

## **Procedures of the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel**

With respect to the appointment, retention, and promotion of academic personnel, the charge of the CQ is comprehensive:

“The Committee is charged with reviewing all recommendations from faculty ad hoc committees and School deans regarding the initial hiring, promotion, and promotion to tenure of members of the faculty, assuring that high academic standards are maintained, that appropriate and uniform procedures were followed in the review process, and that the evidence supports the recommendations. The Committee is further charged with reviewing and assessing the standards of excellence for the various academic ranks and for tenure, making due allowance for the different traditions and requirements of the different disciplines.”

These bylaws do not modify or abrogate this responsibility or the standards to which the charge refers. Rather, they address the way the charge is carried out.

### **General operating rules:**

CQ deliberations are confidential. CQ meetings are not open, and members are not to describe them to others outside the meetings.

Members of CQ should not normally chair ad hoc committees. CQ members who are on ad hoc committees or who otherwise have been involved in preparing the cases that come before the CQ do not normally recuse themselves from the proceedings. More usually, they describe their involvement and position and try to provide what information they can with that involvement in view. They may, however, refrain from voting.

If there are significant deficiencies in the preparation of the case, the CQ will return the file to the dean, ad hoc committee, or search committee with appropriate queries. (Reviews of files are expedited if references who were chosen by the committee are clearly identified and if outside letters of reference are accompanied by biographical sketches that specify rank or title.) The CQ will not let such deficiencies work to the detriment of the person under review, but will judge the case solely on substance. If deficiencies or lapses in the file are due to the action or inaction of the faculty member under consideration rather than due to the ad hoc committee or dean, the CQ expects this to be clearly documented.

Although all the members are expected to familiarize themselves with all cases, one member is usually charged with introducing the case and summarizing the issues to start the discussion. This is normally not a member from the school of the person under consideration. The members from the school then commonly respond, and the discussion proceeds from there. CQ members do not act as advocates for their schools and indeed do not act as advocates or opponents generally, but try to weigh all sides of all cases as best they can.

Each case is given as much time as is necessary to reach a sense that no major issue has been left unexplored. Although the committee takes and records formal votes, the votes are not generally taken as decisive until those in the minority are satisfied that their position has been fully presented, discussed, and understood, and by and large the weight in the vote is recognized as fairly reflecting the balance of pro and con positions or issues in the discussion.

The record of the vote is sent forward to the Provost in a memo signed by all members of the CQ who voted. The memo should contain a succinct but informative statement of the rationale for CQ's

conclusion, with the considerations reflected in the votes both for and against the final recommendation.

In the case of third year internal reviews, the CQ attempts to judge whether the candidate's career trajectory appears to provide a good prospect of tenure or, if it does not, to summarize why. The aim of CQ deliberations is to put past accomplishments and evidence of present potential together to provide a sense of the overall likely career trajectory of the person under review and to compare this with what is normal and desirable, given the general state of the field as well as the situation in other fields that may be relevant.

The CQ does not view cases in isolation. Since it is charged with being concerned with maintaining general university standards as well as with assuring fairness in the process for individual cases, it must try within reasonable limits to view them in the context of the entire university and across time.

All internal reviews and all appointments of new faculty that are not entry level appointments will be discussed and voted on at a regular meeting of the CQ.

If files for new hires are received that are incomplete and not prepared according to the search procedures in the Faculty Handbook, it is expected that information in the file will justify the exception(s). If the information is insufficient for CQ to judge the suitability of the appointment, the file will be returned to the Provost for the deficiencies to be remedied, without prejudice as to the qualifications of the candidate. The Provost and CQ will meet in late April to review decisions made during the faculty internal review cycle.

A quorum is two-thirds (8 members) of the CQ.

Beginning in the Fall of 2008, the CQ will transition to digital files in order to allow members to be able to access the material remotely, through a secure website. Candidates for promotion and tenure as well as ad hoc committees for new hires should be advised of this as early as possible. Members of the committee who have difficulty accessing the files should promptly notify the Provost's office.

These bylaws may be changed at any time by a two-thirds vote of the full CQ.

### **Expedited procedures for initial entry-level appointments.**

In order to expedite consideration of candidates for entry level, non-tenured appointments, after the file has been distributed to CQ members, an email vote will be taken, unless one or more members raise an issue of concern. In this latter case, the file will be discussed at a meeting prior to taking the vote. Files will be reviewed as to:

- 1) Completeness with all necessary elements (ie: letters from referees, evidence of research, evidence of teaching).
- 2) Constitution of the search committee, whose members should not have a conflict of interest in the selection of the candidate.
- 3) Due diligence of the search committee, consistent with maintaining standards of fairness across the university.
- 4) Minimal requirements of the candidate needed to assume the position offered, normally a PhD or equivalent, with a dissertation in the relevant area. (It is helpful if the CQ knows how the search was described in an advertisement, and where the advertisement appeared.)

- 5) Whether the candidate appears to have the basis of a possible research career.
- 6) Whether the candidate appears to fit into the UT Dallas teaching program

---

The CQ membership, with emails, will be posted in the Senate section of the university web site, along with the charge, the description of the general policies covering hiring and promotion, and these bylaws.