

September 8, 1998

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, Department Chairs, Division Chiefs, College Committee APT Chairs

FROM: Medical Center Clinical Sciences Academic Area Advisory Committee

RE: Comments on the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Process

To facilitate the process of promotion and tenure, the Medical Center Clinical Sciences Area Committee has several observations from its work during this year that may help the review process for dossiers and improve the Committee's ability to approve job descriptions without return.

1. The volume of the dossier is not a criterion for promotion. The Committee would encourage Department Chairs to help faculty be selective in choosing the materials that will best represent the individual's accomplishments. It is not necessary that every paper published or every handout prepared for a course be included in the dossier. Several representative examples should be sufficient and many dossiers are provided this way. This will also allow the Committee to conduct a more appropriate and efficient review.
2. It will be helpful to the committee if the curriculum vitae (or some other document) clearly indicates the status of grants and the individual's role with the grant (e.g. PI versus co-investigator). The specific amount of the grant should also be provided. In most cases, this information is appropriately documented. However, there have been enough instances where the information has been unclear that the Committee wanted to issue this reminder.
3. The Committee expects the letter from the Department Chair or Division Chief to address the performance of the individual in relation to the Distribution of Effort (DOE). This is important for Regular Title Series positions where there is no formal job description. It is also important for other title series where job descriptions exist. The Committee encounters situations where the DOE changes substantially over time without adequate revision of the job description. The individual evaluated is placed at a disadvantage as the Committee carries out its evaluation based on the job description included in the dossier.

4. The Area Committee's responsibility in reviewing job descriptions is to assess the appropriateness of the criteria identified for appointment and promotion. The Committee reviews the criteria for consistency with the identified responsibilities and the Distribution of Effort described to assure the individual appointed will have an opportunity to be successful in the APT process. One common reason the Area Committee returns job descriptions for revision is that there are inconsistencies between the criteria for appointment and promotion, the distribution of effort, and the stated responsibilities of the position. Examples would be having a 20% teaching commitment but no stated criterion for evaluation of teaching performance or requiring evidence of creative or scholarly activity as a criterion, with no committed effort identified for this activity.
5. An issue of concern relates to making sure the criteria for appointment and promotion match with the title series selected. The Committee is fully aware that the choice of title series for a position can be dictated by funding sources and tenure or non-tenure track position availability. As an example however, the Committee reviews some Special Title Series job descriptions that seem to more appropriately belong in the Clinical Title Series because of a relatively high allocation for patient care service. Once the right title series is determined for an appointment, it is important to remember that the job description and the DOE must agree. The DOE assigned must provide the individual appointed adequate time to meet the requirements set forth in the criteria.

If you have any comments or questions, please contact Ann Amerson, Chair of Medical Center Clinical Sciences Academic Area Advisory Committee at 323-5852 or aamer1@pop.uky.edu.

ABA/co