



**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

**Office of the Academic Senate**  
500 Parnassus Ave, MUE 230  
San Francisco, CA 94143-0764  
Campus Box 0764  
tel: 415/514-2696  
fax: 415/514-3844

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH, Chair  
Robert Newcomer, PhD, Vice Chair  
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, Secretary  
Anne Slavotinek, MD, Parliamentarian

March 8, 2011

Daniel Simmons, JD  
Chair, Academic Council  
Academic Senate, University of California  
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Re: Division Response to the [Report of the Task Force on Senate Membership](#), dated April 15, 2010

Dear Chair Simmons:

The San Francisco Division has carefully and thoroughly reviewed the [Report of the Task Force on Senate Membership](#), dated April 15, 2010. This letter summarizes our responses.

#### **UCSF REVIEW PROCESS**

Eight committees were asked to review and provide formal responses. They included:

- Clinical Affairs Committee (CAC)
- Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
- Committee on Committees (COC)
- Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW)
- School of Dentistry Faculty Council (SOD FC)
- School of Medicine Faculty Council (SOM FC)
- School of Nursing Faculty Council (SON FC)
- School of Pharmacy Faculty Council (SOP FC)

Their responses were compiled and debated at the January 10, 2011 meeting of the Coordinating Committee, when all committee chairs were present. Following that meeting, some committees further revised their responses, and these revised responses are attached to this letter. This letter captures the major points which were raised by our committees, as well as the essence of the discussion at the January 10, 2011 Coordinating Committee meeting.

During the January 10, 2011 Coordinating Committee meeting, it became clear that this issue has been considered several times in the past and continues to represent a major challenge for UCSF faculty. To review and discuss these issues in greater detail, we have created a Division task force to further examine Academic Senate membership for UCSF faculty. This task force expects to finalize its recommendations by June 2011.

## **UCSF RESPONSE TO THE UC SYSTEMWIDE TASK FORCE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Although each committee reviewed the entire Report, not all committees responded to each recommendation. Please find a summary of their responses to each recommendation below.

### **Recommendation #1: The Task Force recommends against extending the list of titles according to membership in the Senate to existing non-Senate titles.**

Members of the School of Nursing Faculty Council were conflicted and conditionally agreed with the recommendation. However, the majority of UCSF faculty who reviewed and responded to this recommendation did not agree with recommendation #1 and made the following points:

- All full-time faculty who support the education, research and service missions of the University of California should be members of the Academic Senate (CAP, COC, CFW, SOD FC, SOM FC, SON FC)
  - At UCSF, faculty in the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical (HS Clinical) series assume responsibilities which are consistent with Academic Senate participation, such as educating students, conducting research and participating in academic service, including governance. (CAP, COC, CFW, SOD FC, SOM FC)
  - The School of Dentistry Faculty Council noted: “Our School would not function appropriately nor achieve our mission to train dental care providers and residents without our HS Clinical or Adjunct series faculty.”
- The UCSF faculty includes 1,225 Senate members and 1,157 non-Senate members (772 Health Sciences Clinical and 385 Adjunct faculty). The dichotomization of UCSF faculty into Senate and non-Senate categories, according to series, per [Standing Order of the Regents 105.1](#), excludes 48.6% of full-time UCSF faculty from shared governance via the Academic Senate, resulting in effective disenfranchisement. (COC, SOD FC, SOM FC, SOP FC)
  - Without a voice in shared governance, non-Senate faculty were not able to participate in important discussions and debates, such as the recent deliberations about furloughs and the UC Retirement System. At UCSF, HS Clinical series faculty help generate the revenue that make up the largest component (50%) of campus resources. In 2009-10, HS Clinical faculty shouldered the same salary furloughs as Academic Senate colleagues, yet the HS Clinical faculty had limited opportunities to officially express their opinions on this topic via the Academic Senate. (COC)
  - One School of Medicine Faculty member stated: “The purpose of the Academic Senate is to include the voices of the faculty about the academic programs at the University. Dividing the faculty into Senate and non-Senate weakens the faculty voice in shared governance because not all teaching faculty can participate in the decisions regarding curriculum. It doesn’t make sense in terms of the way we work together; it doesn’t facilitate our collaborative work as a faculty and is not transparent.” (SOM FC)
- The recommendation, which would perpetuate the exclusion of some faculty from the Academic Senate, maintains the status quo, ignores the historical precedent of inclusiveness for faculty engaged in the broadest range of university activities, and does not appear to address the growth and diversity of today’s University of California (CAP, CFW).
- The UCSF Committee on Committees is committed to including the broadest faculty representation possible in Academic Senate activities. However it is constrained to only include a fraction of our non-Senate colleagues in active committee service. Furthermore, non-Senate

colleagues must be told that while their voices are important and valued on our campus, their votes cannot be counted when we report our actions to the UC Systemwide Academic Senate. This imposes an artificial divide among colleagues who work side-by-side to educate, conduct research and treat patients. (COC)

- The School of Medicine Faculty Council noted that non-Senate faculty are excluded from the Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) home loan program. Although the MOP program can only offer a limited number of loans, being excluded outright from the program impacts UCSF's ability to recruit new faculty and contributes to the non-Senate faculty perception that they are second-class citizens among their colleagues. (SOM FC, SOP FC)

**Recommendation #2: The Task Force recommends local review of existing individuals in non-Senate titles and reclassification of those that are clearly in the wrong series based upon duties and responsibilities consistent with membership in the Academic Senate.**

UCSF faculty who reviewed this recommendation agreed with the principle that all faculty should be appointed to the series which is appropriate for their duties and responsibilities. In the course of discussing this recommendation, the following issues were raised:

- The UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel already includes a consideration of the appropriate series for the review of each advancement and promotion packet. Consistent with the [2003 report](#) issued by the [UCSF Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion](#) (TFFRRP), the UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel "been conscious of reviewing faculty for appropriateness of series". Furthermore, per the TFFRRP recommendations, "the Vice Provost Academic Affairs granted a two-year waiver of searches to transfer faculty into their most appropriate series, which was often to In Residence or Clinical X. CAP in particular reviews each and every file submitted for review for appropriateness of series. On this campus push for inclusion of Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professor in the Academic Senate is not because these faculty are in the wrong series, but rather there are faculty fully committed to the University and contributing the same effort to the same goals as Senate members without the benefit of Senate membership. These faculty are also contributing to the University and conducting their careers in a manner consistent with criteria for their appointments in either the Adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical as stated in the APM." (CAP, CAC, CFW, SOM FC)
- CAP, CFW, SON FC and SOP FC called for the re-evaluation of the 1:6 ratio applied to the number of Clinical X series faculty at each campus. [APM 275-16 \(f\) 2](#) states, "If the number of appointees in the series exceeds 1/6 of all local Senate members in all the clinical departments on the campus, a Senate committee will review the appropriateness of adding new members to the Professor of Clinical (e.g., *Medicine*) series." (CAC, CAP, CFW, SON FC, SOP FC)
- CAP, COC and SOM FC took issue with the requirement that a department initiate a search when moving a faculty member from a non-Senate to a Senate series, noting that this process prevents some departments from shifting faculty into Senate series. (CAP, COC, SOM FC)
- The School of Medicine Faculty Council noted that the perceived requirement of one year of financial support for faculty in Senate series also precludes some departments from appointing faculty to Senate series, even when warranted. (SOM FC)
- The School of Pharmacy Faculty Council highlighted a disparity among the Senate series, stating that faculty in the "Professor of Clinical X series are presently treated like second-class citizens. For example, they are not eligible for certain awards, sabbaticals, etc. Faculty Council members strongly believe that equality of benefits should be brought to all faculty series." (SOP FC)
- For faculty who would remain in the HS Clinical series even after review, the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council argued "Health Sciences (Clinical) faculty have suffered within a system built for academic units that include only ladder rank faculty. When Health Sciences (Clinical) faculty

review the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) for advancement policy, we find language written for ladder rank faculty. Consequently, Health Sciences (Clinical) faculty at the campus level must interpret how the APM applies for their series.” (SOP FC)

- The Clinical Affairs Committee recommended the creation of a committee of faculty from the five UC Health Sciences complexes to evaluate the use of these and related title codes on their campuses and identify the extent to which inappropriate titles have been used at the point of hire, and to develop a consistent practice with respect to the use of title codes. (CAC)

**Recommendation #3: The Task Force recommends retention of the historical practice of separating curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education.**

CAC and COC agreed with this recommendation, while CFW, SOM FC, SON FC and SOP FC sought clearer language and more detail.

- CAC’s support for the recommendation was conditional on the creation of a UC Systemwide clinical committee which would draw members from the five UC health sciences campuses. (CAC)
- COC argued that the separation of undergraduate from professional education could pave the way for greater local autonomy for UCSF to determine Academic Senate membership for its faculty. (COC)
- CFW posited that clarity could be increased by use of the term *academic* to include undergraduate and graduate program instruction. The report separates *undergraduate instruction* from *professional instruction* in some instances, and at other times use the terms *undergraduate* and *graduate instruction* as distinct from *professional curricular instruction*. (CFW)
- Without undergraduates at UCSF, SOM FC noted that this recommendation translates to a separation between curricula for professional degrees (DDS, MD and PharmD) and curricula for graduate degrees (MS and PhD). (SOM FC)
- SON FC faculty “found the language in the document itself to be potentially divisive. Specifically, the separation of faculty into two distinct groups, “professional” vs. “academic,” was viewed as problematic. Although this separation appears fixed in history, it seems rather artificial and may promote on-going feelings of separateness across the campuses in terms of roles and responsibilities. It was viewed as unfortunate that there is a belief that somehow graduate education is inherently different from and not equivalent to education at the undergraduate level. There are individuals who must teach across that divide and even at UCSF there are many levels of education, even though we are considered a fully “professional” campus in terms of the types of students that we educate and mentor. Although many would agree that the undergraduate faculty should have final say in their curricular decisions and that professional schools should have final say in their curricular decisions, dialogue across these levels would seem to be valuable because there is movement across these levels and, in many cases, faculty have experience at more than one level. Discussions at the department level included a call for ways to lessen the undergraduate-versus-professional faculty tensions across campuses in order to address real and basic issues facing shared governance and Senate membership.” (SON FC)
- SOP FC members found problematic “the complete absence of the Graduate Division and its programs in the report’s discussion. Many faculty involved in undergraduate and professional education are also involved in graduate programs, which have their own needs unaddressed by this report.” (SOP FC)

**Recommendation #4: The Task Force recommends a revision of administrative titles automatically granting Senate membership.**

UCSF committee and faculty council responses to this recommendation varied as follows:

- COC concurred with the exception of the position of University Librarian. At UCSF the University Librarian is a major advocate for student education. (COC)
- CFW had no comment.
- SOD FC concurred.
- SOM FC members did not reach a consensus. Some members thought it was important to continue to include the University Librarian and the Registrar in the Academic Senate, as they play important roles in the educational mission of the University. Other members agreed with the Report's recommendation that as those positions have become professionalized, their membership in the Academic Senate could be revisited.

**UCSF Division Recommendations**

- The Academic Senate should return to historical precedent and philosophy of membership to include all full-time faculty with the responsibility to uphold the University's mission, and that it should not be determined by academic series. (CAP, COC, CFW, SOD FC, SOM FC, SON FC)
- Call for the amendment of the Standing Orders of the Regents to allow campuses to determine Academic Senate membership (COC)
- UC Systemwide Academic Senate bylaws should be rewritten to allow faculty granted Academic Senate membership at their own campus to participate in UC Systemwide Academic Senate committees and activities.
- Expressing concern that Senate Membership Task Force did not consult non-Senate faculty, any future consideration of Academic Senate membership must include participation by faculty currently not included in the Academic Senate. (COC, SOD FC, Coordinating Committee discussion)

**UCSF Faculty Concurrence with the UCFW Minority Report**

On January 31, 2011, UCSF Faculty Welfare Chair and UCFW Representative Grayson W. Marshall co-authored a [minority report](#) with UCFW Chair Joel Dimsdale. UCSF faculty members who reviewed this minority report agreed with the report, including these sentiments,

"There are increasing numbers of "provisional faculty" throughout the University of California—in engineering, in the national labs, and in our health sciences schools. We feel that these faculty members are not being treated respectfully by the system and that their demeaned status demoralizes them and weakens the Academic Senate's mission of shared governance. They have little recourse for grievances and as a result are subject to ever more powerful departmental chairs and administrators. As the University shrinks in the face of budgetary exigencies, it is likely that we will increasingly be relying on such contingent faculty. How the University treats them can become a template for how the University subsequently attempts to treat Academic Senate faculty members."

**Conclusions**

School of Dentistry Faculty Council Chair Janice Lee expressed the sentiments of many colleagues when she concluded, "We realize that many iterations and discussions have occurred over the issue of Academic Senate membership in the past. We realize that compromises and small steps have been made to improve the representative role of the UCSF Academic Senate while working within the by-laws

of the Academic Senate. But we urge you to champion the comprehensive meaning of shared governance and faculty voice. If UCSF will not, it is unlikely that anyone else will. UC is undergoing tremendous change and careful deliberations over its future, therefore, now is the time for the Academic Senate and Council to question whether we are fulfilling our role in representing our faculty and whether we can do it better.

Faculty suffrage is at the core of this issue on Senate membership. At UCSF, approximately 50% of our faculty cannot vote. Until 1920, 50% of the American population could not vote – women in the US. Significant changes have occurred since that moment in history and we are undoubtedly better because of it. We hope UC will learn from that historical period, not re-enact the lengthy period of discrimination but choose to expand the right to vote to all full-time faculty.” (SOD FC)

At UCSF, we believe that the existing system is unfair. The separation of Senate from non-Senate faculty creates a two-tiered system which excludes a large proportion of faculty from the unique and valuable process of shared governance. Regardless of the decisions made at the UC Systemwide level, the faculty at UCSF will continue to work diligently to mitigate the perpetuation of a two-tiered system. Based on the recommendation from the School of Medicine Faculty Council, UCSF has created a local task force to review the impact of the current system on UCSF faculty.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the Task Force's recommendations and opine on the implications of these recommendations. We look forward to working with our colleagues across the UC System to develop a satisfactory and equitable resolution of our concerns.

Sincerely,



Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

Attachments

CC: Martha Winnacker, JD, Executive Director, UC Systemwide Academic Senate

## **Communication from the Clinical Affairs Committee**

### **Steven Pletcher, MD, Chair**

February 24, 2011

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the UC Systemwide *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership* (April 15, 2010)

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick,

As requested, on November 17, 2010, the Clinical Affairs Committee reviewed the *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership* (April 15, 2010) for comment.

In reviewing the report, members focused on recommendation two, requesting that UCSF non-Senate faculty members who are doing Senate-level work with Senate-level responsibilities undergo file review for a re-classification of series. Members felt this dovetailed on other recommendations involving adjunct faculty made by the *Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention, Promotion, and New Faculty Appointments*.

Members also suggest that if campuses are to shift such non-Senate faculty into series like Professor of Clinical X, then the UC Systemwide regulation of having a 1:6 ratio of non-clinical to clinical faculty should be re-examined for its effectiveness and value. Policies that require a new faculty search for a change in series and potentially limit the senate positions available for clinical faculty are not compatible with the task force's goal of reclassifying health sciences faculty performing Senate-level work to a Senate series.

This recommendation arises primarily with respect to the health sciences and the Professor of Clinical X series. The APM defines a limit of 1:6 of the current Senate membership of clinical departments for appointment to the Professor of Clinical X series. However, this is not an absolute cap but a trigger of a review of further appointments to this series. Some campuses have viewed this limit as a cap, while others have viewed it as a limit requiring review. As a consequence, some faculty perform the duties of Professor of Clinical X series who are appointed to non-Senate titles. These faculty need to be reviewed and placed into the correct series as dictated by their actual duties.

We further recommend that a committee of faculty from the five Health Sciences complexes be formed to evaluate the use of these and related title codes on their campuses and identify the extent to which inappropriate titles have been used at the point of hire, and to develop a consistent practice with respect to the use of title codes. Further, the 1:6 cap as a trigger for review appears somewhat arbitrary.

If such a new clinical committee is established, UCSF Clinical Affairs Committee members support the *Task Force on Senate Membership* recommendation that a separation be maintained between review of undergraduate and professional school curriculum.

Sincerely,

**Clinical Affairs Committee**

Steven Pletcher, MD, Chair, (Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery)  
Maxwell Meng, MD, Vice Chair (Urology)  
Shoshana Arai, RN, PhD (Physiological Nursing)  
Chris Barton, MD (Emergency Medicine)  
John Feiner, MD (Anesthesia)  
Marcus Ferrone, PharmD (Clinical Pharmacy)  
Ruth Goldstein, MD (Radiology)  
Miguel Hernandez-Pampaloni, MD, PhD (Radiology)  
Mehran Hossaini, DMD (Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery)  
Shelley Hwang, MD (Surgery)  
Susan Janson, RN, DNS, ANP, FAAN (Community Health Systems)  
Jeff Meadows, MD (Pediatrics - Cardiology)  
Phil Rosenthal, MD (Pediatrics - Gastroenterology)  
Hope Rugo, MD (Hematology/Oncology)

Cc: David Morgan, Executive Director, Ambulatory Services

## **Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel Russell Pieper, PhD, Chair**

December 15, 2010

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the Task Force on Senate Membership Final report

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick,

The Committee on Academic Personnel has reviewed the Report from the Task Force on Senate Membership (April 15, 2010) submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment and dissents from the most significant “finding” and recommendation. Specifically, CAP disagrees with the unsupported finding that title codes for the Adjunct and HS Clinical series do not confer responsibilities consistent with Academic Senate participation. Thus, we disagree with the recommendation that faculty in these series not be included in the Academic Senate.

As noted in the task force report, *“The role of the Academic Senate has been codified in the Regental Standing Orders.” Regental Standing Order 105.2.a states: “The Academic Senate, subject to the approval of the Board, shall determine the conditions for admission, for certificates, and for degrees other than honorary degrees” and thereby delegates authority to the Senate for both admissions and criteria of admission. Standing Order 105.2.b delegates responsibility for the design and delivery of the curriculum to the Senate: “The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies approved by the Board”.*

Based on our experience reviewing the academic records of UCSF faculty members, we know that faculty members in all series, including HS Clinical and Adjunct, are expected to contribute to this primary charge outlined by the regents. Thus, it is clear that the council has not interpreted the APM descriptions as they have been interpreted at UCSF. We suggest that UCSF interpretation and practice more closely approximate the spirit and intent of the APM and that faculty in the Adjunct and HS Clinical series have duties and responsibilities that can only be interpreted as being consistent with the regents’ standing orders for the academic senate.

It is clear that the regents have delegated membership rules to the Senate. It is our opinion that the rules should be formulated to maintain a membership that includes all faculty members who are charged with fulfilling the Regental Standing Orders. It is improper to exclude faculty who are actively fulfilling the University’s mission, especially those from series with proportionately greater representation of women and under-represented minorities. The task force was clearly influenced by the fear that inclusion of additional faculty from professional schools might have a negative influence on undergraduate campuses. However, as they suggest, self-determination of curricula at undergraduate campuses can be protected by separating undergraduate and professional school Senate responsibilities. We agree that this is a reasonable protection and efficiency.

The Committee would also like to address the recommendation from the task force that faculty who contribute in the same fashion as Senate members but are not in Senate series be reviewed and

transferred into series such as In Residence or Clinical X. For many years now UCSF has been conscious of reviewing faculty for appropriateness of series, has convened two task forces on the subject (2004-2005 and 2008-2009) and the Vice Provost Academic Affairs even granted a two-year waiver of searches to transfer faculty into their most appropriate series, which was often to In Residence or Clinical X. CAP in particular reviews each and every file submitted for review for appropriateness of series. On this campus push for inclusion of Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professor in the Academic Senate is not because these faculty are in the wrong series, but rather there are faculty fully committed to the University and contributing the same effort to the same goals as Senate members without the benefit of Senate membership. These faculty are also contributing to the University and conducting their careers in a manner consistent with criteria for their appointments in either the Adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical as stated in the APM.

In the historical review it is clear that original definition of the Academic Senate was to indicate the role and authority of the faculty who were and continue to be critical to determining admissions and curricula. In many, many cases at UCSF, our Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty do exactly that. In fact, we have departments which hire Adjunct faculty to lead the courses, design the courses, direct the courses, and know the curriculum and students better than many of the faculty in the Ladder Rank or other Senate series. It almost appears that the original definition of the academic senate has been modified to signify only certain types of faculty, particularly those that do original and creative work, without recognizing those who contribute in the dissemination of information and knowledge.

CAP notes that just as there are faculty members in Senate series who are not fully engaged in Senate business, there are those in the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical series who are also not fully engaged in curriculum design or shared governance. However, we believe the number of faculty who are not so inclined is not sufficient to deny the voice and benefits of membership in the Academic Senate to the preponderance of faculty who are. Philosophically speaking, there no longer seems to be a direct correlation between a faculty member's primary appointed series and their dedication and mantle in shared governance, and perhaps a mechanism other than series appointment should be used to confer Senate membership.

In summary, the UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel agrees with the historical precedent and philosophy of Senate membership, and therefore disagrees with the recommendations of task force. UCSF CAP recommends that faculty members in the Health Sciences Clinical and Adjunct series who contribute to the duties of the Senate and exhibit all hallmarks of Senate membership as historically described, be granted membership in the Academic Senate, either by inclusion of the faculty series in those granted Senate membership or by some other mechanism for inclusion independent of their primary appointment.

Sincerely,

**The Committee on Academic Personnel**

Russell Pieper, PhD, School Medicine, Chair  
Paul Garcia, MD, School of Medicine, Vice Chair  
Ann Bolger, MD, School of Medicine  
Jeanette Brown, MD, School of Medicine  
Pat Fox, PhD, School of Nursing  
Nola Hylton, PhD, School of Medicine  
Stephen Kahl, PhD, School of Pharmacy  
Arthur Miller, PhD, School of Dentistry  
Jean Olson, MD, School of Medicine

Senate Staff:  
Wilson Hardcastle, MLIS, Senior Analyst  
wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu; 415/476-4245



**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

## **Communication from the Committee on Committees Candy Tsourounis, PharmD, Chair**

February 15, 2011

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
University of California, San Francisco  
500 Parnassus Avenue, MUE 230  
San Francisco, CA 94143  
[academic.senate@ucsf.edu](mailto:academic.senate@ucsf.edu)

Re: Review of the *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership*

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick,

As requested, the Committee on Committees reviewed the *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership* (April 15, 2010) submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment. The report makes four recommendations, to which we respond below.

### **Recommendation #1: Do not extend the list of titles conferring membership in the Senate.**

COC opposes this recommendation as it deprives nearly half of the UCSF full time faculty direct access to the Academic Senate as a body representing their interests. At UCSF the non-Senate faculty hold titles in the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical series. These colleagues serve the local and international community by training researchers, physicians, nurses, dentists, and pharmacists in clinical care and research to advance science and cure disease.

Furthermore, at UCSF, Health Sciences Clinical faculty help generate the revenue that make up the largest component (50%) of our campus resources. In 2009-10 they shouldered the same salary furloughs as Academic Senate colleagues, yet had limited opportunities to officially express their opinions on this topic via the Academic Senate.

Not including Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty on Academic Senate committees is particularly challenging for the UCSF Committee on Committees. Each year as we work to include the broadest faculty representation possible, we are constrained by only being able to include a fraction of our non-Senate colleagues in active committee service. Furthermore, our non-Senate colleagues must be told that while their voices are important and included in our campus processes, their votes will not be counted when reported to the UC Systemwide Academic Senate. This imposes an artificial divide among our colleagues who work side-by-side to educate, conduct research and treat patients.

We understand and appreciate the concerns being voiced on other campuses that the growth of health sciences programs (because they are less dependent on state general funds than undergraduate programs) has led to disproportionate growth of the health sciences campuses. We recognize that adding all current non-Senate faculty members to the Academic Senate would change the representation in the Academic Assembly. This change is precisely what is needed as the current membership of the Academic Senate does not represent the voices of all faculty in the UC system. We maintain that all faculty should have an equal voice in shared governance.

Therefore, we recommend:

1. That the Systemwide Senate bylaws be amended to delegate to the campuses the authority to determine which faculty series could be appointed as voting members of campus committees and serve in positions of faculty leadership on that campus, with these decisions and recommendations having full force when passed up to the Systemwide Senate.
2. That the Systemwide Senate Bylaws be changed so that Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty can serve on Systemwide committees (including in leadership positions) in those areas where they can provide appropriate expertise and experience or when the committees deal with issues that directly affect their personal welfare as members of the faculty.
3. That UCOC and the Systemwide Senate develop a new formula for assigning Academic Assembly seats that provides a reasonable voice for all full time faculty.

**Recommendation #2: *Within the divisions and campuses, review the duties and responsibilities of non-Senate academic appointees and reclassify those who should be appointed in Senate into appropriate series, e.g. from “Clinical Professor” to “Professor of Clinical X”.***

We agree, as this is essentially the recommendation in a [2003 report](#) generated by the UCSF Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion<sup>1,2</sup> Faculty should be hired into the series that best suits their responsibilities, the series in which they are likely to remain, and the series which best meets their career goals. It is our understanding that the UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel already consistently reviews appointments for appropriateness of series. COC acknowledges and supports their efforts and continues to encourage departments and schools to appoint faculty into academic series appropriate to their work. It is important that this review be extended to all appointments, not just appointments at Assistant Professor III and above, as is the current practice.

**Recommendation #3: *Retain the historical separation of curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education.***

We concur. While this recommendation seems to have been developed to “protect” the general campuses from the growth of the Health Sciences Clinical faculty, it might also form the basis for the kind of local option on Academic Senate membership we recommend in response to Recommendation #1.

**Recommendation #4: *Revise the list of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.***

We concur with the exception of the position of University Librarian. At UCSF the University Librarian is a major advocate for student education.

In addition to these concerns, we are troubled that the task force did not consult with the faculty who are disenfranchised by their series. These colleagues are most directly impacted by these recommendations.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment.

Sincerely,



**Candy Tsourounis, PharmD**  
Chair, Committee on Committees

Senate Staff:  
Heather Alden, Executive Director  
[heather.alden@ucsf.edu](mailto:heather.alden@ucsf.edu) 415/476.8827

---

<sup>1</sup> Armitage Report 2003 <http://senate.ucsf.edu/2002-2003/v2-FRRP-12-17-03-Report.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Armitage Report 2010 Revision <http://senate.ucsf.edu/2009-2010/v2-frrp-02-17-10-armitagereport.pdf>

**Committee on Faculty Welfare**  
**Grayson W. (Bill) Marshall, DDS, PhD, MPH, Chair**

October 12, 2010

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, Chair  
UCSF Academic Senate  
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Review of *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership*

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick:

The UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare reviewed the *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership* and the historical background on the evolution of Senate membership appended to their report.

The Task Force was asked to examine the essential principles underlying Academic Senate membership and assess the degree to which current practices reflect those principles. They reviewed the evolution of membership in the Academic Senate since its inception and surveyed the contemporary range of practices in the University's distinctive academic units. The Task Force made four specific recommendations as detailed in the transmittal letter from Task Force Chair Linda Bisson to Academic Council Chair Harry Powell:

1. Do not extend the list of titles conferring membership in the Senate.
2. Within the divisions and campuses, review the duties and responsibilities of non-Senate academic appointees and reclassify those who should be appointed in Senate into appropriate series, e.g. from "Clinical Professor" to "Professor of Clinical X".
3. Retain the historical separation of curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education.
4. Revise the list of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.

Overall, despite the detailed and excellent review of the historical changes in Senate membership, we believe that one of the recommendations (#1) does not reflect the historical spirit of inclusiveness that provides Senate membership to faculty engaged in the essential activities of the University, namely instruction, research, and professional service to the University. Thus we will comment on this below.

We also believe that some of the discussion concerning curricular authority for undergraduate and professional education (recommendation #3) would benefit from rewording and clarification as noted below. The reports at various points use the terms *undergraduate instruction* as distinct from *professional instruction* and at other times use the terms *undergraduate* and *graduate instruction* as distinct from *professional curricular instruction*. We believe clarity could be increased by use of the term *academic* to include undergraduate and graduate program instruction.

We agree with the second recommendation, namely, the importance of classifying faculty into their appropriate series, and we note that it is our belief that the UCSF administration and the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel has diligently addressed this issue for several years. However, the Committee also notes that the current limitation on Clinical X faculty numbers imposed by a set ratio to other Senate faculty appears arbitrary, and the basis for this limitation is neither documented nor fully addressed. This limitation may hinder the reclassification efforts on other campuses with significant faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

Lastly on the specific recommendations, the Committee on Faculty Welfare has no comment on the final recommendation concerning revision of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.

**The primary recommendations of the Committee on Faculty Welfare is that Senate membership should be conferred on faculty engaged in the scope of essential activities of the University.**

The Task Force on Senate Membership was charged with elucidating “a set of principles that should govern decisions about who is and who is not a member of the Academic Senate” and provide “a set of derived principles of Senate membership that might be expected to apply”. The *raison d'être* for this Task Force stems from the current imperfect criteria for Senate membership that have evolved over the years based on a series of Standing Orders. As the committee noted “Senate requests to the Regents for changes in Senate membership were ahistorical in rationalizing requests, making it difficult to discern operative principles and considerations.” Given the committee’s charge to provide a rational set of principles for Senate membership, we were disappointed that the committee decided to recommend perpetuation of “current practice of use of specific title codes”, despite the fact that the Committee’s analysis often highlighted the apparent ad hoc processes and unclear justification of Senate membership eligibility.

Historic examination is useful to establish parameters of intent concerning membership qualifications of the Academic Senate. It is clear that the original Organic Act and later Standing Orders established principles of inclusion and shared governance of the University of California. We feel that the *status quo* exclusion of faculty in the Adjunct Professor series goes against these fundamental principles, and does not reflect the *de facto* status of Adjunct faculty, many of whom are long term and fully committed faculty members. The status of Adjunct faculty has changed considerably from their establishment following the 1969 Senate-requested Revisions to Standing Order 105.1 (a); Adjunct faculty were in that series because they “lacked full-time commitment to the University, and had lesser participation in teaching.” Because of the fixed number of state-funded, tenure-track positions, there has been an expansion in the number of faculty appointed in the Adjunct series. Unlike the original description of Adjunct faculty, the majority of Adjunct faculty, particularly on this campus, are full-time teaching and research faculty, who perform essentially all of the research, teaching and University service functions that are typically associated with tenured faculty (Howell *et al.*, 2010) but without representation at the Senate level. While the In Residence and Clinical X series do confer Senate membership to non-tenured faculty, there are substantial barriers for many Adjunct faculty to transfer to these series, including the required or assumed financial obligations that many mid- and small-sized departments cannot afford.

Notwithstanding their commitment and contribution to the mission of the University, Adjunct faculty are perceived to be “second class” by faculty in other series, and even more troubling are disproportionately female (Howell, *et al.*, 2010). We believe that extending membership of Academic Senate to full time, fully engaged Adjunct faculty would go a long way to redress negative perceptions and inequities and more fully fulfill that stated mission of inclusion and shared governance.

**Conclusion:**

After careful review of the Report of the Task Force on Senate Membership and the additional background material provided, the UCSF Committee on Faculty Welfare members are of the opinion that the Task Force should re-examine its first recommendation that in essence maintains the status quo, ignores the historical precedent of inclusiveness for faculty engaged in the broadest range of university activities, and does not appear to address the growth and diversity of today’s University of California.

Sincerely,

Grayson W. Marshall, DDS, PhD, MPH  
Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair 2010-2011

## **Communication from the School of Dentistry Faculty Council** **Janice S. Lee, DDS, MD, FACS, Chair**

December 17, 2010

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick,

Please note that the School of Dentistry has approximately 220 full-time faculty (>50% time), 50% of which are Senate members, with the vast majority of the remaining 50% in the Health Sciences (HS) Clinical series and a few in the Adjunct series. With this knowledge, we are responding to the above report.

**Recommendation #1:** Do not extend the list of titles conferring membership in the Senate.

The School of Dentistry Faculty Council opposes this recommendation.

“The Systemwide Academic Senate... enables the faculty to exercise its right to participate in the University's governance. Under the leadership of the [Systemwide Senate Chair](#), the faculty voice is formed through a deliberative process...” (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/Senate>)

Several reasons have been given to explain why this inequity between faculty series exists and they include the historic purposes of Senate membership, the potential imbalance of faculty proportions for campuses that have a large percentage of non-Senate members (if they were to be made Senate members) therefore introducing an imbalance of power and representation in the Academic Assembly, the concern for FTE and resource imbalance for campuses that would balloon if non-Senate members were made Senate members. None of these reasons provide a satisfactory explanation why colleagues on our campus or at any of the other UC campuses do not share the same rights to vote and to exercise shared governance. This inequality is counter to what we believe UC stands for. During the last two years, UC leadership has been forced to make difficult and unpopular decisions. At one point, even shared governance was questioned and the concern that faculty opinion was not being considered was expressed during the debate on faculty furloughs. We weathered that period. However, the shared governance did not extend to half our faculty, those in the Health Science Clinical and Adjunct series. On the one hand, we embrace diversity, encourage respect for all persons regardless of race, gender, and orientation, promote inclusiveness, collaboration and widespread input, fight against health disparities, and plan to promote our ideals and theories globally. Yet we have willingly allowed segregation among our faculty due to Senate membership.

“With some exceptions and as defined by the [Standing Order of the Regents 105.1](#), Senate membership is granted to anyone who has an academic appointment at the University... As mandated by the University's governing body, the [Board of Regents](#), the faculty is empowered to determine academic policy, set conditions for admission and the granting of degrees, authorize and supervise courses and curricula, and advise the administration on faculty appointments, promotions and budgets. This delegated

authority makes the UC Academic Senate unique among faculty governments.”  
(<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/Senate>)

All full-time faculty should be allowed to vote. Our campus is a graduate health science campus without undergraduates, yet our faculty, including HS Clinical faculty, fulfill the mission of UC. We have HS Clinical faculty who demonstrate excellence in teaching, clinical research, and leadership (i.e. medical executive committees). Through exceptional education and mentoring, we are producing world-class academic and clinical leaders for the next generation. In the School of Dentistry, the HS Clinical faculty are an integral component in admitting and preparing trainees for their professional degrees, participate in academic policy and curricula. Our School would not function appropriately nor achieve our mission to train dental care providers and residents without our HS Clinical or Adjunct series faculty.

The School of Dentistry HS Clinical faculty serve the broader local and international community through clinical care while training dentists in patient care or young researchers to discover cures for conditions that ail our community. Without question, there are similar faculty in the other three schools. To ignore this contribution of all the HS Clinical faculty is to ignore our mission, to educate. They help generate the revenue that make up the largest component (50%) of our campus resources. Their quality care attracts donors and grateful patients. They have shouldered the same salary furloughs, yet they could not express their opinion on this topic. And while half of the UC campuses do not have a medical center or clinical training programs, there is clearly a benefit to the entire UC community and the state of California to have 5 medical centers and 2 dental schools of clinical excellence as part of UC.

A potential solution may be to consider an alternative non-academic appointment, such as staff ie staff-clinician, staff-scientist, etc and there is no obligation to be regulated by the same policies by which academic Senate members must abide as these staff members will not vote. Staff members may consider union policies instead. Their responsibilities would not include the educational mission of UC.

In review of the Task Force recommendations and inquiry on the composition of the committee, it is ironic that there was no non-Senate input provided on this Task Force. Yet the recommendations impact the non-Senate population. Until their opinion is surveyed and discussed, it is impossible to assume that any Taskforce or Senate action will ever resolve this issue. Without broad and appropriate input, it appears elitist. This does not seem acceptable and certainly not UC.

We realize that many iterations and discussions have occurred over the issue of Academic Senate membership in the past. We realize that compromises and small steps have been made to improve the representative role of the UCSF Academic Senate while working within the by-laws of the Academic Senate. But we urge you to champion the comprehensive meaning of shared governance and faculty voice. If UCSF will not, it is unlikely that anyone else will. UC is undergoing tremendous change and careful deliberations over its future, therefore, now is the time for the Academic Senate and Council to question whether we fulfilling our role in representing our faculty and whether we can do it better. Faculty suffrage is at the core of this issue on Senate membership. At UCSF, approximately 50% of our faculty cannot vote. Until 1920, 50% of the American population could not vote – women in the US. Significant changes have occurred since that moment in history and we are undoubtedly better because of it. We hope UC will learn from that historical period, not re-enact the lengthy period of discrimination but choose to expand the right to vote to all full-time faculty.

**Recommendation #2:** within the divisions and campuses, review the duties and responsibilities of non-Senate academic appointees and reclassify those who should be appointed in Senate series.

The School of Dentistry Faculty Council concurs. Additionally, this would require that the Academic Assembly representation is reviewed and there is a balance among all UC campuses.

**Recommendation #3:** retain the historical separation of curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education.

The School of Dentistry Faculty Council concurs.

**Recommendation #4:** revise the list of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.

The School of Dentistry Faculty Council concurs.

We appreciate your time and your efforts.

Respectfully yours,

**Janice S. Lee DDS, MD, MS**

School of Dentistry Faculty Council Chair 2009-2011

## Communication from the Chair of the School of Medicine Faculty Council

December 9, 2010

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the UC Systemwide *Task Force Report on Senate Membership*

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick,

As requested the School of Medicine Faculty Council reviewed the *Task Force Report on Senate Membership* (April 15, 2010) submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment. The Faculty Council discussed the Report on November 18, 2010 and provided the following responses to the four recommendations.

**Recommendation #1:** *Do not extend the list of titles conferring membership in the Senate.*

**Response:** The Faculty Council did not agree with this recommendation. At UCSF, Senate and non-Senate faculty have similar and overlapping responsibilities as they work together to advance the teaching, research and clinical care missions of the University. Excluding some faculty from having a voice in shared governance creates a two-tiered system that has been a source of frustration for faculty in non-Senate series. One Faculty Council member explained,

“The purpose of the Academic Senate is to include the voices of the faculty about the academic programs at the University. Dividing the faculty into Senate and non-Senate weakens the faculty voice in shared governance because not all teaching faculty can participate in the decisions regarding curriculum. It doesn’t make sense in terms of the way we work together; it doesn’t facilitate our collaborative work as a faculty and is not transparent.”

Furthermore, non-Senate faculty are excluded from the Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) home loan program. Although the MOP program can only offer a limited number of loans, being excluded outright from the program impacts UCSF’s ability to recruit new faculty and contributes to the non-Senate faculty perception that they are second-class citizens among their colleagues.

**Recommendation #2:** *Within the divisions and campuses, review the duties and responsibilities of non-Senate academic appointees and reclassify those who should be appointed in Senate into appropriate series, e.g. from “Clinical Professor” to “Professor of Clinical X”.*

**Response:** The Faculty Council agrees with this recommendation and recognizes that this practice is already in use by the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Office of Academic Personnel at UCSF. Some departments are unwilling or unable to implement recommended changes in series for one or more of the following three reasons:

- Department budgets are not sufficient to provide one year of support for additional faculty members in Senate series.
- Hiring faculty into an Academic Senate series requires that the department conduct a search for the position.

- Hiring faculty into the Adjunct series may provide additional time for the faculty member to establish their research before being recommended for an advancement to Associate (no “8 year rule”).

**Recommendation #3:** *Retain the historical separation of curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education.*

**Response:** Without undergraduates at UCSF, this recommendation translates to a separation between curricula for professional degrees (DDS, MD and PharmD) and curricula for graduate degrees (MS and PhD). UCSF is currently reconfiguring its course review practices to better separate Academic Senate oversight for graduate and professional degree courses.

**Recommendation #4:** *Revise the list of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.*

**Response:** The Faculty Council did not reach a consensus on this issue. Some members thought it was important to continue to include the University Librarian and the Registrar in the Academic Senate, as they play important roles in the educational mission of the University. Other members agreed with the Report’s recommendation that as those positions have become professionalized, their membership in the Academic Senate could be revisited.

The Faculty Council appreciated the opportunity to respond to the Report. If the recommendation to not extend the list of titles conferring Academic Senate membership stands at the UC Systemwide level, the Faculty Council strongly recommended that the Division form a task force to determine line-by-line possibilities for mitigating the differences between Senate and non-Senate faculty at UCSF.

Sincerely,

**Heather Fullerton, MD, MAS**

School of Medicine Faculty Council Chair 2010-2011



University of California  
San Francisco

**Academic Senate**  
senate.ucsf.edu

## **Communication from the School of Nursing Faculty Council** **Margaret Wallhagen, RN, PhD, FAAN, Chair**

February 25, 2011

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the Task Force on Senate Membership Final report

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick,

The School of Nursing faculty had the opportunity to review the Report from the Task Force on Senate Membership (April 15, 2010) submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment. Respondents had mixed reactions to the findings and recommendations.

**Overall there was cautionary support for the recommendation not to expand membership but to assure that individuals were in the appropriate series.** The majority of the respondents were in agreement with the recommendations of the report but raised some concerns about the potential impact of a shift in the balance across schools in shared governance of the campus. Thus, there was support for the recommendation to promote movement of faculty with duties that are consistent with Senate membership into a more appropriate series. This was voiced especially on by Health Sciences Clinical faculty in the School of Nursing who are interested in the Clinical X series. These faculty are fully-engaged and desire to be recognized as participatory in the mission of the University and conferred the responsibilities and benefits of membership in the Academic Senate. This support assumed no changes to the criteria for the faculty series, and was again accompanied by support of the concerns raised in the report regarding the potential inappropriate inclusion of certain administrative positions. Further, these comments suggested support for the recommendation to review titles to assess their appropriateness. The concerns focused on whether, for example, the School of Medicine, with its greater number of faculty whose current series might be deemed inappropriate and who might be appointed to a series that carries Senate membership have an overwhelming voting position compared to the other schools. These comments did not reflect the fact that the campus has been reviewing individuals in relation to the appropriateness of their series for several years.

Those who voiced opposition were actually voicing support of the findings of the report itself. There was some feeling that expansion of Senate membership was unnecessary and could dilute the stature Senate membership. Because there was concern that including administrators would allow for administrative input or control where it is not appropriate, these respondents appeared to support the concerns raised in the report about the increasing number of administrators with Senate membership.

It is also worthy to note that some of the faculty in Adjunct series who were polled on the issue chose not to weigh in on the matter as they are "not concerned." Furthermore, the Faculty Council and those consulted supported a removal of the 1/6 cap on Clinical X appointments.

Regarding other facets of the Final Report, the Faculty Council and other faculty who participated in the review found the language in the document itself to be potentially divisive. Specifically, the separation of faculty into two distinct groups, "professional" vs. "academic," was viewed as problematic. Although this separation appears fixed in history, it seems rather artificial and may promote on-going feelings of

separateness across the campuses in terms of roles and responsibilities. It was viewed as unfortunate that there is a belief that somehow graduate education is inherently different from and not equivalent to education at the undergraduate level. There are individuals who must teach across that divide and even at UCSF there are many levels of education, even though we are considered a fully "professional" campus in terms of the types of students that we educate and mentor. Although many would agree that the undergraduate faculty should have final say in their curricular decisions and that professional schools should have final say in their curricular decisions, dialogue across these levels would seem to be valuable because there is movement across these levels and, in many cases, faculty have experience at more than one level. Discussions at the department level included a call for ways to lessen the undergraduate-versus-professional faculty tensions across campuses in order to address real and basic issues facing shared governance and Senate membership.

Overall, the faculty of the School of Nursing had mixed responses to the findings and recommendations of the Report. However, faculty reaction was consistent in the opinion that faculty who are engaged in the life of the School and the University, actively participate in service to the School and the University, and participate in teaching or curriculum development should be included in the rights and responsibilities of Senate membership regardless of academic series.

Sincerely,

**The School of Nursing Faculty Council**

Margaret Wallhagen, RN, PhD, FAAN, Chair  
Jyu-Lin Chen, RN , PhD, Vice Chair  
Gerri Collins-Bride, RN, MS, ANP  
Pilar Bernal de Pheils, RN, MS, FAAN, FNP  
Shari Dworkin, PhD, MS  
Jill Howie Esquivel, RN, PhD, NP  
Susan Janson, RN, DNS, ANP, FAAN  
Hai-Yen Sung, PhD  
Sally Rankin, RN, PHD, FNP, FAAN, Interim Dean  
Jason Nolan, NSU Representative

## **Communication from the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, Chair**

February 1, 2011

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH  
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate  
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership*

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick,

As requested, on December 2, 2010, the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council reviewed the UC Systemwide *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership* (April 15, 2010) submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment.

While Council members agreed the tone of the report's cover letter was unintentionally discriminatory, overall the following points were determined in response to this report and its recommendations:

1. Members recommend the abolition of the 1:6 clinical: non-clinical faculty ratio that has artificially held some individuals back in their career development.
2. While Recommendation # 2, to review and move those already doing Senate work into the Clinical X series, is supported, the report doesn't acknowledge that the Professor of Clinical X series are at present treated like second-class citizens. For example, they are not eligible for certain awards, sabbaticals, etc. Faculty Council members strongly believe that equality of benefits should be brought to all faculty series. Council members hope these issues would be addressed, if even to note that they are issues to be considered for future discussion.
3. Members agreed with Recommendation # 3, to maintain a separation between curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education. We advocate for the clearer, more effective mechanisms at UCSF to facilitate and maintain the separation.
4. The complete absence of the graduate division and its programs in the report's discussion is problematic for Faculty Council members. Many faculty involved in undergraduate and professional education are also involved in graduate programs, which have their own needs unaddressed by this report.

Separately, Faculty Council members advocated that Health Sciences Clinical faculty series should be recognized in some way. Health sciences faculty have suffered within a system built for academic units that include only ladder rank faculty. When health sciences faculty review the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) for advancement policy, we find language written for ladder rank faculty. Consequently, health sciences faculty at the campus level must interpret how the APM applies for their series.

At UCSF Health Sciences Clinical faculty are not Academic Senate members. They do not have direct voting privileges or access to the home loan program. Many at UCSF believe these individuals should have Academic Senate membership. Lifting the 1:6 cap would not fully address our concerns; saying that faculty, if worthy of a Senate appointment should be moved into the right series also doesn't address that either. This is a separate issue that members wanted highlighted.

Sincerely,

**School of Pharmacy Faculty Council**

Norm Oppenheimer, PhD, Chair, Pharm Chem

Thomas James, PhD, Vice Chair, Pharm Chem

Mitra Assemi, PharmD, Clin Pharm

Nadav Ahituv, PhD, BTS

Tina Brock, EdD, MS, BSPHarm, Education Policy Rep, Clinical Pharmacy

Ruth Greenblatt, PharmD, Clin Pharm

Shuvo Roy, PhD, BTS

Sue Miller, PhD, Pharm Chem

Bill Soller, PharmD, Non-Senate Representative, Clin Pharm

Mary Anne Koda-Kimble, PharmD, Office of the Dean

Brian Alldredge, PharmD, Clin Pharm

Bob Day, PharmD, Office of the Dean

Don Kishi, PharmD, Assoc. Dean Student and Curricular Affairs

Michael Nordberg, MPA/HAS, Chief Financial Officer

Lorie Rice, MPH, Assoc. Dean External Affairs

Ellie Vogt, RPh, PhD, Clin Pharm

Akash Dandappanavar, Student Representative

Cc: Heather Alden, Executive Director, UCSF Academic Senate Office