

UCSF Doctor of Philosophy in Global Health Policy on Student Progress

1. Criteria for satisfactory academic progress

The policy regarding satisfactory academic progress in the Doctor of Philosophy in Global Health Sciences program is as follows:

First and Second Year Students

First and second year students meet with their Academic Advisor at least once a quarter. Satisfactory academic progress in the first and second year in the program is marked by timely and successful completion of all courses, with grades of C or better in all required courses, and cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or above in all coursework. Student progress is assessed at the end of each year on the basis of course grades, the annual Individual Education Plan and Progress Report, plus additional comments from course instructors and advisors about students.

In the second year, the student is additionally evaluated on the basis of his/her progress toward and then successful completion of the qualifying exam. Substandard work or unprofessional conduct (as reported by a research advisor, a course instructor, or other faculty) would constitute unsatisfactory progress toward the qualifying exam.

Third Year Students and Beyond

Students must form their Dissertation Committee within one quarter (three months) of passing their Qualifying Exam, not including the summer term.

Students must meet with the Dissertation Committee chair at least once per quarter. It is recommended that students communicate their progress to their committee members on a minimum of a quarterly basis, and confer with individual committee members about specific aspects of their dissertation research and writing as needed.

Student progress is assessed at the end of each year on the basis of the annual Individual Education Plan and Progress Report, plus additional comments from Dissertation Committee chairs about students who might be struggling.

Students are expected to complete all degree requirements within four years.

2. Unsatisfactory progress indicators

These include:

- Falling below a cumulative 3.0 GPA

- Failing grades (D or F) in any course
- Unsatisfactory research work (as reported by a research advisor or research rotation director)
- Failing the qualifying exam the first time
- Unprofessional conduct (as reported by a Research Advisor, a course instructor, or other faculty)
- 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 director, 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 academic 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 academic 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 academic advisors, research advisors, course directors, or representatives of the GHS Graduate Group who serve on the executive, curriculum, or admission committees.