

Final Report 3/19/2014
Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Awards, Professorships, and Prizes (CFAPP)

To: Dean Conley, Faculty Affairs Committee

From: *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Awards, Professorships, and Prizes (CFAPP)

Robert Archibald (Economics)
Anne Charity-Hudley (English)
Maryse Fauvel (MLL)
Greg Hancock, co-chair (Geology)
Elizabeth Harbron (Chemistry)
Kathleen Morgan (Dean's Office, *ex officio*)
Steve Otto (Dean's Office, *ex officio*)
Charles Palermo (Art and Art History)
Carol Sheriff, co-chair (History)

Re: Final Report from *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Awards, Prizes and Professorships

I. Background

The Faculty Affairs Committee, at the request of the Dean, created the *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Awards and Professorships in spring 2013. The Committee was charged to 1) select or recommend recipients of awards and professorships to the Dean in 2013-2014 following current practices; 2) ascertain the eligibility and stewardship requirements for Arts and Sciences awards and professorships; 3) design by-laws for a new elected Committee on Faculty Awards, Prizes, and Professorships to start in fall 2014; and 4) codify procedures for selecting recipients of the various awards and professorships beyond 2013-2014. The Committee was urged to look carefully at existing procedures for selecting recipients and at the original documentation that established each award and professorship.

The creation of the *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Awards and Professorships was motivated by a number of issues associated with the process for selecting the recipients of awards, prizes and professorships. These issues include: 1) committee and recommendations for recipients of faculty awards, prizes, and professorships in Arts and Sciences are currently done primarily by various *ad hoc* committees; 2) committees are formed anew each year, limiting the carryover of knowledge from prior selection committees; 3) concerns over fairness, equity, efficiency, and transparency in the nomination and selection of awardees; 4) inconsistency and lack of clarity in the solicitation of and the requirements for prizes, professorships and awards; 5) complexity in the structure of awards/professorships (e.g., some are Arts and Sciences only, others are campus-wide); and 6) the absence of an A&S faculty committee with knowledge of the solicitation, nomination, and selection processes for these awards.

In this report, the *ad hoc* CFAPP provides 1) suggestions for modifying the process of soliciting, nominating, and selecting awardees and 2) a draft charge for the permanent Committee on Faculty Awards, Prizes and Professorships. Our recommendations and draft charge are motivated by the Committee's desire to clarify and standardize the solicitation, nomination and selection pro-

cess to make it more efficient for nominators and reviewers as well as more equitable for nominees.

II. Draft Charge for the Permanent CFAPP

The Dean of Arts and Sciences hereby establishes the Committee on Faculty Awards and Professorships to advise the Dean and oversee the solicitation, nomination, and selection of awardees as described below. The goal is a more efficient and transparent award process that facilitates fairness, equity and broad participation.

Committee structure and activities

1. The permanent committee will consist of six voting members (two each from Areas I, II, and III). In addition, one ex officio representative from the Dean of Arts and Sciences Office will be selected by the Dean of Arts and Sciences to serve on the committee in an advisory role.
2. Voting members of CFAPP will be elected and serve for three years, and must be tenured. Election will be staggered, with two members being elected each year.
3. The CFAPP, in cooperation with the Dean, will review and suggest revisions to solicitations for awards, prizes, and professorships, and will suggest methods of advertising solicitations that reach as many faculty as possible.
4. Except for awards, prizes, and professorships with existing committee structures, at least one CFAPP faculty member will be part of each review committee for A&S eligible awards, prizes, and professorships.
5. By September 1, the Dean's office should provide a list to CFAPP of all A&S Faculty who have active awards, prizes, and professorships that are required to serve on review committees in the upcoming academic year. At the same time, the Dean's Office should provide a list to CFAPP of all likely award, prizes, and professorship solicitations for the upcoming academic year. The CFAPP will then make recommendations to the Dean for various review committee members.
6. The CFAPP will, in cooperation with the Dean's Office, keep an ongoing annual record of all nominees and awardees for all awards, prizes, and professorships. Using this record, the CFAPP will attempt to identify inequities in the selection and distribution of awards, prizes, and professorships within A&S, and make recommendations to the Dean to remedy these issues.
7. The CFAPP will monitor and review the procedures for solicitation, nomination, and selection of awards, prizes, and professorships, and it will recommend changes with the goal of improving efficiency, transparency, participation, and fairness.
8. The CFAPP will serve as a contact for A&S Faculty with compliments, concerns, and/or recommendations about the process of soliciting, nominating, and selecting awards, prizes, and professorships.
9. The CFAPP will report once per year to the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, including numbers of nominees; numbers of awards, professorships, and prizes; and names of faculty members awarded.
10. CFAPP members are eligible for all awards, prizes, and professorships during their tenure on the committee.

11. CFAPP members that hold awards, professorships, or prizes are exempt from the requirement of serving on review committees, as their service on CFAPP is considered to fulfill that requirement.
12. During the first year, two members of the ad hoc CFAPP will be appointed for one year to the permanent CFAPP, and four new members will be elected (2 for 3 years, 2 for 2 years).

Notes

1. It is essential that the review load to the CFAPP not be excessive, as the committee has additional responsibilities beyond reviewing of nominees. It is not feasible to have CFAPP be solely responsible for reviewing A&S awards, professorships, and prizes.
2. The proposed charge above is predicated on the acceptance of our recommendation that all recipients of awards, prizes, and professorships will be required to serve on award review committees for the duration of their award.
3. Assuming the requirement that recipients of awards serve on review committees is enacted in academic year 2014-2015, the first year in which the review process laid out in the charge above can begin will be academic year 2015-2016. In the 2014-2015 academic year, therefore, current procedures should be followed for forming review committees, with assistance from the new CFAPP committee.

II. Recommended Modifications to Existing Solicitation, Nomination and Selection Processes

A. Solicitation for Awards, Professorships and Prizes

The Dean's Office should:

- 1) Create an annual calendar of award, professorship and prize deadlines, and distribute it at the start of each academic year. Reduce the number of nomination deadlines, perhaps to two deadlines during the academic year, even if the nominee reviews are spaced across the academic year. In setting deadlines, consider getting faculty input to avoid setting deadlines during particularly busy parts of the academic year.
- 2) Distribute all calls for nominations for awards, professorships and prizes to all faculty members, unless explicit instructions in the documents establishing the award require a different practice.
- 3) Specify how nominees should be selected and from whom nominees should be forwarded for consideration, or state that department or program procedures should be followed (e.g., "as dictated by department or program procedures"). If self-nominations are allowed, the self-nomination procedure should be described (e.g., "Nominations and required materials should be sent directly to the Dean").
- 4) Specify the criteria for evaluating nominees (e.g., ranking strategy, weighting of each aspect of the nomination materials, etc.). This will provide guidance for both the nominators and the review committees. Explicitly state the relative weight of teaching, research and service.
- 5) Remind nominators and letter writers that faculty who are not specialists in the nominees' field will likely be reviewing the nominations.

- 6) Describe the full process of solicitation, nomination, selection, and notification, including a timeline that includes deadlines and the timing of each aspect of the process (e.g., “Review of nominees will occur in early spring by a committee of three tenured faculty, who will forward to the Dean a ranked list of recommendations, with decisions announced by April 1”).
- 7) Create a nomination form for each award, prize and professorship that includes a checklist of required materials (e.g., teaching scores, external review), name/phone/email of nominee, name/phone/email of nominator, and name/phone/email of submitter. The CV of the nominee should be attached. The nomination form should include, for cases of self-nomination, the option to waive access to recommendation letters.

B. Nomination for Awards, Professorships and Prizes

a. Department and Program Procedures

- 1) Departments and programs should develop procedures for selecting and nominating faculty for awards, professorships, and prizes, and these should be included in the department or program policies.
- 2) To encourage more nominations of worthy colleagues, department or program procedures should be designed to facilitate multiple pathways to nominate people for an award. For instance, department or program procedures should ideally not rely solely on independent selection and nomination by department chairs or program directors. For example, nominations from a department could come from the chair, a personnel committee, and/or anyone within the department who wishes to nominate a colleague.
- 3) Nominators should promptly inform the chair or program director the name of the person nominated and the award(s) for which they were nominated. This will allow chairs and program directors to keep track of who has been nominated and to avoid duplication of effort.

b. Recommendation Letters

- 1) Restrict letters to a page or word limit. Provide details of what should be addressed in recommendation letters (based on section A, #4).
- 2) Provide specific questions for recommenders to address in their letters.
- 3) Specify requirements or provide suggestions for selecting recommenders (e.g., should it be the department chair, off-campus colleagues).
- 4) Self-nominees may fill out nomination forms (see section A, #6), but are encouraged to request recommendation letters from others.
- 5) Recommendations from chairs are welcomed but not required unless specifically stated in the call for nominations. Preference should not be given to letters from department chairs over those from other recommenders.
- 6) Require at least one support letter from within the department or program for all nominees.
- 7) State the maximum number of allowed support letters. Do not suggest “a minimum of...”, as it is hard for reviewers not to give more weight to nominees with more recommendation letters.
- 8) Where external evaluations, such as promotion reviews or manuscript reviews, are used in the nomination, the nominator should provide a brief review of these letters for the review committee, as committee members are unlikely to be familiar with the field.

- 9) All recommendation letters should be confidential.

C. Selection

a. *Committee Review*

- 1) As part of acceptance of professorships, prizes and awards, recipients should be required to serve on an evaluation committee for future professorships, prizes, and awards. The duration of the evaluation committee service should be tied to the duration of the award (e.g., serve on evaluation committee in each year of a three-year professorship, serve on an evaluation committee the year following the receipt of an award). Committee service could be on any evaluation committee, and should not be restricted to evaluating nominees for the professorship, prize or award received by the recipient.
- 2) Each committee should have at least one outside member (e.g., a faculty member not currently holding a professorship, prize, or award). We envision that the outside reviewer will typically be a member of the permanent CFAPP.
- 3) Where possible, pool as many professorships as possible into a single call for nominations (e.g., Distinguished Associate Professorships). The review committee could rank nominees for the pool as a whole, and the Dean could then select from that list for each professorship.
- 4) Review committees should submit recommendations to both the Dean and the permanent Committee on Faculty Awards, Prizes and Professorships (CFAPP). CFAPP will note final rankings to maintain records of awardees and nominations. Note that many of the review committees will in practice have members from CFAPP.

b. *Eminent Scholars*

- 1) In cases where an Eminent Scholar professorship is tied to a specific department, program, or discipline area, the nomination and selection process should be completed at the department, program or discipline area level if desired by the department, program, or discipline. In these cases, a recommendation would then be forwarded to the Dean's Office with the expectation that that the Dean's office would endorse the recommendation.
- 2) In cases where an Eminent Scholar professorship is tied to a specific department, program, or discipline area, the department, program or discipline area should develop specific policies for the solicitation, nomination and selection process. As much as possible, these procedures should be standardized across departments, programs, and discipline areas.

D. Stipends and Professional Development Funds

- 1) For professorships, awards, or prizes that are similar in stature and purpose, the amount of the stipend and/or professional development funds provided to awardees should be standardized.

- 2) For professorships, awards, and prizes that provide a stipend and/or professional development funds, awardees should be provided a lump sum award, from which awardees can decide how to split the funds between stipend and professional development.

E. Review of Renewable Professorships

Eminent Scholars

- 1) Review and renewal of Eminent Scholar professorships should be tied to merit reviews. If the holder of such a professorship does not receive merit reviews that trigger a post-tenure review, then the professorship should be renewed. If a merit review does trigger a post-tenure review, a review committee (similar to current practice) should be convened to determine whether renewal is warranted.