



Tamara Maimon, Director
500 Parnassus, MUE 230
San Francisco, California 94143-0764
(415)476-3808 Fax (415)476-9683

Leonard Zegans, MD, Chair
Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS, Vice Chair
Jon Levine, MD, PhD, Secretary
Jean Olson, MD, Parliamentarian

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET

David Gardner, MD, Chair

May 24, 2004

Leonard S. Zegans, M.D.
Chair, Academic Senate
UCSF
San Francisco, CA 94143

Dear Len:

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget has reviewed the Report of the Academic Senate Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion. The Report was discussed at the March, April and May (2004) meetings of the Committee. Stan Glantz and Gary Armitage, members of the Task Force, and Lee Goldman, Chairman of the Department of Medicine, each attended one or the other of these meetings to present their views of the Task Force findings. Subsequent to the May meeting, the opinions of individual Committee members were compiled for the generation of this letter.

There were four recommendations of the Task Force which I have attempted to address individually below.

A. Implementation of a Multifaceted Educational Program

This multi-tiered approach to improve education of new faculty appointees and provide a standardized approach for making new appointments is strongly endorsed by APB. There was no opposition to putting a structured approach like this in place. It is viewed as a long term solution to the inconsistencies that currently exist in the system and should be embraced by the Academic Senate and the Chancellor.

B. Establishment of General Guidelines for New Appointments

While APB members generally supported the establishment of guidelines for new appointments, concern was raised over one particular aspect of this recommendation specifically dealing with appointment of junior faculty in the non-Senate series. While APB recognizes the potential for abuse with the latter approach, it also recognizes that a number of departments, most notably the Department of Medicine, use the Adjunct appointment as a mechanism to allow upper level fellows to continue their training through NIH support vehicles (e.g. K-awards) which would otherwise not be available to them. Junior faculty in these types of appointments (K-award funded) typically spend most of their time in research activities which conform to the intent of the Adjunct series appointment. Several committee members regard this as a valuable tool to allow more advanced fellows to continue their training here at UCSF and, eventually, to

launch their independent research careers from a more competitive position – regardless of whether that occurs here at UCSF or elsewhere. APB supports retention of these Adjunct appointments to accommodate these trainees at the Instructor or Assistant Professor level. If possible, such appointments should be made for a defined period of time that precludes promotion to the Associate Professor level and should not be linked to a “promissory note” for potential appointment, with or without a search, in the in Residence series. The chair of the department should make the caveats of these appointments clear to the faculty member at the time of the appointment. While these Adjunct appointees would certainly be eligible for searched in Residence and other positions as they arise, APB believes that the use of the Adjunct series as a “proving ground” for in Residence faculty represents a misuse of that series.

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

The Task Force findings indicate that there is a sizable group of faculty in the Adjunct series whose daily activities parallel those in the in Residence or Ladder Rank track. There also appears to be a concentration of female faculty in the non-Senate series (i.e. Adjunct and Clinical series) relative to the Senate series at UCSF. Review of individual CV’s suggests that there is considerable overlap in the quality and quantity of publication among the different series. APB believes that this situation needs to be rectified. Long term appointments in the Adjunct series (this does not include the “incubator” group described above) should be reserved for those faculty whose academic activities are best accommodated in that series. Shuttling faculty to the Adjunct series purely for economic reasons is not supportable given the current APM guidelines. There was a consensus of opinion on the Committee that salaried, full-time faculty members who are presently in the Adjunct series, but carrying out activities more typical of in Residence faculty, should be evaluated for possible change of series. This should be carried out in a systematic Career Review of all candidates (not including trainees at the Instructor or Assistant Professor level – the “incubator” group described above) requesting such action by senior faculty who are familiar with the requirements for appointment or promotion in the different Academic Senate series (e.g. CAP or former CAP members). These reviews should be carried out at the time of the candidate’s next scheduled merit/promotion review which should effectively limit the time to completion of this process to three years. During the three year period, this rigorous Career Review would take the place of a formal national search. Afterward, this process for entry into Senate series would not be continued, unless the Academic Senate recommended otherwise. In summary, APB recommends that salaried, full-time individuals in the Adjunct (or Clinical) series at the Associate or Full Professor rank, by their request and by policy, be reviewed for possible shift to the in Residence or Ladder Rank (or Clinical X) track at their next scheduled merit/promotion review.

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

APB recognizes that the transfer of a significant number of eligible non-Senate series faculty into a Senate series track could result in significant financial exposure for home departments. Such exposure would derive from (1) ongoing support required to accommodate the 5% salary that currently cannot be covered by extramural grants and (2) by the potential risk of providing salary support (e.g. up to a year in the Department of Medicine) for individuals who have a lapse in extramural funding. Many of the programs that would be affected by the review outlined in Section C (above) add significantly to the academic environment of the campus as a whole and, therefore, the attendant financial exposure should not be regarded solely as a departmental problem. APB supports the Task Force recommendation that the Campus Administration (Office of the Chancellor and the Deans of the individual schools) find a mechanism to help offset the additional cost of assimilating eligible non-Senate faculty into the appropriate Senate series.

Finally, APB recommends that a systematic review take place at the end of the three year transition period to determine if the process has been successful in accomplishing the goals outlined above and to assess the financial and non-financial impact of the changes recommended in Section C above.

APB appreciates your willingness to consider these issues as you engage in future discussions with the Chancellor over the Task Force report. Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

Respectfully,

Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

David G. Gardner, M.D., Chair

cc: APB Members