Summary of UCSF Committee Responses to the Report of the UC Systemwide Task Force on Senate Membership (submitted April 15, 2010)

For discussion at the January 10, 2011 Coordinating Committee meeting.
Objective: formulate a Division response.

The San Francisco Division of the University of California Academic Senate is currently reviewing the April 15, 2010 Report of the Task Force on Senate Membership. It was discussed at length by faculty members serving on the following committees and faculty councils:

- Committee on Committees
- Committee on Academic Personnel
- Committee on Faculty Welfare
- Clinical Affairs Committee
- Schools of Dentistry Faculty Council
- School of Medicine Faculty Council
- School of Nursing Faculty Council
- School of Pharmacy Faculty Council

TASK FORCE REPORT OVERVIEW
The UC Systemwide Task Force on Senate Membership was charged with reviewing 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 its April 15, 2010 report:

1. Do not extend the list of titles conferring membership in the Academic Senate.
2. 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”.
3. Retain the historical separation of curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education.
4. Revise the list of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.

UCSF INFORMATION
- The UCSF faculty includes approximately 2,277 members, 990 (43%) of whom hold non-Academic Senate titles (341 Adjunct and 649 HS Clinical).
- The last major Academic Senate discussion of the Senate/non-Senate issue was summarized in the 2003 Task Force Report on Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Promotion (sometimes referred to as the “Armitage Report” in reference to the Task Force Chair Gary Armitage). That task force took more than a year to survey department chairs, faculty members, faculty publications and campus hiring practices, building on information gathered in a 2000 survey of clinician scientists at UCSF. The Task Force’s recommendations resulted in changes in hiring practices and the re-classification of a significant number of faculty from non-Senate to Senate series.
SUMMARY OF UCSF ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE RESPONSES TO DATE

Task Force Recommendation #1: Do not extend the list of titles conferring membership in the Senate.

→ Seven committees disagree with the recommendation, one committee offers cautionary support (SON Faculty Council).

COC – oppose with recommendations
1. Allow individual campuses to determine which faculty series could be appointed as voting members of campus committees and serve in positions of faculty leadership on that campus, with these decisions and recommendations having full force when passed up to the Systemwide Senate.
2. That the Systemwide Senate Bylaws be changed so that Adjunct and HS Clinical faculty can serve on Systemwide committees (including in leadership positions) in those areas where they can provide appropriate expertise and experience or when the committees deal with issues that directly affect their personal welfare as members of the faculty.
3. That UCOC and the Systemwide Senate develop a new formula for assigning Academic Assembly seats that provides a reasonable voice for all full time faculty.

CAP - disagree
UC Systemwide Academic Senate membership rules should be formulated to maintain a membership that includes all faculty members who are charged with fulfilling the Regental Standing Orders. It is improper to exclude faculty who are actively fulfilling the University’s mission, especially those from series with proportionately greater representation of women and under-represented minorities. The task force was clearly influenced by the fear that inclusion of additional faculty from professional schools might have a negative influence on undergraduate campuses. However, as they suggest, self-determination of curricula at undergraduate campuses can be protected by separating undergraduate and professional school Senate responsibilities. We agree that this is a reasonable protection and efficiency.

Committee on Faculty Welfare - oppose
- Recommendation #1 does not reflect the historical spirit of inclusiveness that provides Senate membership to faculty engaged in the essential activities of the University, namely instruction, research, and professional service to the University. Faculty Welfare recommends that Senate membership should be conferred on faculty engaged in the scope of essential activities of the University.
- The status quo exclusion of faculty in the Adjunct Professor series goes against these fundamental principles, and does not reflect the de facto status of Adjunct faculty, many of whom are long term and fully committed faculty members.

School of Dentistry Faculty Council - oppose
- A potential solution may be to consider an alternative non-academic appointment, such as staff ie staff-clinician, staff-scientist, etc and there is no obligation to be regulated by the same policies by which academic senate members must abide as these staff members will not vote. Staff members may consider union policies instead. Their responsibilities would not include the educational mission of UC.
- Although the recommendations impact the non-Senate faculty, no non-senate input provided on this Task Force.

School of Medicine Faculty Council - disagree
- The purpose of the Academic Senate is to include the voices of the faculty about the academic programs at the University. Dividing the faculty into Senate and non-Senate weakens the faculty voice in shared governance because not all teaching faculty can participate in the decisions regarding curriculum.
- Non-Senate faculty are excluded from the home loan program.

School of Nursing Faculty Council – cautionary support

School of Pharmacy Faculty Council - oppose
• SOP Faculty Council members strongly believe that equality of benefits should be brought to all faculty series.
• Health sciences faculty have suffered within a system built for academic units that include only ladder rank faculty. When health sciences faculty review the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) for advancement policy, we find language written for ladder rank faculty.

**Recommendation #2:** 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”.

⇒ All eight committees agree.

Committee on Committees - agree
Concern about the use of the Adjunct faculty series for faculty members who can get K awards.

Clinical Affairs Committee - agree
• Re-evaluate the 1:6 ratio of clinical to non-clinical faculty triggering a review of appointments to the series.
• Reconsider the requirement for a search when a faculty member is moved from HS Clinical into Clinical X.
• Recommend forming a UC Systemwide committee with faculty from the five UC health sciences complexes to evaluate the use of these and related academic series.

School of Pharmacy Faculty Council - agree
SOP Faculty Council members recommend the abolition of the 1:6 clinical:non-clinical faculty ratio.

**Recommendation #3:** Retain the historical separation of curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education.

⇒ Five committees agreed with the recommendation, one committee disagreed two committees did not comment

**Recommendation #4:** Revise the list of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.

⇒ Two committees agreed with the recommendation, six committees did not comment.

Committee on Committees – agree
COC recommends retaining Academic Senate membership for Librarians, as they are a critical part of the University’s academic mission.