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MINUTES
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PRESENT:  G. Marshall (Chair), P. Green (Vice Chair), P. Bellefeuille, C. Calfee, C. Cheng, M. Dall’Era, A. Rudolph, J.A. Seago

ABSENT:  B. Lin (Clinical Representative)

PERMANENT GUESTS:  J. Sevelius (Adjunct Representative)

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (FW) was called to order by Chair Marshall on November 4, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. in room MUE 507. A quorum was present.

The minutes of September 30, 2010 were approved.

Chair’s Report
Chair Marshall reported on the following topics:

- The Committee’s Communication to Division Chair Fuentes-Afflick was appreciated and attached to the preliminary Divisional response to Academic Council. The formal response from the Division is due next week and will include information from the review conducted by the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget and the electronic survey of the faculty.

- While neither the responses from the divisions nor the Academic Council have yet been submitted to UCOP, President Yudof did send an e-mail message this week to the campuses expressing his likely recommendations. This message is posted to the UCOP web site under the section titled The future of UC Retirement Benefits. Discussion followed.

Report from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW)
Jean Ann Seago reported on the October 8 meeting of UCFW. Discussion centered included the letter from President Yudof to the Regents regarding PEB options. The Committee discussed local concerns and discussions within the medical center and clinical staff.

Agendas and minutes of UCFW meetings will be posted to the UCFW web page.

Analyst’s Report
The deadline for nominations for the Academic Senate Distinction In Teaching Awards is Wednesday, November 10 at 4:00 p.m. The deadline for nominations for the Distinction in Mentoring Awards is Thursday, November 18 at 4:00 p.m. Nomination forms for both awards are posted to the Academic Senate Web site.
Review of Report from the Senate Membership Task Force
The Committee reviewed the report from the system-wide Senate Membership Task Force (Attachment 1). UCSF, as well as the other campuses with health sciences professional schools, have been pushing for inclusion of fully-engaged Adjunct and Health Sciences faculty in membership of the Academic Senate for many years. There has been significant resistance from the undergraduate campuses and non-health sciences campuses which is evidenced in this report. Division Chair Elena Fuentes-Afflick has asked for several standing committees to draft a response to her to craft into a single and strongly supported response from the San Francisco Division.

From the system-wide call for comment:

The Task Force was asked to examine the essential principles underlying Academic Senate membership and assess the degree to which current practices reflect those principles. After reviewing the evolution of membership in the Academic Senate since its inception and surveying the contemporary range of practices in the University’s distinctive academic units, the Task Force made four specific recommendations as detailed in the transmittal letter from Task Force Chair Linda Bisson to Academic Council Chair Harry Powell:

- Do not extend the list of titles conferring membership in the Senate.
- Within the divisions and campuses, review the duties and responsibilities of non-Senate academic appointees and reclassify those who should be appointed in Senate into appropriate series, e.g. from “Clinical Professor” to “Professor of Clinical X”.
- Retain the historical separation of curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education.
- Revise the list of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.

Council received the report in April but elected to postpone the Senate’s review until Fall 2010 in order to ensure that all Senate agencies, especially in the divisions, would have ample time to consider its analysis and recommendations. Reviewers are asked to comment specifically on the recommendations in the context of the analysis underlying them.

Discussion followed and included the following topics:

- Distinguishing “Graduate” versus “Professional” students.
- Vagueness of historical precedent and intent.
- Historical decisions regarding Senate inclusion and exclusion was clearly ad hoc, and the Task Force was charged with devising a rational response. It seems to have found the situation too complex and therefore recommended doing nothing. The task force may have failed in its charge.
- Page 10 of the report: Adjunct title has changed significantly from its original intent, and persists at some campuses purely for financial reasons/limits on FTE, Clinical X and other purely financial concerns regardless of the faculty.
- Disagree with the conclusion that the creation of a new academic Senate series title would be too problematic. Precedent has been set recently with the creation of Health Sciences Clinical Professor (which is distinct from still in use Clinical Professor series)
- Small schools and departments must not be disadvantaged by being forced into funding commitments by switching large numbers of Health Sciences Clinical Professors into the Clinical X series.
- Abuse of the adjunct series is considerably less an issue on this campus as it is on other campuses, and the Adjunct series is a fully-engaged series doing what they are supposed to be doing (see the Report from the Academic Senate Task Force Following Up on the Task Force on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion)
- The odd historical distinction of graduate versus professional education.
- Unclear historical basis for series distinction should not result in maintaining the status quo today.
• Vice Chair Green referenced the recent article in Academic Medicine (Vol. 85, No. 6/June 2010) titled Issues and Challenges of Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty: The UC Davis School of Medicine Experience (Attachment 2)

Chair Marshall and Vice Chair Green will lead the creation of the first draft of the response from the Committee, and each faculty member is asked to submit a paragraph of their concerns, responses and /or criticisms either directly to the Chair (with a copy to the Analyst at Wilson.hardcastle@ucsf.edu) or via the Listserv for inclusion in the response from UCSF’s Faculty Welfare.

Responses should be submitted no later than Friday, November 19 so that we have time to craft a final response by the December 17 due date.

To send comments to the entire committee via the Committee on Faculty Welfare Listserv, address messages to Fac-Wel@listserv.ucsf.edu. Chair Marshall may be reached gw.marshall@ucsf.edu.

Old Business
None

New Business
None

Chair Marshall adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.