

September 29, 2006

To: The Academic Senate

From: David F. Channell, Chair of the Committee on Qualifications

Subject: Annual Report (2005-2006) of the Committee on Qualifications

During the 2005-2006 academic year the Committee on Qualifications consisted of: Farokh Bastani (ECS), David Channell (A&H and Chair), John Fonseka (ECS), Richard Golden (BBS and Vice Chair), Zsuzsanna Ozsvath (A&H), Viswanath Ramakrishna (NMS), Sumit Sarkar (SOM), Chelliah Sriskandarajah (SOM), Brian Tinsley (NSM), Anne van Kleeck (BBS), Wim Vijverberg (SS), and Douglas Watson (SS).

During November, January, February and March CQ met on almost a weekly basis to review the files of candidates undergoing 3rd year and promotion reviews and to review the files of new hires with tenure. During April and May CQ met occasionally to review the files of new hires with tenure. In total CQ conducted 27 internal reviews, including 10 3rd year reviews, 11 tenure reviews, and 6 full professor reviews. In 25 of the 27 cases CQ supported the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committees and the Deans. In one case CQ voted to disagree with the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee and the Dean and in one case, where the Ad Hoc Committee and the Dean disagreed, CQ voted to support the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee over the Dean. In 23 of the 27 cases the Provost agreed with the recommendations of CQ. In two cases the Provost chose to terminate candidates that CQ recommended for tenure, in one case the Provost chose to deny promotion to full professor to a candidate that CQ recommended to promote (in this case siding with the recommendation of the Dean over the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee), and in one case the Provost chose to promote to full professor a candidate that CQ recommended wait one more year.

The disagreements between CQ and the Provost led to some discussion and debate but in the end CQ concluded that the cases did not raise any red flags that would require Senate action. In three of the cases the Provost chose to not promote candidates that CQ had recommended for promotion. If CQ's job is seen as determining whether or not a candidate is qualified for reappointment, tenure or promotion a positive vote by CQ could be considered to be a necessary condition for reappointment, tenure or promotion. But the determination that a candidate is qualified may not be a sufficient condition for reappointment, tenure or promotion. The Provost obviously must take into consideration other factors, such as budgetary constraints, curricular needs and research needs, among others. Therefore, CQ concluded that its role was not being ignored when the Provost

chose to not promote three candidates that CQ deemed qualified for promotion. The case in which the Provost chose to promote to full professor a candidate that CQ had not recommended for promotion (by a 9 to 1 vote), was a little more troubling but CQ ultimately concluded that the case was not serious enough to warrant any Senate action. CQ noted that in this case the candidate already was a tenured member of the faculty and the both the Ad Hoc Committee and the Dean had recommended promotion. CQ did not find any major problem with the candidate's file but simply thought that the case for promotion would be much stronger and more clear cut if the candidate waited one more year. If any of the disagreements with CQ had involved the granting of tenure to a candidate that CQ deemed to be unqualified, that would have raised a red flag that would have required Senate action but since this was not the case, and after hearing the Provost's explanation for his actions, CQ decided not to object to the Provost's decisions.

A problem arose when it was realized that the Procedures for Faculty Promotion, Reappointment and Tenure require that before making a recommendation to the President the Provost should meet with CQ concerning any cases in which the Provost disagrees with CQ. Traditionally the Provost has met with CQ at the end of the spring semester, after the final recommendations have been made, to discuss with CQ any instances of disagreement. The Provost did meet with CQ to discuss the four cases where there were disagreements but that meeting took place after the final recommendations had been made and technically went against the Procedures for Faculty Promotion, Reappointment and Tenure. The Senate may wish to consider whether the Provost should be required to meet with CQ before or after the April 1st deadline. One practical problem is that CQ did not complete all of its reviews until a few days before April 1st because many of the files arrived late.

CQ also reviewed the files of 14 new hires with tenure, including 7 full professors and 7 associate professors. In all cases CQ supported the recommendations of the Search Committees and the Deans.

CQ also recommended a number of minor revisions to the Procedures for Faculty Promotion, Reappointment, and Tenure. These recommendations, most of which removed inconsistencies and cleared up vague language, were passed by the Senate.

No significant issues arose during the year, but there were a few minor ones. CQ continued to discuss and debate the issue of the criteria that should be used in 3rd year reviews. Unlike tenure and promotion reviews which are based on actual accomplishments, 3rd year reviews are often based on potential and guesses about future accomplishments. It is often not clear how such future accomplishments can or should be evaluated. A related and not so minor issue is the problem of evaluating 3rd year review files of candidates who were appointed before they completed their terminal degrees. In many cases these candidates spend a year or two completing their degrees which leave little information upon which to base a 3rd year review. As a result these reviews, more often than not, end in recommendations for termination. In fact two of the faculty members recommended for termination this year were candidates who had not completed their terminal degrees when they were appointed. The Senate, in consultation with CQ,

may wish to make clearer the criteria that should be used in a 3rd year review, and to find some way to minimize or eliminate the appointment of candidates who have not completed all of the requirements for their terminal degrees at the time they begin their tenure-track appointments.

A continuing problem for CQ is the late arrival of files. A very small number of files arrive by the stated deadline and this year the last files arrived only a few days before the April 1st deadline for the President to send out letters. This makes CQ's already heavy workload even more difficult to manage. A related problem is that many of the searches for new hires are not being completed until very late in the spring or sometimes into the summer. While this year CQ was able to deal with these late files through e-mail there is a significant possibility that in the future it will be difficult to obtain a quorum of CQ during late May and the summer months in order to act on new hires. The Senate may want to consider some arrangement for dealing with new hires that are made over the summer.

Finally a very minor issue: the requirement that members of CQ physically sign each of the reports adds some extra burdens. This usually is not a problem with the internal reviews, which are done when CQ is meeting on a weekly basis, but for the new hire files that arrive over the summer it is often impossible for members of CQ to come in and sign the reports. This is especially a burden for CQ members from Callier. It seems in this electronic age some alternative to physically signing reports could be found.

Last but not least, the work of CQ, and particularly its chair, would have been infinitely more difficult without the help and support of Dowla Hogan.