



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS MEDICAL BRANCH
GALVESTON, TEXAS 77550

April 3, 1979

MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty of Medicine

From: Academic Planning Committee
James C. Guckian, M.D., Chairman *J*

The Academic Planning Committee (APC) is continuing to look at issues that are important to the future development of UTMB and the excellence of its faculty. One of the issues that is widely recognized is that of the policies concerning appointment, promotion, and tenure. Over the past several months the APC has been conducting a thorough study of this complex issue.

The Faculty of Medicine does not have guidelines for appointment, promotion, and tenure, other than those in the Regents' Rules generally applicable to academic institutions in The University of Texas System. UTMB has been cited recently by various accrediting bodies for the lack of such guidelines. This, however, is not the most important reason to examine this issue. The APC has become concerned with promotion and tenure because these are important in the development and retention of quality faculty.

We know that our investigation must be comprehensive and take into account factors which affect every level of our institution. Hence, we are exploring it from the point of view of the faculty, the departmental chairmen, the administration, and the academic community in general, as reflected in the experience of other schools and in the literature.

We are at the point in our study where it is essential to determine if the faculty as a whole feels that this is an important issue and also to determine the sentiments of the faculty regarding possible improvements. For this purpose, the APC has prepared a general questionnaire (enclosed) listing some of the broad questions surrounding the issues of appointment, promotion, and tenure.

Please take time to respond to these questions thoughtfully, or if you prefer, write a letter to the APC reflecting your views and concerns. Most of these questions are familiar, having been discussed at one time or another by faculty members here and elsewhere. What is not known is the degree to which any of these may be important issues at this time on our campus.

Finally, we wish to emphasize that the APC has not developed a position on any of these questions, nor on what changes, if any, are needed in current policies or procedures. After we have received your responses, we will complete our study and report our finding to the faculty.

JCG:elf
Enclosure

QUESTIONNAIRE

FROM ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
ON APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
DATED APRIL 3, 1979

INTRODUCTION

The Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Questionnaire represents an initial effort by the Academic Planning Committee (APC) to seek input from the full faculty of medicine on the issues surrounding appointment, promotion, and tenure at UTMB. The APC is particularly interested in your opinions on the strong points and possible problem areas in our present system, and, if you believe our present system might be improved, how this could be accomplished.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please answer the following questions briefly but as completely as possible. Use additional sheets where necessary, identifying your answers by the number of the question. The APC will consider the number of questionnaires returned and the thoughtfulness of the answers as one measure of the importance of these issues to the faculty of medicine at this time.

There may be those who find that approach of the questionnaire is not useful in expressing their views. Please feel free to write a letter to the APC, addressing the concerns which are important to you.

Please return the questionnaire or your letter by Wednesday, April 18, 1979 to Bettylu Fitzsimmons, Room 541 Administration Building, R-7.

QUESTIONS

1. In your opinion, are guidelines for appointment, promotion, and tenure needed?

Please circle one: YES NO DON'T KNOW

2. Upon what criteria should appointment, promotion, and tenure be based (ranking "1" least important to "10" most important)?

Teaching 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Patient Care or Service 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Research 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Administrative Duties 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Other (Specify) _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. Should guidelines which might be developed for the appointment, promotion, and tenure of basic scientists be different from those of clinical scientists? Please list and explain your reasons, pro or con.

4. Among clinical faculty, should guidelines for appointment, promotion, and tenure be the same for both the clinicians whose time is spent primarily in service to patients and teaching, and the clinicians who primarily do research and publish? Please give reasons for your answer.

5. In the basic sciences, should faculty who spend all their time doing research be evaluated by the same guidelines as those who also carry a teaching responsibility? Please give reasons for your answer.

6. Separate non-tenure track has been suggested as a possibility for the clinicians who do no research or publish and for the basic scientists who do not teach. Please indicate your opinion, with explanation.

Questionnaire to Faculty
From Academic Planning Committee
Re Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Page Three

7. Some schools have considered changing the tenured faculty positions so they are no longer permanent but are renegotiable at specified periods. Should this idea be explored further for UTMB? Please explain your answer.

8. Do you feel that you have an adequate understanding of the current mechanisms by which an individual is proposed, reviewed, and approved for appointment, promotion, and tenure? Do you have suggestions as to how these procedures might be changed or improved?

9. What additional problems or areas of concern, if any, do you perceive with appointment, promotion, and tenure at UTMB?

10. Should tenure be continued? Please discuss.

7. Some schools have considered changing the tenure faculty positions so they are no longer permanent but are negotiable at specified periods. Should this idea be explored further for UH? Please explain your answer.

8. Do you feel that you have an adequate understanding of the current mechanisms by which an individual is proposed, reviewed, and approved for appointment, promotion, and tenure? Do you have suggestions as to how these procedures might be changed or improved?

9. What additional problems or concerns, if any, do you perceive with appointment, promotion, and tenure?

10. Should tenure be continued?

DR. WILLIAM E. THORNTON
DEPT. OF INTERNAL MEDICINE