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Background

A letter was sent to the UCSF community in March 2012 with our plan to include 100%-time Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty at UCSF in the Academic Senate, effective July 1, 2012. These faculty would join the current Academic Senate membership which consists of full time faculty in the Ladder Rank, In Residence, and Clinical X series. We based this recommendation on an updated interpretation of the Standing Orders of the Regents (SOR) 105.1 that would allow faculty appointed to professional schools without undergraduates to be included in the Academic Senate. This revised interpretation was initially proposed by UCSF General Counsel and supported by the UC Office of General Counsel (OGC), but it was stridently opposed by the UC Systemwide Academic Council. In June 2012, the UC Systemwide Academic Senate Rules & Jurisdiction Committee, ruled against the UCSF position and the Academic Council was unwilling to forward the issue to the Office of the President for resolution by the Regents. The UC OGC had suggested that a regents ruling was appropriate.

Without support from the Academic Senate, UCSF did not automatically include 100%-time Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty in the Academic Senate on July 1, 2012, as announced to the campus in a letter sent to faculty on July 3, 2012. The UCSF Academic Senate Membership Task Force and I continue to seek other means to eliminate the disparities among faculty titles. Among other things it is our position that 100%-time Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Faculty should have the same rights to formally participate in campus and UC Systemwide shared governance as those of Ladder Rank, In Residence, and Clinical X faculty. These rights include the ability to vote on departmental issues including colleague promotions, access to Privilege & Tenure Committee reviews, and the array of rights and privileges outlined below.

The following Strategies have been formulated by the UCSF Senate Membership Task Force and are in various stages of consideration.

**Strategy 1 – Request a revision of the Standing Orders of the Regents (SOR) to include UCSF Adjunct and HS Clinical faculty in the Academic Senate**

This approach would have the UCSF Chancellor request that President Yudof schedule a Regent’s agenda item to amend the SOR to include UCSF HS Clinical and Adjunct professors as members of the Academic Senate. This request might eventually be made in the context of strengthening the participation of faculty in shared governance at UCSF.

**Strategy 2 - Make local campus bylaw and other practice changes to grant access to Academic Senate rights for 100%-time Associate and Full Adjunct and HS Clinical faculty members.**

The UCSF Academic Senate Membership Task Force continues to work on disparities among the series for faculty at UCSF. This work parallels an effort initiated last Spring by the Academic Senate Council to identify UC System wide bylaws, and SOR rules that would need modification to equalize each of these rights and privileges. A report and committee recommendations is expected by Fall 2012. All actions relative to the
other Strategies listed here are being held until the extent of Senate Council support for these incremental changes is determined. Rights and Privileges that can be unambiguously conferred locally are being pursued by the UCSF Senate. There is no assurance that the Academic Council will support all of the changes desired by UCSF. Many may ultimately require Academic Assembly approval or even Regents approval.

A UCSF Bylaw Review Task Force has been formed to incorporate any recommendations into proposed bylaw revisions.

**Issues Under Review by the Task Force:**

- Access to all Privilege & Tenure processes

- Vote/Participate in SF Division governance issues (a) appointment to all UCSF Senate Committees, (b) modify local Senate bylaws for local voting; (c) modify local Senate bylaws for committee memberships that do not currently allow for ‘non-senate’ participation, i.e. CAP, P&T, COC).

- Right to chair Senate standing committees and to represent UCSF on System wide committees and task forces as voting members. (Possible actions, (a) could be resolved by appointments of non-Senate faculty to WOS senate titles. (b) Ignore Senate rules relative to the reporting of votes by Senate and non-senate series and senate status of committee appointments. (c) Seek System wide bylaws revisions.)

- Vote on academic appointment and advancement packets and have their packets voted upon. This is already happening in some departments by recording separate votes: one for Senate faculty, one for non-Senate faculty. This process is complicated in that non-Senate votes currently cannot be recorded within the Advance system. Instead they are reported in the comments section. Updates to the Advance system will be needed to simplify the packet development and review process. Academic Affairs, to date, has been unwilling to make these Advance upgrades pending the Senate membership status resolution.)

- Ability to chair thesis and dissertation committees should be determined by department, program, or division chair rather than Graduate program waiver. (Can be done locally working with the Graduate Division, Graduate Council, and departments.)

- Automatic awarding of Emeritus Professor status upon retirement. It is not clear whether this can be done locally or only with System wide action. Currently non-Senate faculty can only receive Emeritus status by petition to Academic Affairs.

- Access to MOP loans: MOP loan eligibility is determined at UCOP. MOP loans are funded/administered by Office of Loan Programs (OLP) at UCOP, there is a fixed pool of resources for these loans. Demand exceeds supply. Dean recommendations influence funding priorities. (Any change in who obtains these loans may require Regents action. It is unclear whether waivers on these loans can be sought by the Chancellor.)

**Strategy 3 - Codify and extend current practices to include Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty in all UCSF Academic Senate activities.** The effect of this would be to incorporate Adjunct and HS Clinical faculty into our Senate. Votes on UC Systemwide issues would be recorded and reported by faculty series, but otherwise there would be no distinctions made by faculty series.

- If we go this route, is there any reason to limit participation to Associate and above, or to 100%-time faculty?
The viability of this strategy would increase if the UC Systemwide working group on Senate membership issues recommends a substantial reduction or elimination of the disparities among the series.

**Strategy 4 - Developing a memorial about senate membership for circulation among the Divisions and possible vote by the Academic Assembly.**

This approach follows the Senate procedures by which a Division can raise issues for consideration by the Assembly and the Regents. While this process is seen as having a low probability of success it is a means of keeping our senate membership issue before the Senate. That may help keep the senate’s attention on finding a compromise with us. It may also keep the issue in front of OP and could be a complement to any steps taken by the Chancellor to bring this issue to the Regents.

**Next Steps**

Last year we opted for a SOR interpretation that, if adopted, would have simplified and even obviated most of the more incremental approaches outlined here. This year, faced with the reality of the UC Systemwide rejection of our effort and reluctance by the Senate Council to approach to the Regents directly for clarification of the Standing Orders, we are moving incrementally. The current strategies are not inherently mutually exclusive. We will give priority to achieving some changes, and could well accomplish a high percentage of the changes we seek. The UCSF Senate has already formed a bylaws revision task force to draft changes in campus bylaws to locally accomplish the above outlined tasks. For those items outside local discretion we will wait for the Senate Council work group report and recommendations to determine what we can do locally, and what, if anything the Senate will do to remedy the remaining disparities in rights and privileges. The UC Systemwide work group report is expected in October or November. Adoption of any recommendations by the Council may be much later. If they are dependent on the Assembly then the chances for adoption reduce substantially.

So far we have operated with the assumption that we understand the concerns/priorities of Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical faculty. Do our above outlined approaches address the issues/concerns of non-senate faculty? Which are being ignored? If what everyone wants is the legitimacy of being able to serve on UC Systemwide committees and to vote on UC Systemwide issues--then the above strategies other than Strategy One accomplish nothing. Similarly, if the main aim for non-Senate faculty is to gain access to MOP loans, but the reality is that very few or no one from the non-Senate titles will ever be recommended for MOP loans, have we made matters worse rather than better?

One suggestion for clarifying matters is that the Senate conduct a survey of the Health Sciences Clinical and Adjunct and faculty to ask what these faculty want and/or expect from Senate membership. Are these rights and privileges such as the ability to mentor students and to gain emeriti status without waivers, access to P&T, eligibility to vote on hires and promotions, eligibility for MOP loans, etc important? In other words are the interest/desires tied to specific benefits or are they largely symbolic, as in the ability to vote on UC Systemwide issues? If we elect to do the survey we need to either do this before the UC Systemwide campus climate survey scheduled for November or wait until 2013. The bottom line, if the wants/desires of faculty cannot be addressed by the proposed structure (and the other incremental gains in equality) then there may be no reason to pursue these proposed steps. Should we move forward with a survey...