The UC Senate Membership Task Force Report was submitted to the UC Academic Senate last spring. 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. We have been asked to review and comment on the task force report.
Dear Professor Powell,

The L&S Executive Committee has discussed the report of the UC Task Force on Senate Membership. The committee agrees that this is an important issue meriting careful study and action by the Senate, and had the following comments:

• The number of Senate faculty appointments in the professional schools seems to be increasing as opposed to the static or declining numbers for Senate members comprising the Faculty of the undergraduate colleges and schools. That raises the important question of how decisions are made in the professional schools as to who may be a Senate member. Additional information in that regard could be useful when considering more broadly the principles and practices associated with conferring Senate membership.

• The committee strongly endorses the recommendation that the historical practice of separating curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education be continued. Indeed, it was noted that Standing Order 105.1 includes the following statement: “Members of the faculties of professional schools offering courses at the graduate level only shall be members also of the Academic Senate, but, in the discretion of the Academic Senate, may be excluded from participation in activities of the Senate that relate to curricula of other schools and colleges of the University.” The committee believes such separation is reasonable and wise. However, there was uncertainty about whether appropriate controls were in place to enforce that provision, assuming the Senate so elects.

• In general, the four recommendations presented in the report seem well-considered and reasonable.

Sincerely,

Patricia C. Boeshaar, Chair
Executive Committee
College of Letters and Science
CAP Oversight Committee

October 29, 2010 2:14 PM

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the report of the Task Force on Senate Membership and provides the following comments.

While CAP endorses all the recommendations of the Task Force, it notes that there is a potential for significant impact on the number and type of personnel actions the committee might see as a result of Recommendation #2, which states: The Task Force recommends local review of existing individuals in non-Senate titles and reclassification of those that are clearly in the wrong series based upon duties and responsibilities consistent with membership in the Academic Senate.

The change could be negative as well as positive, but nonetheless, CAP wishes to comment on the possibility of a significant increase in workload.
No response at this time.
Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (MANAGEMENT)

February 17, 2011 8:51 AM

No response at this time.
Most of the faculty in the School of Medicine are members of the Academic Senate (AS) with full voting rights on Academic Senate committees and at general faculty meetings. Some faculty, including those in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor (HSCP) series and Adjunct faculty, are not part of the Academic Senate. These two groups represent about 30% of the total faculty in the School of Medicine. There are differing proportions of non-AS faculty at other medical schools in the UC system. Of equal concern is the variation across departments in the UC Davis SOM, with at least one department having over 65% of their faculty in a non-AS series. Non-AS members are prevented by system-wide and Davis division bylaws from full participation in shared governance. Many faculty believe that this is fundamentally unfair.

There are limitations to the task force recommendations. Firstly, maintaining the current list of titles that are included in the AS does not address the growing discontent of a large portion of faculty system-wide. Secondly, recommending that non-AS faculty switch to an AS title (e.g., from HSCP to Clin X) is impractical. Many HSCP faculty at higher levels (Clinical Professors) have not done enough scholarly work sufficient to permit transfer into the Clin X series.

Non-AS faculty must enjoy shared governance to the fullest extent, at least within the UC medical schools (and other professional schools). There are several ways that this might come about:

- Changing Regental Standing Order 105 to include HSCP (and other non-AS faculty) as members of the AS
- Altering bylaws at UC medical schools such that non-AS faculty enjoy full rights within the SOM.
- Provide Instructor appointments to HSCP faculty so that they would be covered by SO 105.

Whatever the solution, the recommendations of the task force (essentially maintaining the status quo) are exclusionary and inconsistent with fundamental fairness. We disagree with the first two of the four recommendations of the Task Force, as noted above. We do agree with keeping the historical separation of curricula between the professional education and undergraduate education (a position, we believe, that should assuage concerns that non-AS faculty in the SOM will impact decisions regarding undergraduate education). We also agree that some administrative titles do not belong in the AS.

Sincerely,
Joseph F. Antognini, M.D., M.B.A.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee

Other comments received:
To the Task Force on Senate Membership

I would like to provide a comment on Senate Membership following a discussion on the topic in the 26 January UC Davis General Faculty meeting. There appears to be one major problem that is rooted in the very fabric of some non-Senate titles, as they are set up as providing Senate-worthy work, but are not entitled to membership. Here is what I believe to be, the core problem:

There are Academic Federation job series at UC Davis that mandate (and I quote from APM-310 which pertains to the Professional Research Series):

"An appointee in this series must demonstrate continuous and effective engagement in independent and creative research activity of high quality and significance, equivalent to that expected of the Professor series. Proposed merit increases and promotions in the Professional Research series shall be reviewed with the same rigor accorded to proposed merits and promotions in the Professor series. (See APM - 210-1)"

In other words, UC Davis puts individuals in this example series in a position where they are expected to conduct the same work as an Academic Senate member, yet they have no say in the Academic Senate. This creates a two-class hierarchy of non-Senate members and Senate members essentially providing same-standard/quality work, but leaving the affected non-senate employees extremely dissatisfied (and judging from personal communications, making them ultimately decide to UC Davis). This cannot be in the interest of our university.

It must be understood that it is an institutional policy that produces this issue, namely that individuals who have the same responsibilities as Academic Senate members have none of their rights. This, in my eyes, is the very heart of the problem.

I'm attaching APM-310 for your reference.

Best,
Chris Lossin.

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a member of the Faculty Executive Committee of the UC Davis School of Medicine and am a former chair of that committee. I also chair the School of Medicine’s Faculty Personnel Committee, so I am very interested in the conclusions of the Task Force on Senate Membership. These conclusions were discussed in detail at our last FEC meeting, and we were encouraged by our FEC chair to contact you directly with our opinions.

In general I support the Task Force’s conclusions, but this is clearly a minority opinion on our FEC. A quick review of our School’s recent personnel actions reveals that over a third of our non-Senate faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series may already be generating ‘creative works’ that would be appropriate for advancement in the Senate’s Clin X series, and I’m encouraged by your recommendation that these faculty move, if they wish, to a Senate series. I do have two concerns with this process. One is the 1/6th Clin X quota, which is already long passed at UC Davis. From my interpretation of the APM it looks like a Senate committee at UC Davis can review this and decide that it is appropriate to move many faculty into the Clin X series, regardless of the quota. My other concern has to do with the appointment by change-of-series process itself. Hopefully, the change-of-series can take place without a competitive external search, as the time and expense of such a search (perhaps as many as 80 School of Medicine faculty qualify for this transition) would make it impossible.

Someday I would like to see a new Senate series that parallels the State-supported Senate series ‘Lecturer with security of employment’:
'Clinical Lecturer with security of employment'. This series would not be funded by the State and, like the Senate’s Lecturer series, would not require creative works. It would require a competitive search, arms-length letters for promotions, etc., but ‘only’ excellence in clinical service, teaching and university/community service for advancement. Not only would a lot of our new hires be attracted to such a position, but In Residence and Clin X faculty looking for opportunities to advance while spending more time teaching and less time writing might find it attractive as well, and they would stay in the Senate instead of moving to HSCP. I shall continue to dream.

What I view as the major problem with the growth of HSCP faculty in our professional schools is that these faculty may not be informed until long after they’ve started work that there is such a thing as an Academic Senate, and that non-Senate faculty can’t do everything that Senate faculty can. This may not be the case in all departments, but it certainly is the case in many. Chairs like to hire faculty into the HSCP series because there isn’t the expense of a major search and the appointment process is less cumbersome: they can fill specific clinical needs quickly and relatively inexpensively. I would like to have every prospective faculty member sign off on a description of the requirements of their position that compares and contrasts their series with the other series in the department. If a new faculty member knows that he or she can’t chair or vice chair a Senate committee, and can’t vote on appointments, merits and promotions of their colleagues in the Senate, can’t serve on CAP or vote while on FEC, and can play only supporting roles in curriculum development and admissions, then I don’t think they’ll complain about their series later on. Certainly someone should point out to the HSCP faculty upset that they can’t serve equally on Senate committees that university service isn’t a factor in their merits and promotions until they go up for professor, and even then that leg of the wobbly stool is a short one.

Another thing to keep in mind: anything that makes it harder for clinical chairs to hire faculty into the HSCP series, or makes it harder for clinical chairs to move HSCP faculty who are ready and willing into the Clin X series, will just make our clinical chairs hire more Staff Physicians instead of faculty. Many Staff Physicians are already under the impression that they belong to the faculty. This will probably be the topic of your next Task Force!

Thank you for your hard work.

Richard Tucker

**********

John P. McVicar, M.D.

I would also emphasize the practical limitations that we encounter in committee work. For example, Stacy Wallach is a faculty member very involved in medical student education at the UCD SOM. She cannot be a chair of an AS committee, because she is in the wrong series. I would perhaps illustrate your points with a concrete example, to drive home the point that the recommendations of the task force are not an acceptable solution.

Other than that, I think your response summarizes the substance of the issues we have discussed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary S. Leiserowitz, M.D.</td>
<td>I think that this draft hits all of the important issues. I agree with the sentiment and details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Yellowlees MBBS, MD</td>
<td>looks fine to me bernadette.........only issue is to potentially make the comments stronger to recommend that we do not accept the recommendations, and suggest that a process is developed to review our comments. Peter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

March 2, 2011 2:55 PM

We strongly disagree with recommendation 1, which recommends against extending titles conferring Senate membership. The rationale is too weak to support the recommendation. The rationale is that shared Senate appointments are "currently allowable." However, their being allowable does not imply that they are feasible. In many cases on the Davis campus, there are non-Senate members who "engage in the academic mission of the Senate on a regular basis" but have no Senate title and due to the culture of the campus never will have a Senate title unless the range of titles is extended.

We would support a recommendation that all non-members of the Senate who "engage in the academic mission of the Senate on a regular basis" must be granted a Senate title.

This is not a matter of faculty being in "the wrong series," as addressed in recommendation 2, but rather of whether faculty can be appointed in an additional series.

Recommendation 3 supports "retention of the historical practice of separating curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education." We note that the Davis campus has requested a Legislative Ruling from the systemwide committee on Rules and Jurisdiction regarding this issue. Such a ruling would be binding. At present, UCR&J has taken the position that courses and grading are the province of the professional schools, but that their curricula are subject to the authority of the Graduate Councils on their campuses.

Regarding recommendation 4, we note that any change in this regard would require a change in Standing Order of the Regents 105.1(a), which reads in part: "The Academic Senate shall consist of the President, Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Deans, Provosts, Directors of academic programs, the chief admissions officer on each campus and in the Office of the President, registrars, the University Librarian on each campus of the University, and each person giving instruction in any curriculum under the control of the Academic Senate whose academic title . . ."
Faculty Welfare

March 2, 2011 10:43 AM

The Academic Senate, Davis Division, Faculty Welfare Committee voted unanimously on the following resolution as its response to The UC Senate Membership Task Force Report.

The Davis Division Faculty Welfare Committee supports the four recommendations delineated in the UC Senate Membership Task Force Report dated April 15, 2010, and would like to emphasize two points:

1. Criteria for Senate membership of non-Senate Health Sciences Faculty be uniform across the UC campuses.

2. Strict adherence to current requirements for Senate membership, as described in the Academic Personnel manual, be maintained to prevent appointment of non-Senate personnel to Senate positions on the general campuses.
Planning & Budget

December 19, 2010 7:51 PM

No response at this time.