Report of the 2010-2011 Committee on Qualifications
Tim Redman, Chair

Members of the Committee on Qualifications are proposed by the Nominations Committee and confirmed by the Academic Council and Senate for appointment by the President each August. It reports to the Senate the following August. During the year it advises the Provost on matters of third-year renewals, tenure and promotion decisions, and new appointments carrying tenure. In that capacity it works closely with the designated Associate Provost. The Committee consists of 12 senior professors, two from each of the major Schools of the University, who serve staggered, two-year terms.

CQ had its first organizational meeting on Friday, October 29, 2010. The Chair spoke of the tasks and policies of the Committee; the Associate Provost spoke on accessing credential files on-line; and we arranged our tentative meeting schedule for 2011. Old business that carried forward consisted of rewriting the CQ bylaws to correspond to our new and suggested practices, and helping draw up the new ATEC/EMAC tenure and promotion guidelines in the School of Arts and Humanities. Committee members brought forward two items of new business to be addressed: 1) the need for CQ to review new hires with tenure before the offer is made and/or announced. 2) the need for a spring meeting with the Provost to discuss our recommendations and his decisions. The Chair decided that the latter point was simply a matter of scheduling (no meeting was held the previous spring) and he promised to follow up on both points. A further point from the previous year, the need of CQ to have access to third-year review files from cases before it concerning promotion to associate professor with tenure, had been resolved. CQ will have access to those files, not for the purpose of revisiting the decision, but in order to see whether or not the recommendations of the ad hoc committee to the candidates were followed. As a pleasant addendum to this subject, CQ commends the ad hoc committee for the third-year review of Professor Jie Zheng in NS&M for writing a report that was exemplary in its helpfulness and collegiality.

CQ needs to have from 4-6 meetings to review all of its cases during the period of mid-January to the end of February. For at least the second year in succession, CQ members found that they could only meet on Friday mornings (weekend meetings were not considered). For next year, therefore, CQ members need to hold open at least four of the Fridays between January 20 and February 24, 2012, between 8:30am and 12:00 noon. CQ recommends that the letters of appointment for the 2011-2012 CQ specify this condition of service.

For several years, CQ had requested more information from the School of Arts and Humanities regarding cases from the program in Art and Technology (ATEC) and Emerging Media and Communication (EMAC). As those programs grow, the need became more urgent. In early fall semester, the Chair met with Dean Dennis Kratz and Tom Linehan and an A&H committee was appointed to draft new guidelines. The Chair attended two of the meetings and participated in the e-mail discussion. CQ met once with the two senior members of those programs, Tom Linehan and Mihai Nadine, and twice with the A&H Dean. It also commented on early drafts and the penultimate draft written
by the Dean. The new guidelines, after further revision, passed the faculty of the School and the University Senate.

In creating the new guidelines, Dean Kratz noticed that portions of the existing guidelines, e.g., those referring to tenure criteria for costume design, were outdated. **CQ recommends that each of the Schools update its tenure and promotion guidelines if necessary, particularly those areas involving the requirements for external funding.** CQ encountered some problems in its deliberations regarding the higher expectations for grants and contracts in four of the six major Schools (these don’t pertain in anywhere near the same degree in SOM or A&H, fields in which very little grant money is available).

On this same subject, CQ was of the opinion that obtaining funding and/or managing a project cannot be a substitute for the creative productivity and scholarly activity which are an essential basis for promotion and the award of tenure. In other words, grants and contracts are input not output. A new standard (and a higher level of expectation) for external funding is evolving, and the questions that arose in CQ’s deliberations on a number of cases were what type and what amount of funding is sufficient for granting tenure. These questions need to be resolved within the academic units and incorporated into the guidelines of the various schools.

CQ in its first meeting expressed serious concern about the occasional practice by some Deans of sending out new appointment letters and/or making public announcements of new appointments of tenured faculty before the required review by CQ. In one case CQ expressed its displeasure in its vote to approve the appointment: 1 in favor, 0 opposed, and 10 abstaining. We worked with the Provost’s office and will be reminding the Deans that we must adhere to our published procedures regarding appointments. At the same time CQ recognizes the need for urgency in some of these distinguished appointments and has established an expedited procedure making use of our electronic access to files: CQ will make a decision within one week of receiving the files for review. On the other matter of concern, CQ did meet with the Provost last spring, and although we disagreed on a few cases they were all decisions in which reasonable people could disagree. We also recall that CQ is advisory to the Provost.

Another change last spring which we will continue in August and again next spring is that the Chair joins the Associate Provost in meetings with the candidates and the chairs of the ad hoc committees to help answer questions.

The most consistent concern voiced by CQ over the course of its deliberations was the need for arms-length reviewers. We even encountered a case where a third-year review case was chaired by the candidate’s Ph.D. supervisor. There was a similar case last year. There was another case where co-authors and co-PIs were not listed on the candidate’s CV. **CQ recommends that no Ph.D. advisor, co-PI, co-author, formal mentor, etc. chair a candidate’s ad hoc committee.** The publications portion of a candidate’s CV or the ad hoc committee report should clearly identify the discipline’s norms for authorship order in multi-authored papers. All co-authors
should be listed for publications and all co-PIs should be listed for grants. There should be no “outside” letters from Ph.D. advisors, post-doc supervisors, co-authors, co-PIs, laboratory colleagues, former professors, classmates, etc. Candidates may include such persons on their lists only if they are identified as such. Further, the template for soliciting outside letters should be revised to ask for a description of the reviewer’s relation to the candidate and the degree to which this relation is “arms-length.”

The revision of CQ’s bylaws is still in process. Since the first two months of the fall semester is a relatively slow time for CQ, I expect we’ll have something for the Senate’s consideration no later than November.

Catherine Eckel chaired CQ for the past few years and she did a splendid job in introducing and streamlining new procedures. Associate Provost Inga Musselman works constantly, quietly, and professionally on every aspect of CQ’s work. Dowla Hogan until her retirement and Vicki Carlisle since effectively manage CQ’s various logistical needs. The Provost’s Technology Group has fully implemented the on-line review system and quickly fixed minor glitches.

The other members of CQ this year were Daniel (Dann) Arce, Poras Balsara, R. Chandrasekaran (Chandra), Milind Dawande, Walter (Jay) Dowling, Xinchou Lou (Vice-Chair), David Mauer, Alice O’Toole, Zsuzsanna (Zsuzsi) Ozsvath, Lawrence (Larry) Reitzer, and Marianne Stewart. They all have my thanks for forming a most effective committee.

Service on CQ entails a great deal of work, but you come away with a renewed pride in the University and your colleagues.