

UCSF Master of Science in Global Health Policy on Student Progress

1. Criteria for satisfactory academic progress

The policy regarding satisfactory academic progress in the Master of Science in Global Health program is as follows:

- a) Students must attend all classes (no more than one unexcused absence per course in a quarter), participate actively in all courses, maintain academic integrity (as stated in the [UCSF Code of Conduct](#)), and complete all requested course/faculty/TA evaluations.
- b) Students must meet with their faculty advisors at least once a quarter and their capstone mentors at least biweekly once their projects have been chosen.
- c) Students must pass their oral and written qualifying exam at the end of the winter quarter in order to advance to candidacy and work on their capstone project.
- d) Students must advance to candidacy at least two quarters before participating in the comprehensive exam.
- e) Students must maintain the highest standards of academic integrity, professionalism, and cultural humility in the program, as reported by course directors, course assistants, capstone mentor, site mentors, academic advisors, staff, and other faculty.
- f) Students must pass their oral and written comprehensive exam by the end of the summer quarter.
- g) Students must pass all of their courses (grades of C or higher in any given class), and maintain a cumulative GPA of equal to or greater than 3.0. This is equivalent to a B average.
- h) Students are expected to complete all degree requirements within one year.

2. Unsatisfactory progress indicators

These include:

- Falling below a cumulative 3.0 GPA
- Failing grades in any course
- Poor attendance
- Unsatisfactory work on the capstone project
- Unprofessional conduct in the classroom or during the capstone project
- Failing the qualifying exam the first time

- Failing the comprehensive examination the first time
- Disciplinary problems and other conduct and professionalism infractions that fall within the scope of the UCSF Code of Conduct and Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline

3. Process by which failing students will be notified and remediated

Internal Warning and Letter of Performance Expectations

Students whose progress is unsatisfactory (according to one or more of the criteria listed above) will be notified, and may not be allowed to conduct a capstone project until all issues are resolved. Depending on the seriousness of the alleged misconduct or academic difficulty, an internal process of counseling, advising, and notification will occur. In cases deemed of sufficient seriousness, the process may immediately involve the UCSF Graduate Division (see below: Formal Procedures).

A meeting will occur with the student, the program directors, and the graduate student affairs officer; depending on the nature of misconduct, course director(s) and/or the student's academic advisor may be invited to the meeting. The goal of the meeting is to determine if there are any extenuating circumstances affecting the student, to educate the student about program policies and resources for support, and to provide an internal warning outlining:

1. The nature of the specific misconduct;
2. The method of correction; and
3. The consequences of continued misconduct.

Following the meeting, the student will receive a letter of performance expectations that summarizes the aforementioned meeting, informs the student of future expectations, and educates the student about how to avoid future misconduct or academic difficulty.

The student will be offered the opportunity to provide a written response within five business days of receipt of the letter of performance expectations. The written response allows the student to provide information in response to the alleged misconduct and/or academic difficulty.

These documents will be kept in the student's file at GHS but will not be filed with the Graduate Division unless further misconduct occurs.

Formal Procedures

A formal procedure will occur if:

1. the internal warning and letter of performance expectations is not successful;
2. there are multiple occurrences of misconduct; and/or
3. an egregious incident has occurred.

Determination of egregious conduct will be made by the Program Director.

The Program Director will provide a written notice of the allegation and outline steps of the formal procedure to the student, who will be offered the opportunity to provide a written response within five business days of receipt of the notice of allegations. The written response allows the student to provide information in response to the notice of allegations and gives the program director more information to determine the next steps.

The Program Director will review the student's written response and provide a written notice of proceeding with developing a Memorandum of Understanding, or referring the student to a committee charged with an in-depth review of academic performance and consideration of dismissal (details outlined below). This letter and subsequent communication is filed in the student's academic file within the program, and the Assistant Dean for Graduate Programs is notified.

Memorandum of Understanding

The student will meet with the Program Director, their faculty advisor, and the graduate student affairs officer to develop an individualized remediation plan to address the deficiencies. The meeting results in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that clearly outlines specific steps and associated deadlines that the student must fulfill in order to receive a satisfactory report; the MOU will also detail the consequences of continued misconduct. The student, their faculty advisor, and the Program Director sign the MOU. The MOU is shared with the Assistant Dean for Graduate Programs and becomes part of the student's official University record.

Should the student be unable to fulfill the expectations outlined in the MOU, the student will be subject to dismissal from the program.

In-Depth Review of Academic Performance and Consideration of Dismissal

The Program Director will provide formal notice to the student that their performance does not meet Graduate Division standards and is therefore referred to a committee charged with an in-depth review of academic performance and consideration of dismissal. This information will be transmitted in writing and conveyed electronically or in person.

The process for in-depth review of a student's eligibility for dismissal will follow the [UCSF Divisional Procedure for Student Grievance in Academic Affairs, section 4.0](#), and will be conducted by an in-depth review committee appointed by the Program Director.

- The in-depth review committee shall consist of three faculty members within GHS who are knowledgeable about the academic program and

student performance standards, and may include academic officers of the GHS as long as they number in the minority of those committee members present at the review hearing.

- Members may include faculty advisors, capstone mentors, course directors, or representatives of the GHS Graduate Group who serve on the executive, curriculum, or admission committees.