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Total Files Reviewed: 424
Stewardship Reviews: 8 completed, 6 in process

Statistical Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>06-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Files Reviewed</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerations</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Series</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits to Step 6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits to Above Scale</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers are not expected to calculate to the total files reviewed as a file may feature more than one descriptor, and these descriptors do not represent all forms of review.

Policy Review Items:
- Stewardship Review Processes
- Implementation of the Distinction In Mentoring Award
- Procedure for Career Reviews
- Phase I Implementation of the Advance System
- Authority for Advancement Criteria Differing from the APM

Task Forces:
- Task Force Following Up on the Recommendations of the 2003-2005 Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion

Issues for Next Year (2008-2009)
- Formal request to UCAP to review authority of departments to enact criteria for advancement more onerous than those set in the Academic Personnel Manual

2008-2009 Members

Stephen Kahl, Chair (SOP)         Nola Hylton (SOM)
Russell Pieper, Vice Chair (UCAP Rep) (SON) Art Miller (SOD)
Claire Brett (SOM)             William Shore (SOM)
Jeanette Brown (SOM)         Margaret (Peggy) Walsh, ex officio, UCAP Rep
James Cleaver (SOM/P)

Number of Meetings: 36
Senate Analyst: Wilson Hardcastle
Systemwide Business

Regarding system-wide concerns, the Committee (CAP) reviewed proposed amendments to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), either as members of a divisional task force or as a committee reviewing matters on behalf of the Division.

Systemwide Review of Changes to APM 240 (Deans)
The Committee reviewed and recommended approval of the proposed changes to APM 240 regarding the review of academic deans. CAP also notes that these criteria do not apply to those under the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, and therefore do not affect this campus. (Appendix 1A and 1B)

UCAP and CAP Review of Proposed Policies Governing Furloughs or Salary Cuts submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment.
On May 15, The UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel met and thoroughly discussed the Proposed Policies Governing Furloughs or Salary Cuts submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment. After much discussion, the Committee reached a consensus on the several points of concern which were provided to the Division Chair in a communication dated May 15, 2009. (Appendix 2)

As of June 30, 2009, subsequent to many discussions on the campuses regarding the developing plans for salary cuts and furloughs, UCAP is revising the issue and soliciting additional responses from the divisional CAPs. As of the writing of this report, that conversation is ongoing.

Divisional Business

This year, Members of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel participated on divisional task forces and worked closely with the Vice Provost Academic Affairs Sally Marshall and the Office of Academic Personnel on several policy issues.

Consideration of Magna Syllabi as Dissemination of Creative Activity
CAP issued a communication to the Vice Provost Academic Affairs and the Office of Academic Affairs clarifying that reference to significant syllabi produced by faculty should be included in advancement packets as evidence of creative activity (Appendix 3).

Review of the Stewardship Review Process
In 2008, VPAA Sally Marshall convened a task force of academic administrators and faculty members to review the current process for Stewardship Reviews and to propose revisions to the process and form of Stewardship Reviews. This task force was chaired by SOM Vice Dean Donna Ferriero.

Rita Redberg served as the CAP representative to this task force and continue to do so into the 2008-2009 academic year. The work of this task force has concluded and CAP awaits a final report from the Office of Academic Personnel.

Campus Guidelines for Advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale
The new APM section for advancement to Professor, Step 6 differs slightly from our campus practice with respect to international recognition as criterion for advancement to Step 6. Although the OAP addressed this in the revised "Series description for use in correspondence" document, the Vice/Associate Deans of Academic Affairs expressed concern that faculty may not review this document as a source for clarification. As such, they asked OAP to prepare a memo to provide specific clarification on the campus guidelines as they relate to the new APM revisions. The intent was that this memo would then will be distributed to the faculty within the Schools.
OAP prepared a memo in response to their request which was vetted and approved by the Vice/Associate Deans. CAP reviewed it and concurred prior to the distribution of a final version to the departments and the campus at large.

**The Electronic Advance System**
CAP Chair Stephen Kahl has been participating on the steering committee for the development and implementation of the electronic Advance system. Phase I on the implementation is expected to begin September 2009.

**Ongoing Review of Departmental Criteria**
CAP is charged with academic personnel reviews in accordance with the policies and requirements set forth in the Academic Personnel Manual (the APM). From time to time, departments block advancement of faculty who meet the criteria for advancement set forth in the APM but do not meet some internal criteria. CAP and the office of the VPAA has requested that any department that has promotion criteria other than the APM submit these for review and approval. This has been a year-long process with only minimal compliance by the departments. CAP maintains that if there are to be departmental guidelines other than the University and campus rules (the APM), these criteria must be in writing and submitted to department faculty.

Furthermore, there is a question as to the authority of departments to set criteria for advancement which are not in the APM, for example: the requirement in the Department of Medicine that a candidate have an RO1 before they may be promoted to Associate. This is very much in dispute. (Funding or grant requirements are expressly and deliberately absent from the APM.)

The UCSF UCAP representative (Margaret Walsh) raised this concern at a UCAP meeting, where the members of UCAP expressed great concern over such practices and were of the opinion that campus departments may not set advancement criteria other than those set forth in the APM (APM rules are set by faculty and administration, reviewed by the divisions, and approved by UCAP and the Academic Council. Department criteria undergo no such review or authoritative approval.)

UCAP directed the UCSF CAP representative to charge the local CAP analyst to submit CAP’s query via an e-mail memo to the UCAP analyst for delivery to the UCAP Chair and discussion at UCAP. This communication was sent March 12, 2009 (Appendix 4). Unfortunately, this matter was not taken up by UCAP, but instead the UCAP Chair responded in a personal memo to the CAP analyst, and this communication was contrary to the opinion of UCAP during their last discussion as reported by the UCSF UCAP representative (Appendix 5).

CAP will resume this matter in the 2009-2010 year and request that the matter be added to the UCAP agenda and that a formal ruling or set of guidelines be issued regarding departmental authority and criteria for academic advancement.

**Distinguished Faculty Awards: The Distinction In Teaching and the Distinction In Mentoring Awards**
This year marked the first year of the Distinction In Mentoring Awards. After this round of review, CAP decided that faculty at the Assistant level should not be eligible for this award as they should be establishing their career and activities in other areas to prepare for successful advancement themselves. The DIM Awards come with an honorarium of $1,500 as do the Distinction In Teaching Awards, however this is to be taken from the budget of the Executive Vice Chancellor’s Office and not the Academic Senate budget as the DIT honoraria. Due to budget cuts and cost-cutting measures, the DIT Awards Ceremony and the DIM Awards Ceremony were combined into one Distinguished Faculty Awards Ceremony, which worked will and will become the standard practice. However, for 2010, the Committee and Senate Office
are considering moving the event to the afternoon or evening and include a reception rather than holding the ceremony during the lunch hour with snacks provided.

The 2008-2009 recipients of the Distinction In Teaching Awards were Conan MacDougall, PharmD, MAS, BCPS in the Department of Clinical Pharmacy (Category 1) and Barbara Drew, RN, PhD, FAAN in the Department of Physiological Nursing (Category 2).

The 2008-2009 recipients of the Distinction In Mentoring Awards were Priscilla Hsue, MD in the Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology (Category 1) and Lisa Bero, PhD, in the Department of Clinical Pharmacy (Category 2).

The small flyer announcing the awards ceremony is attached as Appendix 6.

Appraisals for Junior Faculty
The Committee recognizes the importance of the appraisal process for junior faculty and its vital role in their successful advancement. Appraisals are only required for Senate series faculty, and CAP recommended to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs that some form of appraisal be available to all junior faculty, not necessarily requiring CAP review, and perhaps that this appraisal process be managed by faculty mentors, that mentors be available to all faculty, and that such an initiative could be encouraged or supported by the Faculty Development Program (Appendix 7).

CAP Retreat
The Committee held its annual retreat with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Director of the Office of Academic Personnel, and the academic deans from the four schools on March 25. All CAP members were present as were Sally Marshall, Vice Provost Academic Affairs; Cynthia Leathers, Director of Academic Personnel; Associate Dean Brian Alldredge (SOP), Associate Dean Renee Binder (SOM), Associate Dean Caroline Damsky (SOD), Vice Dean Donna Ferriero (SOM), Associate Dean Christine Miaskowski (SON), and Associate Dean Joan Voris (Fresno).

Many issues were discussed. Minutes from the 2009 CAP Retreat are linked as Appendix 8.

Task Forces and Other Committee Service
This year members of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel served on the following Academic Senate task forces or other campus committees as representatives of CAP or the Academic Senate. Where possible, the reports from these task forces or committees are linked to or attached to this Annual Report.

- VPAA’s Steering Committee for Academic Affairs Information Systems Initiatives (AKA Advance, Ongoing)
- Stewardship Review Task Force (Pending)
- Task Force Following Up on the Recommendations of the 2003-2005 Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion (Ongoing)
Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions which the Committee will continue into 2008-2009:

**Task Force Following Up on the Recommendations of the 2003-2005 Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion**
The Task Force sent out a request for information to ascertain the implementation and potential success of the original task force. This request for information was sent to Committee on Academic Personnel, the Vice Provost Academic Affairs and the Academic Associate or Vice Deans in each of the four schools. Responses are expected late August and the task force will resume its work in the 2009-2010 academic year. (Appendix 9)

**Ongoing Review of Department Policies**
CAP and the VPAA have requested that all departments that have written criteria for advancement (i.e. those who do not rely solely on the APM) submit their policies to the VPAA and CAP. As of this writing, only four departments have complied. This review effort will resume in the 2009-2010 academic year.

**Ongoing Review of Department Authority in Setting Criteria for Advancement.**
In the 2009-2010 year, CAP will request that UCAP formally discuss and make a recommendation regarding the authority of campus departments to set criteria for advancement that differ from the Academic Personnel Manual.
Appendices

Appendix 1A: Proposed Revisions to APM 240 (Deans) submitted to the Division for review.

Appendix 1B: CAP response dated February 6, 2009 regarding the Proposed Revisions to APM 240 (Deans) submitted to the Division for review.

Appendix 2: CAP response dated May 15, 2009 to Division Chair Gardner regarding its review and recommendations of Proposed Policies Governing Furloughs or Salary Cuts submitted to the Divisions for review.

Appendix 3: Communication dated November 5 from the Committee on Academic Personnel to the Vice Provost Academic Affairs regarding the inclusion of magna syllabi as evidence of creative activity.

Appendix 4: E-mail memo dated March 12, 2009 to the UCAP Analyst requesting UCAP discussion and ruling on the authority of departments to set criteria for advancement which differ from the Academic Personnel Manual.

Appendix 5: Response from UCAP Chair to the UCSF CAP Analyst dated May 7, 2009 regarding the authority of departments to set criteria for advancement which differ from the Academic Personnel Manual.

Appendix 6: Flyer for the 2008-2009 Distinguished Faculty Awards.

Appendix 7: Committee communication to VPAA dated December 10, 2008 regarding appraisals for junior faculty.

Appendix 8: Minutes from the CAP Retreat March 25, 2009.

Appendix 9: Request for Information from the Task Force Following Up on the Recommendations of the 2003-2005 Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion (June 22, 2009)

Appendix 10: CAP Meeting Attendance Record
January 22, 2009

COUNCIL OF VICE CHANCELLORS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR CROUGHAN
VICE PRESIDENT – AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES DOOLEY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR – LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY ALIVISATOS

Dear Colleagues:

Re: Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Policy 240 – Deans

Enclosed for systemwide review is proposed revised Academic Personnel Policy 240 – Deans. Proposed academic personnel policies on other faculty administrator titles such as Vice Provost, College Provost, and Department Chair will follow.

The Deans’ policy has been revised to provide greater clarity as to the role of the Dean on the campus as a high level academic administrator. The revised policy further seeks to clarify eligibility for service as a Dean, and provides detailed information on the terms of service, appointment and salary, conditions of appointment, benefits, and privileges for faculty serving as Dean. Deans who are Health Sciences Compensation Plan members will continue to be members of the Senior Management Group (SMG) and will not be subject to APM - 240.

Our goal is to implement the revised Deans’ policy by July 1, 2009. Implementing guidelines (including information on possible grandfathering existing Deans in the SMG program) will be issued at that time.

This is a systemwide review of a proposed revised personnel policy, and employees should be afforded the opportunity to review and comment. The proposal is online at: http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/review.html. Also enclosed is a model communication which can be used to inform non-exclusively represented employees affected by these proposed revisions. Please forward your comments to Principal Analyst Doris Lopez by March 31, 2009. Comments may be sent by e-mail if you wish to doris.lopez@ucop.edu. If you have any questions, please contact Associate Director Janet Lockwood at (510) 987-9499 or at janet.lockwood@ucop.edu.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert D. Grey
Interim Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs

Enclosures
cc: President Yudof
    Senior Vice President Vacca
    Acting Associate Vice President Cammidge
    Associate Vice President Nation
    Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel
    Executive Director Boland
    Executive Director Larsen
    Interim Executive Director Price
    Executive Director Winnacker
    Academic Personnel Directors
    Director Frazier
    Associate Director Lockwood
    Coordinator Capell
    University Counsel Van Houten
    Manager Donnelly
    Manager Okada
    HR Policies Analyst Bello
    Principal Analyst Lopez
Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel
Stephen Kahl, PhD, Chair

February 26, 2009

David Gardner, MD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the Proposed Modifications to APM 240 Regarding Academic Deans

Dear Chair Gardner,

As requested, on February 25, 2009, the Committee on Academic Personnel reviewed the Proposed Modifications to APM 240 (Deans) submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment.

The Committee recommends approval of these revisions.

The Committee also notes that this revised policy does not apply to those under the Health Sciences Compensation Plan.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Academic Personnel

Stephen Kahl, PhD, Chair
Russell Pieper, PhD, School Medicine, Vice Chair
Claire Brett, MD, School of Medicine
Jeanette Brown, MD, School of Medicine
James Cleaver, PhD, School of Pharmacy
Pat Fox, PhD, School of Nursing
Nola Hylton, PhD, School of Medicine
Arthur Miller, PhD, School of Dentistry
William Shore, MD, School of Medicine
Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel
Stephen Kahl, PhD, Chair

May 15, 2009

David Gardner, MD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the Proposed Policies Governing Furloughs or Salary Cuts

Dear Chair Gardner,

The UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel has met and thoroughly discussed the Proposed Policies Governing Furloughs or Salary Cuts submitted to the San Francisco Division for review and comment. After much discussion, the Committee reached a consensus on the following points:

1. Individual UC campuses must be given flexibility to deal with reductions in state funds caused by the President's declaration of a financial emergency. No "one size fits all" solution exists for all UC campuses. UCSF, in particular, is unique among the ten campuses for a variety of rather obvious reasons. This position is in accord with President Yudof's statements during his May 4th meeting with members of the Academic Senate Coordinating Committee.

2. The goal of any response to reductions in state funding is clearly to save resources equivalent to these cuts. Since more than 85% of the faculty on the UCSF campus receive their salaries from non-state funds, any salary cuts and/or furloughs that are not limited solely to state funds must not be made. It makes absolutely no sense to reduce salaries through direct cuts or furloughs if such reductions will not save anything in state funds. CAP believes very strongly that faculty in the Ladder Rank series at UCSF will support this position.

3. To the extent that faculty members in the In Residence, Clinical X and Health Sciences series draw a portion of their salaries from state funds, that fraction should be subject to appropriate reduction.

4. In addition to salaries, extramural funds pay for health insurance and other benefits. The consequences of furloughs and/or salary cuts that are not limited solely to state funds must also be considered with respect to benefits.

5. CAP believes that there is an emerging consensus among UCSF faculty that furloughs are preferable to salary cuts.

6. CAP is concerned about how merits and promotions of faculty will be handled in the event of a "financial emergency." If they will continue to be funded in a normal manner, there is no problem. If not, however, CAP must continue to perform its responsibilities in this regard and there must be written assurances that all merits and promotions made during the course of such an emergency declaration must be funded at its conclusion.
7. The circumstances under which the Academic Senate cannot be consulted in advance of furloughs and/or salary reductions are not defined in the proposed amendments, but clarification on this issue would be helpful.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Academic Personnel

Russell Pieper, PhD, School Medicine, Vice Chair
Claire Brett, MD, School of Medicine
Jeanette Brown, MD, School of Medicine
James Cleaver, PhD, School of Pharmacy
Pat Fox, PhD, School of Nursing
Nola Hylton, PhD, School of Medicine
Arthur Miller, PhD, School of Dentistry
William Shore, MD, School of Medicine
Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel
Stephen Kahl, PhD, Chair

November 5, 2008

Sally Marshall, PhD
Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
Campus Box 0652

Re: Magnum Syllabi as Evidence of Creative Activity

Dear Dr. Marshall

The Committee notes that faculty in the Clinical X series, and perhaps in other clinical endeavors, often create or contribute to expansive, substantially developed course syllabi. These sorts of syllabi are considered magna opera and can run to the many hundreds of pages.

For the purposes of review for academic advancement, CAP values contributions to such works as evidence of creative activity. If a candidate has created or contributed to these syllabi, the Committee would encourage the candidate to include reference to such in the packets submitted for review.

In these cases, the Committee on Academic Personnel recommends that candidates be mentored or notified by their Department Chair that they should describe in their submission materials the magnum syllabus (content, context, adoption etc.) and their role in its creation. CAP will consider this information in their evaluation of creative activity for those in the Health Sciences Clinical and Clinical X series, and possibly elsewhere if appropriate.

The Committee requests that this information be shared with the appropriate academic personnel staff so that faculty who may benefit will be informed.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Academic Personnel

Russell Pieper, PhD, School Medicine, Vice Chair
Claire Brett, MD, School of Medicine
Jeanette Brown, MD, School of Medicine
James Cleaver, PhD, School of Pharmacy
Pat Fox, PhD, School of Nursing
Nola Hylton, PhD, School of Medicine
Arthur Miller, PhD, School of Dentistry
William Shore, MD, School of Medicine

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

At the last meeting of UCAP, Dr. Peggy Walsh reported that the UCSF Divisional CAP, which reviews and evaluates research and creative work in accordance with APM 210-1.d(2) and APM 210-2.b(3), was taking issue with isolated departmental policies which require grant funding, generally in the form of an RO1 or equivalent, in order to be eligible for promotion to the Associate rank. UCSF CAP is actively working to eliminate any grant or funding requirement from departmental promotion policies.

APM 210-1 language includes the following “Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate’s published research or recognized artistic production in original architectural or engineering designs, or the like.”

Furthermore, for the purposes of this health sciences campus, UCSF CAP relies on APM-2.b(3), which includes further instruction on the evaluation of creative works. Nowhere in the APM is there a stated requirement that a candidate must have outside funding, only that they be creative and disseminate evidence of such activity.

It would benefit the UCSF CAP effort to bring certain departments into compliance with the APM if UCAP could prepare a statement to the divisional CAPs that the APM does not require grants or funding of any kind to be eligible for advancement or promotion. While dissemination of creative work may more often than not require the candidate to have some form of external funding, funding in and of itself is not a criterion for advancement, and should be disallowed as a requirement in departmental promotion policies.

I am sending this communication to you and UCAP at the request of the UCSF UCAP representative Peggy Walsh. Based on her experience in the UCAP meeting this week, she believes that UCAP may be receptive to this request. Would you please forward this request to Dr. Steven Plaxe on her behalf.

Thank you for your attention and consideration,

Wilson

_____________________________________________________________________________
Wilson Hardcastle
May 7, 2009

WILSON HARDCASTLE
UCSF ACADEMIC SENATE

Re: GRANT FUNDING REQUIREMENT

Dear Wilson,

The APMs are quoted correctly in the memo, and it is quite right to note that nowhere in the APM is grant funding specified as a necessary requirement for promotion to the Associate rank. It is also true that divisional Committees on Academic Personnel look to the individual departments to establish the criteria for advancement and promotion.

Bearing this in mind, the specifications of the APM may be regarded as a minimum level of requirement. If a particular department chooses to set a higher standard, they typically have been permitted to do so. Should a department choose to specify a particular set of criteria for promotion and advancement, our expectation would be that these criteria are explicitly defined, and that all faculty are informed of these criteria in writing. Best practices would include offering a program of education, and faculty development, directed at enabling departmental faculty to be advanced and promoted.

Sincerely,

 Steven Plaxe, Chair
 UCAP
THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Distinguished Faculty Awards

THE DISTINCTION IN TEACHING AWARDS

Conan MacDougall, PharmD, MAS, BCPS
Assistant Professor of Clinical Pharmacy
Department of Clinical Pharmacy
Category 1: At UCSF Five Years or Fewer
Introduced by Joseph Guglielmo, PharmD

Barbara Drew, RN, PhD, FAAN
Professor
Department of Physiological Nursing
Category 2: At UCSF More Than Five Years
Introduced by Melvin Scheinman, MD and Christine Miaskowski, RN, PhD, FAAN

THE DISTINCTION IN MENTORING AWARDS

Priscilla Hsue, MD
Assistant Adjunct Professor
Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology
Category 1: Assistant or Associate Rank
Introduced by Peter Ganz, MD

Lisa A. Bero, PhD
Professor
Department of Clinical Pharmacy
Category 2: Rank of Full Professor
Introduced by Ruth Malone, RN, PhD, FAAN

APRIL 8 COLEHALL NOON
Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel
Stephen Kahl, PhD, Chair

December 10, 2008

Sally Marshall, PhD
Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
Campus Box 0652

Re: Offering Career Appraisals for Non-Senate Assistant Faculty

Dear Dr. Marshall,

The Committee on Academic Personnel would like to recommend the involvement of the Faculty Development Program in encouraging departments across all UCSF schools to routinely conduct appraisals for faculty at the Assistant Professor rank. As you know, “pre-tenure” appraisals are required for junior faculty in the Academic Senate series (Ladder Rank, Clinical X, and In Residence). For the Adjunct series, appraisals at the Assistant rank are strongly suggested for those faculty interested in possible change in series to an Academic Senate appointment. However, Appraisals at the Assistant rank are not required for faculty in the Adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

From CAP’s perspective, faculty in the Adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series are valued members of the faculty and deserve equal mentoring and guidance regarding their career advancement at UCSF. However, reviews of many academic packets indicate that oftentimes such mentoring does not occur for faculty in these series, which is understandable for various reasons.

Nevertheless, it seems that systematic attention should be paid to the career development of non-Senate faculty members in order to insure that they also receive, as a matter of course, early guidance regarding their careers. This is especially important considering the frequency with which faculty initially appointed in these series subsequently move into Academic Senate series.

It is the understanding of the Committee that all junior faculty are required to have a mentor. CAP recommends that the Faculty Development Program encourage mentors and Department and/or Division Chairs to offer Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty at the Assistant level (with 50% or greater appointments) career development appraisals comparable to the Academic Review appraisals conducted by the Deans and CAP for junior faculty in the Senate series.

We realize that this may be seen by some as burdensome, and we would like to initiate a dialogue with you and the Director of the Faculty Mentoring Program to explore the advantages and disadvantages of this idea. We welcome your input and extend an invitation to discuss this further in a future committee meeting.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Academic Personnel

Stephen Kahl, PhD, Chair
Russell Pieper, PhD, School Medicine, Vice Chair
Claire Brett, MD, School of Medicine
Jeanette Brown, MD, School of Medicine
James Cleaver, PhD, School of Pharmacy
Pat Fox, PhD, School of Nursing
Nola Hylton, PhD, School of Medicine
Arthur Miller, PhD, School of Dentistry
William Shore, MD, School of Medicine

cc: Mitchell Feldman, Director, UCSF Faculty Mentoring Program
The Retreat for the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) was called to order by Chair Kahl on March 25, 2009 at 12:15 p.m. in room S-30. A quorum was present.

Presentation
Ned Hamilton gave an informational overview of the Advance System. Phase 1 will begin a phased roll out in late April. The project website can be found at: http://oaais.ucsf.edu/OAAIS/projects/facultyadvancement.html

Concerns of the Committee

Advancement to Step 6 and Above Scale Actions in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series
The Committee raised the concern of the general lack of Step 6 advancement actions from those in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, and the Step 6 criteria as it applies to the expected responsibilities of those in this series. Discussion followed.

It would be beneficial to have an APM section directly applicable to these concerns. This would be a long-term solution, and such an endeavor would likely have to originate from this CAP.

Schools may adjust the criteria for “national AND international” reputation to “national OR international” reputation as such is more relevant to pure clinician educators who would not have a significant record of dissemination.

If departments have specific criteria related to this Step 6 advancement, it is important that these criteria be in concert with the APM.

The Instructions to Letter Writers should be reviewed to directly address Step 6 advancement for Health Sciences Clinical Professors. The campus should also put forth specific criteria in writing to educate the schools, departments, and divisions. This will be included in the annual Call for Personnel Actions. CAP will look at the language in the Instructions to Letter Writers and the Call and make suggestions to the VPAA for distribution.

Importance of Appointments into the Correct Series
The Committee again raised the issue that new faculty appointments should be in to the series which best describes their activities and service to the University. The Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention
and Promotion recommended that faculty should not be appointed into an Adjunct series pending a period of review or security of funding with an anticipation to change to another series such as In Residence or Clinical X at a later time.

However, the Committee and those present discussed the necessities and merits of appointing new faculty into an Adjunct position even though they may be put forth for a change in series in the future or if their responsibilities better match another series. These factors include hiring sorely needed clinicians into the Adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical series who might better resemble a Clinical X position, those who need time to establish themselves and might later be put forth for a change in series, or candidates who have a choice of an Adjunct position or no position at all.

It was agreed that the original recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion did result in a great deal of faculty moving into the Clinical X series, and that by and large the troublesome practices have been successfully addressed.

**Discussion: Should On-Time Merits Be Automatic**

As a matter of process and efficiency, those present discussed the benefits and drawbacks to making it campus policy that every other on-time merit advancement for Full Professors (in any series) could occur automatically (without full OAP review) at the appropriate time with the Chair’s review, and with Chair’s discretion to put the candidate for full review or not.

It was agreed that the first merit for any new appointee should be at the discretion of the Department Chair and not requiring a full packet for review.

The Committee moved on to the related topic of the role of the Chair’s letter and its possible exclusion. It was suggested that the information in the Chair’s letter is often repetitive, and a “difference letter” or checklist explaining what has changed since the last action may provide the relevant information.

CAP prefers to retain the Chair’s letter which often presents information essential for its review. For CAP the Chair’s letter is more important than the Dean’s letter, which could be eliminated or greatly reduced. In the larger departments, administrators write the Chair’s letter. In the smaller schools, Chairs and Vice Chairs write the letters, and this represents a significant activity.

**Topic Summary**

CAP supported the proposal for alternating on-time merits at the Professor level to be at the discretion of the Department Chair, as well as first merits for new appointees.

CAP would like a letter from the Department Chair for actions submitted for CAP review. Actions which are not submitted for CAP review (e.g., on-time merits or accelerations or decelerations of one year) do not need a Chair’s letter. OAP may develop a checklist for Chairs to submit in lieu of a letter.

**Reiterated Request: If Departmental Criteria for Advancement Differ from the APM, Then These Policies Should Be in Writing and Copied to CAP for Review**

Those present discussed the ongoing complications in obtaining departmental criteria for advancement.

In the next Annual Call for Personnel Actions, OAP may include the following: “The Committee on Academic Personnel will review all actions in accordance with the criteria set forth in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). If the department has criteria other than those stated in the APM, they should be submitted for CAP review.”
CAP has been engaged in ongoing discussions as to where the authority lies in setting criteria more stringent than the APM. This topic is currently under discussion at UCAP as well. There is a significant issue of faculty equity involved in such uneven criteria at the department level. CAP is of the opinion that if there are department criteria which are different from the APM, they should be submitted to CAP for review. Discussion continued regarding certain departments enforcing criteria for advancement substantially more stringent than those required by the APM, and reasons for doing so.

**File Paperwork**
The Committee noted the following process items for discussion.

a. The preponderance of the letters of professional support should be drafted by faculty more senior than the candidate.
b. The Committee would be more confident that all items have been discussed if the items on the Checklist for New Faculty Appointments were all checked before signing.
c. The Chair’s letter should clearly indicate justification for accelerations. CAP was encouraged to send packets back if they feel the justification is not sufficiently addressed.
d. CAP does not require reprints or copies of textbooks or manuscripts, and no longer needs to be required. A list or description of the top five publications is sufficient. This change to the list of materials to be supplied can wait one year and be implemented with the Advance system.
e. The Role of the Chair’s Letter and Dean’s Comments (discussed earlier in the meeting).

**Concerns of Administration**

**Efficiencies in the Academic Review Process**
Those present discussed this item as relevant to previously listed items and had no further discussion.

**Valuing Inter-professional Education**
B. Alldredge led the Committee in a discussion regarding the perceived value among the faculty for the amount of energy and dedication to inter-professional education and the perceived lack of reward and respect in the advancement process and structure.

Diversity has been specifically identified as a valued activity with regards to advancement, and such should be done for inter-professional education. This could be expressed as a valued activity in the Annual Call and even in the Chair’s letter.

CAP will also include language in its recommendation to the VPAA expressing its valuation of inter-professional education activities, such as CAP currently does for diversity.

Faculty engaged in inter-professional education will be encouraged to disseminate their work in this regard as well.

**One Year Acceleration for Major Service (e.g. CAP, CHR, Admissions etc)**
D. Ferriero led the Committee in a discussion of valuing significant University service by a one-year acceleration. Concern was raised regarding faculty who are appointed to work-intensive committees because they are least burdened, and that in such cases the resulting service accounts for the standard service requirement and is not necessarily service worthy of acceleration.

After discussion, it was agreed that the Annual Call will include language encouraging Chairs to consider a one-year acceleration for faculty with three years of significant service to UCSF, specifically professional school Admissions committees, the Committee on Academic Personnel, the Committee on Human Research, and the Committee on Animal Research.
Stewardship Review Paragraph
S. Marshall and C. Leathers led a discussion regarding two new documents, revised language, and an electronic survey to be included in the revision of the stewardship review process. These materials will be submitted shortly for CAP to review, discuss, and comment as necessary.

Old Business
None.

New Business
Love all around.

Chair Kahl adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.
Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion
Kit Chesla, RN, DNSc, FAAN, Chair
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To:

The Office of Academic Personnel
Sally Marshall, PhD
Vice Provost Academic Affairs
Campus Box 0401

Cynthia Leathers
Director, Academic Personnel
Campus Box 0401

Associate and Vice Deans for Academic Affairs
Brain Alldredge, PharmD
Associate Dean Academic Affairs
School of Pharmacy
Campus Box 0622

Donna Ferriero, MD
Vice Dean Academic Affairs
School of Medicine
Campus Box 0410

Caroline Damsky, PhD
Associate Dean Academic Affairs
School of Dentistry
Campus Box 0430

Christine Miaskowski, RN, PhD, FAAN
Associate Dean Academic Affairs
School of Nursing
Campus Box 0604

With copy to:
Renee Binder, MD
Associate Dean Academic Affairs
School of Medicine
Campus Box 0984

With copy to:
Renee Navarro, MD, PharmD
Associate Dean Academic Affairs
School of Medicine
Campus Box 1371

The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Care of Wilson Hardcastle
Senior Analyst, Office of the Academic Senate
Campus Box 0764

RE: Request for Information; Follow Up to the Report of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion

The Academic Senate, working through its Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, has convened a new task force to follow up on the recommendations (approved by the Chancellor on July 25, 2005) put forth in the 2003 Report of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion. (The report is available at http://senate.ucsf.edu/2003-2004/v2-FRRP-Report.html.)
To this end, the new task force is requesting outcome responses and quantifiable data where possible to evaluate the means of implementation of the specific recommendations made in the 2003 Report of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion. This request for information is directed to the three related divisions named in the salutation above, but not all queries will pertain to all parties. However, all queries are presented together so that all may have a clearer understanding of the recommendations of the original task force and may better respond to this request for information. Please reply to the questions directed to your office either by campus mail or electronic mail to Wilson Hardcastle at campus box 0764 or to wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu.

Some of the 2003 recommendations have been paraphrased for brevity, others have been quoted in entirety for completeness and clarity.

Section A: Implementation of a Multifaceted Educational Program

**Recommendations A.1-5:** These recommendations pertain to new appointments (as well as current faculty advancement) and the discussion of the specific criteria and expectations of each series. The task force recommended the implementation of a new checklist, and that its completion be required for all new appointments. This checklist is referred to as the New Faculty Checklist and is titled “Important Points for Discussion Between Department Chairs/ORU Directors And New Faculty Appointees.”

**Question to the Committee on Academic Personnel:** Is this new checklist being utilized and required for all new appointments regardless of level? If not, which appointments are being excluded and why? Also, what are the consequences if a candidate’s file does not include the completed checklist?

**Related question to the Office of Academic Personnel and the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs:** Have search committees been educated regarding the requirements and criteria for the specific faculty series required for a position prior to engaging in the search or during the candidate evaluation process?

**Recommendation A.6:** Mentors should include information on series requirements as part of the overall advisory program.

**Question to the Office of Academic Personnel:** Over the past several years, what sort of, and how many, workshops and/or educational sessions have been offered for faculty, administrators and mentors regarding the criteria for appointment and advancement in the specific series?

**Question to the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs:** On an annual basis, how many sessions have you held with faculty, administrators and mentors regarding the criteria for appointment and advancement in each specific series?

**Recommendation A.7: Career Reviews** “How are faculty being made aware that, under existing procedures described in the APM, they may request a career review and a re-review of their academic personnel file at any time? Does this awareness-raising
education include situations where the faculty member believes that he/she may be in the wrong series.”

Question to the Office of Academic Personnel: What processes or policies are in place to educate faculty members of the opportunity for a career review?

Section B. Establishment of General Guidelines for New Appointments

Recommendation B.1. “The criteria for appointment and advancement in a given series should be determined by an individual faculty member’s actual duties and should be consistent with those described in the APM. Departments should not create additional criteria for appointment and promotion beyond those in the APM, although the department can provide more specific guidelines and details of the appointment expectations to the faculty member.”

Question to the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs: Are departments using criteria for appointment and advancement other than those set forth in the APM? If so, What departments are these? What are their criteria? and How are these criteria justified in light of the recommendations of the 2001-2005 task force of faculty and administrators and the endorsement of the Chancellor?

Question to the Committee on Academic Personnel: Does CAP use criteria for appointment and advancement other than those set forth in the APM? If so, what are these criteria? How does CAP respond to departments (if any) that apply additional criteria beyond the APM?

Recommendations B.2-4: 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 fits their career goals.

Question to the Office of Academic Personnel: Does it appear that hiring practices in the schools and departments are consistent with this recommendation? If not, what are the exceptions to this recommendation? What procedures does the Office have in place to see that this policy is being consistently implemented? How many faculty members fall under these exceptions? If data are not available, please provide an educated guess.

Question to the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs: Are hiring practices in your school consistent with this recommendation? If not, what are the exceptions to this recommendation? Are exceptions characterized by series, department, type of work or other general category?

Recommendation B.5. “In approving new appointments, CAP should pay special attention to the proposed duties of the new appointee and, if it appears that someone is being appointed in the wrong series, bring this to the attention of the appropriate associate/vice dean for Academic Affairs before acting on the file.”
Question to the **Committee on Academic Personnel**: How does CAP attend to this issue for new appointments? Are there data regarding how often CAP recommends an alternate series for a proposed appointment? Are these recommendations concentrated in any school(s) or department(s)? If so, where?

Question to the **Office of Academic Personnel**: What is the oversight for new appointments at levels not reviewed by CAP? How is OAP ensuring that these new faculty members are being appointed into the correct series?

Section C. Systematic Review of Existing Faculty in the Adjunct or Clinical Series

**Recommendation C.1**: “*At the time of review for merits and promotions of all existing faculty who hold Adjunct or [Health Sciences] Clinical titles, there should be a review of actual duties. If individual faculty are satisfactorily performing all of the duties expected of a Senate member in a particular series, then they should be transferred into the appropriate Senate series. The associate/vice deans for academic affairs should instruct the departments to consider these issues when preparing merit and promotion packets.*”

Question to the **Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs**: What processes have been used in the past five years to ensure this review of Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Faculty, and that their duties are appropriate to their appointed series? How many (or what fraction) of faculty in these series have been moved from non-Senate to Senate series? Are there any schools or departments where this policy does not seem to have been implemented?

**Recommendation C.2**: “*CAP should consider these issues when reviewing packets for those faculty it reviews and bring to the attention of the appropriate associate/vice dean for academic affairs through the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs cases of those individuals who should be considered for movement into a Senate series.*”

Question to the **Committee on Academic Personnel**: What are the processes CAP has used to ensure faculty, particularly those in the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, have appointments into the series consistent with their duties? What data can CAP provide that there have been appropriate changes in series in the last five years?

**Recommendation C.3**: “*The associate/vice deans for academic affairs should provide an annual report to CAP on the number of Clinical and Adjunct faculty reviewed each year and the number who are moved into an appropriate Senate series.*”

Question to the **Committee on Academic Personnel**: Has CAP been provided with these annual reports? If so, please provide copies of these reports.

**Recommendation C.4**: “*There should be a blanket waiver of national searches of all series changes of those individuals who are UCSF faculty satisfactorily performing all of the duties expected of a Senate member in a particular series as of the date that these recommendations are implemented through the time it takes to review all eligible faculty. This waiver should not apply to new appointments.*”
**Question to the Office of Academic Personnel:** Did this blanket waiver occur? If so, is it still in force? What effect did it have? How many individuals were affected by such a blanket waiver?

Section D: Identification by Campus Administration of Ways to Minimize the Financial Liability of Hiring People into the In-Residence Series

**Recommendation D.1:** “Administrators must find ways to financially accommodate the growth of academic units, while at the same time taking into account the well-being and future careers of the faculty who are hired, rather than shifting all the financial risk on to the junior faculty as a de facto condition of offering them a UCSF faculty position.”

**Question to the Associate/Vice Deans for Academic Affairs:** What actions have been taken to support the growth of academic units without requiring junior faculty to bear the burden of securing their own salaries?

**Recommendation D.2:** “Department chairs, in particular, should be held accountable for the practice of hiring people into the Adjunct or Clinical series purely for financial reasons when the positions being filled more appropriately call for an In-Residence appointment. This issue should be part of the stewardship review of department chairs and other administrators.”

**Question to the Office of Academic Personnel:** Is this issue expressly included in the materials to be provided and reviewed during the Stewardship Review process for Department Chairs?

**Recommendation D.3:** “This report should be transmitted to the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Budget (APB) to inform the committee of the problem of hiring faculty, strictly for financial reasons, in the Adjunct or [Health Sciences] Clinical series when the positions being filled call for In-Residence appointments. APB should take an active role in monitoring and discouraging this practice when they advise the Administration on budgetary matters.”

The report of the original task force was transmitted to the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, and the Committee’s active role in monitoring these recommendations is manifest in the formation and leadership of this new task force.

Thank you all for your consideration and cooperation. The New Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion requests that the responses to these queries be returned to the Office of the Academic Senate, care of Wilson Hardcastle (Box 0764 or wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu), by Thursday, August 27, 2009.
Sincerely,

The Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion
Kit Chesla, RN, DNSc, FAAN, Chair
Margaret Walsh, EdD
Stanton Glantz, PhD
Dan Bikle, MD, PhD
### Attendance Record 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Kahl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Pieper</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Brett</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Brown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-/X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cleaver</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X/X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Fox</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nola Hylton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Miller</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Shore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Kahl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Pieper</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Brett</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>In Nepal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Brown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/RSVP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cleaver</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Fox</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nola Hylton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Miller</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Shore</td>
<td>Lv early</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>SR mtg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

April 8: Award Ceremony