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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 their 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?

This checklist is required to be included in all appointment packets, and to be signed by both the Department Chair and the Candidate. There have been extremely rare instances (less than five last year as memory serves) when the checklist has been missing from an appointment packet. If the candidate is a new hire and there is cause for concern, CAP may return the packet to the Office of Academic Personnel and require that the file be returned with the new hire checklist, else CAP may note the absence of the checklist in its recommendation to the Vice Provost Academic Affairs. If the candidate is an experienced faculty member changing series and all else seems to be clear and in order, CAP may not delay the change in series pending the submission of the checklist but will note the absence of the checklist to the VPAA. Again, the instance of a missing checklist is extremely rare.

**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?

**OAP:** There is a new search tool kit that is given to search committees that contains all relevant information.

**SOD:** Search committees have not been routinely educated regarding requirements and criteria for specific faculty series. However, the Associate Dean reviews all Recruitment Plans, which are required to contain descriptions of the position and the proposed series. If there is incompatibility between the job description and the proposed series,
the Associate Dean contacts the Division/Dept Chair and the Search chair to discuss and make the job description and proposed series compatible.

SOM: This is handled through Office of Academic Personnel.

SON: The search committees work from a position description, which, in the School of Nursing, has been developed in consultation with Department Chairs and the Dean – it would be during that consultation that questions, if any, would arise about the faculty series matching the position needs.

SOP: The Associate Dean reviews all search plans (e.g., position description, search committee membership) and will occasionally consult with the department chairperson to ensure that the faculty series matches the position description and the department’s needs. Historically, the Associate Dean would meet with each search committee to discuss series requirements and diversity issues. As a regular practice, this stopped during the “Search Ambassador” program (Harvey Brody’s program). It is now done on an intermittent and less formal basis (e.g., it may involve a telephone call between the Associate Dean and the search committee chair; or, if the search chair has chaired other search committees (with satisfactory outcome), the discussion may not take place).

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?

Each year there are numerous sessions (4 this year) held during FIWW. In addition we have held faculty development sessions on this topic.

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?

SOD: The Associate Dean holds one meeting annually with all department Academic Personnel staff and MSO’s in the School. This is devoted to new and current faculty advancement policies, and plans for the coming year. The Associate Dean offers annually to meet with Chair and Division Chairs of the four School of Dentistry departments. Over the course of the last three years, the Associate Dean has met with the division/department chairs of the two large departments in the School to discuss advancement policies, and have scheduled quarter break lunch time sessions with interested faculty from our largest department (keep in mind that our whole School is smaller than several departments in the SOM). I also meet individually with faculty on request, to discuss series descriptions and advancement criteria in the context of their career development goals.

SOM: We have multiple workshops aimed at faculty at junior, mid and senior levels each year.

SON: The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Research have had periodic meetings with various series faculty to review CV preparation, expectations for merit and promotion, and the like. These have been well attended. In addition, the
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs meets individually with faculty and collectively with department chairs with regard to criteria for specific series.

SOP: The School holds orientation sessions for newly-hired faculty approximately every two years (last held November 2008). At this session, the Associate Dean reviews the advancement criteria for the faculty series. On an ad hoc basis, the Associate Dean also provides counsel to individual faculty and to department chairs (re: appointment/advancement criteria) when it is requested and/or seems to be needed. The Associate Dean is a member of the Dean's Leadership Group – and provides annual updates to chairs on advancement issues (e.g., those highlighted in the Annual Call or that have arisen within the School over the past year). One of the three departments in the School (Clinical Pharmacy) requests that all newly-hired faculty meet with the Associate Dean for a one-on-one session related to academic advancement. The Dean's Office also encourages faculty participation in Faculty Information & Welcoming Week each year (where appointment/advancement criteria are reviewed).

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?

SOD: School of Dentistry departments are not using criteria for appointment and advancement other than those set forth in the APM.

SOM: Departments use the APM as the floor. Many departments have set up specific criteria for advancement and promotion that are within the guidelines. We have asked
departments to send us their criteria. So far only a minority of departments have responded.

SON: The School of Nursing uses the criteria set forth in the APM.

SOP: Are departments using criteria for appointment and advancement other than those set forth in the APM? Yes – one department has developed appointment/promotion guidelines that are intended to supplement the APM information.

What departments are these? Department of Clinical Pharmacy
What are their criteria? Included as an attachment along with this report
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? These ‘guidelines’ are intended to clarify the APM and are felt to be consistent with APM appointment/advancement criteria. They have previously been submitted to CAP for review.

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?

CAP relies on the criteria set forth in the APM for academic evaluation. APM 210-6 indicates that faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series should be evaluated regarding University and public service and research and creative work according to campus guidelines. At UCSF, each school has written guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series and these have been provided to CAP for review and consultation.

If a department has criteria more onerous than those set forth in the APM, that level of review takes place at the department and school, where a candidate may not advance until such criteria are met. Thus, CAP is usually unaware that such additional criteria have been applied to a specific candidate. At the level of CAP review, CAP relies on the APM (as instructed by the APM).

CAP is currently considering the authority of departments to set criteria for advancement which differ from those in the APM (e.g. grant or funding requirements). CAP requested clarification from the Chair of UCAP last year, however the matter was not discussed by UCAP nor did UCAP provide an official response. In the 2009-2010 academic year, UCSF CAP plans to request that this discussion appear on the UCAP agenda and that a formal opinion be provided.

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?

Yes and no.

If not, what are the exceptions to this recommendation?
Most exceptions seem to be of the nature of a choice between being appointed in a non-Senate series or not appointed at all. In addition, many new faculty have not clearly defined their career goals.

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.

No guess, it is all I can do to review the packets – no time to count different categories, no electronic data base as yet.

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?

SOD: In the School of Dentistry, faculty are for the most part hired into the series that best fits their career goals and department needs. One modification of this relates to hiring DDS/PhD faculty whom we feel have not had enough time to get their research programs started. In those cases (about 4 in the past 5 years), the Department in question has initially hired them into the Adjunct series for 2 years, with very low clinical obligations, to give them protected time to develop their research. The intention from the beginning is to then transfer them to the Clinical X, in Residence or Ladder Rank series. There is no School or Department policy to use the non-Senate series as testing grounds.

SOM: Many faculty in the junior level who are trainees here enter as K awardees and are placed in clinical or adjunct series to allow them time to differentiate. They are then searched at the associate level for the appropriate series. This is not true for basic science departments who hire at the assistant level into tenure track series.

SON: We believe that hiring practices are consistent with this recommendation.

SOP: Yes. In the School of Pharmacy, it is the practice to hire faculty into the series which best fits their career goals and the department's needs. We do not use non-Senate series’ for “interim appointments” before deciding which series best suits the faculty member.

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?
The Committee on Academic Personnel carefully reviews the intended activities of new appointments in accordance with their appointed series. CAP does not hesitate to recommend modification of an appointment should the candidate expectations differ from the characteristics of their proposed appointed series. CAP also pays strict attention to series-appropriateness in all reviews, not only appointments or proposed changes in series.

There is no specific data regarding how frequently CAP recommends modification to a proposed series or makes an additional recommendation to a Department Chair that a faculty member consider a change in series. Anecdotally, there is no particular concentration to any school or department.

**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?

*Standard review process, see above.*

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?

**SOD:** There are no specific documented processes to assure that the duties of faculty in non Senate series are appropriate to their series. However, when packets are reviewed, the Associate Dean has on occasions contacted the Department/Division Chair and the faculty member to discuss such discontinuity when it is apparent. In one case, this action has resulted in a change in series recommendation, without a search, since the faculty member had been performing at a level consistent with the Senate series since her hire date. In two other cases, Change in Series actions were initiated by a Department when the duties of the faculty members changed significantly and FTE became available.

**SOM:** We use the merit process to keep track of this. We also hold “appraisals” in our office to assist faculty who would not otherwise receive an appraisal (non-Senate).

As of 08/20/09, there are 1,922 Core Faculty, of which 322 are Adjunct. Using the actual earnings records, since Jan 2004, there were 156 instances when faculty who had been paid in Adjunct title codes were subsequently paid in Non-Adjunct (Clinical, Clinical X, In Res, and Ladder) title codes.

Here is the count of those change in series by department:
SON: Each faculty member is reviewed upon opportunity for merit or advancement. We have had non-Senate faculty members apply, and be selected, for ladder rank appointments. They then perform to the requirements of their new position.

SOP: Faculty duties are routinely reviewed at the times of advancement (or 5-year review) to ensure that they are appropriate for the current series. If there appears to be a disconnect between series and duties (which is uncommon), these cases are discussed first with the department chairperson. In the past five years, we have had one faculty member move from a non-Senate series to a Senate series (H.S. Clinical to Professor of Clinical X). This individual applied for an open position in the Clinical X series (vacated by a retiree) and was ultimately selected for this position. There has been one change from a salaried Senate appointment to a salaried non-Senate series (Ladder rank to Adjunct). This was done at the request of the Chair and the faculty member and was based on a change in the faculty member’s career direction (to a teaching focus).

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?

In every review, CAP pays specific attention to faculty activities and accomplishments with
regards to their appointed series. If faculty in any series, not just Adjunct or Health Sciences
Clinical, have responsibilities or accomplishments more suitable to another academic series,
say In Residence or Clinical X, CAP makes a recommendation for a change in series, or that a
candidate consider a change in series should they be interested in doing so. This of course
works in the converse, and CAP may make a recommendation for an In Residence faculty
member to change to Adjunct should they exhibit a specific imbalance in their activities, or
perhaps a Clinical X faculty member may be recommended to consider an appointment into the
Health Sciences Clinical Professor series should that be more in line with their interests,
activities, and accomplishments.

The number of proposed actions involving a Change in Series over the past five years is as
follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>'08-'09</th>
<th>'07-'08</th>
<th>'06-'07</th>
<th>'05-'06</th>
<th>'04-'05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes In Series Actions</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Files Reviewed</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken as a percentage of total files reviewed, the percentage of files resulting in changes in
series actions has increased somewhat in '06-'07 and '07-'08 and substantially this past year.
We attribute the latter increase to CAP’s increased awareness and diligence in making sure that
faculty are located in series consistent with their duties and responsibilities.

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.

Neither the Committee on Academic Personnel nor the Office of the Academic Senate is in
possession of any annual reports from the associate or vice deans of academic affairs regarding
the review of Health Sciences Clinical or Adjunct faculty for appropriateness of series
appointment.

Note from the SON: We have not made such reports, nor would we wish to start making these
reports, given the current constraint on all resources.

Note from the SOP: No – these reports have not been explicitly generated, but they could be
using CAP and/or School data. Every faculty member evaluated by the Dean’s office for
advancement (or 5-year review) is “reviewed”. The numbers of series changes are discussed
above (in response to C.1.) and could be cross-checked using CAP data.

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? Yes.

If so, is it still in force? No.

What effect did it have? Many faculty changed series.

How many individuals were affected by such a blanket waiver? Please see academic affairs website for numbers of faculty in each series over the last 5 years.

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?

SOD: Wherever possible, new junior faculty hires are given support packages that include salary support for an initial period, and start up costs to enable research programs to be supported. In some cases these packages are a collaborative effort between departments and even Schools. However, finances are extremely tight, and we are fully aware that in some cases Departments and the School cannot afford generous start up packages. However, the School does not deliberately hire faculty into non Senate series purely for financial reasons if the faculty member’s qualifications are more appropriate for a Senate series position.

SOM: We offer an award to junior women faculty interested in translational research. Otherwise, these financial burdens must be negotiated by Department Chairs with the Dean.

SON: At the moment, ‘financial risk’ falls on the departments and central academic affairs, as administrative resources have been consistently been reduced, while faculty numbers consistently grow. Each recruitment of a junior faculty has been discussed within a department, and at the school level, to determine what kind of “start-up” package can be offered; what kind of released time can be accommodated, and which mentor(s) are best to guide the new faculty. No one has made this kind of assessment of the administrative needs within each department, school, and on campus, in order to support this growth.

SOP: In the School of Pharmacy, the Dean and department chairperson have a discussion related to each faculty recruitment. In some instances (primarily, basic science recruitments), the start-up packages provide funds that may be used for salary support. One or more departments, and one or more Dean’s Offices may contribute funds to these start-up packages, depending upon the specifics of the recruitment. The School has been mindful to assure that junior faculty members are not overly stressed by the need to bring in funds to support their salaries. We use the In-Residence and Adjunct series’ relatively sparingly.
**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?

*That sentence does not appear in the documents, but appropriate faculty review is a significant part of a stewardship review of a chair.*

**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