



Sally J. Marshall, Ph.D.
Vice Provost
Academic Affairs
513 Parnassus Avenue
Room S-101
San Francisco, CA 94143-0401
tel: 415/514-0421
fax: 415/514-0200
email: sally.marshall@ucsf.edu
<http://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu>

April 28, 2010

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH
Chair, Academic Senate
c/o Academic Senate Office
Box 0764

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick:

I am writing on behalf of Chancellor Desmond-Hellmann in response to the Senate report (February 2010) from the Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion and New Faculty Appointments. We have consulted with the Deans and the Vice and Associate Deans for Academic Affairs in all four schools and are in unanimous agreement in our response to the report.

Search committees will continue to be encouraged to use the toolkit on the Office of Academic Affairs website, as well as other resources that may become available. The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) will continue to review appointments at the Assistant Professor III level or higher.

All schools will be encouraged to promote hiring into the series that best represents the duties performed by the faculty member, whether that is a Senate or non-Senate series. However, there are notable exceptions:

Many Adjunct faculty members, especially those with career development awards, would not be hired by their departments in either the In Residence or Ladder Rank series even though they may perform the duties required in those series. In most of these cases the faculty members have their own support. It should be the choice of the faculty member whether or not to accept a position in the Adjunct series or to look for a faculty appointment elsewhere. A similar situation may exist for a faculty member offered a position in the HS Clinical series versus the Clinical X series. In addition, the deans and vice/associate deans for academic affairs support the concept that such faculty members are still somewhat in training for ladder rank positions at other institutions as part of the overall training mission of the University.

Another situation in which a faculty member may not be appointed in the most appropriate series for his/her activities is when the faculty member wishes to be part-time. Part-time appointments are not allowed in the Senate series except for documented family or medical reasons.

All faculty members should be knowledgeable about the requirements for their series and any other series that may be appropriate. However, to routinely remind faculty in non-Senate series of the requirements of the Senate series suggests that the non-Senate series are inferior series. We have worked hard to promote the concept that all series are valuable, just with differing criteria for appointment and advancement. The idea that a position in a Senate series is better is in conflict with our philosophy. A formal career review to judge whether a faculty member is in the correct series and at the correct rank and step is available only once in a career, not every time he/she is eligible for a merit or promotion.

The report says that the rules of the APM should be the only standard. This would be in conflict with campus practice that the APM is the floor and additional criteria may be added. The APM is intentionally vague in many areas to allow for campus interpretation and to allow for additional standards as necessary. Departments have been asked to forward their criteria to the appropriate dean's office, academic affairs, and CAP.

We welcome having APB monitor the growth in faculty numbers and making appropriate recommendations. Thank you for your continuing efforts on behalf of our faculty.

Sincerely,



Sally J Marshall, PhD
Vice Provost
Academic Affairs

cc: Chancellor Desmond-Hellmann

SJM:mf