

Dr. Deckers

I reviewed the proposed criteria, thought the changes were appropriate and responsive, and I am supportive.

Clinical Council

The Clinical Council met on May 22, 2008. The Council voted unanimously to support the proposed changes in the promotion criteria for collaborative researchers.

Dean's Council

On May 19, 2008, the Dean's Council reviewed and discussed the proposed promotion and tenure guidelines for collaborative researchers. The Dean's Council does endorse the need for guidelines such as these. Members of the DC were agreed about one area of concern in the proposed guidelines, however. In several places, the phrase "several principal investigators on multiple projects" is used. Dean's Council members are concerned that the use of the word "principal" undermines the very effort being made, since in some cases a project may be led by a co-principal investigator or even be one investigator of several on a project grant. It is therefore the suggestion of the Dean's Council that that wording of the phrase be changed to "several investigators on multiple projects."

Education Council

The Education Council met on May 14, 2008 to discuss the proposed changes in promotion guidelines related to faculty who are involved in collaborative research. The Council unanimously endorsed the idea of changing the current guidelines to provide appropriate criteria by which this important group of faculty can be promoted. However, there was far less agreement on the specifics of the proposed criteria. Below is a summary of the Council's concerns.

Section B.2.e. Leadership in a research, or significant, essential and independent contributions to the work of at least several principal investigators on multiple projects primarily or exclusively at the University of Connecticut.

The Council questioned the rationale for limiting such collaboration to the University of Connecticut. One suggestion was to simply delete "or exclusively." This same wording appears in C.1.c. (and also in that same section for promotion to Professor – criterion e).

Section C.1.c A record of sustained publication in refereed journals of important work resulting from collaborations with at least several principal investigators on multiple projects primarily or exclusively at the University of Connecticut to which the applicant has contributed his/her unique skills. The applicant must have made significant, essential and independent contributions to this published work. The applicant must also periodically be corresponding author of refereed articles in journals that are devoted

largely to the individuals area(s) of professional expertise.

Many Council members found the underlined sentence too high of a hurdle for a junior faculty member. What was discussed was the need to retain good collaborative scientists, and not lose them to the up-or-out promotion clock associated with these professional categories. They felt such an individual is a valuable asset to the School and should be retained by promotion to senior rank for that reason. However, they would retain this criterion for promotion to the rank of Professor since there is no clock associated with this promotion step, and attaining a rank of Professor should have a high hurdle. That said, there was still argument over whether the term “sustained” versus periodic should be used in this context. The same argument would apply to the Clinical Investigator category (Section C.2.e, and criterion for promotion to rank of Professor).

In summary, the Education Council endorses the modification of promotion criteria to acknowledge collaborative research faculty and their efforts, but would suggest the criteria as presented still need some work. They would like this discussed at the upcoming Faculty Forum.

Public Issues Council

The Public Issues Council expressed no concerns about this new category or guidelines.

Research Council

Reviewed by Research Council. No concerns expressed.