REVIEW COMMITTEE TRAINING – BEST PRACTICES
REVIEW COMMITTEE EXPECTATIONS

• All discussions of the committee are confidential except as needed by administrators at Department/College/University level (discussions should occur only at the meetings)
• Follow all policies and procedures so as to be fair to every candidate
• Base all decisions and discussions on the materials in the portfolio and the Departmental/College expectation
• Use the Departmental/College expectations for evaluation – a rubric or set of criteria should be used by each individual on the committee during the review
• Review should be based on the criteria, not in comparison to others
  • Each member conducts their own review of the materials
• Leave time should not be ‘counted’—there isn’t an expectation of MORE work because the time to review is longer.
• Prior to review, departments should discuss how interdisciplinary work is reviewed. What types of evidence might the committee need to evaluate such work?
• Communication between the committee and the candidate should go through the Department Chair. e.g. if the committee sees something is missing, or asks for another piece of information
WHEN DISCUSSING CANDIDATES

- Discuss each candidate based on your criteria prior to making a judgement (Reappoint, Tenure etc.)

  An Example:
  - For Reappointment – The teaching philosophy and teaching responsibility statement is clear, and understandable and is reflected in the teaching materials presented – i.e. syllabus, exams, paper rubrics, evaluations – both teaching and peer – use of technology etc.

- All discussion should be based on criteria in the Cato College of Education, “Criteria and Procedures Used at Department and College Levels to Conduct Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Reviews in the College of Education,” and must be based on factual information presented in the dossier.
WHAT IS MY ROLE ON THIS COMMITTEE?

- **Department:** Discussions should be ongoing about what constitutes excellence
- **Chair:** Discuss the criteria and how the committee will be using those criteria to review the dossier
  - Should there be a rubric or simply use the 9/30/16 document as the guiding piece
  - When will the review be available and how
- Discuss both confidentiality and respect for each others opinions and time
  - This means everyone should have time to speak and no one person should dominate the discussions
  - Everyone has an equal voice regardless of tenure track status and rank. There should be no repercussions from voicing any opinion but all opinions must have a documentable basis in the dossier
- Make sure all discussions begin with the criteria and it is not until **all** facets have been discussed that a decision is reached by the committee
WHAT IS MY ROLE ON THIS COMMITTEE?

- Members – must speak up and take the time to review all materials. Each person must take the time to review the criteria and be aware of biases so that they are not allowed to alter the review process. They should attend meetings prepared for discussion having reviewed the entire dossier.
  - Prior to beginning the reviews, all members should discuss the criteria and biases so that everyone is on the same page
  - Any member with a conflict must recuse themselves
  - Be open to others’ opinions and an open dialogue on how materials are weighted
  - Ultimately you must make up your own mind and be willing to support it in the letter from the committee
• Remember that the process is not unbiased and this includes letter writers, differences in number of citation (impact factors etc.), our personal biases (including those regarding who has written letters)
  o Social science research shows the pervasive nature of bias in evaluation of faculty
  o Teaching evaluations are lower for female, minority and international faculty
  o Company startups are higher for male faculties and there is bias in licensing
UNIVERSITY OF MAINE-NSF IT GROUP -LETTERS

• Male Faculty
  • Highly Skilled
  • Highly Effective
  • Important Figure
  • Expert Scientist
  • Skilled Diplomat
  • Enormous Credibility

• Female Faculty
  • Excellent Citizen
  • Diligent
  • Committed
  • Determined
  • Enthusiastic
  • Energetic
BIASES

• The assumption that we know a scholar’s work is excellent if it has been recognized by a very narrow set of legitimacy markers adds bias to the process, and works against recognition of newer form of scholarship.

• For example – we know that males self-cite more than woman, and this biases against women in citation indices

• San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), is a statement written jointly by 75 science organizations and 150 scientists that notes the metrics of impact factor are being used as quick assessments of performance and should not

• WHAT SHOULD YOU DO???
  o We must use more than a single set of metrics to evaluate candidates, and be aware of the biases inherent in all these metrics
  o The Chair should make sure that they keep the group focused on the link between the criteria and the dossier
LETTER FROM COMMITTEE

• Should include the summative evaluation based on the criteria and should be supported by factual information in the dossier used for the evaluation
• Should be based on information during the relevant review period
• Should discuss information in the dossier that is contradictory to the recommendation
• If there are/is a dissenting vote, the letter must address issues raised by those dissenting
RESOURCES


• https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UZHxFU7TYo4&feature=plcp
  ○ (go to minute: 1:36 to 2:47)

• https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html