

Annual Report on Academic Personnel Review, 2009-2010

Office of Academic Affairs and Provost

200 Gibson Hall New Orleans, LA 70118

T (504) 865-5261 F (504) 865-6723 <http://provost.tulane.edu>



Annual Report on Academic Personnel Review, 2009-10

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Uptown Campus Statistics	3
Downtown/Health Sciences Campus Statistics	4
School of Medicine	4
School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine	5
Challenges in Academic Review Processes	6
Prospective Issues for Consideration	7
Appendix: Academic Personnel Review Committees, 2010-2011	8

Introduction

This is the first in a series of annual assessments concerning academic personnel review at Tulane that will be distributed by the Office of Academic Affairs and Provost. This report includes summary statistics for reviews conducted in the prior academic year, comments about some of the challenges encountered throughout the year, and brief discussion of issues to consider in future reviews. All colleagues are encouraged to read through the “Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Review” (for the Uptown campus) and the “Guidelines for Personnel and Honors Review” (for the Health Sciences/ Downtown campus), which are updated annually, and posted on the Academic Affairs website at <http://tulane.edu/provost/acadreview.cfm>.

We are extremely grateful to everyone who served (and serves) on the academic personnel review committees that are such a crucial part of the faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure processes at the University. The shared governance involving academic personnel review, grounded in the collaboration between faculty and senior academic leadership, is the foundation of the excellence that animates the research, scholarship, art-making, teaching, and community and professional service that define Tulane’s faculty as a whole. The quality of our faculty is the driving force behind Tulane’s continued classification by the Carnegie Foundation as a “Research University (Very High Research Activity),” a singular distinction of which we are all very proud. It cannot be emphasized enough that the appointment and promotion standards set by the faculty – in a shared responsibility with the University leadership – are the essential ingredients of our success as a university of superb capability, influence, and standing.

Uptown Campus Statistics

The Office of Academic Affairs reviewed seventy-three faculty files for reappointment, third-year review, promotion and/or tenure for the Uptown campus Schools during the 2009-2010 academic year. Forty of these cases were in the School of Liberal Arts, twenty-two in the School of Science and Engineering, four in the Freeman School of Business, two in the School of Architecture, two in the Law School, one in the School of Social Work, and two in Newcomb-Tulane College (see Table 1).

Table 1: Uptown Campus Academic Personnel Review Statistics, 2009-2010

Uptown Campus	Total #	Number Approved	Number Denied	Number Withdrawn	Approval Rate
TENURE TRACK					
Third Year Review	19	18	1	0	95%
Appeal Neg. Third Year Review	2	1	1	0	50%
Promotion & Tenure (P&T)	16	14	2	0	88%
Appeal Neg. P&T Review	1	0	1	0	0
Promotion To Full Rank	8	7	0	1	88%
New Hire With Tenure	1	1	0	0	100%
New Hire Full Professor	6	6	0	0	100%
Subtotal	53	47	5	1	89%
NON-TENURE TRACK					
Reappointment	19	18	1	0	95%
Reappoint. with Promotion	1	1	0	0	100%
Subtotal	20	19	1	0	95%
GRAND TOTAL	73	66	6	1	90%
<i>Data on turnaround time were not gathered for the Uptown Campus reviews during 2009-2010. They will be in the future.</i>					

Downtown/Health Sciences Campus Statistics

School of Medicine

In the School of Medicine, during the 2009-2010 academic year, twenty-three faculty files were reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs in the following categories (see Table 2):

- 16 in the tenure track (including 8 third year reviews)
- 2 in the research track
- 13 in the clinical track

Overall, the average turn around time in Academic Affairs was 10 days, and 96% of the reviews were positive.

Table 2: School of Medicine Academic Personnel Review Statistics, 2009-2010

School of Medicine	Total #	Number Approved	Approval Rate	Additional Information Requested	Average Turnaround Time (Days)
TENURE TRACK					
Appointment *	3	2	67%	1	13
Promotion & Tenure (P&T)	5	5	100%	0	15
Endowed Appointment	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Track Change	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Subtotal	8	7	88%	1	15
Third Year Review	8 [^]	[^]	[^]	0	6
RESEARCH TRACK					
Appointment *	1	1	100%	0	7
Promotion	1	1	100%	1	36
Track Change	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Subtotal	2	2	100%	1	22
CLINICAL TRACK					
Appointment *	5	5	100%	0	3
Promotion	8	8	100%	2	12
Track Change	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Subtotal	13	13	100%	2	8
GRAND TOTAL	23	22	96%	4	10
Track Changes are tabulated by track of original appointment					
N/A: Not Applicable					
[^] : Third-Year Review processes are currently under review and revision					
* Associate and Full Professor ranks (does not include faculty appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor)					

School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine

In the School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, during the 2009-2010 academic year, sixteen faculty files were reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs in the following categories (see Table 3):

- 16 in the tenure track
- 0 in the research track
- 0 in the clinical track

Overall, the average turnaround time in Academic Affairs was 22 days, and 94% of the reviews were positive.

Table 3: School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine Academic Personnel Review Statistics, 2009-2010

SPHTM	Total #	Number Approved	Approval Rate	Additional Information Requested	Average Turnaround Time (Days)
TENURE TRACK					
Appointment *	2	2	100%	0	60
Promotion & Tenure (P&T)	4	3	75%	1	20
Third Year Review ^	9	9	100%	0	19
Endowed Appointment	1	1	100%	0	1
Track Change	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Subtotal	16	15	94%	1	22
RESEARCH TRACK					
Appointment *	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Promotion	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Track Change	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Subtotal	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
CLINICAL TRACK					
Appointment *	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Promotion	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Track Change	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Subtotal	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
GRAND TOTAL	16	15	94%	1	22
Track Changes are tabulated by track of original appointment					
N/A: Not Applicable					
^ Includes three Fourth Year Reviews in 2009-2010					
* Associate and Full Professor ranks (does not include faculty appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor)					

Challenges in Academic Review Processes

In the course of our review work this past academic year, we noted certain challenges in the review process that we briefly note here. It is our hope that these observations will be useful to academic units and Schools in the preparation of review files that are clearly argued, well documented, and persuasive.

- **External Referees:** The utilization of the commentary of independent, capable, and prominent external referees is an exceedingly important part of robust academic personnel review. It is very important that academic units and Schools make clear why particular external referees are chosen for faculty file review in the tenure track. Review files should contain an explanation of the extent to which each referee has the appropriate expertise, visibility, stature, reputation, and independence from the candidate to serve as a credible commentator on a case.
- **Research:** For research intensive faculty, commentary on the significance of the candidate's research or creative activity, the independence of his/her contributions to their field, the likelihood that the research or creative activity will have an impact on the field and move it forward, and the synergies of the work with the mission and strategic goals of the candidate's academic unit and/or School should be provided.
- **Votes:** Split votes at either the academic unit and/or School review committee-level should be explained in the dossier -- preferably in the cover letter provided by the Dean and/or the review committee chair.
- **Multi-Author Publications:** The dossier should explain the specific role of the candidate in any collaborative endeavors and/or multi-author publications.
- **Publication/Performance/Exhibition Venues:** The significance of the publication and/or performance/exhibition venues of a candidate's work and contributions should be explained when it is not immediately apparent. It is especially important that the quality and significance of foreign language publications be fully explained and documented (along with a clear indication of the extent to which they have been rigorously peer-reviewed).
- **Mentoring:** Assessment of third-year review files highlighted many opportunities for mentoring and faculty development. Clear and consistent communication to review candidates (not to mention all colleagues) regarding the requirements for promotion and tenure should be provided as well as specific mentoring on how best to build a strong and compelling dossier for successful academic review.
- **Institutional and Professional Service:** We noted in some reviews a recurring concern about "protecting" junior colleagues from service assignments. Of course, we should not overburden junior faculty with excessive responsibilities, but a complete absence of appropriate service experience for junior colleagues is neither appropriate nor wise. Senior faculty and Deans should work with junior faculty to ensure that research, teaching, and service are appropriately balanced. At the same time, it is vitally important for junior faculty to develop a sense of their obligations as members of the University community, to be represented in School and University committees and activities, and to develop experience in service activities.

Prospective Issues for Consideration

Throughout the past academic year, a variety of issues and questions regarding the future evolution of academic review at Tulane emerged. We share some thoughts about those matters here – and we invite comments, suggestions, and insights on them from all colleagues as well as from members of the leadership of all the academic units and Schools.

- **Evolving publication/exhibition practices:** The rapidly changing digital environment for publication, exhibition, and performance continues to be a challenge for academic review. The Office of Academic Affairs is always eager to assess the impact of new practices in this regard, and it welcomes the advice and suggestions of academic leadership and faculty in all the Schools.
- **Feedback in the wake of review:** Are review candidates receiving appropriate feedback after completing academic review? What mentoring initiatives are in place at the levels of the academic unit and/or School to insure that such sharing of information is taking place? Would it be useful to provide candidates with redacted external referee letters? This would provide the candidate with an array of detailed information concerning his/her career progress to date. One of Tulane's Schools is already engaged in this practice (the Law School). Should other Schools be encouraged to take up a similar protocol? Should other redacted materials be shared with candidates – such as the reports from the relevant academic units and/or the relevant promotion and tenure review committees?
- **Length of the tenure clock:** Is the current length of the tenure clock – a uniform seven years across all the disciplines of the University – appropriate and useful? In many disciplines, not solely but especially in the health sciences area, it has become a major challenge to meet the standards for promotion in external grants and sponsored projects due to the current funding environment. In some other fields, long publication queues in journals and book series also interfere with traditional expectations regarding the tenure clock. Would an extension of the tenure clock (a University Senate decision) alleviate these problems? Should such an extension apply uniformly across all fields? How would expectations regarding the accomplishments expected for tenure change (if at all) if the tenure clock were lengthened?
- **Evaluating teaching and service:** Are we properly and adequately evaluating and valuing community and professional service, engaged learning, effective teaching, and other mentoring and program-building activities in our academic review processes?
- **Consistency and transparency in academic review practices:** Are we properly and appropriately consistent and transparent in our academic review practices across all Schools, especially given our increasingly interdisciplinary research endeavors?

Appendix: Academic Personnel Review Committees, 2010-2011

Architecture			
	Erroll Barron: Chair	ebarron@tulane.edu 865-5389	
	Scott Bernhard		
	Eugene Cizek		
	Bruce Goodwin		
	John Klingman (spr 11)		
	Ellen Weiss (fall 10)		
Freeman (Business)			
	John Trapani: Chair	Finance	jtrapan@tulane.edu 865-5419
	Michael Burke	Management	
	Albert Cannella	Management	
	James McFarland	Finance	
Law			
	Glynn Lunney: Chair	glunney@tulane.edu 865-5987	
	Jeanne Carriere		
	Martin Davies		
Liberal Arts			
	Nancy Maveety: Chair	Political Science	nance@tulane.edu 862-8300
	William Balee	Anthropology	
	Jean-Godefroy Bidima	French & Italian	
	Elizabeth Boone	Art	
	Christopher Dunn	Spanish & Portuguese	
	Barbara Hayley	Music	
	T.R. Johnson	English	
	Mary Olson	Economics	
	Jonathan Riley	Philosophy	

Medicine			
	Kevin Krane: Chair	Nephrology	kkrane@tulane.edu 988-6191
	Ramesh Ayyala	Ophthalmology	
	Vecihi Batuman	Nephrology	
	Barbara Beckman	Pharmacology	
	Neil Boris	Psychiatry	
	Matt Burow	Hematology/Oncology	
	Robert Garry	Microbiology/Immunology	
	Marc Kahn	Hematology/Oncology	
	Dewan Majid	Physiology	
	Gilbert Morris	Pathology	
	Eric Simon	Nephrology	
	William Wimley	Biochemistry	
Public Health & Tropical Medicine			
	Larry Webber: Chair	Biostatistics	webber@tulane.edu 988-7322
	Patty Kissinger	Epidemiology	
	Hugh Long	Health Systems Management	
	Richard Oberhelman	Tropical Medicine	
	Roy Rando	Environmental Health Sciences	
	Diego Rose	Community Health Sciences	
	Mark VanLandingham	International Health & Development	
Science and Engineering			
	YiPing Chen: Chair	Cell & Molecular Biology	yichen@tulane.edu 247-1593
	Oscar Barbarin	Psychology	
	Ricardo Cortez	Mathematics	
	Mark Fink	Chemistry	
	David Heins	Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	
	Karen Johannesson	Earth & Environmental Science	
	Victor Moll	Mathematics	
	David Mullin	Cell & Molecular Biology	
	Robert Pascal	Chemistry	

Social Work		
	Charles Figley: Chair	figley@tulane.edu
	Richard Ager	862-3473
	Frederick Buttell	
	Judith Lewis	
	Marva Lewis	
	Lynn Pearlmutter	