

OVERVIEW

The *Diversity and Equity in Promotion and Tenure Workshop* is most useful if participants take 20 minutes to review the two promotion and tenure cases that will be the focus of the Workshop. These cases are based on several actual cases from the social and behavioral, as well as physical and biological, sciences.

Of course, when faculty review actual promotion and tenure cases, they have substantially more detailed information. Our goal is to provide condensed case information so as to minimize time demands for participants and foster constructive discussion about issues related to the bias and burden of faculty from groups historically underrepresented and/or marginalized in academia.¹

In this vein, for the external evaluator letters, we present excerpts based on real letters. To put these excerpts in the type of context that would be available with the full letters, we indicate the overall tone of the letter (ranging from *extremely, quite, and mildly negative* to *mildly, quite, and extremely positive*).

Please read each case and think about the issues you and your colleagues would consider in evaluating it in the promotion and tenure context. Although the normative practices and standards in the fields on which the cases are based may be different from your own field, many of the issues around diversity and equity are similar.

Feel free to contact the Workshop facilitators with questions or concerns before or after the workshop.

¹Underrepresentation and/or marginalization may be due to race and ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, age, sexual orientation, disability status, religion, national and geographic origin, language use, socio-economic status, or other factors.

RESEARCH SUMMARY

Publications

- 11 empirical articles in peer-reviewed journals with low, medium, and high impact factors within field
- Co-author with former PhD supervisor on 3 articles (1 medium and 2 high impact)
- Lead (e.g., first, last, or corresponding) author (with graduate students) on 3 articles (1 low and 2 medium)
- Co-author with collaborator of similar rank, with co-author always lead author (2 low, 1 medium, and 2 high impact)

Grants

- \$400,000 3-year NSF grant on which she is the Co-PI with her collaborator of similar rank as PI

Presentations

- 1 invited department colloquium seminar at a Big Ten University
- 2 presentations as part of conference symposia at major conferences in her field

Context information. Faculty successfully promoted in similar departments in the last 5 years generally have 11 to 16 articles, funding from \$400,000 to \$600,000, and 3 to 8 department colloquia or seminars along with 2 to 6 symposia presentations

TEACHING SUMMARY

- Undergrad intro course almost every semester (100-150 students)
 - : US Minority Cultures Gen Ed requirement
 - : Developed course
 - : Ratings in below-average to average range
- 1 upper-level undergrad course every year (40 students)
 - : Developed course
 - : Course ratings initially in below-average range but in average range last 2 times
- 2 grad-level courses taught once (8 students)
 - Course ratings in high-average range

Context information: The teaching requirement in the department is 3 courses per year— either 2 undergrad and 1 grad course or 3 undergrad courses

SERVICE SUMMARY

- Member of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee for the major organization of her field
- Member of steering committee for organization in her field focused on research among underrepresented and marginalized groups
- Member of department Curriculum committee, Chair of subcommittee reviewing courses for diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Member of department Graduate Studies and Financial Aid committee
- Member of college Public Engagement committee

EXTERNAL EVALUATION LETTER EXCERPTS FOR JADA JACKSON

Letter 1 (Chosen by Unit): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Quite Positive

Dr. Jackson has what is considered a large number of publications—above the norm for the field. Moreover, these papers provide novel and important insight about . . . They will certainly move the field forward. However, Dr. Jackson is not typically the lead author. In fact, if one ignores her work with her PhD advisor, Dr. Jackson is the lead author on only 5 out of 10 of the peer reviewed papers, which is a pretty slim publication record. In her narrative, Dr. Jackson indicates that her role in the team was the development of the conceptual framework motivating the research and that she played a major role in the design of the research. If this was the case, why is she never the lead author on her collaborative work?

Letter 2 (Chosen by Unit): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Extremely Positive

Dr. Jackson’s work will change how the field thinks about . . . It could lead to a major shift in our approach to . . . Dr. Jackson’s model of . . . is sure to be a catalyst for innovative work in the years to come in a variety of areas . . . One conceivable concern about Dr. Jackson’s record is that most of her publications are in what are considered second-tier journals. This is because she is doing innovative work that has not yet made it into what is considered “mainstream” by the “old guard”. Her work is certainly important as well as methodologically rigorous.

Letter 3 (Chosen by Candidate): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Quite Positive

Dr. Jackson’s publication record is good. Her research shows . . . which provides a richer understanding of . . . Dr. Jackson also nicely pulls together various theoretical perspectives in her work. In addition, in her effort to understand people of color, who have been ignored until now, she is significantly advancing the field. I am reluctant to say that her record is “excellent” or “outstanding” because I would have liked to see her be a little more aggressive in terms of first authorship on more papers. That said, given her record, I expect she would pass through the rigors of tenure in my department. It is clear she works hard and will thus make useful contributions to the field.

Letter 4 (Chosen by Unit): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Mildly Positive

Although Dr. Jackson’s work as a whole is conceptually grounded and demonstrates methodological rigor, it is out of the mainstream. Thus, the findings while interesting are unlikely to have a substantial impact. And, even if one was to see her work as a major mover in the field, it is of concern that she is not often the lead author.

Letter 5 (Chosen by Unit): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Mildly Positive

I wonder about the real quality of the work given that although there are some high impact journals, none of the journals are considered core in our field. In fact, Dr. Jackson’s research focus on minorities represents a deviation from the important focus of the field on basic mechanisms of change. She is examining only a small slice of the American population.

The **overall tone** of the letters can range from *extremely, quite, and mildly negative* to *mildly, quite, and extremely positive*.

RESEARCH SUMMARY

Publications

- 10 empirical articles in peer-reviewed journals with low, medium, and high impact factors within field
- Co-author with former PhD supervisor on 4 articles (2 medium and 2 high impact)
- Lead (e.g., first, last, or corresponding) author (with graduate students) on the other 6 articles (1 low, 3 medium, and 2 high impact)

Grants

- \$500,000 3-year NIH grant on which he is the single PI

Presentations

- 8 colloquium presentations at Big Ten Universities
- 4 presentations as part of symposia at major conferences in his field

Context information. Faculty successfully promoted in similar departments in the last 5 years generally have 11 to 16 articles, funding from \$400,000 to \$600,000, and 3 to 8 department colloquia or seminars along with 2 to 6 symposia presentations

TEACHING SUMMARY

- Team member for undergrad intro course every semester (100-150 students)
 - : Teaches first half of each semester
 - : Ratings for his teaching in course in average range
- 1 upper-level undergrad course every year (25 students)
 - : Ratings vary from year to year between average and high-average
- 1 grad-level course every year (8-12 students)
 - : Ratings in average to high-average range

Context information: The teaching requirement in the department is 3 courses per year— either 2 undergrad and 1 grad course or 3 undergrad courses

SERVICE SUMMARY

- Member of department Colloquia committee
- Member of department Graduate Admissions committee
- Organized 2 workshops in subfield

EXTERNAL EVALUATION LETTER EXCERPTS FOR SCOTT COLE

Letter 1 (Chosen by Unit): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Quite Positive

To balance all the positives, I would like to point out that Dr. Cole has only one paper in the premier journal of our field, with most of his publications appearing in what are considered workhorse journals. This says to me “solid research” which is good, but one would hope for a few more significant publications from someone who is a leader in the field. However, I am confident in stating that Dr. Cole’s work is influential, with implications that extend beyond his specialty subfield. I have high regard for his work and continued potential. From his CV, I see that he has received funding from the NIH – this is significant and makes up for my qualms about the lack of articles in premier journals. I am also impressed by the active leadership role he has taken in organizing workshops for his area.

Letter 2 (Chosen by Candidate): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Extremely Positive

Dr. Cole was the first to point out that . . . The fact that . . . is a beautiful proposal to resolve this problem. In another paper, he suggests . . . These ideas are very attractive in that they require minimal additions to the standard model to solve the difficult problem of . . . This is a great idea. In another line of research, Cole is working on . . . Cole’s work is impressive. Among other contributions, he spearheaded research into . . . His analytic calculations are quite simply genius. Although he is not as productive of some of his peers, I am not worried because his work is innovative.

Letter 3 (Chosen by Unit): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Extremely Positive

Professor Cole is a very engaging, talented young researcher. His research interests span a broad range of issues related to . . . While Professor Cole may not be as prolific as some of his peers, the quality of his contributions is extremely high. His papers exhibit brilliance and ingenuity. His results inspire confidence, and many of them will have a lasting impact on the field. I have no doubt that Professor Cole will continue to generate scholarly achievements of the highest level and that his work will contribute to international recognition of the University of Illinois in the field of . . .

Letter 4 (Chosen by Unit): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Mildly Positive

Dr. Cole is not particularly productive, and there could be some concerns about the quality of some of the journals he publishes in. However, he comes from an excellent lab and thus is conceptually and empirically skilled which shows up in his work. His paper on . . . is an excellent demonstration of . . . which is likely to move the field forward once it gets the attention it should. I have discussed research with Dr. Cole at a few conferences and the discussions have moved my own thinking forward.

Letter 5 (Chosen by Unit): Overall Tone of the Full Letter is Quite Positive

Dr. Cole hits all the check boxes-- important research coming out of his lab published in good journals, an NIH grant, and taking the lead to organize workshops in his area. Dr. Cole is clearly getting his ideas out there. Although not incredibly prolific, Dr. Cole’s record is what we expect of someone coming up for tenure and bodes well for his future success.

The **overall tone** of the letters can range from *extremely, quite, and mildly negative* to *mildly, quite, and extremely positive*.