

Transition to Clinical Weeks and Calendar Years

Last Modified on 04/06/2018 1:17 pm PDT

Starting with the 2017-2018 M&P cycle, there are several changes that candidates and packet reviewers may notice related to clinical effort and calendar year reporting.

Clinical Effort

Starting in Summer 2016, documentation of clinical effort switched from Clinical Hours to Clinical Weeks. This was done to simplify the reporting process, as clinical weeks can be directly harvested from the Clinical Scheduling System whereas the clinical hours had to be manually entered for every faculty member every term. This was done at the academic year break.

Academic Year > Calendar Year

Due to adjustments to timelines and stricter deadlines from the office of the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs, gathering all of the required effort and evaluation data for faculty had become increasingly difficult.

Starting with the 2017-2018 action cycle, teaching evaluations and clinical effort in the M&P packets will be based on calendar year rather than academic year. This gives department and VMDO staff time to collect all of the necessary effort and evaluation data to meet deadlines.

Calculating Average Hours and Average Weeks for 2016 Data

With the change from hours to weeks starting in the middle of 2016, calculating the average for the clinical activity type becomes challenging. Let's look at a hypothetical example.

"Dr. Smith"	2014	2015	2016	Average
Lecture	15	15	15	15
Clinical Hours	200	200	100	166.7
Clinical Weeks			10	10

For our example above, we are showing a 3 year average for Lecture and Clinical Hours, but a 1 year "average" for the Clinical Weeks (which for 2016 is the actual weeks worked).

In subsequent review cycles (2018-2019 and 2019-2020), this partial year of clinical weeks/clinical hours may cause some confusion as the clinical hours average decreases and the clinical weeks average increases, but after that, for a regular 3 year review period, the clinical weeks should more accurately represent the clinical effort of the instructor.

The combination of moving to the calendar year and clinical weeks tracking mid-year has resulted in the information appearing differently than candidates and reviewers are accustomed to. After careful review and analysis by SVM's Academic Personnel unit and SVM-IT, we believe the data is currently presented in the most accurate manner.