TO: Jose Wudka, Chair of Academic Senate

FROM: Iryna Ethell, Chair of Faculty Executive Committee, School of Medicine

RE: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised APM 278, APM 279, APM210-6, 112 and APM 310

SOM Executive committee reviewed and support the proposed changes and recommendations to policies APM 278, APM 279, APM210-6 and the creation of APM 310, which will provide more clarity on definitions, responsibilities, term of appointments and re-appointments, restrictions/limits and review criteria for Health Science Clinical Professors (APM 278), Volunteer Clinical Professor series (APM 279) and an additional group for non-faculty academic appointments, Clinical Associates (APM 350).

SOM Executive committee requests several clarifications as follows.

APM 278

1. Statement on page 9 is not clear as written

“An appointee in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series may change to another academic or professorial series following academic review. A competitive search may or may not be required. The Chancellor may grant an exception to a waiver of the search requirement in exceptional circumstances.” Does it mean that there are other instances when competitive search “may not be required” beside a waiver by the Chancellor?

Recommended revisions are as follows
“An appointee in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series may be appointed to another academic or professorial series following academic review after a competitive search. The Chancellor may grant an exception to a waiver of the search requirement in exceptional circumstances.”

2. On page 10, the document states that “Each appointment and reappointment at this rank is limited to one year or less. The review period is two years at each step.” Who will determine whether the appointment should be extended for another year prior to the two-year review and what is the process?

3. On page 11, the document states that “Total University service at more than 50 percent time in this title, combined with service at more than 50 percent time in any of those titles listed in may not exceed eight years.” Is this limit applies to a specific step (HS Assistant Prof, or HS Associate Prof) or entire series?

The proposed 8 year limitation of service for Faculty holding a without salary HSCP series appointment would impact UCR SOM. As we are attempting to build long-term community partnerships it seems we have many faculty who would be affected by this. Will we be avoiding this track and sticking with more of the volunteer clinical faculty track in order to avoid term limitations? There is a huge concern that due to a small number of faculty recruited to UCR it would be difficult to find new faculty every eight years.

APM 279

1. Statement on page 3

“If the individual has participated in professional organizations, University and community service, and/or research, a description of these activities may be included in the appointee’s personnel file as part of the review material” contradicts with a previous statement on page 1 “An individual with teaching, research/creative activity, and service responsibilities who holds a clinical appointment paid by an a facility that has a formal affiliation with the University (UC-affiliated site, facility) must hold a concurrent, without salary appointment should be made in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.”

Proposed modifications are as follows

“If the individual has participated in professional organizations, University and community service, and/or research, a description of these activities may be included in the appointee’s personnel file as part of the review material and the individual should be considered for re-appointment in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.”

2. To add “in consultation with the clinical schools and departments” to the statement on page 3 as follows.

“The Chancellor, in consultation with the clinical schools and departments, shall establish campus guidelines that specify the minimum number of required hours per year; the number of minimum hours may vary in different schools or departments.”
3. Clinical faculty appointments, reappointments, and/or promotions are usually reviewed and approved by the committee on Volunteer Clinical appointments and promotions.

Proposed changes on page 5 are as follows

“Sheer appointment, reappointment, and/or promotion, each candidate’s clinical competence shall be reviewed and approved by Volunteer Clinical appointments committee, the Department Chair and/or the Dean, as appropriate to the School.”

4. On page 7, is competitive search necessary for re-appointment of Volunteer Clinical Professor at Health Science Clinical Professor if the individual participated in professional organizations, University and community service, and/or research?

Proposed changes are as follows

“Transfer of a Volunteer Clinical Professor to another University title requires academic review. Appointment to another University title may be made after a competitive search, provided that the individual meets the appointment criteria associated with that title.”

5. On page 8, it is not clear what “the opinion” is. This should be more clearly stated.

“An appointment may be terminated before the ending date for cause, such as failure to serve the required minimum number of hours, or when, in the opinion of the Dean or designee,”

6. On page 9 document states that

“An appointee may present a written complaint about his or her appointment or early termination of the appointment to the Dean for administrative review.”

If the appointment terminated as a result of “the opinion of the Dean”, it appears to be a conflict of interest here.

APM 310

The UCR FEC was confused about the intent of APM 350 Clinical Associate. In the Work Group Proposal, the rationale was given as follows:

New policy APM - 350. We identified an additional group for which a non-faculty academic appointment would be beneficial to the University: these are clinical practitioners who contribute to the mission of the University by practicing their disciplines at University-managed clinics or practices, or satellite healthcare facilities; however, they have no clinical teaching duties. Although a faculty appointment is not recommended, we propose
repurposing the Clinical Associate title, currently defined in APM - 112-4-b(8), as a title to be used for 1) without academic salary and paid staff clinicians with no teaching duties, and 2) without academic salary, volunteer appointees employed by University health system network sites and satellite facilities.

The area of confusion regards the following issue: does this draft permit the series to be used by UC employed and paid physicians working in UC owned and operated clinical settings? If it does, we are in support, but then the language needs to be clarified, because the APM 350 draft says:

350-18 Salary

Individuals appointed to the title of Clinical Associate are ineligible for compensation, whether in the form of salary or wages, from the University of California, in connection with that appointment.

As a practical matter, this would prevent us from using this series for one of the groups it seems to have been intended for.

We agree that this new category would be helpful at UCR if it could be used for physicians who are employed by UC who provide clinical services but no teaching (the current draft appears to allow the series for physicians employed by affiliates, but not UC employed physicians unless we are misreading the draft). At UCR, as a new school, this is a category that we would anticipate using on occasion for a UCR employed physician at a UC owned and operated clinic, for example, who provides clinical care but is not involved in teaching.

For this reason, we suggest clarifying the APM 350 draft to specifically allow the series to be used for both UC employed physicians and physicians employed by UC owned or affiliated practices.

The simplest edit to accomplish this would be to edit the section 350-18 to read:

350-18 Salary

Individuals appointed to the title of Clinical Associate may be with or without salary.

Iryna Ethell, PhD
Professor of Biomedical Sciences
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
On Mar 28, 2016, at 11:45 AM, Cherysa P Cortez <cherysa.cortez@ucr.edu> wrote:

For Review by CAP, R&J, GC, CEP, CoDEO, CoR and the SoM Executive Committee
Responses due May 2, 2016

On behalf of Senate Division Chair Jose Wudka, I am forwarding for systemwide Senate review the attached set of proposed revisions to APM Sections 278 (Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series), 210-6 (Instructions to Review Committees), 279 (Volunteer Clinical Professor Series), 112 (Academic Titles, Clinical Associate) and New APM – 350 (Clinical Associate). Please submit comments to senate@ucr.edu by May 2, 2016 to allow us to compile and summarize comments for timely submission to Systemwide. As always, any committee that considers these matters outside its jurisdiction or charge may decline to comment.

Many thanks,
Cherysa

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
From:    Susan Carlson
Vice Provost
Academic Personnel and Programs

Re:      Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 278, Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series; Section 210-6, Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series; Section 279, Clinical Professor Series, Volunteer Series; New Section 350, Clinical Associate; and Section 112, Academic Titles

Attached is a letter forwarding proposed revisions to the aforementioned Academic Personnel Manual Sections. Additionally, the APM - 278 Work Group’s Recommendations Report with Appendix A and the proposed draft policies are also attached. Revisions to the existing policies and the creation of new policy are proposed in response to academic administrator requests to update these policies.

Systemwide Review is a public review distributed to the Executive Vice Chancellors/Provosts, the Director, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and the Vice President of Agriculture and Natural Resources requesting that they inform the general University community, affected employees, and union membership about policy proposals. Systemwide Review also includes a mandatory, three-month full Senate review. Employees should be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the draft policy, available online at http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/policies-under-review/index.html. Attached is a Model Communication which may be used to inform non-exclusively represented employees about these proposals. The Labor Relations Office at the Office of the President is responsible for informing the bargaining units representing union membership about policy proposals.

Please submit your comments to ADV-VPCARLSON-SA@ucop.edu no later than June 24, 2016.
Cherysa Cortez
Executive Director, Academic Senate
University Office Building 221
951.827.6154  cherysac@ucr.edu
http://senate.ucr.edu/
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