Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Grayson W. (Bill) Marshall, DDS, PhD, MPH, Chair  

October 12, 2010  

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, Chair  
UCSF Academic Senate  
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764  

Re: Review of Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership  

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick:  

The UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare reviewed the Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership and the historical background on the evolution of Senate membership appended to their report.  

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. They reviewed the evolution of membership in the Academic Senate since its inception and surveyed 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:  

1. Do not extend the list of titles conferring membership in the 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.  

Overall, despite the detailed and excellent review of the historical changes in Senate membership, we believe that one of the recommendations (#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. Thus we will comment on this below.  

We also believe that some of the discussion concerning curricular authority for undergraduate and professional education (recommendation #3) would benefit from rewording and clarification as noted below. The reports at various points use the terms undergraduate instruction as distinct from professional instruction and at other times use the terms undergraduate and graduate instruction as distinct from professional curricular instruction. We believe clarity could
be increased by use of the term *academic* to include undergraduate and graduate program instruction.

We agree with the second recommendation, namely, the importance of classifying faculty into their appropriate series, and we note that it is our belief that the UCSF administration and the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel has diligently addressed this issue for several years. However, the Committee also notes that the current limitation on Clinical X faculty numbers imposed by a set ratio to other Senate faculty appears arbitrary, and the basis for this limitation is neither documented nor fully addressed. This limitation may hinder the reclassification efforts on other campuses with significant faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

Lastly on the specific recommendations, the Committee on Faculty Welfare has no comment on the final recommendation concerning revision of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership.

**The primary recommendations of the Committee on Faculty Welfare is that Senate membership should be conferred on faculty engaged in the scope of essential activities of the University.**

The Task Force on Senate Membership was charged with elucidating “a set of principles that should govern decisions about who is and who is not a member of the Academic Senate” and provide “a set of derived principles of Senate membership that might be expected to apply”. The raison d’être for this Task Force stems from the current imperfect criteria for Senate membership that have evolved over the years based on a series of Standing Orders. As the committee noted “Senate requests to the Regents for changes in Senate membership were ahistorical in rationalizing requests, making it difficult to discern operative principles and considerations.” Given the committee’s charge to provide a rational set of principles for Senate membership, we were disappointed that the committee decided to recommend perpetuation of “current practice of use of specific title codes”, despite the fact that the Committee’s analysis often highlighted the apparent ad hoc processes and unclear justification of Senate membership eligibility.

Historic examination is useful to establish parameters of intent concerning membership qualifications of the Academic Senate. It is clear that the original Organic Act and later Standing Orders established principles of inclusion and shared governance of the University of California. We feel that 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. The status of Adjunct faculty has changed considerably from their establishment following the 1969 Senate-requested Revisions to Standing Order 105.1 (a); Adjunct faculty were in that series because they “lacked full-time commitment to the University, and had lesser participation in teaching.” Because of the fixed number of state-funded, tenure-track positions, there has been an expansion in the number of faculty appointed in the Adjunct series. Unlike the original description of Adjunct faculty, the majority of Adjunct faculty, particularly on this campus, are full-time teaching and research faculty, who perform essentially all of the research, teaching and University service functions that are typically associated with tenured faculty (Howell *et al.*, 2010) but without representation at the Senate level. While the In Residence and Clinical X series do confer Senate membership to non-tenured faculty, there are substantial barriers for many Adjunct faculty to transfer to these
series, including the required or assumed financial obligations that many mid- and small-sized departments cannot afford.

Notwithstanding their commitment and contribution to the mission of the University, Adjunct faculty are perceived to be “second class” by faculty in other series, and even more troubling are disproportionately female (Howell, et al., 2010). We believe that extending membership of Academic Senate to full time, fully engaged Adjunct faculty would go a long way to redress negative perceptions and inequities and more fully fulfill that stated mission of inclusion and shared governance.

**Conclusion:**
After careful review of the Report of the Task Force on Senate Membership and the additional background material provided, the UCSF Committee on Faculty Welfare members are of the opinion that the Task Force should re-examine its first recommendation that in essence maintains the status quo, ignores the historical precedent of inclusiveness for faculty engaged in the broadest range of university activities, and does not appear to address the growth and diversity of today’s University of California.
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