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This task force was charged with reviewing the implementation of the Report of the Academic Senate Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion¹ (AKA the Armitage Report, Attachment 1), a joint faculty and administration task force. After additional review by the Academic Senate, deans, and the Chancellor’s Shared Governance Working Group, these recommendations were adopted by the Chancellor on July 25, 2005.

The Armitage Report’s conclusions and recommendations fell into three broad categories:

1. A substantial fraction of faculty in the Adjunct and (Health Sciences) Clinical series, about 40%, had responsibilities and quality of work essentially the same as Senate faculty in the In Residence or Clinical X series.

2. Procedures are necessary to review existing faculty and change these appointments into the appropriate Senate series.

3. Policy changes and a combination of individual education and institutional monitoring are necessary to ensure that this situation does not recur.

This task force was also charged with evaluating increases in faculty numbers since the Armitage Report was released in December 2003, identifying possible sources of growth and potential negative impacts of such growth on the performance of existing faculty roles.

This task force consists of the following members: Kit Chesla of the School of Nursing, Chair of the task force and 2008-2009 chair of the UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Budget, Dan Bikle, former chair of the School of Medicine Faculty Council and of the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate, Stanton Glantz of the School of Medicine, member of the original Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion and the Chancellor’s Shared Governance Working Group, former chair of the UCSF Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, former chair of the UC Systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget and originator of the request for this review, and Margaret Walsh of the School of Dentistry and former chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel and 2008-2009 division delegate to the Systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel.

This task force sent a request for information about steps taken to implement the Armitage Report recommendations to the Office of Academic Personnel and the Vice Provost Academic Affairs, the

¹ The Academic Senate Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion was formed in 2002 and issued its report in December of 2003. This report was transmitted by then Academic Senate Chair Len Zegans to the Chancellor’s Shared Governance Working Group in January 2004, and endorsed by the Chancellor on July 25, 2005.
Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel, and the Vice or Associate Deans for Academic Affairs in each of the four schools. This Request for Information and the responses from these agencies are attached to this report (Attachment 2).

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force finds that the second category of recommendations mentioned above was implemented with reasonable fidelity, but there has been some backsliding to previous practices, and old problems of junior faculty being inappropriately appointed in Adjunct and Clinical series when, based on actual duties, a Senate appointment would be appropriate are re-emerging. The primary evidence for this conclusion is the fact that the proportion of Senate faculty, which transiently increased after the initial implementation of the recommendations of Armitage Report, has fallen to below 50% (Figure 1). As of 2008, only 48.8% of current full time UCSF faculty were appointed in Senate series. The percentage of Adjunct members relative to the full faculty notably began to drop after 2004, and continued to do so in 2005 and 2006 (when the recommendations of the Armitage report to reassess faculty then currently holding these appointments began taking effect throughout the campus). However, the proportion of Adjunct faculty on campus began to rise again in 2007 and 2008. This rise suggests that the practices sought to be remedied by the recommendations of the Armitage Report are returning.

Figure 1: Faculty Composition by Series 2004-2008

Based on the Armitage Report’s estimate that about 40% of faculty in Adjunct and (Health Sciences) Clinical series were doing work indistinguishable from Senate faculty, we would estimate that if all of those faculty were appointed into the Academic Senate series appropriate for their responsibilities, about 70% of UCSF faculty should then hold appointments in Senate series (50% of current Senate faculty plus 40% of the 50% who are non-Senate faculty). While the Task Force was reluctant to set any specific numerical targets for the fraction of faculty that hold Senate rank appointments, it does believe that this calculation can serve as a guide for future policy implementation.

In addition to the findings and recommendations described below, the Task Force notes that there is a need for a renewed commitment to implementing the consensus recommendations of the TRRRP as approved by the Chancellor in 2005.
Improving Faculty Education About the Appointment and Promotion Process

The recommendations directed at ensuring that faculty at all levels were educated about faculty series, appointed into appropriate series and given the right to ask for a reevaluation of their series appointment focused on several actions. (Recommendations A.1-7)

At the time of initial hire, department/division chairs are to explicitly discuss the duties of the position and the duties of faculty series into which new appointees were being hired. This discussion is to be documented in writing via the “Checklist” (Important points for discussion between Department Chairs and ORU Directors and new Faculty Appointees). This practice appears to be widely followed. Both the Office of Academic Personnel (OAP) and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) monitor packets for inclusion of the signed checklist.

The Office of Academic Affairs has produced a detailed search and recruitment toolkit on their website, which is given to all Search committees. Continuing efforts are needed to ensure that search committees are not only aware of these resources but that they also adhere to the guidelines set forth therein.

In Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy, administrative oversight to ensure that new faculty are appointed into the appropriate series is in place. For each new hire, job descriptions are reviewed for match to the series being proposed by Associate Dean or Dean. This level of review is not occurring in the School of Medicine. A similar system of checks and balances is needed in Medicine to ensure that academic series is consistent with the job descriptions that are developed for all new appointments.

The Armitage Report recommended that mentors take an active role in educating faculty about appropriate series. Multiple and repeated workshops conducted by OAP and by Associate Deans in all schools, have been held to support mentors and mentoring facilitators in appropriate knowledge about the varied series requirements. These sessions, which are also a prominent part of the Faculty Information and Welcoming Week program offered annually, have been widely publicized and well attended. Most of these informational sessions are open to faculty at all levels.

The Armitage Report recommended that faculty be 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. While this information may be included in the informational sessions highlighted above, it is not clear how it is otherwise being systematically communicated to all potentially affected faculty. Two routes to disseminate this information are through the formal mentor program, via communication to the mentoring facilitators, and by highlighting this option in the Annual Call. Faculty in Adjunct and Clinical series should be routinely informed at the time of each review for merit or promotion of the criteria for appointment in the corresponding Senate series and that they have the option to request a formal review of their appointment for appropriate series.

Implementing Policies to Ensure that Faculty are Appointed and Promoted in Appropriate Series

A second set of recommendations from Armitage Report focused on criteria for appointment or advancement. The key recommendation (B1) reads: “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.”

It appears that most schools follow the APM guidelines in establishing appointments and in reviewing files for merit and promotion. In the School of Pharmacy additional guidelines have been developed, to clarify the criteria for faculty. These additional guidelines were submitted for review to CAP before being
implemented to ensure that they were in alignment with APM guidelines. Requests for information from departments about additional guidelines for advancement have not been completely answered. There are, however, still departments that employ APM guidelines as a floor and invoke additional criteria for advancement (particularly grant funding) before approving an appointment to a Senate series, merit or promotion.

The rules of the APM should not be considered a floor for advancement criteria, but rather the standard. If documents clarifying the application of the APM in the context of specific schools are developed (as in the case of the School of Pharmacy), these criteria should be reviewed and approved by CAP for compliance with the APM. The Chancellor should direct deans and department chairs to withdraw all supplemental criteria for appointment and promotion and base decisions solely on the standards in the APM.

Variable practices prevail about initially hiring faculty into the appropriate series. In most schools, faculty are hired into the series which fit their career goals and in which they will remain. However, in Medicine, many junior faculty are hired into clinical or adjunct series, funded by NIH K awards (or similar awards from other sources), “to allow them time to differentiate” into research or clinical tracks. Formal searches are only conducted at the point of promotion to Associate level, at which point faculty are appointed into the appropriate series. The number of faculty who have been hired under these conditions is not known, but the practice appears to be normative in some departments. In other departments, faculty are initially hired into the clinical series, and are expected to support portions of their salaries via clinical revenues, until such time as they demonstrate research productivity and can be promoted to another series (In Residence or Clinical X). Hiring practices that purposefully use initial appointments in the Adjunct or Clinical Series as a testing ground for faculty productivity before transferring the faculty member to a series that confers membership in the Academic Senate is inconsistent with the previously agreed upon recommendation that faculty be hired into the series which matches the duties they are to perform. Deans and the Chancellor should see that, with very limited exceptions, this practice should end.

Some exceptions to programmatic-need hiring move research activities forward, support the educational mission of the University beyond the fellowship stage and may increase the candidate’s likelihood of attaining prestigious employment elsewhere. The task force was divided on the extent to which exceptions should be granted to consider junior faculty positions as supporting the educational mission of the University beyond the fellowship stage by appointing individuals as Adjunct Assistant Professors. Some members believed that such appointments were appropriate on a very limited basis and others believed that they were inconsistent with the Armitage Report and the UCSF Strategic Plan. Despite this lack of complete consensus, this task force recommends that such exceptions, while discouraged, be governed by written policy. To be consistent with the campus Strategic Plan, such exceptions should be limited at the school level to fill needs in specific programmatic areas in accordance with the school and department’s strategic plans for department and faculty growth. (They should not be routinely granted to any fellow who can obtain a K award.) Deans should have to approve such exceptions on a case-by-case basis and based on specific justifications by department chairs.

Armitage Report recommendations (B2-4) addressed career trajectories of new faculty. Regarding whether faculty are hired initially into the series that suits their responsibilities, and in which they will likely remain, there are no hard trend data. (Once promotion files are electronic, transitions into and out of series will be easier to track.) Based on earnings records, in August 2009 322 of 1,922 core faculty were appointed in the Adjunct series. The School of Medicine reported that in the SOM from January 2004 through August 2009 there were 156 instances of faculty who were at one time paid as Adjuncts who were subsequently paid as faculty in another series (Clinical, Clinical X, In Residence or Ladder.) The School of Nursing reports three changes in series since 2004. The School of Pharmacy reports two. According to CAP records, CAP reviewed three changes in series from Adjunct or (Health Sciences) Clinical to Senate series between 2004 and 2008 in the School of Dentistry.
The Committee on Academic Personnel in particular has been acutely attentive to the issue of hiring and promotion into appropriate series. CAP reports that it carefully assesses the appropriateness of the series for new hires, as well as for faculty who are brought forth for review or promotion. CAP recommends a Change of Series as part of its review if the duties documented in faculty member’s CV and academic review packet are not aligned with their current series. CAP provided data that suggests the number of Changes in Series vary by year but are accelerating in number and percentage of the files reviewed (2004-05: 13%; 2005-06: 12%; 2006-07: 14.7%; 2007-08: 14.6%; and 2008-09: 20.2%). CAP should continue to be vigilant in monitoring this issue, particularly for all new appointments, and continue to suggest changes in series for initial appointments when appropriate.

Systematic Review of Existing Faculty in Adjunct and Clinical Appointments

The third major Armitage Report recommendation was for a systematic review of existing faculty in the adjunct or Health Sciences Clinical series, to determine the appropriateness of these series appointments. This review appears to have been largely accomplished, and the task force applauds the exceptional work of the Office of Academic Personnel and CAP in addressing this concern.

ISSUES RELATED TO FACULTY GROWTH

The recommendations of the Armitage Report did not expressly address concerns regarding faculty growth as a separate issue, but was concerned with inappropriate growth within certain series. This task force, however, was also charged to review trends in faculty growth both in light of the recommendations of the Armitage Report and in light of the Strategic Plan. It appears that (1) faculty growth has occurred, and (2) it seems to be doing so regardless of programmatic goals or the Armitage Report.

Based on the numbers reported by the Office of Academic Personnel, the faculty grew from 1,840 members in 2001 to 2,051 members in 2004, an increase of 11.5% for that period, or an average annual rate of growth 2.86%. During the four year period after the issuance of the Armitage report, the faculty grew from 2,051 members in 2004 to 2,336 members in 2008, a rate of faculty growth of 13.9%, or average annual rate of growth 2.78%. While the total number of faculty decreased in 2006 (to 2,107 members), the growth in faculty numbers resumed in 2007. The composition of the faculty for these years by series is presented in Figure 2, and Tables 1, 2 and 3.

Figure 2: Total Numbers of Faculty 2001-2008
While the number of Clinical X faculty grew by 89 persons during 2004-2008, the Clinical X series has the fewest number of appointees (currently only 288) and the relatively small population of Clinical X faculty gives rise to a somewhat misleading average annual growth rate of 8.94% for this period. Setting aside the Clinical X figures, the greatest growth occurred in the non-Academic Senate Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical series, which grew by 3.06% and 3.04% respectively from 2004-2008. Appointments to the Ladder Rank and In Residence series have remained relatively stable over this time period, expanding at 0.59% and 1.22%, respectively.

Table 1: Faculty Numbers by Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Rank</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Residence</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical X</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Clinical</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>2336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Faculty Growth Rates, Annual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Rank</td>
<td>-1.08%</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>-0.81%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>-1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Residence</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical X</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
<td>17.06%</td>
<td>10.55%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>9.63%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>-1.93%</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Clinical</td>
<td>-4.44%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
<td>-7.45%</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
<td>7.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
<td>-1.40%</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Data sets prior to 2001 were unavailable.)

Table 3: Average Annual Faculty Growth Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Rank</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Residence</td>
<td>3.93%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical X</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
<td>8.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Clinical</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall rate of faculty growth has not significantly decreased since the Armitage Report, and the current rate of faculty growth is not sustainable without parallel strategic growth of faculty support infrastructure. The strain on campus resources is seen in obvious ways such as access to parking, childcare facilities, and teaching, laboratory and clinical space. This level of unfocused faculty growth has put an enormous strain on administrative resources such as human resources, facilities, contracts, grants, advancement processing by Academic Affairs, academic review by CAP and department-level administration. These stresses have a campus-wide impact, and opportunistic hiring practices in one department can negatively stress other departments and even the entire system.

As part of the UCSF Strategic Plan, Point Six of the Strategic Direction (page 13) is *Promoting a Supportive Work Environment*. The vision here stated is to “Provide a supportive and effective work environment to attract and retain the best people and position UCSF for the future.” The first goal to achieve this vision is to “Recruit, mentor and retain the highest-caliber faculty, staff, students, residents,
fellows and postdoctoral scholars.” These statements support the practice of planned recruitment and appointment over opportunity hiring (i.e., offering Adjunct appointments to any fellow who can win a K award). It also argues against the practice of creating Adjunct positions on an ad hoc basis, or granting Adjunct appointments to several candidates and then waiting to see who ultimately “makes the grade.” The Task Force would like to reiterate the Armitage Report recommendation that “Hiring people into the wrong series for purely financial reasons is an unacceptable administrative practice.”

While the inappropriate use of the Adjunct series has weakened the faculty’s position in shared governance, so has the overall unrestrained and non-strategic rise in the faculty numbers. While the San Francisco Division values its Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Faculty, they are not members of the Academic Senate. As stated earlier, the level of faculty with Senate appointments has been hovering at or below 50% of the total faculty since 2004. Also, as noted above, based on actual duties one would expect the fraction of the faculty with Senate appointments to be around 70%.

Regarding faculty growth, the task force recommends:

1. Unrestrained growth stresses every part of the system at UCSF and must be checked by clear and enforceable policies.

2. New faculty appointments and faculty growth should, with very few exceptions, be in direct response to programmatic needs.

3. Checks and balances on growth should happen at the level of the deans, and any growth should have a clear strategic purpose, rather than simply adding promising postdoctoral fellows to the faculty because they can secure extramural funding.
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