

September 21, 2007

To: The Academic Senate

From: John P. Ferraris, Chair of the Committee on Qualifications

Subject: Annual Report (2006-2007) of the Committee on Qualifications

During the 2006-2007 academic year, the Committee on Qualifications consisted of: Peter Assmann ((BBS) Farokh Bastani (ECS), William Cready (SOM), Richard Golden (BBS), John Ferraris (NSM and Chair), Philipos Loizou (ECS), James Marquart (EPPS) Zsuzsanna Ozsvath (A&H), Viswanath Ramakrishna (NSM), Chelliah Sriskandarajah (SOM), Theresa Towner (A&H and Vice Chair), and Wim Vijverberg (EPPS).

CQ met regularly from November (2006) through mid-May (2007), frequently on a weekly basis, to review the files of candidates undergoing 3<sup>rd</sup> year and promotion reviews and to review the files of new hires with tenure. During the summer, CQ availed itself of a new on-line review instrument that was developed by the Provost's office. Two additional files were reviewed as late as August, 2007. In total, CQ conducted 27 internal reviews, including seven 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews, ten tenure reviews, and ten full professor reviews. In 25 of the 27 cases the majority vote of 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, CQ had a split decision and forwarded no recommendation. In these 25 cases the Provost agreed with the recommendations of CQ. In one case the Provost chose to promote a candidate to full professor (siding with the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee and Dean) that CQ had recommended waiting additional time; in a second, the Provost chose to promote the candidate that had received the split decision from CQ.

In accordance with the Procedures for Faculty Promotion, Reappointment and Tenure the Provost met with members of CQ to provide his rationale for the one promotion file for which he disagreed with the recommendation of CQ and, after hearing the Provost's explanation for his actions, CQ decided not to object to the Provost's decision. 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 also reviewed the files of 12 new hires with tenure, including 8 full professors and 4 associate professors. In all cases CQ supported the recommendations of the Search Committees and the Deans.

CQ discussed the issue of the criteria that should be used in 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews since evaluations are often based on estimates of future accomplishments. Since variation in these estimates across Schools is inevitable, the judgments of the Ad Hoc committees, above rank-faculty, and the respective Deans take on special importance.

The late arrival of files complicated the work of CQ. Many of the files for tenure, promotion, or reappointment arrived after April 1<sup>st</sup>, which, although not a strict deadline for the President to send out letters, has been the traditional one. The Provost's insistence that the deadlines for internal reviews be strictly met for this upcoming year should go far to alleviate the extra burdens that late files have placed on CQ's workload. In addition, many of the searches for new hires are not being completed until very late in the spring or into the summer, but perhaps this is unavoidable. The new on-line review instrument to evaluate these over the web was tested this past summer and appeared to work well, and CQ was able to deal with these files through e-mail.

As pointed out in the previous year's report, the requirement that members of CQ physically sign each of the reports adds some extra burdens. This mainly becomes an issue for the new hire files that arrive over the summer, since many of the members of CQ are not on campus. We support the recommendation of the previous CQ committee that some alternative to physically signing reports be found.

Finally, CQ, and especially its chair, greatly appreciate the highly professional support we received from Dowla Hogan.

A more detailed breakdown by School follows.

**2006-2007  
TENURE, PROMOTION AND  
REAPPOINTMENT DECISIONS**

Reappointment as Assistant Professor

Seven faculty members were reviewed for reappointment as Assistant Professors. Of those, all seven were reappointed. The Committee on Qualifications (C.Q.), Provost and President agreed on all seven.

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure

Ten faculty members were reviewed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Eight were promoted, two were terminated. One had a split vote by C.Q. (2 promotion, 2 termination, and 5 abstentions). The C.Q., Provost and President agreed on ten of those.

Promotion to Professor

Ten faculty members were reviewed for promotion to full Professor. Nine were promoted; one was reappointed. The C.Q., Provost and President agreed on seven of those. One was recommended for reappointment by C.Q., but for promotion by all others.

**PROMOTIONS AND REAPPOINTMENT BY SCHOOL**

Arts and Humanities

2 reappointed as Assistant Professor  
2 promoted to Associate Professor

Behavioral and Brain Science

1 promoted to Associate Professor  
2 promoted to Full Professor

Engineering and Computer Science

1 promoted to Associate Professor  
2 promoted to Full Professor

Economic, Political and Policy Sciences

1 promoted to Associate Professor  
2 promoted to Full Professor

Management

5 reappointed as Assistant Professors  
1 promoted to Associate Professor  
2 promoted to Full Professor  
1 was terminated

Natural Sciences and Mathematics

2 promoted to Associate Professor  
1 reappointed as Associate Professor  
1 promoted to Full Professor  
1 was terminated

**INITIAL APPOINTMENT DECISIONS**

The C.Q. reviewed twelve files for initial appointments; eight at the rank of full professor with tenure, and four at the rank of associate professor with tenure. All twelve were approved by the C.Q.