tracked; student needs identified and supported
2.11 Co-curricular programs assessed
2.12 Timely, useful information and advising
2.13 Appropriate student services
2.14 Information to and treatment of transfer students (if applicable)
Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

Faculty and Staff
3.1 Sufficient qualified personnel for operations and academics
3.2 Sufficient qualified and diverse faculty
3.3 Faculty policies, practices, and evaluation
3.4 Faculty and staff development

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources
3.5 Financial stability, clean audits, sufficient resources; realistic plans if deficits; budgeting, enrollment and diversified revenue
3.6 Sufficient information resources/library, aligned and adequate
3.7 Information technology coordinated and supported

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes
3.8 Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority on academics
3.9 Independent governing board with proper oversight; CEO hiring and evaluation
3.10 Full-time CEO; CFO; sufficient administrators and staff
3.11 Effective academic leadership by faculty

Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Strategic Thinking and Planning
4.1 Reflection/planning with constituents; strategic with priorities and future direction; aligned with purposes; plan monitored and revised
4.2 Plans align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technology
4.3 Planning informed by analyzed data and evidence of educational effectiveness

Commitment to Learning and Improvement
4.4 Quality assurance processes; assessment and tracking; comparative data; use of results to revise/improve
4.5 Institutional research capacity; used to assess effectiveness/student learning; review of IR
4.6 Leadership and faculty committed to improvement; faculty assesses teaching and learning; climate and co-curricular objectives assessed
4.7 Inquiry into teaching learning leads to improvement in curricula, pedagogy and evaluation
4.8 Stakeholder involvement in assessment of effectiveness

UEETF Analysis of the CLA

by Mark Appelbaum, Michael Brown and Keith Williams

Validity
The matter of evaluating the psychometric qualities of the CLA is challenging for at least one important reason: though individual student scores are required, the unit of analysis is NOT at the student level; the unit of analysis is the institutions being “represented” by their student samples. There is no information in the CAE technical report (CAE, 2008) that describes the standards to which the tasks were developed. While CAE identifies a general conceptual framework for cognitive abilities that might be addressed by different types of learning assessment, it provides only general justification for why measurement of general “broad abilities” is appropriate as the primary target for CLA assessment (Shavelson, unknown date). While this reference identifies a general conceptual framework for cognitive abilities that might be addressed by different types of learning assessment, it provides only general justification for why measurement of general “broad abilities” is appropriate as the primary target for CLA assessment. Moreover, there is little direct evidence directly attesting to what the derived CLA scores measure or whether the proposed uses and anticipated test-based decisions are empirically supported.

Because institutions are not obligated to follow specific sampling practices – and because those practices are not externally controlled between institutions – CLA cross-institutional comparisons may not be very meaningful. Moreover, if institutional sampling practices are nonrandom, CLA results may not be representative of the students attending the institution; again, this would raise questions about the meaning of an institutions CLA score.

In answer to a question about the availability of evidence supporting the CLA’s construct validity, the technical report (CAE, 2008) merely states that the CLA program is currently participating in a construct validity study in concert with ACT and ETS, and they suggest readers look over a copy of a previous test and judge face validity for themselves. The recent report from the Social Sciences Research Council (Arum, Roksa, & Velez, 2008) noted that their research did not “formally test the instrument’s psychometric properties nor its construct validity, the CLA indicator appears from a sociological perspective quite promising and worthy of further research and development.” Thus, it is reasonable to keep tracking research into the validity of instruments such as the CLA in the future for possible reexamination of conclusions. However, Arum et al. also observed that the kinds of students public research universities pride themselves on trying to admit (e.g., the socially and economically under-represented) would disadvantage such institutions in comparative standing on CLA value-added scores. Moreover, admitting students likely to major in education, human services, or business subject areas would seem to disadvantage such institutions as well, given Arum et al’s findings. Such findings would caution against the high-stakes use of CLA-like measures.

Reliability
The reliability of the CLA scores, especially the “value-added” scores, has come under special scrutiny, and this is especially a concern for the typical cross-sectional analysis where comparisons are made between freshmen tested in the fall and seniors in the spring.
Data regarding either student level or institutional level test-retest reliability for the CLA scores, which would give evidence for the temporal stability, was not found. This is important because if the institutional profile changes rapidly over time due to instability of CLA scores, the institutional comparisons are meaningless. However, other reliability data are available. The correlation between hand and machine assigned scores on the make-an-argument and break-an-argument tasks and between two hand scores for the performance tasks also appears acceptable (Klein, 2007). Unfortunately, the correlation of CLA mean and residual scores for random samples drawn from a population show strong correlations for the mean total scale scores but marginal correlations for the residual scores. This would mean that the picture of an institution on the basis of the CLA program could change markedly depending on the samples drawn.

The reliability of the residuals (i.e., the adjusted CLA scores) has come under special scrutiny, and this is especially a concern for the typical cross-sectional analysis where comparisons are made between freshmen tested in the fall and seniors in the spring. Larson (2008) has identified a number of threats to the reliability of the residuals and difference scores: differences in institutional approaches to sampling; variability due to demographic variables (e.g., distribution of academic majors or student sex); differences in the admissions tests used to measure incoming academic quality of students; differences in the CLA task types or versions assigned at an institution; possible interactions between task types and student characteristics; stability of freshman residual and potential differences between freshman residual and what would have been the residual score of current seniors when they were freshman. These threats question the meaning of the difference between freshman and senior residuals, the “value-added” effect. Some of the CLA reliability issues could be mediated by use of a longitudinal model, where a large sample from a given entering class is sampled when they are freshmen and seniors, rather than the more typical use of a cross-sectional model. Yet, few institutions elect to employ the CLA in longitudinal ways.

Evaluation of CLA for Accountability - Value-Added Scores
Advocates of the CLA make a strong case for using a standardized test to generate a score that can be compared across campuses nationally. However the benefits of a standardized measure such as CLA rest upon the assumptions that the estimated scores are the result of a scientific approach to measuring a college’s value-added, and that the standardized metric is reliable and valid for estimating the value-added at a given institution and for comparing the estimated value-added scores across institutions. The use of value-added scores involves many complex issues (see Raudenbush, 2004, Reckase, 2004, and Rubin et al., 2004) and the simple assumption that CLA value-added scores are accurate evaluations of differences in learning at different institutions remains to be validated. Questions related to the reliability of the value added scores have already been addressed in the previous section. A variety of assumptions and issues that could affect the validity and reliability of the value-added scores are further discussed below.

Additional concerns that come from the use of value-added scores involve both how variations in scores from year to year will be reconciled, and how results will be used beyond nominal uses for improving teaching and learning. There is a legitimate concern that the value added results will be used to develop rankings comparing quality at different institutions, without delving into any of the more specific information that might result from use of the test. When the University
APPENDIX 9

of Nebraska at Omaha found out that its CLA scores showed that the University “contributes more to the learning gains made by students than 100 percent of the 176 four-year undergraduate institutions participating in the 2007–2008 CLA,” they released a press release touting “UNO First in U.S. for Value-Added Education,” drawing criticism from a variety of organizations for their marketing use of value-added scores (Lederman, 2008b). In another example of how use of results can be questioned, officials at Bethel University became “concerned about the great variability in results from year to year. The first year, we looked great, another year, so so. Another year, the results look horrible, like we're not adding any value.” (Lederman, 2008a).

We note that the CLA ranks schools according to their estimated “value-added” score, and thus provides a relative rather than an absolute score. UEETF thinks that the public, as well as the universities, care about the absolute performance of graduates, and the graduates’ skills and talents and ability to function in their roles as workers, citizens, and family members.

Further Issues Regarding the CLA
There are numerous procedures, claims and assumptions involved with the administration and analysis of data for the CLA that have the potential to undermine the validity and reliability of the resulting institutional scores. They all have the potential to increase the amount of sampling error and undermine the accuracy and usefulness of the resulting data. A number of them will be briefly listed here and where appropriate, discussed. While the CAE has tried to address a number of these criticisms, we generally find their arguments unconvincing.

Sampling
- Differences in institutional approaches to sampling. There are no clear guidelines for how tests should be administered, and the selection of sample students is left to the institution. A common criticism involves a non-random sampling of students taking the test, usually volunteers getting some kind of material reward for participating.

- Variability due to demographic variables (e.g., distribution among fields of study and academic majors, race/ethnicity, primary language spoken at home, gender, etc.). In Klein et al. (2008) the developers of the CLA provide data comparing average SAT scores and the percentages of minorities and females taking the CLA compared to the student body population in 93 participating colleges, and argue that this shows that participants are “a lot like their classmates”. While this may be true for this limited set of variables, there are many other potentially confounding factors that are not evaluated – influences such as motivation, academic discipline, socioeconomic level, etc). Similarly, concerns have been raised about interaction between task content area and academic major. To refute this claim, Klein et al. (2008) cites only one as yet unpublished study that showed no better CLA score predictability when task performance area and academic major were included compared to SAT scores alone. Banta (2008) cautions that standardized tests of general intellectual skills “are not content neutral, thus disadvantage students specializing in some disciplines.”

- Stability of freshman residual and potential differences between freshman residual and what would have been the residual score of current seniors when they were freshman. Sampling design relies on administering separate components of the full set to different
sub-samples of students and comparing these samples of students cross-sectionally. Colleges may pay an additional fee to have an additional CLA test administered to freshmen in their fourth year, if they are still enrolled, to provide a more valid test of the same population (minus attrition due to drop-outs and nonparticipation).

- Sampling method does not include students who drop out or transfer students, who enter after the freshman year.

**Test Versions**
- Differences in the CLA task types or versions assigned at an institution.
- Possible interactions between task types and student characteristics.

**Direct Usefulness of CLA scores**
- The nature of what’s being assessed by the CLA program, the proper meaning of the CLA scores, and the appropriateness of expected uses of those scores remains to be established.
- The test results do not separate out the direct educational contribution of a particular institution as separate from general skill development and learning that may have happened regardless of which college a student attended or even learning that might have happened if the student hadn’t attended college (i.e., maturation effects).
- Justification for testing critical thinking, analytical reasoning, problem-solving and written communication in a more general sense of “broad abilities” instead of in a context more closely aligned with student curricular programs and disciplines of study remains to be established.
- The claim that CLA offers a standard of learning outcome and a method for assessment that is useful for evaluating instructional improvement efforts and for comparing UC to other higher education institutions in a manner free of institutional differences in incoming student ability and other student characteristics has not been established.
- CLA as an outcome measure does not diagnose the factors that lead to the observed results.
- Many of the factors affecting student learning are educational processes that CLA does not measure and does not capture. The Council of Independent Colleges (CIC, 2008) has suggested pairing the CLA with other assessment methods, and this might be taken as evidence that by itself the CLA is limited in how it can help improve teaching and student learning.
- The reported CLA scores have no empirically supported educational meaning or value that can be used to improve undergraduate curriculum. Assessments and curricula need to be aligned so that the assessments match the learning experiences of the students at an institution.
• To the extent that the CLA measures only the kinds of students admitted by an institution, high-stakes use of the CLA may dictate changes to institutional admissions practices, changes that may conflict with the mission of the institution.

Challenges of Implementing CLA

• Obtaining an appropriate cohort of students, who volunteer to take the test, to obtain a sampling of students across all disciplines.

• Ensuring that students are motivated to do their best on the test.

• Time required for students to take the test (approximately 3 hours). “Getting students to sit at a computer long enough to take the test can be a dilemma when it comes to first years and can be an outright challenge when it comes to seniors.” (CIC, 2008).

• Cost of participating in the CLA program ($28,000 for CLA tests administered at UC Riverside).
  – Cost of student enrollment (or volunteer) incentives ($30 to $50 per student test).
  – Cost of administering the tests (information unknown)
Common Data Set (CDS) – Background and Data Categories

In the 1980s, various news and publication agencies began asking for more detailed and extensive information about the campuses to be used for the publication of college guide books and ratings of campuses. Often, the information requested, though similar in scope, was sufficiently different that it required special analyses to extract the requested information. Given the workload required to respond to these requests, a UC institutional researcher (Bob Daly, now at UC Riverside) developed a common template of information that he provided to each publication firm. This idea caught on and was adopted by the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) and is now employed at most four-year colleges and universities.

AIR has established an on-going committee that evaluates and recommends information to be included in the Common Data Set (CDS), although the data elements included remain very consistent from year to year. Each university is encouraged to publish its Common Data Set on the campus web site. Each UC campus, with the exception of UCSF, publishes the CDS on their web site.

The CDS includes the following sections and corresponding information:

- **General Information** (contact information, calendar type, degrees offered)
- **Enrollment and Persistence** (full-time/part-time, gender, race/ethnicity, degrees awarded, rates of graduation and retention)
- **First-Time, First-Year (Freshman) Admission** (number of applicants, admits, and enrolled by gender, high school credit requirements, selection criteria, admittance test polices, average high school performance, and admission policies)
- **Transfer Admission** (number of applicants, admits and enrolled by gender, application requirements, transfer credit policies, and transfer admission policies)
- **Academic Offerings and Policies** (special study options, and areas of required coursework)
- **Student Life** (freshmen participation characteristics, offered activities, and housing types)
- **Annual Expenses** (tuition and fee costs and policies, and typical cost to attend)
- **Financial Aid** (data presented by type of aid including total university expenditures, numbers of recipients, and average award amounts)
- **Instructional Faculty and Class Size** (full-time/part-time faculty headcount by gender, student/faculty ratio, and number of classes by class size)
- **Degrees Conferred** (percentage of Bachelor degrees awarded in prior year by standard Classification of Instruction Program (CIP) code)
- **Glossary of Terms.**
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Websites for the UC Undergraduate Campus Profiles:

**Berkeley:**  [http://metrics.vcbf.berkeley.edu/Berkeley%20Template.pdf](http://metrics.vcbf.berkeley.edu/Berkeley%20Template.pdf)

**Davis:**  [http://facts.ucdavis.edu/profile.lasso](http://facts.ucdavis.edu/profile.lasso)


**UCLA:**  [http://www.aim.ucla.edu/profile/main.asp](http://www.aim.ucla.edu/profile/main.asp)

**Merced:**  [http://ipa.ucmerced.edu/docs/facts/UC%20Merced%20Profile.pdf](http://ipa.ucmerced.edu/docs/facts/UC%20Merced%20Profile.pdf)

**Riverside:**  [http://collegeportrait.ucr.edu/](http://collegeportrait.ucr.edu/)

**San Diego:**  [http://studentresearch.ucsd.edu/sriweb/UCSDCollegeProfile.pdf](http://studentresearch.ucsd.edu/sriweb/UCSDCollegeProfile.pdf)

**Santa Barbara:**  [http://bap.ucsb.edu/IR/UCSB_Portal.pdf](http://bap.ucsb.edu/IR/UCSB_Portal.pdf)

**Santa Cruz:**  [http://planning.ucsc.edu/portrait/](http://planning.ucsc.edu/portrait/)
-----Original Message-----
From: Robert Dynes
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2007 1:37 PM
To: bkirwan@usmd.edu
Cc: pmcperson@nasulgc.org; dshulenburger@nasulgc.org; chancellor@berkeley.edu;
    chancellor@uci.edu; chancellor@ucsd.edu; robert.grey@ucr.edu;
    jmbishop@chanoff.ucsf.edu; lnvanderhoeft@ucdavis.edu;
    henry.yang@chancellor.ucsb.edu; chancellor@conet.ucla.edu.edu; chancellor@usc.edu;
    chancellor@ucmerced.edu; Rory Hume; Katherine Lapp; Bruce Darling; Scott Sudduth
Subject: Voluntary System of Accountability
Importance: High

Brit Kirwan, Chancellor, University System of Maryland
Chair, VSA Presidential Advisory Committee

Dear Brit:

Thank you very much for your invitation of September 14 to participate in the
Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). The University of California applauds
NASULGC's and AASCU's joint effort to develop a common accountability template in
order to improve the quality of information about college and universities that is
publicly available. The development of the VSA template represents a tremendous
service to students, parents, and policymakers alike.

We have been pleased that UC staff--Dennis Hengstler of UC Berkeley and Samuel
Agronow of the Office of the President--were invited to participate in the development of
the accountability measures. They both noted the highly collaborative, professional,
and efficient process by which various reporting measures were developed. We
appreciate that you have acknowledged the value of our own extensive survey of
student engagement, the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey
(UCUES), and that Part 2 of the VSA was constructed in part on the UCUES model.

The University of California is also very committed to ensuring that students and
families have information to make informed decisions about college attendance. Thus,
we strongly support the parental information section that is included in Part 1 of the
VSA.

However, we continue to have concerns about Part 3 of the VSA on student learning
outcomes. The University has concluded that using standardized tests on an
institutional level as measures of student learning (1) fails to recognize the diversity,
breadth, and depth of discipline-specific knowledge and learning that takes place in
colleges and universities today and (2) usurps the role of campus and departmental
faculty in assessing student learning.
It is for these reasons that I regret to inform you that all nine of the University of California's general campuses will opt out of participating in the VSA program. Instead, the nine UC campuses with undergraduate programs will develop a common systemwide accountability and reporting template whose format and definitions are consistent with the VSA, thus providing information to the public that can easily and reliably be compared to information on other university Web sites. We will also include student learning information that the public can use to evaluate our educational quality. Finally, we are considering inclusion of a few additional items that reflect recommendations from AAU, NASULGC, NAICU and the AASCU, such as data about retention and graduation rates, results from student and alumni surveys, and information about our graduate programs.

The information we ultimately provide for UC Web sites will recognize, honor, and support the overall VSA approach and will be responsive to the widespread calls for greater accountability across higher education. The University of California thanks NASULGC for its efforts in developing the original template.

We look forward to working with you in the future on higher education accountability efforts.

Sincerely,

Bob

Robert C. Dynes
President
University of California

cc: President M. Peter McPherson, NASULGC
Vice President David Shulenberger, NASULGC
Chancellors
Provost Hume
Executive Vice President Lapp
Executive Vice President Darling
Assistant Vice President Sudduth
Websites for the UC UCUES Reporting:

Berkeley: http://ucues.berkeley.edu/main/
Davis: http://www.sariweb.ucdavis.edu/
Irvine: http://www.assessment.uci.edu/UCUESindex.html
UCLA: http://www.sairo.ucla.edu/data/efforts_ucues.html
Merced: http://ipa.ucmerced.edu/survey.htm
San Diego: http://studentresearch.ucsd.edu/sriweb/Surveys/ucues.html
Santa Barbara: http://bap.ucsb.edu/IR/UCSB_Portrait.pdf (pp. 5-6)
Santa Cruz: http://planning.ucsc.edu/irps/ENROLLMT/UCUES/
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**Dates and Websites for UC Graduating Senior/Career Destination & Alumni Surveys** *

**Graduating Senior Surveys / Career Destination Surveys**

- **Berkeley:** [http://career.berkeley.edu/CareDest/CareDest.stm](http://career.berkeley.edu/CareDest/CareDest.stm) (every year)
- **Irvine:** 2008
- **UCLA:** [http://www.sairo.ucla.edu/data/efforts_grad.html](http://www.sairo.ucla.edu/data/efforts_grad.html)
- **Riverside:** 2007 graduating class
- **San Diego:** [http://career.ucsd.edu/sa/Survey/Survey.shtml](http://career.ucsd.edu/sa/Survey/Survey.shtml)

**Alumni Surveys:**

- **Berkeley:** by department
- **Irvine:** mid-1990s; Social Science alumni, spring 2009
- **UCLA:** by department
- **Riverside:** summer 2001 – spring 2002 graduates
  [http://abet.ucsd.edu/ce25/assessments/alumni/default.aspx](http://abet.ucsd.edu/ce25/assessments/alumni/default.aspx) (engineering)
- **Santa Barbara:** by department; 1996 survey of classes of 1973, 1983, 1993
- **Santa Cruz:** by department and 1993; 1999 survey of classes of 1995-97

* UC Merced had its first graduating class in May 2009 so this type of survey data is not applicable.
Communication from the Committee on Educational Policy
Thomas Kearney, PharmD, Chair

December 16, 2009

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the Report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick,

As requested, at its November 4 and December 9, 2009 meetings, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed the report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment.

Overall, the committee supports the ideas put forth in the report however they have concerns about the burden of implementation and the use of faculty and department time on matters that might already be handled by other campus agencies such as alumni associations. The concerns were as follows:

(1) The report’s suggestions, especially in tracking undergraduate learning objectives, seem burdensome and difficult to implement. While the committee agrees that there should be some external measure to determine if students are developing competencies, it wondered about the ability of faculty to implement the proposed ideas.

(2) The report focused “on defining and assessing student learning outcomes as the primary way to evaluate educational effectiveness” (pg. 7). These are activities faculty deliver and control, however the proposed methods of tracking and determining said effectiveness require substantial financial and physical manpower to implement and maintain, which would also be beyond what can be supported in the current fiscal environment.

(3) CEP also wondered why the tracking of former students didn’t fall to the campus alumni association rather than departments? If these organizations contact alumni to determine living locations why not also ask about professions and other information sought by the departments?

(4) Separately, if tracking were to start at the point of acceptance to the University by an alumni association, the University could then track all of their information whether or not they choose to attend that campus. Then, if they pursue graduate education, the university system already will have data on them. If a database such as this was centralized for use by all at UC Systemwide, it would be a phenomenal resource for online surveys, and other options, especially for seeking of donations.

We therefore support and recognize the potential value of the ten recommendations as put forth by the UEETF, but suggest that the timetable for implementation be contingent upon the availability of adequate
resources and administrative support. This will require an additional assessment of the short-term and long-term fiscal impact for implementation of each recommendation and identification of who bears responsibility for additional resources.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Educational Policy

Thomas Kearney, PharmD, Chair
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, Vice Chair
Abby Alkon, RN, PhD, PNP
Sergio Baranzini, PhD
Kurt Giles, PhD
Vineeta Singh, MD
Douglas Schmucker, PhD
Sophia Saaed, DMD
Elisabeth Wilson, MD, MPH
Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion and New Faculty Appointments
Kit Chesla, RN, DNPc, FAAN, Chair

November 2009 Report and Recommendations
Revised January 2010

This task force was charged with reviewing the implementation of the Report of the Academic Senate Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion1 (AKA the Armitage Report, Attachment 1), a joint faculty and administration task force. After additional review by the Academic Senate, deans, and the Chancellor’s Shared Governance Working Group, these recommendations were adopted by the Chancellor on July 25, 2005.

The Armitage Report’s conclusions and recommendations fell into three broad categories:

1. A substantial fraction of faculty in the Adjunct and (Health Sciences) Clinical series, about 40%, had responsibilities and quality of work essentially the same as Senate faculty in the In Residence or Clinical X series.

2. Procedures are necessary to review existing faculty and change these appointments into the appropriate Senate series.

3. Policy changes and a combination of individual education and institutional monitoring are necessary to ensure that this situation does not recur.

This task force was also charged with evaluating increases in faculty numbers since the Armitage Report was released in December 2003, identifying possible sources of growth and potential negative impacts of such growth on the performance of existing faculty roles.

This task force consists of the following members: Kit Chesla of the School of Nursing, Chair of the task force and 2008-2009 chair of the UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Budget, Dan Bikle, former chair of the School of Medicine Faculty Council and of the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate, Stanton Glantz of the School of Medicine, member of the original Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion and the Chancellor’s Shared Governance Working Group, former chair of the UCSF Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, former chair of the UC Systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget and originator of the request for this review, and Margaret Walsh of the School of Dentistry and former chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel and 2008-2009 division delegate to the Systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel.

This task force sent a request for information about steps taken to implement the Armitage Report recommendations to the Office of Academic Personnel and the Vice Provost Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel, and the Vice or Associate Deans for Academic

---

1 The Academic Senate Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion was formed in 2002 and issued its report in December of 2003. This report was transmitted by then Academic Senate Chair Len Zegans to the Chancellor’s Shared Governance Working Group in January 2004, and endorsed by the Chancellor on July 25, 2005.
Affairs in each of the four schools. This Request for Information and the responses from these agencies are attached to this report (Attachment 2).

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force finds that the second category of recommendations mentioned above was implemented with reasonable fidelity, but there has been some backsliding to previous practices, and old problems of junior faculty being inappropriately appointed in Adjunct and Clinical series when, based on actual duties, a Senate appointment would be appropriate are re-emerging. The primary evidence for this conclusion is the fact that the proportion of Senate faculty, which transiently increased after the initial implementation of the recommendations of Armitage Report, has fallen to below 50% (Figure 1). As of 2008, only 48.8% of current full time UCSF faculty were appointed in Senate series. The percentage of Adjunct members relative to the full faculty notably began to drop after 2004, and continued to do so in 2005 and 2006 (when the recommendations of the Armitage report to reassess faculty then currently holding these appointments began taking effect throughout the campus). However, the proportion of Adjunct faculty on campus began to rise again in 2007 and 2008. This rise suggests that the practices sought to be remedied by the recommendations of the Armitage Report are returning.

Figure 1: Faculty Composition by Series 2004-2008

Based on the Armitage Report’s estimate that about 40% of faculty in Adjunct and (Health Sciences) Clinical series were doing work indistinguishable from Senate faculty, we would estimate that if all of those faculty were appointed into the Academic Senate series appropriate for their responsibilities, about 70% of UCSF faculty should then hold appointments in Senate series (50% of current Senate faculty plus 40% of the 50% who are non-Senate faculty). While the Task Force was reluctant to set any specific numerical targets for the fraction of faculty that hold Senate rank appointments, it does believe that this calculation can serve as a guide for future policy implementation.

In addition to the findings and recommendations described below, the Task Force notes that there is a need for a renewed commitment to implementing the consensus recommendations of the TRRRP as approved by the Chancellor in 2005.
Improving Faculty Education About the Appointment and Promotion Process

The recommendations directed at ensuring that faculty at all levels were educated about faculty series, appointed into appropriate series and given the right to ask for a reevaluation of their series appointment focused on several actions. (Recommendations A.1-7)

At the time of initial hire, department/division chairs are to explicitly discuss the duties of the position and the duties of faculty series into which new appointees were being hired. This discussion is to be documented in writing via the “Checklist” (Important points for discussion between Department Chairs and ORU Directors and new Faculty Appointees). This practice appears to be widely followed. Both the Office of Academic Personnel (OAP) and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) monitor packets for inclusion of the signed checklist.

The Office of Academic Affairs has produced a detailed search and recruitment toolkit on their website, which is given to all Search committees. Continuing efforts are needed to ensure that search committees are not only aware of these resources but that they also adhere to the guidelines set forth therein.

In Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy, administrative oversight to ensure that new faculty are appointed into the appropriate series is in place. For each new hire, job descriptions are reviewed for match to the series being proposed by Associate Dean or Dean. This level of review is not occurring in the School of Medicine. A similar system of checks and balances is needed in Medicine to ensure that academic series is consistent with the job descriptions that are developed for all new appointments.

The Armitage Report recommended that mentors take an active role in educating faculty about appropriate series. Multiple and repeated workshops conducted by OAP and by Associate Deans in all schools, have been held to support mentors and mentoring facilitators in appropriate knowledge about the varied series requirements. These sessions, which are also a prominent part of the Faculty Information and Welcoming Week program offered annually, have been widely publicized and well attended. Most of these informational sessions are open to faculty at all levels.

The Armitage Report recommended that faculty be made aware that, under existing procedures described in the APM, they may request a career review and a re-review of their academic personnel file at any time. While this information may be included in the informational sessions highlighted above, it is not clear how it is otherwise being systematically communicated to all potentially affected faculty. Two routes to disseminate this information are through the formal mentor program, via communication to the mentoring facilitators, and by highlighting this option in the Annual Call. Faculty in Adjunct and Clinical series should be routinely informed at the time of each review for merit or promotion of the criteria for appointment in the corresponding Senate series and that they have the option to request a formal review of their appointment for appropriate series.

Implementing Policies to Ensure that Faculty are Appointed and Promoted in Appropriate Series

A second set of recommendations from Armitage Report focused on criteria for appointment or advancement. The key recommendation (B1) reads: “The criteria for appointment and advancement in a given series should be determined by an individual faculty member’s actual duties and should be consistent with those described in the APM. Departments should not create additional criteria for appointment and promotion beyond those in the APM, although the department can provide more specific guidelines and details of the appointment expectations to the faculty member.”

It appears that most schools follow the APM guidelines in establishing appointments and in reviewing files for merit and promotion. In the School of Pharmacy additional guidelines have been developed, to clarify the criteria for faculty. These additional guidelines were submitted for review to CAP before being implemented to ensure that they were in alignment with APM guidelines. Requests for information from departments about additional guidelines for advancement have not been completely answered. There are, however, still departments that employ APM guidelines as a floor and invoke additional criteria for
advancement (particularly grant funding) before approving an appointment to a Senate series, merit or promotion.

The rules of the APM should not be considered a floor for advancement criteria, but rather the standard. If documents clarifying the application of the APM in the context of specific schools are developed (as in the case of the School of Pharmacy), these criteria should be reviewed and approved by CAP for compliance with the APM. The Chancellor should direct deans and department chairs to withdraw all supplemental criteria for appointment and promotion and base decisions solely on the standards in the APM.

Variable practices prevail about initially hiring faculty into the appropriate series. In most schools, faculty are hired into the series which fit their career goals and in which they will remain. However, in Medicine, many junior faculty are hired into clinical or adjunct series, funded by NIH K awards (or similar awards from other sources), "to allow them time to differentiate" into research or clinical tracks. Formal searches are only conducted at the point of promotion to Associate level, at which point faculty are appointed into the appropriate series. The number of faculty who have been hired under these conditions is not known, but the practice appears to be normative in some departments. In other departments, faculty are initially hired into the clinical series, and are expected to support portions of their salaries via clinical revenues, until such time as they demonstrate research productivity and can be promoted to another series (In Residence or Clinical X). Hiring practices that purposefully use initial appointments in the Adjunct or Clinical Series as a testing ground for faculty productivity before transferring the faculty member to a series that confers membership in the Academic Senate is inconsistent with the previously agreed upon recommendation that faculty be hired into the series which matches the duties they are to perform. Deans and the Chancellor should see that, with very limited exceptions, this practice should end.

Some exceptions to programmatic-need hiring move research activities forward, support the educational mission of the University beyond the fellowship stage and may increase the candidate’s likelihood of attaining prestigious employment elsewhere. The task force was divided on the extent to which exceptions should be granted to consider junior faculty positions as supporting the educational mission of the University beyond the fellowship stage by appointing individuals as Adjunct Assistant Professors. Some members believed that such appointments were appropriate on a very limited basis and others believed that they were inconsistent with the Armitage Report and the UCSF Strategic Plan. Despite this lack of complete consensus, this task force recommends that such exceptions be governed by written policy. To be consistent with the campus Strategic Plan, such exceptions should be reviewed at the school level to fill needs in specific programmatic areas in accordance with the school and department’s strategic plans for department and faculty growth. Deans should approve such exceptions on a case-by-case basis and based on specific justifications by department chairs.

Armitage Report recommendations (B2-4) addressed career trajectories of new faculty. Regarding whether faculty are hired initially into the series that suits their responsibilities, and in which they will likely remain, there are no hard trend data. (Once promotion files are electronic, transitions into and out of series will be easier to track.) Based on earnings records, in August 2009 322 of 1,922 core faculty were appointed in the Adjunct series. The School of Medicine reported that in the SOM from January 2004 through August 2009 there were 156 instances of faculty who were at one time paid as Adjuncts who were subsequently paid as faculty in another series (Clinical, Clinical X, In Residence or Ladder.) The School of Nursing reports three changes in series since 2004. The School of Pharmacy reports two. According to CAP records, CAP reviewed three changes in series from Adjunct or (Health Sciences) Clinical to Senate series between 2004 and 2008 in the School of Dentistry.

The Committee on Academic Personnel in particular has been acutely attentive to the issue of hiring and promotion into appropriate series. CAP reports that it carefully assesses the appropriateness of the series for new hires, as well as for faculty who are brought forth for review or promotion. CAP recommends a Change of Series as part of its review if the duties documented in faculty member’s CV and academic review packet are not aligned with their current series. CAP provided data that suggests the number of Changes in Series vary by year but are accelerating in number and percentage of the files reviewed (2004-05: 13%; 2005-06: 12%; 2006-07: 14.7%; 2007-08: 14.6%; and 2008-09: 20.2%). CAP should
continue to be vigilant in monitoring this issue, particularly for all new appointments, and continue to suggest changes in series for initial appointments when appropriate.

Systematic Review of Existing Faculty in Adjunct and Clinical Appointments

The third major Armitage Report recommendation was for a systematic review of existing faculty in the adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical series, to determine the appropriateness of these series appointments. This review appears to have been largely accomplished, and the task force applauds the exceptional work of the Office of Academic Personnel and CAP in addressing this concern.

ISSUES RELATED TO FACULTY GROWTH

The recommendations of the Armitage Report did not expressly address concerns regarding faculty growth as a separate issue, but was concerned with inappropriate growth within certain series. This task force, however, was also charged to review trends in faculty growth both in light of the recommendations of the Armitage Report and in light of the Strategic Plan. It appears that (1) faculty growth has occurred, and (2) it seems to be doing so regardless of programmatic goals or the Armitage Report.

Based on the numbers reported by the Office of Academic Personnel, the faculty grew from 1,840 members in 2001 to 2,051 members in 2004, an increase of 11.5% for that period, or an average annual rate of growth 2.86%. During the four year period after the issuance of the Armitage report, the faculty grew from 2,051 members in 2004 to 2,336 members in 2008, a rate of faculty growth of 13.9%, or average annual rate of growth 2.78%. While the total number of faculty decreased in 2006 (to 2,107 members), the growth in faculty numbers resumed in 2007. The composition of the faculty for these years by series is presented in Figure 2, and Tables 1, 2 and 3.

Figure 2: Total Numbers of Faculty 2001-2008

While the number of Clinical X faculty grew by 89 persons during 2004-2008, the Clinical X series has the fewest number of appointees (currently only 288) and the relatively small population of Clinical X faculty gives rise to a somewhat misleading average annual growth rate of 8.94% for this period. Setting aside the Clinical X figures, the greatest growth occurred in the non-Academic Senate Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical series, which grew by 3.06% and 3.04% respectively from 2004-2008. Appointments to the Ladder Rank and In Residence series have remained relatively stable over this time period, expanding at 0.59% and 1.22%, respectively.
Table 1: Faculty Numbers by Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ladder Rank</th>
<th>In Residence</th>
<th>Clinical X</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>HS Clinical</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>2051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>2137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>2107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>2217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>2336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Faculty Growth Rates, Annual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ladder Rank</th>
<th>In Residence</th>
<th>Clinical X</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>HS Clinical</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-1.08%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>-4.44%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>17.06%</td>
<td>9.63%</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-0.81%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>10.55%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>-1.93%</td>
<td>-7.45%</td>
<td>-1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-1.29%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>7.49%</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Data sets prior to 2001 were unavailable.)

Table 3: Average Annual Faculty Growth Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Rank</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Residence</td>
<td>3.93%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical X</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
<td>8.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Clinical</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall rate of faculty growth has not significantly decreased since the Armitage Report, and the current rate of faculty growth is not sustainable without parallel strategic growth of faculty support infrastructure. The strain on campus resources is seen in obvious ways such as access to parking, childcare facilities, and teaching, laboratory and clinical space. This level of unfocused faculty growth has put an enormous strain on administrative resources such as human resources, facilities, contracts, grants, advancement processing by Academic Affairs, academic review by CAP and department-level administration. These stresses have a campus-wide impact, and opportunistic hiring practices in one department can negatively stress other departments and even the entire system.

As part of the UCSF Strategic Plan, Point Six of the Strategic Direction (page 13) is Promoting a Supportive Work Environment. The vision here stated is to “Provide a supportive and effective work environment to attract and retain the best people and position UCSF for the future.” The first goal to achieve this vision is to “Recruit, mentor and retain the highest-caliber faculty, staff, students, residents, fellows and postdoctoral scholars.” These statements support the practice of planned recruitment and appointment over opportunity hiring (i.e., offering Adjunct appointments to any fellow who can win a K award). It also argues against the practice of creating Adjunct positions on an ad hoc basis, or granting Adjunct appointments to several candidates and then waiting to see who ultimately “makes the grade.” The Task Force would like to reiterate the Armitage Report recommendation that “Hiring people into the wrong series for purely financial reasons is an unacceptable administrative practice.”

While the inappropriate use of the Adjunct series has weakened the faculty’s position in shared governance, so has the overall unrestrained and non-strategic rise in the faculty numbers. While the San Francisco Division values its Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Faculty, they are not members of the Academic Senate. As stated earlier, the level of faculty with Senate appointments has been hovering at
or below 50% of the total faculty since 2004. Also, as noted above, based on actual duties one would expect the fraction of the faculty with Senate appointments to be around 70%.

**Regarding faculty growth, the task force recommends:**

1. Unrestrained growth stresses every part of the system at UCSF and must be checked by clear and enforceable policies.

2. New faculty appointments and faculty growth should, with few exceptions, be in direct response to programmatic needs.

3. Checks and balances on growth should happen at the level of the deans, and any growth should have a clear strategic purpose, rather than simply adding promising postdoctoral fellows to the faculty because they can secure extramural funding.

Finally, the task force recommends that APB take an active role in monitoring faculty growth in the various series. When promotion records are electronic, an annual review of numbers of faculty in the various series, changes in series and new hires should be monitored.
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BACKGROUND

In 2000 the Academic Senate Task Force on the Future of Clinician Scientists reported on factors that influence the success rate of clinician scientists and proposed recommendations to enhance the success of these faculty members. In 2002 the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion (TFRRP) was created in order to continue studying these and other faculty issues. The Task Force on the Future of Clinician Scientists conducted a survey that included questions regarding research support, mentoring, promotion, and balancing research, patient care and teaching loads. In addition to the survey, over 80 faculty members participated in focus groups and offered personal experiences and suggestions on how to enhance their success as clinician scientists. These groups were encouraged to discuss issues of concern with respect to their careers as clinician scientists. A number of themes identified from the questionnaire served as a starting point for these discussions. When asked to provide a preferred balance of responsibilities between research, teaching, patient care, administration and public service, 94% of respondents indicated a desire to have more research time, indicating that increasing clinical responsibilities was the biggest barrier to achieving this balance. Respondents also noted that they did not receive any mentoring or the mentoring was insufficient to assist them in career development.

The 2000 survey also identified a general concern about the shift in the nature of appointments in the UCSF faculty away from Senate appointments (Ladder Rank, In-Residence, and Clinical X) to non-Senate appointments (Clinical and Adjunct). In 2000 faculty in the Senate series represented a minority of UCSF salaried faculty. This trend appeared most notably at the assistant professor level. This trend poses a challenge for the University because fewer faculty voices are heard in the University if only a small percentage of faculty are Senate members and can participate in shared governance. With fewer faculty available for Senate committee participation, the minority of faculty end up speaking for the majority, especially since Clinical and Adjunct faculty are not generally granted the same privileges by the Regents and generally cannot participate in the decision-making process or committee structure within the Senate. For UCSF this shift is particularly significant, since the faculty who provide the majority of teaching and clinical service are excluded from participating in many levels of shared governance. In addition, there was concern that non-Senate appointments could put individual faculty at long-term disadvantage in terms of career development.

It should be noted that the TFRRP believes that shift in appointments away from tenure-track (Ladder Rank) appointments is primarily based on two facts: until FY 2002-03, UCSF had not received any additional FTE lines for over 30 years yet UCSF faculty continued to grow during that time, in large part to meet the increasing teaching and clinical responsibilities. As a consequence, all faculty growth at UCSF has, of necessity, been in the In-Residence, Clinical X, Clinical, or Adjunct faculty series. This makes it an arithmetic certainty that the tenure-track series will continue decreasing in proportion to those other series, as long as the UCSF faculty continues to grow. Therefore, a major concern of the TFRRP was the decreasing proportion of faculty with appointments in two of the three Academic Senate-membership series (i.e., In-Residence and Clinical X).

The five series have in many respects served UCSF very well. Although many of the faculty, particularly those who have clinical responsibilities, have similar professional expectations, the allocation of the responsibilities varies from one series to another. The different series, when used correctly, allow the faculty member the opportunity to define the appropriate distribution of responsibilities according to interests, skills, departmental expectations and funding alternatives. Operationally, except for eligibility for tenure, the Ladder Rank and In-Residence series are considered identical with regard to the types of duties performed and the criteria for advancement.
Faculty in the different series are paid based on the same salary scale and the allocation of responsibilities represents a horizontal array of different, but equally important tasks.

The Task Force on the Future of Clinician Scientists identified methods to increase the proportion of faculty with appointments in Senate-membership series based on the fact that a substantial number of faculty currently holding Adjunct or Clinical appointments are doing work indistinguishable in its nature and quality from faculty holding Senate appointments. At the same time the this task force regarded as critically important the need to ensure that any changes not inadvertently denigrate the Adjunct or Clinical series for those faculty whose duties are appropriate for those series. The Clinical and Adjunct series are absolutely essential at UCSF, and faculty holding appointments in them should not to be made to feel like second-class citizens.

In October 2001 the Shared Governance Working Group, composed of the five Deans and Academic Senate leadership initiated a joint task force, the TFRRP, to further examine the reasons for the increasing numbers of new Clinical and Adjunct faculty as related to the relative lack of new In-Residence, Ladder Rank, and Clinical X faculty; the increased pressures of faculty in clinical departments to generate clinical income, thereby allowing less time and fewer resources to develop research programs; and the ambiguity of the hiring and promotion processes leading to discordance between faculty expectations and expectations of the department chairs. In particular, the working group sought to create a process by which policy decisions can be made to address these concerns.

The Task Force on the Future of Clinician Scientists had made specific recommendations and using these as starting points, Daniel Bikle, Chair of the Divisional Academic Senate from 2001 to 2003, in collaboration with the Deans, initiated the TFRRP. The TFRRP was composed of one senior Academic Senate member from each school, each associate/vice dean for academic affairs from the four schools, and Diane Dillon, Director, Academic Personnel in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Chair Bikle and the Deans charged the TFRRP to:

- Examine the causes for the trend toward the recruitment of higher numbers of non-Senate faculty (Clinical, Adjunct) but lower numbers of Senate faculty (especially Ladder Rank and In-Residence.)
- Clarify the criteria for recruitment and promotion within the newly expanded Clinical X series.
- Develop policies to ensure that faculty are hired and promoted within the appropriate series and with full understanding of the expectations associated with their career paths.
- Identify ways to maximize availability of existing resources, encourage their use, and expand them where possible to optimize the creative activities of all faculty.

The TFRRP did not address the issue of clarification of “…the criteria for recruitment and promotion within the newly expanded Clinical X series” since the UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and other groups within the Academic Senate, as well as the administration, are well along in developing and implementing these criteria. The lifting of the ceiling on appointments into the Clinical X series at UCSF in 2000 has increased the number of faculty appointed into or changed to this series, which, in turn, increases the number of faculty who can participate in shared governance.

**METHODOLOGY**

The TFRRP initially developed two surveys to gather data on the possible causes for the increasing percentage of faculty in non-Senate series.
A paper questionnaire for department chairs (Appendix 1) sought to identify the departmental trends in hiring practices. Of the 36 chairs who received a survey, 33 responded. Initially organized research unit (ORU) chairs were also asked to participate in the survey, but because hiring authority rests in departments and not ORUs, these responses were not included in the report.

A second survey (Appendix 2) entailed telephone surveys with a case group of 100 Assistant Clinical and Adjunct professors and a control group of 25 Assistant Ladder Rank and In-Residence professors (Appendix 3). The questionnaire was designed using Academic Personnel Manual (APM) criteria for promotion in the Ladder Rank and In-Residence series.

In addition, a Faculty Publication Study was conducted. In this study the publication records of a random sample of 25 Assistant Clinical and Adjunct professors who participated in the telephone survey were examined to determine the nature and quality of their publications, as well as to determine whether these faculty tended to have independent research programs or simply play supporting roles.

In addition to the above surveys, the TFRRP discussed common hiring practices and procedures utilized by departments in each of the four schools. The collective experience of the associate/vice deans for academic affairs of each of the four schools and the Director of Academic Personnel, who are members of the TFRRP, served as an important source of information in this area. Findings and recommendations of the “Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on the Climate of Faculty” (Ruth Greenblatt and William Margaretten, Co-chairs) and the “Report of the Academic Senate Mentoring Task Force” (Mary Croughan and Dorothy Bainton, Co-chairs) were also reviewed and discussed.

**KEY FINDINGS OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS SURVEY**

Asked whether they appointed faculty to the Adjunct or Clinical series, even if he/she qualified for Ladder Rank, In-Residence, and Clinical X series (without the restrictions on the number of Clinical X appointments), department chairs responded that they had implemented such hiring practices 33%, 24%, and 24% of the time respectively.

Factors which always or often affected appointment decisions included (in decreasing order of frequency): funding issues/lack of FTE, space issues, concern that the individual would not meet promotion criteria, the need for extensive clinical work from the individual, and the need for extensive teaching work. Of major significance to hiring practices for the In-Residence series were potential financial liability issues when individuals reached the rank of Associate Professor In-Residence. At the departmental level, hiring decisions are often made on the basis of available funds. Choices about what series a person is hired into is influenced by what resources are available and what level of financial liability or commitment by the department might be involved.

Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 present the complete results of this survey.

**KEY FINDINGS OF FACULTY TELEPHONE SURVEY**

A telephone survey was administered by the staff of the Academic Senate Office to a stratified random sample of 100 Assistant Clinical and Adjunct professors with salaried appointments and a simple
random sample of 25 Assistant In-Residence and Assistant Ladder Rank faculty. The principal findings of this survey were:

- About 40% of the UCSF junior faculty in the Clinical and Adjunct series are engaged in the same types of activities expected of people appointed in either the In-Residence or Clinical X series. Individuals in this group of faculty conduct research and publish their findings in peer-reviewed journals; do a considerable amount of teaching and participate in the full range of service activities (e.g., committee service, patient care).
- The distribution of effort between teaching, research, clinical activities, and university and public service is not significantly different between Adjunct and In-Residence/Ladder Rank faculty.
- Clinical faculty spend more time in teaching and clinical service and less time in research than Adjunct and In-Residence/Ladder Rank faculty.
- More than half the Adjunct faculty and about one quarter of Clinical faculty appear to meet the criteria for In-Residence (or Ladder Rank) faculty appointments using the APM criteria (teaching, active research program and publication, University and public service.) These faculty are primarily in the Schools of Dentistry and Medicine.
- Only about half the Clinical and Adjunct faculty who appear to meet the APM criteria for In-Residence appointments anticipate a change in series.
- Many junior faculty in the Clinical and Adjunct series do not have a clear understanding of the different types of faculty series at UCSF. Importantly, the administration often does not make it clear to people appointed in the Clinical and Adjunct series what the expected duties are for these series.

Faculty who participated in the telephone surveys also offered open-ended comments on the following areas:

- Difficulties of changing series
- Disadvantages of the Adjunct series
- Lack of compensation and recognition for teaching service
- Lack of security of employment in the Clinical and Adjunct series
- Lack of clear promotion criteria information and lack of communication of these criteria
- Lack of financial support from University
- Lack of protected time for research activities
- Shortage of adequate mentoring and faculty development opportunities
- Perception that junior faculty carry higher load than senior faculty
- Perception that female faculty are at a disadvantage, especially junior faculty
- Lack of laboratory space and office space
- Perception that the University prefers to recruit external candidates
- Quality of life and difficulty balancing family needs and career goals
- Difficulty balancing basic research activities and clinical duties
- Satisfaction with career and University environment

Appendix 6 and Appendix 7 present the complete results of this survey.

**KEY FINDINGS OF FACULTY PUBLICATION STUDY**

- About 44% (7 out of 16) of Assistant Adjunct professors publish in high-quality journals as first authors, second authors, or senior authors.
• Assistant Clinical professors also produce similar data with 44% (4 out of 9) using the same criteria.

Appendix 8 presents the complete results of this study.

**KEY FINDINGS REGARDING PROBLEMS WITH CURRENT HIRING PRACTICES**

• There is often a mismatch between the needs and expectations of the Department and those of junior faculty appointed in the Clinical and Adjunct series. For example, a Department may need someone to primarily perform patient care and clinical teaching. In some cases a qualified clinician/teacher, although hired in the Clinical series to meet departmental needs, is also interested in a broader academic career and therefore performs research or other creative activities normally expected of those with In-Residence or Clinical X series.

• Some departments appoint junior faculty in the Adjunct or Clinical series with the intent to change the appointment to an In-Residence or Clinical X series only if the individual develops a strong research, teaching, and service portfolio. For example, one department in the School of Medicine routinely places new appointees in the Adjunct or Clinical series and will only consider changing the appointment to the In-Residence series when the individual obtains a research grant from the National Institutes of Health (or “equivalent” funding agency).

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

A major component of the TFRRP’s charge was to make recommendations in response the following question:

**What mechanisms can be put in place to support more willingness on the part of the individual Department Chairs/Schools to hire and promote faculty in a series that confers Academic Senate membership (i.e., In-Residence and Clinical X)?**

The TFRRP acknowledged that several mechanisms already exist that help in the attempt to reach the goal of hiring and promoting faculty in the appropriate series. These include: 1) faculty participation in departmental search and personnel review process, 2) written and verbal communications from department chairs with prospective new faculty about employment and existing faculty about advancement, 3) oversight by the associate/vice dean for academic affairs of each school, and 4) oversight by CAP.

Despite these mechanisms, it is quite clear that a sizable percentage faculty appointed in the Clinical and Adjunct series is doing the types of work expected of those in the In-Residence or Clinical-X series. This mismatch between actual duties and appointment series needs to be addressed in a systematic way.

In addition, many individuals appointed in the Adjunct or Clinical series do not have an adequate understanding of the different faculty series at UCSF.

The TFRRP recommendations are in the following four areas: A) Implementation of a multifaceted educational program, B) Establishment of general guidelines for new appointments, C) Systematic review of existing faculty in the Clinical and Adjunct series, and D) Identification by the campus
Administration of ways to minimize the financial liability issues of hiring people in the In-Residence series.

**A. Implementation of a Multifaceted Educational Program**

The TFRRP believes that the best way to deal with the low awareness of faculty regarding the types of faculty series at UCSF is through a multifaceted educational effort. There is a considerable need to increase the awareness of new and existing faculty on available career paths at UCSF. This awareness program should occur at all possible levels.

1. Existing faculty who participate in the search and review process of colleagues should be given sufficient information about the expectations for each series so that they understand the appropriate series for appointment or advancement for each faculty member being evaluated. They should also be educated about the responsibility to identify situations where faculty are being recruited into an incorrect or inappropriate series. If a perceived problem exists, it is the responsibility of the reviewing faculty to document and report their concerns to the relevant department chair and associate/vice dean for academic affairs. This responsibility also should be in effect during the departmental merit and promotion reviews of their colleagues.

2. Department chairs, in their Departmental discussions with new and existing faculty, need to increase their efforts at communicating the differences between the various faculty series at UCSF, the expectations for advancement in each series and the appropriate alternatives for each faculty member. It should be the responsibility of the chair to document that these discussions have taken place. Such documentation needs to be in the personnel files of new and existing faculty.

3. At the time of initial hire, information about the precise nature of the series should be put in writing. A written description of the expectations and duties of individuals in that series should be provided to the new faculty member. Use of the recently implemented CAP “Important Points for Discussion Between Department Chairs/ORU Directors And New Faculty Appointees” (“Checklist”) that appears in the annual call should help in this regard (Appendix 9).

4. The associate/vice deans for academic affairs should intensify their efforts at identifying and correcting situations where people are clearly being considered for appointment in the wrong series. This also applies to existing faculty who are being proposed for merits or promotions.

5. CAP should intensify its efforts at identifying situations where people are clearly being considered for employment or advancement in the wrong series. The recently approved, and now utilized, appointment “Checklist” required by CAP should be a useful tool for establishing general guidelines for new appointments. In cases of a mismatch between an individual and their faculty series, CAP needs to strongly make recommendations for initial appointment in the appropriate series.

6. As part of the formal faculty mentoring program, mentors need to incorporate into their overall advisory program information on the different series available at UCSF. An attempt should be made to ensure that mentored faculty have a working knowledge of the different series and how this knowledge applies to them. The goal, of course, is to minimize situations where faculty find themselves in the inappropriate series.

7. All faculty need to be made aware that, under existing procedures described in the APM, they may request a career review and a re-review of their academic personnel file at any time. This includes situations where the faculty member believes that he/she may be in the wrong series.
B. Establishment of General Guidelines for New Appointments

1. The criteria for appointment and advancement in a given series should be determined by an individual faculty member’s actual duties and should be consistent with those described in the APM. Departments should not create additional criteria for appointment and promotion beyond those in the APM, although the department can provide more specific guidelines and details of the appointment expectations to the faculty member.

2. When new faculty are hired, particularly at the junior level, they should be appointed in the series that best fits their anticipated duties over the long run. These duties and the faculty series into which they are appointed should be consistent with those described in the APM.

3. When new faculty are hired, particularly at the junior level, they should be appointed in a series where it is anticipated that they have a reasonable chance of fulfilling the criteria for advancement as described in the APM. People should be hired directly into the series that one expects them to stay in throughout a successful academic career. Changes in series should be the exception rather than the rule, although as career goals change, it might be appropriate for a faculty member to consider a change in series to align the professional goals with the series. The practice of appointing faculty in a non-Senate series with the expectation that they will be transferred to a Senate series when specific criteria (such as obtaining an NIH grant) should be ended.

4. When new faculty are hired, all attempts should be made to place them in the faculty series that best fits their career goals. If an individual is expecting to pursue an academic career involving teaching, research/creative activity, and the full range of service – they should be placed in an appropriate Senate faculty series that is consistent with their career goals.

5. In approving new appointments, CAP should pay special attention to the proposed duties of the new appointee and, if it appears that someone is being appointed in the wrong series, bring this to the attention of the appropriate associate/vice dean for academic affairs before acting on the file.

C. Systematic Review of Existing Faculty in the Adjunct or Clinical Series

Since a significant percentage (estimated by the TFRRP to be approximately 40%) of existing junior faculty in the Clinical and Adjunct series appear to be doing the types of work expected of those in the In-Residence or Clinical X series, the TFRRP recommends that a systematic review be conducted to identify people who might be in an inappropriate series. An attempt should be made to move people into the series that best fits their actual duties and records of academic achievement. This will take time, perhaps as long as three years. Responsibility for these reviews should rest with the associate/vice deans for academic affairs in the four schools, with oversight by the Academic Senate through CAP.

1. At the time of review for merits and promotions of all existing faculty who hold Adjunct or Clinical titles, there should be a review of actual duties. If individual faculty are satisfactorily performing all of the duties expected of a Senate member, they should be transferred into the appropriate Senate series. The associate/vice deans for academic affairs should instruct the departments to consider these issues when preparing merit and promotion packets.

2. CAP should consider these issues when reviewing packets for those faculty it reviews and bring to the attention of the appropriate associate/vice dean for academic affairs through the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs cases of those individuals who should be considered for movement into a Senate series.
3. The associate/vice deans for academic affairs should provide an annual report to CAP on the number of Clinical and Adjunct faculty reviewed each year and the number who are moved into an appropriate Senate series.

4. There should be a blanket waiver of national searches of all series changes of those individuals who are UCSF faculty as of the date that these recommendations are implemented through the time it takes to review all eligible faculty. This waiver should not apply to new appointments.

D. Identification by Campus Administration of Ways to Minimize the Financial Liability of Hiring People into the In-Residence Series

The TFRRP recognizes that in these times of severe financial constraints that identification of resources to guarantee limited (i.e., 1 year) support for In-Residence faculty when they have reached the Associate Professor level is particularly difficult. Department chairs are often reluctant to take the possible financial risk associated with hiring In-Residence faculty. Nevertheless, hiring people in the wrong series purely for financial reasons is an unacceptable administrative practice.

1. In budgetary negotiations between the Chancellor, Deans of the four Schools, and department chairs, funds should be designated to guarantee the limited support currently mandated for In-Residence faculty. Administrators must find ways to financially accommodate the growth of academic units, while at the same time taking into account the well-being and future careers of the faculty who are hired, rather than shifting all the financial risk on to the junior faculty as a de facto condition of offering them a UCSF faculty position.

2. Department chairs, in particular, should be held accountable for the practice of hiring people in the Adjunct or Clinical series purely for financial reasons when the positions being filled more appropriately calls for an In-Residence appointment. This issue should be part of the stewardship review of department chairs and other administrators.

3. This report should be transmitted to the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Budget (APB) to inform the committee of the problem of hiring faculty, strictly for financial reasons, in the Adjunct or Clinical series when the positions being filled call for In-Residence appointments. APB should take an active role in monitoring and discouraging this practice when they advise the Administration on budgetary matters.
APPENDIX 1. SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

INITIAL APPOINTMENT

Have you ever had occasion to appoint an individual to the Adjunct or Clinical series, even if he or she qualified for the Ladder Rank series?

Yes

No (If No, proceed to Question 4)

How often did the following factors affect this appointment decision? Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding issues/Lack of FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that individual would not meet Ladder Rank promotion criteria and would fail to be promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that Ladder Rank series maintains lax promotion criteria (i.e., unwarranted promotion might be granted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support available to individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive clinical work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive teaching work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive administrative work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for national search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from faculty for new appointments to this series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any other factors or issues affecting your appointment decisions for Ladder Rank series.

Have you ever had occasion to appoint an individual to the Adjunct or Clinical series, even if he or she qualified for the In-Residence series?

Yes

No (If No, proceed to Question 8)
How often did the following factors affect this appointment decision? Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding issues/Lack of FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding issues/Financial liability related to In-Residence series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that individual would not meet In-Residence series promotion criteria and would fail to be promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that In-Residence series maintains lax promotion criteria (i.e., unwarranted promotion might be granted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support available to individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive clinical work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive teaching work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive administrative work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for national search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from faculty for new appointments to this series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any specific funding issues and how often they affect your appointment decisions for In-Residence series.

List any other factors or issues affecting your appointment decisions for In-Residence series.

Did you ever have occasion to appoint an individual to the Adjunct or Clinical series, even if he or she qualified for the Clinical X series when there was a ceiling of Clinical X appointments?

  Yes
  No (If No, proceed to Question 11)
How often did the following factors affect this appointment decision? Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that individual would not meet Clinical X series promotion criteria and would fail to be promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that Clinical X series maintains lax promotion criteria (i.e., unwarranted promotion might be granted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support available to individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive clinical work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive teaching work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive administrative work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for national search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from faculty for new appointments to this series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any other factors or issues affecting your appointment decisions for Clinical X series.

Do you have occasion to appoint an individual to the Adjunct or Clinical series, even if he or she qualified for the Clinical X series since the ceiling has been lifted? (If No, proceed to Question 14)

Yes
No
How often do the following factors affect this appointment decision? Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that individual would not meet Clinical X series promotion criteria and would fail to be promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that Clinical X series maintains lax promotion criteria (i.e., unwarranted promotion might be granted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support available to individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive clinical work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive teaching work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive administrative work from individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for national search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from faculty for new appointments to this series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any other factors or issues affecting your appointment decisions for Clinical X series.

**RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION**

In general please describe issues that hinder the recruitment/retention of excellent faculty in your department or ORU.

In your opinion, please describe the factors that you believe facilitate recruitment/retention of excellent faculty in your department or ORU.

Please add any additional comments that you think would be helpful to the task force.
APPENDIX 2. TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR 100 ASSISTANT CLINICAL AND ADJUNCT FACULTY

1a. Do you think that you are in the correct faculty series (i.e., Adjunct or Clinical as opposed to Clinical X, In-Residence or Ladder Rank)?
1b. If not, what series would you prefer?
1c. What do you see as the barriers to being appointed to that series?
2a. Have you changed series since you began at UCSF?
2b. If yes, what was the change?
3a. Do you anticipate a change in series in the future?
3b. If yes, to what series?
3c. Under what conditions?
4a. What percentage of your time do you participate in didactic and laboratory teaching (including preparation)?
4b. What types of courses are these? (e.g., lecture, seminar, web-based, lab)
5. What percentage of your time do you participate in clinical teaching?
6. What percentage of your time do you participate in clinical service activities?
7. What percentage of your time do you spend mentoring students, residents, fellows, doctoral candidates and/or post-docs?
8. What percentage of your time is devoted to research?
9. What percentage of your time is devoted to other creative or scholarly activity outside of research and teaching? (e.g., widespread dissemination of syllabi, book or book chapter publishing, etc.)
10. What percentage of your time do you engage in University and public service? (e.g. mentoring of other faculty members, formal administrative duties, such Senate or other UC committee service, etc.)
11a. What percentage do you spend in other activities not listed above?
11b. What are these activities?
12a. Would you like to spend more time teaching?
12b. If yes, what are the impediments to doing so?
13. What is the general nature of your research?
14. What do you characterize as your creative or scholarly activity?
15a. Do you publish the results of your research or creative activity?
15b. What kind of publications?
15c. About how many per year?
16a. Have you received intramural or extramural funds to support your research or creative activity?
16b. If so, from what agencies?
17a. Would you like to spend more time doing research and creative activity?
17b. If yes, what are the impediments to doing so?
18. What organizations do you hold a leadership role?
19. Do you receive clinical referrals from local, national and/or international sources?
20a. Have you been invited to present on the topic of your specialty to local, national, or international audiences?
20b. If so, how many times in the last two years?
21a. Do you participate in the review of manuscripts or grant applications?
21b. If so, for which journal and/or agency?
22. Would you be interested in serving on university committees?
23. How would you rate your knowledge of the series structure at UCSF? (no knowledge, poor, fair, good, excellent)
24. Did you receive an employment letter at the time of your appointment which listed your job duties, promotion criteria, protected time, etc?
25. Do you have any further comments?
APPENDIX 3. TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR 25 ASSISTANT LADDER RANK AND IN-RESIDENCE FACULTY

1a. Have you changed series since you began at UCSF?
1b. If yes, what was the change?
2a. What percentage of your time do you participate in didactic and laboratory teaching (including preparation)?
2b. What types of courses are these? (e.g., lecture, seminar, web-based, lab)
3. What percentage of your time do you participate in clinical teaching?
4. What percentage of your time do you participate in clinical service activities?
5. What percentage of your time do you spend mentoring students, residents, fellows, doctoral candidates and/or post-docs?
6. What percentage of your time is devoted to research?
7. What percentage of your time is devoted to other creative or scholarly activity outside of research and teaching? (e.g., widespread dissemination of syllabi, book or book chapter publishing, etc.)
8. What percentage of your time do you engage in University and public service? (e.g., mentoring of other faculty members, formal administrative duties, Senate or other UC committee service, etc.)
9a. What percentage do you spend in other activities not listed above?
9b. What are these activities?
10. Would you like to spend more time teaching?
11. What do you characterize as your creative or scholarly activity?
12a. Do you publish the results of your research or creative activity?
12b. What kind of publications?
12c. About how many per year?
13a. Have you received intramural or extramural funds to support your research or creative activity?
13b. If so, from what agencies?
14. Would you like to spend more time doing research and creative activity?
15. What organizations do you hold a leadership role?
16. Do you receive clinical referrals from local, national and/or international sources?
17a. Have you been invited to present on the topic of your specialty to local, national, or international audiences?
17b. If so, how many times in the last two years?
18a. Do you participate in the review of manuscripts or grant applications?
18b. If so, for which journal and/or agency?
19. Would you be interested in serving on university committees?
20. How would you rate your knowledge of the series structure at UCSF? (no knowledge, poor, fair, good, excellent)
21. Did you receive an employment letter at the time of your appointment which listed your job duties, promotion criteria, protected time, etc?
22. Do you have any further comments?
## APPENDIX 4. RESULTS OF SURVEY FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS PART A – OCCURRENCES OF APPOINTMENTS TO CLINICAL AND ADJUNCT SERIES EVEN IF FACULTY QUALIFIED FOR OTHER SERIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Appointed faculty to Adjunct or Clinical even if he/she qualified for Series</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ladder Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed faculty to Adjunct or Clinical even if he/she qualified for Ladder Rank</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed faculty to Adjunct or Clinical even if he/she qualified for In-Residence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical X with Ceiling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed faculty to Adjunct or Clinical even if he/she qualified for Clinical X (with ceiling)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical X without Ceiling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed faculty to Adjunct or Clinical even if he/she qualified for Clinical X series (without ceiling)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total appointments even if faculty qualified for Ladder Rank, In-Residence, Clinical X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>28%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1. OCCURRENCES OF APPOINTMENTS TO CLINICAL AND ADJUNCT SERIES EVEN IF FACULTY QUALIFIED FOR OTHER SERIES
APPENDIX 5. RESULTS OF SURVEY FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS PART B - FACTORS THAT AFFECT APPOINTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding issues/Lack of FTE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding issues/Financial liability related to In-Residence series</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that individual would not meet promotion criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that In-Residence maintains lax promotion criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive clinical work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive teaching work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extensive administrative work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from Dean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for national search</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from faculty for new appointments to this series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 2. FACTORS THAT ALWAYS AND OFTEN AFFECTED APPOINTMENTS

- Need for extensive administrative work
- Funding issues/Lack of FTE
- Concern that individual would not meet promotion criteria
- Need for extensive clinical work
- Space issues
- Need for extensive teaching work
- Funding issues/Financial liability related to In-Residence series
- Lack of administrative support
- Lack of support from Dean
- Requirement for national search
- Need for extensive administrative work
- Funding issues/Lack of FTE
- Concern that individual would not meet promotion criteria
- Need for extensive clinical work
- Space issues
- Need for extensive teaching work
- Funding issues/Financial liability related to In-Residence series
- Lack of administrative support
- Lack of support from Dean
- Requirement for national search
APPENDIX 6. RESULTS OF TELEPHONE SURVEY FOR ASSISTANT LADDER RANK, IN-RESIDENCE, CLINICAL, AND ADJUNCT PROFESSORS

A telephone survey was administered by the staff of the Academic Senate Office to a stratified random sample (stratified on school) of 100 Assistant Clinical and Adjunct professors with salaried appointments and a simple random sample of 25 In-Residence or Ladder Rank faculty. Faculty in the Clinical X series were not selected to participate in the survey due to the recent increase of faculty members moved into this series.

Comparisons between schools and series were done by one way analysis of variance or chi-square analysis of contingency tables, as appropriate. For interval variables (percent efforts), comparisons were made between series and schools with a general linear model implementation of a two way analysis of variance. P<.05 was considered significant.

Because of the large number of faculty appointed in Clinical and Adjunct series in the Department of Medicine, these series were broken out from the rest of the School of Medicine for purposes of the analysis.

- About 40% of Clinical and Adjunct faculty are engaged in the full range of activities expected of In-Residence (or Ladder Rank) Senate members.
- The distribution of effort between teaching, research, clinical activities, and university and public service is not significantly different between Adjunct and In Residence/Ladder Rank faculty.
- Clinical faculty spend more time in teaching and clinical service and less time in research than Adjunct and In-Residence/Ladder Rank faculty.
- More than half the Adjunct faculty and about one quarter of Clinical faculty appear to meet the criteria for In-Residence (or Ladder Rank) faculty appointments using the APM criteria (teaching, active research program and publication, University and public service.) These faculty are primarily in the Schools of Dentistry and Medicine.
- Only about half the Clinical and Adjunct faculty who appear to meet the APM criteria for In-Residence appointments anticipate a change in series.

Findings Related to Clinical and Adjunct Faculty:

- The School of Medicine and specifically the Department of Medicine use Adjunct appointments whereas the other schools tend to use Clinical appointments.
- Except for the Department of Medicine, where the faculty do less didactic teaching and total teaching than the others, there are not significant differences between the schools in activities amongst the Clinical and Adjunct faculty. Even in the Department of Medicine, however, Clinical and Adjunct faculty spend considerable effort on teaching.
- There are the expected differences between Clinical and Adjunct faculty. Clinical faculty are more involved in clinical activities and clinical teaching than Adjunct faculty, who spend more time in research. These differences in the balance of effort between clinical work and research between Clinical and Adjunct faculty are different from school to school (significant school x series interaction).

1 80 of the 100 Clinical or Adjunct faculty identified themselves as full time; the remaining 20 were more than 50%. (Based on answers, there may have been some confusion in answering the question. Our intent was to survey only full time faculty.) In-Residence and Ladder faculty were not asked about full or part time employment.
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• The primary barrier to teaching for Adjunct faculty is that it was found to not be part of the job and that there was insufficient funding to cover teaching time. Most Adjunct faculty surveyed would like to do more teaching.
• Research, clinical service, and other duties are not substantial barriers to teaching for both series.
• Lack of protected time and teaching are a barrier to research among Clinical faculty.
• Both Clinical and Adjunct faculty members are being recognized outside UCSF by being invited to review manuscripts and grants, speak at national and international meetings and (for Clinical faculty) receiving referrals from outside the region.
• Virtually all the Adjunct faculty and a majority of Clinical faculty publish in peer reviewed journals.
• The vast majority of Adjunct faculty have attracted extramural funding for their research. Nearly half of the Clinical faculty have, as well.
• Seventy-five percent of Clinical faculty and about 40% of Adjunct faculty would like more research time.
• Strong majorities of Clinical and Adjunct faculty are interested in serving on UC committees; 25% of Clinical faculty are already involved in committee service.
• About half the Assistant Adjunct professors believe that they are in the wrong series and anticipate a change to Ladder Rank or (mostly) In-Residence.
• About half the Assistant Clinical professors anticipate a change in series to Ladder Rank or (mostly) Clinical X.
• Faculty in the School of Nursing are less likely to expect a change in series than the other schools.
• There is not a clear pattern in the perceived barriers to be in the desired series for either group of faculty.
• Knowledge of the differences between series is low; only 38% of Clinical and Adjunct faculty said they had good or excellent knowledge of the differences. (52% of In-Residence/Ladder Rank faculty said they had good or excellent knowledge of the differences.)
• Less than half these faculty received an employment letter, with the School of Dentistry substantially below the other schools (56% of In-Residence/Ladder Rank faculty received an employment letter).

### Faculty Distribution Listed by School and Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 P<0.05
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### Gender Distribution Listed by Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distribution of Activities Among Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Listed by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Didactic Teaching (%)</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>18.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>19.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>15.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Teaching (%)</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>16.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>13.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Service (%)</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>23.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>18.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>19.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Activities (%)</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Teaching (%)</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>20.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Medicine</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>19.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.89</td>
<td>24.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>21.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research (%)</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical Teaching (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical Service (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Activities (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Teaching (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39.08</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54.23</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.12</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Distribution of Teaching Activities Among Clinical, Adjunct, and Senate Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab²</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group²</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Barriers to Teaching Among Clinical and Adjunct Faculty³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Paid/Part of Job²</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Obligations</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Duties²</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Duties</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to Spend More Time Teaching²</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Creative Activities Among Clinical, Adjunct, And Senate Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers/Books/Syllabus</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Papers²</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching²</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Projects</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Practice</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Publishing Activities Among Clinical, Adjunct, and Senate Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journals²</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/Book Chapters</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Senate faculty were not asked this question.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barriers to Research Among Clinical and Adjunct Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Time$^2$</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Money</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching$^2$</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Support Staff</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Duties</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want More Research Time$^2$</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership, Presentations, and Manuscript Review Activities Among Clinical, Adjunct, and Senate Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Role in Organization$^2$</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National or International Clinical Referrals$^2$</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Professional Society Talks</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Manuscripts or Grants$^2$</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Responses to Whether They Were Appointed in Correct Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 3. NUMBER OF CLINICAL AND Adjunct FACULTY RESPONSES TO WHETHER THEY WERE APPOINTED IN CORRECT SERIES

Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Series Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Appropriate</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Residence</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical X</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Responses to Barriers to Appointments in Desired Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Appropriate Series</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of FTE or Open Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Generated Salary/Lack of Grant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Promotion Opportunity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Responses to Anticipation of Series Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Responses to Anticipation of Series Change
Listed by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Responses for Expected Series Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Change Expected Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Rank Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Residence Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical X Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Publications Among Clinical, Adjunct, and Senate Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0  Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 To 3 Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 To 6 Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Invited Talks in Last Two Years Among Clinical, Adjunct, and Senate Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 To 5 Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 To 10 Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest in Serving on UC committees Among Clinical, Adjunct, and Senate Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already Serve</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Knowledge of Series Among Clinical, Adjunct, and Senate Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 4. LEVEL OF CLINICAL, ADJUNCT, AND SENATE FACULTY KNOWLEDGE OF FACULTY SERIES

Clinical, Adjunct, and Senate Faculty Who Received Employment Letter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clinical Adjunct Faculty Who Received Employment Letter Listed by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical Adjunct Faculty Who Received Extramural Research Funding Listed by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Who Meet APM Criteria for In-Residence Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Series</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 5. NUMBER OF CLINICAL AND ADJUNCT FACULTY WHO MEET APM CRITERIA FOR IN-RESIDENCE SERIES

Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Who Meet APM Criteria for In-Residence Series Listed by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dentistry</th>
<th>Medicine w/o Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Dept of Medicine</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clinical and Adjunct Faculty Who Meet APM Criteria for In-Residence Series and Who Anticipated Series Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anticipate Change in Future</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anticipate Change in Future</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Anticipate Change in Future</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 7. OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS FROM RANDOM SURVEY OF ASSISTANT CLINICAL, ADJUNCT AND SENATE PROFESSORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ADJUNCT/CLINICAL</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Changing series/Hired in wrong series | • My critical issue is whether I will be able to transition to In-Residence.  
• UCSF not flexible in converting people because the criteria are excessively rigid.  
• It's not uncommon for people to be hired in[to] wrong series. They often don't have a choice.  
• When I started pursuing a position is when I needed to be advised. I don't think I'm in the correct series or department.. At the time my research topic did not fit in *(discipline deleted)* so I ended up in *(discipline deleted)*. Now it's hard to switch once you're in a series. I feel pretty locked into this series. The series may be accurate now but my department is not. I tried to change but one needs a mentor to champion one’s issues. The best I can do [now] is get a joint appointment.  
• I pushed for my series change. |
| 2. Disadvantage of Adjunct series | • I thought of establishing career a in US, went to International Scholars and Students Office to see about getting a green card, but was told I would not get one because I was in the Adjunct series. My series is meaningless. It's a title that does not receive support from UC, while tenure track has everything. In this series, I have little support.  
• There is no advancement or prestige in this series.  
• I'm full time here. Outside Adjunct means not full time faculty or not belonging at a university. Feel like it's discrimination against me because I'm here full-time; therefore the title is not accurate.  
• I understand for me it's a dead end so I'm leaving for another position elsewhere.  
• I'm ineligible for a few grants because I'm Adjunct.  
• I'm unhappy that people who do research are in Adjunct series. Other universities do not do this. This impedes my profile nationally and with granting agencies. I don't need any more money but just want to drop Adjunct. I bring in *(dollar sum deleted)* a year in indirects that I don't get back. But most important is to drop Adjunct in my title. This also prevents me from hiring into Adjunct. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ADJUNCT/CLINICAL</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct series cannot hire students in lab. If there were a grant mechanism that's administratively allowable to have students in my lab, my research would go more rapidly.</td>
<td>• Teaching not rewarded in my school&lt;br&gt;• I would like to teach more if I was rewarded financially or recognized for it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teaching not paid or recognized</td>
<td>• I'm not recognized for the teaching that I do. I should spend 100% on research but requested to spend time teaching. In order to advance I have to do teaching.&lt;br&gt;• I would like to do more teaching but am not getting recognized. Want to be recognized what a commitment that is to teach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of employment</td>
<td>• I want to be in a series where UC supports me. If someone is here temporarily it's ok to be in this series, but I've been here over 3 years, it doesn't make sense to be in this series. This series is used to hire the best people without giving support. I give everything but only get a salary.&lt;br&gt;• Currently (discipline deleted) field is having problem getting people into academics due to problems with salary. Specific problem to UC is not being able to get tenure unless in Ladder Rank. This is not the case at other (discipline deleted) schools. Salaries at UCSF are not comparable to private practice, plus there is no security of employment.&lt;br&gt;• I would like security of employment.&lt;br&gt;• Little job security, salary range is low, criteria for promotion is obscure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Promotion criteria info, communication | • Not very aware of different series.<br>• Information should be made more available for [all] series, requirements for promotion. This should be posted on the UCSF website.<br>• People in my department don't know about series, Academic Senate.<br>• Very difficult to understand promotion requirements. I get information from the Dean, but when information goes to division, criteria are not clear. Subjectivity has a role in promotions, but it seems as if being liked by division chair is very important. I get vague answers from academic personnel. I was told by department chair that I would get support to be promoted to associate, but division chair said not unless I teach continuing education courses. Department chair has said that I'm doing well, but I think division chair is not advocating for me. I was initially told that in (number deleted) years I would move to associate level, but I'm at year (number deleted) now and still am assistant. Was Clinical instructor for (number deleted) years, then Assistant Clinical. Seems that criteria for promotion are not objective enough. I am not allowed time for scholarly activities but expected to put in my own | • Not clear to me who to contact for questions about promotion process.<br>• Wish promotion information more clearly spelled out. Clinical teaching is important for promotion but I haven't been approached to do this. I felt left on my own.<br>• Not sure about different series or how promotion works, particularly In-Residence series.<br>• There's more attention to my series than others, but once here for a few years can figure it out. Don't blame the school. More information should be given what series mean.<br>• I learned promotion information much after the fact and not from appropriate people. When I've asked for information on paper it's vague or unavailable. I've had to ask faculty in other departments. When people are hired there seems
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ADJUNCT/CLINICAL</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time. At appointment, I received the faculty handbook, and verbal contract with division chair on work. I'm here because I love UCSF and have commitment to university. I can make more money in private practice in three days than [I can in]five days here.</td>
<td>to be lots of inequities because people don't know what to ask for. Should be more clearer communication. All this should be in writing, eg. salary and how much clinical work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I would rate my knowledge of series as good now but with a qualifier. When I first started as a faculty member, nobody explained the differences to me, or what the requirements were, what Academic Senate was, or governance, or any of that. So initially it was very high stress being thrown into a system that you really had very little understanding of yet being told you were required to do this or that and thinking, &quot;nobody told me that!&quot; Even today, I'm still not clear about the Adjunct series or In-Residence series, and whenever I do peer review I need to either go ask someone or look it up (and sometimes I don't even know where to look for it). I think there is a bad assumption that people starting as faculty already understand this stuff when, in reality, we really don't.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hiring process seems vague. Where is information? Before I got this job, application process vague, requirements were not clear. I arranged a meeting with department chair to know what my position meant. <em>(Gender deleted)</em> explained the nuances. This was only basis. No discussion on protected time. Did not know about faculty orientation held on <em>(date deleted)</em>. Did not receive faculty handbook when hired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is little knowledge about promotion. Faculty handbook is not clear. At time of hire, no discussion on job requirement, no communication on promotion criteria. Promotion criteria are arbitrary, but not sure if that's a bad thing because it would be difficult to quantify what we do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I have received information. It would have been nice to get more in-depth information on promotions. Seen faculty handbook, but don't have my own copy. UCSF doesn't have a hiring contract. When hired, verbal contract. Every promise was fulfilled. Taught at another health sciences university and contracts were written.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotion is a very slow process. Got promotion <em>(number deleted)</em> years ago, but took effect one year later. Did get retroactive pay. Promotion criteria is not clear and is open for interpretation, depending on supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotion system is very confusing, even senior faculty in department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>ADJUNCT/CLINICAL</td>
<td>SENATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are unclear. Did not hear about new faculty orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruitment process was positive. We sense that people at higher levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are not as supportive as I expected. Feel demoralized, not validated or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>helped to feel good about working hard. My division chief is great.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need more information for new faculty on faculty orientation. Did not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hear about new faculty orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not enough information on promotion criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need more orientation from department or school on how the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>runs and introduce to dean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not enough information on series structure. I do get feedback on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>promotion in department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Did not hear about new faculty orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Don't know how to maneuver the system. Need new faculty orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received faculty handbook but department chair sent memo on what</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>department uses, but for my series it said very little. Did not receive any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information on promotion criteria. I think it's up to me to get that info.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clinical series was never discussed nor was option to change series.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion criteria difficult to meet because don't have protected time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department leadership encourages fairness and excellence but school-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wide promotion criteria is variable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficult to understand system here. I feel worried about how to survive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in this community because these parts are very unclear for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My appointment went very smooth. Received faculty handbook. Had</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very little interaction with UCSF formally. I am holed up in my lab and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[have] little communication; do get informal communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Little teaching about series in my department and school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Given a faculty handbook recently. Told that handbook does not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>necessarily indicate criteria. No one can tell me what the rules are.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I'm up for merit but have never talked to anyone about it. Never been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>told what to do for promotion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding series is incredibly confusing. It's not intuitive or clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where is best place to get information on start-up funds? It's hard to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>get major funding in the first year or two, so I'd like to get seed money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not clear what benefits of different tracks and what it takes to jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from one track to another.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>ADJUNCT/CLINICAL</td>
<td>SENATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Supervisor did not know about series, told me wrong information that Adjunct is step to In-Residence.  
• Did not know about faculty orientation.  
• I love working here but orientation was spotty. I had to learn on my own. I had gone to school here so it helped.  
• Knowledge of series is very lacking for me. I'm in a school that is not my training. I feel directionless and not sure about my options. My boss is a busy person so it's hard to get time to talk. I want to learn about what are the options here.  
• My employment letter clearly stated what was expected of me.  
• Requested and received letter of employment.  
• I asked for an employment letter and received one.  
• Got orientation from faculty members on series, promotion criteria.  
• Faculty orientation was helpful.  
• I know about UC system since was at (institution deleted).  
• Hiring was communicated openly.  
• Took Teaching Fellowship run by (name deleted). That's where I learned about advancement.  
• My chair is positive, communicates promotion criteria and opportunities to me.  
• It's been clear to me what expectations are. |

**6. Lack of support**  
• I support my salary 100%.  
• My position is year to year, not secure and this is frustrating.  
• Don't sense job security or backup for funding in this series. My appointment will end as soon as funding dries up.  
• I control my own fate because if [I] lose funding, [I]lose [my] job. Although university did give me funding, I feel like they don't care in the end about me. If I bring in grants it's ok, but if I don't the tone changes really quick.  
• Expectations are unrealistic for me to support myself 100%. But in Adjunct series I'm expected to teach, therefore I'm in a difficult position.  
• I need to hustle for grants for salary.  
• I've had good experience except hard to get 80% of salary from outside and then asked to spend more than 20% by UCSF on other duties.  
• Needs to be a better way to support junior faculty. Support such as a job. I want to work here but right now I'm on soft money.  
• There are problems with In-Residence series. This is equal to Ladder Rank but without university's support. They both have same expectations. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ADJUNCT/CLINICAL</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7. Lack protected time for research | • I hope to get protected time to develop own research projects. Have lots of vacation time that I could use for research. Main obstacle is clinical work is very taxing. I hope an additional attending physician can divide the work.  
• Clinical faculty are in tough place. Clinical demands are high. Support for ancillary staff is low. Not able to have time to generate ideas, let alone apply for grants. Difficult to achieve anything academic. | • As a Clinical faculty who's In-Residence, difficult to do research with clinical responsibilities. |
| 8. Mentoring, faculty development | • There is a need for a formal policy for faculty development.  
• Need a well-developed mentorship program.  
• Mentor helped me get grant funding so I wouldn't need to buy clinical time. My mentor has helped me a great deal.  
• It's been helpful to have senior faculty to get sense of what career steps to take. My peers probably have less of that.  
• I receive good mentoring and support.  
• In a university setting but don't have time to take advantage for self-improvement and increased productivity.  
• Want to have faculty mentor; some departments have this program but not my division.  
• I've had outstanding mentoring. I believe whatever resources are needed are available but you have to be assertive and proactive in this environment. | • Need for better mentoring. |
| 9. Junior faculty carry higher load | • Poor faculty-to-student ratio in the school, high workload. More junior members carry higher workload and are more productive than senior faculty. Department and School need to examine this issue.  
• Concern for faculty without FTE asked to do as much as those with FTEs; is inconsistent here. I'm getting frustrated that I don't have [an] FTE. | • This [lack of university support] also applies to Adjunct series although these provide base teaching, clinical duties, and mentoring duties. People on bottom of pyramid free up time for Ladder Rank to do their work. |
| 10. Women at disadvantage | • Majority of junior and mid-level faculty are now female.  
• I'm feeling a little bit abused by division, but I have no way to address that. I have talked to department chair. Told by division chief that can't have everything, meaning successful career with family life. Had a baby (date deleted). Told not to expect to be successful because I don't have enough time to be promotable.  
• I'm glad I have my job, but it seems like a secret way to keep good scientists because taking advantage of personal situations, especially women. | • Generally women are at disadvantage. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ADJUNCT/CLINICAL</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **11. Lab space, office space** | • One barrier for obtaining further funding is lack of lab space. Translational research is not viable here. Chair told me not to ask for space because there is none at UCSF. If want to do research, I should go elsewhere or take 100% clinical position with possibility of doing clinical research.  
• My division did not have space for me, but mentor had extra space so I got own office.  
• My critical issue is space. | |
| **12. Recruit external candidates more than internal** | • UC tries to hire best researchers but looks outside for candidates. I suggest to look within organization if something can be done for people like me to continue to serve. Young investigators should be encouraged.  
• I see it is difficult at UCSF for Adjunct to transfer to different series. If there is an open positions, they tend to search outside of UCSF. For example, I was asked to be on search committee for Ladder Rank position but was told I was not viable for that position.  
• There’s more emphasis on hiring in junior rank from outside versus trying to keep those already here.  
• Because it’s a competitive place, hard to move up if started here. (Sentence deleted) Perhaps that’s the way it should be. | |
| **13. Quality of life, balancing family needs and career** | • Even though I would want a tenure position at UCSF, quality of life issues are important. I have (number deleted) young children, housing is expensive.  
• UCSF is great place to work but high pressure atmosphere. Never enough time, added responsibilities, not enough money to pay me for added work. In my department everyone is fully booked. It's an atmosphere that you want to do more, but there's a cost to mental health.  
• Hard to negotiate family needs and succeed in career.  
• I have a family with (number deleted) children (ages deleted) and it's difficult to do other creative activities and keep up teaching, clinic duties, and research. | • Balancing clinical duties, research, life has been harder than I thought. |
| **14. Basic research vs clinical duties** | • UCSF is more focused on scientific research than clinical duties.  
• System is biased to reward researchers and not to people who are clinicians and teachers. | |
<p>| <strong>15. Satisfaction with career</strong> | • I'm happy with my position now and enjoy my coworkers. My division chair is a nice person. | • Experience has been very enjoyable. Received good support from department. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ADJUNCT/CLINICAL</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Once I got into Adjunct series, I'm in correct series. Happy with series now.</td>
<td>• Experience so far has been very good. No complaints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Positive experience at recruitment.</td>
<td>• I've been treated well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My research is going well.</td>
<td>• Positive experience so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department treats me well, my experience here has been positive.</td>
<td>• Good experience so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• So far positive experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I have great support from department chair. My experience here is wonderful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Happy within department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experience has been positive. I've brought a lot of community connections from outside UC to university for the project. Bureacracy is slow, but other than that I like my department and school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My recruitment experience was easy <em>(phrase deleted)</em>, I got a lot of direction in the first few years here. I've gotten advice to increase research part of my career, but don't feel that Ladder Rank is my goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My division and department are generous. I'm very happy. In-Residence would have been better, but it doesn't make much difference. Adjunct has some advantages too. Happy where I am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Great university to be part of.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overall I'm happy with UCSF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I love what I do here, it's a wonderful place to be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experience has been good so far. I've had a lot of support in getting in Adjunct series which means I can get my own grant and do more teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enjoy students, faculty, staff at UCSF. Everyone is supportive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experience with department has been good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I've been here <em>(length of time deleted)</em>. Experience so far has been positive; I'm enthusiastic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I've had a good experience since I got here <em>(length of time deleted)</em>. I like being here because of its focus on healthcare.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Other</td>
<td>• I would like to have the same resources for research in Clinical series as other series.</td>
<td>• The series are presented that they don't matter and this continues to be an issue for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too much administrative service prevents faculty from doing what they want to do.</td>
<td>• Need for better administrative support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Been here <em>(number deleted)</em> years, so don't know much about UCSF. Many faculty are hired on part-time basis due to economics and not as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>ADJUNCT/CLINICAL</td>
<td>SENATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>many people interested in academics <em>(discipline deleted)</em>. Departments may save</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>money by hiring part-time faculty so don't have to offer benefits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I would like information on doing anything outside my series such as research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overall experience is pretty good, but wish for more flexibility for faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who've been here a while to explore other opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8. RESULTS OF RANDOM PUBLICATION STUDY OF 25 ASSISTANT CLINICAL AND ADJUNCT PROFESSORS

In order to determine the nature and quality of publications by Assistant Clinical and Adjunct faculty, as well as determine whether these faculty tended to have independent research programs or were playing supporting roles in other faculty members’ research, we examined the publications by a random sample of 25 Assistant Clinical and Adjunct Professors who participated in the telephone survey. Each participant’s publication history was gathered from the National Library of Medicine’s PubMed citation database. Only publications from January 2000 to July 2003 were included. Faculty were considered “primary investigators” if they were predominantly listed as first or last author in most papers. Faculty were considered “supporting role” if they were consistently listed somewhere in the middle of a long list of authors. “Intermediate” described circumstances where both situations existed for the same person in about equal amounts. The primary conclusions of the survey are:

- About 44% (7 out of 16) of Assistant Adjunct Professors publish in high-quality journals as first authors, second authors, or senior authors.
- Assistant Clinical Professors also produce similar data with 44% (4 out of 9) using similar criteria.

Table 1 and Table 2 present the complete results of this study.

TABLE 1. CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATION RECORD OF 25 ASSISTANT CLINICAL AND ADJUNCT PROFESSORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERIES</th>
<th>TYPE OF AUTHOR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary investigator</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>44% (n=7)</td>
<td>31% (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>44% (n=4)</td>
<td>22% (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 6. PERCENTAGE OF CLINICAL AND ADJUNCT FACULTY ROLES IN PUBLICATIONS

- Primary investigator: 28%
- Intermediate: 44%
- Supporting role: 28%
### TABLE 2. CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BY TYPE OF AUTHOR FOR 25 CLINICAL AND ADJUNCT FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary investigator</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Supporting role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acad Med</td>
<td>Addict Behav (2)</td>
<td>Am J Med Qual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Am J med</td>
<td>AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am J Med</td>
<td>Biochemistry (2)</td>
<td>Carbohydr Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Emerg Med</td>
<td>Can J Appl Physiol</td>
<td>Diabetes Care (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Epidemiol</td>
<td>Can J Vet Res</td>
<td>Fam Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Dermatol</td>
<td>Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers</td>
<td>Gerontologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Intern Med</td>
<td>Prev</td>
<td>Hum Reprod Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMJ (3)</td>
<td>Cell Mol Biol Lett</td>
<td>Int J Health Serv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br J Cancer</td>
<td>Circ Res</td>
<td>Int J STD AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Invest</td>
<td>Clin Obstet Gynecol</td>
<td>J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clin Infect Dis</td>
<td>Curr Opin Cell Biol</td>
<td>J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Dent Oral Epidemiol</td>
<td>EMBO J</td>
<td>J Neurosurg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA Repair</td>
<td>Health Care Women Int</td>
<td>Mov Disor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBO J (2)</td>
<td>Human Reprod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocrinology</td>
<td>Immunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environ Health Prospect (2)</td>
<td>Immunol Rev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Radic Biol Med</td>
<td>J Am Board Fam Pract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Biosci</td>
<td>J Am Vet Med Assoc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genes Chromosome Cancer</td>
<td>J Biol Chem (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int J Radiat Biol (2)</td>
<td>J Cell Sci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Adolesc Health</td>
<td>J Clin Endocrinol Metab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr</td>
<td>J Immunol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Am Acad Dermatol</td>
<td>J Mol Biol (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Cataract Refract Surg (2)</td>
<td>J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Comp Neurol</td>
<td>J Tissue Viability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Neurophysiol (2)</td>
<td>J Vet Intern Med</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Physiol</td>
<td>J Virol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Public Health Dent</td>
<td>Med Oncol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsc Res Tech</td>
<td>Med Pregl (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutat Res (3)</td>
<td>Menopause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat Genet</td>
<td>Nat Biotechnol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Nat Cell Biol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurs Times</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstet Gynecol</td>
<td>Nephrol Dial Transplant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Dis (2)</td>
<td>Neuron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prev Med</td>
<td>Nicotine Tob Res (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proc Natl Acad Sci (2)</td>
<td>Paediatr Drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Proc Natl Acad Sci (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends Genet</td>
<td>Public Health Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West J Med</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 9. IMPORTANT POINTS FOR DISCUSSION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT CHAIRS/ORU DIRECTORS AND NEW FACULTY APPOINTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td>Home Dept.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appointments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION**

- Series of proposed appointment and information on how it differs in expectations and commitments from other series, including criteria for advancement.

- Rank, step and percent time of the appointment as well as the implications of these for advancement.

- Total Negotiated Annual Salary: ___________ Covered Compensation: ___________

- Sources of Compensation.

- Responsibilities of the faculty member related to the compensation plan (if applicable). A copy of the plan should be provided to the candidate.

- Provision of the booklet “Advancement and Promotion at UCSF: A Faculty Handbook for Success” and the opportunity to have questions answered about its content.

**RESPONSIBILITIES AND EXPECTED DISTRIBUTION OF TIME**

- Approximate percent of protected time to conduct research/creative activities during the first year of the appointment and discussion of the percent of protected time that can be expected in future years.

- Clarification of specific responsibilities for participation in departmental teaching and/or clinical programs, including approximate percent of time devoted to teaching (if applicable) and to clinical practice (if applicable).

- Expectations for University and public service (as compared to professional commitments).

**IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR MENTORING**

**ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND RESOURCES**
- Identification of Department/School resources and mentors for faculty development of research, teaching, and professional competence.

- Identification of the location of office space and research space (if applicable).

- Specific computer and other technology or equipment that will be available.

- The nature of administrative and clerical support and other resources that will be available.

- Identification of Department, School and/or campus resources and contacts related to health and other benefits, library support, parking and commuting, et cetera.

CONFIRMATION OF DISCUSSION

- Confirmation letter of discussion.

Rev. 7/03
Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion
Kit Chesla, RN, DNSc, FAAN, Chair

Originally Submitted to the Below Parties June 22, 2009

To:

The Office of Academic Personnel
Sally Marshall, PhD
Vice Provost Academic Affairs
Campus Box 0401

Associate and Vice Deans for Academic Affairs
Brain Aldredge, PharmD
Associate Dean Academic Affairs
School of Pharmacy
Campus Box 0622

Caroline Damsky, PhD
Associate Dean Academic Affairs
School of Dentistry
Campus Box 0430

With copy to:
Renee Binder, MD
Associate Dean Academic Affairs
School of Medicine
Campus Box 0984

The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Care of Wilson Hardcastle
Senior Analyst, Office of the Academic Senate
Campus Box 0764

RE: Request for Information; Follow Up to the Report of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion

The Academic Senate, working through its Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, has convened a new task force to follow up on the recommendations (approved by the Chancellor on July 25, 2005) put forth in the 2003 Report of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion. (The report is available at [http://senate.ucsf.edu/2003-2004/v2-FRRP-Report.html](http://senate.ucsf.edu/2003-2004/v2-FRRP-Report.html).)
To this end, the new task force is requesting outcome responses and quantifiable data where possible to evaluate the means of implementation of the specific recommendations made in the 2003 Report of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion. This request for information is directed to the three related divisions named in the salutation above, but not all queries will pertain to all parties. However, all queries are presented together so that all may have a clearer understanding of the recommendations of the original task force and may better respond to this request for information. Please reply to the questions directed to your office either by campus mail or electronic mail to Wilson Hardcastle at campus box 0764 or to wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu.

Some of the 2003 recommendations have been paraphrased for brevity, others have been quoted in their entirety for completeness and clarity.

Section A: Implementation of a Multifaceted Educational Program

**Recommendations A.1-5:** These recommendations pertain to new appointments (as well as current faculty advancement) and the discussion of the specific criteria and expectations of each series. The task force recommended the implementation of a new checklist, and that its completion be required for all new appointments. This checklist is referred to as the New Faculty Checklist and is titled “Important Points for Discussion Between Department Chairs/ORU Directors And New Faculty Appointees.”

**Question to the Committee on Academic Personnel:** Is this new checklist being utilized and required for all new appointments regardless of level? If not, which appointments are being excluded and why? Also, what are the consequences if a candidate’s file does not include the completed checklist?

*This checklist is required to be included in all appointment packets, and to be signed by both the Department Chair and the Candidate. There have been extremely rare instances (less than five last year as memory serves) when the checklist has been missing from an appointment packet. If the candidate is a new hire and there is cause for concern, CAP may return the packet to the Office of Academic Personnel and require that the file be returned with the new hire checklist, else CAP may note the absence of the checklist in its recommendation to the Vice Provost Academic Affairs. If the candidate is an experienced faculty member changing series and all else seems to be clear and in order, CAP may not delay the change in series pending the submission of the checklist but will note the absence of the checklist to the VPAA. Again, the instance of a missing checklist is extremely rare.*

**Related question to the Office of Academic Personnel and the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs:** Have search committees been educated regarding the requirements and criteria for the specific faculty series required for a position prior to engaging in the search or during the candidate evaluation process?

**OAP:** There is a new search tool kit that is given to search committees that contains all relevant information

**SOD:** Search committees have not been routinely educated regarding requirements and criteria for specific faculty series. However, the Associate Dean reviews all Recruitment Plans, which are required to contain descriptions of the position and the proposed series. If there is incompatibility between the job description and the proposed series,
the Associate Dean contacts the Division/Dept Chair and the Search chair to discuss and make the job description and proposed series compatible.

SOM: This is handled through Office of Academic Personnel.

SON: The search committees work from a position description, which, in the School of Nursing, has been developed in consultation with Department Chairs and the Dean – it would be during that consultation that questions, if any, would arise about the faculty series matching the position needs.

SOP: The Associate Dean reviews all search plans (e.g., position description, search committee membership) and will occasionally consult with the department chairperson to ensure that the faculty series matches the position description and the department’s needs. Historically, the Associate Dean would meet with each search committee to discuss series requirements and diversity issues. As a regular practice, this stopped during the “Search Ambassador” program (Harvey Brody’s program). It is now done on an intermittent and less formal basis (e.g., it may involve a telephone call between the Associate Dean and the search committee chair; or, if the search chair has chaired other search committees (with satisfactory outcome), the discussion may not take place).

Recommendation A.6: Mentors should include information on series requirements as part of the overall advisory program

Question to the Office of Academic Personnel: Over the past several years, what sort of, and how many, workshops and/or educational sessions have been offered for faculty, administrators and mentors regarding the criteria for appointment and advancement in the specific series?

Each year there are numerous sessions (4 this year) held during FIWW. In addition we have held faculty development sessions on this topic.

Question to the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs: On an annual basis, how many sessions have you held with faculty, administrators and mentors regarding the criteria for appointment and advancement in each specific series?

SOD: The Associate Dean holds one meeting annually with all department Academic Personnel staff and MSO’s in the School. This is devoted to new and current faculty advancement policies, and plans for the coming year. The Associate Dean offers annually to meet with Chair and Division Chairs of the four School of Dentistry departments. Over the course of the last three years, the Associate Dean has met with the division/department chairs of the two large departments in the School to discuss advancement policies, and have scheduled quarter break lunch time sessions with interested faculty from our largest department (keep in mind that our whole School is smaller than several departments in the SOM). I also meet individually with faculty on request, to discuss series descriptions and advancement criteria in the context of their career development goals.

SOM: We have multiple workshops aimed at faculty at junior, mid and senior levels each year.

SON: The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Research have had periodic meetings with various series faculty to review CV preparation, expectations for merit and promotion, and the like. These have been well attended. In addition, the
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs meets individually with faculty and collectively with department chairs with regard to criteria for specific series.

**SOP:** The School holds orientation sessions for newly-hired faculty approximately every two years (last held November 2008). At this session, the Associate Dean reviews the advancement criteria for the faculty series. On an ad hoc basis, the Associate Dean also provides counsel to individual faculty and to department chairs (re: appointment/advancement criteria) when it is requested and/or seems to be needed. The Associate Dean is a member of the Dean’s Leadership Group – and provides annual updates to chairs on advancement issues (e.g., those highlighted in the Annual Call or that have arisen within the School over the past year). One of the three departments in the School (Clinical Pharmacy) requests that all newly-hired faculty meet with the Associate Dean for a one-on-one session related to academic advancement. The Dean’s Office also encourages faculty participation in Faculty Information & Welcoming Week each year (where appointment/advancement criteria are reviewed).

**Recommendation A.7: Career Reviews** “How are faculty being made aware that, under existing procedures described in the APM, they may request a career review and a re-review of their academic personnel file at any time? Does this awareness-raising education include situations where the faculty member believes that he/she may be in the wrong series.”

**Question to the Office of Academic Personnel:** What processes or policies are in place to educate faculty members of the opportunity for a career review?

**Section B. Establishment of General Guidelines for New Appointments**

**Recommendation B.1.** “The criteria for appointment and advancement in a given series should be determined by an individual faculty member’s actual duties and should be consistent with those described in the APM. Departments should not create additional criteria for appointment and promotion beyond those in the APM, although the department can provide more specific guidelines and details of the appointment expectations to the faculty member.”

**Question to the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs:** Are departments using criteria for appointment and advancement other than those set forth in the APM? If so,

What departments are these?
What are their criteria? and
How are these criteria justified in light of the recommendations of the 2001-2005 task force of faculty and administrators and the endorsement of the Chancellor?

**SOD:** School of Dentistry departments are not using criteria for appointment and advancement other than those set forth in the APM.

**SOM:** Departments use the APM as the floor. Many departments have set up specific criteria for advancement and promotion that are within the guidelines. We have asked
departments to send us their criteria. So far only a minority of departments have responded.

SON: The School of Nursing uses the criteria set forth in the APM.

SOP: Are departments using criteria for appointment and advancement other than those set forth in the APM? Yes – one department has developed appointment/promotion guidelines that are intended to supplement the APM information.

What departments are these? Department of Clinical Pharmacy
What are their criteria? Included as an attachment along with this report
How are these criteria justified in light of the recommendations of the 2001-2005 task force of faculty and administrators and the endorsement of the Chancellor? These ‘guidelines’ are intended to clarify the APM and are felt to be consistent with APM appointment/advancement criteria. They have previously been submitted to CAP for review.

Question to the Committee on Academic Personnel: Does CAP use criteria for appointment and advancement other than those set forth in the APM? If so, what are these criteria? How does CAP respond to departments (if any) that apply additional criteria beyond the APM?

CAP relies on the criteria set forth in the APM for academic evaluation. APM 210-6 indicates that faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series should be evaluated regarding University and public service and research and creative work according to campus guidelines. At UCSF, each school has written guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series and these have been provided to CAP for review and consultation.

If a department has criteria more onerous than those set forth in the APM, that level of review takes place at the department and school, where a candidate may not advance until such criteria are met. Thus, CAP is usually unaware that such additional criteria have been applied to a specific candidate. At the level of CAP review, CAP relies on the APM (as instructed by the APM).

CAP is currently considering the authority of departments to set criteria for advancement which differ from those in the APM (e.g. grant or funding requirements). CAP requested clarification from the Chair of UCAP last year, however the matter was not discussed by UCAP nor did UCAP provide an official response. In the 2009-2010 academic year, UCSF CAP plans to request that this discussion appear on the UCAP agenda and that a formal opinion be provided.

Recommendations B.2-4: Faculty should be hired into the series that best suits their responsibilities, the series in which they are likely to remain, and the series which best fits their career goals.

Question to the Office of Academic Personnel: Does it appear that hiring practices in the schools and departments are consistent with this recommendation?

Yes and no.

If not, what are the exceptions to this recommendation?
Most exceptions seem to be of the nature of a choice between being appointed in a non-Senate series or not appointed at all. In addition, many new faculty have not clearly defined their career goals.

What procedures does the Office have in place to see that this policy is being consistently implemented?

How many faculty members fall under these exceptions? If data are not available, please provide an educated guess.

No guess, it is all I can do to review the packets – no time to count different categories, no electronic data base as yet.

**Question to the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs:** Are hiring practices in your school consistent with this recommendation? If not, what are the exceptions to this recommendation? Are exceptions characterized by series, department, type of work or other general category?

**SOD:** In the School of Dentistry, faculty are for the most part hired into the series that best fits their career goals and department needs. One modification of this relates to hiring DDS/PhD faculty whom we feel have not had enough time to get their research programs started. In those cases (about 4 in the past 5 years), the Department in question has initially hired them into the Adjunct series for 2 years, with very low clinical obligations, to give them protected time to develop their research. The intention from the beginning is to then transfer them to the Clinical X, in Residence or Ladder Rank series. There is no School or Department policy to use the non-Senate series as testing grounds.

**SOM:** Many faculty in the junior level who are trainees here enter as K awardees and are placed in clinical or adjunct series to allow them time to differentiate. They are then searched at the associate level for the appropriate series. This is not true for basic science departments who hire at the assistant level into tenure track series.

**SON:** We believe that hiring practices are consistent with this recommendation.

**SOP:** Yes. In the School of Pharmacy, it is the practice to hire faculty into the series which best fits their career goals and the department’s needs. We do not use non-Senate series’ for “interim appointments” before deciding which series best suits the faculty member.

**Recommendation B.5.** “In approving new appointments, CAP should pay special attention to the proposed duties of the new appointee and, if it appears that someone is being appointed in the wrong series, bring this to the attention of the appropriate associate/vice dean for Academic Affairs before acting on the file.”

**Question to the Committee on Academic Personnel:** How does CAP attend to this issue for new appointments? Are there data regarding how often CAP recommends an alternate series for a proposed appointment? Are these recommendations concentrated in any school(s) or department(s)? If so, where?
The Committee on Academic Personnel carefully reviews the intended activities of new appointments in accordance with their appointed series. CAP does not hesitate to recommend modification of an appointment should the candidate expectations differ from the characteristics of their proposed appointed series. CAP also pays strict attention to series-appropriateness in all reviews, not only appointments or proposed changes in series.

There is no specific data regarding how frequently CAP recommends modification to a proposed series or makes an additional recommendation to a Department Chair that a faculty member consider a change in series. Anecdotally, there is no particular concentration to any school or department.

**Question to the Office of Academic Personnel**: What is the oversight for new appointments at levels not reviewed by CAP? How is OAP ensuring that these new faculty members are being appointed into the correct series?

*Standard review process, see above.*

Section C. Systematic Review of Existing Faculty in the Adjunct or Clinical Series

**Recommendation C.1**: “At the time of review for merits and promotions of all existing faculty who hold Adjunct or [Health Sciences] Clinical titles, there should be a review of actual duties. If individual faculty are satisfactorily performing all of the duties expected of a Senate member in a particular series, then they should be transferred into the appropriate Senate series. The associate/vice deans for academic affairs should instruct the departments to consider these issues when preparing merit and promotion packets.”

**Question to the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs**: What processes have been used in the past five years to ensure this review of Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Faculty, and that their duties are appropriate to their appointed series? How many (or what fraction) of faculty in these series have been moved from non-Senate to Senate series? Are there any schools or departments where this policy does not seem to have been implemented?

*SOD*: There are no specific documented processes to assure that the duties of faculty in non Senate series are appropriate to their series. However, when packets are reviewed, the Associate Dean has on occasions contacted the Department/Division Chair and the faculty member to discuss such discontinuity when it is apparent. In one case, this action has resulted in a change in series recommendation, without a search, since the faculty member had been performing at a level consistent with the Senate series since her hire date. In two other cases, Change in Series actions were initiated by a Department when the duties of the faculty members changed significantly and FTE became available.

*SOM*: We use the merit process to keep track of this. We also hold “appraisals” in our office to assist faculty who would not otherwise receive an appraisal (non-Senate).

As of 08/20/09, there are 1,922 Core Faculty, of which 322 are Adjunct. Using the actual earnings records, since Jan 2004, there were 156 instances when faculty who had been paid in Adjunct title codes were subsequently paid in Non-Adjunct (Clinical, Clinical X, In Res, and Ladder) title codes.

Here is the count of those change in series by department:
SON: Each faculty member is reviewed upon opportunity for merit or advancement. We have had non-Senate faculty members apply, and be selected, for ladder rank appointments. They then perform to the requirements of their new position.

SOP: Faculty duties are routinely reviewed at the times of advancement (or 5-year review) to ensure that they are appropriate for the current series. If there appears to be a disconnect between series and duties (which is uncommon), these cases are discussed first with the department chairperson. In the past five years, we have had one faculty member move from a non-Senate series to a Senate series (H.S. Clinical to Professor of Clinical X). This individual applied for an open position in the Clinical X series (vacated by a retiree) and was ultimately selected for this position. There has been one change from a salaried Senate appointment to a salaried non-Senate series (Ladder rank to Adjunct). This was done at the request of the Chair and the faculty member and was based on a change in the faculty member’s career direction (to a teaching focus).

Recommendation C. 2: “CAP should consider these issues when reviewing packets for those faculty it reviews and bring to the attention of the appropriate associate/vice dean for academic affairs through the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs cases of those individuals who should be considered for movement into a Senate series.”

Question to the Committee on Academic Personnel: What are the processes CAP has used to ensure faculty, particularly those in the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series,
have appointments into the series consistent with their duties? What data can CAP provide that there have been appropriate changes in series in the last five years?

In every review, CAP pays specific attention to faculty activities and accomplishments with regards to their appointed series. If faculty in any series, not just Adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical, have responsibilities or accomplishments more suitable to another academic series, say In Residence or Clinical X, CAP makes a recommendation for a change in series, or that a candidate consider a change in series should they be interested in doing so. This of course works in the converse, and CAP may make a recommendation for an In Residence faculty member to change to Adjunct should they exhibit a specific imbalance in their activities, or perhaps a Clinical X faculty member may be recommended to consider an appointment into the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series should that be more in line with their interests, activities, and accomplishments.

The number of proposed actions involving a Change in Series over the past five years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>'08-'09</th>
<th>'07-'08</th>
<th>'06-'07</th>
<th>'05-'06</th>
<th>'04-'05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes In Series Actions</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Files Reviewed</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken as a percentage of total files reviewed, the percentage of files resulting in changes in series actions has increased somewhat in '06-'07 and '07-'08 and substantially this past year. We attribute the latter increase to CAP’s increased awareness and diligence in making sure that faculty are located in series consistent with their duties and responsibilities.

**Recommendation C.3:** “The associate/vice deans for academic affairs should provide an annual report to CAP on the number of Clinical and Adjunct faculty reviewed each year and the number who are moved into an appropriate Senate series.”

**Question to the Committee on Academic Personnel:** Has CAP been provided with these annual reports? If so, please provide copies of these reports.

Neither the Committee on Academic Personnel nor the Office of the Academic Senate is in possession of any annual reports from the associate or vice deans of academic affairs regarding the review of Health Sciences Clinical or Adjunct faculty for appropriateness of series appointment.

Note from the SON: We have not made such reports, nor would we wish to start making these reports, given the current constraint on all resources.

Note from the SOP: No – these reports have not been explicitly generated, but they could be using CAP and/or School data. Every faculty member evaluated by the Dean’s office for advancement (or 5-year review) is “reviewed”. The numbers of series changes are discussed above (in response to C.1.) and could be cross-checked using CAP data.

**Recommendation C.4:** “There should be a blanket waiver of national searches of all series changes of those individuals who are UCSF faculty satisfactorily performing all of the duties expected of a Senate member in a particular series as of the date that these recommendations are implemented through the time it takes to review all eligible faculty. This waiver should not apply to new appointments.”
**Question to the Office of Academic Personnel:** Did this blanket waiver occur?  **Yes.**

If so, is it still in force?  **No.**

What effect did it have?  **Many faculty changed series.**

How many individuals were affected by such a blanket waiver?  **Please see academic affairs website for numbers of faculty in each series over the last 5 years.**

Section D: Identification by Campus Administration of Ways to Minimize the Financial Liability of Hiring People into the In-Residence Series

**Recommendation D.1:** *“Administrators must find ways to financially accommodate the growth of academic units, while at the same time taking into account the well-being and future careers of the faculty who are hired, rather than shifting all the financial risk on to the junior faculty as a de facto condition of offering them a UCSF faculty position.”*  

**Question to the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs:** What actions have been taken to support the growth of academic units without requiring junior faculty to bear the burden of securing their own salaries?

**SOD:** Wherever possible, new junior faculty hires are given support packages that include salary support for an initial period, and start up costs to enable research programs to be supported. In some cases these packages are a collaborative effort between departments and even Schools. However, finances are extremely tight, and we are fully aware that in some cases Departments and the School cannot afford generous start up packages. However, the School does not deliberately hire faculty into non Senate series purely for financial reasons if the faculty member’s qualifications are more appropriate for a Senate series position.

**SOM:** We offer an award to junior women faculty interested in translational research. Otherwise, these financial burdens must be negotiated by Department Chairs with the Dean.

**SON:** At the moment, ‘financial risk’ falls on the departments and central academic affairs, as administrative resources have been consistently been reduced, while faculty numbers consistently grow. Each recruitment of a junior faculty has been discussed within a department, and at the school level, to determine what kind of “start-up” package can be offered; what kind of released time can be accommodated, and which mentor(s) are best to guide the new faculty. No one has made this kind of assessment of the administrative needs within each department, school, and on campus, in order to support this growth.

**SOP:** In the School of Pharmacy, the Dean and department chairperson have a discussion related to each faculty recruitment. In some instances (primarily, basic science recruitments), the start-up packages provide funds that may be used for salary support. One or more departments, and one or more Dean’s Offices may contribute funds to these start-up packages, depending upon the specifics of the recruitment. The School has been mindful to assure that junior faculty members are not overly stressed by the need to bring in funds to support their salaries. We use the In-Residence and Adjunct series’ relatively sparingly.
**Recommendation D.2:** “Department chairs, in particular, should be held accountable for the practice of hiring people into the Adjunct or Clinical series purely for financial reasons when the positions being filled more appropriately call for an In-Residence appointment. This issue should be part of the stewardship review of department chairs and other administrators.”

**Question to the Office of Academic Personnel:** Is this issue expressly included in the materials to be provided and reviewed during the Stewardship Review process for Department Chairs?

*That sentence does not appear in the documents, but appropriate faculty review is a significant part of a stewardship review of a chair.*

**Recommendation D.3:** “This report should be transmitted to the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Budget (APB) to inform the committee of the problem of hiring faculty, strictly for financial reasons, in the Adjunct or [Health Sciences] Clinical series when the positions being filled call for In-Residence appointments. APB should take an active role in monitoring and discouraging this practice when they advise the Administration on budgetary matters.”

The report of the original task force was transmitted to the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, and the Committee’s active role in monitoring these recommendations is manifest in the formation and leadership of this new task force.

Thank you all for your consideration and cooperation. The New Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion requests that the responses to these queries be returned to the Office of the Academic Senate, care of Wilson Hardcastle (Box 0764 or wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu), by Thursday, August 27, 2009.

Sincerely,

**The Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion**
Kit Chesla, RN, DNSc, FAAN, Chair
Margaret Walsh, EdD
Stanton Glantz, PhD
Dan Bikle, MD, PhD
Communication from the Chair of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
George Rutherford, MD, Chair

February 11, 2010

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

RE: Recommendation on Mission Bay Library Space

Dear Dr. Fuentes-Afflick,

As you know, the UCSF Mission Bay campus has undergone dramatic growth during the past decade. A majority of graduate programs are now located at Mission Bay with students expecting library services and study space comparable to that found on Parnassus. Additionally, more than 500 graduate and professional school students, as well as postdoctoral scholars live in Mission Bay housing and many of them spend significant amounts of time at Mission Bay, especially at night and on weekends. New research and clinical buildings such as the Orthopaedic Institute, the Cardiovascular Research Building, and the Helen Diller Family Cancer Center are either fully operational or coming on-line shortly. Finally, the planned UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay will generate even greater demand for expanded library services, particularly from medical students, residents, clinical fellows, and patients.

Recognizing the ongoing demand for space, the Campus Library worked with the Academic Senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) to develop a Master Plan that articulates Library Space requirements for the next 5-10 years. This Master Plan was submitted to Executive Vice Chancellor Washington February 2009 and is enclosed for your review.

The plan identifies two critical issues. First, on the Parnassus campus students need 24-hour library access for study. While the Parnassus Library was originally designed with a separate area for 24-hour access in mind, the dedicated space was never utilized in this capacity due to issues of accessibility and lack of a restroom. Efforts are underway to secure funding for the required space upgrades.

Second, at Mission Bay there are two small library spaces but these are inadequate to meet current demand and future growth. Moreover, one of these will soon be converted into laboratory teaching space, and the other library in the student center closes early in
the evening due to building hours and is almost always filled to capacity. Thus, there is no permanent library space at Mission Bay with safe and secure 24-hour access.

The COLASC urges the Academic Senate, and any relevant Senate Committees to endorse strongly the recommendations outlined in the Library Master Plan, especially for a larger consolidated library at Mission Bay, and to encourage Campus Administration to secure crucial space and funding. Given current needs, we feel that such new library space must be a reality when the UCSF Medical Center opens in 2014.

Yours truly,

George W. Rutherford, M.D.
Chair, Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

Enclosure: Master Plan for Mission Bay Libraries
University of California, San Francisco

Master Plan for Mission Bay Libraries

January 2009
Executive Summary

The growth of the Mission Bay campus creates demand for additional academic services. As one of the academic services the existing Mission Bay Library is at maximum capacity today and new academic and clinical programs, growth in numbers of students, faculty and staff and the new medical center will place added pressures. In preparation for the next Long Range Development Plan the Library was asked to project Mission Bay space needs over the next 5 -10 years. The design of the library calls for a mixture of traditional and innovative space with elements that foster interdisciplinary/interprofessional collaboration, emphasize well-planned informal and formal learning spaces, provide ubiquitous access to technology and support, and highlight a service-oriented environment. The space will emphasize the collaborative nature of teaching, learning and research. The recommendations call for a library of 12,790 square feet. This is calculated from projected populations and programs at Mission Bay over the next 5-10. This plan would replace the current 3,000 square foot Community Center Library.

In the short term students place a high value on safe and secure 24-hour study space on Parnassus. The addition of a restroom would create useable space in the Kalmanowitz Library and allow reductions in personnel expenses and service improvements for students. At Mission Bay the pending loss of the Genentech Hall Library creates a similar demand and short term solutions are under review. In both facilities a primary considerations is the safety and security of students.

Introduction

Two planning initiatives offer an opportunity to consider long term space needs for library services and programs. Campus Planning is developing a Mission Bay Non-Academic/Academic Support Master Plan as part of the next Long Range Development Plan. The Library was asked to summarize its current facilities, space requirements and future expansion potential. At the same time the campus is reviewing all capital projects to ensure that they reflect priorities in the UCSF Strategic Plan. EVC Washington has assembled a small group to work with Campus Planning to advise him on academic priorities, including library space, to add to the planning effort.

This document describes library space allocations today and projections for the next 5-10 years.

Background

Today’s libraries remain central to the academic enterprise, bringing together new and emerging information technologies combined with traditional knowledge resources in a user focused, service-rich environment to support today’s patterns of learning, teaching, research and community service. The Library serves as the centerpiece for the intellectual community and the scholarly enterprise.

Current Operations and Facilities

UCSF Library at Parnassus

In 1991, the campus celebrated the opening of the new UCSF Library at Parnassus, a state-of-the-art facility with remarkable views of San Francisco. The building was designed with capacity to house 800,000 volumes, an assortment of individual and group study areas, a computing lab, classroom, a community meeting room, an area to exhibit art, and staff offices and work areas.
The Library also functions as meeting and work space. Small faculty carrels bridge geographic boundaries by providing meeting and work areas to faculty members who are traveling between campuses. The Lange Room, a showcase on Parnassus, is a popular venue for departmental receptions and meetings. For research the rich collection of digital and print materials, advanced technologies and expert staff support ongoing projects and explorations in new disciplines and unfamiliar territory.

Since its opening, space allocation has remained relatively constant. Space reassignments have added two additional programs now occupying around 6,000 square feet. In large part the programs replaced book and journal stacks. One program is directly related to library activities but the other has evolved to a clinical service with no library collaboration.

**UCSF Libraries at Mission Bay**
Two libraries at Mission Bay occupy 6,000 square feet. The UCSF Library at Genentech Hall opened in the first phase of the Mission Bay campus in 2003 followed by the UCSF Library at the Community Center in 2006. The former serves as a highly valued 24-hour study facility and the latter offers a computer classroom for academic and administrative training, core and specialized library services. The Genentech Hall Library, which serves as the 24 hour facility, is likely to close in the next year and the space converted to another function.

**Affiliate UCSF Libraries**
In addition to facilities mentioned above there are small libraries at UCSF clinical sites, managed generally through the School of Medicine dean’s offices (San Francisco General Hospital; UCSF Mt. Zion; and, UCSF Fresno). For the most part these facilities are organized around service delivery and curriculum support though small they are heavily used services. While each site purchases a small set of selective, unique material the electronic books and journals are managed and paid for by the UCSF Library.

**Planning Considerations for Future Library Space**

**Parnassus**
Space that fosters collaboration is the concept behind a construction project in the UCSF Library at Parnassus. A new Teaching and Learning Center with general assignment classrooms, a clinical simulation/clinical skills facility and redesigned student computing/instructional development area will replace study tables and journal stacks. A key concept in the design of the TLC is an expanded definition of classrooms as both formal and informal spaces – hallways, computer labs, libraries, student lounges and coffee shops and the integral role libraries play in student learning. The project includes relocating two library functions from the 2nd floor to the 3rd floor and moving the library-managed student computing lab to the north wall on the 2nd floor.

There are two longer term space issues for the Parnassus Library. The most pressing need is a 24 hour study facility. An area on the 3rd floor was designed as such but lacks restrooms. Adding restrooms would allow continuity with existing library facilities. Students now have access to small computer lab in the Medical Sciences Building. This space is used heavily but is not large enough for individual study. There remains a critical need for a secure, safe 24-hour study area for students on Parnassus. The other longer term issue is office space for staff. Staff work areas will soon be needed as the library continues to partner on technology projects and is successful in competing for grants and contracts. There are opportunities to capture existing space within the library, which would require redesign and perhaps relocation of current tenants.
Mission Bay

To meet current and future needs, the Mission Bay library must expand. The following contributes to space needs.

- New academic and clinical programs
- Growth in student populations
- Opportunities for partnerships and collaboration

1. New Academic and Clinical Programs

As faculty and academic programs move to Mission Bay, there will be additional pressures on library space and services. To date the service needs have been met through the two existing facilities with strong support from library staff at Parnassus. Special considerations should be given to the design of areas to support faculty. Space for faculty collaboration, well-designed areas for quiet study and room for experiments with new technologies for teaching and learning are examples. Additionally, we project ongoing demand for training to assist in managing the biomedical literature, to support publication and guidance on using advanced databases and tools.

The UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay and other planned clinical facilities will require additional library staff support. Medical Center staff consults libraries for patient care and to support clinical research. A paper and electronic patient library with expert information assistance is a possible joint project with the Medical Center to respond to the expected patient and family visits.

2. Growth in Student Populations

There are three areas of student growth at Mission Bay. 1) graduate students, including postdocs; 2) UCSF students living on or near UCSF campus; 3) students, residents and fellows that will accompany the professional school programs moving to Mission Bay once the Medical Center opens.

Data indicate about a steady growth in the number of graduate students and the possibility that 2nd year medical students will move to Mission Bay. Additionally, we can expect to see other professional students on clinical rotations at the new Medical Center adding to the campus student population and need for space to study, to work with colleagues and to prepare for clinical work.

The Mission Bay student housing has increased the need for a convenient, nearby, safe place to study. Study at home is often impossible due to living arrangements that may include roommates who function on a different schedule. Graduate students and fellows require space outside their labs to study for exams, write papers, and prepare grant proposals. Students study late into the night due to their busy schedules and graduate students need to monitor laboratory experiments. With additional programs located at Mission Bay and the build-out of nearby housing more students will live on or near campus and consider Mission Bay their primary location.
3. Opportunities for Partnerships and Community Building

In the recent redesign of the UCSF Library at Parnassus the library sought partnerships that strengthen existing programs and enhance student and faculty life. There are opportunities for similar partnerships at Mission Bay, given the diversity of programs and interdisciplinary activities planned for that site. At a minimum careful thought should be given to locating related functions either in or adjacent to library space.

Young biotech companies, often founded by UCSF faculty, typically do not have funds to access the range of scientific and technical journals and databases to bring their products to market. Today, many rely on the UC online journals and databases through visits to the Mission Bay Community Center Library.

Mission Bay Library Space Planning

Conceptualizing a vision for health sciences libraries is useful in planning space. The future will include advanced tools for communication; seamless access to UC and worldwide information resources regardless of format; a well-integrated online learning environment that blends class sessions with online course materials; easy remote access to meetings, courses and lectures regardless of geographic location; a robust technical infrastructure with support that is unified across the UCSF enterprise; immediate online connections to library staff expertise for help with databases, information questions; and an increasingly complex information universe with highly specialized databases.

Programming
Some elements of the space requirements for the library of the future will look similar to today’s library. A mixture of traditional and innovative space will preserve the essential elements yet emphasize the integral nature of technology to the academic health sciences enterprise.

Study space is an essential function. It should include separate seating areas that meet diverse needs for individualized, quiet work and interactive, group work. An instructional computing area would enable students to use specialized programs with a campus ‘help’ desk to assist with hardware and software problems. Even with the widespread computer requirements for students many will continue to rely on library-supported workstations. Additionally, high end equipment will support advanced tools for curriculum development and space would be set aside to join in meetings and events across the UCSF locations. A small staff would deliver services, offer training and support the technology. Shelving would hold a very small number of books. Finally, the space should be designed so that one area is open 24 hours a day with security and nearby restroom facilities. Ideally, the space would be situated adjacent to other teaching/learning facilities for convenience and synergy.

Sizing the Library

A common metric that has been used in the past for library planning considers student population using a standard of 25 square feet/student and then adding space for work areas and book stacks. Currently, there are 200 students at Mission Bay. For rough planning purposes we will add another 200 professional school students assuming some portion of their curriculum will move to Mission Bay. This method would result in a library of 12,970 square feet. This figure does not account for the 756
students living in Mission Bay housing, many of whom are professional school students who use the Mission Bay Library. Nor does it consider students who live in adjacent Mission Bay neighborhoods.

Another very rough way to determine appropriate size is to divide the population by the current size of Mission Bay library and then project the size of expanded space (2837/3000 sf=1.057 sq/person). Using population figures for 2026 would require a library of 15,042 square feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Mission Bay</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2007</td>
<td>2,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2011</td>
<td>2,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2026</td>
<td>4,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5,131 (Medical Center opens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is rough space allocations library for a 12,790 square foot library at Mission Bay. These calculations consider the growth in populations and new academic programs but not opportunities for partnerships and community building.

**Space Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>8,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable Seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hour Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelving for 1000 volumes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Commons</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Service/Help Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Work Areas (11) /Technical infrastructure</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,790</strong> square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timeframe**

There are pressures now on Mission Bay libraries. The Community Center Library is not large enough to support the student population in 2009 nor is it designed for 24-hour access. Additionally, the small size and location, directly on a major walkway from the parking garage, results in considerable noise and significant use by non-UCSF community members. The space pressures will increase as new programs and populations locate at Mission Bay. A new library should be in place when the Medical Center opens in 2015. Planning should begin now to identify space, functions, locations, design and construction funding.
Interprofessional Education presentation to the Education Policy Committee
December 9, 2009
Dorothy Perry, Kimberly Topp, Phaedra Bell

Thank Education Policy committee for opportunity to inform them of IPETF efforts, receive faculty input and ideas, and further engage faculty throughout the campus

Brief history
• Task force of Associate Deans formed in 2003
• Charged to “achieve small steps towards greater interdisciplinary education at UCSF”
• Elevated to the level of the Deans because of structural barriers to IP education across schools
• Additional committee members include representatives from Physical Therapy, Library, Student Academic Affairs, and interested students and faculty

IPETF initial accomplishments
• Generated IPE Report of current educational activities that are, or could be, interprofessional, copy provided
• Electives listed online to facilitate student enrollment, copy provided
• Achieved common calendar across schools

IPE Day 1
• 2006, 2007 - Patient safety focus
• 2008, 2009 - Health care disparities focus
• Positive evals, suggestions relating to logistics, requests for additional IP interactions

IPE Day 2
• Designed to keep groups engaged
• Uses IP communication training video developed with Macy Fdn funds
• IP groups from IPE Day 1 continue to interact on the CLE (85% of students posting responses to “question of the month”)

Library Instructional Improvement grants
• 2008 - IP focus, funded use of standardized patient for IP approach to patient with chronic disease, scheduled for Jan-Mar 2010
• 2009 – continue IP focus and adding use of the Teaching and Learning Center
• Teaching and Learning Center was planned for IP and school specific activities

Challenges
• Scheduling of simultaneous classroom education for 500 students
• IP electives are available, but don’t work into all students’ schedules
• Clinical IP education is limited by school schedules and off site rotations

Ongoing activities
• Annual report to the Deans, charged to improve assessment and outcomes data demonstrating improvements in patient care, communication
• Beginning discussions of cross-school Health Policy course
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I. Introduction

Interprofessional Education (IPE), also known as Interdisciplinary Education, is considered by many an important component of health professions’ curriculum. It is defined as formal, planned “occasions when two or more professions learn with, from and about each other to improve collaboration and the quality of care\(^1\)”. This is excluding situations where students simply learn the same content in the same course without interacting to learn with and from each other about each other’s roles; this latter case is known as multidisciplinary education. Also distinguished from IPE is inter-professional practice, in which providers of different professions work together for the care of a patient, or researchers in different fields collaborate in research. While it serves as a model for students to emulate, inter-professional practice does not teach future health professionals the skills needed to fully collaborate and communicate proficiently. IPE means that students from different fields are interacting and learning in a way that prepares them for the seamless teamwork between different specialists that modern medicine requires.

The goal of IPE is to ensure that students and trainees in the health professions build a skill set that will ultimately increase patient safety, reduce errors, maximize efficiencies, and improve quality of care. It can serve to “modify negative attitudes and perceptions, remedy failures in trust and communication, reinforce collaborative competence, cope with problems that exceed the capacity of any one profession, secure collaboration in policy, create a more flexible workforce, and enhance job satisfaction and ease stress\(^1\)”.

As a university dedicated to the health professions and comprised of some of the best programs in the country, UCSF possesses great potential for becoming a leader in IPE. UCSF’s administration recognizes the importance of strengthening the University’s commitment to collaboration and innovation; the first goal highlighted in the Strategic Plan is to “design novel interdisciplinary and interschool approaches in education, research, and discovery”. Eventually, UCSF will become “simultaneously innovative, effective and efficient” through interdisciplinary coursework, learning experiences, and teamwork\(^2\).

UCSF has a number of attributes that would make implementation of strong IPE programs viable. The foremost of these is UCSF’s status as a health professions campus; its leadership focuses solely on educating future health professionals and researchers. Therefore, resources and time can be concentrated on IPE from the top down once the need and specific goals are identified. Also bolstering the development of effective IPE activities is the prominence of each UCSF school in its respective field – across the board, UCSF is a research and clinical powerhouse. Students could also learn from each other, as noted below with the peer teaching between pharmacy students and medical students, or use their own initiative to start programs, as in Students for Interprofessional Learning or Children’s Health Hut. The exceptional faculty and students that comprise UCSF will invigorate efforts for collaborative learning.
The objective of this report is to address UCSF’s progress toward achieving its goal of innovative and interdisciplinary education. It will discuss current inter-professional activities, as well as opportunities for future expansion of IPE. Furthermore, the report will detail UCSF’s institutional barriers that hinder the development of IPE. Lastly, we will summarize the interprofessional activities occurring at other institutions to guide future endeavors here at UCSF. Hopefully these endeavors will lead to further innovation that will maintain UCSF’s prominence as a health-professions university.


II. Existing Interprofessional Education, Activities, Events & Opportunities

A. Curricular

- Students from the Graduate Division teach neuroscience to first year dental students on discussion sections. (Spring BMS 118, Mike McMaster)
- 3rd year medical students take intersession course taught by School of Pharmacy student on improving patient outcomes by utilizing pharmacists’ expertise.
- Physical Therapy (PT) students teach surface anatomy and musculoskeletal physical exam skills to medical students. The medical students also get to learn about PT’s role in patient care.

B. Electives Open to All Students (*See the appendix for further detail)

- **School of Dentistry**
  BIOMED SCI 186 Adv Head & Neck Anatomy
  BIOMED SCI 187 Lab Instruction in Gross Anatomy
  BIOMED SC 188 Basic Science Curriculum Development
  DPH 186 Interdisciplinary Team Training in Geriatrics
  OMFS 186 Acupuncture for Orofacial Pain

- **School of Medicine**

  **Biochemistry**
  160.01 Food Facts, Fads and Pharmacology

  **Clinical Pharmacy**
198 BAD BUGS: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Antimicrobial Resistance

**Epidemiology & Biostatistics**
170.16 Environment and Health Hall
180.08 Violence Prevention Conference
180.10 Introduction to Global Health

**Family & Community Medicine**
170.01A Introduction to Developmental Skills Training
170.01B Communicating with the Mandarin Speaking
170.01E Introduction to Health Policy
170.10A Homeless Health Issues
171.03 AIDS Forum
171.01 The Healer's Art
170.01A Prison Healthcare
170.01B Issues in LGBTI Health Care
170.01E Public Policy Advocacy for Healthcare Professionals
170.07 Communicating with the Latino Patient (Intermediate)
198 Caring for the Underserved
198 Communicating with the Mandarin Speaking Patient
170.01A Integrative Medicine Forum
170.01B Communicating with the Cantonese-Speaking Patient
170.01C Public Policy Advocacy for Healthcare Professionals
170.31C Narrative Medicine: Student as Writer

**Medicine**
170.02 Social Activism in Medicine
170.01A Impact of Interpersonal Violence on Health
170.01B Bioethics and Society
170.30 Older Adults and End of Life Care
170.31B Narrative Medicine

**Obstetrics & Gynecology**
170.06 African American Health Disparities
170.03 Reproductive Choices
170.05 Health Care Issues in the Sex Worker Population
170.07 Latina Health Issues Robertson
Pediatrics
170.01B Beginning Vietnamese

Inter-disciplinary studies
202. Health Policy Research Across Disciplines
203. Health Policy Writing Seminar
140.03. Global Health Problem Solving and Science

School of Nursing
B187 Introduction to Statistics
B192 Introduction to Linear Models
N203 End of Life Care Across Practice Settings
N209A Comparative Qualitative Research Design
N212A Qualitative Data Collection and Ethics
N212B Quantitative Measurement and Theory
N230 Measuring Outcomes of Health Care
N231A Substance Use & Mental Illness
N232.04A Pediatric Pharmacology
N240.04 Violence and Health
N242B HIV Clinical Pharmacology
N253 Theories of the Policy Process
N262.05 Primary and Complementary Care Research Utilization
N273D Environment & Health
N289.01 Advanced Methods: Meta-Analysis
N407 Basic Interpretation of Chest X-rays
S212C Sociological Theory: Symbolic Interaction
S233 Sociology of Aging
S235 Tobacco Control Policy Issues
S236 Race and Class Factors in Health Care Delivery
S246 Communications & Policy Leadership
S282 Sociology of Science/Technology
S285A Qualitative Methods I
S285B Qualitative Methods II: Analysis
S286 Gender, Sex & Health

School of Pharmacy
CP 151 Pediatric Pharmacology
CP 152.03 Women’s Health Issues
CP 152.04 Focus on HIV
CP 170.08 Chemo. & Clinical Oncology
CP 170.10 Herbal & Dietary Supplements
CP 170.30 Clinical Toxicology
CP 198 Bad Bugs
CP 198 Diabetes Elective: “Interdisciplinary Management of Diabetes”

C. Clinical / Community Outreach

- Masters Entry Program in Nursing (MEPN) shadowing program:
  Fourth-year Medical students and MEPN students are paired and the MEPN students shadow the medical students and communicate with them about patient care. MEPN students observe: pre-rounds, rounds, seminar, and patient care from 8AM-2:30PM.
  WHO: Medical students, Nursing students.
  Contact: Katherine Holbrook (MEPN student), Dr. Helen Loeser, Christopher Peabody

- Homeless Tenderloin Clinic:
  The UCSF Students’ Homeless Clinic is comprised of UCSF medical students, nursing students, pharmacy students, medical residents, and physicians. Their mission statement is to provide sensitive, accessible, and high-quality health care and create an environment in which students, preceptors, and patients may teach and learn from one another at the same time.
  WHO: Medical students, Nursing students, Pharmacy students, Medical residents, Physicians.
  Contact: https://www.medschool.ucsf.edu/homeless/pubClinic/tarc.asp

- ADEA (American Dental Education Association):
  Spearheaded one of the largest interprofessional events on campus (The High School Outreach Conference)
  WHO: UCSF students
  Contact: Bunly Pel (bunly.pel@ucsf.edu), past-president of ADEA

- Children’s Health Hut:
  Its mission is to play a part in lessoning the health disparities in access to care and health education among the undeserved children in San Francisco. Children's Health Hut is a campus volunteer organization that reaches out to the underserved community. It is comprised of Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, Nursing and Physical Therapy Students. Together, this organization interacts with the community by giving free medical screenings, dental screenings, and health education through games.
WHO: UCSF students
Contact: Shirin Mullen (shirin.mullen@ucsf.edu), http://web.ucsf.edu/hut

- Glide Memorial Church Health Clinic:
  A federally funded Health Care for the Homeless, it is managed by the UCSF School of Nursing Adult Nurse Practitioner program in cooperation with Glide Memorial United Methodist Church, Catholic Healthcare West and other community partners. Glide Health Clinic is hoping to have affiliation with the School of Pharmacy via tele-pharmacy project and also School of Dentistry with oral health in near future.
  WHO: UCSF students, Physicians, Nurse Practitioners.
  Contact: Joanne Saxe (joanne.saxe@nursing.ucsf.edu)

- AIDS Action Network
  AIDS Action Network brings students together from multiple disciplines who are interested in AIDS advocacy work. Our projects focus on: 1) Community Outreach, 2) Social Activism, and 3) Global Action, and include the annual Global AIDS Week of Action and the Mosaic Variety Show. For more info, see http://ucsf.edu/action.

- UCSF Vietnamese Community Health Promotion Project (VCHPP)
  An organization dedicated to conducting research and public health programs for Vietnamese Americans. VCHPP currently manages four studies targeting hepatitis B awareness, tobacco use, and breast and cervical cancer screening in the Vietnamese American community.
  WHO: UCSF students
  Contact: Tung Nguyen, M.D. Internal Medicine (Tung.nguyen@ucsf.edu)

- SNPhA (Student National Pharmaceutical Association)/ SNMA (Student National Medical Association)
  Both organizations facilitate healthcare community outreach events, and provide opportunities to work with students from the other schools. They organized joint High School outreach events, and a Health Disparity lecture series.
  WHO: Students from School of Medicine and Pharmacy
Contact: http://rco.ucsf.edu/index.php/snma/index/, http://rco.ucsf.edu/index.php/snpha/index/

- Project HIV
The project, part of UCSF’s chapter of the American Pharmacist Association-Academy of Student Pharmacists (APhA-ASP) is managed by students from the School of Pharmacy. The goal is to increase HIV/AIDS awareness and educate the public on various ways of prevention, myths, and treatment in a variety of settings. Project collaborates with the AIDS Action Network from the School of Medicine. Future events are planned to include School of Medicine, but scheduling conflicts seem persistent.

**WHO:** UCSF Pharmacy Students, future events planned to include School of Medicine

**Contact:** Jennifer Cocohoba (cocohobaj@pharmacy.ucsf.edu)

- **Hepatitis B Project:**
  Collaboration with the San Francisco Department of Public Health. The program is a citywide effort to eradicate hepatitis B from the City of San Francisco by providing free screening efforts and affordable vaccination.

  **WHO:** Pharmacy Students, Medical Students, Nursing Students

  **Contact:** [http://www.ucsf.edu/sfhbc/](http://www.ucsf.edu/sfhbc/)

- **Academic Geriatric Resource Center (AGRC):**
  Offers Interdisciplinary Team Training (ITT) via six-week clinical rotations three times a year. Students and faculty from Medicine, Nursing, Dentistry, Pharmacy and Physical Therapy visit geriatric patient’s homes. Emphasize student exposure to core aspects of geriatric care and encourages students to think about the older adult from a perspective other than their discipline.

  **WHO:** UCSF students

  **Contact:** [http://agrc.ucsf.edu/programs.html](http://agrc.ucsf.edu/programs.html)

- **Chronic Care Project:**
  Ambulatory Care clinics at Parnassus and Mt. Zion focuses on team based healthcare for patients with chronic illnesses especially diabetes, hypertension, heart disease and lung disease. Students / residents from School of Medicine (residents), Pharmacy (4th year students) and Nursing (2nd year NP students) complete one rotation with faculty supervision.

  **WHO:** Medical students, Nursing students, Pharmacy students

  **Contacts:** Pharmacy: Dr. Lisa Kroon (kroonl@pharmacy.ucsf.edu), Nursing: Dr. Susan Janson (susan.janson@nursing.ucsf.edu), Medicine: Dr. Molly Cook (mcooke@medicine.ucsf.edu)
• **UCSF Diabetes Clinic:**
  Weekly Wednesday interprofessional clinic comprised of physicians, nurses, nutritionists, pharmacists, and students/residents that offer patients an effective, personalized treatment plan for optimal diabetes control.
  **WHO:** UCSF students, Physicians, Nurse Practitioners, Nutritionists, Pharmacists, Residents
  **Contact:** [http://www.diabetes.ucsf.edu/EN/dc_home/](http://www.diabetes.ucsf.edu/EN/dc_home/)

• **UCSF Chest Clinic:**
  Weekly Monday interprofessional clinic comprised of students and practitioners from Nursing, Medicine, and Pharmacy, focused on patients with a variety of lung diseases. (Dr. Susan Janson)
  **WHO:** Medical students, Nursing students, Pharmacy students
  **Contact:** Dr. Susan Janson ([susan.janson@nursing.ucsf.edu](mailto:susan.janson@nursing.ucsf.edu))

D. Research

• **UCSF Health Care Disparities Research Symposium**
  This symposium is an opportunity to highlight faculty research on health disparities. The goal is to build community among disparities researchers from many disciplines and across units, schools, and campus sites.
  **WHO:** UCSF faculty, students, postdoc, resident or fellow
  **Contact:** [http://ucsfstudents.wordpress.com/2008/08/01/ucsf-health-disparities-research-symposium/](http://ucsfstudents.wordpress.com/2008/08/01/ucsf-health-disparities-research-symposium/)

• **Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute:**
  An NIH-funded organization dedicated to bringing scientific discoveries to the bedside through translational research. Multidisciplinary Research Project Planning Awards are used to support development of complex cross-disciplinary research projects, through funding of activities leading to large grant applications, such as a PO1 grant.
  **WHO:** UCSF students
  **Contact:** [http://ctsi.ucsf.edu/](http://ctsi.ucsf.edu/)

• **Pathways to Careers in Clinical and Translational Research:**
  Year-long fellowship program that is open to students of all schools for translational research, hosted by Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute
  **WHO:** UCSF Students
  **Contact:** [http://ctsi.ucsf.edu/about/index.php](http://ctsi.ucsf.edu/about/index.php)
• **Pathways to Discovery Program**
  School of Medicine program that has recently been expanded to all schools. The goal of the program is to foster the pursuit of discovery, inquiry, and innovation as part of the career of every health professional trained at UCSF. Trainees are provided with opportunities for in-depth study and experience in one of several areas of inquiry that go beyond the routine practice of health care. Research Areas consist of Clinical and Translational Research, Global Health, Health and Society, Health Professions Education, Molecular Medicine.
  **WHO**: UCSF Students
  **Contact**: http://medschool.ucsf.edu/medicaleducation/pathways/

• **Training Program in Transdisciplinary Health Policy Research (TdHPR)**
  The TdHPR program trains researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to develop innovative approaches to complex policy problems in health and healthcare. From our perspective, such policies can range from proposals to revamp the health care system to better guidelines for clinicians to apply in daily practice. The program emphasizes how to use perspectives, tools, and theories of multiple academic disciplines and fields. The program seeks to train scholars to be fluent and to translate across the multiple “languages” of health policy. The goal is not just to do excellent research, but research with methods and findings sufficiently well-grounded that one can confidently offer them for use by policymakers.
  **Contact**: http://www.ihps.medschool.ucsf.edu/Training

• **Global Health Sciences**
  Global Health Sciences has developed and continues to develop a range of programs to prepare the next generation of researchers and clinicians for careers in global health. These programs span professional health sciences education, clinical training, and graduate research. They bring students and faculty from partner institutions in developing countries together with UCSF students in all four professional schools and the graduate division, e.g. Clinical Scholars Program.
  **WHO**: UCSF Students, Clinicians and Faculty
  **Contact**: http://globalhealthsciences.ucsf.edu/

E. **Other Activities**

• **Interprofessional Education Day (2006, 2007)**
  The development and implementation of a unique interprofessional education experience involving patient safety and emphasizing communication and collaboration for beginning students in the health professions.
  **WHO**: First-year students for all schools.
• **Seminar for Enhancing Interprofessional Teamwork & Communication Skills to Improve Care and Safety at UCSF.**
Seminar designed and implemented by Students for Interprofessional Learning to discuss patient safety issues that arise in inter-professional situations.
**Contact:** Jessica Chan ([Jessica.Chan@ucsf.edu](mailto:Jessica.Chan@ucsf.edu))

• **Chancellor's Health Policy Lecture Series**
The Chancellor’s Series has been established to bring to the campus several times per year a major figure in health policy to raise awareness in the UCSF community of the important health policy issues of the day.
**WHO:** UCSF students
**Contact:** [http://pub.ucsf.edu/today/cache/news/200603278.html](http://pub.ucsf.edu/today/cache/news/200603278.html)

• **4th NaHSSA (National Health Science Student Association)**
Annual National Interprofessional Healthcare Student Conference during MLK weekend. Their mission statement: NaHSSA strives to promote collaborative patient-centered practice and teamwork through interprofessional education in order to respond to the evolving health care needs.
**WHO:** UCSF students
**Contact:** Associate Deans (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy)

• **Annual Integrative Medicine Forum**
Held in May of each year. The 10th annual event was held in 2008. This is multi school student organized/ planned weekend event highlights integrative approaches to medicine. It involves weekly committee/ planning activities at least 6 month prior to event, and is a great opportunity to work with students from different schools.
**WHO:** UCSF students. Pharmacy and Medicine have been primary participants. Dentistry and PT has yet to get involved.
**Contact:** [http://rco.ucsf.edu/index.php/imn/index/](http://rco.ucsf.edu/index.php/imn/index/)

• **Office of Career & Professional Development**
Prepares UCSF students, post-docs for future careers as faculty members through events, seminars, job resources, and skill development. Also has a list-serve that can be joined.
**Website:** [http://web.ucsf.edu/career/pff.shtml](http://web.ucsf.edu/career/pff.shtml)

Professional & Academic Success Skills Series (PASS)
PASS is a series of intensive workshops designed to enhance the professional development of UCSF students and scholars engaged in research. Past topics include:

- Funding Your Research
- Giving a Dynamic Research Talk
- Setting Goals for Your Career Direction and Professional Growth
- Negotiation & Conflict Resolution for Scientists
- Publishing Your Research

List of activities held by OCPD (http://web.ucsf.edu/career/pass/index.html)

- **Registered Campus Organizations**
  (* See the appendix for RCO initiated events in 2007 catalogue)

F. Future plans

- Kanbar Clinical Skills Simulation Center. Housed on the second floor of the UCSF library and scheduled to open in 2010. Will be open to all four professional schools and will foster an environment of collaboration and inter-professional activity.

- Collaborations between ethnic organizations in the different professions - as an example, the Latino Medical Student Association and the Latino Association of Pharmacy Students are partnering in the coming year to organize a health fair for the community and hold talks by Latino faculty.

- Harvard-Macy Work – Interprofessional scenario developed by Preetha Basaviah, MD; Carrie Chen, MD, MSEd; Shieva Khayam-Bashi, MD; Rosemary Plank, RN, PhD; and Sharon Youmans, PharmD, MPH. The scenario was filmed and will be shown to interprofessional small groups for discussion. Eventually it will be turned into a simulation in which students will be given the scenario and make decisions on their own.

- Calendar Working Group – A group convened to align the calendars of the various schools at UCSF to enable collaboration.

- Collaborative Learning Environment: A project supported by the Center for Instructional Technology to change the current WebCT web environment to a new, more flexible system called Moodle. The hope is that this new system will provide for better collaboration between the schools and more opportunities for cross-communication between students and faculty of different professions.
III. Barriers to Expanding Interprofessional Education at UCSF

A. Challenges/barriers for students
- Existing curricular commitments (to own program)
- Scheduling conflicts (varied schedules across schools, inability to view other school’s calendar’s)
- Traditional beliefs in hierarchical roles
- Split of student governments between Associated Students of UC and Graduate Student Association
- Communication (limited/no e-mail access to other schools list serves)

B. Challenges/barriers for faculty
- Scheduling conflicts
- Lack of resources (funding, IPE models, etc.)
- Lack of team culture/cultural barriers
- Lack of resources (e.g. administrative support, funding, educational)
- Student’s variable educational/clinical knowledge
- Competition for clinical sites (-> need to think less territorial)

C. Suggestions
- Start up UCSF IPE website with resources for students AND faculty
- Write a grant to get funding for IPE Center (even if virtual), that provides resources and supports faculty’s and a staff person’s efforts.
- Get buy in/leadership for IPE from UCSF’s chancellor and CEO
- Advocate IPE at state level. Expand professional boards to include healthcare professionals from other areas. (e.g. Board of Medicine includes PharmDs, Board of Pharmacy include MDs, etc.)
- Foster collaboration with UC Hastings, with whom UCSF has a partnership agreement going back years.
- Define measurable endpoints for success/benefit of IPE/IPP (e.g. patients, institution).
- Provide larger classroom to accommodate students from two or more schools at the same time.
- Facilitate better advertisement of elective classes to all students. (e.g. Better connection between webct and registrar)
- Implement Student survey idea about interprofessional education – in Spring
- Organize interprofessional social teams/families
• Hold Interdisciplinary Monthly/Quarterly Series (student conversations, seminars, etc.)
• Develop Problem-Based Learning Models for Interprofessional Small Group
• Designate a communications officer in all campus student organizations, who will facilitate communications/more IPE activities across organizations. (monthly/quarterly meetings of all/relevant communication officers)
• Foster relationship with additional clinical sites who already implement interprofessional practice, to obtain additional IPE focused preceptorships.
• Foster development of faculty IPE champions

D. Opportunities
• **Global Health Sciences Program**
  UCSF Global Health Sciences (GHS) is dedicated to improving health and reducing the burden of disease in the world's most vulnerable populations. It integrates UCSF expertise in all of the health, social, and biological sciences, and focuses that expertise on pressing issues in global health.
  **Contact:** [http://www.globalhealthsciences.ucsf.edu/about/Mission.aspx](http://www.globalhealthsciences.ucsf.edu/about/Mission.aspx)

• **International Center of HIV/AIDS Research and Clinical Training in Nursing.** “New” study in China that evaluates quality of hospital care to HIV/AIDS patients in 800 tertiary hospitals.
  **WHO:** Nursing Students, but upcoming potential for all UCSF students
  **Contact:** [http://nurseweb.ucsf.edu/www/ctrhiv.htm](http://nurseweb.ucsf.edu/www/ctrhiv.htm), Dr. Bill Holzemer

• **International Nursing Group**
  Primarily focused on bringing together nurses interested in working or volunteering internationally in order to share ideas, experiences and network, but open to all students. Organizes UCSF’s International Woman’s Day, facilitates lunch time seminars.
  **WHO:** Currently only Nursing Students, but open to all UCSF students
  **Contact:** [http://nurseweb.ucsf.edu/public/ing/](http://nurseweb.ucsf.edu/public/ing/)

• **APhA-ASP**
  Manages several community health projects in School of Pharmacy. May be an opportunity to expand collaboration and work with students from other schools.
  Please contact Community Affairs Officers.
  **WHO:** School of Pharmacy Students
Contact: Karoline Tum, Leslie Tieu http://rco.ucsf.edu/index.php/aphaasp/

- **The Triad Study for Optimal Patient Safety (TOPS)**
  In 2005, UCSF Medical Center was one of three facilities in the Bay area to receive funding as part of the Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation’s project, Triad Study for Optimal Patient Safety (TOPS). The Medicine service, nursing, support staff, and pharmacy all participated in the two year project to improve communications and teamwork on this complex medical unit. The program completed in March, 2007, but the skills learned by staff are still being practiced to enhance the care to these patients. Plans are currently underway to harvest successes from this project and diffuse them throughout the Medical Center.  
  **Contact:** Robert Wachter, MD (bobw@medicine.ucsf.edu)

- Rosalia Mendoza, MD, fellow in the Department of Family and Community Medicine - She developed an oral health component to Family Medicine training for residents and medical students. She sees collaboration with dental fellows/attendings to help improve the medical school oral health curriculum for 3rd-year students in the Family Medicine rotation and for Family Medicine residents to prevent early childhood caries.

**IV. National / International IPE Models**

- **U.S. Universities with IPE centers, offices or initiatives**
  
  - **Thomas Jefferson University’s Jefferson Interprofessional Education Center.**  
    **Highlight:** Multidisciplinary learning model: “This two-year program is required for all first-year health profession students, which includes those studying medicine, nursing, physical therapy, and occupational therapy. The students are grouped into teams of at least two medical students and one nursing student, and each team is partnered with a person living with a chronic condition, who serves as the "patient mentor."
    **Launched:** 2007  
    **Info:** [http://jeffline.jefferson.edu/jcipe/](http://jeffline.jefferson.edu/jcipe/)

  - **University of Washington, Seattle; Center for Health Sciences Interprofessional Education and Research**  
    **Highlight:** UW Innovative Funds Project  
    “The goal of the Innovative Funds Project is to develop a UW Health Sciences Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) to certify the competence of students graduating from Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Social Work, and
Nursing in core skills common to these professionals and in skills specifically required to collaborate in interprofessional teams.”

**Launched:** 2002  
**Info:** [http://interprofessional.washington.edu/](http://interprofessional.washington.edu/)

- **St. Louis University’s Center for Interprofessional Education and Research**  
  **Highlight:** “Focused on offering and further developing collaboratively courses that have objective(s) and experiences, promoting interprofessional competence, conducting interprofessional community outreach and interprofessional research.”  
  **Launched:** 2002  
  **Info:** [http://www.slu.edu/centers/interpro/](http://www.slu.edu/centers/interpro/)

- **Creighton University**  
  1. **Medical Center Office of Interprofessional Education**  
     **Highlight:** “Collaborative Care Seminar. The seminar is designed to provide Creighton health professions students and students of related disciplines an opportunity to learn from and about each other's professional roles and responsibilities. One half-day seminar is offered each semester for students in dentistry, medicine, nursing, occupational therapy, pharmacy, physical therapy, and social work.”  
     **Launched:** 2005  
     **Info:** [http://www.creighton.edu/ipe/](http://www.creighton.edu/ipe/)

  2. **School of Pharmacy’s Office of Interprofessional Scholarship, Service and Education**  
     **Highlights:** “The office offers interprofessional community learning activities for students in medicine, nursing, pharmacy, physical therapy and occupational therapy. These community activities currently include the Native American Outreach and the International Outreach to the Dominican Republic.”  
     **Launched:** 2001  
     **Info:** [http://oisse.creighton.edu/default.asp](http://oisse.creighton.edu/default.asp)

- **Center for Interprofessional Education at the University of Minnesota.**  
  **Highlight:** “Priority Initiatives at the center consist of developing and fostering common ground (leadership and teambuilding, quality improvement and patient safety, health informatics, health policy and society, care systems), new models of care delivery (chronic care, inpatient critical care, health promotion, prevention and maintenance,) and interprofessional outcomes (knowledge about the roles of
other health professionals, ability to work with other health professionals in the context of a team where each member has a clearly defined role, application of disciplinary strengths of health professionals for their highest and best value in health promotion, prevention, and care delivery.” 

**Launched:** 2006  
**Info:** [http://www.ipe.umn.edu/](http://www.ipe.umn.edu/)

- **Medical University of South Carolina’s Interprofessional Initiative**  
  **Highlights:** “First year and second year student interprofessional days, Interprofessional Team Case Competition (Enhancing Patient Safety through Team Innovation).”  
  **Launched:** 2007  
  **Info:** [http://www.musc.edu/academics/interprofessional](http://www.musc.edu/academics/interprofessional)

B. Selected Non U.S. Universities with IPE Centers/Offices

- **The University of Toronto Office of Interprofessional Education Initiative**  
  **Highlights:** “A three year research study, Structuring Communication Relationships for Interprofessional Teamwork (SCRIPT) Program seeks to transform hospital Clinical Teaching Units into settings where interprofessional, collaborative patient-centered practice is enacted, learned and evaluated. A competency-based, longitudinal curriculum design will include a mandatory core curriculum, complementary learning activities, simulation experiences, and a 4-week clinical placement where students will learn how to apply the theoretical concepts of collaboration in practice settings.”  
  **Launched:** 2006  
  **Info:** [http://ipe.utoronto.ca/](http://ipe.utoronto.ca/)

- **Queens University’s Office of Interprofessional Education and Practice**  
  **Highlight:** “The South Eastern Interprofessional Collaborative Learning Environment (SEIPCLE) project. The SEIPCLE Project represents a collaboration of several health care stakeholders in the Kingston community. Supported by Health Force Ontario, this initiative aims to develop a collaborative learning environment that supports interprofessional education and care. This environment will form a foundation to enable and support current and future caregivers to work effectively within a collaborative patient/family-centered care model. Caregivers, patients, families, students and volunteers will participate as educators and learners within the collaborative learning environment.”  
  **Launched:** 2007
• New Foundland Memorial University’s Centre for Collaborative Health Professional Education  
  **Highlight:** In 2006 three IPE modules, (Health and Wellbeing of Children; HIV/AIDS; and Geriatric Care) were first implemented to students from their schools of Medicine, Pharmacy, Nursing, and Social Work. This was followed by conducting a student survey to obtain feedback about their experience.  
  **Launched:** 2006  
  **Info:** [http://www.med.mun.ca/cchpe/IPE.asp](http://www.med.mun.ca/cchpe/IPE.asp)

C. Selected Non U.S. IPE Consortiums, Associations, Collaboratives, and Networks

• **Australian Capital Territory Health Interprofessional Learning Project (Australian Department of Health)**  
  **Highlight:** “A collaborative research partnership was formed between the Centre for Clinical Governance Research (CCGR) at the University of New South Wales (UNSW), ACT Health, the Australian National University, the University of Canberra, the University of Sydney, the University of Queensland and the Australian Patient Safety Foundation. Together the partners are conducting a four-year Australian Research Council (ARC) linkage project, ‘An action research project’ to strengthen inter-professional learning and practice across the ACT Health system’. The project’s goal is to use IPE as the basis for improving IPP, leading to enhanced safety and quality of care for patients, and improved morale and outcomes for patients, staff and students. The project’s specific aims are to enhance teamwork, collaboration and the sharing of ideas, knowledge and practice amongst clinicians, academics and students.”  
  **Launched:** 2004  

• **Institute of Interprofessional Health Sciences Education, Canada**  
  **Highlights:** “The Institute of Interprofessional Health Sciences Education is a virtual learning centre supported by 4 universities (McMaster University, University of Ottawa, Laurentian University and Western University) and by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), and funded by Health Canada. Their’ IPE for patient centered collaborative practice model’ is designed to reinforce the inter-relationship between learner outcomes and collaborative practice by focusing on learners as they transition from academic to clinical environments, and on clinicians as they work together and with learners.”
Launched: 2008
Info: http://www.iihse.ca/

- **The Canadian International Health Collaborative**
  Highlight: “This is a hub for Canadian interprofessional activity. As a Canada-wide initiative, the CIHC developed a start-up structure that ensures all interprofessional projects across the country have a shared venue for exchanging ideas and promising practices related to interprofessional education, collaborative practice and patient-centered care.”
  Launched: 2006
  Info: http://www.cihc.ca/

- **UK Centre for the Advancement of Interprofessional Education (CAIPE)**
  Highlight: “A virtual hub that is dedicated to the promotion and development of interprofessional education (IPE) with and through its individual and corporate members, in collaboration with like-minded organizations in the UK and overseas. It provides information and advice through its website, bulletins, papers and outlets provided by others, and has a close association with the Journal of Interprofessional Care. CAIPE also delivers workshops which facilitate development in IPE and foster exchange and mutual support between members and others.”
  Launched: 1987
  Info: http://www.caipe.org.uk/

- **European IPE Network**
  Highlight: “The EIPEN is a network of sixteen academic and non-academic organizations. EIPEN aims to develop and sustain a network in the EU to share and develop effective interprofessional vocational training curricula, methods and materials for improving collaborative practice and multi agency working in health and social care.”
  Launched: 2004
  Info: http://www.eipen.org/

- **The International Association for Interprofessional Education and Collaborative Practice**
  Highlight: “Conceived in Vancouver, Canada, in 2004 during the second All Together Better Health Conference. The Association promotes and advances scholarship and informs policy in interprofessional education and collaborative
practice worldwide in partnership with patients, colleagues, communities and other organizations.”

**Launched:** 2005

**Info:** [http://www.interedhealth.org/site/](http://www.interedhealth.org/site/)

## V. Resources

### A. General

- Several fully developed team based, practice and generic clinical IPE modules
  Info: [http://www.iihse.ca/_bin/resources.cfm](http://www.iihse.ca/_bin/resources.cfm)
- The Prevention Education Resource Center (PERC) is a web-based repository of educational materials related to prevention and population health. The site promotes collaboration across health care disciplines, professions and institutions by facilitating the exchange of teaching resources and connecting educators.

### B. Publications on Interprofessional Education

- *Developing Health Care Teams. A Report by the Academic Health Center Task Force on Interdisciplinary Health Team Development.*
  [http://www.ahc.umn.edu/tf/ihtd.html](http://www.ahc.umn.edu/tf/ihtd.html)
- Hugh Barr. *Interprofessional Education: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow.* UK Centre for Interprofessional Advancement of Interprofessional Education
VI. Conclusion

There is a global trend towards interprofessional education and practices. Many national and international organizations have already adopted models of interprofessional education, in light of its benefits, e.g. maximized efficiencies, reduced errors (malpractice), and overall improved patient care. We found an abundance of interprofessional activities at UCSF, ranging from pediatrics to geriatrics, from first-year students to clinical students, residents, and fellows.
Many of these were student-initiated electives and volunteer opportunities. There are a surprising number of clinical learning opportunities that are interprofessional. Also, we found that a large number of student- or faculty-run electives are open to students from all schools.

While individuals from the UCSF community have implemented these IPE projects, they have not been coordinated in a centralized manner; in other words, there is no administrative structure to support interprofessional activities or education. Also, there have been no specific criteria set for conducting successful IPE electives or modules. UCSF’s size has made it challenging to centralize IPE in the past, yet we hope that the information in this report will enable UCSF to move forward rapidly and incorporate the core concept of interprofessional education and practices.

We propose the following:

Address and eliminate current barriers to IPE, identify objectives to accomplish (from list of suggestions), prioritize them, and assign immediate, short, and long term goals. Immediate steps that should be taken consist of writing an IPE grant, hosting an IPE website (Office of Career Development has offered to keep and manage it for now). Short term goals include beginning a quarterly IPE event (weekend day IPE seminar, utilize existing IPE educational models, see resource section), facilitating the implementation of IPE communication officers at all relevant organizations and have them meet quarterly. Long term goals include the launching of an IPE Center, with the staff from each school and departments to contribute their pieces into this centralized organization. Curriculum changes maybe necessary for the adjustment into global calendar planned for 2010. Development of new (better version) WebCT should be implemented in a way that it is interconnected with office of registrar for easier access to registration and schedule of classes offered each quarter.
Appendix

I. List of Electives open to students from all schools
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name &amp; Number</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Science 186</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Prerequisites: Successful completion of BMS 116, 117, and 118. Restrictions: Enrollment requires permission of instructor. Laboratory 3-9 hours. <strong>M. McMaster</strong> For high achieving students who want more exposure to gross anatomy through cadaver dissection, and study of prosected specimens, texts, atlases and supplemental materials. Students perform advanced dissections to explore functional anatomy of the head/neck and develop prosections for teaching and board review. All elements of the course are under the supervision of the anatomy faculty and will enhance student knowledge and understanding of anatomy science. (department: CELL &amp; TISBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Science 187 Lab Instruction in Gross Anatomy</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Prerequisites: Successful completion of BMS 116, 117, and 118. Restrictions: Enrollment requires permission of instructor. Laboratory 3 hours. Seminar 3 hours. <strong>M. McMaster</strong> This course provides advanced training for students interested in anatomical sciences. Upperclass students will TA first-year dental students in the gross anatomy laboratory and rotate with faculty answering questions and assisting with dissection and study of cadavers. It provides reinforcement of anatomic knowledge covered in the first year of dental education in preparation of the National Board Part 1. (department: CELL &amp; TISBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Science 188 Basic Science Curriculum Development</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer</td>
<td>Prerequisites: Successful completion of BMS 116, 117, and 118. Restrictions: Enrollment requires permission of instructor. Project 3-9 hours. <strong>M. McMaster</strong> Students will develop computer-based multimedia teaching tools working with basic science faculty. Projects will be incorporated into learning modules covering topics in the anatomy, histology, and/or neuroscience that will be applied in teaching and reviewing basic sciences for dental students. (department: CELL&amp;TISBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH 186 Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer</td>
<td>Lecture 2 hours. Clinic 3 hours. Field Work 2 hours. Observation 2 hours. <strong>S. Hyde</strong> A seminar and clinical rotation in which the students function as members of a multidisciplinary health care team. Students evaluate geriatric patients and formulate comprehensive treatment plans. Seminar topics include functional assessment, home assessment, social resources and dental management. (department: PRV RS DEN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Training in Geriatrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMFS 186 Acupuncture for</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Prerequisites: Completion of two years of dental school; course will be offered as an elective. Restrictions: No students below D3. Seminar 1 hours. Clinic 1-2 hours. <strong>G. Goddard</strong> Each student will have a basic knowledge of the basic acupunction points, learn good needling technique for painlessly inserting acupuncture needles for dental and orofacial pain. Students will be taught safe placement of needles and how to prevent or manage complications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## School of Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Course Name &amp; Number</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>160.01 Food Facts, Fads and Pharmacology</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Contacts: Clyde Wilson, PhD, <a href="mailto:cfw@stanfordalumni.org">cfw@stanfordalumni.org</a>; Alex Pastuszak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Alexander.Pastuszak@ucsf.edu">Alexander.Pastuszak@ucsf.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Pharmacy</td>
<td>198 BAD BUGS: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Antimicrobial Resistance</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Macdougall, C. 1 starts 4/2, Wednesdays , 12-1 pm, N-217 Contact: Ariane Wilson (<a href="mailto:ariane.wilson@ucsf.edu">ariane.wilson@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
<td>170.16 Environment and Health Hall</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>T. 1 1/16/08, Wednesdays, 5-7 pm in C-701 Student coordinator: Elizabeth Harrington (<a href="mailto:Elizabeth.Harrington@ucsf.edu">Elizabeth.Harrington@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
<td>180.08 Violence Prevention Conference</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>McLoughlin, E. / Hall, T. 1 Full day conference contact: Elizabeth McLoughlin (<a href="mailto:emclhall@comcast.net">emclhall@comcast.net</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
<td>180.10 Introduction to Global Health</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Novotny T. Toland Hall (U-142) Contact: Vaishali Patel (<a href="mailto:patelvs@globalhealth.ucsf.edu">patelvs@globalhealth.ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01A Introduction to Developmental Skills Training</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Mehling, W. 1 9/10 &amp; 9/11; Monday &amp; Tuesday, 8 am - 4 pm, HSW-302 (DST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01B Communicating with the Mandarin Speaking</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Wang, X. 1 starts 10/8; Mondays, 4-6 pm, S-174; student coordinators: Elizabeth Tsang (<a href="mailto:lizzyx@gmail.com">lizzyx@gmail.com</a>); Patient John Shen (<a href="mailto:john.shen@ucsf.edu">john.shen@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01E Introduction to Health Policy</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Rittenhouse, D. 1 starts 9/17; Mondays, 12-1 pm, N-225; student coordinators: David Kaufman (<a href="mailto:david.kaufman@ucsf.edu">david.kaufman@ucsf.edu</a>); Charlotte Carlson (<a href="mailto:charlotte.carlson@ucsf.edu">charlotte.carlson@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.10A Homeless Health Issues</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>J. 1 9/15; Saturday, 9:30 am - 4 pm, Cole Hall; breakout rooms: S-172, 174, 176, 178, 180; student coordinators: Katie Menzel (<a href="mailto:margaret.menzel@ucsf.edu">margaret.menzel@ucsf.edu</a>); Solmaz Poorsattar (<a href="mailto:solmaz.poorsattar@ucsf.edu">solmaz.poorsattar@ucsf.edu</a>); Ashkon Shaahifar (<a href="mailto:ashkon.shaahifar@ucsf.edu">ashkon.shaahifar@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>171.03 AIDS Forum</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Educate the UCSF student community about the HIV/AIDS epidemic beyond the scope of our standard medical, pharmacy, dental and nursing curricula. Encourage interaction and collaboration between UCSF students and neighboring HIV/AIDS community organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01 The Healer's Art</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Remen, R. HSW-301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01A Prison Healthcare</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Shavit, S. Class size limited. Pre-register with organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01B Issues in LGBTI Health Care</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Vener, M. Student coordinator: Amanda Yeaton-Massey (<a href="mailto:amanda.yeaton-massey@ucsf.edu">amanda.yeaton-massey@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01E Public Policy Advocacy for Healthcare Professionals</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Barnes, R. Student coordinator: Justin Miyamoto (<a href="mailto:Justin.Miyamoto@ucsf.edu">Justin.Miyamoto@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.07 Communicating with the Latino Patient (Intermediate)</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Braveman, Student coordinators: Edward Durant (<a href="mailto:Edward.Durant@ucsf.edu">Edward.Durant@ucsf.edu</a>); Jimmy Padilla (<a href="mailto:Jimmy.Padilla@ucsf.edu">Jimmy.Padilla@ucsf.edu</a>); Shawn Slack (<a href="mailto:Shawn.Slack@ucsf.edu">Shawn.Slack@ucsf.edu</a>); Hugo Torres (<a href="mailto:Hugo.Torres@ucsf.edu">Hugo.Torres@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>198 Caring for the Underserved Wilson</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Elisabeth (Beth) Student coordinators: Bianca Watson (<a href="mailto:Bianca.Watson@ucsf.edu">Bianca.Watson@ucsf.edu</a>); Amy Sargious (Amy <a href="mailto:Sargious@ucsf.edu">Sargious@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>198 Communicating with the Mandarin Speaking Patient</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Vener, M. Student coordinators: John Shen (<a href="mailto:John.Shen@ucsf.edu">John.Shen@ucsf.edu</a>); Elizabeth Tsang (<a href="mailto:lizyx@gmail.com">lizyx@gmail.com</a>, 707-592-8919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01A Integrative Medicine Forum</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Hughes, E location TBA Student contacts: Jeff Krauss (<a href="mailto:jeff.krauss@ucsf.edu">jeff.krauss@ucsf.edu</a>); Mia Smucny (<a href="mailto:mia.smucny@ucsf.edu">mia.smucny@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01B Communicating with the Cantonese-Speaking Patient</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Vener, M./ Liang, C. S-174 Student contacts: Aileen Sy (<a href="mailto:aileen.sy@ucsf.edu">aileen.sy@ucsf.edu</a>), Brian Toy (<a href="mailto:brian.toy@ucsf.edu">brian.toy@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.01C Public Policy Advocacy for Healthcare Professionals</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Barnes, R. S-178 Student contact: Erica Brode (<a href="mailto:erica.brode@ucsf.edu">erica.brode@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Medicine</td>
<td>170.31C Narrative Medicine: Student as Writer</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Aronson L. S-168 Contact: Louise Aronson (<a href="mailto:aronsonl@medicine.ucsf.edu">aronsonl@medicine.ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>170.02 Social Activism in Medicine</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Jain, S. location TBA Student coordinators: Tim Poore (<a href="mailto:timothy.poore@ucsf.edu">timothy.poore@ucsf.edu</a>); Vicky Ward (<a href="mailto:victoria.ward@ucsf.edu">victoria.ward@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>170.01A Impact of Interpersonal Violence on Health</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Gross M./ McNamara, M. S-176 Student coordinator: Carrie Cunningham (<a href="mailto:Carrie.Cunningham@ucsf.edu">Carrie.Cunningham@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>170.01B Bioethics and Society</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>White D. S-176 Student coordinators: Christopher Bautista (<a href="mailto:Christopher.Bautista@ucsf.edu">Christopher.Bautista@ucsf.edu</a>); Fan Liu (<a href="mailto:Fan.Liu@ucsf.edu">Fan.Liu@ucsf.edu</a>); Celeste Reinking (<a href="mailto:Celeste.Reinking@ucsf.edu">Celeste.Reinking@ucsf.edu</a>); Naftali Presser (<a href="mailto:Naftali.Presser@ucsf.edu">Naftali.Presser@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>170.30 Older Adults and End of Life Care</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Aronson, L. S-176 Stories student coordinators: Tess Lang (<a href="mailto:Tess.Lang@ucsf.edu">Tess.Lang@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>170.31B Narrative Medicine</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Aronson L. N-417 Student coordinator: Mel Hayes (<a href="mailto:Mel.Hayes@ucsf.edu">Mel.Hayes@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetrics &amp; Gynecology</td>
<td>170.06 African American Health Disparities</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Raine-Bennett, T. 1 starts 9/18; Tuesdays, 12-1 PM in S-182; Student coordinators: Christian Okoye (<a href="mailto:Christian.Okoye@ucsf.edu">Christian.Okoye@ucsf.edu</a>); Latifat Alli (<a href="mailto:Latifat.Alli@ucsf.edu">Latifat.Alli@ucsf.edu</a>); Julia Crothers (<a href="mailto:Julia.Crothers@ucsf.edu">Julia.Crothers@ucsf.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obstetrics & Gynecology  | 170.03 Reproductive Choices           | Winter         | Darney, P./ Raine, T.  
HSW-300  
Student coordinator: Jessie Plauche (Jessica.Plauche@ucsf.edu)                                                                                   |
| Obstetrics & Gynecology  | 170.05 Health Care Issues in the Sex Worker Population | Winter         | Cohan, D.  
S-18  
Contact: Jay Dwyer (jdwyer@php.ucsf.edu); KC Bly                                                                                               |
| Obstetrics & Gynecology  | 170.07 Latina Health Issues           | Winter         | Robertson, P. / de Pineres, T.  
S-157  
Student coordinator: Megan Swanson (megan.swanson@ucsf.edu)                                                                                     |
| Surgery                  | 198 Making Good Decisions in High Stakes Situations | Fall           | Belkora, J.  
Schedule TBD  
Student coordinators: Laura Petrillo (laura.petrillo@ucsf.edu); Mary Zhang (mary.zhang@ucsf.edu)                                           |
| Pediatrics               | 170.01B Beginning Vietnamese          | Winter, Spring | Kelly T.  
C-130  
Student coordinator: Nga Hoang (Nga.Hoang@ucsf.edu)                                                                                         |
| Inter-disciplinary studies | 202. Health Policy Research Across Disciplines | Winter         | Prerequisites: None. Restrictions: Consent of instructor. Lecture 1 hours. Laboratory 3 hours.  
**D. Dohan**  
Course examines the relationship between the kinds of health policy questions asked and the various quantitative and qualitative research methods we use to address them. Strategies range from assessing whether and how programs meet stated goals to understanding when and why new technologies are adopted, to explaining variation in disease rates or treatment cost effectiveness.  
(department: CL PHARM HISTSOCMED ) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Course Name &amp; Number</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inter-disciplinary studies | 203. Health Policy Writing Seminar       | Fall, Winter, Spring | Prerequisites: None. Restrictions: Consent of instructor. Seminar 3 hours. Project 3 hours. **D. Dohan**  
This course provides a structured format in which students and faculty from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds (including medicine, nursing, public health, and social and behavioral science) write, read, and critique research papers in progress and other products of creative activity related to health policy research. Interdisciplinary review and feedback supports student’s efforts to develop research that translates across disciplines and reaches diverse policy audiences. (department: CL PHARM HISTSOCMED SOC BEH SC) |
| Inter-disciplinary studies | 140.03. Global Health Problem Solving and Science | Summer       | Prerequisites: Advanced medicine, pharmacy, nursing and PhD students in Global Health Areas of Concentration. Restrictions: UCSF students only. Must be taken in conjunction with IDS 150.03, Designing Clinical Research. Seminar 12 hours. **C. Stewart, G. Rutherford, H. Debas**  
This is a problem-based learning course using case studies of interest to the students, who share the responsibility for seminar preparation with mentoring faculty. They will learn about multinational organizations, high disease burden global health problems, collaborative approaches to solving these problems, and career tracks for global health. (department: EPID & BIO SURGERY) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name &amp; Number</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B187 Introduction to Statistics</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Review of basic statistical theory, sampling, descriptive statistics, and probability. Presentation of confidence intervals, hypothesis testing, one- and two-factor analysis of variance, correlation, simple linear regression, and chi-square tests. A preparation for more advanced work. EPID &amp; BIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B192 Introduction to Linear Models</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>This course begins with bivariate correlation and simple linear regression and then moves on to a presentation of multiple regression techniques and the analysis of variance under the general model. The focus is on the choice of technique and interpretation of results rather than on mathematical development of the methods. EPID &amp; BIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N203 End of Life Care Across Practice Settings</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Taught by faculty from UCSF Schools of Medicine and Nursing as well as outside speakers, this course examines the theory and practice of providing end-of-life care to patients and their families within and across multiple practice settings, including acute care. A case-based, experiential, and multidisciplinary approach to palliative care will address symptom management as well as cultural, spiritual, ethical, and communication issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N209A Comparative Qualitative Research Design</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Course provides an introduction to the principles and methods of qualitative research, critically analyzing the elements of qualitative research design set within the context of the research questions to be asked and the existing knowledge in the area. FAM HLTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N212A Qualitative Data Collection and Ethics</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Course examines the construction of qualitative research and ethics in research. Students formulate research questions and design a qualitative study. FAM HLTH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School of Nursing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name &amp; Number</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N212B Quantitative Measurement and Theory</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Course critically evaluates concepts underlying measurement reliability and validity. Construction of measurement tools and their use in quantitative research will be explored. INTERDEPARTMENTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N230 Measuring Outcomes of Health Care</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Course presents current approaches and methods for clinical effectiveness and outcomes evaluation. The influence of patient, provider, and organizational factors on clinical effectiveness and outcomes evaluation is critically analyzed. COMM HLTH SYST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N231A Substance Use &amp; Mental Illness</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Examines causes and consequences of substance use disorders among severely mentally ill adults. Examines service delivery models developed for harm reduction and to promote recovery among high-risk populations. Emphasis on culturally competent services for diverse groups. COMM HLTH SYST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N232.04A Pediatric Pharmacology</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Course provides overview of pediatric pharmacology with emphasis on medications used in primary care settings. Content includes developing changes in drug absorption, distribution, elimination and adverse effects from birth through adolescence. Legal, ethical, safety and patient education aspects of furnishing medications to children are discussed, as well as the integration of evidence-based pharmacologic interventions into advanced practice pediatric nursing. FAM HLTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N240.04 Violence and Health</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Seminar focuses on family violence and its impact on health, family, and community. FAM HLTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N242B HIV Clinical Pharmacology</td>
<td>Fall, Spring</td>
<td>Course will introduce the clinical application of pharmacology in the management of HIV-infected adults and adolescents based on the current U.S. DHHS Treatment Guidelines for Antiretroviral Therapies and the Prevention of Opportunistic Infections. COMM HLTH SYST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N253 Theories of the Policy Process</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Course focuses on learning and using theories of the policy process, including analyzing how health policy problems are constructed. Perspectives on agenda setting, media roles, advocacy, policy innovations, diffusion and implementation will be integrated with examples of policy problems. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N262.05 Primary and Complementary Care Research Utilization</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Course develops skills in research utilization and the critical review of current published research on complementary approaches to health and healing. COMM HLTH SYST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N273D Environment &amp; Health</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>This interdisciplinary course will introduce a broad range of environmental health topics affecting health status. Exposure assessment, risk communication, prevention strategies, and environmental health policies will be covered, with special attention to childbearing families, children and communities at risk for environmental injustice. Directed reading in environmental health and critical thinking skills are emphasized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N289.01 Advanced Methods: Meta-Analysis</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Course will familiarize students with meta-analysis techniques for conducting integrative research review on a phenomenon of interest. Content includes an overview of meta-analysis techniques, issues and controversies, steps in conducting a meta-analysis, including effect sizes, and inter-rater reliability. FAM HLTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N407 Basic Interpretation of Chest X-rays (Practicum in Physiological Nursing)</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Opportunity to apply theory in clinical practice to further develop skills and to extend clinical expertise in selected aspects of physiological nursing. Guided clinical laboratory experience is designed to develop mastery of advanced skills. PHYS NURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S212C Sociological Theory: Symbolic Interaction</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Course consists of readings and discussions on interactionist theory in sociology, with emphasis on the origins and development of the Chicago School of Sociology, as well as an examination of the link between philosophy of pragmatism and interactionism. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S233 Sociology of Aging</td>
<td>Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Course reviews theories of aging including a review of theories of aging, current and historical trends in aging, factors related to aging, effects of aging on individuals and families, and formal and informal service systems for an aging population. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S235 Tobacco Control Policy Issues</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Course focuses on issues and evolution of tobacco control policies in the United States and internationally. Lectures and readings in the history of tobacco control will prepare students to engage in weekly discussions and case studies of particular tobacco control policies. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S236 Race and Class Factors in</td>
<td>Fall, Winter,</td>
<td>Course examines racial and class membership impact on access to health care services, variations in the quality of those services, and how professional and sub-professional roles in the health care system are organized along racial and class lines. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Delivery</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S246 Communications &amp; Policy</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Course focuses on developing students' skills in various types of policy-relevant communications and leadership across different policy venues. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S282 Sociology of Science/Technology</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Course examines early functionalist and Marxist theories, Kuhn's work, social constructionist, ethnomethodological, interactionist, neo-functionalist, critical, and neo-Marxist perspectives. Focuses on laboratory, controversy, technological, and representational studies and organization and funding. Links history and philosophy. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S285A Qualitative Methods I</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Course reviews many of the types of qualitative research methods, emphasizing assumptions, approaches. Focus on design, entree, ethics, data-gathering techniques [interviewing, observing], data recording and management. Introduction to data analysis. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S285B Qualitative Methods II: Analysis</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Course compares and contrasts modes of qualitative analysis. Examines issues in establishing plausibility, credibility, adequacy. Intensive data analysis and examination of the problems of presentation of findings with focus on questions of authority and preparation of text. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S286 Gender, Sex &amp; Health</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Course examines women's participation in formal/informal health and healing systems, emphasizing health problems, recruitment to health professions, images of women in health and illness, and women as providers. Health issues of women of color in the U.S. are highlighted. SOC BEH SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 151 Pediatric Pharmacology</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>A survey course of the common childhood diseases. The course will cover the basic principles and applied pharmacology of diseases of children as well as common problems such as dosage delivery, adverse reactions and immunization requirements for the pediatric patient. Instructor: Englert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.02. Veterinary Pharmacy</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>This course introduces the field of veterinary pharmacy, variability in drug response, metabolism, dosing and compounding for animal patients, regulatory issues relative to using drugs in food animals, public health regarding zoonotic disease and economic considerations in different practice situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 152.03 Women’s Health Issues</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>This course will focus on the important women’s health issues such as premenstrual syndrome/premenstrual dysphoric disorder, HIV and pregnancy, hormone replacement therapy, contraception, fertility, breast cancer, etc. The information presented in this course would be beneficial and useful for all students in healthcare professions. Instructor: El-Ibiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 152.04 Focus on HIV</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Students will participate in a lecture series that outlines the HIV disease process, prevention and treatment strategies and the psycho-social aspects of HIV and its treatment. Periodic quizzes will be given and students are to participate in mock medication adherence and patient confidentiality projects. Instructor: Cocohoba/Dong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 170.08 Chemo. &amp; Clinical Oncology</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>This interdisciplinary course is designed to provide a framework of concepts and skills about preventive medicine, focusing on cancer prevention. Instructor: Yuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Name &amp; Number</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 170.10 Herbal &amp; Dietary Supplements</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>The course provides a thorough review of the most likely herbal and dietary agents that will be encountered in practice. Specific product information including source, use, pharmacokinetics, pharmacology, side effects, precautions, dosing and availability for each agent will be reviewed. Instructor: Tsourounis/Dennehy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 170.30 Clinical Toxicology</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>This is a survey elective course on the principles of clinical toxicology. Emphasis will be on pre-hospital and hospital management of poisonings with a case-oriented lecture format. Topics are prioritized by prevalence of human poisoning, natural and synthetic toxins, and target organ effects. Course may be appropriate for pharmacy and medical students that have had previous pharmacology course experiences. Instructor: Kearney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 198 Bad Bugs</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>This course explores interdisciplinary perspectives on antimicrobial resistance. Instructor: Kirby Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 198 Diabetes Elective</td>
<td>see the current schedule /quarter varies, 2009: Winter quarter</td>
<td>Description to be added.... Instructor: Kirby Lee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication from the Committee on Educational Policy
Thomas Kearney, PharmD, Chair

March 12, 2010

Jeff Kilmer, MA
Director, Office of Student & Curricular Affairs
UCSF School of Nursing
Office of Student Affairs
2 Koret Way, Box 0602

Re: Review of the Draft Report by the Education Systems Advisory Committee Task Force on Education Technology Infrastructure

Dear Director Kilmer,

As requested, at its March 10, 2010 meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed and commented on the Education Technology Infrastructure Report drafted by the Education Systems Advisory Committee Task Force.

Overall, the committee supports the ideas put forth in the report however they have concerns about the creation of new projects and methods atop already inefficient modes of operation. Some of the Principles especially those related to leadership should be developed prior to the Priorities. The key concerns were as follows:

1. The committee agreed with the bullet-point that “to achieve our educational goals, the campus must make…Modern and functional classroom space to meet evolving needs of faculty and learners.” As part of that “evolving needs of faculty and learners,” committee members recommended the creation of a new teaching arena.

   However, a glaring absence in the report was fiscal classroom and classroom support issues. These pre-existing inefficiencies should be addressed instead of creating other new systems and models. It may well be that Task Force members understand that the classroom issues fall within the umbrella of other priorities already listed in the report—however that was unclear to committee members. This should be added to the report prior to its delivery to the Chancellor.

2. The committee supports the report’s suggestions on Content Capture Maintenance and Upgrades. Members commented as to the ease of using P-Box technology for audio and video capture in classrooms. A further suggestion was made to provide training and podium cheat sheets for faculty on use of such equipment.

3. The report’s suggestion to create a Technology Help Desk for Learners is supported by the committee. However, members wondered why staff and faculty were originally to be denied access? Is it that the technology needs are different for faculty, staff and students and thus they need a different Help Desk? Or that such assistance could for now be provided via OAAIS?
If OAAIS already should be providing such assistance, then members further agree with the principle within the report of a Commitment within OAAIS to their Role in the Educational Mission of the Campus and concur that they have “lacked an appreciation of their role” to date.

(4) The report’s suggestion of an Educational Technology Review was valid and important. However, the committee agreed that such expertise existed within UCSF to perform such a review. The committee recommended a council or committee be formed, comprised of IT people from across the schools, and departments within them, to conduct the review. The committee also encouraged such a council to remain in place so that information was continually pooled and shared to create a better overall central system.

(5) Following on the above, the committee further supported the principle of a Consolidated Educational Technology Leadership and Governance. Another more detailed suggestion to be further addressed by leadership and governance and directed toward resolving inefficiencies, was to have central overnight upgrade of systems and programs rather than have each department need an IT person to personally go to each computer to perform the upgrade. This current method is highly inefficient.

We therefore recognize the potential value of the Principles and Priorities as put forth by the ESAC Task Force Report on Educational Technology Infrastructure, but suggest the above issues be addressed.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Educational Policy

Thomas Kearney, PharmD, Chair
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, Vice Chair
Abbey Alkon, RN, PhD, PNP
Sergio Baranzini, PhD
Kurt Giles, PhD
Vineeta Singh, MD
Douglas Schmucker, PhD
Sophia Saaed, DMD
Elisabeth Wilson, MD, MPH
Appendix A

Help Desk for Learners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(starts 11/1/10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Service Desk PA 1 (includes benefits)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$67,033</td>
<td>$118,154</td>
<td>$124,062</td>
<td>$130,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;E ($2500/FTE/year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$3,675</td>
<td>$3,859</td>
<td>$4,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Increased Hours &amp; Customer Contact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$69,033</td>
<td>$121,829</td>
<td>$127,921</td>
<td>$134,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outsourced Help Desk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSF Coordinator (includes benefits)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>$13,100</td>
<td>$27,510</td>
<td>$28,886</td>
<td>$30,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;E ($2500/FTE/year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$417</td>
<td>$656</td>
<td>$689</td>
<td>$724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 Support ($10/call, 12,000 calls per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$145,200</td>
<td>$159,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Tools ($1/FTE/year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$7,260</td>
<td>$7,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Outsourced Help Desk (vendor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Ticketing (licensing cost)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$6,050</td>
<td>$6,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Outsourced Help Desk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$122,517</td>
<td>$177,266</td>
<td>$193,085</td>
<td>$210,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer-to-Peer Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,333</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Learner Help Desk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$194,883</td>
<td>$304,096</td>
<td>$326,005</td>
<td>$349,731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Incremental Cost Per Learner (6000 students)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$51</th>
<th>$54</th>
<th>$58</th>
<th>$63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Learners include students, residents, postdocs, and fellows**

**The costs listed in this table are estimates based upon user volume. It is hoped that actual costs might be lower, either because initial bids may result in preferable rates or because of efficiencies of scale due to volume.**
## Appendix B

**STUDENT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**  
**CONTENT CAPTURE ONGOING BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Assistant III</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$5,904</td>
<td>$6,111</td>
<td>$6,325</td>
<td>$6,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Engineer</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$65,475</td>
<td>$67,767</td>
<td>$70,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Technician</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$51,717</td>
<td>$53,527</td>
<td>$55,400</td>
<td>$57,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmer/Analyst III</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>$70,715</td>
<td>$73,190</td>
<td>$75,751</td>
<td>$78,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,514</td>
<td>$48,142</td>
<td>$49,827</td>
<td>$51,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$240,325</strong></td>
<td><strong>$248,737</strong></td>
<td><strong>$257,442</strong></td>
<td><strong>$266,452</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Personnel-Related Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,483</td>
<td>$1,528</td>
<td>$1,574</td>
<td>$1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment (5-year replacement cycle)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Charge</td>
<td></td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$719</td>
<td>$744</td>
<td>$770</td>
<td>$797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,633</td>
<td>$1,485</td>
<td>$1,530</td>
<td>$1,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Personnel-Related Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,597</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,713</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,833</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vendor Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing and Support</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$41,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,250</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$286,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$294,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>$303,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>$320,535</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This budget does not include system installation/startup expenses in first year
# Appendix C

## CLE Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core CLE Budget</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>FY12-13</th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Funding Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>$ Amount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>$ Amount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Payroll Expenditures</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>$239,200</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>$349,571</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing / Data Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Party Hosting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Non-Payroll Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td>$63,800</td>
<td>$64,800</td>
<td>$68,800</td>
<td>$68,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core CLE Supplementary Funding TOTAL</td>
<td>$303,000</td>
<td>$414,371</td>
<td>$433,785</td>
<td>$456,852</td>
<td>$479,134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Kanbar Simulation Center Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simulation Technician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,993</td>
<td>62,923</td>
<td>64,181</td>
<td>65,465</td>
<td>66,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>52,780</td>
<td>53,836</td>
<td>54,912</td>
<td>56,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,888</td>
<td>35,868</td>
<td>38,946</td>
<td>39,724</td>
<td>40,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$147,881</strong></td>
<td><strong>$151,571</strong></td>
<td><strong>$156,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,101</strong></td>
<td><strong>$163,303</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kanbar Operational Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Cycle Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bline Server Cycle Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bline Annual Service Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                       |       | **$147,881** | **$193,772** | **$203,304** | **$216,302** | **$223,114** |
## Appendix E

Library Classroom Budget

**STUDENT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES**

**LIBRARY CLASSROOM OPERATIONS BUDGET - 2-26-10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Engineer</td>
<td>$56,232</td>
<td>$28,936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Engineer</td>
<td>$56,232</td>
<td>$87,300</td>
<td>$90,356</td>
<td>$93,518</td>
<td>$96,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Technician</td>
<td>$33,312</td>
<td>$51,717</td>
<td>$53,527</td>
<td>$55,400</td>
<td>$57,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$42,275</td>
<td>$53,745</td>
<td>$50,359</td>
<td>$56,589</td>
<td>$58,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$188,051</td>
<td>$221,698</td>
<td>$194,242</td>
<td>$205,508</td>
<td>$212,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Other Personnel-Related Expenses** |            |            |            |            |            |
| Communication         | $1,440     | $1,730     | $1,528     | $1,574     | $1,621     |
| Computer equipment (5-year replacement cycle) | $12,000 |            |            |            | $8,000     |
| Printers              | $900       |            |            |            |            |
| Furniture             | $9,000     |            |            |            |            |
| Network Charge        | $840       | $980       | $840       | $840       | $840       |
| Toolkits              | $4,000     |            |            |            |            |
| Carts                 | $3,000     |            |            |            |            |
| GAEL                  | $641       | $739       | $633       | $655       | $678       |
| Supplies & Expenses   | $1,400     | $1,633     | $1,485     | $1,530     | $1,576     |
| **Total Other Personnel-Related Expenses** | $33,221 | $5,083     | $4,486     | $4,599     | $12,715    |

| **Operations Expenses** |            |            |            |            |            |
| Spare Projector        | TBD        | TBD        | TBD        | TBD        | TBD        |
| Equipment Replacement (5-year cycle) | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| **Total Operations Expenses** | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD |

**TOTAL EXPENSES**

- $221,272
- $226,781
- $198,728
- $210,106
- $225,415
NOTES

The library classrooms are scheduled to be completed in November 2010.

The staffing plan calls for 2.0 television engineer FTE in the first year (November 2010 to October 2011) and 1.0 television engineer FTE in the second year and beyond.

The staffing plan also calls for 1.0 television technician FTE for the first year (beginning November 2010) and beyond.

Furniture costs can be excluded if the project will provide furniture.

Salaries increase 3.5% per year for merit pay.

Costs increase 3.0% per year for inflation.
Site Visit: updates from behind the scenes

KANBAR CENTER FOR SIMULATION
CLINICAL SKILLS AND TELEMEDICINE
COUNTDOWN TO THE FUTURE

The Kanbar Center will relocate into the new Teaching and Learning Center, and expand services to the four UCSF professional schools in January, 2011.
Purpose

Create a centralized learning center where health professions students develop competence in:

- clinical procedures
- physical exam skills
- communication and team skills
- telemedicine consultation and presentation skills
MISSION

Support the educational mission of teaching, learning, assessment and research through realistic simulations and interprofessional team training for routine and complex situations, thereby improving patient care and safety.
The clinical skills training provides a learning environment where students can practice skills ranging from:
- learning the patient interview
- physical exam skills
- procedural skills
- team communication skills
The simulation facility provides a learning environment where the learner can:
- practice without risk of harming patients
- engage in repetitive practice to master skills
- interprofessional development and team communication development through mannequin based simulation
FULL BODY SIMULATORS

- Interactive manikin with feedback control physiological parameters that change over time
- Generate automatic debriefing, based on the event log synchronized with video pictures
- Simulation of relevant airway management and chest tube insertions scenarios and birthing scenarios
TASK TRAINERS

- Injection and IV arms
- Arterial puncture
- Intubation heads
- Infant simulators
- Breast exam models
- Lumbar puncture
- Spinal injection
- Inventory on our website @
  www.medschool.ucsf.edu/kanbar
MATRIX OF LEARNING

All on one floor design
- Classrooms
- Simulation
- Clinical Skills
- Media Development
- Student Spaces
KANBAR CENTER DESIGN

Kanbar Center Design
- 12 Clinical Skills Exam Rooms
- Standardized Patient Lounge
- Training Room
- Task-based Simulation Space
- 2 bed ICU/ED
- 4 bed Ward or Operation Room Suite
- Debriefing rooms
• Two exam rooms open to double size
• Can serve as additional part-task space
• Clinical Skills – Simulation proximity facilitates hybrid scenarios
SIMULATION DESIGN ELEMENTS

- 4 bed Ward or OR Suite
- Viewing/Debrief Room
Broadcast Studio Model

- Grid Ceiling
- Camera, light and microphone placement snaps to grid
- HD video and audio systems

Modular/Flexible
TECHNOLOGY

Technology Enhanced Design
- Designed with 4 team based learning rooms
- State of the art recording and monitoring equipment
- Pan/tilt/zoom cameras
- Ceiling microphones throughout
- Interactive white boards
- Large screen LCD displays
Audio/video capture of clinical skills/simulation activities

- Allowing sessions to be broadcast or reviewed later by instructors and students
- Recordings will enable increased feedback to improve student performance

Centralize, back-up and protect data and digital archiving

Drag-and-drop checklist builder

Exam room scheduling

Rapid and flexible exam setup

Real-time exam scoring

Schedule simulation activities

Generate usage and aggregate reports

100% web-based
TLC Floor Plan Overview

- Classrooms
- Technology Commons
- Clinical Skills
- Simulation
Video Broadcast To Classrooms

Classrooms
Technology Commons
Clinical Skills
Simulation
Video Broadcast To Exam Rooms

Classrooms

Technology Commons

Clinical Skills

Simulation
Orientate Large Group
Orientate Activity Groups

Classrooms
Technology Commons
Clinical Skills
Simulation
Activity Event in Sim/Exam Rooms

Classrooms  Technology Commons

Clinical Skills  Simulation

UCSF
TELEMEDICINE AND PRIME-US EDUCATION FACILITIES
Broadcast to Media Review Room

Classrooms

Technology Commons

Clinical Skills

Simulation
Debrief Activity in Small/Large Rooms

Classrooms
Technology Commons
Clinical Skills
Simulation
Teaching & Learning Center: interprofessional health education

Construction Project
The Library is working to minimize the disruption to students and others who use the Library during the construction and other activities related to this project. Below are some of the major events that will be impacting Library spaces. See Alerts.

September 29, 2008 - July 1, 2010
The East Asian Room on the 5th floor will be closed and converted into temporary space for the Interactive Learning Center and Center for Instructional Technology.

October 2008
All books and journals will be moved to make room for the 117,000 volumes leaving the 2nd floor. All print journals will be moved to the 1st floor, and all books will be shelved to the 4th and 5th floors. The Hearst Reading room on the 3rd floor will be rearranged to provide more study tables and light. Some areas of the library may be closed to users during the move. During the construction period staff will happily assist you to locate any materials that are not available while being moved.

November - December 2008
Minor construction on the 3rd and 5th floors will be performed after hours. The East Asian Room will get a new floor to accommodate the temporary ILC/CIT. The GALLEN room on the 3rd floor will be converted into Library office space to house the Interlibrary Services staff. The GALLEN Room computers will be relocated to the tables adjacent to the Information Desk. A new office for the Copy/Cashier Service will be created in the copy room on the 3rd floor.

January 2009
The entire 2nd floor of the Library will be remodeled and under construction for
# Collaborative Learning Environment Road Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launch CLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration from WebCT complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic nuts &amp; bolts training for migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to online training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch CLE Users Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Support for new releases and new components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Management (Moodle)</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build out Local Test Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decommission WebCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle &amp; Other Software Upgrades (e.g., Moodle 1.9.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision on internal or external hosting for ay 10-11 (DONE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle 2.0 testing (tentative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle 2.0 upgrade (tentative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Release (Summer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Releases (Summer and Winter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See "Releases" tab worksheet for details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build out Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Implementation (expected)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Improvements - Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Improvements - Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism Checker - Turnitin (SON implementation complete)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Conferencing System - Eluminate (DONE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyAccess Authentication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI Enhancements (&quot;MyCourses&quot; idea)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Content Capture System integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confluence Wiki (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library TLC Classroom &amp; Sim Center Systems (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management (Illios) Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

Institutional Context and History
The University was founded in 1864 as Toland Medical College in San Francisco. The campus affiliated with the University of California in 1873 to become the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF). UCSF is the only campus in the University of California system dedicated exclusively to graduate-level education in the life sciences and health professions. Professional training occurs in the Schools of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy. UCSF also educates students in graduate programs granting academic degrees in biological, biomedical, pharmaceutical, nursing social and behavioral sciences through the Graduate Division. In addition to these schools, UCSF has a medical center with two locations: Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion. A third location, a 289 bed women’s, children’s and cancer hospital complex at Mission Bay, is scheduled to open in 2014.

UCSF’s students, faculty and staff work to accomplish UCSF’s mission “advancing health worldwide.” The University’s goals underpinning this mission are to:

• Develop the world’s future leaders in health care delivery, research and education.
• Educate, train and employ a diversity faculty, staff and student body.
• Be a world leader in scientific discovery and its translation into exemplary health.
• Provide high-quality, patient-centered care leading to optimal outcomes and patient satisfaction.
• Provide a supportive and effective work environment to attract and retain the best people and position UCSF for the future.
• Serve our local, regional and global communities and eliminate health disparities.

In 2009 UCSF enrolled 2,900 students in its professional schools and graduate programs. The university has almost 19,000 full-time equivalent positions and employs 21,900 people. UCSF is the second largest employer in San Francisco and the fifth largest employer in the nine-county Bay Area.

Teaching and Learning
UCSF’s primary operations are its educational programs, clinical enterprise (UCSF Medical Center), and UCSF research institutes, centers and foundations. Its professional and graduate programs and the UCSF medical center and UCSF Children’s hospital are ranked among the best in the country by U.S. News and World Report. Admissions to all of its programs are very competitive and attract some of the most talented students in the country.

The School of Dentistry admits 80 students per year into a four-year curriculum that leads to the DDS degree; for each student admitted, the school received 19 applications in 2009. The School offers postgraduate programs in several dental specialty areas: dental public health, endodontics, oral and maxillofacial surgery, orthodontics, pediatric dentistry, periodontology, prosthodontics and general practice residency.

In 2009, the School of Medicine received almost 6,000 applications for 150 spaces.
The school ranks among the top 10 programs in the U.S. in seven of eight medical school specialty programs, including first in AIDS medicine, second in women’s health, and third in internal medicine according to the *U.S. News and World Report*. The school received $418 million in NIH funding in 2009, second in the nation for medical schools behind John Hopkins University.

The **School of Nursing** ranked first in the nation in terms of NIH research funding every year from 2003 to 2008. The school offers more than 14 master’s degree specialties in nursing and an outstanding PhD program. Four departments of instruction and research are within the main School: Family Health Care Nursing, Community Health Systems, Physiological Nursing, and Social and Behavioral Sciences.

The **School of Pharmacy** has ranked first in the nation in NIH research funding for 30 consecutive years. The School provides professional degrees in Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) and pathways in Pharmaceutical care, Pharmaceutical Health Policy and Management, and Pharmaceutical Sciences. Out of a pool of more than 1,500 applicants in 2009, the school admitted 122 students.

The **Graduate Division** offers graduate degrees in the Biological, Biomedical, Pharmaceutical, Nursing, Social and Behavior Sciences. The division offers 22 degree programs, a high proportion of which are ranked in the top ten, nationally. Degrees offered include PhD, Master of Science, Master of Arts, Master of Clinical Research, and Doctor of Physical Therapy.

**Medical Center**

UCSF operates the UCSF Medical center, a 722-licensed bed tertiary care referral center with two major sites (Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion). The UCSF Medical Center and UCSF Children’s Hospital are world leaders in health care, known for innovative medicine and advanced technology. UCSF’s expertise covers virtually all specialties, including cancer, heart disease, infertility, neurological disorders, organ transplantation, and orthopedics as well as special services for women and children.

**Research Enterprise**

UCSF is one of the top biomedical research enterprises in the world. Scientists in basic research laboratories study the genetic, molecular, and cellular basis of diseases, while others carry out epidemiological, behavior, and clinical-research studies, all working to develop improved treatments and cures. The quality and breadth of this research has led to UCSF scientists being among the most prolific publishers of scientific discoveries worldwide. 1,757 patents have been issued to UCSF from 1977 to 2009; 602 patents have been issued to UCSF from 2000 to 2009, more than any other UC campus.

UCSF research focuses on treatment for such diseases as cancer, diabetes, HIV/AIDS, and infectious diseases; cardiological and immunological diseases; and such neurological conditions as Alzheimer’s disease and Parkinson’s disease. The University is a leader in such innovative areas as stem cell science, bioengineering, and pharmaceutical chemistry and was home to the co-discovery of the techniques of
recombinant DNA-splicing genes from one organism into another, a discovery that spawned a revolution in biology and the birth of biotechnology.

**Review of WASC Reaffirmation and Accreditation Process**

The reaffirmation and accreditation process officially began for UCSF in May 2007 when the Institutional Proposal was submitted to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The WASC Proposal Review Committee approved the Institutional Proposal in July 2007. The second step of the process, the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) Report was presented to WASC in December 2008. The CPR site visit took place in February 2009 and the Site Team’s Report was approved by the WASC Commission in June 2009.

As was set forth in the Institutional Proposal and the CPR Report, along with guidance from the Visiting Team’s Report and the Commission’s Action Letter provided subsequent to the CPR visit, UCSF now presents the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) Report. The UCSF WASC website [http://www.wasc.ucsf.edu] includes this report and appendices as well as all previous WASC related reports, appendices, and relevant communication from the Commission and the UCSF campus. The report was completed by the WASC Accreditation Steering Committee ([Appendix X](#)) and has been reviewed and is endorsed by appropriate faculty, staff, and student groups across the campus. **CFR citation**

The Educational Review Report will demonstrate that UCSF:

1. has continued to make visible and significant progress relative to the themes of learning environment; learning outcomes, and diversity;
2. has been responsive to the WASC CPR review team and Commission recommendations in the areas of learning outcomes, diversity, technology, and institutional research; and
3. has implemented numerous enhancements and improvements both responsive too and beyond the scope of the WASC review process.

The appendix includes substantial supporting evidence for the narrative included in the three thematic essays. In addition, an updated glossary of abbreviations is attached ([Appendix X](#)), a matrix identifying our response to the CFRs can be found in [Appendix X](#), and the CFRs are cited in the narrative of the report. A final summary of our work is available in the Work Plan and Milestones chart and the WASC timeline ([Appendices X and X](#)).
LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

"UCSF’s educational technology mission is to create exceptional learning environments through the innovative use of educational technology and information systems and services. The vision includes harnessing the power of educational innovation and information technology to advance UCSF’s role as a global leader in health sciences education. Guiding values include service, collaboration, innovation, and scholarship."

-- UCSF Education System Advisory Committee Strategic Plan, June 2008

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

A. **Mature the Teaching and Learning Center by clarifying the governance and operational support including technical support; leadership of the Center must develop a business plan and identify how to fund operations.**

The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) is a campuswide initiative to create a technology enhanced education environment. (CFR 1.2, 1.5) Funded by California State Proposition 1D, construction began in September 2008 but was halted due to the state fiscal crisis in December 2008. After a nine month delay work was restarted in 2010; the expected opening date is January 2011. The School of Medicine, the Library, and Student Academic Affairs are the lead campus units in organizing the TLC. Representatives from these units and from the Schools of Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy have been meeting for more than a year to develop operating principles, identify synergies, and develop budgets and funding models (or sources or proposals) to support the TLC. A draft Business Plan for the TLC can be found in Appendix X.

The TLC requires ongoing operational funding. A budget was submitted to the campus in March 2010 as part of a priority request by the Chancellor for educational technology and infrastructure. The Education Services Advisory Committee supported this effort as well by including these items in their annual budget request. The requested funds will add information technology staff for the new classrooms, expand the Kanbar Center’s simulation and interprofessional training services to all UCSF professional schools, and add student customer support for the Technology Commons. In June 2010, the Chancellor approved $438,000 for the first year and $542,000 in ongoing support for TLC operations. In addition to campus funding, TLC staff have worked with the UCSF Development Office on a plan for external support.

The Library Education Space Program Coordinating Committee has been charged with oversight for the Teaching and Learning Center from its inception. (CFR 4.1, 4.2)
part of the planning process a cross-school working group is constructing a five-year plan for simulation program development for the TLC (see attached charge). To date, the working group has developed cost models for clinical simulation activities, produced models to determine the capacity of the center and traffic flow, created a sustainable business plan and fostered learning activities across schools and programs. (CFR 3.6, 3.7)

B. Engage all stakeholders in achieving the interprofessional goals of the Center.

Interprofessional Education (IPE) is considered an important component of health professions’ curriculum and the TLC initiative. (CFR 1.4, 2.3, 2.11) IPE is defined as formal, planned “occasions when two or more professions learn with, from and about each other to improve collaboration and the quality of care”. IPE is intended to teach students the skills needed to fully collaborate and communicate proficiently in a way that prepares them for the teamwork required to succeed in today’s health delivery environment and to improve health outcomes. A 2008 report outlines UCSF’s progress toward achieving its goal of innovative and interdisciplinary education and discusses current inter-professional activities and opportunities for future expansion of IPE. http://cit.ucsf.edu/grants/ucsf_ipe_report_2008.pdf.

Similarly, a cross-school Curriculum Working Group was launched in spring 2010 to plan short and longer-term education programming for the TLC (see Appendix X for working group charge).

An Instructional Grants Program funds innovative projects to improve teaching and learning at UCSF is focusing on new learning strategies that will utilize the TLC. Over the past two years the grants program was refocused requiring that proposals involve collaborators from two or more schools. The awards address one of the goals of the campus strategic plan: “to ensure that students and trainees are immersed in a culture that embraces interdisciplinary, interprofessional and transdisciplinary educational programs”. Funds can be used to cover faculty release time and other project costs. The following proposals supporting the IPE initiative were funded in the past two years:

Fiscal Year 2010-2011

- Chronic Illness Management by Interprofessional Learners using the Chronic Care Model: Medical residents, Nurse Practitioner Students, and Pharmacy Students in Teams to Improve Care of Adults with Chronic Disease in Weekly General Medicine Clinics (Nursing, Medicine and Pharmacy)

- Development and Implementation of High Fidelity Simulation Cases for Acutely Poisoned Patients (Medicine and Pharmacy)

Fiscal Year 2009-2010
• Patient Simulation to Promote Interprofessional Teamwork and Collaboration among Clinical Practice Level Students (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy)

• Designing an Interactive Curriculum for Third-Year Medical, Pharmacy and Nursing Students on Inpatient Geriatric Issues and Safe Transitions in Care (Medical, Nursing and Pharmacy schools)

In addition to the above projects the Student Learning section of this report has a detailed discussion of campus activities designed to create a culture of interprofessional education.

C. Realize research potential on learning outcomes and identify student learning projects and outcomes. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

The TLC will play a key role in accomplishing this goal, as it will support both implementation and innovation in health professions learning, assessment, and scholarship. Program development that nurtures inquiry and discovery is well underway across schools and will have an enriched interface with current opportunities for student learning projects and outcomes to be shared at the campus level.

The Pathways to Discovery Program, open to all UCSF learners, is designed to facilitate motivated learners in developing the knowledge, skills, and experience to contribute to health beyond the care of individual patients. The five pathways are: a) clinical and translational research, b) global health, c) health and society, d) health professions education, and e) molecular medicine. These pathways represent areas of specialization including health research, curriculum and education theory development, policy and advocacy, and other interventions to improve health on a global scale. http://medschool.ucsf.edu/pathways/.

The School of Dentistry has embarked on a portfolio project for dental students who are learning dental surgical skills. Each student creates a portfolio of specific procedures, documenting the steps from diagnosis to completion, and providing evidence-based rationale for each activity. They also collaborate on-line to discuss the projects and understand differences in treatment philosophy.

Research Poster Sessions allow students in the School of Medicine who have received research funding to present their work. Other students who have completed research projects while in medical school are also encouraged to participate. Additionally a Dean’s prize for Research is awarded to students "who have the creativity and curiosity that is an essential characteristic of the great physicians and great scientists of the future." http://medschool.ucsf.edu/studentresearch/deans_prize.aspx.

Do we need School of Nursing text?
All students in the School of Pharmacy must enroll in one of three specialty pathways (Pharmaceutical Care, Pharmaceutical Health Policy & Management, or Pharmaceutical Sciences) and must complete a research project associated with the specialization chosen. Most of these students will present their findings during scheduled poster sessions.

Do we need Grad Division text?

The first annual campuswide Inter-School Research Festival took place May 18-21, 2010 (Appendix X- article on UCSF Today re event). Sponsored by the Clinical and Translational Science Institute and the Pediatric Fellowship Program, the festival participants included students from the Schools of Nursing, Pharmacy, Dentistry, and Medicine as well as from the Pathways to Discovery Program, the Doris Duke Fellowship Program, the Office of Student Research, and the Pediatrics Subspecialty Fellowship Program. The event included symposia, a poster session (Posterpalooza), an inter-school Journal Club, and selected oral presentations. (CFR 2.8, 2.9).

**WASC Commission’s Guiding Recommendation:** 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.

Since the last WASC visit the campus has made significant progress in updating the campus education infrastructure.

A. Instructional technology initiatives for fiscal year 2009-2010.

Two educational initiatives received campus funding in fiscal year 2009-2010 following recommendations from the Education Systems Advisory Committee (ESAC). (CFR 3.7, 4.2, 4.1) First, the Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE) received funding for one year. The CLE is used by all schools and graduate programs to provide a platform for learner-centered environments and collaborative activities. The CLE allows the schools and programs to customize learning modules using a combination of classroom and virtual teaching and learning methods. Working with the schools, ESAC developed a Five Year Roadmap (Appendix X) that outlines new functions critical to UCSF education programs including ePortfolios, Virtual Microscopy, Elluminate and a Curriculum Management System.

The second educational priority was content capture. In January 2010, the Chancellor approved funding to establish and support a new, robust content capture system for 11 classrooms including portable units to extend coverage beyond the 11 classrooms. The same system will be installed in the TLC classrooms. An analysis is underway to select the optimal system to meet the needs of the educational programs.

Also of note, the Office of Information Technology Services (formerly called the Office of Academic and Administrative Information Systems), the central campus information
technology organization, added wireless connections for all classrooms on Parnassus in late 2009.

B. Priorities for educational technology improvements 2010-2015.

In January 2010 Chancellor Desmond-Hellmann requested a report identifying short- and long-term priorities for the campus educational infrastructure. (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 4.1) The report builds upon the Education Systems Advisory Committee Strategic Plan that was completed in 2008 and the two initiatives that received one time funding in fiscal year 2009-10. In addition to funds to support the Teaching and Learning Center, ESAC presented four educational technology improvements to the Chancellor as high priority items. Of the four campuswide initiatives listed below the campus approved ongoing funding for Content Capture, CLE Operations and Upgrades, and TLC Operations. The fourth, a central IT help desk for students and trainees will be considered as part of a larger help desk for the entire campus community.

The newly funded Content Capture and delivery system will provide state-of-the-art functionality to capture audio, VGA output from computer to projector, and, in some classrooms, video. The system will allow students to review the captured content on the Web and, likely, to download the content to their computer or mobile device.

The Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE) provides core functionality for UCSF professional school and graduate programs to meet current and future curriculum needs. It is designed to support a learner-centered environment. The five-year roadmap outlining plans for adding new functions critical to UCSF education programs such as portfolios, curriculum management and content capture will require additional support and training for faculty and students. Funding for this initiative enables ongoing support for a centralized, integrated learning platform.

The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) is the realization of the UCSF strategic goal to develop exceptional educational facilities and infrastructures to keep UCSF at the forefront of health sciences education. As described above, The TLC will provide a technology-rich environment in support of interprofessional and transdisciplinary learning programs at UCSF. The programs will focus on training future health professionals and scientists to become leaders in delivering high quality care to underserved communities.

In addition to these campuswide innovations, the School of Dentistry has now opened the Fleming Predoctoral Simulation Lab. The lab is designed to provide a simulation environment for dental students to practice skills before working on patients. Students watch demonstrations and then work on models under the close guidance of faculty. The high tech lab highlights the innovative research in the Dental School. The Lab was featured in an article in Wired magazine – Dentistry Goes Digital. http://www.wired.com/rawfile/2010/06/dental-school/all/1

C. Changes to Library learning spaces.
Along with the construction of the TLC, the Library is working on a project to open a portion of the Parnassus Library for 24-hour, 7-days-per-week use by students. (CFR 2.13, 3.6) A place to study, consult digital materials, and prepare for exams and papers after the library closes has been a long-standing need for UCSF students. This redesigned space is a response to reductions in library hours. Modifications to the Library’s Hearst Reading Room, a 3,500 square foot area off the entrance of the Parnassus Library, will permit unstaffed 24-hour use. The room will be open to UCSF students in phases as funds are raised.

The Hearst Room opened for Saturday use in February 2010 and 24-hour access is expected by late 2010. On the opening day in February one student commented, “One hour studying in the library is worth three hours at home.” Both the Library and Student Academic Affairs contributed initial funds to begin the project followed by a generous gift from the Hearst Foundation. In June, the Chancellor approved the use of some Registration Fee funds to help cover the cost of this important project. Additional funds are expected from alumni.

**WASC Commission’s Guiding Recommendation:** 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.

UCSF schools and academic programs add to the health professional education knowledge base in numerous ways. A compendium of UCSF scholarship and publications, *Contributions of UCSF Faculty, Staff and Students to the Scholarship of Teaching*, is included in Appendix X documenting the contributions made by UCSF faculty, students and staff.

Initiatives in each school offer opportunities for faculty to promote curriculum innovation and scholarship in education. (CFR 3.2, 3.4, 4.5) Additionally, programmatic support for developing future faculty is robust.

The School of Dentistry provides faculty development for improving instruction using technology during noontime sessions. Timing is critical to permit maximum faculty attendance without interfering with clinic operations. Faculty have been trained this past year on the use of the Collaborative Learning Environment, Articulate Presenter for narrating PowerPoint lectures, and lecture casting in the classrooms. In addition, the Library provides on-line training to enhance the use of the CLE by faculty. Many dental faculty are also active members of the American Dental Education Association (ADEA) and participate in programs that contribute to curriculum development. The School has pioneered an integrated dental curriculum that has become a model for many and hosts visitors from various institutions who come to experience the developments. One such visit included the dean and five senior faculty and administrators from the Medical College of Georgia. Over a two-day time period the visitors interviewed course directors...
and began to develop a curriculum based on the UCSF model. Specific papers and presentations are detailed in Appendix X.

The School of Medicine sponsored the 3rd annual Faculty Development Day on February 23, 2010 open to all UCSF faculty. The focus was on implementation of electronic portfolios, demonstration of the UCSF portfolio platform and presentation of portfolio pilot projects. [http://medschool.ucsf.edu/workshops/pdf/PortfolioFlyer022310.pdf](http://medschool.ucsf.edu/workshops/pdf/PortfolioFlyer022310.pdf)

Through the UCSF Teaching Scholars Program, faculty selected in a competitive process can participate in a longitudinal experience to learn about education. Each scholar works on a project in that program and is mentored by one of the five UCSF School of Medicine educational researchers. Participants from other UCSF schools have successfully competed for slots in this program and its impact has been felt on programs across the UCSF campus.

The UCSF School of Medicine’s Academy of Medical Educators honors and rewards excellent teachers and provides service to the school and fellow educators. The Academy offers intramural grants, endowed chairs for physicians whose passion is teaching, mentorship and professional development and visiting scholar lectures. More information is available at [http://medschool.ucsf.edu/academy/](http://medschool.ucsf.edu/academy/).

The Office of Medical Education provides individual consultation for faculty undertaking educational scholarship. Additionally, it sponsors a weekly seminar, the Educational Scholarship Conference (ESCape), to mentor faculty in the development of their educational scholarship. Individuals request a consultation and materials are distributed to a large list of interested faculty. Participants can attend the physical meeting or join by conference call. Consultations include a review of ideas, abstracts, manuscripts and posters as well as practice opportunities for oral presentations. The website is updated weekly. Interested individuals can read a description of the program and view the consultations schedule at [http://www.medschool.ucsf.edu/edresearch/escape/](http://www.medschool.ucsf.edu/edresearch/escape/).

Grant programs are also available to encourage research into medical education. The Office of Medical Education funds two Medical Education Research Fellows every other year. These individuals spend one day a week developing their educational scholarship. The program description can be found at [http://www.medschool.ucsf.edu/edresearch/fellowships/](http://www.medschool.ucsf.edu/edresearch/fellowships/). The Office also provides seed funding via a competitive peer review process for faculty proposals to do educational research.

The Office of Medical Education also produces an Annual Report describing academic programs that contribute to the scholarship of teaching and learning. In 2008-09 School of Medicine faculty members, students, residents, fellows and staff gave 270 scholarly presentations or workshops on medical education locally, nationally and internationally, and published 62 peer reviewed journal articles. Additional faculty members received 88

The School of Nursing’s commitment to assessment, teaching-learning initiatives, and innovation and sharing best practices is best demonstrated through scholarship. School of Nursing faculty has generated over 75 journal articles and book chapters within the past three years and these are referenced in the Contributions of UCSF Faculty, Staff and Students to the Scholarship of Teaching (Appendix X).

The topics range from innovative methods in teaching advanced practice nurse students to care for underserved populations to recruiting diverse students into graduate (MS and PhD) programs of study. School of Nursing faculty are also well represented at local, regional, and national conferences of specialty organizations as well as faculty specific conferences, where faculty present podium and/or poster presentations on various topics related to the education of pre-licensure and graduate students in nursing. Conferences such as those sponsored by the Western Institute of Nursing, the National Organization of Nurse Practitioner Faculty, and the American Association of Colleges of Nursing are well attended by School of Nursing faculty, where podium or poster presentations are made. The School of Nursing also produces a publication entitled "The Science of Caring" four times per annum. Two of the issues are devoted to highlighting exciting and innovative teaching, education, and practice strategies. The other two issues are focused on research discoveries.

The School of Nursing’s "Diversity in Action (DIVA)" Committee provides one example of how the School has contributed to generalizeable knowledge. The DIVA initiative has focused on increasing diversity-related content in the curriculum and in the learning environments of classroom and clinical settings. A series of six courses was developed by the DIVA Committee to assist faculty in incorporating diversity-related content into their courses, and to provide strategies for faculty to address potentially uncomfortable classroom and clinical-related situations related to diversity issues. These courses have subsequently become modules and all core course faculty are required to complete all six modules. The modules were developed on the basis of student input on the diversity content in the School’s Master’s curriculum and faculty requests to learn more about handling difficult student-faculty and student-student diversity issues when they arise. This work has been published in an issue of the Journal of Transcultural Nursing (2008). The modules have been extremely well-received by faculty. Assessment of the effectiveness of the modules is ongoing and a standard question related to incorporation of diversity-related content was added to the Master’s Student Exit Survey that is an ongoing monitoring of course evaluations.

In the School of Pharmacy newly appointed full-time faculty members have access to orientation and development sessions at the department, School, and campus levels which informs them of their teaching roles, research resources, responsibilities, and rights. Additionally, the School's three departments have established a Faculty Mentoring Facilitator Program to assure that newly hired assistant professors receive effective mentoring. A 2007 faculty survey conducted by the American Association of
Colleges of Pharmacy and the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education revealed that 80 percent of the School’s faculty were satisfied that they have received adequate guidance on career development.

Contributions of UCSF Faculty, Staff and Students to the Scholarship of Teaching (Appendix X) includes 46 entries from School of Pharmacy faculty or pharmacy students over the last six years. Included are textbooks, book chapters, and individual articles, as well as posters and presentations at various professional or educational association meetings. Although all students in the School are trained in the design and presentation of posters, a handful will choose a pedagogical project (experiences with an experimental coursework, methodologies, etc.) and will present at professional or educational association meetings. In order to acknowledge exceptional teachers, the School has established a slate of teaching awards, including the Long Award for Distinction in Teaching and a series entitled “The Apple Award” for instructors (faculty and students) who receive a rating of no less than 4.5 (on a 5 point scale) on any of the questions on the standard student evaluation of teaching forms completed quarterly by students.

In 2004 UCSF introduced the Preparing Future Faculty, modeled after the Preparing Future Faculty national initiative (http://www.preparing-faculty.org/). UCSF’s program was founded by a group of UCSF students and postdoctoral scholars who recognized a need to balance UCSF’s excellent training in research with better training in teaching. The program is designed to increase the value for and visibility of teaching training at UCSF, to broaden the opportunities for students and postdoctoral scholars to gain teaching experience, and to prepare them for the academic job search. The program includes a series of campuswide events, courses, a teaching apprentice program, and activities to prepare for an academic job search. http://career.ucsf.edu/pff/.

Emphasizing interprofessional education and harnessing technological advances, UCSF continues to implement improvements to its learning environment. The Teaching and Learning Center is at the forefront of UCSF’s advancement of these goals and represents a strong collaboration and clear commitment to student learning. In addition to the technological advancements represented by the TLC, the campus has implemented a multitude of other technology-based initiatives including the Collaborative Learning Environment, Content Capture, and the School of Dentistry’s simulation lab. The multitude of student learning projects and faculty teaching contributions also serve as excellent indicators of the productivity and broad impact of the learning environment at UCSF.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

“Whereas the Flexner¹ model (two years of basic science instruction followed by two years of clinical experience) has been rigorously maintained through the system of accreditation, medical education should now instead standardize learning outcomes and general competencies and then provide options for individualizing the learning experience for students and residents, such as offering the possibility of fast tracking within and across levels.”

-- Educating Physicians—A Call for Reform of Medical School and Residency, Cooke², Irby³, O'Brien⁴, 2010

¹ In 1910, Abraham Flexner articulated the current blueprint for medical education in North America.
² Molly Cooke is a faculty member at the UCSF School of Medicine and leader of the Academy for Medical Education.
³ David M. Irby is Vice Dean for education and professor of medicine at UCSF School of Medicine where he directs undergraduate, graduate, and continuing medical education programs and heads the Office of Medical Education.
⁴ Bridget C. O'Brien is an assistant professor of medicine at UCSF School of Medicine and researcher in the Office of Medical Education

**WASC Commission's Guiding Recommendation:** 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 outcomes, and evidence that they are used in planning and resource allocation, and used to effect change.**

The WASC review committee requested that UCSF better specify the connections between objectives and learning outcomes through published educational objectives and demonstrate the extent to which these data are used to effect change (see Appendix 2c of the CPR, pages 4 and 10). Each School and the Graduate Division has addressed this recommendation. A brief description of the connections follows.

The **School of Dentistry** has a set of sixteen learning outcomes for graduates, termed competency statements, in accordance with national accreditation standards. The competency measures are linked to the specific competencies expected of graduates of the courses in the curriculum. This document has identified where the material supporting each competency statement is introduced, in what courses it is developed, and where in the curriculum it is measured. This has also given faculty the opportunity to view how the competencies fit into overall instruction. Faculty have initiated a
process to review and refine the competency statements in preparation of an upcoming Commission on Dental Accreditation review in 2012. The competency grid can be viewed in Appendix X.

The School of Medicine has its competencies benchmarked across the four years of the curriculum. The benchmarks are developed for each of the six competency domains and can be found at https://moodle.ucsf.edu/course/view.php?id=825 [not able to access link, log-in necessary]. Students are evaluated on meeting these benchmarks using school-generated evaluations and their own selected evaluations assembled in a portfolio and reviewed with an advisor and peers. The process is described at the link and the results are detailed in each student’s individualized learning plans.

The School of Nursing regularly collects course evaluation data from current students and satisfaction data from students, alumni, and employers. Methods include surveys of graduating students and alumni, group forums with employers, and analysis of administrative data such as graduation or comprehensive examination pass rates. Surveys focus on how well the didactic courses and clinical experiences helped students achieve individual student learning outcomes in courses and expected student learning outcomes of their program of study. Aggregate survey data and student outcome data are used to foster ongoing program improvement.

One example of how student feedback and survey data was used to improve a specialty program of study is demonstrated in the Acute Care Nurse Practitioner (ACNP) program. To ensure that the graduates of the program are successful in passing their national certification exam, the curriculum is regularly revised to assure it remains current by including topics included on the ACNP national certification exam. Initially, ACNP faculty integrated the blueprint published for the exam as part of the curriculum. Unfortunately, pass rates for our graduates were not as high as expected (greater than or equal to 90%).

The program faculty coordinator began surveying graduates to provide feedback on the program curriculum and their experiences with the exam. Overall, student response showed that the ACNP curriculum adequately prepares the student for the exam, but some students reported that several topics tested on the exam were not covered adequately as part of the curriculum. As a result, the areas of deficiency were examined and additional depth to the content provided in the Diagnosis and Treatment of Ill and Injured courses students take in fall and winter quarters. Subsequent to these changes the program graduate pass rate was reported as 100% on the ACNP national certification exam in 2008 and 2009.

The School of Pharmacy launched a more systemic and evidence-based process in 2009 for revising the existing education accreditation standards. This change recognizes best practices and resulted from an extensive review of the educational literature. Based on the findings, a draft was circulated to all faculty for review and comment and is currently in the final review and approval process. The revised
educational outcomes are grouped by domain areas derived from the Institute of Medicine’s 2003 report *Health Professions Education: A Bridge to Quality* that was written by experts across the health professions. It calls for students and working professionals to develop and maintain proficiency in five core areas: a) delivering patient-centered care; b) working as part of interdisciplinary teams; c) practicing evidence-based medicine; d) focusing on quality improvement; and e) using information technology. The total number of outcomes represents a balance between the need to be concise and achieving an adequate level of detail for mapping and assessment purposes. It is typical for research intensive, university-affiliated PharmD programs to develop 100 or more educational outcomes. Some of the more significant changes include detailed outcomes related to a strong basic and clinical sciences foundation for graduates. (See Appendix X)

The Graduate Division, of which the School of Nursing graduate students are also a part, has developed a common set of student learning outcomes for the qualifying examination and the doctoral dissertation and these are now published on the Graduate Division website (http://graduate.ucsf.edu/content/doctoral-degree). The Graduate Division has also adopted three more specific sets of evaluation rubrics developed in conjunction with educational consultant Barbara E. Lovitts, author of *Making the Implicit Explicit: Creating Performance Expectations for the Dissertation* (Stylus, 2007). The evaluations are developed for the basic sciences, social sciences, and humanities. Evaluations are shared between the primary advisor, committee members and the student. Each graduate program is encouraged to tailor the rubrics specifically to the standards and requirements of their particular discipline and program. The rubrics are used to communicate more clearly the student learning outcomes required for each program. A pilot study has been initiated by representative programs from each of the three main areas (basic sciences, social sciences, humanities) in which rubrics will be completed by every student-advisor pair in the program. Data will be assessed by program and used for improvement. Upon successful completion of the pilot study, the collection and dissemination of rubric data will be extended to all of the UCSF graduate programs. (See data in Appendix X)

In addition, data are gathered through a variety of graduate exit surveys and alumni surveys in order to evaluate perceptions of learning outcomes. Each School and the Graduate Division have provided examples of surveys used to gather information from students and graduates regarding their perceptions of learning outcomes. (CFR 2.4, 2.7, 2.10) Data gathered from students and graduates is reflected back to Faculty Councils and curriculum committees so that changes and improvements can be incorporated in the curricula. Examples of changes are included in Appendix X.

B. Define global learning outcomes that distinguish a UCSF graduate irrespective of discipline.

The UCSF WASC steering committee, in association with the deans, associate deans, and the Academic Senate has agreed upon two global learning outcomes to be
measured and met by every UCSF graduate. These expectations for all graduates are “knowledge” and “professionalism.”

Knowledge refers to what is known through study or experience. It encompasses the following entities: information (a collection of facts and data), learning (knowledge gained specifically by schooling and study), erudition (profound, often specialized knowledge), and scholarship (the mastery of a particular area of learning).

Professionalism encompasses the set of skills, behaviors, methods, and standards that characterize a learned profession. An important component of professionalism is the practice of ethical conduct.

These outcomes are measured very specifically in each of the professional Schools and the Graduate Division and characterize a general expectation of every graduate. The global outcomes were proposed to the Academic Senate through its Faculty Councils and committees. The approval process has resulted in broad agreement of these concepts, and permitted each school and division to articulate appropriate measures. Although it is early in this process, faculty have agreed to this change and are implementing measurement strategies. Included in Appendix X are minutes of Senate meetings discussing and approving these global outcomes. Also included in the Appendix are preliminary plans and measures of the outcomes for each school and the Graduate Division. (CFR 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6)

In addition to the WASC Commission’s Guiding Recommendations addressed above, the WASC Visiting Team asked that UCSF consider the need for alternative teaching strategies, demonstrate direct assessment of student performance, continue to foster a culture of interprofessional education, and continue to find ways to encourage graduates to pursue academic careers. These recommendations are addressed below.

C. Identify the extent to which there is a need for alternative teaching strategies beyond the dominant mode of delivering material through classroom lectures.

In general, teaching methods employed across campus include small group learning, case-based analyses, large group activities, seminars, and journal clubs. These activities are facilitated by lecture casting capacity, development of breakout locations for small groups and extensive use of the CLE (collaborative learning environment) to provide a breadth of educational materials for students to facilitate alternative learning strategies. (CFR 2.10, 4.8) A catalogue of teaching methods employed in the schools is included in Appendix X.

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. (CFR 2.4, 2.6)
All schools and the graduate division utilize direct assessments. The **School of Dentistry** provides extensive learning activities in clinical simulation environments and under supervision in the patient care clinics. These activities include both learner-directed practice and supervised clinical practice. Faculty use a variety of formative and summative evaluations to assist students in mastering these skills. Common assessments are a) evaluation of technical performance in the simulation environment, b) assessment of patient care activities on the clinic floor, and c) overall assessment of student performance by assigned faculty members done quarterly. In addition mastery of knowledge covered in each course is a requirement for successful completion of courses, and professionalism is a component of the academic evaluation of each student. Knowledge is transmitted through classroom and study activities and is measured using written tests and performance evaluations if appropriate. Professionalism has been defined by the faculty as “the level of ethical, legal and moral conduct in one’s field that an individual must adhere to in order to gain and maintain the trust of others.” Specific objectives are defined in the courses and student behavior is monitored. Students who do not adhere to the learning objectives receive professional evaluation reports and are subject to academic sanction, remediation, and possible disciplinary action.

The **School of Medicine** has an ongoing assessment of the six competencies both within and independent of courses. Independent of the courses there are annual benchmarks. In the first year, all students complete a performance assessment in a three station mini objective structured clinical examination (OSCE). The student receives professionalism, history, physical examination, and communication scores. Students also complete a portfolio assessing and reflecting on evidence related to actual performance in four of the six competency domains.

At the end of year two all students complete another performance assessment in a six station OSCE and receive scores as described above. At this same stage, all students sit for the first of the examinations for licensure, USMLE Step1. They also submit a portfolio detailing the remaining two competencies and reviewing the previous ones.

In the middle of the third year, students participate in a formative clinical performance examination of three cases receiving feedback from faculty observers as well as standardized patients. At the end of year three the students complete their last direct performance assessment with an eight station Clinical Performance Examination (CPX). UCSF participates in a consortium of all eight California medical schools to undertake this standardized assessment. The student receives scores in history taking, physical examination, and physician-patient communication.

Students in their fourth year will complete USMLE Step 2. This system provides a longitudinal assessment of student performance. Faculty members have created direct observation of skills that reflect other than medical knowledge within each course and clinical rotation. Examples of these range from peer assessment of anatomy presentation to brief structured clinical observation. Course-content requirements are
The School of Nursing provides over 540 hours of clinical direct patient care with clinical faculty or clinical preceptor faculty on a one-on-one or two-on-one basis for 90% of students (all in clinical graduate programs). Additionally, clinical simulation is used for students who are in clinical programs. Students in non-clinical programs of study, such as Health Policy and Leadership, also have residency hours performed with a clinical faculty mentor. Clearly identified individual student learning outcomes developed by the student and faculty, prior to setting up the residency, are developed and monitored. Student projects such as quality assurance projects and drafting of a policy brief are evaluated by the clinical faculty and faculty mentor. Doctoral students not only develop scholarly papers related to their modal doctoral curriculum, but they are expected to write three papers for a qualifying exam, a research proposal, and a dissertation. The qualifying exam, proposal and dissertation are all completed working closely with faculty committees.

The School of Pharmacy requires that all students complete a series of advanced professional pharmacy practice experiences (APPEs), where students are assigned patients in actual patient-care settings and, under the supervision of preceptors, manage their therapy. Students are required to "work up" their patients, provide recommendations for therapy and monitor progress on a "patient-monitoring sheet" (see Appendix X Patient Monitoring Sheet--General Medicine). Student progress (or the result of their "work product") is recorded by preceptors on a standard evaluation form designed and utilized by the faculty in all appropriate APPEs. (See Appendix X UCSF Clinical Pharmacy Student Performance Evaluation.) This form also enables evaluation of the student's development as a professional (e.g., "dresses appropriately, communicates well with patients, communicates well with other health care providers, maintains patient confidentiality, independent, but not autonomous, collaborative, respectful of others, uses tact and diplomacy, defends therapeutic decisions with appropriate rationale, takes responsibility for actions"). The preceptor presents the student with a copy of the form and the reasons for the various ratings are discussed.

The Graduate Division defines the acquisition of the global learning outcome of "knowledge" at two stages of the student's development. The qualifying examination provides measurable evidence that the student is able to: a) critically read, understand, and evaluate current literature in the discipline; b) integrate and synthesize ideas within the field; c) demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of the literature in the field; d) critically evaluate empirical evidence; and e) demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of techniques critical to scholarship in the field.

The dissertation provides measurable evidence the student is able to: a) identify/define problems; b) generate questions and/or hypotheses; c) review and summarize the literature; d) apply appropriate research methods; e) collect data systematically; f) evaluate, interpret, and analyze a body of empirical data and evidence; g) discuss findings in the broader context of the field; and h) develop and sustain an evidence-based argument.
In terms of the global learning outcome of “professionalism,” Graduate Division students demonstrate that they are able to: a) conduct research responsibly and ethically; b) communicate clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences; and c) produce publishable results.

Every graduate academic student is evaluated for his/her demonstration of achieving the global learning outcomes (knowledge and professionalism) at several stages of the academic career. First, in addition to completing a sequence of courses to fulfill the curricular requirements for the acquisition of knowledge relevant to the field, all academic graduate students take courses in research methods and ethical research practices to learn the standards of professionalism. Doctoral students take qualifying exams mid-way through their program (in the second, third, or fourth year). A committee of at least four faculty members review these written and/or oral exam (see Appendix X for examples of evaluation reports).

As discussed above, the dissertation provides the direct evidence that the student has mastered the learning outcomes that collectively indicate his/her understanding and incorporation of the global learning outcomes of knowledge and professionalism (see Appendix X for examples of UCSF PhD dissertations). And, finally, many students get a head start on their professional careers by getting their scholarly work published in academic journals (see Appendix X for examples of students’ journal publications).

E. Continue to foster a culture of interprofessional education.

From the moment of its inception as a campus solely devoted to health care and research in the late 1800’s, UCSF has nurtured the concept of interprofessional education. As the campus grew from two to four health profession schools, cross and interdisciplinary teaching as well as jointly taught classes became commonplace across the many decades. Indeed many of the major changes that took place within professional education, particularly pharmacy, medicine, and nursing, came about as a result of joint efforts of interdisciplinary teams and took place in multidisciplinary settings.

UCSF has continued to expand its interprofessional activities and has now completed the fourth introductory interprofessional day, held on September 30, 2009. In addition, groups participate in a continuing exercise where students blog on-line about discussion questions. The September interprofessional day was attended by 465 students, 97% of the first year students enrolled in dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy and physical therapy. Students evaluated the experience and 84% of the 352 attendees who evaluated the program agreed or strongly agreed that the program was effective. (CFR 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.10) Add in appendices student evaluations, possibly script and agenda for day.)

First year interprofessional activities were expanded in 2009-2010 to include a second interprofessional experience, held on January 25, 2010 to review and discuss patient communication issues in small groups in reaction to a UCSF produced video. In
preparation for this gathering, first year students were assigned questions monthly on the IPE and developed lively blogs among mixed groups of professional students. 445 students attended the second IPE day in January. Of the students who submitted evaluations, 87.8% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Overall I feel this was an effective session.”

(Supportive evidence for appendix – 1) CLE records of blogging and 2) student evaluations, 3) possibly the script) A pre-survey on attitudes regarding working together in interprofessional teams was completed and will be followed up with a post survey at the end of the students’ first year of study. These data will inform us of longer-term attitude development following these interventions.

One project students completed utilized an interprofessional standardized patient. The students were pre and post tested on a previously validated attitude survey. Results indicated that the experience was associated with a significant improvement of attitudes toward team value and team efficiency. Another project focused on geriatrics education during patient care, GeriWard, to be initiated in 2010-2011 academic year. Selected third-year medical students, pharmacy students, and nursing students will be enrolled in the curriculum over the course of the academic year. The general course objectives include: 1) identify, learn and teach key geriatric competencies pertaining to the hospital setting; 2) implement clinical assessment tools in evaluating the elderly hospitalized patient on the wards; 3) work as a team consisting of interprofessional students to complete a clinical exercise; and 4) work as a team consisting of interprofessional students and demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively and collaborate with other healthcare professionals.

In addition to these continued efforts, several other notable advances have been made. The UCSF Library recast its instructional improvement grants to incorporate interprofessional education activities (full description on page X). In 2009 three grants were awarded for meritorious proposals that reached across disciplinary lines. Proposals were evaluated based on their interprofessional focus, innovation, sustainability, implementation, high impact, evaluation and cost efficiency. The titles of the successful proposals are listed in the report on page X. Documentation of these programs is included in Appendix X. Finally, the IPE team is in the early stages of working with a group of faculty to develop an interprofessional course on health policy to further engage students on this set of issues that is common to all the professions.

It is also important to highlight the increased interprofessional patient rounds occurring in the medical center. These are teams of medical and nursing students rounding on patients with clinical faculty in the medical center. Nursing students round with School of Medicine faculty and fulfill the role of the medical student, followed by medical students making rounds with School of Nursing faculty in the role of student nurse. This allows for new medical and nursing students in their first year to learn to participate in patient care from the perspective of another profession, to learn the value of the two disciplines, and to appreciate a different work effort as it relates to patient care.
As part of the ongoing efforts to emphasize interprofessional education, the deans met with the IPE team on February 27, 2009. They charged the Interprofessional Task Force to identify metrics to measure success (CRF 2.7), further communicate the advantages of the common academic calendar (CRF 2.4), connect with the Academic Senate and Academic Affairs regarding the scholarship of teaching for academic advancement (CFR 2.8), and explore how IPE efficiencies could save resources for the schools (CFR 3.5). Continued efforts described above have begun to address this charge. Also of note, Chancellor Susan Desmond-Hellmann has created a Chancellor’s Task Force on Interprofessional Education chaired by the Vice Provost of Student Academic Affairs. The task force is developing a report that formulates a vision for interprofessional education for the next five years. The report will be submitted to the Chancellor in July 2010. The minutes of the meetings and Context Map are included in Appendix X.

In addition, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the academic affairs associate deans have discussed the inclusion of faculty interprofessional education efforts as elements for promotion. With the concurrence of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel, a statement was added to the 2009 Annual Call, the document that highlights the changes to the academic review and advancement processes. It now states that “substantial teaching contributions that enhance interprofessional education (in particular, the development/enhancement of interprofessional curriculum) are encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of a candidate’s qualifications for advancement.”

Students have responded well to the interprofessional elements of their education and understand and value the benefits to them as professionals and to their patients:

“We feel it was much more a reward than a burden. The fact that we had members of our team with at least a year’s worth of experience in nursing, medicine, pharmacy and public health allowed us to approach our tasks with a greater confidence than one or more of us had experience with the task at hand... because we are new to the field we probably approached our team with a greater willingness to learn from one another.”
– Team Kenya

“We deepened our insight into a totally different culture and learned to become more culturally competent. Living and working together as an inter-disciplinary team provided an opportunity to learn about the various aspects of health care, which would help us collaborate with other health professionals in our future practices.”
– Team Tanzania

In sum, interprofessional education is enjoying a great deal of momentum at UCSF. Adopting the common academic calendar in 2009 has cleared a number of hurdles for planning programs. Faculty and the IPE team are working to identify and expand curricular offerings that meet the needs of professional students, and evaluation efforts are ongoing. This momentum has set the stage for defining and measuring endpoints.
that highlight the benefits for learners, faculty, patients, and the institution. (CFR 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.10, 4.6, 4.8)

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

UCSF recognizes the critical role of preparing future faculty members. Each schools’ plans have been enacted and have identified ways of recruiting young faculty and encouraging students to consider academic careers. The faculty mentoring program has flourished and now provides a variety of regular programming along with individual mentoring experiences. (CFR 3.1, 3.2) In addition, efforts continue in each school to offer opportunities to students that prepare them for academic careers. These efforts include teaching electives, the curriculum ambassador program, and particular mentoring programs. (CFR 2.9, 2.10)

The School of Dentistry has developed a number of elective activities to prepare students for academic careers. Faculty provide both elective teaching and tutoring opportunities and faculty-sponsored dental student organizations create activities that stimulate interactions between interested students and research-intensive and teaching-intensive faculty. In 2008, the School of Dentistry was awarded a T32 training grant by the NIDCR/NIH (National Institute for Dental and Craniofacial Research and the National Institutes for Health) to develop a combined DDS-Masters in Clinical Research degree track. This program is analogous to the Pathways program offered through the School of Medicine. In addition, the American Dental Education Association (ADEA) sponsors a national program to train and mentor future faculty members. The fellowship’s components include a day and a half summer fellow/mentor training session, biweekly collaborative meetings between fellows and mentors, faculty/administrator interviews, teaching practicum in four settings, career reflection essays, research practicum, and a poster presentation at the 2011 ADEA Annual Session. In 2010, two of the seven dental students from around the country selected for the year-long fellowship are at UCSF: Mahboobeh N. Bajestan mentored by Dr. Maria Orellana, D.D.S., Ph.D., M.Sc.; and Almut Ellwanger, mentored by Diane L. Barber, Ph.D., and Caroline H. Damsky, Ph.D. Each of these opportunities serves to assist students in understanding the responsibilities of an academic career and to gain experience in the aspects of academic life that distinguish it from a practice career.

Within the School of Medicine the Health Professions Education Pathway has become a well-developed course of study in medicine and students from other disciplines are now participating. Much of the learning activity is done independently and online which enhances opportunities for students from the other schools to participate. Currently the curriculum covers learning theory, teaching strategies, curriculum development, assessment, and leadership. Participants also complete a mentored legacy project. UCSF has established an extremely advanced academic and professional environment and as a result, serves as a model for those potentially interested in academics.

The School of Nursing received a significant 5-year grant from the Gordon and Betty Irene Moore Foundation to enroll and graduate doctorally prepared nurses, with a three-
year course of doctoral study, to assume nurse faculty roles in California upon graduation. Students were provided a generous stipend of $60,000 per year of study which allowed students to reduce their outside professional work and study full-time while in the doctoral program. Specific academic teaching courses and seminars were developed to support the students’ development of academic teaching skills and expertise. Currently two classes of Moore fellows are completing their doctoral education, one in spring 2010 and the other in spring 2011. At the end of the program over 55 new nursing faculty will have graduated from this initiative. The courses and mentoring received by the Moore fellows were offered to all interested nursing doctoral students, and will remain long after the Moore fellows have graduated.

Through role modeling and coursework the School of Pharmacy encourages its students to consider roles in academe. The School’s success in this regard can be measured in many ways, including the fact that its graduates hold a substantial number of faculty positions across the nation. In addition 276 of the School’s volunteer clinical faculty, 49.6%, are alumni. Over the last three years, roughly 64% of the School’s graduates have sought and been placed in residencies which are not required as a part of pharmacy education but serve as major sources for replenishing and building the clinical pharmacy faculties of the nation.

**WASC Commission’s Guiding Recommendation:** 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.

Each program in the Graduate Division undergoes external review every five years. Incorporated into the review is an assessment of student learning outcomes. In preparation for the review, each program is asked to identify specific learning outcomes for students at key stages of the program (e.g., qualifying exam, dissertation prospectus, research presentations, dissertation defense) and to explain the methods used to assess achievement of these student learning outcomes (e.g., aggregate annual reports of qualifying exam completions, acceptance of abstracts at national meetings, grants awarded, papers published, dissertations completed). The review team is then asked to evaluate the assessment methods and the outcomes data presented and to comment on how well the student learning outcomes align with both the discipline’s standards and the institution’s goals. Programs then incorporate this feedback into refining the curriculum, student support and advising services, and resource allocation. (CFR 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 4.6, 4.8) Refer to relevant materials in the Appendix

**WASC Commission’s Guiding Recommendation:** 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.
Faculty at UCSF are engaged in research and dissemination of knowledge related to education, curriculum, interprofessional education and many other topics specifically related to the professions. The publication and presentation of the knowledge gleaned through this process provides convincing evidence that UCSF faculty are active participants in fostering improvements in education. (CFR 2.2, 4.7) A listing of publications, abstracts, and presentations by UCSF faculty is included in Contributions of UCSF Faculty and Staff to the Scholarship of Teaching Appendix X.

As described above, the schools and Graduate Division are actively employing various methods of identifying and measuring student learning outcomes. The data from the direct and indirect assessments is used for planning and has provided a stimulus for positive change. In addition to the school- and program-based outcomes, the WASC team, associate deans, and academic senate have agreed upon two global learning outcomes: knowledge and professionalism. Supportive of these learning outcomes, the schools and the Graduate Division continue to foster interprofessional education through jointly taught classes, student projects and grants, patient rounds, and special activities such as the campuswide Interprofessional Day events. Finally, the emphasis on professional competency is balanced by a strong commitment to preparing students for academic careers. Mentoring activities, elective courses, the Pathways program, and other similar efforts provide support and encouragement for students to consider academic careers. In sum, UCSF has made significant progress in standardizing learning outcomes and general competencies, while still allowing for the individualization of the learning experience.
DIVERSITY

“Diversity refers to the variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstance. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identity, socioeconomic status, and geographic region, and more.”

--The University of California Diversity Statement developed by the UC Academic Senate and endorsed by the UC President, June 2006

As discussed during the Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2009, the Institutional Proposal stated that "UCSF is committed to being a leader in the effort by the University of California to enhance diversity across all its campuses." UCSF's efforts are rooted in a historical commitment to diversity. The efforts of the UCSF Black Caucus almost 40 years ago inspired the institution to build a more diverse faculty, staff, and student body. Since then, UCSF's professional schools have worked to keep pace with, and in some cases, have surpassed peer institutions in enrolling a higher proportion of underrepresented students. This success is especially noteworthy since UCSF is a post-baccalaureate university and there is a tendency for diverse representation to decline with advanced education. Although the State of California's Proposition 209 and the UC Board of Regents’ 1995 decision to discontinue affirmative action have resulted in a lower proportion of underrepresented students, UCSF continues to actively engage in a wide array of efforts to promote diversity. (CFR 1.5, 1.6)

WASC Commission’s Guiding Recommendation 1: 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.

In 2009 a campuswide Office of Institutional Research was re-constituted and a Director appointed. The office has reviewed metrics used by the U.S. Census Bureau, the University of California Office of the President (UCOP), the UCSF Graduate Division, the Central Application Services used by Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Physical Therapy, and the MCAT/Central Application system. A system is now in place that has the ability to capture data from different sources.

UCOP recently expanded the student race/ethnicity information that it collects in response to changes in federal reporting requirements, including new multi-race reporting requirements using federally prescribed roll-up rules. For the next few years, UCOP will continue to report race/ethnicity using its traditional single-reporting categories through use of a hierarchy or trumping scheme developed by UCOP and campus graduate division staff. This hierarchy has been accepted by all UC campus
Graduate Divisions, and will enable consistent reporting of the traditional single-race/ethnicity categories for the near future. United States and California census data was used to determine the broad categories (bolded) of under-represented students at UC, as well as the most underrepresented Hispanic and Asian sub-groups within the population of people aged 25 and older with at least a four-year college degree. These sub-groups are ordered with respect to the degree of their under-representation. No such system-wide hierarchy has previously existed for graduate student data, where the roll-ups have been determined by local campus practice.

**Graduate Hierarchy - UCOP Categories**
- **African-American**: African American/Black
- **Hispanic/Latino**: Mexican/Mexican American/Chicano; Other Spanish American/Latino
- **American Indian**: American Indian/Alaskan Native
- **Pacific Islander**: Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- **Asian**: Vietnamese; Filipino; Japanese; Chinese; Korean; East Indian/Pakistani; Other Asian
- **White**: White/Caucasian

This hierarchy will be implemented with fall 2010 graduate academic and professional enrollment and admissions data, however the current single-race/ethnicity reporting structure will be gradually phased out over the next four to five years. UCOP plans to discontinue the use of all hierarchies and to begin acknowledging multiple races in order to achieve consistency with emerging national reporting practices.

UCSF’s Academic Demographic System was developed to track faculty searches, applicant demographics, national availability data and current and trend information of existing faculty. It facilitates best practices for academic searches and improves transparency by providing timely demographic information about the current faculty. The system will be expanded to generate the Search Process Report and to request GLBT/Gender Identify information of applicants. Faculty gender and ethnicity (African American, Asian American, American Indian, Hispanic and White) data are reported annually by the Office of the Vice Provost, Academic Affairs. Each year, this data is used to create UCSF academic placement goals for under-represented minorities and women by School-wide job group as well as by Affirmative Action/Diversity progress report planning unit. Departments are required to use the planning unit/department specific placement goals on their Academic Recruitment Plan and Search Waiver forms, and this requirement is reiterated on the Annual Call for Academic Personnel Actions and Academic Appraisal.

UCSF Human Resources collects demographic data on full- and part-time staff to comply with Federal reporting guidelines, including the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) EEO-1 Report of the US Department of Labor. OFCCP currently requires Federal contractors to collect and maintain information about the gender, race, and ethnicity of their employees in five race and ethnic categories: Blacks, Hispanics, Asians/Pacific Islanders, and American Indians/Alaskan Natives. The EEO-1 categories are currently undergoing revision, and will add one new category.
("two or more races") as well as dividing the category "Asian/Pacific Islanders" into two separate categories, "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders". This data is used annually to create UCSF staff placement goals for under-represented minorities and women by job group.

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

In June 2007, UCSF completed a campus wide Strategic Plan. The vision statement specifically provides 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."

One major initiative to enhance campuswide diversity of faculty, students, and trainees was the creation of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Diversity (CACAD). (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.5) Through this new committee, the campus set forth on an ambitious set of goals that resulted from the development of the campus Strategic Plan (http://strategy.ucsf.edu/contents/ucsf-strategic-plan/) and the 10-point Diversity Initiative (http://pub.ucsf.edu/today/news.php?news_id=200702281) adopted in 2007. Progress from CACAD related to the goals in the Institutional Proposal is summarized below. (CFR 1.5, 3.1, 3.2).

The ten points are summarized below:

- Implement comprehensive communication program and diversity webpage;
- Establish faculty database for conducting faculty searches;
- Implement best practices for faculty searches;
- Develop comprehensive plan for staff recruitment and retention;
- Develop comprehensive program promoting diversity among trainees;
- Develop preliminary set of proposals on accountability and incentives;
• Recruit director of academic diversity;
• Establish coordinated outreach program;
• Establish school-specific plans
• Incorporate recommendations from the Strategic Planning Initiative.

The campus has put in place an effective communication strategy, with a robust Diversity web site (http://diversity.ucsf.edu) that includes data indicating progress on diversity among students, trainees, faculty and staff.

With guidance and oversight by the Chancellor’s Academic Diversity Committee, the Chancellor’s Office put in place an accountability structure in 2007 that requires annual reporting and a public presentation of diversity plans and progress in achieving goals. The most recent public reporting of diversity took place on April 13, 2010 with Chancellor Desmond-Hellmann and other senior leaders presenting an update on progress in achieving diversity goals and answering questions from the campus community. A description of that event can be found at: http://today.ucsf.edu/stories/ucsf-leaders-to-provide-status-report-on-academic-staff-diversity/

The Director of Academic Diversity has worked with the Office of Institutional Research to collect trainee demographics from each of the Schools. In addition, first generation to college students are followed with this system. (Revised CFR 2.11) The Graduate Medical Education Program has also implemented a new system that more efficiently captures demographic data. This data is included on both the campus Diversity web site and the OIR web site.

UCSF is also in a unique position to model cultural competency strategies across the health professions. Each of the professional schools includes formal training in cultural competency in its curriculum. Below are some examples of this important work.

Students in the School of Dentistry must meet specific competencies that address cultural competency. Graduates must be competent in the application of the fundamental principles of behavioral sciences as they pertain to patient-centered approaches for promoting, improving, and maintaining oral health. They must also present competency in managing a diverse patient population and have the interpersonal and communications skills to function successfully in a multicultural work environment. These competencies are required through coursework in behavioral science, cultural competency, and ethics that span all four years of the dental curriculum.

The School of Medicine has mapped Social and Cultural Issues in Health Care into all years of the core curriculum. The goal is to address what physicians need to know and do to provide appropriate care to patients with differing social, cultural and economic backgrounds.

Within the School of Nursing, all students are required to take a two to three unit
course on socio-cultural issues. In addition, several required core courses have identified learning outcomes with respect to cultural/racial/ethnic diversity.

The School of Pharmacy provides cultural competence training to students through various modalities including lectures, workshops, role-plays, and interactive exercises. Early in the curriculum students are introduced to the concepts of cultural competence (i.e., culture and health, health beliefs, health disparities, health literacy, low English proficiency) and students have the opportunity to discuss the impact culture has on a patient’s health and especially on how patients may communicate their health and medication needs to the pharmacist. In addition, students receive training on the proper techniques for using interpreters in the clinical setting. As students learn about medication therapy options the concepts of culture are integrated as important elements to consider when designing treatment regimens and recommendations. Students complete their clinical training during the final year of the program during which they apply cultural competence concepts learned while interacting with patients and other health care professionals.

[Proposed response for Graduate Division—Draft text language below:]

The Graduate Division administers several diversity programs including the NIH/NIGMS-sponsored IRACDA Scholars in Science (ISIS) Fellowship Program for postdoctoral scholars and the Initiative to Maximize Student Diversity (IMSD) Fellowship for underrepresented minority graduate students; the NSF-sponsored Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP) "Postdoc Bootcamp" program; the UC Leadership Excellence through Advanced Degrees (LEADS) Program; and Summer Research Opportunities http://graduate.ucsf.edu/content/outreach-amp-diversity. In addition, a number of resources are made available to under-represented students or anyone interested in fostering diversity. These resources can be found on the Graduate Division website http://graduate.ucsf.edu/content/other-diversity-resources.

WASC Commission’s Guiding Recommendation: 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.

(Need Chris Cullander and Renee Navarro to write up some text for this section)

Moving Toward a New Campus Organization for Diversity

In December 2009, Bobby Baron, the Chair of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Academic Diversity (CACAD) appointed a Subcommittee on Outreach and Diversity to review and analyze three recent reports and develop a single consolidated proposal to enhance outreach and diversity at UCSF consistent with the Chancellor’s strategic priorities under the leadership of co-chairs Joseph Castro, Vice Provost – Student Academic Affairs and Special Assistant to the Chancellor and Renee Navarro, Associate Dean Academic Affairs and Director of Academic Diversity.
The subcommittee reached near unanimous support for recommending that UCSF:
1) Establish a campus-wide diversity office;
2) Appoint a highly visible, senior level leader to lead the campus-wide diversity office who will report directly to the Chancellor;
3) Incorporate existing UCSF diversity programs and offices within the campus-wide diversity office;
4) Allocate sufficient new resources, including adequate staffing, to the diversity office to support collaboration among existing programs, initiate pilot programs, and provide seed money to leverage new sources of financial support for diversity and outreach;
5) Charge the new diversity office with the establishment of a campus-wide multicultural center; and
6) Charge the new diversity office with the establishment of a coordinated campus diversity plan covering students, trainees, staff and faculty that includes a comprehensive inventory of existing programs, a strategic plan for strengthening existing programs and developing new programs, and an institutional research framework for assessing program effectiveness over time.

The report’s recommendations have been endorsed by the CACAD, the Chancellor, and Executive Committee as long-term strategies to improve UCSF’s outreach efforts. The report can be found in Appendix X. Specific plans to address the recommendations included (CFR 1.5, 3.1, 3.2): a) increasing the coordination of outreach activities by the Director of Academic Diversity; b) expanding, enhancing, and financially supporting existing post baccalaureate programs for disadvantaged students interested in health science careers at all four schools; and c) supporting the establishment of new programs. Include text about next steps to implement Report’s recommendations.

Initiatives to Enhance Diversity

UCSF sponsors an array of initiatives that nurture and increase diversity. Some examples are described below:

A successful example of a campuswide outreach initiative that identifies disadvantaged students for all our professional schools and graduate programs is the **Inside UCSF Program**. This program, which recruits talented and diverse students from community colleges and four-year institutions, was successfully conducted between 1999 and 2004, then again in 2008, 2009 and 2010. Concurrently, we compare annual enrollment data for underrepresented students to average enrollment rates for all students, monitor for trends, and evaluate for contributory factors. For example, 2009 data indicate 34% of enrolled graduate students and 47% of enrolled medical students are from ethnicities considered to be underrepresented in science and medicine (American Indian, Asian, Black, and Hispanic) compared to 46% and 33%, respectively, in 2008. A similar plan is in place to evaluate factors contributing to differences in matching residency programs for underrepresented students in medicine (UIM) as compared to other students. 2008 data showed a 25% match rate for UIM compared to 34% for majority students. These rates have continued to converge, with a 26% match rate for UIM compared to 28% for
non-UIM students in 2009, and 28% UIM match rate compared to 27% for majority students in 2010. Data for 2009 can be found in Appendix X.

Campus wide programs aimed at recruiting postdoctoral fellows and faculty who enhance our diversity include the Travelling Ambassador Program, in which Travelling Ambassadors representing UCSF attend national professional meetings, advertise open faculty positions at UCSF, and focus on making contact with potential applicants who would enhance the diversity of the campus. The ambassador provides information about specific UCSF faculty openings and obtains contact information from those individuals with whom they interact. The Director of Academic Diversity, Dr. Renee Navarro, coordinates the recruitment of potential candidates that have been identified by ambassadors, forwards announcements of new searches, and assists in identifying and training new ambassadors. A similar program for postdoctoral fellows, the University of California President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, was established in 1984 to encourage outstanding women and minority PhD recipients to pursue academic careers at the University of California. The current program offers postdoctoral research fellowships in all fields, along with faculty mentoring and eligibility for a hiring incentive to qualified scholars whose research, teaching, and service will contribute to diversity and equal opportunity at the University of California. We also specifically have recruited fellows from this program as faculty members at UCSF (http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/ppfp/faculty_app.html).

The UCSF Communications Program ensures that we are fully communicating the overall picture of UCSF’s diversity efforts, which includes our commitment to diversity, programs underway to support these efforts, and areas where we can improve. The Communications Program has played a major role in disseminating diversity efforts at UCSF, making them available to other campuses and serving as a model for the academic community. The Public Affairs Office, in collaboration with the CACAD, has made a strong effort to ensure that campuswide diversity events are covered and appropriately featured. A list of diversity communications for 2010 can be found in Appendix X (need to update Appendix 16 provided with the CPR report). Efforts to communicate and disseminate approaches to enhancing diversity are described briefly below. (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.5)

The Diversity Website at UCSF (diversity.ucsf.edu) was launched in August 2008. The site features the Chancellor’s welcome message, stories about diversity news and events, related sites and resources, and a section to recognize Diversity Champions. The site also provides demographic information about the university. Another feature of the site is VOICES, a new video series profiling diverse members of the campus community. This section is expanded in an ongoing manner to reflect the full breadth of campus diversity.

A diversity brochure focusing on UCSF’s commitment to diversity was developed and distributed beginning in 2008. The brochure was designed to reflect the look and style of the diversity website and to be used for recruiting faculty, staff, students, and trainees. It includes a statement from the Chancellor about diversity as well as links to important
websites for all of the groups.

Other recent accomplishments include a diversity listserv, a calendar of key annual events that UCSF representatives can attend and provide a booth and/or advertisements. Other methods to maximize diversity of our faculty is the Academic Demographic System, standardization of definitions and reporting, generic advertising, improvements to the search committee tools and the Academic Affairs website, and exit surveys for faculty who leave UCSF. (CFR 1.5, 3.2) More details on these activities are included below.

The **Academic Demographic System** was developed to track faculty searches, applicant demographics, national availability data, and current and trend information of existing faculty. It will facilitate best practices for academic searches and improve transparency by providing timely demographic information about the current faculty. Training will continue, and the Director of Academic Diversity will review pool information earlier in the search process.

An **advertisement** to publicize UCSF's commitment to diversity was developed and placed on 20 online sites and in journals of organizations likely to reach a diverse pool of applicants. The ad directs potential applicants to the Academic Affairs website where there are links to job opportunities. A link to the academic diversity e-mail address was incorporated into the advertisement for those interested in making direct contact about a particular position. Although the response rate was low, several of the online ads received substantial traffic. This was an important step taken to enhance UCSF's visibility to organizations most likely to attract diverse applicants.

A **Search Committee Checklist and Tool Kit** for conducting faculty searches has been developed and included in the new Academic Search Chair Orientation Tool Kit and on the Academic Affairs website. It provides a step-by-step guide for establishing a new search and includes best practices to ensure a diverse and qualified applicant pool. In the next two years, the Director of Academic Diversity will strive to meet with search chairs for orientation on best practices and disseminate the Best Practices in Faculty Searches Tool Kit.

The **Academic Affairs Website** page (http://acpers.ucsf.edu/diversity/) has been updated to feature a Recruitment and Diversity header. (Revised CFR 2.8) The recruitment section has forms, policies, and best practices for conducting academic searches and is easily accessible to search committees and their staff. The diversity section includes important documents and resources related to diversity and a link to the UCSF diversity website. The New Faculty Orientation Program includes a section on “Who We Are” and Principles of Community. (Revised CFR 3.3)

An **exit survey** developed by the Academic Senate Clinical Affairs Committee has been expanded and sent to all faculty to determine reasons for leaving UCSF. This allows any differences among demographic groups to be identified and addressed. The movement from a paper survey to online input has increased the response rate from
less than 20% to greater than 60%.

Efforts to improve the diversity of trainees and postdoctoral fellows follow similar paths as those described for faculty. Some of those activities are described below. (CFR 1.5, 1.7)

**Diversify Postdoctoral Candidate Pool.** The Dean of the Graduate Division, Patricia Calarco, and Assistant Dean of the Graduate Division, Christine Des Jarlais, have defined principles for identifying a diverse pool of postdoctoral candidates. In collaboration with the Director of Academic Diversity, they also have developed guidelines to expand searches to increase the hiring of underrepresented individuals.

The last diversity action in the Institutional Proposal concerns accountability and incentives. Progress to date and plans are described below. (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5)

**Dissemination of Implementation Guidelines for APM 210.** The University of California Academic Personnel Manual policy governing faculty appointment and advancement (APM 210) was amended effective July 2005 so that faculty contributions to diversity would receive recognition and reward in the academic personnel process. (Revised CFR 2.8) The guidelines for evaluating contributions to diversity have been added to the Annual Call and the Academic Affairs website, distributed to department chairs, and discussed in the retreat with the Committee on Academic Personnel. (Revised CFR 2.8)

**Evaluation of the Stewardship Review Process.** Diversity is one component in the evaluation of the stewardship of a department or school. The Director of Academic Diversity is now able to provide departmental demographic data (including trend data) for the review. (Revised CFR 2.8)

**Inclusion of all segments of the faculty in the Chancellor’s Council on Faculty Life Activities.** Broad participation is encouraged for all CCFL activities, including leadership training, faculty development, faculty mentoring, and stress management programs. Diversity of participants is monitored, and intervention has not been necessary.

**UCSF’s Leadership Panel on Diversity.** A program highlighting challenges and plans for the future was first presented in 2007 by then Chancellor J. Michael Bishop and the executive leadership team. This event was originally requested by the Chancellor’s Committee on Diversity and has been held each academic year since (Appendix X—Agenda for upcoming 2010 program).

**Deans’ Annual Reporting to the Chancellor and Executive Committee.** A template has been developed for the annual reporting process to standardize presentation of information and facilitate tracking over time to assess progress.

**Staff Diversity.** UCSF has a long-standing commitment to hiring and retaining a diverse
staff. This commitment is evidenced by analysis of staff ethnicity and gender for the past five years (Appendix X). As part of that commitment, the Office of Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity and Diversity (AAEOD) produces an annual Affirmative Action Plan. The Affirmative Action Plan establishes goals and good faith efforts for addressing underutilization of women and minorities in staff and academic job groups. The plan is in compliance with federal affirmative action regulations. The 2009 Affirmative Action Plan is included in Appendix X.

As part of the campus Strategic Plan, UCSF launched an initiative in 2007-08 to nurture and increase staff diversity. This initiative had three goals: a) nurturing diversity; b) improving institutional climate and; c) promoting professional development. Each goal had strategies that the campus has implemented and continues to sustain. The individual goals and strategies are discussed below.

**Nurturing Diversity.** (CFR 1.5, 3.1) Training is provided for supervisors and managers on diversity awareness and best practices in outreach, recruitment and retention. To make trainings more accessible a new online course, “Foundations of Diversity for Supervisors,” has been created.

Through the University Community Partnership Program, the University has formed partnerships with 31 community-based organizations order to help improve the career opportunities for disadvantaged communities and identify and recruit new staff from diverse backgrounds. [https://partnerships.ucsf.edu](https://partnerships.ucsf.edu). Co-Director of UCP will provide additional text.

**Improving Institutional Climate.** (CFR 1.5, 3.4) New Employee Orientations are held bi-monthly to welcome new staff to UCSF and help integrate them into the organization more quickly, familiarizing them with its structure, values, mission and culture. In 2009, 756 new employees attended the orientation. The University conducts employee opinion surveys every two years to assess employee satisfaction and organizational climate. This analysis is then shared with key institution, department, and unit leadership in order to address any institutional climate concerns. When employees leave the university the campus conducts exit interviews to assess the institutional climate and attempt to identify any factors that may enhance or impede our diversity efforts.

AAEOD conducts in-person diversity training workshops for employees and supervisors. Over 1,500 staff and other members of the campus community participate annually in these workshops. Topics include cultural awareness/humility, managing diverse teams, and conflict prevention and resolution.

UCSF has recognized more than 850 staff, and other members of the campus community, who contribute to the positive climate for diversity through the Champions of Diversity program, the Diversity and Affirmative Action Best Practices awards, and the Chancellor's awards, including the Martin Luther King Jr., Status of Women, LGBT Leadership, Public Service, Exceptional University Management and UCSF Medal.
Support Awards [http://diversity.ucsf.edu/champions/]. Additional information about the Chancellors' Awards can be found in Appendix X.

**Promoting Professional Development.** (CFR 1.5, 3.3, 3.4) In the fall of 2008, UCSF launched a Leadership Development Program to enhance current leadership capacity and to create a diverse pipeline of future senior leaders. The Leadership Development Program consists of two academic year-long development programs for emerging and senior leaders, the Leadership Academy and the Leadership Institute. The program is designed to ensure organizational success through sustained development of current and future leaders. In 2009 and 2010 we have been able to develop approximately 20% of the leadership population, including substantial representation of people of color, women, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender staff in the areas of collaboration, communication, strategic planning and decision making [http://leader.ucsf.edu/].

In the spring of 2009, Human Resources launched a Career Development Initiative to support staff in advancing their professional careers. A website ([http://careerdev.ucsf.edu/](http://careerdev.ucsf.edu/)) was created to provide staff access to career development pathways and resources. A series of career development workshops served over 200 UCSF staff and Human Resources is in the process of creating career paths and defining associated development activities to advance staff in their professional fields.

**Plans to Further Strengthen Diversity Efforts**

In December 2009, Bobby Baron, the Chair of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Academic Diversity (CACAD) appointed a Subcommittee on Outreach and Diversity to review and analyze three recent reports and develop a single consolidated proposal to enhance outreach and diversity at UCSF consistent with the Chancellor’s strategic priorities under the leadership of co-chairs Joseph Castro, Vice Provost – Student Academic Affairs and Special Assistant to the Chancellor and Renee Navarro, Associate Dean Academic Affairs and Director of Academic Diversity.

The subcommittee reached near unanimous support for recommending that UCSF:

1) Establish a campus-wide diversity office;
2) Appoint a highly visible, senior level leader to lead the campus-wide diversity office who will report directly to the Chancellor;
3) Incorporate existing UCSF diversity programs and offices within the campus-wide diversity office;
4) Allocate sufficient new resources, including adequate staffing, to the diversity office to support collaboration among existing programs, initiate pilot programs, and provide seed money to leverage new sources of financial support for diversity and outreach;
5) Charge the new diversity office with the establishment of a campus-wide multicultural center; and
6) Charge the new diversity office with the establishment of a coordinated campus diversity plan covering students, trainees, staff and faculty that includes a comprehensive inventory of existing programs, a strategic plan for strengthening existing programs and developing new programs, and an institutional research framework for assessing program effectiveness over time.

The report's recommendations have been endorsed by the CACAD, the Chancellor, and Executive Committee as long-term strategies to improve UCSF's outreach efforts. The report can be found in Appendix X.

Concurrently, the University of California Office of the President established in June 2010 a systemwide Council on Climate, Culture and Inclusion and has urged each UC Chancellor to establish a local Council on Climate, Culture and Inclusion. The councils were created, in part, as a response to problematic incidents targeting students of color and LGBT students at several campuses. The UCSF Council, which will take the place and continue the role of the Chancellor's Academic Diversity Committee, meets for the first time in late July 2010.

Diversity and inclusiveness have always been core values of the University of California. The faculty who founded UC's professional schools more than a century ago made that clear when they decided to accept applications from women and people of color, a bold decision for the times. UCSF's Black Caucus later provided an impetus for the campus to improve its efforts to diversify its faculty, students, and staff at all levels to keep pace with an ever more diverse population in California and the nation. External political and cultural events have at times hampered our efforts. Nevertheless, the recent report and recommendations from the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Diversity and the new staff diversity initiative provide the campus with an action plan. The strategies, goals, and actions outlined in the report have already led to considerable progress, and we have the expertise and energy to do even better in the future.
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

“I believe that we should be held accountable by parents, by students, by taxpayers, by employees, by the Legislature. If someone asks…about a specific research program or asks about diversity or asks about new technology – whether it’s worth the cost and what are you getting out of it – I think we ought to be able to give an honest answer, backed up by empirical data, and that is my view. My motto… ‘In God we trust – all others bring data.’"

“Proving the Value of Higher Education,” speech by UC President Mark Yudof to Commonwealth Club of California, Nov. 17, 2008

**WASC Commission’s Guiding Recommendation:** 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.

Institutional research has proven to be a critical element to all areas of the WASC review and to the university’s ongoing commitment to plan, measure, and improve the educational effectiveness at UCSF. At present, institutional research is distributed between several campus administrative units at UCSF, primarily the Office of Institutional Research, the Graduate Division, the Admissions Offices and the Offices of Student Affairs for the professional programs, and the program administration for the graduate academic programs. Budget and Resource Management, Human Resources Information Systems, and Campus Life Services also have some institutional research functionality with respect to student data. All these units provide timely responses to strategic data needs, and the data and analyses that they provide are regularly used to inform decision-making and in institutional review. (CFR 4.5)

The WASC review team recommended that the UCSF administration 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).

The **UCSF Office of Institutional Research (OIR)** in Student Academic Affairs was formally re-established in fall 2009, and is staffed by a full-time Director and a half-time analyst. The OIR is the source for validated student and trainee data and both periodic and ad-hoc reports and analyses that are provided to campus leadership and Public Affairs, the UC systemwide office, and the U.S. Department of Education and to other clients. Student learning assessment at UCSF takes place at the program level, however the OIR plans to institute a campus climate and student satisfaction survey modeled on the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) in
the near future, and is working with Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) staff to implement this initiative. The Office of Institutional Research has also taken a lead role in the WASC affirmation of accreditation and was able to move UCSF to ‘Specified’ degree level approval in October 2009.

The majority of data used by the OIR is currently obtained from the data systems of the Registrar and Student Financial Aid, with additional data provided as needed from Services for International Students and Scholars, the Office of Student Life, and Student Health and Counseling Services. An arrangement has been made with Institutional Research at the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) to create a data warehouse for the UCSF campus as part of the Decision Support System (DSS) currently under development at UCOP (see Appendix X, correspondence from Kathleen Dettmann, Director of Institutional Research at UCOP). The expectation is that this will eventually become the primary means of campus data reporting and analysis.

The Director of the OIR is a member of UCOP’s Decision Support System Student Data Business Requirements Work Group that is in the process of developing business requirements and functional specifications for DSS Phase II - Student and Instructional Data. Once these requirements and specifications are completed in late July 2010, the next step will be to build the data model for the first release of Phase II as well as to develop data dictionaries and a glossary of business terms. The DSS will make it possible to integrate data system-wide as well as incorporate data from external sources, and (where appropriate) will provide users in the University community with direct access to data from many of the University’s major administrative systems.

The **Office of Institutional Research** web page (oir.ucsf.edu) publishes student data and provides links to campus, faculty, staff, and UC systemwide data, including UC Accountability. Google Analytics tracks use of the web pages. There is an ongoing review of the OIR that includes a comparison of data collection methodologies, a critical examination of performance indicators for the campus, creation of partnerships with other institutional research-related units on campus, and active outreach to existing and potential constituencies.

**Graduate Division Institutional Research/Information Technology (IR/IT)** provides data for program review and grant applications, is responsible for the administration of various surveys, responds to Federal, State, UC systemwide, and campus information requests, and implements and oversees the graduate school application process. Staffing consists of the Director of IR/IT and one staff member. The data for program review and grant applications is obtained from Student Financial Aid and the Office of the Registrar. Graduate Division IR administers the NSF-NIH Graduate Student Survey and the Survey of Earned Doctorates (the SED), UC systemwide’s triennial Graduate Student Survey, the UCSF Survey of Doctoral Experiences, and the CGS/GRE Survey of Graduate Enrollment and Degrees. This unit supports the Graduate Division web pages (graduate.ucsf.edu/), but does not have a web presence itself.
Each graduate professional program at UCSF has its own **Admissions Office** and the Graduate Division administers admission to graduate academic programs. Data on applicants and offers made (number, gender, race and ethnicity) is transmitted to the Registrar in the late fall or early winter of each academic year, and information regarding the preparation and selectivity of applicants is maintained at the program level. Admissions Office staffing varies by program, and there is an admissions webpage for each professional program and for the Graduate Division. As noted earlier, student assessment takes place at the program level and is conducted by each **Office of Student Affairs** for the professional programs. Assessment data is used internally to track student progress and to fulfill programmatic accreditation requirements. As a rule, student assessment in the **Graduate Division** is done during program review.

Other units that work with student data include the following:

- The Institutional Analysis (IA) unit in Budget and Resource Management has three FTE, and is charged with conducting analyses relevant to decisions regarding the funds to support building projects, including instructional space. Institutional Analysis publishes an in-depth UCSF Institutional Profile each year that includes student data (http://brm.ucsf.edu/finance/2517-DSY.html).

- Human Resources Information Systems tracks part-time student employees serving as technical, laboratory or office assistants. This data may be useful when looking at persistence and time to degree for some programs. Student data is also reported when students take staff trainings.

- Campus Life Services (CLS) has a marketing group that does research regarding the use and potential use of CLS Services (including housing, shuttle service, recreation, arts and events, childcare and retail on campus) by the campus community. They regularly use surveys and focus groups to obtain feedback on existing services and identify future needs. Since some of their survey questions concern student satisfaction, the Office of Institutional Research will be working with CLS to avoid repetitive questions and survey fatigue on the part of students.

Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning. (CFR 4.3)

**Report will go out for review without this section completed.**

**Suggestions for narrative and links to address two paragraphs above:**

- Office of Student Life, particularly learning and disability resources
- Financial counseling information in SFS
• Graduate Division website, as source of general information about graduate study at UCSF
• Academic Affairs, particularly the information about appointment and advancement in faculty series

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

Suggestions for narrative and links to address paragraph above:
• OIR webpage as source of verified student data on admission and enrollment
• Graduate program review process - possible appendices about this are:
  http://senate.ucsf.edu/2005-2006/i-gradc-06-2006-programpreparation.pdf and
• Description of procedure to establish new graduate programs in Compendium

The WASC review team also recommended that 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).  [Need narrative to support that this has occurred]

UCSF’s information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions. (CFR 3.7)  [Need narrative to support that this has occurred]

UCSF, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology. (CFR 4.7)

[Concluding paragraph to be written once essay is complete]
NEW ENHANCEMENTS TO STUDENT SERVICES

“We make sure we have the most talented faculty possible, to train the best and brightest students and trainees and make an impact in this world. These young adults are so talented, so diverse, so smart and so dedicated to do great things for the world. They are filled with hope and optimism and tenacity.”


The Student Academic Affairs (SAA) Team and campus colleagues are working diligently to address two significant challenges that are priorities in the UCSF Strategic Plan.

First, SAA is identifying and implementing new ways to better serve the ever-changing needs of UCSF students inside and outside the classroom. Rapid advances in technology provide new opportunities to serve students’ needs faster and more efficiently than in the past. New technologies have been implemented to streamline student systems, especially the financial aid and registration systems. The recent creation of an endowment has also enabled the campus to sustain advances made in improving student classrooms. New and more complex health needs of students, especially in the realm of mental health and counseling, have prompted an increase in access to a wider range of health services as well as to enhanced wellness and support services.

Second, the SAA team is working with faculty, staff, and students throughout the campus to better coordinate existing programs and design new initiatives that increase the diversity of our students. The establishment of a new expanded partnership with San Francisco Unified School District is a very important component of the effort to strengthen local educational pathways serving P-12 students from diverse backgrounds. By enrolling and graduating more students from underrepresented backgrounds, UCSF will help to increase the diversity of the next generation of health care leaders while expanding access to care in many of California's underserved communities.

Each of the new enhancements described below have addressed one or both of the SAA goals for improved services to students and increased diversity within the UCSF student population.

**Technology Enhancements**

In 2009-10 the [Student Financial Aid Office](#) introduced a 100% on-line application process to continuing students for the first time. The office also implemented new software allowing for automated aid awards, eliminating the need for manual and repetitive input. Offer letters are now generated on-line and available for student
retrieval at any time, and electronic signatures were implemented on all promissory
notes, allowing students to instantly complete the paperwork from home or school.

Other technological enhancements include the expansion and promotion of electronic
deposits for all loan funds, leading to a dramatic decrease in the number of paper
checks being issued and safer and more efficient distribution of funds to students.
Finally, Student Financial Aid is working with the Controller’s Office to create and
implement a student Accounts/Receivable system that is scheduled to go live in August
2010.

In addition to the technological enhancements, Student Financial Aid hired a new staff
member to implement and manage a holistic debt-management and budget-planning
program to educate students on ways to minimize debt and explore loan repayment
options upon graduation. The program also provides workshops in conjunction with
both individual school intersession programs and as part of the Student Enrichment
Series sponsored by SAA.

The Office of the Registrar significantly improved services in 2009-10 by launching a
new web site to provide information to students in a logical, easy-to-navigate format. In
the same year, on-line grade reporting for faculty was implemented. Currently 99
percent of grades are reported on-line, allowing students faster access to their grades.

To enable employers to verify degrees of our alumni quickly, the Office of the Registrar
implemented on-line degree verifications through the National Student Clearinghouse.
In addition, 30 years of course catalogs were electronically archived. Finally, the Office
of the Registrar's implementation of an e-check system for fee payments reached
maturity, with 77 percent of students paying fees by e-check.

In addition to the Financial Aid and Registrar improvements, Student Academic Affairs,
in partnership with Capital Programs and Facilities Management, upgraded 35
classrooms with new carpet, paint, or flexible furniture. These improvements
significantly enhanced the learning experience for our students. Student Academic
Affairs also installed modern technology in classrooms, raising every classroom to at
least a baseline level of technology for instruction. The reliability of equipment and the
delivery of support services to instructors were improved and SAA piloted a system to
capture lectures electronically and provide these recordings to students. A larger-scale
deployment of a robust lecture capture system is funded and is in progress.

Student Academic Affairs Websites
In an effort to continuously enhance the effectiveness of student services, Student
Academic Affairs (SAA) launched eight new websites in April 2010. The goal of the
redesign initiative was to create functional, accessible, user-friendly, student-focused
websites for all of Student Academic Affairs.

Highlights include user polls, multimedia content, departmental calendars, up-to-date
forms and brochures, expanded search features, as well as campus-wide resource
listings. Student Academic Affairs looks forward to continuing the expansion of web-based services and information as an integral feature to serving students.

**Graduate Student Health Insurance Plan (GSHIP)**
In October and November 2007 the Vice Chancellors of Student Affairs and the Council of Graduate Deans expressed their interest in exploring a UC systemwide perspective for graduate student health insurance. In response, then Executive Vice President, Katherine N. Lapp, convened the UC Graduate Student Health Insurance Plan (GSHIP) Workgroup in August 2008. The committee’s charge was to undertake a fresh examination of the structuring of graduate student health insurance at the University of California. Although this issue has been examined previously, a rigorous market-based analysis was deemed necessary to determine the challenges and opportunities of a systemwide plan, including identification of areas where costs can be reduced and competitive advantages gained.

The University of California (including UC Hastings College of the Law) had 11 separate insurance plans for approximately 40,000+ insured graduate and professional students. These plans generally provided coverage for services beyond the primary care that is available in the campus’ student health and counseling centers through an insurance network. The plans varied substantially by campus with respect to benefits, premiums, administrative oversight, and cost containment. The cost differentials reflect variations in plan design provisions, covered student health and counseling center services, carrier provided discounts, care management arrangements, administrative fees, as well as regional and funding requirements.

The Workgroup was co-chaired by Joseph I. Castro, Vice Provost for Student Academic Affairs at UC San Francisco and Jeffery C. Gibeling, Dean of Graduate Studies at UC Davis. The workgroup’s recommendations were threefold: to contain costs, increase benefits, and stabilize GSHIP plans. Hewitt Associates, a consulting firm that has a dedicated operation to higher education, was retained to assist with the actuarial analysis. The committee met from October 2008 through June 2010 and distilled its findings into ten recommendations that resulted in a number of changes that are responsive to the stated goals.

First, a University-wide policy has been implemented that requires proof of health insurance coverage as a non-academic condition of enrollment for all University graduate students, consistent with its earlier action for undergraduates. The University has purchased “best in class” contracts for medical, dental and vision coverage from vendors with strong services and financial guarantees within each line of coverage rather than consolidating these services with one vendor. Contracts with Anthem and Delta Dental were signed in June 2010. The University self-insured the medical plan, fully-insured the dental and vision benefits, and contracted for administrative and marketing support.
Augmentations to benefits include a systemwide insurance plan to cover dependents and an optional extension of health insurance benefits upon completion of the degree program or during an approved leave of absence. Lastly, students who study/conduct research at a UC campus other than their home campus will be allowed to seek care via GSHIP throughout the state of California and abroad.

These structural changes to GSHIP resulted in a 10.7% reduction of the GSHIP fee for UCSF students for the upcoming 2010-2011 academic year. Annual increases in insurance premiums for UCSF students have been up to 10% more or more each year prior to this major change.

**Mission Bay Student Resource Center**
The student population continues to grow at Mission Bay. By fall 2010 there will be over 700 graduate students assigned to academic programs and approximately 300 UCSF graduate and professional students living in Campus Housing. The University anticipates substantial growth at Mission Bay for the next five to ten years. With the addition of new laboratory space and with the new hospital opening within the next five years, the number of students on that campus will grow exponentially.

The mission of the Student Resources Center at Mission Bay (SRC) is to add value to the quality of student life at Mission Bay and aid in the recruitment and retention of students. The Center is projected to open in December 2010 and will house the office of Student Services at Mission Bay and the Graduate Student Association (GSA).

The SRC will provide a highly visible and accessible center that promotes UCSF student services and student participation in diverse co-curricular programs and events. The Center will also deliver support and resources for student-initiated activities, provide on-site support for the GSA and other student groups, and serve as a center for organizing and delivering academic and career development programs and community building events.

**Office of Career Planning and Development/Graduate Division Internship Program**
The Graduate Student Internships for Career Exploration (GSICE) program is the first internship program in the nation geared toward placing basic science graduate students into internships in both traditional and non-traditional scientific fields, including biotech/pharmaceutical industry research, business relating to science, patent law, science policy, and science education.

The internships offer full-time placement for a three-month period and occur year round (fall, winter, spring, and summer academic quarters). The student interns are senior-level doctoral students from UCSF all trained rigorously in the basic sciences. Internships are project-oriented designed for the advanced capabilities of a PhD-level student. ([http://gsice.ucsf.edu](http://gsice.ucsf.edu))

**UCSF/San Francisco Unified School District Partnership**
The San Francisco Unified School District's (SFUSD) new strategic plan has articulated the charge of the UCSF/SFUSD Partnership: “To close the achievement gap by eliminating the predictive power of demographics. For far too long demographics, specifically the socio-economic, linguistic, and racial backgrounds of children have often been closely correlated to their success in school.”

UCSF also recently approved its own strategic plan, which calls for a greater and deeper engagement with the K-12 community. The UCSF/SFUSD Partnership is an opportunity to operationalize the goals expressed in each of our respective strategic plans. The Partnership has a two-fold purpose: 1) To support SFUSD students and educators by harnessing the clinical, educational and research resources of UCSF; and 2) To prepare the citizens of tomorrow and expose them to health sciences careers.

The Partnership will focus on science education, college readiness and clinical services via intensive work with five schools within the southeast sector of San Francisco. UCSF has a significant presence in this part of the city, which can be leveraged to support the partnership. In addition, this region demonstrates the greatest need and opportunity for a focused effort to bear positive results. In addition, the program serves a pre-school program, two elementary schools, two middle schools and one high school. Proceeding in this way will enable UCSF to create a deep, meaningful partnership with children and families who live within the same “neighborhood” of the city.

The SFUSD strategic plan states, “The changes we demand require that we relinquish pretense and embrace the simple truth that we all have to learn how to serve students and their families more effectively.” Serving students more effectively will mean developing a more engaging science curriculum so that students are excited about learning. It will require addressing the physical and mental health needs of students so that they will be able to learn. And notably, strategies will be implemented to engage the families of students as their active participation can make a huge difference in helping students meet their educational goals.

Serving all students more effectively will require UCSF and SFUSD, both individually and collectively, to be transparent about those areas where new learning and strategies are needed. This process of learning will inevitably transform both organizations for the better and lead to a deeper and more meaningful partnership.

**Student Aid Initiative**
UCSF is a recognized world leader in health sciences education. This excellence depends on sustained quality in clinical, research, and educational programs. Without the ability to retain top students, the ability to retain faculty is also jeopardized.

Unfortunately, the cost of the exemplary education provided by UCSF is rising. Student fees continue to increase dramatically and private and public peer institutions offer more generous financial aid than UCSF has been able to offer. As a result, growing numbers of top candidates decline UC in favor of competitors with better aid packages. The rising costs are also affecting the university’s service mission. Increased debt levels
require students to pursue high salary jobs, fewer graduates can afford to work with underserved populations, and finally, fewer graduates will pursue academic career paths.

It is important to note that these rising costs may hamper efforts to recruit and retain underrepresented minority students. Fee increases adversely affect low-income, out-of-state, and international students. Top candidates of diverse backgrounds are courted by peer institutions offering better aid packages. In order to sustain excellent health science education—of which diversity is a vital part—the University is launching the Student Aid Initiative.

Professional and PhD/Master’s students are the top priority for support. The next priority are trainees: postdoctoral fellows, residents, clinical fellows, and certificate programs. Scholarships are the primary goal, providing free money awarded primarily to professional and masters-level students to assist with educational expenses incurred while earning a degree at UCSF. Fellowships providing similar dollars for doctoral students, post-doctoral and clinical fellows, and residents is also a top priority. The secondary priority are awards that do not fit in the Scholarship and Fellowship categories, including funds awarded to students and fellows to recognize specific academic achievements, and to support academic endeavors such as summer research opportunities.

A strong case can be made to invest in the University. The return on investment for scholarships/fellowship gifts is significant. In addition, new health professionals, scientists, and researchers add millions to the economy. The University is placing an emphasis on building an endowment, however some donors will restrict gifts to current operational use. The majority of gifts will go to specific schools, departments, and programs, with some institution-wide funds as well. While these funds are being raised, a concurrent lobbying effort is underway to reduce or maintain current fees and secure governmental support for education.

Numerous opportunities exist for donors to support the initiative, from funding a single student through their educational program to naming programs and schools, to providing matching endowment funds. An extensive and exerted effort is underway to identify donors and prospects and the University anticipates much success from this initiative.

The initiatives described above are examples of the concerted and ongoing effort in recent years to enhance the student experience at UCSF through improved student services and support. Technological advances in Student Financial Aid and the Office of the Registrar, coupled with information-rich and user-friendly websites, have made the transactional and business functions of student life less burdensome. At the same time, improved and more affordable health insurance and health services have been realized and direct student services and activities will soon be implemented at the Mission Bay site. These enhancements support and improve the learning environment,
contribute to achieving the stated learning outcomes, and lead to improved retention and well-being of UCSF’s diverse and talented student population.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

UCSF has maintained its position at the forefront of health sciences education and has demonstrated an ability to respond to the growing demand for health care professionals and life scientists. The mission of “advancing health worldwide” is actualized within each of the Schools, the Graduate Division, and the Medical Center. While selectivity of admissions, national rankings, and NIH funding are just a few recognized measures of excellence, the University will always continue to strive to surpass its achievements in the areas of education, research, service, and health care delivery.

To plan for and measure the University’s continued quest for excellence, the campus has endorsed and implemented multiple planning, assessment and review measures—many of which have been enhanced by the WASC re-accreditation process. The benefit of these augmented processes and measures is already being realized in advancements to the quality of teaching, learning, research, service, and patient care at UCSF.

The Teaching and Learning Center, UCSF’s flagship initiative, is on track to open in January 2011 and represents the manifestation of the campus commitment to interprofessional education and innovative learning strategies. Instructional technology initiatives and improvements to library and classroom learning spaces also reflect the University’s commitment to a continuously enhanced learning environment.

As this report has highlighted, numerous measures are in place and utilized throughout the campus to assess student learning outcomes at the program and school level, as well as within the context of global learning outcomes. The WASC review process has inspired improvement and growth in the use of assessment in all areas of the university. As demonstrated in the preceding narrative, students, faculty, staff and patients have benefitted from these assessments and subsequent changes.

As a critical element for the enhancements described above, and a measure of continued excellence, UCSF continues to place diversity as foundational to all campus goals and initiatives. Recent efforts have strengthened the campus’ effectiveness in recruiting and retaining a diverse community of students, trainees, faculty and staff. At the same time, we acknowledge that more work must be done and we are putting in place an organizational structure that will further strengthen our efforts.

The success and commitment to ongoing excellence at UCSF will be more readily studied, understood, and reported via the improved capacity for institutional research. Likewise, students have experienced more accessibility to information and ease in
transactional activities, as well as increased access to programs and services, as a result of numerous **new enhancements to student services**.

Finally, the schools and academic programs have made repeated and significant contributions to the generalizeable knowledge—contributions that have enhanced UCSF’s best practices while also contributing the literature and practice of health care education well beyond the limits of our own campus. The compendium of UCSF scholarship and publications, *Contributions of UCSF Faculty, Staff and Students to the Scholarship of Teaching* (Appendix X) provides an overview of the many and diverse contributions of the University.

UCSF’s ability to continuously strive toward its mission and goals has been affirmed and supported by the WASC reaccreditation process. Through the process of this thorough and intensive self- and peer-review, we have come to better understand our strengths and identify specific and meaningful ways to enhance our educational effectiveness. During this review, we have strengthened our educational infrastructure in ways that will have a long-term positive impact on the students, faculty, staff, patients, and community members affiliated with UC San Francisco.
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The Learning Outcomes Subcommittee has been charged with addressing the relevant recommendations and issues brought to light by WASC subsequent to its February 2009 site visit.

One concern of the subcommittee is crafting an appropriate response to Recommendation 4 found on page 34 of this document:
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW  February 18-20, 2009
REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM to the University of California, San Francisco

The text of Recommendation 4 is as follows, with the emphasis on global learning outcomes added:

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).

The report goes on to say “How findings are translated into action will also need to be documented into the EER Report” and “work remains to focus...what might be the global learning outcomes for a UCSF graduate regardless of program of student.”

The subcommittee reviewed the mission statements of the various schools and the campus. In light of these discussions and after extensive debate, the subcommittee suggested that two global learning outcomes be considered:

- Knowledge
- Professionalism

These two outcomes appear to be measureable for all programs, and currently have extensive structures in place in the professional schools and the graduate division that would provide measures of attainment. This does represent a change in thinking for the faculty and should be reviewed by the Academic Senate. Record of that review at various levels would provide some of the documentation needed to satisfy the WASC recommendation. It could be supplemented with documentation from the units of the specific measures of knowledge and professionalism required of students from each area.

The subcommittee has forwarded their recommendations to Vice Provosts Castro and Marshall for consideration.
Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Overview

Brief Facts

- WASC is a campus accreditation process.
- Approval is needed to continue providing federal student aid.
- Occurs once each decade. The current process started in 2006.
- Three Stage Process
  - Institutional Proposal – Approved in 2007
  - Capacity and Preparatory Review – Approved in 2009
  - Educational Effectiveness Review -- Report is due in August 2010 and Final Site Visit will take place in October 2010
- WASC Accreditation Steering Committee
  - Representatives from each school and the graduate division as well as the Academic Senate. Co-chaired by Joseph Castro and Sally Marshall. Helen Loeser is primary representative for the School of Medicine.
- Focus primarily on three themes selected by campus in 2006 that were tied to the UCSF Strategic Plan:
  - Learning Environment
  - Learning Outcomes
  - Diversity
- Site Visit Team – 6 External Reviewers
  - Chair is Edward Miller, Dean of Medicine and CEO of John Hopkins Medicine at John Hopkins University
- EER Report will be distributed to the Academic Senate and other entities for comment beginning next Friday, June 25 and through early July. Your comments are welcome.
- Discussion – Global Learning Outcomes
  - Knowledge
  - Professionalism
- For more information about WASC process, please see the UCSF WASC web site at: http://wasc.ucsf.edu/ or contact Joseph Castro at joseph.castro@ucsf.edu or Helen Loeser at helen.loeser@ucsf.edu.