ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON QUALIFICATIONS TO THE UTD SENATE

1999-2000

The Committee on Qualifications (CQ) met throughout the academic year. This was the first CQ with 12 members resulting from the addition of two members from the School of Engineering and Computer Science

While the primary mission of CQ was to make recommendations to the Administration as to hiring or promotion of tenure-track candidates, other related issues surfaced, which were considered.

There had been a suggestion that CQ form into two subcommittees: one to consider new hires and the other to consider promotions. The idea was to alleviate the potential heavy workload especially anticipating many new hires in some of the Schools CQ rejected this since there was concern about the uniformity of evaluation.

Other issues that arose are indicated later in this document. The dominant activity was the review of candidates as summarized below:

EW APPOINTMENTS	
Assistant Professors	32
Associate Professors	5
Full Professors	3
Total	40
FACULTY REVIEWS	
3 rd Year Reviews	6
Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure	7
Tenure Review of Associate Professors	4
Promotion to Full Professor	4
Total	21
TOTAL REVIEWS	61

UNRESOLVED ISSUES

There were a number of recurrent issues that could only be partially be addressed by this CQ. Such information as to procedure for departmental or school voting, method for determining referees, evaluation of journal rankings were often not included in *ad hoc* committee reports. In some review files there were no teaching evaluations. In addition, CQ felt that in many new-hire files, insufficient attention was given to the teaching capability of a candidate

A significant problem encountered for some files was conflict of interest between the candidate and member(s) of the review or *ad hoc* committee. In some cases it could be discerned from a reading of the file but in some cases there was no indication in the file of a conflict of interest.

Another problem encountered was failure of some deans to recognize the role of CQ in the promotion/hiring process with the consequent results that CQ's request for additional information were not fully addressed if at all and in one case CQ was totally bypassed in evaluating a new hire.

These are problems likely to continue. They will not be resolved simply by pointing the problems out to future *ad hoc* and review Committees, to deans or future CQs. Rather it is recommended that a special committee be appointed to prepare hiring and review guidelines to be used by all UTD *ad hoc* and search committees and deans.

Such guidelines should consist on specifics as to what constitutes a complete *ad hoc* or search committee report. It could be visualized as a checklist covering the essentials of the report on the candidate.

The make up of the committee might consist of current and previous CQ chairs or members, people who have served or chaired review or *ad hoc* committees. Ideally the RUO should be the Provost. Also, the committee should include representatives from various UTD schools so that specific criteria in the different schools can be reviewed, and if need be, reformulated

Issues to be addressed include those presented above but the bottom line should be to come forward with a document that if followed will provide all the essentials to allow CQ to make an evaluation of a candidate based on known and well promulgated guidelines. It should not be a "cookie cutter" arrangement but rather a specific set of guidelines that insure that every appropriate step was taken in evaluating the candidate, that every essential document was included and that specific pitfalls were avoided (e.g. conflict of interest)



To: goertzen

cc: nelsen@utdallas edu

Subject Report

:

Hi Sandee,

Here is the CQ report for 1999-2000. My apologies for being

late.

Best wishes, Bob Glosser

- cq9900reprt doc