

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Prepared by Task Force Subcommittee

Clifford G. Grulee, Jr., M.D., Chairman

George R. Meneely, M.D.

Helmut M. Redetzki, M.D.

Marion D. Hargrove, Jr., M.D.

POSITION PAPER

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL--TENURE, PROMOTION AND RECRUITMENT

In addressing the task of preparing a "position paper," it is first necessary to decide what purpose the effort is to subserve and what types of information will be most helpful. The data must be accurate and timely and should logically relate to any basic objective being sought by those who will be using the position paper in their deliberations. If basic assumptions are to be made, these should be clearly stated.

Since one assumption has been made, let us start by stating it. In attempting to fulfill my assignment, it has been assumed that this faculty is a community of scholars which includes among its primary purposes the addition of new knowledge to and improved care of patients in the field of medicine. Stated otherwise, no apology will be offered in the discussion for those elements of policy and procedure which preserve the importance of scholarly activities in the life of our institution.

With respect to the objectives of this faculty retreat, the planning task force realized that a realistic and accurate description of "Where We Are" is a necessary prelude to planning for the future. In dealing with the tenure, promotion and recruitment of academic personnel, every effort has been made to keep these purposes in mind.

Tenure is undoubtedly the oldest academic perquisite. It is at the same time the most definite and the most vague of concepts. From origins largely in privately supported institutions with small numbers of faculty members, it has become quite ubiquitous applying equally to private and state universities. Recently President Hackerman of Rice University

discussed the subject with the Council of Deans of the American Association of Medical Colleges. He pointed out that a creative person must have untrammelled time in which to work, and continued by saying that research and scholarly activities inevitably lead to alterations in existing truths and thus upset established social groups. The implication was obvious that nontenured and thus unprotected faculty members would soon fall prey to such displeasure. Later in his remarks, opinions were expressed that up to two out of ten decisions to confer indeterminate tenure are mistakes, that a few faculty start the process of retiring when tenure is granted and, finally, that difficulty in obtaining "court room" evidence is so great in cases where abuse of tenure is suspected that efforts at challenge are almost never made.

Tenure has also acquired various grades of meaning. Although originally applied only when "permanent" or "indeterminate" tenure was involved, the term is now used in the limited sense of two, three or five-year appointments. Some institutions, including our own, which are supported by annual or biannual legislative appropriations and/or a high percentage of "soft money" from research grants and contracts refer to tenure of title, implying that academic title is assured to be permanent but no parallel guarantee of compensation exists. Another variation being utilized by an increasing number of medical schools is tenure (as applied to salary) on payments made from university funds but not on any additional salary increments from professional earnings or grant supported activities.

Without exception, tenure applies only to full-time faculty appointments and assumes greater significance when the intellectual discipline involved is not readily marketable outside an academic setting. There are evidences

that changes are beginning to occur in traditional concepts of tenure. As the administrative and organizational chores of running large academic units become more complex and costly, administrators have become exquisitely sensitive to continuing and escalating costs. They are examining the ratios of tenured to nontenured personnel, and they are beginning to question the relevance of the concept of tenure in an emerging climate in some parts of our country of collective bargaining. Many universities are living uneasily with excessively high ratios of tenured to untenured personnel which they feel they cannot afford or which at best restrict the number of new junior faculty positions that can be offered.

Tenure was never intended to apply to such administrative designations as department heads, program directors, or members of a Dean's staff. Nevertheless, in many institutions a loose application of the word is beginning to apply to department heads. In the past, the permanency of this type of appointment was not questioned. In recent years, however, a rapidly changing knowledge base, the greatly increased complexity of operating an academic department, and the desire on the part of increasingly remote upper echelons of university administration for immediate response to proposed program changes, have led to optional and even mandatory limits to terms of service of departmental chairmen referred to as "limited tenure." This trend, not infrequently, is supported by department heads themselves who wistfully contemplate a return to research and other purely academic pursuits and, likewise, is supported by younger faculty who feel that older department heads can no longer respond to their needs. Granting that program flexibility, appropriate current leadership, efficient use of a limited dollar supply and the continuing sanity of department heads are desirable, there are also very

serious disadvantages to this new trend. First, most department heads can and wish to continue serving; and secondly, there is necessary disruption of departmental functioning with each change in leadership. Not only are such shifts expensive to accomplish, but more important, they may result in serious instability and program discontinuity. Fortunately, your essayist believes, our School of Medicine has not limited the terms of its department heads.

Against the background of this general discussion, "Where Are We" now in Shreveport? First, some statistics may help put things in perspective. There is a total of 413 faculty members, of these, 306 are volunteers from the practicing profession, 107 of the total are individuals paid all or part of their salaries by the University. Of these, 85 are classified as full-time. Thirty-four of the 85 faculty members have permanent tenure and an equal number have tenure limited by the usual terms of appointment at the level of assistant professor or below or by the source of their salary payment (such as from a grant or contract). Thus, 40% of our full-time faculty have permanent tenure and this figure rises to 80% if limited tenure arrangements are included. Stated differently, only 17 of our faculty do not have tenure of one type or another and several of these are senior house staff members. The figure for permanently tenured faculty members is not inordinately high but, if the number rises progressively, it becomes much more difficult to add to the faculty the bright young intellects who will become the academic leaders of the future.

A valuable dividend from the task of preparing this paper has been a systematic review of the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Supervisors of the Louisiana State University pertaining to the subject at hand.

Section 6-6 specifies that "full-time members of the instructional staff having the rank of instructor or higher, and persons engaged in artistic, research and investigative positions of equal dignity, shall constitute the faculty of the University." Section 7-9 deals with tenure and starts out as follows: "The provisions of tenure apply only to the full-time members of the academic staff of the various campuses with respect to the academic rank only." Subsection A is quoted in its entirety since it furnishes the basis for most of the tenure questions in which we would have interest.

"a. Tenure - Faculty Ranks. The tenure of all those on the various campuses who rank as professors or as associate professors or equivalent shall be of indeterminate duration, except that the initial appointment and subsequent reappointments through not more than four years of total service may be for a stipulated term, and persons promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor after less than four years of service may be continued on term appointment through no more than the fourth year. Persons appointed to or promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor while being paid from a grant or contract may be given limited tenure, not exceeding the duration of the grant or contract. The tenure of those who rank as assistant professors shall be for a stipulated term of no longer than three years. Those who rank as instructors and associates shall be on annual appointment. Upon reappointment after seven years of satisfactory service, the tenure of assistant professors shall be of indeterminate duration. When possible, at least three months' notice shall be given of intention

not to renew a limited term appointment, but failure of the respective campus to give such notice shall not constitute reappointment."

Section 7-12 of the same article and Section 4 of Article 8 provide a carefully described appeal mechanism when problems of tenure arise.

No discussion of tenure could be complete without considering promotion and the process by which it is attained. With promotion comes recognition that the individual involved is not only academically and professionally competent, but that his worth to his institution has increased. Almost invariably the salary is increased and a big step toward the attainment or the actual granting of tenure occurs. In fact, in the eyes of many, promotion is important because it leads to tenure.

In October of 1972 an ad hoc committee prepared and presented a report entitled "Guides for promotion of members of the faculty of the School of Medicine in Shreveport." The Faculty Council approved the document which is attached to this paper as Appendix A. Its tenets are basically sound and proper. Undoubtedly, some refinements could be effected through periodic review but this is not seen as an urgent need. For example, board certification rather than board qualification seems appropriate for appointment as Assistant Professor (rather than as Associate Professor). Further, reference to the possession of administrative ability in the promotion of an Associate Professor to the rank of Professor, probably should not be universally applied. In the guidelines, appropriate references are made to recognition of community service, teaching abilities, and activities of the School which could be lumped under the heading of "good academic citizenship," but it could be made more explicit that such desirable attributes of a faculty member do not entirely substitute for scholarly attainments, such as substantial

published research and significant recognition from professional peer groups. Neither decreasing sources of support for research nor the apparently less favored status of these activities in universities today should discourage us from continuing emphasis on them in developing our faculty. At the same time we must be responsive to societal demands and, in so doing, must give real recognition in matters of promotion and tenure to efforts of this sort.

In addition to the criteria used for promotions, the procedures by which these promotions are effected are important. Department heads prepare recommendations supported by biographical data and material descriptive of the activities upon which the proposed promotion is based. These are sent to the Office of the Dean for referral to the Faculty Promotions Committee. That body, after careful study of the materials submitted to it, augmented if need be by its own inquiries, makes its recommendation to the Faculty Council which in turn reviews the individual recommendations for the Dean recording its judgments on approval or disapproval by secret ballot. Section 4-12 of the Bylaws and Regulations states "The Faculty Council shall counsel with the dean or director in administration of the affairs of the school or division and in the administration of its policies and shall review the qualification of all candidates for promotion and for academic appointments at the rank of associate professor and full professor." The Office of the Dean then executes appropriate forms for transmittal to the Chancellor. Again, the recommended promotion is reviewed for conformance to University Rules and Regulations before final approval by the Board of Supervisors is accomplished. In this careful stepwise process, the need for a secret ballot

on each recommendation by the Faculty Council is questionable. It may even be objectionable. If the work of the Faculty Promotions Committee has been done properly, a motion approving its findings would seem to be sufficient. In those instances where questions must be raised, free discussion by the Faculty Council should be encouraged; but, when the question is called, the balloting should be open. It is much easier to indulge a bias or personal prejudice if your colleagues do not know how you are voting.

In the special case of appointing new department heads, a variant of the promotions procedure is followed which can become cumbersome. Search committees first develop a list of promising candidates and, after collecting supporting information, usually interview leading prospects. By the time the Search Committee reports its choices to the Dean, usually as three names listed in the order of preference, many faculty members have become familiar with the individuals concerned. The Dean then initiates negotiations but cannot finalize these until the academic rank being offered (not the Departmental Headship) has been reviewed by the Faculty Council. This degree of caution can be quite awkward if not a significant deterrent to recruiting. Some streamlining here would be in order.

The final subject, namely recruitment of academic personnel, has already been introduced. For an institution such as ours, still in the process of development, it is of great importance. A full complement of faculty to meet the multiple needs of our School of Medicine when we have reached full operating size must be acquired gradually. This is true because it is not possible to recruit everyone needed at any one time and because the funds to do so must be developed with full justification for each requested annual

increase. Under such circumstances, the maintenance of a healthy balance between developing departments can be difficult. Many factors must be considered. First, there is the importance of the contribution made by the department to the overall program of the School. It could hardly be argued, for example, that a strong program in orthopedics or neurosurgery is of comparable importance to a strong program in internal medicine. Second, some attention must be given to potential sources of departmental support. Basic science units, at least in the past, have had less opportunity for acquiring federal grant funds than have their clinical counterparts and, in addition, cannot generate significant amounts of professional service income. Proper funding policy must include balancing judgments, as difficult as these may be to make. The ability to recruit successfully stems from many points of origin. An attractive academic climate includes first and most importantly department heads and other faculty members with whom others want association and work experience. There must be reasonable physical facilities and, finally, there must be enough dollars to support these facilities, the faculty and the work to be done by them. Though not of pivotal importance, the administration of the School and overall University are significant influences also.

The general environment is of great though somewhat less importance than the academic features referred to. The characteristics of the geographic area in which the School is located can be most helpful. If the economy is sound and developing, this too can be very important because it is usually in such cities or areas where progressive local government policies create good school systems, public health programs, police and fire protection, etc.

Cultural enrichments are attractions sought by most academicians. The

presence in the community of a comprehensive University is often the principal nidus around which many cultural activities develop, and so for this and many other cogent reasons, we should all encourage the further development of the institutions of higher education in our area and the development of graduate programs in them.

In terms of salary arrangements, usually new and developing institutions are somewhat liberal. Schools such as Harvard or Hopkins, as we all know, have such a wealth of resources of all kinds that bright young people are eager to work there even for low salaries. Also, such institutions have different missions than ours and relate to a considerably different community and area. There are other considerations, however, which influence salaries. In Los Angeles or New York it is estimated that the increased cost of living as compared to many other parts of our country amounts to four or five thousand dollars a year for the usual academic family. In Shreveport, real estate is alarmingly high, but other living costs are quite reasonable and we are probably advantaged in this aspect of attracting new faculty.

In the interest of brevity, other circumstances influencing recruitment are tabulated as positive or negative factors:

Strengths

1. New institution and new opportunities
2. New physical facilities
3. Small, pleasant city
4. Potential for private giving by the community

Weaknesses

1. Lack of a full or comprehensive university in the immediate area
2. Tendency to select faculty (and students) predominately from the local area
3. Limited State resources
4. Medical Center organization (where we are the geographically remote unit)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 5. Strengths of the LSU system | 5. Lack of facilities for serving private patients |
| 6. Potential for bringing the Hospital and University together | 6. Current operation in temporary quarters in two locations |
| 7. Fine student and faculty groups | 7. Division of primary and secondary educational system strength between private and public schools |
| 8. Pride in the School from local community | 8. Biases imputed to Southern areas of the United States |
| 9. V.A. Dean's Committee Hospital relationship | 9. The avidity with which State government addresses itself to University problems |

Hopefully, this paper will be helpful in examining some of our current assets, options and problems. It was not intended as a means of making choices or of providing answers to problems. When personal judgments have been interjected, it is expected that they will be recognized for what they are and dealt with accordingly.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER
School of Medicine in Shreveport

Re: Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Promotions

Guides for promotion of members of the faculty of the LSU School of
Medicine in Shreveport

- I. The requirements of the Louisiana State University System regarding faculty status and appointments should be met.
- II. Guidelines pertinent to this campus:
 - A. Length of service in rank. Recommended length of service (or a portion of that time) at any of the levels of faculty status may have been met by in-service time at this institution or at other institutions of scholarly pursuit in which capabilities were demonstrated similar to those expected of an individual in service at this institution. Examples of how this might be fulfilled include: (a) residency or a stipulated specialty requirement fulfillment for the clinical faculty. (b) a comparable faculty appointment at another institution. (c) research post-graduate work for the basic science faculty. This length of service time should not be considered inflexible. The Dean of the School and Heads of Departments should be allowed to recommend to the promotions committee that certain faculty members be advanced to another level. Justification of such recommendations might be that considerations which were contingent to a person's faculty appointment are met or in those cases where particularly outstanding capabilities or service to the school and profession should be recognized. (d) the Dean

should be given the latitude of intervening with a strong recommendation for promotion for a particular individual if he (the Dean) feels that the department head may be deliberately holding a worthy individual back for purely selfish reasons. One of the presidential memoranda relates to this indirectly.

The specific guidelines agreed on for promotion between the various ranks are as follows:

Instructor to Assistant Professor.

Normally, promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor shall not be made until the faculty member has completed two years as an Instructor. The time spent as a post-doctoral fellow would count toward the two years in the case of a basic science man.

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.

Normally, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall not be made until the faculty member has completed three years as Assistant Professor. The faculty member should become a member of or at least be proposed for membership in the medical or scientific society most closely related to his discipline before promotion to Associate Professor (this demonstrates that the person is interested in establishing and keeping open lines of communication that are normally needed for proper intellectual development).

Associate Professor to Professor.

Normally, promotion to the rank of Professor shall not be made until the faculty member has completed five years as Associate Professor.

In addition, the person being promoted to full Professor should have demonstrated administrative ability. This length of service time should not be inflexible.

Effective ⁱⁿ Service ~~to~~ the medical school ^{toward} and the accomplishment of its goals, viewed in the broad sense, should be the basis of promotion and should include a wide range of activities such as:

- ① 1 - effectiveness in teaching
- ② 2 - faithfulness in fulfilling assignments
- 3 - committee work
- 4 - community service and civic work
- 5 - attendance at faculty meetings
- 6 - attendance at medical meetings

③
+ other
Evidence of
Contribution
Effectively
To the org.
as an
"P.R." org.
Member of

and other
Evidence of
Scholarly advancement
and/or attainment

② 7 - (publications - ^{and magnitude of the} In looking at the publication record, the quality and effort that went into each publication should be considered as well as the number of publications. An investigator may have spent much effort ^{which may have produced} and had come up with only one publication over a period of several years while another investigator ^{may have} had published many times during the same period with much of the same information appearing in two or more publications or ^{may have} had produced short publications containing ^{only} a small amount of material ^{new})

- ③ 8 - ^{Professional} clinical proficiency and effectiveness
- 9 - moral character
- 10 - relation to fellow workers
- 11 - membership in professional or scientific societies ^{+ other "Recognition" by his peers}
- 12 - periodic survey of faculty members who put time in good service

add
to
2

- 13 - A ^{clinical} faculty member should become board qualified before he is promoted to Assistant Professor.
- 14 - A ^{clinical} faculty member should become board certified before he is promoted to Associate Professor.

At each successive level of academic rank, performance in these activities should be at a higher level, appropriate to that rank. The fundamental basis of promotion is demonstrated service to the school either in the above activities or by any number of other ways that one may contribute to the overall program of the medical school.

Charles L. Black, M.D.

Chairman