

## **Faculty Workforce 2018 Report: Comment to the Total Population Increase**

The total faculty counted by the Workforce Report has been steadily increasing year over year.

Increase 2015 over 2014: 214

Increase 2016 over 2015: 205

Increase 2017 over 2016: 106

Over the past several years, the variety of faculty appointments has also increased, and not all of these appointments were being captured by the traditional methodology for counting faculty. Advancements in the electronic systems which manage and track faculty appointments enabled the campus to refine the methodology and better quantify the faculty population at UCSF. A detailed description of the definition of faculty and the refinements to the methodology for the faculty workforce report are online at <http://tiny.ucsf.edu/facultyheadcountupdate>.

In short, the refined method captures faculty by their academic appointment rather than their primary paid title code, and so it better captures faculty administrators and those who have a commitment to the University but are paid by an affiliate (e.g. HHMI Investigators, some VA faculty, and paid-by-affiliate Health Sciences Clinical Professors), while no longer counting truly volunteer faculty or temporary Instructor appointments.

Using the updated methodology for 2018, the total faculty headcount comes to 3,352, which is 253 more total faculty than reported in 2017.

Increase 2015 over 2014: 214

Increase 2016 over 2015: 205

Increase 2017 over 2016: 106

**Increase 2018 over 2017: 253**

One factor which is reflected in this increase is that the methodology is not only capturing more of the new appointments, it is capturing more of the fastest-growing type of appointments; specifically, Health Sciences Clinical Professors and others paid-by-affiliate.

To better understand the increase in the total faculty, it may be helpful to compare how the campus faculty population grew from 2017 and 2018 considering both the historic methodology and the refined methodology.

### **Total Faculty Headcount**

	<b>Historic Method</b>	<b>Refined Method</b>	
<b>2017</b>	3,099	3,228	Δ 129
<b>2018</b>	3,193	3,352	Δ 159
	Δ 94	Δ 124	↘ Δ 253

These growth numbers are consistent with our trending increases in faculty and it is reasonable that the refined method has a greater total increase as it captures net more appointments. Overall, the refined methodology captures 253 more faculty in 2018 than the old method did in 2017.

Considering the faculty growth over the past two years, comparing the greater total of 2018 under the new method would be expected to be relatively much higher than the lower total under the old method. Comparing 3,352 (2018) to 3,099 (2017) is an increase of 253, but comparing consistent methodologies the net campus increase is only 124 faculty. The application of a wider-capturing method to two years of growth compounds the difference.

It is likely that the rate of increase of the number of new HS Clinical appointments is driving increase in total campus faculty. Comparing the HS Clinical headcount alone looks like this:

**HS Clinical Headcount**

	<b>Historic Method</b>	<b>Refined Method</b>	
<b>2017</b>	1,212	1,336	Δ 124 (10.2% more)
<b>2018</b>	1,259	1,399	Δ 140 (11.1% more)
	Δ 47 (3.9%)	Δ 63 (4.7%)	∩ Δ 187

The refined methodology captures 140 more HS Clinical appointments when applied to the 2018 census, and it would have reported 124 more than the traditional method if reported in 2017.

The increase in the total number of HS Clinical appointments from 2017 to 2018 (187) represents 73.9% of the total headcount increase (253) from 2017 to 2018.

The refined methodology was able to capture 253 more faculty in 2018 over 2017, and almost three-quarters of those are HS Clinical appointments. The total campus increase is a result of both a methodology which accurately captures more faculty appointments (including a large number of HS Clinical appointments previously elusive), *and* an increase to HS Clinical appointments overall in 2017 and 2018.