

---

## Questions to Consider during Promotion & Tenure Review Processes

### *Understanding How Unconscious Bias Influences Decision Making*

- 1. Is the feedback provided within external/internal letters consistently valid, constructive, pertinent, and useful to the career development of the faculty member under review [1]? Do letters include basic features while aligning the candidate with their critical job responsibilities [2]?** Compared with recommendation letters written on behalf of men, research has shown that letters written on behalf of women were shorter and more likely to lack basic features, such as a statement of how the letter writer knew the applicant, concrete references to the applicant's record, or evaluative comments about the applicant's traits or accomplishments [3]. Letters written on behalf of women had more "doubt raisers" (hedges, faint praise, and irrelevancies) and were four times more likely to refer to their personal lives, compared with letters written on behalf of men [2,3,4]. Research has also shown that in recommendation letters, descriptions of men more closely align with critical job requirements (i.e., research record and ability) compared with descriptions of women [3].
- 2. What approaches to evaluating collaboration might be appropriate [1]?** With regard to collaboration, identify the advantages and disadvantages to collaborating [1]. Research has found that women prefer collaborative work more than their male peers do [5]. Address the difficulties and complexities related to the assessment of collaboration for tenure and promotion [1]. Is the work of women faculty members unfairly attributed to a research director or collaborators, despite contrary evidence in publications or letters of recommendation [4]? Is less credit given to women faculty because the research was not done alone? Are collaborators viewed as equal contributors, or is one viewed in a secondary or assisting role?
- 3. How will you weigh student teaching evaluations, and what other mechanisms will you use to evaluate teaching effectiveness?** Some scholars have found gender to have no (or very little) influence on evaluations of teaching, whereas other scholars have found gender to affect evaluations significantly [6,7,8], in which case findings generally show that student teaching evaluations are more negative for women faculty [9-19] with possible implications extending to award considerations [20]. Other possible alternative evaluation methods may include alumni ratings, peer ratings, informal student surveys, self-assessment statements, syllabi and other course documents, examples of student work, and teaching portfolios [6,21,22].
- 4. Is a heavy service burden evident in the candidate's portfolio [1]?** Many possible conditions exist for excessive service. For women and minority candidates who report spending more time on service commitments than their male and majority peers, respectively, it could lead to evaluation penalties for their not saying "no" to excess service, when saying "no" is sometimes not a viable option for them [1, 23]. **Are there any additional positive benefits to the institution when the female or minority faculty members participate in this type of service [1]?**
- 5. How will the committee account for gaps in the candidate's record, leaves of absence, or tenure clock extensions [1]?** Gaps during the review period can be evaluated in various ways such as by viewing achievements as cumulative. Extensions to the tenure probationary period should not increase the expectations for an individual faculty member's achievements towards tenure [24]. If the candidate for tenure had received an extension to his/her tenure probationary period, the reasons behind this extension will not be disclosed within the committee's letter [25].

6. **Consider how gender shapes expectations for family responsibilities. Does parental status of a candidate affect arguments for or against a case [1]?** Traditionally, men with families are viewed as stable, settled, and committed to career, whereas women with families are expected to put family first and thus not considered to be serious about their careers [1,4].
7. **What is *your* responsibility as a reviewer to notice and address potential issues of bias for the committee [1]?** Becoming aware of and minimizing bias is a collective endeavor. As a committee member, is the expectation that members will inform the committee of possible bias issues in the review process for a particular candidate? Is the expectation that members will discuss bias that they or others exhibit?

### **Recommendations for Reducing Unconscious Bias in Promotion & Tenure Review Processes**

1. Require committee members to participate in a bias literacy workshop. Research provides evidence that educational interventions lead to a reduction in unconscious bias [26,27].
2. Recognize and accept that all of us are subject to the influence of bias and assumptions, despite good intentions. Avoid considering yourself as “objective” [2,4].
3. Diversify promotion and tenure review committee membership by race, gender, rank (if appropriate), hearing status, age, etc. This will provide committee members with visible reminders that excellence comes in diverse forms. It will increase group members’ motivation to respond equitably [4].
4. Discuss criteria that your review committee will use before evaluating candidates, and apply the criteria consistently [4].
5. Devote sufficient time and attention to evaluating each candidate, and minimize distractions [4].
6. Minimize time pressure and stress from competing tasks [28].
7. Evaluate the entire package of each candidate [4].
8. Recognize how the differential power/status of committee members shapes group discussions [29].
9. Use an inclusive rather than an exclusive decision-making process (such as considering why a candidate should be granted tenure or promotion rather than why they should be denied). This will cause evaluators to pay more attention to the merits of individual candidates and less attention to their membership in a specific demographic group [4].
10. Periodically evaluate the criteria being used during the review process and the manner in which the committee implements the review process [4].
11. Hold tenure and promotion review committee members responsible for fair and equitable evaluations [4]. In addition, hold them responsible for decisions based on concrete information, not on vague assertions or assumptions [4].

## Other Resources:

- AdvanceRIT Project Resources on Career Success and Benchmarking
  - <http://nsfadvance.rit.edu>
- Gender Equality in Engineering – Advocacy Tips, A National Imperative, NDSU
  - <http://wied.asee.org/AdvTips.html>
- “Solving the Equation” – AAUW publication
  - <http://www.aauw.org/research/solving-the-equation/>
- Facebook, Managing Unconscious Bias
  - <https://managingbias.fb.com/>
- Implicit Association Test, Project Implicit, Harvard University
  - <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html>
- The Impact of Implicit Bias from Ohio State University, Part 1 Bias and Schemas,
  - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UZHxFU7TYo4&feature=plcp>
- Video: AAMC, "What You Don't Know: The Science of Unconscious Bias and What To Do About It in the Search and Recruitment Process"
  - <https://surveys.aamc.org/se.ashx?s=7C7E87CB561EC358>
- Tips for Reducing Unconscious Bias Language in Job Descriptions
  - <http://www.ncwit.org/resources/ncwit-checklist-reducing-unconscious-bias-job-descriptionsadvertisements>
- How Can Reducing Unconscious Bias Increase Women's Success in IT?
  - Avoiding Gender Bias in Recruitment/Selection Processes (Case Study 2):  
<http://www.ncwit.org/resources/how-can-reducing-unconscious-bias-increase-womens-success-it-avoiding-gender-bias>
- Video: Unconscious Bias and Why It Matters For Women & Tech
  - <http://www.ncwit.org/resources/unconscious-bias-and-why-it-matters-women-and-tech>
- Students: How Do Stereotype Threats Affect Retention? Better Approaches to Well-Intentioned, but Harmful Messages (Case Study 1)
  - <http://www.ncwit.org/resources/how-do-stereotype-threats-affect-retention-better-approaches-well-intentioned-harmful>

## References:

- [1] Adapted from Shaffer, A., Interim Faculty Diversity Officer, Case Western Reserve University. *Promotions & Tenure Committee: Case School of Engineering*. September 8, 2009. Retrieved from [http://www.case.edu/provost/ideal/doc/P&TAdvisoryCSE\\_2009.ppt](http://www.case.edu/provost/ideal/doc/P&TAdvisoryCSE_2009.ppt)
- [2] *How Can Reducing Unconscious Bias Increase Women's Success in IT? Avoiding Unintended Bias in Letters of Recommendation* (Case Study 1), National Center for Women & Information Technology. Retrieved from <http://www.ncwit.org/resources/how-can-reducing-unconscious-bias-increase-womens-success-it-avoiding-unintended-bias>
- [3] Trix, F. & Psenka, C. (2003). Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty. *Discourse & Society*, 14(2), 191-220.
- [4] Adapted from Fine, E. & Handelsman, J. (2012). *Searching for Excellence & Diversity: A Guide for Search Committees: National Edition*. Madison, WI: Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- [5] Kuhn, P. J. & Villeval, M. C. (2013). *Are Women More Attracted To Cooperation than Men?* National Bureau of Economic Research. NBER Working Paper No. 19277.
- [6] Benton, S. L., & Cashin, W. E. (2012). **Student ratings of teaching: A summary of research and literature** (IDEA Paper #50). Retrieved from [http://ideaedu.org/sites/default/files/idea-paper\\_50.pdf](http://ideaedu.org/sites/default/files/idea-paper_50.pdf).

- 
- [7] Spooen, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598-642.
- [8] Wright, S. L., & Jenkins-Guarnieri, M. A. (2012). Student evaluations of teaching: Combining the meta-analyses and demonstrating further evidence for effective use. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(6), 683-699.
- [9] Abel, M. H., & Meltzer, A. L. (2007). Student ratings of a male and female professors' lecture on sex discrimination in the workforce. *Sex Roles*, 57, 173-180.
- [10] Arbuckle, J., & Williams, B. D. (2003). Students' perceptions of expressiveness: Age and gender effects on teacher evaluations. *Sex Roles*, 49(9/10), 507-516.
- [11] Basow, S. A. (1995). Student evaluations of college professors: When gender matters. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(4), 656-665.
- [12] Basow, S. A., & Silberg, N. T. (1987). Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(3), 308-314.
- [13] Bennett, S. K. (1982). Student perceptions of and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(2), 170-179.
- [14] Chamberlin, M. S., & Hickey, J. S. (2001). Student evaluations of faculty performance: The role of gender expectations in differential evaluations. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 25(2), 3-14.
- [15] Kierstead, D., D'Agostino, P., & Dill, H. (1988). Sex role stereotyping of college professors: Bias in students' ratings of instructors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(3), 342-344.
- [16] MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. N. (2014, December 5). What's in a name: Exposing gender bias in student ratings of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 1-13.
- [17] McPherson, M. A., Jewell, R. T., & Kim, M. (2009). What determines student evaluation scores? A random effects analysis of undergraduate economics classes. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 35, 37-51.
- [18] Sidanius, J., & Crane, M. (1989). Job evaluation and gender: The case of university faculty. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19(2), 174-197.
- [19] Sprague, J., & Massoni, K. (2005). Student evaluations and gendered expectations: What we can't count can hurt us. *Sex Roles*, 53(11/12), 779-793.
- [20] Mason, S., Marchetti, C., Bailey, M., Baum, S., Valentine, M. (2014). Faculty awards at a large private institution: an indicator of evolving university values?" *2014 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference and Exposition*, Indianapolis, Indiana. 15-18 June 2014. n.p. Web
- [21] Spooen, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598-642.
- [22] Wright, S. L., & Jenkins-Guarnieri, M. A. (2012). Student evaluations of teaching: Combining the meta-analyses and demonstrating further evidence for effective use. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(6), 683-699.
- [23] Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe*, 97(1), 22-26.
- [24] RIT Policy on Tenure, E05.0 Section 2.c.4.g, 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/e050>
- [25] RIT Policy on Tenure, E05.0 Section 3.c.2.d, 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/e050>
- [26] Carnes, M., Devine, P. G., Isaac, C., Manwell, L. B., Ford, C., Byars-Winston, A., Fine, E., & Sheridan, J. (2012). Promoting institutional change through bias literacy. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 5(2), 63-77.
- [27] Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 1267-1278.
- [28] Fiske, S. T. (2002). What we know now about bias and intergroup conflict, the problem of the century. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11(4), 123-128.
- [29] Adapted from Wadia-Fascetti, S., Isaacs, J., & Jones, G. of the ADVANCE Program at the Northeastern University. *Workshop on Faculty Recruitment for Diversity and Excellence*. May 13, 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.northeastern.edu/advance/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/2016-17-STRIDE-Search-Committee-Presentation-FOR-WEB-1.pdf>