TASK FORCE ON FACULTY RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION

MINUTES
Meeting of July 8, 2003

PRESENT: G. Armitage (Chair), N. Cohen, T. Daniels, D. Dillon, S. Glantz, Z. Mirsky, M. Wallhagen

ABSENT: B. Alldredge, M. Bogetz, J. Guglielmo

The Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion was called to order by Chair Armitage on July 8, 2003 at 8:00 a.m. in S-118.

Chair’s Report
The Committee on Academic Personnel has responded via a communication to the Task Force on several of the Task Force’s recommendations on the “Important Points for Discussion between Department Chairs and New Faculty Appointees.”

Chair Armitage will attend a future Coordinating Committee meeting to provide an update on the Task Force’s progress.

Results from 25 Senate Faculty Phone Surveys
After the last meeting the Academic Senate Office conducted additional phone surveys with 25 assistant professors in the Ladder Rank and In-Residence series in order to provide for a comparison group. The findings were combined with the original 100 Clinical and Adjunct faculty surveys, and presented at the meeting. The results suggest that a substantial number of Adjunct faculty and a sizable number of Clinical faculty are engaging in work similar to that performed by faculty in the Ladder Rank and In-Residence series. The results were gathered by identifying those in the surveys who engaged in substantial teaching, received extramural funding, devoted a major part of their time to research, were serving or willing to serve on university committees, and were invited to give presentations at national and international meetings. For Clinical faculty, this list also included receiving clinical referrals from regional and national sources. If a Clinical or Adjunct faculty member in the survey met all of these criteria, they were noted as fulfilling the Academic Personnel Manual’s (APM) requirements for Academic Senate faculty. Fifty-five percent of the Adjunct faculty and 25% of the Clinical faculty surveyed met these five criteria.

A Task Force member proposed creation of a questionnaire to be distributed to all Clinical and Adjunct faculty members to gather the percentage time engaged in the above categories and then examining in detail those faculty members who fit APM guidelines for Academic Senate membership. The intent of this questionnaire would be to determine whether such faculty belong in a different series. Other Task Force members indicated that this type of review already occurs at the department level and to conduct such a review would replace the department chair’s role in the academic review process. In addition,
faculty may request a career review and a re-review of their academic personnel file at any time. In addition, a Task Force member stated that the Committee on Academic Personnel’s (CAP) routinely attempts to identify faculty who appear to be in the wrong series. However, a certain percentage of the CAP membership changes each year which contributes to varying interpretations of the APM criteria.

Another Task Force member suggested improving communication to faculty members on definitions of the series, their requirements, and promotion criteria. The Task Force agreed on examining mechanisms to strongly encourage department chairs, associate deans of academic affairs, and CAP to identify those faculty members currently in the wrong series.

The issue of Adjunct faculty considering themselves “second-class citizens” at UCSF arose in the survey and a Task Force member indicated that UCSF defines this series differently than other UC campuses and universities.

**Results from 25 Clinical/Adjunct Faculty Publication Surveys**

As a result of the decision at the last meeting to examine publication records of the Clinical and Adjunct faculty who participated in the phone survey, 25 were randomly selected and each participant’s publication history was gathered from the National Library of Medicine’s PubMed citation database. Only publications from 2000 to now were noted. Faculty were considered “primary investigators” if they were predominantly listed as first or last author in most papers. Faculty were considered “supporting role” if they were consistently listed somewhere in the middle of a long list of authors. “Intermediate” described situations where both situations existed for the same person in about equal amounts. The primary conclusions of the survey were:

- About 44% (7 out of 16) of Adjunct assistant professors publish in high-quality journals as first authors, second authors, or senior authors.
- Clinical assistant professors also produce similar data with 44% (4 out of 9) using similar criteria.

**Open-ended Comments from Clinical, Adjunct, and Senate Faculty Phone Surveys**

The open-ended comments from all 125 faculty phone surveys were combined and presented to the Task Force. Each of these sections of the two phone surveys will be organized into one final report.

**Presentation of Academic Senate Mentoring Task Force – Mary Croughan, Co-Chair**

Dr. Croughan presented an overview of the recent work of the Academic Senate Mentoring Task Force which is co-chaired by Mary Croughan and Vice Chancellor Dorothy Bainton. Principally, she highlighted the following:

The task force was charged with designing and implementing a faculty mentoring program for the UCSF campus to assist in career advancement. Other goals of the program were to:

- Enable UCSF to develop a reputation for excellent faculty mentoring as a means of recruiting and retaining the highest quality faculty
- Increase faculty satisfaction at UCSF

Details of the program which the task force will recommend to UCSF Chancellor J. Michael Bishop are highlighted in the Executive Summary and supporting documents. The program will be available to all UCSF faculty in every series and at all levels. The program intends to focus first on assistant professors, new faculty members to UCSF, and faculty changing career directions.

Following discussion of the proposed program, the group expressed broad support of the efforts of the Academic Senate Mentoring Task Force. Dr. Croughan intends to attend a faculty meeting of each department to inform faculty of the program and to gain support from department chairs. There are plans
to implement the mentoring program in fall 2003, with initial administrative support from Vice Chancellor Bainton’s office.

**Preparation of a Report of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion.**

Chair Armitage suggested that members of the Task Force begin thinking about preparation of a report summarizing its findings and recommendations. A major component of the Task Force’s charge is to make recommendations in response to the following question:

- What mechanisms can be put in place to support more willingness on the part of the individual Chairs/School to hire and promote faculty in the Ladder Rank and In-Residence series?

  A consensus was reached that several mechanisms already exist that help in the attempt to reach the goal of hiring and promoting faculty in the appropriate series. These include: 1) faculty participation in the search and personnel review process, 2) written and verbal communications from department chairs with prospective new faculty about employment and existing faculty about advancement, 3) oversight by the associate deans for academic personnel of each school, and 4) oversight by CAP. Despite these mechanisms, it is quite clear that a sizable percentage of faculty do not have an adequate understanding of the different faculty series at UCSF. The Task Force believes that the best way to deal with this problem is through a focused educational program designed to increase the awareness of new and existing faculty on available career paths at UCSF. This awareness program should occur at all levels of review.

- Existing faculty who participate in the search and review process of colleagues need to be made aware that it is partly their responsibility to identify situations where people are being recruited in the wrong series. This responsibility also should be in effect during the merit and promotion reviews of their colleagues.

- Department chairs, in their discussions with new and existing faculty, need to increase their efforts at communicating the differences between the various faculty series at UCSF. Documentation that these discussions have taken place needs to be in the personnel files of new and existing faculty.

- The associate deans for academic personnel should intensify their efforts at identifying and correcting situations where people are clearly being considered for employment in the wrong series. This also applies to existing faculty who are being proposed for merit increases or promotions.

- CAP should intensify its efforts at identifying situations where people are clearly being considered for employment or advancement in the wrong series. In cases of a mismatch between an individual and their faculty series, CAP needs to strongly make recommendations for a series change.

- As part of the formal faculty mentoring program, mentors need to incorporate into their overall advisory program information on the different series available at UCSF. An attempt should be made to ensure that mentored faculty have a working knowledge of the different series and how this knowledge applies to them. The goal, of course, is to minimize situations where faculty find themselves in the wrong series.

- All faculty need to be made aware that, under existing APM procedures, they may request a career review and a re-review of their academic personnel file at any time. This includes situations where the faculty member believes that he/she may be in the wrong series.

Chair Armitage asked Task Force members to think about what they want to have included in the group’s final report and how it should be structured.
The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.
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