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 academic code of conduct), and complete all requested course/faculty/TA evaluations.

b) Students must meet with their faculty advisors at least once a month 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. Passing will be determined by an examination committee appointed by the program director comprising the capstone mentor (non-voting), a member of the GHS 203 faculty, a faculty member from the MS course leader roster, and/or a member of the GHS Graduate Group. A single revision will be allowed.

d) Students must advance to candidacy. Advancement to candidacy requires students to achieve an average GPA of at least 3.0, pass the qualifying examination, and make satisfactory progress in individual coursework, assignments, and related exams. Additionally, students cannot have any failing grades, incompletes, or unpaid fees. 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 during the course of their capstone project, as reported by their capstone mentor or their site mentors.

f) Students must pass their oral and written comprehensive exam by the end of the summer quarter as determined by the examination committee (membership outlined above). A single revision will be allowed.

g) Students must pass all of their courses (grades of C or higher in any given class, but overall GPA equal to or greater than 3.0, which is equivalent to a B average).

h) Students are expected to complete all degree requirements within one year.

2. Student evaluation

Students are evaluated by the program directors and the course faculty during the middle of each of the fall, winter, and spring quarters. These evaluations are intended to
identify students who are having academic difficulty and could be at risk of failing any courses. All students who are at risk of failing based on participation, quizzes, or midterm exam/paper grades will receive notification from the program director(s) informing them about their risk. Additionally, the program director(s) will meet with these students in order to determine if there are any extenuating circumstances and to offer resources for support. Students who are at risk for course failure or who do not uphold the requirements outlined above may not be allowed to conduct a capstone project until all issues are resolved. All students will be assessed at the end of each quarter on the basis of their course grades. Students who have failed a course will be notified by and required to meet with the program director(s).

3. 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 UCSF’s Code of Conduct

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

Students whose progress is unsatisfactory (according to one or more of the criteria listed above) will be notified and will meet with the faculty advisor and the program director to develop an individualized remediation plan to address the deficiencies. The meeting results in a Memorandum of Understanding that clearly outlines specific steps and associated deadlines that the student must fulfill in order to receive a satisfactory report. The report is then signed by the following parties: the student, the faculty advisor, and the program director.

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

Should it be necessary, the in-depth review committee shall consist of faculty members within the school who are knowledgeable about the academic program and student performance standards, and may include academic officers of the school as long as they number in the minority of those committee members present at the review hearing. Members may include academic advisors and course directors or representatives of the GHS Graduate Group who serve on the executive, curriculum, or admission committees. A quorum must be present to conduct the academic review. The review will follow the guidelines set forth by the Graduate Division.