

29 August 2003

To: Academic Senate &  
Academic Council

From: Stephen G. Rabe, Chair  
Qualifications of Academic Personnel Committee (CQ)

Re: Annual Report

From the CQ's perspective, the review process during the 2002/2003 academic year was without significant controversy. Most of CQ's decisions were unanimous affirmations of recommendations made by the several ad hoc committees, tenured faculty, and deans. Only in two cases did CQ members question whether the recommendations could be supported by the evidence presented in the files. CQ members readily agreed, however, that both cases were "close calls" and that reasonable people could draw different conclusions.

In terms of internal reviews, the CQ reviewed 29 cases this academic year. This consisted of 13 Third-Year Reviews, 10 Sixth-Year or Tenure Reviews, and 6 Full Professor Reviews. In 28 of the 29 cases, the Provost and President accepted the recommendations of the CQ. The one case was one of the aforementioned "close calls."

The CQ reviewed 14 new appointments this year, of which 7 were appointments which carried tenure. The number of new appointments was down considerably this year because of the state of Texas's financial crisis.

The CQ would like to point out three areas of the review process that need improvement. The CQ believes that some of the Third-Year Reviews were superficial and did not fulfill the mandate of conducting a "critical review" of the candidate's career at UTD combined with a frank assessment of the candidate's tenure prospects. The CQ understands that there is a natural and commendable desire to encourage and be supportive of new assistant professors. But it hardly assists a candidate when, for example, an ad hoc committee or dean cheerily, and with little evidence, predicts a rapid increase in scholarly productivity for the candidate.

The CQ would also point to the continuing difficulty of securing outside evaluations of candidates for tenure and promotion. For the most part, ad hoc committees will receive evaluations from reviewers suggested by the candidate. These reviewers presumably know the candidate. But the ad hoc committees have a "low yield" from reviewers

suggested by the committee. These reviewers probably are not personally acquainted with the candidate. In one case, an ad hoc committee diligently compiled an extensive list of reviewers and did not receive one response. The CQ does not have a solution to the problem.

Finally, the CQ would like to note there are often discrepancies between the report submitted by the Graduate Dean and the actual record of the various candidates. The Graduate Dean reports on the number of graduate theses and dissertations a candidate has supervised or is supervising. In addition, the Graduate Dean reports on the amount of outside funding that a candidate has secured for research in the past five years. The experience of the CQ was that the reports submitted by the Graduate Dean were not always accurate. The CQ believes that there are probably some problems in communication between the Graduate Dean's office and the various schools.

As always, the CQ is grateful for the professional assistance given to the committee by Ms. Dowla Hogan of the Provost's Office.

## Goertzen, Sandra K

---

From: mjleaf [mjleaf@utdallas.edu]  
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2003 4:39 PM  
To: Goertzen, Sandra K; Nelsen, Robert S  
Subject: CQFinalrpt03



CQFinalrpt03.doc  
(30 KB)

Dear Sandee:

Here is the annual report from CQ. I assume it is too late to get it into the meeting packet, but make copies and we will ask to add it to the Senate agenda.

mjl