

# STR<sup>IP</sup>E

ADVANCE at Texas A&M

**Strategies and Tactics for Retention  
through Inclusive Promotion Evaluation**

**Handbook for Promotion & Tenure Committees**

**(8-27-2021)**

# STR<sup>IR</sup>PE

ADVANCE at Texas A&M

## Strategies and Tactics for Retention through Inclusive Promotion Evaluation

### Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION _____	3
THE CONCEPT OF IMPLICIT BIAS _____	3
EXPERIENCES OF MINORITIZED FACULTY _____	4
LAYING THE FOUNDATION FOR A FAIR & EQUITABLE EVALUATION _____	5
BEST PRACTICES FOR EVALUATING RESEARCH RECORDS _____	14
BEST PRACTICES FOR EVALUATING TEACHING RECORDS _____	17
BEST PRACTICES FOR EVALUATING SERVICE RECORDS _____	18

### Appendices

APPENDIX A: RELEVANT LITERATURE _____	19
---------------------------------------	----

## Introduction

The STRIPE workshop and handbook are designed to assist faculty members serving on promotion and tenure committees with the process of reviewing candidates for promotion in a fair and equitable manner. We recognize that departments, disciplines and sub-disciplines have their own “cultures” which include expectations for evaluating promotion cases. This handbook offers resources to aid P&T committee members in a way that aligns with university requirements and goals.

The handbook is organized in sections that represent key elements of the promotion and tenure review process:

- ✓ Laying the Foundations for Fair & Equitable Evaluations
- ✓ Best Practices for Reviewing Teaching Records
- ✓ Best Practices for Reviewing Research Records
- ✓ Best Practices for Reviewing Service Records

The objective of this handbook is to provide evidence-based practices to ensure the fair and equitable review of all candidates for promotion.

## The Concept of Implicit Bias

Many of the strategies and techniques in this handbook are designed to reduce the influence of implicit bias. We all have subconscious or implicit biases about other social groups (including but not limited to groups based on age, gender, sexual orientation, race and ethnicity). These perceptions are shaped by past experiences and stereotypes, and may inadvertently influence our behaviors and decisions. Researchers who study implicit bias refer to it as the “thumbprint that culture leaves on our brains.” In other words, as members of a culture, we have all picked up implicit biases about various groups and these implicit biases may be at odds with our explicit beliefs and ideals, such that a person should be judged solely on their merit and accomplishments.

There is an extensive amount of literature on the impact of implicit bias on the types of materials that are typically evaluated during a promotion case (e.g. CV, student evaluations, external letters, etc.) Implicit bias can “creep into” evaluation processes in a way that gives slight advantages to majority group members. While the advantages may be slight in any one decision, these advantages accumulate over a person’s academic career and lifetime.

Although it may be impossible to eliminate implicit bias, it is possible to adopt practices that will weaken the influence of implicit bias. The research on implicit bias provides many steps that can be taken to reduce the influence of implicit bias in the review of promotion cases. That is one of the central objectives of this handbook. Reducing implicit bias = the key to ensuring that the review process is fair and equitable for all candidates.

## The Experience of Minoritized Faculty Members

Much has been written about the experiences of minoritized faculty members in predominantly white institutions. As a university community, we need to reflect on these experiences as we strive create a healthy campus climate and to build inclusive procedures and practices. The quotes below capture some of the systemic issues that affect minoritized faculty members in academia:

*“As the individuals asking how universities work are usually successful in their fields and often belong to a variety of private clubs, I point out that – in my opinion – universities have much in common with elite country clubs. The academic credentials are necessary to be invited to join, but like all country clubs, not all members are perceived as equal.” (Samuel H. Smith as quoted in Presumed Incompetent, p. 450)*

*“[O]ur research and the work of others show that blacks, Asians, and white women who have impeccable qualifications may be hired or promoted at rates comparable to those of white men, but when their record is anything short of perfect, they are victimized by discrimination. In these cases, decision makers weigh the strongest credentials of white men most heavily while they systematically shift their standards and focus on the weakest aspects of racial minorities. The process often occurs unconsciously, even among people who believe that they are not racist or sexist. Moreover, because people justify their decisions on the basis of something other than race or sex – how a particular aspect of the record falls short of the standards, for example – they fail to understand the way racism or sexism operate indirectly to shape the qualities they valued or devalued*

*and, ultimately, what they decided.” (John F. Dovidio, as quoted in Presumed Incompetent, p. 483)*

*“To build diversity and inclusion in our institutions and disciplines... we need more than numbers... we must create a healthy climate. This requires a culture of collaboration where issues of intersectionality can be addressed.” (Nancy Cantor as quoted in Presumed Incompetent, p. 449)*

## Foundations for a Fair and Equitable Evaluation

### ESTABLISHING CLEAR AND FAIR GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION

- ✓ **Criteria for promotion should be clearly stated in departmental guidelines.** Guidelines and criteria should be as transparent as possible. Guidelines should strike a balance between setting clear benchmarks for faculty to demonstrate meritorious performance, while also allowing sufficient flexibility to accommodate different sub-specialties and “sub-cultures” within a discipline. For example, guidelines that state that faculty must publish their work within a set of established journals may disadvantage scholars who work in emerging and interdisciplinary areas of inquiry.
- ✓ **Revisit promotion criteria and guidelines on a regular basis, particularly if existing criteria for promotion no longer work for a changing discipline.** Disciplines evolve over time. Just as new discoveries are made, new journals and new pedagogical approaches emerge. If a department finds itself in a situation where some faculty are thriving as scholars, yet not meeting established criteria, it might be a good time to re-evaluate the criteria. Existing criteria might inadvertently benefit some scholars at the expense of others. Recognize that power structures are likely at play when it comes to discussions of broadening criteria. This is not a matter of “lowering the bar” as much as it is a matter of recognizing that scholarship within a field may not fit a “one-size-fits-all” model. The ideal set of guidelines will not include “deal-breaker” criteria.

## EFFECTIVE MENTORING OF PROMOTION CANDIDATES

- ✓ **Develop an effective mentoring program for your department.**  
Mentors can provide future promotion candidates with clear guidance on promotion criteria and departmental expectations. There should be a system in place to ensure that mentors meet regularly with their designated mentees.
  
- ✓ **Develop clear channels of communication between mentors, promotion & tenure committee chairs, and department heads.**  
Faculty who are eligible for eventual promotion should ideally be receiving feedback from multiple sources (e.g. departmental mentors, departmental promotion and tenure committee chair, and the department head). Although individual points of view may vary slightly on some matters, there should be a concerted effort to ensure that faculty receive a relatively consistent message prior to coming up for promotion.
  
- ✓ **Revisit departmental practices that “vet” candidates for promotion prior to a formal promotion review.** Some departments require candidates to be pre-approved for non-mandatory promotions, such as promotion to full professor and/or APT promotions. It is appropriate for these reviews to take place as part of a formal review process (such as a post-tenure review of an associate professor). It is also appropriate for a mentor and/or department head to review faculty materials and provide feedback if a faculty member wants to know whether or not they are ready to come up for promotion. It is problematic (and against university policy) if the vetting mechanism is a departmental practice where a group of senior faculty members are expected to give their approval (or “blessing”) before a faculty member is allowed to submit their materials for a non-mandatory review. In most departments, such a process would disadvantage women faculty and BIPOC faculty, and slow down their progress towards promotion.

**In order to ensure a fair and equitable promotion review, there are a number of steps that a department should take before the formal review process is underway.**

## BEST PRACTICES FOR COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

**Ensure that multiple and diverse perspectives are represented on the promotion and tenure committee.** Some departments at TAMU use “committees of the whole” while others have a smaller designated committee to review promotion and tenure cases. There are pros and cons to both approaches: a small committee may not include a diversity of perspectives, and a large committee may include one or more “toxic” committee members. It is important, however, to ensure that the committee has multiple and diverse perspectives. The Dean of Faculties guidelines state that all committees must have a minimum of 5 committee members who are eligible to vote.

Multiple observers produce more and complete judgments than single observers (Stewart & Valian, 2018; Thorngate et al., 2009; Vazire & Gosling, 2004). In a study of simulated P&T committee discussions, the least diverse committees rated a hypothetical candidate the lowest (Mallery et al., 2019). At Texas A&M University, who counts as a “voting member” of the committee varies from one department to the next. Some departments use designated promotion and tenure committees to review promotion cases. Other departments use a “committee of the whole” consisting of all tenured faculty for the review of tenure-stream faculty, or all promoted faculty for the review of APT faculty promotions. In such a case, a subset of committee members is typically responsible for preparing letters evaluating research, teaching and service.

- ✓ **Consider revisiting your department’s practices for selecting P&T committee members (and/or P&T sub-committee members.** If your department’s current practices do not ensure the representation of diverse perspectives, consider reevaluating those practices, or coming up with an alternative way to add committee members from other units on campus. Committees that do not believe that there are external barriers to women and BIPOC faculty tend to promote fewer women faculty and faculty of color (Regner et al. 2018). (Refer to the DOF guidelines on the inclusion of committee members from another unit.)

## PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW

- ✓ **Refer to department, college and university guidelines for the administrative aspects for promotion and tenure.** University, college, and department guidelines for promotion and tenure can be found on the

Dean of Faculties (DOF) website. See “Promotion and Tenure” on the Dean of Faculties website ([dof.tamu.edu](http://dof.tamu.edu)) for more information. The DOF guidelines provide detailed information on the materials submitted by candidates and departments, the organization and formatting of those materials, and the process. Colleges and department guidelines provide more detailed guidance on the criteria used for evaluating promotion cases.

- ✓ **Develop clear expectations for committee members.** Committee members should understand from the onset that promotion reviews are an important and time-consuming task. The committee chair should clearly communicate expectations for committee members attend all meetings, participate actively in the process, treat all applicants fairly, maintain confidentiality, etc.
  
- ✓ **Establish ground rules for committee meetings that allow multiple voices to participate in the discussion.** If promotion and tenure meetings are typically dominated by the opinions of a small number of senior faculty, the department should revisit departmental practices for discussing promotion cases. Case studies of minoritized faculty members indicate that a single toxic faculty member can derail a promotion case, especially in cases where other faculty members are afraid to challenge the authority of a senior colleague (Niemann 2012). Ideally, all committee members will have a chance to share their opinions about a case, and to point out potential bias in the review process. The committee should agree upon (or revisit) a set of ground rules before discussing a candidate’s record. Ground rules can also help ensure that committee members feel comfortable sharing their opinion, and that no one dominates the discussions.
  
- ✓ **Establish ground rules regarding confidentiality.** The committee chair should clearly and explicitly communicate the need to remain confidential. The candidate should be informed of the outcome of their own case at each level of review, as outlined in the DOF guidelines for promotion and tenure (p. 4). Promotion proceedings should not be discussed with staff members, graduate students, undergraduate students, faculty who are not part of the committee, faculty in other departments, etc.

- ✓ **Establish ground rules regarding conflicts of interest.** The DOF Guidelines for P&T state that faculty members with a conflict of interest recuse themselves from voting on a candidate (p. 24). This includes relatives of the candidate, graduate or post-doc advisor; etc. Prior to reviewing a candidate, the committee should discuss whether there are any other circumstances that might constitute a conflict of interest. The P&T Chair should may want to discuss these situations with the associate dean of faculty affairs in their college.
- ✓ **Review departmental decision-making process with committee members.** The department should have clearly stated policies for who votes on promotion cases and how voting takes place. Department policies must align with any policies set by the college/school. This would include language about whether senior APT faculty vote on APT faculty who are up for promotion. (It is sensible for APT faculty to be included as voting faculty for APT faculty promotions.) This might also include language about whether the votes are taken by secret ballot (which is highly recommended), and whether voting should take place in writing or via an electronic platform.
- ✓ **Make sure search committee members review implicit bias training materials before reviewing applications.** Research finds that implicit bias can influence how committee members evaluate CVs, external letters, publication outlets, and other evaluation materials. Awareness of implicit bias and barriers to equity can impact promotion decisions (Regner, Thinus-Blanc, Netter, Schmader and Huguet 2018).
- ✓ **Encourage committee members to prioritize equity over equality during the evaluation process.** An emphasis on equity can help balance the reality that faculty workloads in areas of teaching and service are unlikely to be truly equal, and therefore research expectations should not be equal either. Contributions should be strong in all three categories, yet an equitable review will acknowledge and reward exceptional service or teaching that goes above and beyond departmental expectations. For example, it would be inequitable for a woman faculty of color who has been making meaningful contributions to college and university committees and who has been informally mentoring and advising students of color outside of the classroom to be expected to have an equal number of publications and grants as a faculty member who merely has a

“solid” record of teaching and service within the department (Niemann 2012).

### SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS TO MINIMIZE IMPLICIT BIAS

- ✓ **Committee members should be reminded that the mechanism through which a person was hired is irrelevant in the review of their promotion case.** Case studies indicate that faculty who were hired through the partner placement program or hired as an opportunity hire are sometimes held to different standards during a promotion review (Niemann 2012). The promotion review is not the time or place to revisit how a person joined the department. The review should focus on whether or not the candidate meets expectations for promotion. Even a small comment about how an individual was hired can introduce bias into the review process.
- ✓ **Avoid the pitfalls of tokenism when viewing a promotion candidate from a minoritized group.** In departments where the majority of faculty are white and/or male, there is a risk that faculty from historically underrepresented groups will be viewed as tokenized persons who represent their particular group. An example of tokenism is when conversations about a faculty center around memories that reinforce a stereotype about their particular group (Dovidio et al. 2001; Fiske and Taylor 1984; Niemann 2012). Similarly, referring to a person as a “diversity hire” suggests that they were not hired on their own merit, and are only there for symbolic reasons.
- ✓ **Avoid using positive labels for candidates, such as “superstar.”** This may be viewed as a harmless practice, but the concept of a superstar suggests that such individuals are infallible and can do no wrong. Typically, these labels are only used for faculty who study “mainstream” topics. The problem with these labels is that it may inadvertently carry a bias against other faculty, such as caregivers who work hard but are unable to put in as many long hours in the office (Williams 2000).
- ✓ **Use questions to disrupt the use of labels that suggest that a candidate was not hired on their own merit or is unique.** Some examples include: “Why is this coming up?”; “How is this relevant to the case?”; “Why is this only coming up when X is discussed but not when Y is discussed?”

- ✓ **Provide written and clear instructions in annual reviews for any faculty with joint appointments.** Joint appointments can be a wonderful thing for faculty who are doing interdisciplinary research. Faculty in joint appointments, however, may experience bias in the review process because different norms may exist in different disciplines/departments, and work that a joint appointee may do for one department may not be recognized or rewarded by their second department. The annual review process can be used to establish dialogue on expectations between the two units to ensure that annual, mid-term and promotion evaluations are conducted in a fair and equitable way, and that joint appointees are not expected to do double duty.

The Dean of Faculties Guidelines has a section on the procedures for evaluating faculty with joint appointments (p. 9). Individual college guidelines may provide further guidance.

- ✓ **Remind committee members that faculty with tenure clock extensions should be evaluated according to the normal standards of that unit (not higher standards).** There are numerous reasons for a tenure clock to be extended, including but not limited to the birth or adoption of a new child. The university has a gender-neutral tenure clock extension policy, and the university has recently encouraged tenure-track faculty to request an extension due to disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Studies find that gender-neutral tenure clock extensions tend to help male faculty earn tenure at higher rates than they help women faculty (Antecol et al. 2018). Studies also find that tenure clock extensions can contribute to salary differences between male and female faculty with similar years of experience (given that women seek tenure clock extensions more often) (Alanis 2018; Manchester et al. 2010). It is critical that P&T committee members do not penalize faculty members who take tenure clock extensions by expecting them to have a stronger record because they had more years before coming up for promotion.

- ✓ **Committee members should also review all promotion to full professor candidates with the same set of expectations, regardless of the number of years since their last promotion.**

- ✓ **Refer to established departmental criteria when reviewing research records.** Every department should have established criteria for the review of research records. Promotion and tenure committee members should strive to use these criteria during the evaluation process, and avoid the use of criteria that are not relevant.
- ✓ **Avoid informal discussions of a candidate's record prior to the formal review.** Recognize that implicit bias can affect the review process when informal conversations about whether or not a candidate has a strong promotion case are often based on dated information, assumptions about the quality of a candidate's work, and even gossip. Even when conversations are well-intended, they can bring in unfair and biased perceptions about a candidate.
- ✓ **Recognize that informal department practices that encourage or require a subset of faculty members and/or the P&T chair to give their "blessing" or "approval" before a candidate goes up for full professor are not in line with best practices.** These informal reviews tend to be based on partial information, such as a review of a potential candidate's CV, rather than a review of a candidate's statement and feedback from external reviewers. These informal reviews are also creating a biased process where designated "gatekeepers" have the power to limit access to promotion to others. It is best to wait to review a candidate's full promotion case, so that more pieces of information can be evaluated by a larger and more diverse group of individuals.
- ✓ **Make sure that all promotion and tenure committee members review implicit bias training materials before reviewing applications.** Research finds that implicit bias can influence how committee members evaluate CVs, external review letters, publication outlets, and other evaluation materials.
- ✓ **Be mindful of special circumstances where implicit bias is likely to come into play.** For example, if a female faculty member regularly collaborates and publishes with her spouse, assumptions may be made

**During the evaluation of candidate dossiers, it is essential that promotion and tenure committee members take steps to minimize the influence of implicit bias to ensure that all candidates are reviewed fairly and equitably.**

that the husband (not the wife) had made more significant contributions, and/or the female faculty member has not established an independent record of research (even if the order or authorship suggests otherwise and collaborative work is the norm for the discipline).

- ✓ **Allow sufficient time for the review.** Keep in mind that implicit bias is most likely to operate when people work quickly or under time pressure. Promotion materials should be reviewed carefully. Committee members who are assigned the task of writing research letter should take time to read the candidate's publications (not just the CV, candidate statement, external letters, and metrics).

## Best Practices for Reviewing Research Records

- ✓ **When selecting external reviewers, seek individuals who are in the best position to evaluate the candidate based on relevant expertise.** For some promotion candidates, it makes sense to select external letters from individuals who are at peer or aspirant peer research universities. For others, it is possible that the person with the best expertise is not at a “prestigious institution.” This may be particularly true for scholars who are working in nearly emerging areas of research, or unique research specialties. The current DOF guidelines (p. 15-16) allow some flexibility in the selection of external review letters (i.e. associate professors may be used for tenure cases; letters from non-academic institutions may be used; and letters from faculty who are not at peer/aspirant peer universities may be used).
- ✓ **Recognize that external review letters can be a source of bias.** External review letters are an important part of the review process. However, it is important to recognize that letters can be a potential source of bias. There are numerous studies that indicate gender bias, for example, in the case of reference letters for job applicants. One study of external review letters finds that promotion decisions correlate more positively with the characteristics of the letter writer than with the performance of the promotion candidate. In other words, some external letters count more than others, even if the content and tone of the letters are similar (Madera et al. forthcoming).
- ✓ **Decenter citation as the main indicator of impact by recognizing that metrics, such as journal impact factor and H-index, may have some value, but they do not allow for fair and equitable comparisons between faculty.** At best, they should be regarded as an imperfect “short cut” for measuring the achievements of individual scholars (Beal 2015; Bisquert et al. 2015; Zare 2012). Studies indicate that H-indices, for example, are particularly poor measure for evaluating scholars at the beginning of their career. H-indices also place more emphasis on the number of publications, than the quality of publications, and do not capture the creativity of a person’s work (Zare 2012). One study found that people are more likely to cite scholars they know personally, than unfamiliar scholars (Milard 2014; Milard and Tanguy 2018). As a result, scholars who are unable to attend national and international conferences

- as often may be cited less. Scholars have also noted biases in citation practices that disadvantage women, scholars of color, and international scholars (see for example, Pritchard et al., *Inside Higher Ed*, August 27, 2021; Lariviere et al. 2013). Given all of these issues with citation statistics, committees should avoid relying heavily on citation statistics. Instead, more emphasis should be placed on the quality and the originality of the work, and the impact of the scholar's work on the field.
- ✓ **Acknowledge that some forms of scholarship will have a greater impact if published in a subdiscipline journal with a lower impact factor but an appropriate audience.** Note: This point is mentioned in the DOF guidelines, p. 44. Departments that expect candidates to publish their work in a small number of journals should regularly ensure that these target journals are possible venues for all areas of research conducted by faculty in that department.
  - ✓ **Consider citation statistics within the context of the discipline, or field of study.** One approach is to compare citation statistics with comparable scholars in the same area of specialty who are at similar stage in their career. Another approach is to use the Field Citation Ratio (FCR), which is calculated by dividing the number of citations a paper has received by the average number received by documents published in the same year and in the same fields of research (Herbert 2020).
  - ✓ **Committee discussions should focus on the quality of the candidate's research accomplishments, not an assessment of the candidate's research area.** Case studies of minoritized faculty suggest that some faculty are reviewed negatively based on their area of specialization, rather than their actual accomplishments (Niemann 2012). This is a situation where bias against a particular type of research influences the evaluation of a promotion case. Such practices should be recognized for what they are, and avoided at all costs.
  - ✓ **Encourage faculty to consider the option of including alt-metrics in their impact statement.** Altmetrics provide a broader way to measure scholarly impact than citation statistics, such as journal impact factor and H-index (Herbert 2016; Mitchneck 2021). Candidates should not be required to include alt-metrics, but committees should carefully consider the impact of a scholar's work in cases where alt-metrics are included in a promotion dossier. Alt-metrics provide an alternative (and also

imperfect) way to document impact that captures scholarly research cited in public policy documents; course syllabi; and/or social media.

Texas A&M University Libraries has partnered with Digital Science to develop TAMU's Altmetric Explorer which aggregates alternative metrics about TAMU faculty research. Departments can encourage candidates to visit this page and determine whether they would want to refer to altmetric statistics in their statement. The use of almetrics should be an option, not a requirement, as not all scholarly work is likely to be picked up by altmetrics.

- ✓ **Acknowledge that the COVID-19 pandemic shifted faculty workloads, albeit in different ways.** The pandemic disrupted “normal” workloads, and individual faculty pivoted their responsibilities in different ways. Some courses, for example, were more difficult to adapt to new circumstances, and thus took more time and energy away from research. Some forms of research had to be put on hold due to shutdowns, social distancing measures, travel restrictions, etc. The levels of disruption can vary greatly, even within a department, depending on the type of research that a person does and the state of an research project at the beginning of the pandemic. (For example, compare a faculty member who might have been getting ready to start a fieldwork project with a faculty member who had completed fieldwork and was at the writing stage.)
  
- ✓ **Consider asking candidates to write a COVID-19 impact statement that will be taken into account during the evaluation process.** Candidates can be encouraged to write a pandemic impact statement that documents how the pandemic impacted their research, teaching, mentoring, and service. The impact statement can explain disruptions and workload shifts in response to the crisis. These statements should be considered in evaluating candidates with a mind towards an equitable review process. Tenure clock extensions should not be viewed as a complete “solution” to equity issues that will arise due to differential impacts of the pandemic on scholarly work, whether from increased care giving responsibilities, travel restrictions, lab closures, etc. The intent of pandemic impact statements is to give evaluators a way to evaluate faculty in a fair and equitable way that does not derail a career due to the effects of the pandemic.

## Best Practices for Reviewing Teaching Records

- ✓ **Adopt a holistic review of a candidate's teaching record that minimizes the use of Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET).** Studies find that are not the best indicator of teaching effectiveness or student learning (Braga et al. 2014; Lee et al. 2018).
- ✓ **Committees should recognize that student evaluations may be biased in the case of faculty from underrepresented groups.** Studies also find that there are significant biases against female instructors, faculty/instructors of color, and international faculty/instructors (Aruguete et al. 2017; Boring et al. 2016; Boring 2017; Fan et al. 2019; MacNeill et al. 2015; Mengel et al. 2019; Reid 2010; Smith and Hawkins 2011; Wang and Gonzalez 2020).
- ✓ **Recognize that not all course evaluation systems are the same.** The new AEFIS teaching evaluations were designed carefully to generate more qualitative feedback on students' perception of their learning, their sense of belonging in the classroom, and the climate of the learning environment.
- ✓ **When presenting qualitative comments from student evaluations, committee members should take care to select a balance of positive and critical comments, rather than selectively presenting negative comments.** Case studies of minoritized faculty members find that P&T committees can misrepresent a faculty member's teaching effectiveness by selectively presenting negative comments to the exclusion of positive comments (Niemann 2012).
- ✓ **A more holistic review of teaching record shifts the focus to peer evaluations of teaching and student outcomes.** Peer reviews of teaching provide a better alternative to SETs for evaluating the effectiveness of an instructor. Peers can provide constructive feedback about the content of the course, the quality of course organization, and the appropriateness of instructional materials and assessment methods, and the instructor's concern for student learning. (See the CTE website for guidance on how to conduct an effective peer evaluation of teaching, <https://cte.tamu.edu>). Student outcomes includes undergrads completing honors theses, students completing high-impact learning experiences, graduate student accomplishments and job placements, etc.

## Best Practices for Reviewing Service Records

- ✓ **Acknowledge that faculty from underrepresented groups (e.g. faculty of color, women in STEM disciplines, etc.) are likely to be taking on extra service responsibilities based on their social identity.** For example, they may be asked to serve on more committees than the typical faculty member so that the committees are more diverse. Faculty from underrepresented groups are also disproportionately asked to serve on committees that focus on diversity and inclusion. Finally, they are disproportionately expected to mentor junior faculty and students from underrepresented groups. Taken together, these practices have been referred to as a “minority tax” and typically comes at the expense of time that can be spent on research.
- ✓ **Encourage candidates to describe the impact of their invisible service.** Departments can demonstrate that they do value these forms of service by encouraging candidates to describe what they have done and how it has been impactful. For example, a candidate can describe how they have mentored several students from underrepresented groups, and they have helped make these students feel like they belong to the university. A candidate may also describe how they have mentored other faculty from underrepresented groups.
- ✓ **Recognize the importance of “invisible service” contributions by including these things in the department’s service report.** The service report does not have to be limited to “formal” service, such as participation on a committee. A more effective report will acknowledge the impact that a candidate’s service, including informal and invisible service has had on the department and on students.
- ✓ **Acknowledge that identities are complex, and disadvantages accumulate when there is an intersection of two or more minoritized group identities.** For example, the experiences of a Black women in a STEM discipline will be different than the experiences of a white woman in a STEM discipline.

## Appendix A. Relevant Literature

- Benjamin, Losi. 1997. *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils*. University Press of Florida.
- Berry, Theodora Regina and Nathalie Mizelle (Editors). 2006. *From Oppression to Grace: Women of Color and Their Dilemmas within the Academy*. Stylus Press.
- Green, Anna L. and Mabokela Reitumetse. 2001. *Sisters of the Academy: Emergent Black Women Scholars in Higher Education*. Stylus Publishing.
- Gutiérrez y Muhs, Gabriella, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. González, and Angela P. Harris (Editors). 2012. *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. University Press of Colorado/Utah State University Press.
- Lisnic, Rodica, Anna Zajicek, and Shauna Morimoto. 2018. "Gender and Race Differences in Faculty Assessment of Tenure Clarity: The Influence of Departmental Relationships and Practices" *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 5(2): 244-260.
- Madera, Juan et al. (forthcoming) "External Review Letters in Academic Promotion and Tenure Decisions are Reflective of Reviewer Characteristics" Manuscript under review.
- Mallery, Taniecea A., Ilana S. Mittman, Laura Castillo-Page, Jennifer Eliason, and J. Renee Chapman Navarro. 2019. "A Stochastic Model of Consensus Reaching in Committee Decisions for Faculty Advancement, Promotion and Tenure: Does Diversity Matter?" *Journal of the National Medical Association* 111(4): 418-426.
- Manchester, C. F., Leslie, L. M., & Kramer, A. (2013). Is the Clock Still Ticking? An Evaluation of the Consequences of Stopping the Tenure Clock. *ILR Review*, 66(1), 3–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001979391306600101>.
- Mihesusah, Devon A. and Angela Cavender Wilson (Editors). 2004. *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*. Bison Books.
- Niemann, Yolanda Flores, Gabriella Gutiérrez y Muhs, and Carmen G. González (Editors). 2020. *Presumed Incompetent II: Race, Class, Power, and Resistance of Women in Academia*. Utah State University Press.

Niemann, Yolanda Flores. 2012. "The Making of a Token: A Case Study of Stereotype Threat, Stigma, Racism, and Tokenism in Academe" in Gutierrez y Muhs's *Presumed Incompetent*. Pp. 336-355.

Padilla, Raymond V. and Rudolfo Chavez (Editor). 1995. *The Leaning Ivory Tower: Latino Professors in American Universities*. SUNY Press.

Regner, Isabelle, Catherine Thinus-Blanc, Agnés Netter, Toni Schmader and Pascal Huguet. 2019. "Committees with implicit biases promote fewer women when they do not believe gender bias exists" *Nature Human Behavior* 3: 1171-1179.

Stanley, Christine A. 2006. *Faculty of Color: Teaching in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities*. Jossey-Bass.

Stewart, Abigail and Virginia Valian. 2018. *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence*. MIT Press.

Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes and Samuel L. Myers. 1999. *Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success*. Pearson Education.

Zambrana, Ruth Enid. 2018. *Toxic Ivory Towers: The Consequences of Work Stress on Underrepresented Minority Faculty*. Rutgers University Press.