[1] From: Martha Pollack
Sent: April 2, 2015
Subject: Faculty Evaluation: Recognition of entrepreneurial, creative, and outreach activities

Dear Colleagues:

One of our most important responsibilities is the evaluation of faculty colleagues for tenure and promotion and as part of annual activity reporting. When carrying out this responsibility, I encourage you to give full recognition to the broad range of entrepreneurial, outreach, and creative activities in which faculty engage. These activities may enhance any of the criteria on which faculty are measured — teaching, research, and service. They may include involvement with other sectors including public and private organizations that have not traditionally been considered in faculty evaluations, or they may include creative activity that does not take the form of traditional scholarship.

Examples include:
- creating service learning and action-based learning opportunities for students,
- creating new instructional methods,
- engaging in community-based research,
- engaging in research funded by industrial, nonprofit, or other non-federal or foundation sources,
- creating a start-up company that enhances the broader scholarly, public service, or health care missions of the University,
- engaging in creative performance,
- creating new or enhanced practices, products, or services,
- working with to patent or license an invention,
- advising and instructing students in entrepreneurial and public service activities,
- developing collaborative approaches to solving complex world problems.

Activities like these strengthen the University and should be considered as contributions worthy of consideration, both at times of tenure and promotion and on an annual basis.

Sincerely,

Martha E. Pollack
Provost and Executive Vice President for
Academic Affairs

[2] Evaluating Contributions to Diversity for Faculty Appointment and Promotion Under APM-210.

senate.ucsc.edu/committees/caad-committeeon-affirmative-action-and-diversity/Evaluating Contributions to Diversity APM 210.pdf

ENSURING A FAIR AND OPEN PROCESS:

THIRD YEAR, TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEW GUIDELINES

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In May 2012, a small group of senior U-M faculty drawn from several different schools and colleges, including both members of the STRIDE and FASTER committees, met for two days to discuss both their own experiences with third year, tenure, and promotion review processes, and literature outlining best practices, pitfalls, and recommendations. They distilled their reading and discussion into the guidelines outlined here.

PRINCIPLES

Develop well-articulated criteria that are:

- discussed, established, published, and communicated prior to evaluations;
- broad, inclusive, and consistent with University expectations/goals *(see, for example, the Provost's message[1]);*
- quantitative whenever appropriate *(in the interest of removing ambiguity);*
- reviewed periodically.

Use a well-articulated and transparent process.

- Develop a "casebook" template to promote entering of complete and accurate information by the candidate and review committee.
- Provide the candidate with an opportunity to confirm that the review committee's information is accurate and complete.

- Be cognizant of evaluation bias and ensure unbiased evaluation and judgment.
- Be consistent in application of explicit criteria.

Foster accountability.

- Follow explicit criteria and record reasons for decisions based on criteria.
- Inform the candidate of decisions at each step of the process.
- Provide the candidate with information about recourse action(s) available for each step/decision.
- Identify U-M evaluators at each step of process *(including Provost-level review)*.

Promote respectful, supportive interaction.

Treat the candidate as a valued colleague regardless of decision outcome.

- The criteria and evaluation process should be articulated, restated, and emphasized at all stages of faculty development, including orientation of new hires, mentoring of junior faculty, third year review, and tenure and promotion reviews.

Pertaining to Transparency and Accountability

- Publish summary records/empirical evidence of successful candidates in redacted form. For example, provide quantitative data on research records *(e.g. publication record)* that include range, mean, and standard deviation. Consider practice employed at the U-M Medical School.
- Inform candidates of decisions at each step of the process.

Pertaining to Letters

- Reduce reliance on external letters for decision making. These letters represent input where the principles outlined above *(especially reliance on unbiased evidence)* are sometimes violated. At a minimum, U-M evaluators should be educated about evaluation bias prior to reading letters, for example by attending a STRIDE workshop or reading relevant literature. Consider including information about the role of unconscious bias when soliciting external letters and asking letter writers to take this into account.
- If letters are retained in the process, make the first decision without any reference to letters *(that is, without reading them)*. This may reduce evaluation bias.
- No unsolicited letters should ever be considered at any stage of the process.
- Provide an opportunity for colleagues to give input at the start of the process.

PRACTICES

Pertaining to Evaluation Criteria

- Establish clear, written evaluation criteria!
- Account for broader contributions, including diversity, outreach, and mentoring. As an example, consider the criteria developed by the University of California[2] that integrate these broader contributions in the criteria for teaching, research and other creative work, professional activity, and university and public service.
- Determine how you will recognize and evaluate the contributions of members of a collaborative team. Consider collecting descriptive information about the roles of individuals in collaborative projects.

- Assess the value of translational projects, where relevant.
- Employ multiple data sources and multiple forms of evaluation to assess teaching. Recognize the unique value of faculty/peer assessments and require them for both developmental and evaluative purposes. Do not use letters from students in the evaluation process.
- Remind committee of evaluation criteria prior to discussion and evaluation of candidate.
- Base evaluations on evidence and be consistent with the written criteria. Avoid evaluations that are characterized by summary and/or vague discussion.

RESOURCES

AAUP. (2000). Good Practice in Tenure Education: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators: American Council on Education.

Fich, F. E. (2003). "Are student evaluations of teaching fair?" *Computing Research News 15*(3): 2- 10.

Heilman, M. E., & Haynes, M. C. (2005). No Credit Where Credit Is Due: Attributional Rationalization of Women's Success in Male-Female Teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 905-916.

Maynard, D. C., & Brooks, M. E. (2008). The persistence of stereotypes in the context of familiarity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(4), 417-419.

Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe*, 97(1), 22-26.

Steinpreis, R. E., Anders, K. A., & Ritzke, D. (1999). The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study. *Sex roles, 41*(7-8), 509-528.

Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139.

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.