COMMUNICATION FROM THE SCHOOL OF NURSING
FACULTY COUNCIL
Carmen Portillo, RN, PhD, FAAN, Chair

December 15, 2004

Leonard S. Zegans, MD
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California, San Francisco
Box 0984

RE: Report of the Academic Senate Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion

Dear Chair Zegans,

The School of Nursing Faculty Council reviewed the Report of the Academic Senate Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion at its October 29, 2004 meeting. Our comments are as follows:

1. Since the financial risk of hiring belongs to the respective Departments, the decision to hire in the “In Residence” Series should be made at the Departmental level, but subject to having the Committee on Academic Personnel review all full time Adjunct and Clinical appointments.

2. Many faculty members are unaware of the distinctions in series classifications. An effort should be made to re-educate faculty members on the various series because of the potentially negative impact that these distinctions may have on faculty career development.

3. The recommendations proposed in the report are appropriate; however, the report fails to address the lack of financial resources faced by units (e.g., ORUs) with a large number of adjunct faculty members. Some of the units have no revenue building mechanisms other than individual grants, and have no endowments or FTE positions, therefore they cannot meet the financial obligation required to support in-residence faculty that may result from CAP reviews recommending status change for adjunct faculty.

4. Faculty and administration need to work collaboratively to come up with a mechanism to provide funding sources to support faculty members who need temporary funding. One of the ways of overcoming the financial challenges would be to implement a campus wide increase in the faculty "benefit rate" specifically for the creation of a pool to cover potential financial liabilities for which units are responsible.
5. The recommendation of a blanket waiver of a national search for new faculty is overly broad. It should be rephrased to allow for some level of peer review to determine whether a waiver is necessary on a case by case basis. We suggest that the recommendation be changed to read, “There is potential for waiver of the national search…”

6. The report does nothing to address the problem of financing the salary assurance associated with In Residence faculty appointments. In order to adequately address the inequities in the appointments affecting UC faculty, the administration needs to reevaluate its current practice of requiring the respective Departments to assume all the financial risks associated with In Residence Appointments. A risk pool savings account or some other form of accounting practice should be put in place order to effectively address this issue. Perhaps this can come in the form of an increase in the fringe benefit rate, or as increment to the indirect cost rate. However it is financed, departments and/or the schools need to have the means to accumulate a savings account dedicated to this risk pool.

Thank you for the opportunity to formally submit our comments on this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen Portillo, RN, PhD, FAAN, Chair
School of Nursing Faculty Council

cc: Members of the School of Nursing Faculty Council