COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM
Patrick Fox, M.D., Chair

MINUTES
Meeting of February 20, 2002

PRESENT: P. Fox (Chair), R. Munoz, M. Eisner, M. Wallhagen, S. Kahl

ABSENT: L. Centore

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of October 30, 2001 were approved unanimously and with no changes.

Chair’s Report
No report.

Revision of Bylaws
The Committee voted unanimously to approve bylaw revisions forwarded to the Committee by the Academic Senate Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. Existing bylaws will be used until August 2002. The text of the new Committee bylaws reads as follows:

140. Committee on Academic Freedom
   A. Membership: This Committee shall consist of five members with a representative from each of the Schools on the San Francisco campus and one representative from the Clinical Professor or Adjunct Professor series. The Statewide Representative does not have to be a current member. This member shall serve as an ex-officio member of the Committee. A quorum shall consist of 3 members.

   Duties:
   To serve as a resource for individual Faculty and students who feel that their academic freedom has been compromised.
   To study any condition within or outside the University, which in the judgment of the Committee may affect the academic freedom of the University, its Faculty and students, and to report thereon to the Division.
   At least every 5 years, to assess and to report to the Division, the culture of the San Francisco campus in terms of academic freedom and how this culture affects:
   Acceptance of positions and resignation from positions in the University.
   The reputation of the University and the individual members of the Faculty.
Report of the Systemwide Committee on Academic Freedom – Meg Wallhagen

M. Wallhagen informed the Committee members that the systemwide committee on Academic Freedom is currently involved in the review of a student complaint made at another University of California campus. Details of the students complaint are confidential pending the outcome of a State of California civil court hearing.

The Committee continued discussion of the current level of awareness of Academic Freedom issues at the campus-wide and system-wide levels. M. Wallhagen informed the Committee that the systemwide committee is moving forward with plans for a symposium on issues related to Academic Freedom to take place in October, 2002. Discussion issues at this symposium may include a general consideration of the meaning of academic freedom and evaluation on the effect of recent national security crises on academic freedom within universities.

The systemwide Committee on Academic Freedom has submitted proposed bylaw changes to the systemwide Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction.

Finally, M. Wallhagen informed committee members that the systemwide committee will appoint members to act as representatives to the systemwide Taskforce on Copyright and to the UC Committee on the Management of Department of Energy Laboratories.

Promotion Criteria Across Departments – Vice-Chancellor Dorothy Bainton

Vice-Chancellor Bainton joined the committee to discuss two issues related to promotion criteria across departments discussed by committee members at the meeting of October 30, 2001:

- The requirement, or perceived requirement, implemented by certain UCSF departments that in order to be promoted or advanced a faculty member must be a Principal Investigator on a RO1 (or equivalent). The Committee had previously considered whether this perception might constitute a limitation of academic freedom.
- Inconsistencies in promotion criteria across departments and schools.

In discussion of these issues, Vice-Chancellor Bainton provided the following information:

- The UC Academic Personnel Manual (APM) outlines minimal requirements related to grant authorship for promotion.
- Only two departments at UCSF have written criteria outlining specific grant authorship requirements for promotion.
- The four schools at UCSC have no written policy beyond that outlined in the APM. However, Vice-Chancellor Bainton noted that in each of the four schools, promotion and advancement without an RO1 or strong evidence of research independence, would be unlikely. The committee discussed whether research independence can be adequately demonstrated without an RO1. Members questioned whether promotion dependent on obtaining an RO1 may limit research to major areas of investigation. The Committee supports promotion and advancement dependent on research independence demonstrated by an RO1 or equivalent but acknowledged that individual departments must have a high degree of autonomy in determining specific advancement requirements.
• The number of faculty appointed to the In-residence series is decreasing. There is no cap on numbers appointed to this series, although economic uncertainty may have negatively affected appointments in this series because these appointments are funded by FTEs.

The Committee acknowledged that to further discuss this issue, details of numbers of promotions denied due to lack of demonstration of research independence would have to be obtained. Details of specific promotion applications are confidential and numbers related to promotion and rejection of promotion are not available. The Committee agreed that no further discussion of this issue will take place – there are no clearly definable issues related to academic freedom and specific issues related to promotion and advancement are currently being discussed by the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
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