

MARCH 21, 1990

**CONFIDENTIAL**

TO: Dean Robert Kane  
FROM: Henry Blackburn  
RE: Review of the Division of Epidemiology

---

I note in the minutes for the Thursday, March 1 Administrative Council meeting, which I was unable to attend, the statement that "In order to avoid delaying the discussions too long, the [Division] Review will need to be held at an AEC meeting in the near future even if Division Heads are unable to attend."

The pique apparently expressed publicly at that meeting and the impatience manifest in this memo is, in my view, inappropriate to the 13 month process involved in the Division of Epidemiology Review. The fact that this Review cannot be scheduled at a time when the Division can be represented at the Administrative Council meeting is mysterious, in my view of the duration of the process.

You have received memos, I believe from the Division of Epidemiology faculty, that came from them quite spontaneously, about what they regard as flaws in the review process. Though I greatly admired the diplomacy with which Mark Kjelsberg put together the report, I found the notification, the appointments to the evaluating group, the content of the anonymous questionnaires used, the failure to interview people or to visit the Division to see its works, the failure to compile usual and obvious criteria for academic productivity of the Division and the scheduling of the Review before the Administrative Council in the absence of the Division Head, all parts of an inappropriate and uncollegial process.

Informal exploration among our faculty reveals that their failure (40%) to respond to the questionnaire was primarily due to the fact that the questionnaire wasn't relevant to the job of an objective evaluation of the Division or of Division Head.