

Annual Report on Academic Personnel Review, 2014-2015



Annual Report on Academic Personnel Review, 2014-15

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Uptown Campus Statistics	2
Health Sciences Campus Statistics	3
School of Medicine	3
School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine	5
Challenges in Academic Review Processes	6
Prospective Issues for Consideration	8
Appendix: Academic Personnel Review Committees, 2014-2015	10

Introduction

The 2014-15 Annual Report on Academic Personnel Review includes summary statistics for reviews conducted in the 2014-15 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), which are 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)” <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp> -- 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.

Reported statistics on “approval rates” for reviews tend to be biased upwards insofar as some colleagues, in anticipation of a negative review outcome, may choose to leave Tulane or request a change to a different professorial track beforehand. In other cases, some colleagues may be actively mentored to do so. Either way, it is very important to keep this in mind when surveying the data below.



Michael A. Bernstein

Professor of History and Economics

Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Uptown Campus Statistics

The Office of Academic Affairs reviewed eighty-two faculty files for reappointment, third-year review, promotion and/or tenure for the Uptown campus Schools (Architecture, Liberal Arts, Science & Engineering, Business, Law, Social Work and Newcomb Tulane College) during the 2014-2015 academic year. The majority of the cases were in the School of Liberal Arts (thirty-eight) and in the School of Science and Engineering (twenty-six) (see Table 1).

Table 1: Uptown Campus Academic Personnel Review Statistics, 2014-2015

Uptown Campus	Total #	Number Approvals	Number Denied	Approval Rate
TENURE TRACK				
Third Year Review	26	25	1	96%
Appeal Neg. Third Year Review	0	0	0	N/A
Promotion & Tenure (P&T)	15	12	3	80%
Appeal Neg. P&T Review	0	0	0	N/A
Promotion To Full Rank	13	11	2	85%
New Hire With Tenure	1	1	0	100%
New Hire Full Professor	1	1	0	100%
Subtotal	58	52	6	90%
NON-TENURE TRACK				
Reappointment	19	19	0	100%
Reappoint. with Promotion	5	5	0	100%
Subtotal	24	24	0	100%
GRAND TOTAL	82	76	6	93%
N/A: Not Applicable				

Health Sciences Campus Statistics

School of Medicine

During the 2014-2015 academic year, twenty-six files were reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs in the following categories (see Table 2): sixteen in the tenure track, three in the research track, and seven in the clinical track. Ninety-six percent of the reviews were positive. There was 100% concurrence between the recommendations of the School and the Provost. Overall, the average turnaround time was approximately 8 days. This report does not reflect appointment or track-change data for Assistant Professors.

Table 2: School of Medicine Academic Personnel Review Statistics, 2014-2015

School of Medicine	Total #	Number Approvals	Number Denied	Approval Rate
TENURE TRACK				
Appointment – Full Professor with Tenure	2	2	0	100%
Promotion & Tenure (P&T)	2	2	0	100%
Extension of Tenure Clock	2	1	1	N/A
Track Change to Non-Tenure Series with Promotion	2	2	0	100%
Track Change to Non-Tenure Series without Promotion	2	2	0	100%
Third Year Review	6	6	0	100%
Subtotal	16	15	1	94%
RESEARCH TRACK				
Appointment	0	0	0	N/A
Promotion	0	0	0	N/A
Track Change to Tenure Series with Promotion	2	2	0	100%
Track Change to Tenure Series without Promotion	1	1	0	100%
Subtotal	3	3	0	100%
CLINICAL TRACK				
Appointment	4	4	0	100%
Promotion	2	2	0	100%
Status Change to Full Time with Promotion	1	1	0	100%
Subtotal	7	7	0	100%
GRAND TOTAL	26	25	1	96%
Track Changes are tabulated by track of original appointment N/A: Not Applicable				

School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine

During the 2014-2015 academic year, eighteen faculty files were reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs (see Table 3), fifteen in the tenure track, two in the research track and one in the clinical track. Overall, the average turnaround time in Academic Affairs was approximately 11 days, and 94% of the reviews were positive. There was 100% concurrence between the recommendations of the School and the Provost. This report does not reflect appointment data for Assistant Professors.

Table 3: School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine Academic Personnel Review Statistics, 2014-2015

SPHTM	Total #	Number Approvals	Number Denied	Approval Rate
TENURE TRACK				
Appointment	0	0	0	N/A
Promotion & Tenure (P&T)	8	7	1	88%
Third Year Review	4	4	0	100%
Tenure Clock Extension	1	1	0	100%
Track Change to Non-Tenure Series without Promotion	2	2	0	100%
Subtotal	15	14	1	93%
RESEARCH TRACK				
Appointment	1	1	0	100%
Promotion	1	1	0	100%
Track Change	0	0	0	N/A
Subtotal	2	2	0	100%
CLINICAL TRACK				
Appointment	0	0	0	N/A
Promotion	1	1	0	100%
Track Change	0	0	0	N/A
Subtotal	1	1	0	100%
GRAND TOTAL	18	17	1	94%
Track Changes are tabulated by track of original appointment N/A: Not Applicable				

Challenges in Academic Review Processes

In the course of our review work this past academic year, we noted continued improvement in the construction of academic files. We briefly note here certain challenges that were identified in the review process. 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.

- As outlined in the Faculty Handbook, there are circumstances in which tenure clock extensions may be considered (both for personal and professional issues). Requests for early tenure reviews are highly unusual and normally reserved for truly extraordinary achievement and/or matters of retention in the face of competitive outside offers. If an early tenure review is unsuccessful, the candidate will only be entitled to one additional year of appointment.
- Recommendations for appointments of new faculty at tenure rank should report the vote of appropriately enfranchised faculty and/or School appointment, promotion, and tenure committee's. For example, all tenured faculty would vote on the appointment of an Associate Professor with tenure and all Full Professors would vote on the appointment of a Full Professor with tenure.
- External Referees: If units/departments/schools/appointment, promotion and tenure committees have difficulty securing external referees, they should request assistance from their Dean, the Provost, and/or the Office of Academic Affairs. Consideration should be given to notifying external referees regarding the outcome of the review for which they have provided an evaluation.
- Outcomes of Reviews: The appointment, promotion and tenure committees are encouraged to talk with their respective Dean about approaches to notifying the successful candidates about the outcome of reviews. Candidates should be notified about the final decision (i.e., "campus reviewers concluded that..."). However, under no circumstance should the candidate be notified of the outcome of the different levels of review (e.g., the candidate should NOT be informed that the appointment, promotion and tenure committee approved the review and the Dean disagreed with the decision).
- Reconsideration: If a candidate who has not had a successful promotion/tenure review requests reconsideration, a new group of external referees are to be selected to conduct an evaluation of the cases. The letters to the new external referees requesting evaluation of the file should not signal a failed prior review. The file that is forwarded for reconsideration, however, should include all information (including the first set of letters from external referees).
- Early Tenure Reviews: Candidates should not be encouraged to go up for promotion and tenure review early. Only in rare cases -- to address retention issues or when a candidate has a truly extraordinary record of achievement -- are early tenure reviews appropriate.
- Promotion and tenure committees should include tenured and full rank faculty. Inclusion of non-tenured, non- full rank faculty on these committees should be avoided.

- **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, and reputation to serve as a credible commentator on a case. It is normally expected that consideration will be given to selecting external referees from member schools of the Association of American Universities (AAU) (see <http://www.aau.edu/about/article.aspx?id=5476> for an AAU membership list).
- **Call Letters to External Referees:** It is important the call letters to external referees clearly outline the kind of critical assessments that we expect from them, including comparisons with peers in the field. Call letters should never include nor gesture toward the presumption of a particular review outcome.
- **Research:** For tenure-track and 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, the prospects for the continued vitality and productivity of the candidate's research or creative activity, the anticipated visibility of his/her on-going research or creative trajectory, 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. Both sides of split votes should be thoroughly explained.
- **Promotion and Tenure Votes:** It is important to unify votes in promotion and tenure; there is no need to have separate votes. This means that if there is an external appointment of a full professor, associate professors would not vote on the matter of tenure (the unit could allow them to vote on the question of the appointment itself, if so desired).
- **Recusal:** School review committees should consider ending the recusal of departmental and/or specialty area colleagues in consideration of promotion and tenure cases from their home departments. Not allowing such colleagues to vote in these cases is quite understandable, but entirely quarantining them from the deliberative process may deprive the review committee of the opportunity to benefit from their disciplinary and professional expertise.
- **Reporting Results:** Both the school review committee letter and the Dean's letter should discuss the pros and cons of each case thoroughly, identifying strengths as well as weaknesses in the dossier.
- **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 have highlighted many opportunities for mentoring and faculty development. Clear and consistent communication to review candidates (not to mention all colleagues) regarding the expectations 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 the complete absence of appropriate service experience for junior colleagues is neither appropriate nor wise. To be sure,

senior faculty and Deans should work with junior faculty to ensure that research or creative activity, 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 and to be represented in School and University committees and activities.

Prospective Issues for Consideration

We continue to invite comments, suggestions, and insights from all colleagues as well as from members of the academic leadership of all the academic units and Schools on prospective issues and practices in academic personnel review. Listed below are some of the major issues that have our on-going attention and concern in Academic Affairs.

- If appropriate, particular attention should be paid to discussing contributions to collaborative and transdisciplinary research efforts (such as multi-investigator grants and publications and/or dynamic research teams). Similarly, when relevant, the analysis should include a detailed discussion of non-traditional publications (online) and research outlets (networks). The analysis should also discuss any engaged research and public scholarship initiatives. Commentary should also be provided regarding the synergy of the candidate's work with the mission and strategic goals of the School, Department, and/or unit.
- How will the University best evaluate, assess, and reward faculty effort with regard to intellectual property generation, technology transfer, and enterprise development?
- Given the growing importance of faculty mentoring, how might these activities best be recognized and rewarded?
- The Office of Academic Affairs would like to pursue the development of a university-wide template and/or guidelines for construction of review dossiers and resumes.
- Annual Review of Faculty: Deans are encouraged in annual review meetings, to discuss anticipated timelines for promotion to full professor with all faculty at the rank of associate professor.
- 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 ensure that such sharing of information is taking place? Would it be useful to provide candidates with redacted external referee letters – which would provide an array of detailed information concerning the candidate's progress in his/her career 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 with regard to 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? Would periodic joint meetings of all University academic review committees facilitate consistency and transparency of practices?
- Time in track for tenured associate professors: In some academic units, there are a relatively high percentage of associate professors with tenure who have been in rank for fairly long periods of time. What (if any) constraints, practices, presumptions, and expectations may be negatively impinging upon their timely advancement to full professorial rank?

Appendix: Academic Personnel Review Committees, 2015-2016

Architecture			
	Judith Kinnard: Chair	jkinnard@tulane.edu	
	Errol Barron	314-2322	
	Scott Bernhard		
	Ammar Eloueini		
	Graham Owen		
	Kentaro Tsubaki		
Freeman (Business)			
	Lynn Hannan: Chair	Accounting	rhannan@tulane.edu 862-8473
	Mike Burke	Management	
	Ted Fee	Finance	
	James McFarland	Management Science	
	James McFarland	Marketing	
Law			
	Onnig Dombalagian: Chair	odombala@tulane.edu	
	Jim Gordley	865-5968	
	Jancy Hoeffel		
	Adam Feibelman: ex officio		
	Ron Scalise: ex officio		
Liberal Arts			
	William Balee: Chair	Anthropology	wbalee@tulane.edu 862-3055
	John Charles	Spanish & Portuguese	
	Emily Clark	History	
	John Edwards	Economics	
	Barbara Hayley	Theatre & Dance	
	Brian Horowitz	Jewish Studies	
	Kevin Jones	Art	
	Supriya Nair	English	
	Eduardo Silva	Political Science	
Professor of Practice and Lecturer Review Committee			

	Carl Bankston	Sociology	
	Faycal Falaky	French & Italian	
	Amy George-Hirons	Spanish & Portuguese	
	J. Celeste Lay	Political Science	
	Dan Sharp	Music	
Medicine			
	Bruce Bunnell: Chair	Pharmacology	bbunnell@tulane.edu 988-3329
	Matt Burow	Medicine	
	John Clements	Microbiology/Immunology	
	Srikanta Dash	Pathology	
	Yan Dong	Structural & Cellular Biology	
	Vivian Fonseca	Medicine	
	Phillip Kadowitz	Pharmacology	
	Joseph Lasky	Medicine/Pulmonary Disease	
	Cindy Leissingner	Medicine	
	James Robinson	Pediatrics	
	Oliver Sartor	Medicine/Hematology & Oncology	
	Michael Scheeringa	Psychiatry	
Public Health & Tropical Medicine			
	Roy Rando: Chair	Global Environmental Health Science	rando@tulane.edu 988-3870
	Mark Diana	Global Health Amangement & Policy	
	Anastasia Gage	Global Commnity Health & Behaviorial Sciences	
	Patty Kissinger	Epidemiology	
	Don Krogstad	Tropical Medicine	
	Diego Rose	Global Community Health & Behavroial Sciences	
	Sudesh Srivastav	Biostatistics & Bioinformatics	
Science & Engineering			
	Jill Daniel: Chair	Psychology	jmdaniel@tulane.edu 862-3301
	Mike Blum	Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	
	George Flowers	Earth & Enviornmental Biology	
	Bruce Gibb	Chemistry	
	Mac Hyman	Mathematics	
	Vijay John	Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering	
	Michael Moore	Biomedical Engineering	
	Laura Schrader	Cell & Molecular Biology	

	Fred Wietfeldt	Physics	
Professor of Practice Promotion Advisory Committee			
	Wayne Reed: Chair	Physics	wreed@tulane.edu 862-3185
	Ron Anderson	Biomedical Engineering	
	Julie Alvarez	Psychology	
	Donata Henry	Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	
	Carol Zhang	Chemistry	
Social Work			
	Charles Figley: Co-Chair	figley@tulane.edu	862-3473
	Qingwen Xu: Co-Chair	qxu2@tulane.edu	862-3477
	Richard Ager		
	Fred Buttell		
	Marva Lewis		
	Lynn Pearlmutter		