Spring 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR

EQUITABLE PROMOTION & TENURE

DEIAB FACULTY AFFAIRS COUNCIL
OHIO UNIVERSITY

Prepared and submitted by Susan Williams, Professor of Anatomy (Project Lead); Cynthia Anderson, Professor of Sociology; Katie Hartman, Vice Provost for Faculty Development; Janet Hulm, Assistant Dean for Collections & Digitization Strategies, University Libraries; and Yehong Shao-Lucas, Professor of Mathematics

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report shares best practices and ideas for equitable promotion and tenure practices. The goal is to provide broad recommendations and specific suggestions for implementation. The intent is to share ideas for departments/schools to consider rather than specify mandates for policy change.

The report provides:
- A framework to establish a common understanding, including definitions, guiding principles, and approaches to change.
- Considerations about promotion and/or tenure criteria, which refers to achievements, requirements, or conditions by which the candidate's merit for promotion and/or tenure is evaluated and judged.
- Considerations about promotion and/or tenure process, which

Recommendations related to criteria argue that departments/schools should consider:
- Creating flexible pathways to promotion and/or tenure to account for differential faculty workload distributions, opportunities/assignments, resources, and contributions.
- Standardizing a periodic self-study of promotion and/or tenure criteria to demonstrate that criteria provide sufficient specific guidance on standards for promotion and/or tenure at each level and for early promotion and/or tenure.
- Recognizing the value of inclusive scholarship, including inter-disciplinary, applied, and community-based (participatory) research in mission statements, strategies, and other foundational documents.
- Including evidence-based inclusive teaching and learning practices as part of their teaching excellence criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
- Defining service, articulating its value, and providing guidance on what is considered an appropriate amount of service.
- Reviewing the six conditions associated with equity-minded faculty workloads in the context of each promotion and/or tenure evaluation.

Recommendations related to process argue that departments/schools should:
- Provide information about timelines, selection criteria of internal and external reviewers, and the details about which information is shared with any reviewer of the dossier.
- Formalize mentoring opportunities available to all faculty and support opportunities for mentor training if requested.
- Structure and train committees so that all members feel they are able to evaluate candidates and participate in the discussion but are aware of potential sources of bias in the process.
- Provide external reviewers with clear guidelines and expectations about their role in the process and what they are expected to evaluate.
- Provide the faulty member with annual feedback and mid-term reviews about areas of strength and areas of improvements relative to the promotion and tenure guidelines as well as guidance regarding the steps necessary to continue making progress.

For most faculty, promotion and tenure are some of the most important milestones in a faculty member's career. According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2021), the principal purpose of tenure is to safeguard academic freedom by providing "the conditions for faculty to pursue research and innovation and draw evidence-based conclusions free from corporate or political pressure." From a university perspective, tenure promotes stability among its faculty by promoting commitment to the institution (AAUP, 2021).

According to the *Ohio University Faculty Handbook* (Section II.C.7.a), tenure is awarded to those individuals whose records indicate that they are likely to continue to make significant positive contributions to the academic life of the University throughout their professional careers. The criteria and process by which tenure and promotions in rank are awarded reflect the character of the department/school, college, and university. Transparency, clarity, consistency, timeliness, and fairness should be overriding goals for all colleges, schools, and departments as they establish guidelines and procedures governing tenure and promotion (*Ohio University Faculty Handbook, Section II.E*).

Unfortunately, research suggests that tenure and promotion criteria and processes are not always equitable (e.g., Cundiff et al, 2018; DiBenedetto, Peters, & Voight, 2021; Durodoye et al, 2020; Guillaume & Apodaca, 2022; Kulp, Pascale, & Wolf-Wendel, 2021). Often, pre-tenure and pre-promotion faculty receive various and conflicting messages about what it takes to get tenure, with various notions of how many publications it might take, what kind of teaching evidence (if any) will be needed, and how grants and funding factor into decisions (Strunk, 2020). Unspoken rules and vague expectations contribute to holding down and pushing out scholars who have been historically marginalized in the academy (Strunk, 2020). Finally, known biases in peer review and citation rates are large barriers to promotion as they negatively influence both productivity and the perception of one's impact in a field (Hoppe et al. 2019; Kong et al., 2022; Corbyn 2011).

This report shares best practices and ideas for equitable promotion and tenure practices. The goal is to provide broad recommendations and specific suggestions for implementation. The intent is to share ideas for departments/schools to consider rather than specify mandates for policy change.

Framework

Before providing recommendations for equitable promotion and/or tenure, the following provides a framework to establish a common understanding, including definitions, guiding principles, and approaches to change.

Definitions

The following lists definitions relevant for understanding best practices for equitable promotion and tenure.

- **Faculty**. According to the *Ohio University Faculty Handbook* (Section II.C.5), faculty status refers to a person who is recognized as being primarily an officer of instruction rather than an officer of administration. Furthermore, the *Handbook* states that faculty status is reserved for a person who has demonstrated scholarly or professional competence in a recognized academic discipline, and who is engaged in teaching or research pertaining thereto, or both.

- **Promotion**. Promotion is the advancement in rank or position. Each of the three Ohio University faculty classifications (i.e., tenure-track, instructional, and clinical) include three ranks: Assistant, Associate, and Professor.

- **Tenure**. Tenure is a status granted to a faculty member indicating that the position is permanent. A tenured appointment is an indefinite appointment that can be terminated only for cause or under extraordinary circumstances such as financial exigency and program discontinuation.

- **Criteria (criterion)**. Broadly, criteria are standards, rules, or tests on which a judgment or decision can be based. In the context of promotion and/or tenure, criteria are the set of standards or rules for evaluating and judging the merits of an application for promotion and/or tenure.

- **Process (processes)**. Broadly, process refers to a series of actions or operations. In the context of promotion and/or tenure, processes are the systematic series of procedures and practices used to judge applications for promotion and/or tenure.

- **Equity (equitable)**. Broadly, equity refers to the quality of being fair, impartial, and just. In the context of promotion and/or tenure, equity refers to evaluating applications for promotion and/or tenure fairly, impartially, and without bias. (By comparison, *equality* refers to criteria, processes, policies, and/or practices that treat all faculty the same.)

Guiding Principles

The following outlines guiding principles framing best practices and recommendations for equitable promotion and tenure.

- **Criteria**. The academic units of Ohio University should define criteria for tenure and promotion according to the standards of their respective fields and disciplines, with specific expectations for types and levels of achievement and how they will be measured and documented. Transparency, clarity, consistency, timeliness, and fairness should be overriding goals for all colleges, schools, and departments as they establish guidelines and procedures governing tenure and promotion (*Faculty Handbook, Section II.E*).

- **Merit**. Promotions in rank and the granting of tenure shall be based on merit. Promotions shall not be automatic or routine. Promotions shall be awarded to recognize the level of

faculty members' contributions to the missions of the University in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity (if applicable), and service.

- **Non-Discrimination**. Promotions in rank and the granting of tenure shall be made without regard to race, color, religion, gender, age, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, veteran status, political affiliation, or national origin. It is the policy of this University that, in education and employment opportunities, there shall be no discrimination against any individual because of race, religion, color, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, gender identity or expression, mental or physical disability, or military veteran status (*Faculty Handbook, Section IX.A*).

- **Academic Freedom**. Promotions in rank and the granting of tenure shall respect academic freedom. This shall include freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties (*Faculty Handbook, Section I.A.3.a*), freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, avoiding persistently intruding material that has no relation to their subject (*Faculty Handbook, Section I.A.3.b*), and freedom from institutional censorship or discipline, subject to obligations as a member of a learned profession and officers of an educational institution (*Faculty Handbook, Section I.A.3.c*).

- **Peer Review**. Responsibility for promotion and tenure recommendations shall rest principally with the senior members of the faculty. All awards of tenure and all promotions in rank must originate in a positive recommendation by the appropriate departmental committee or after a formal hearing and presidential review in cases that have gone through the grievance procedure (*Faculty Handbook, Section II.E.5*).

- **Contributions**. Tenure shall be awarded to those individuals whose records indicate that they are likely to continue to make significant positive contributions to the academic life of the University throughout their professional careers (*Faculty Handbook, Section II.C.7.a*). Tenure shall be granted by the President upon recommendation of the department, the dean involved, and the Provost of the University (*Faculty Handbook, Section II.C.7.b*).

- **Post-Tenure**. Promotions in rank and the granting of tenure must not be an unconditional guarantee of lifelong employment. Promotions in rank and tenure is a privilege that carries responsibilities within the academic unit, the college, the University, and broader academic community. These responsibilities include maintenance of the highest academic and professional standards.

- **Equity**. The process for granting promotions in rank and/or tenure shall be guided by fairness, integrity, and objectivity. Specifically, departments/school should engage in equitable promotion and/or tenure policies and practices that (1) account for the differences in each individual's starting point when pursuing a promotion and/or tenure, (2) remove barriers to equal opportunity, and (3) provide support based on the unique needs of individual faculty.

Approaches to Change

Based on a review of programs and experiences of institutions that have implemented Institutional Transformation (IT) projects under the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE program, the University of Colorado Boulder classified approaches to making promotion and tenure processes more equitable into two categories: structural and educational (Laursen & Austin, 2014).

Structural. According to Laursen and Austin (2014), the following describes structural changes (referred to interventions) designed to improve equitable process for tenure and promotion.

> *Structural interventions are designed to increase the fairness of formal advancement processes by establishing clear procedures, formalizing them across units, and ensuring that all candidates receive comparable advice and preparation. Policies and procedural guidelines might set in place checks and balances, assign oversight roles, or build in a standard timeline for initiating review processes so that faculty members are not left out and so that they receive accurate signals about their progress prior to major reviews. By clarifying and standardizing aspects of advancement processes that can vary from unit to unit or person to person, such interventions can also increase both real and perceived transparency and accountability in the P&T process.*

Examples of structural interventions include (but are not limited to) standardizing select P&T processes and policies at the college or university-level, asking an external review board to review P&T guidelines periodically for transparency and clarity, and appointing a trained, college-level, non-voting member to the P&T committee to monitor discussions and ensure that policies and procedures were uniformly applied.

Educational. According to Laursen and Austin (2014), the following describes educational changes (referred to interventions) designed to improve equitable process for tenure and promotion.

> *Educational interventions seek to ensure that all participants in P&T proceedings are well-informed about the process and their own role. They aim to influence the culture, behaviors, and norms around advancement decisions by informing participants of requirements and expectations so that procedures can be applied equitably, educating them about potential sources of bias in evaluating candidates for advancement, and providing structures by which deliberations can take place and questions or concerns can be raised.*

Examples of educational interventions include (but are not limited to) formalizing mentoring opportunities for pre-tenure faculty, training institutional leaders about policies and processes, and educating pre-tenure faculty about dossier preparation.

Criteria Considerations

The following describes considerations about promotion and/or tenure *criteria*, which refers to achievements, requirements, or conditions by which the candidate's merit for promotion and/or tenure is evaluated and judged.

Pathways to Promotions and/or Tenure

Promotion and tenure are important to institutions of higher education. According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the principal purpose of tenure is to safeguard academic freedom, which is necessary for all who teach and conduct research in higher education. However, in addition to tenure being important academic freedom and knowledge creation, some argue that tenure is a practical issue for universities and faculty (Greenwald, 2019). Specifically, tenure also ensures that the institution has sufficient tenured faculty to serve on committees or in administrative appointments, such as department chairs and program directors (Greenwald, 2019).

According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the US academic workforce has shifted from mostly full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty to mostly contingent faculty, including full-time non-tenure-track, full-time with no tenure system, and part-time faculty. In addition, despite significant investments in pipeline interventions to diversify academia, faculty of color and women are underrepresented in tenured and tenure-track positions across the academy (AAUP, 2020).

At Ohio University, all tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute to the teaching, research, and service missions of the university (*Handbook*, II.C.3.a). However, the distribution of effort in these areas may vary across faculty members within a unit and, for a specific faculty member, at various stages of their careers. Even when workload distributions are similar among faculty, opportunities and assignments may vary according to evolving needs of the academic unit, optimal utilization of faculty talents and contributions, and/or faculty interests and anticipated career paths.

To recognize the varied contributions of faculty, some institutions have abandoned the typical one-size-fits-all pathway in order to offer flexible pathways to promotion and/or tenure (e.g., Indiana-Purdue University (IUPUI), Worcester Polytechnic Institute, West Virginia University, and Ohio State University (OSU)). The principle is that flexible pathways to promotion and/or tenure enable faculty to contribute to the teaching, research, and service missions of the university in ways that make best use of their talents and abilities. From an institutional perspective, flexible pathways to promotion and/or tenure also provide flexibility for academic units to assign individual faculty different obligations based on academic unit needs and faculty interests.

Recommendation

We recommend that departments/schools create flexible pathways to promotion and/or tenure to account for differential faculty workload distributions, opportunities/assignments, resources, and contributions.

Implementation Examples

Typically, flexible pathways to promotion and/or tenure can be achieved by either (a) specifying distinct pathways with differing criteria or (b) explicitly allowing for flexibility based on variable assignments/opportunities using common criteria. As examples:

- Pathways. IUPUI's *Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers* (2021-22) specifies multiple pathways to promotion and tenure including research-excellence, teaching-excellence, and service-excellence. For each, IUPUI requires a baseline of expectations (i.e., minimum requirements) in all the three areas of evaluation plus demonstrated excellence in one or more areas. Alternatively, IUPUI offers balanced cases where contributions are evaluated as "highly satisfactory" across all three areas.

- Flexibility. Ohio State University's *Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure* (2022) state that: "In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility."

Transparency and Objectivity

> *"A lack of clear definitions and standards for review creates a "foggy" (Beddoes and Pawley 2014) climate for evaluation, which disproportionately hurts women and historically minoritized faculty (Fox et al. 2007; Lennartz and O'Meara 2018; Misra et al. 2011)." – from "[Equity-Minded Reform of Faculty Evaluation](#), by O'Meara and Templeton for the American Council on Education, 2022 p. 3.*

Promotion and tenure criteria can be unclearly specified or inflexible, in some cases relying on tradition entrenched in specific narrow disciplines, or they can be obscure, unevenly applied, or even change (openly or otherwise) midstream of an individual's promotion process (Nyunt et al. 2022). Additionally, collaborative and/or inter- or transdisciplinary scholarship may challenge the paradigm of stated criteria based on individual disciplines, which makes the evaluation standards ambiguous. An additional source of "noise" that creates lack of transparency in tenure decisions comes from processes used to select and solicit external reviewers (see O'Meara et al. 2022).

Lack of transparency and objectivity in tenure and/or promotion standards can have significant ramifications for the individuals being evaluated, but also can have widespread negative effects on the climate of a department, college, or university. At the individual level, the impact on under-represented and female faculty is disproportionate (Van Miegroet et al. 2019; O'Meara and Templeton 2022; Nyunt et al. 2022). While improving transparency and objectivity in the criteria for promotion and tenure is essential to increasing diversity and inclusion in academia, in reality the benefit applies to all individuals going through the process. This broader impact is particularly relevant as many OHIO departments and areas of scholarship are interdisciplinary and/or collaborative, and workload distributions across teaching, research, and service, may differ between individuals.

Recommendation

We recommend a routine (every five years) standardized self-study of department and college level tenure and/or promotion criteria. The goal of the self-study is to demonstrate that criteria provide sufficient specific guidance on standards for promotion and/or tenure at each level and for early promotion and/or tenure. All departments and colleges should make P&T criteria accessible on their webpages. The Equity-Minded Reform of Faculty Evaluation Policies Audit Resource provides helpful guidance for evaluating promotion guidelines for clarity and transparency.

Implementation Examples

To address transparency and objectivity issues, departments and colleges are encouraged to implement the following strategies:

- Implement a rubric for objective evaluation to be used for internal and external review that 1) define standards of evaluation such "excellence" (e.g., "candidates much achieve excellence in research") with specific metrics or examples that would be required to achieve the standard and 2) specify acceptable publication outlets, or other types of outlets, particularly for inter- or transdisciplinary research.

- Explicitly detail criteria for early review of promotion and tenure, promotion, or tenure with rank upon hire in department and college P&T guidelines.

- Implement faculty development plans for all faculty with the criteria for successful advancement within the candidate's specified workload as the guiding framework. Alignment of the workload with the individual development plan should be re-evaluated annually.

Inclusive Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

The Boyer (1990) model of scholarship has been foundational to broadening our understanding of academic research. Boyer argued that universities should recognize other kinds of scholarly endeavors beyond the traditional practice of discovery, specifically highlighting the scholarship of teaching, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of application. Inclusive research here refers to scholarship or creative activity that falls into the domains of integration or application. In many ways, this model has been naturally embraced by faculty, as the scope of research in many traditional fields has expanded to include inter- and transdisciplinary work, applied work, and engagement with individuals and entities outside of the traditional university setting (community-based research).

Despite this, faculty engaging in inclusive research have more impediments to promotion and tenure as criteria have stayed entrenched in traditional academic departments (or disciplines) and higher value continues to be placed on independent research contributions. Indeed, the primary barriers to promotion and tenure for these faculty include a lack of clear criteria for evaluating individual contributions to multi-authored projects and publications and the use of discipline-specific standards related to publications, grants, etc. rather than standards that value the impact of the work outside of these narrow domains (Committee on the Science of Team Science et al. 2015; *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research* 2004; Nyden 2003).

Research has also shown that research that is not "traditional" for a field, e.g., social, diversity, and community-based research, is weighted less in promotion and tenure decisions, and that this disproportionately impacts minority scholars (Mallery et al. 2019). Community-based research (CBR) and community-based participatory research (CBPR; see Collins et al. 2018) face significant additional challenges because it may be seen as political or grass-roots, rather than academic (Nyden 2003). This type of work often addresses systemic issues relating to social problems. Consequently, it can also take longer to develop and complete because it requires developing community partnerships. This can sometimes only be accomplished through community service, which can put the faculty member at a productivity disadvantage. Additionally, the time from translation or implementation to measurable and, thus publishable, outcomes can be lengthy (Ahmed et al. 2004; Marrero et al. 2013; Nyden 2003). While CBR and CBPR can have significant and impactful societal benefits, it may also yield fewer papers and/or papers in less prestigious journals. Funding streams also tend to be more limited and this type of research garners fewer citations (Minkler et al., 2003). Moreover, the impact of this work may go under-recognized during the promotion and tenure process, particularly given that the external evaluations rarely include members or leaders within the community who understand the impact of the work (Marrero et al. 2013).

Recommendation

We recommend that departments and colleges recognize the value of inclusive scholarship, including inter-disciplinary, applied, and community-based (participatory) research in mission statements, strategies, and other foundational documents. We also recommend that departments and colleges have clear criteria for valuing products of this research beyond traditional grants and publications and a clear mechanism to evaluate individual contributions to team-based research. We further recommend that instructions for dossier preparation include guidance for presenting inclusive research and scholarship and guidance for internal and external reviewers include explicit instructions for evaluating a wide range of contributions and achievements beyond publications and grants. Finally, departments and colleges are encouraged to solicit and equally value impact statements from relevant non-academic external reviewers.

Implementation Examples

Klein and Falk-Krzesinski (2017) and Nyden (2003) provide a number of policies and processes that can be implemented to ensure fair and equitable promotion and tenure that are relevant for faculty engaged in inclusive research. Some of these paths of implementation include:

- Have a mechanism that guards against conflating inclusive research with service in workload allocation, performance review, and promotion and tenure decisions, or alternatively recognized aspect of the research as a distinct component of workload (e.g., community service) with clear time-commitment and deliverables).

- Align mentorship of junior faculty to support and advocate for engagement in inclusive research.

- Allow letters from collaborators or community members on the nature and impact of an individual's contributions.

- Encourage copies of Memoranda of Understanding or Letters of Agreements in P&T dossiers.

- Developing specific guidelines for internal and external reviewers on how to fairly review candidates whose scholarship transcends individual or specific disciplines (e.g., applied or community-based scholarship), or who demonstrate other mechanisms of productivity and dissemination beyond traditional mechanisms such as peer reviewed publications and grant funding (e.g., community impact statements, policy changes, white papers).

- Require the use of existing rubrics in annual evaluations and dossier preparation for describing contributions and roles in projects (e.g., [Project Credit](#)), and consistency and transparency in the value of the different contributor roles.

Inclusive Teaching

Ohio University defines its central purpose as "intellectual and personal development of its students." Decades of research across multiple disciplines has demonstrated that student development and achievement of learning outcomes can be impacted by student perceptions of class climate, including the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical environment (Ambrose et al., 2010). Accordingly, faculty are expected to understand how their course climate impacts their students and to respond to calls for fostering inclusive classroom environments (Ambrose et al., 2010).

Broadly, inclusive teaching refers to pedagogy that strives to serve the needs of all students, regardless of background or identity, and support their engagement with subject material. Specifically, Hockings (2010) states, "Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education refers to the ways in which pedagogy, curricula and assessment are designed and delivered to engage students in learning that is meaningful, relevant and accessible to all. It embraces a view of the individual and individual difference as the source of diversity that can enrich the lives and learning of others."

Addy *et al* (2021) suggest inclusive teaching includes two themes: (1) equitable learning environments where all students have the opportunity to reach their potential and (2) welcoming learning environments that foster a sense of belonging. Based on research, the Guide for Inclusive Teaching at Columbia (2020) defines five principles for inclusive teaching:

- Establish and support a class climate that fosters belonging for all students through building instructor-student rapport, building student-student rapport, treating students as individuals, avoiding assumptions based on stereotypes, conveying the same level of confidence in the abilities of all students, and addressing challenging classroom behaviors/attitudes.

- Set explicit student expectations through explicitly articulating assessment criteria, providing timely, clear, and actionable feedback, establishing community agreements and discussion guidelines, providing examples of exemplary work, and modeling expected behavior.

- Select course content that recognizes diversity and acknowledges barriers to inclusion through selecting content that engages a diversity of ideas and perspectives, choosing content by authors of diverse backgrounds, and using multiple and diverse examples that do not marginalize students.

- Design all course elements for accessibility through providing multiple means of representation and supporting materials, providing multiple means of action and expression, and providing multiple means of engagement.
- Reflect on your beliefs about teaching to maximize self-awareness and commitment to inclusion by exploring your identities, implicit and explicit biases, how you handle challenges in the classroom, and how you set up classroom spaces and activities foster inclusion or disinclusion.

Recommendation

We recommend that departments/schools should include evidence-based inclusive teaching and learning practices as part of their teaching excellence criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

Implementation Examples

In order to include evidence-based teaching and learning practices as part of their teaching excellence criteria for promotion and/or tenure, departments and colleges are encouraged to implement the following strategies:

- Add "Inclusion - the ability to serve the learning needs of all students" as one criteria for measuring and documenting teaching excellence. This may be demonstrated through one of more of the following:
  - Creating a welcoming, productive class environment
  - Offering learners with multiple ways to learn
  - Providing learning support for all learners
  - Integrating diverse examples and texts drawn from a broad range of perspectives and experiences
  - Guiding students to think about how knowledge is created and how different experiences/cultural frameworks influence perspectives
  - Limiting biased language
  - Promoting respectful and empathetic interactions among students and between the student and educator
  - Incorporating DEIABJ-focused activities and actions

- Expand sources of evidence-based inclusive teaching and learning practices to include one or more of the following:
  - Self-assessments (i.e., statements prepared by teachers to describe and reflect on their professional approach to teaching)
  - Reports of professional activities (i.e., descriptions and documentation of professional activities in teaching and learning that offer insights into the nature, scope, and range of contributions made through areas of interest and expertise).
  - Direct measures of student learning (i.e., assessment students' knowledge, skills, or attitudes through an evaluation of student performance, either against a defined benchmark or through changes over time).
  - Indirect measures of student learning (i.e., proxy measures of students' knowledge, skills, or attitudes that imply that students have learned).

- o Peer evaluations (i.e., assessments from peer groups, both internal and external to the university, about teaching and learning).

- Support and reward faculty efforts to develop evidence-based inclusive teaching and learning practices, such as:
  - o Participating in workshops about evidence-based inclusive teaching and learning practices.
  - o Earning credentials (e.g., certifications, awards, etc.) related to evidence-based inclusive teaching and learning practices.
  - o Reducing opportunity or achievement equity gaps in student learning.
  - o Incorporating assessment of student learning related to evidence-based inclusive teaching and learning practices into course and/or curriculum improvement.

Equitable Service

Faculty engage in many kinds of service including institutional service, community/public service, and professional service. Faculty evaluation policies may inadvertently debase service work by failing to define, assess and value it as a significant part of faculty merit. Further, research shows that women and members of non-white racial groups tend to take on more service work, especially related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (Eagan and Garvey 2015; Jimenez et al. 2019; Misra et al. 2011, 2021).

As a result, these faculty may not be able to advance in tenure and promotion processes at the same rate as their research-focused peers (Misra et al. 2011). Researchers speculate that if service labor is better recognized, it is likely that we would see fewer inequities in time to promotion, turnover and satisfaction (Misra et al., 2021; Stewart and Valian 2018).

Recommendation

We recommend that faculty evaluation policies define service, articulate its value, and provide guidance on what is considered an appropriate amount of service. Service should be evaluated so that weight is given to leadership, time, effort, and breadth of service. Policies should also document how service might differ by career stage and appointment type, allowing for flexibility and recognizing that the amount and kinds of service a faculty member engages in may change over time (O'Meara et al. 2021). To increase clarity, we recommend the policies articulate concrete examples of service and what it means to meet or exceed service criteria for the different categories of faculty in Section II.C.3 of the Ohio University Faculty Handbook *at each rank*. Further, to increase transparency, we recommend that faculty workload data be collected and shared so that faculty know how much service others are doing, and so individual workloads can be calibrated to be fair (O'Meara et al., 2017).

Assumptions

The following are assumptions to guide the establishment of clear and transparent criteria for promotion:

- Faculty are expected to perform increased additional departmental, college, and university service as they move up in rank. Service expectations for untenured probationary faculty members are generally less than expectations for tenured faculty.

- Faculty presenting committee or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate that it is a direct reflection of professional expertise and has been evaluated by peers as substantive professional and intellectual work.

- Evaluation should address the amount of time involved beyond the allocation of release time, the level of professional knowledge and skill involved, and the quality, significance, and importance of the service in terms of its potential consequences.

- Service that directly supports the University's stated values of equity, diversity, and inclusion are to be acknowledged and considered in the assessment of service.

  - This may include activities that affirm and encourage community and a respect for differences and foster an inclusive environment, characterized by cultural understanding and engagement, ethical behavior, and commitment to social and restorative justice.

- Service that supports the University's value of civic engagement, which prepares students to be informed and engaged global citizens and ethical leaders, is to be given full consideration in the assessment of service.

Implementation Examples

Below are examples of specific types of service faculty might engage in:

- University citizenship: Routine department expectations; chair's/review committee's determination that service is more than mere participation.

- Department, College, and University service such as participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, or the like.

- Leadership at various levels within the University.

- Public or community service, such as workshops; public forums; unremunerated consultations; and technical assistance to the public using the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues; and

- Professional service, such as reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing or judging creative works, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, holding office within an organization of a candidate's discipline, or the like, as defined by the Department.

- Officer, committee chair or other significant leadership role in an academic or professional association.

- Chair and/or membership on University or College committee or sub-committee.

- Receipt of an award for service.

- Professional service to the campus and/or the larger community that is relevant to the faculty's scholarly expertise (may include public issue-oriented consulting, volunteer coordination, and technical assistance).

- Volunteer service in elementary and/or secondary schools that is relevant to the faculty's scholarly expertise.

- Volunteer service relevant to scholarly or creative expertise on community boards and commissions.

- Development and presentation of public lectures and workshops.

- Membership on department/college/university/system committees contributing to the operation of the respective units.

- Administrative duties for the department such as Graduate and Undergraduate Directors

- Administrative duties for the college/university/system, including those on a temporary basis.

- Activity in professional (local, regional, national) groups beyond simple dues paying membership (e.g., role as officer, committee member, etc.)

- Non-funded professional advisory service to community, civic, governmental, religious, or social groups (e.g., periodic consultant, speaker, workshop leader)

- Representative of department/college/university/system at professional meetings

- Testimony on professional matters to legislative bodies

- Advisor for a student organization.

- Assisting individual students working with local, regional, or national organizations

- Public service such as media work (e.g., interviews with television, radio, and other news outlets that expand public knowledge and awareness of the profession, department, or the candidate's research are

Service Examples Related to Inclusive Excellence

Below are some examples of diversity and inclusive types of service faculty might engage in:

- Curricular design in general education or at departmental levels that foster inclusivity.

- Participation in professional development programs designed to improve knowledge of needs for supporting a diverse student population.

- Mentoring faculty members from underrepresented and underserved populations.

- Participation in activities that support successful recruitment, retention, and graduation of students from underrepresented and underserved populations.

- Participation in activities that support successful recruitment, retention, and promotion of faculty from underrepresented and underserved populations.

- University-wide collaborations to enhance recruitment/retention effort (collaborating with Admissions, Center for Student Achievement, TRIO, etc.).

- Commitment to a professional organizations' equity, inclusion, and diversity work.

- Membership on departmental or university committees related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

- Service on local and/or statewide committees focused on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

- Leadership in organizing unit-level or campus-wide events that encourage self-reflection and education regarding issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

- Serving as an advisor to programs such as Women in STEM or other similar professional organization. Serving as an advisor for minority student clubs & associations at the university.

Equity-Minded Workloads

According to a report by the American Council on Higher Education (O'Meara et al., 2022), recent social movements have revealed the systemic ways that racism and sexism remain entrenched in academic cultures. Specifically, O'Meara et al. (2022, p. iv) argues:

> *"Faculty workload is taken up, assigned, and rewarded in patterns, and these patterns show important yet overlooked areas where inequity manifests. Faculty from historically minoritized groups are disproportionately called upon to do diversity work and mentoring, while women faculty do more teaching and service. These activities are vital to the functioning of the university, yet are often invisible and unrewarded, leading to lower productivity and decreased retention."*

Based on research funded by the National Science Foundation, the American Council on Higher Education (O'Meara et al., 2022) identified six conditions linked to equitable workloads:

- Transparency, which refers to offering widely visible information about faculty work activities available for department members to see.

- Clarity, which refers to creating clearly identified, and well-understood benchmarks for faculty work activities.

- Credit, which refers to recognizing and rewarding faculty members who are expending more effort in certain areas.

- Norms, which refers to making a commitment to ensure faculty workload is fair and have systems in place that reinforce these norms.

- Context, which refers to acknowledging different strengths, interests, and demands and offer workload flexibility to recognize this context.

- Accountability, which refers to creating mechanisms for ensuring that faculty members fulfill their work obligations and receive credit.

Recommendation

We recommend that departments/schools and/or colleges explicitly consider the six conditions associated with equity-minded faculty workloads in the context of each promotion and/or tenure evaluation.

Implementation Examples

According to a report by the American Council on Higher Education (O'Meara et al., 2022), the American Council on Higher Education (ACE) suggests using the following to address the six conditions linked to equitable workloads.

- <u>Transparency</u>. ACE suggest using faculty work activity dashboards, including (a) teaching credit dashboard that lists all faculty and describes types of courses, new preps, and total course load per faculty and (b) service credit dashboard that lists all faculty and describes the number/type/scope of service obligations and the estimated time commitment for each faculty member. Departments/schools could also create service audits by asking faculty what they want to do in the next three years in the areas of teaching and/or service roles.

- <u>Clarity</u>. ACE suggests using (a) faculty expectations guidelines that outline the among of teaching, research, and service expected for faculty members at different ranks and in different employment categories and (b) standardized compensation for key roles including overloads, leadership, and course releases.

- <u>Credit</u>. ACE suggests using credit systems where faculty can "bank" work in one area in order to do less in another area.

- <u>Norms</u>. ACE suggests using planned service rotations and planned teaching time rotations to rotate service workload and preferred teaching times.

- <u>Context</u>. ACE suggests using (a) differentiated workload policies where faculty can negotiate a differential workload that is mutually beneficial to both the faculty and university, and (b) modified P&T criteria that may deviate from normal P&T criteria – e.g., faculty members who are hired to do different kinds of faculty work (e.g., administratively focused) or whose scholarship is interdisciplinary or community-engaged and thus more difficult to evaluate by traditional standards like counting peer-reviewed journal articles).

- <u>Accountability</u>. ACE suggests (a) restructuring and reducing committees so that it is clear who will do what on which committees to avoid redundancies and committee bloat, and (b) creating statements of mutual expectations that outline the obligations faculty members have to one another and to the department.

Process Considerations

The following describes considerations about promotion and/or tenure *process*, which refers to the systems series of actions or steps by which a candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure is evaluated and judged.

Transparency

Lack of transparency – either through deliberate or unintentional failure to share accurate information -- has the potential to lead to inequitable practices and decision-making. As O'Meara and Templeton (2022) note, "When policies exclude critical information about any faculty evaluation process, participants within an organization with inside connections are more likely to access the relevant information, and those who may be less networked proceed at a disadvantage (Beddoes and Pawley 2014; Tierney and Bensimon 1996)."

Recommendation

P&T processes and criteria should be readily accessible and accurate. Process information should include information on timelines, selection criteria of internal and external reviewers, and the details about which information is shared with any reviewer of the dossier.

Implementation Examples

- Department chairs should ensure that P&T guidelines are given to candidates during the interview phase and again, upon hiring.
- College and department P&T committees should ensure that P&T guidelines are available on the appropriate website, with version histories clear (and previous versions available if they are still relevant to some candidates).

Mentoring

Diverse faculty in higher education are key to enriching campus environments (Zambrana et al. 2015). The existence of faculty from varied backgrounds and diverse groups are known to be a fundamental element in supporting student sense of belonging and advancement (Pascarella et al. 2014) enriching creative thinking and expanding varied perspectives, knowledge, and pedagogies (Boyd et al. 2010; Zambrano et al. 2015). However, attrition of diverse faculty and low job satisfaction threatens the retention faculty from underrepresented groups (Moreno et al., 2006).

Broadly, research suggests that faculty mentoring can increase teaching and research productivity and lead to improved faculty satisfaction and morale (Fountain & Newcomer, 2016). Specifically, research suggests initiatives such as mentoring faculty from underrepresented groups are in an institutions best interest because can help advance career trajectories and research productivity (Nakamura & Shernoff, 2009) and alleviate the sense of isolation (Boyd et al., 2010). Other potential benefits for the mentee may include quicker acclimation to the work, improved teaching, improved research skills and productivity, better informed choices regarding service activities, and increased social contact with colleagues. For mentors, benefits may include satisfaction from contributing to

the development of a colleague, exposure to new research techniques and topics, exposure to different teaching styles and strategies, and reinvigoration of teaching and research programs.

Recommendation

Departments/schools or colleges should formalize mentoring opportunities available to all faculty and support opportunities for mentor training if requested.

Implementation Examples

According to Columbia University's Guide to Best Practices in Faculty Mentoring, mentoring should be a highly successful, adaptable, and practical strategy for supporting faculty members' success and satisfaction across their career.

Columbia University argues that effective mentoring programs should adhere to specific guidelines:

- Mentorship should be a collaborative learning process that draws upon the knowledge of a variety of faculty who can provide to new faculty entering the professoriate or to more senior faculty transitioning to new roles. The relationship should be a "reciprocal, supportive, and creative partnership of equals."

- Mentoring requires active committed engagement on the part of both mentor and mentee. It is dependent upon the willingness of those acting as mentors to invest time for guidance on an ongoing basis. It also requires the commitment of those needing guidance to actively identify specific developmental goals.

- Mentoring should help junior faculty successfully acquire the key competencies (scholarly independence, educational skills, and preparation for academic advancement), as well as the constructive professional relationships (professional networks) within the institution and beyond needed to develop a productive career.

- The traditional, hierarchical, dyadic mentoring relationships may be enriched by an additional network of individuals providing very specific guidance in areas of professional development that may not be addressed within a single dyadic relationship. In other words, Formal, departmentally assigned mentoring relationships and informal, mentee-initiated relationships may be complementary and support different aspects of career guidance.

- Mentoring need not be limited to junior faculty, as midlevel and senior faculty may wish to focus on career transitions and new directions.

- Mentoring relationships should evolve over time and may focus on one or several elements required for career success depending upon the career stage of the mentee, the career goals to be met, the level of guidance required, and the nature of the input from mentors.

Committee Composition, Expectations and Training

Promotion and tenure involve processes and decisions that impart significant discretion to committee members (O'Meara 2021). Promotion and tenure committees, especially at the departmental level, weigh and provide justification that leads to the recommendation against known guidelines but are also typically privy to norms and practice within the group, which may not be

equitable. Several factors may influence group dynamics and thus the outcome of promotion and/or tenure deliberations. For example, research has shown that the least diverse groups tend to rate candidates for promotion and tenure lower than more diverse groups when provided with the same dossier (Mallery et al. 2019). Additionally, full participation of committee members and group deliberations, especially at the department or college level, may be influenced by internal dynamics, sometimes informal or hierarchical, and social capital among its members, which can negatively impact objectivity of the decision, again having differential impacts on different populations (Mallery et al. 2019; O'Meara 2021). Therefore, thoughtful consideration of group membership and engagement is important for ensuring equitable processes. Committee training ensures shared responsibility in the process and in the evaluation of the candidates. When this training is combined with specific training on potential sources of bias in the process (see O'Meara 2018), there is a higher potential for equity in the review process and fairer outcomes.

Recommendation

Committees should be structured and adequately trained so that all members feel they are able to evaluate candidates and participate in the discussion but are aware of potential sources of bias in the process. Committee members should also have annual training regarding process, expectations for promotion and/or tenure, committee membership expectations and rules of engagement during deliberations. Committee members should understand tenure processes and expectations, including where the process is vague or where there may be unwritten expectations. Departments/schools or colleges should evaluate guidelines for appointment and composition of P&T committees to ensure diversity along multiple axes and appropriate departmental/college representation.

Implementation Examples

- Develop and make available criteria for appointing members of department and college P&T committees. For departments that do not have sufficient faculty at rank for committee(s), processes for additional ad hoc membership with voting privileges and terms should be clear. Additional recommendations regarding committee membership are in Section 11.C.8 of the Ohio University Faculty Handbook. Criteria for recusal of committee members in discussions and voting should be clear, and processes for selection of replacement members, if necessary, should be in place.

- Departments/schools or colleges committees should meet to review criteria, process, and ground rules for the committee deliberations for each type of candidate that will be evaluated that year (e.g., instructional, TT). This meeting should be led by the committee chair and held as a separate meeting prior to reviewing candidates. Committees should use this time to determine any conflicts of interest, recusals, and replacement members.

- Colleges should hold general P&T training for department and college committees (or committee chairs as a representative thereof). This meeting should be led by the college Associate Dean of Faculty, or an appropriate representative of the Dean's office. The goal of this training is to review university policy and procedures related to promotion and tenure.

- All committee members should take bias / diversity and inclusion advocacy training such as that offered by OHIO HR. Committee chairs should work with candidates to discuss removal of unsolicited and potentially biasing information prior to review.

- Department and college meetings to discuss applicants should require active participation for anyone to vote. Standardization of the discussion and strategies such as deliberative

decision making (DDM) to ensure engagement of all individuals is encouraged. Strategies for using DDM in P&T discussions can be found here and here.

- We recommend that Colleges follow a similar two-part training paradigm to OHIO's HR training for search committees[1] to ensure that participating individuals are sufficiently prepared to evaluate candidates in a fair and equitable manner and mitigate bias during candidate discussions and review. In addition, we recommend committees review P&T processes and criteria prior to candidate evaluations to ensure standardized treatment of individuals and adherence to policy and procedure.

- An individual, not the committee chair, should be assigned to record votes. Individual votes (affirmative or negative) should be recorded along with the rationale for the vote to ensure that the committee letter adequately and fairly captures the rationale for the recommendation.

- P&T guidelines should have clear rules for appointment of advocates, if allowable or appropriate, including their specific role (e.g., part of the committee or not, voting or not) in the context of active committee deliberations.

External Evaluator Selection and Engagement

The purpose of external evaluators is to place the work of the candidate in the context of the broader field, to highlight the impact of their contributions, and to provide an assessment of the candidate's contributions relative to the departmental promotion and/or tenure guidelines. Selection for and engagement of external evaluators in the review can be substantially different between candidates, and thus a source of inequitable processes and outcomes (O'Meara and Templeton 2022).

Recommendation

The process and criteria for selection and engagement of external evaluators should be clear, standardized, and detailed in P&T guidelines. Reviewers should be provided with expectations and documentation about their role in the process, including standards for what they are expected to evaluate.

Implementation Examples

- Departmental/school committees should standardize and make accessible the criteria for how external evaluators are selected, including those who may be collaborators or have other conflicts of interest.

- Committees should report on acceptances and declines by external evaluators, and request and record the rationale for why an external evaluator declines to review the dossier.

- Requests to external evaluators should specify on what they should focus their review of candidates (e.g., research versus teaching).

---

[1] All search committee members take standardized training on the hiring process to participate on search committees and that one member of the committee receives special training ("Safeguarding the Candidate Experience") on inclusive candidate evaluation and intervention techniques.

- Dossiers should have unsolicited and potentially biasing information removed prior to external review.

- External evaluators should be instructed on how to account for leaves of absences or other relevant disruptions that led to an extension of the probationary period.

- Solicit external evaluations with a standardized request letter used for all candidates, and reviewer form (in lieu of free-form letters) to encourage a high level of participation in the process in a more structured, consistent, and potentially less unbiased, way (see Appendix 1 for an example of a reviewer form used by Johns Hopkins University).

- If an external evaluator reveals a potential bias, there should be processes in place in how to handle that evaluation.

Mid-term and Annual Evaluations

Annual evaluations and a formal mid-term (3rd year) reviews of a more extended dossier are important points of feedback on progress towards tenure. The goal of these reviews are to 1) assess overall performance and provide the basis for a fair evaluation which may be used in the decision regarding reappointment and promotion; 2) afford faculty an opportunity to practice preparing their files for review, document their achievements, and understand how they will be judged for tenure and promotion; and 3) identify and address concerns on a probationary faculty member's teaching, research, and service. Whereas the Ohio University faculty handbook requires annual progress towards tenure reviews for probationary tenure track faculty, mid-term reviews are not officially required, with discretion left up to departments.

Recommendation

Each department should provide the faulty member with annual feedback on areas of strength and areas of improvements relative to the promotion and tenure guidelines as well as guidance regarding the steps necessary to continue making progress. It is recommended that each probationary faculty member also be reviewed after the end of the 3rd year by the department. This review should be a more comprehensive assessment of the candidate's accomplishments.

Implementation examples

- Promotion and tenure guidelines should incorporate a formal required process for mid-term review that incorporates building a dossier for evaluation.

- Mid-term reviews should be a supplement for the annual evaluation. Annual evaluations during a mid-term review year should still be performed.

- The department chair should share and discuss the outcome of the review with the faculty member.

References

Ahmed, Syed M., Barbra Beck, Cheryl A. Maurana, and Gail Newton. 2004. "Overcoming Barriers to Effective Community-Based Participatory Research in US Medical Schools." *Education for Health (Abingdon, England)* 17 (2): 141–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/13576280410001710969.

Ambrose, Susan A., Michael W. Bridges, Michele DiPietro, Marsha C. Lovett, & Marie K. Norman. *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, 2010.

Addy, Tracie Marcella, Dube, Derek, Mitchell, Khadijah A. & SoRelle, Mallory. (2021). *What Inclusive Instructors Do: Principles and Practices for Excellence in College Teaching: Vol. First edition*. Stylus Publishing.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2021, November 9). *Tenure*. https://www.aaup.org/issues/tenure

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2020, December). *Data Snapshot: IPEDS Data on Full-Time Women Faculty and Faculty of Color*. https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Dec-2020_Data_Snapshot_Women_and_Faculty_of_Color.pdf

Beddoes, K. & Pawley, A. (2014). 'Different people have different priorities': work–family balance, gender, and the discourse of choice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(3), 1573-1585.

Boyer, E. L. (1990), *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* (PDF), Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Boyd, T., Cintron, R., & Alexander-Snow, M. (2010). The experience of being a junior minority female faculty member. In *Forum on public policy online* (Vol. 2010, No. 2). Oxford Round Table. 406 West Florida Avenue, Urbana, IL 61801.

Collins SE, Clifasefi SL, Stanton J, The Leap Advisory Board, Straits KJE, Gil-Kashiwabara E, Rodriguez Espinosa P, Nicasio AV, Andrasik MP, Hawes SM, Miller KA, Nelson LA, Orfaly VE, Duran BM, Wallerstein N. Community-based participatory research (CBPR): Towards equitable involvement of community in psychology research. Am Psychol. 2018 Oct;73(7):884-898. doi: 10.1037/amp0000167

Columbia Center for Teaching and Learning (2020, January). *Guide for Inclusive Teaching at Columbia*. https://bpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/edblogs.columbia.edu/dist/8/1109/files/2020/02/Guide-for-Inclusive-Teaching-at-Columbia_Accessibility-Revisions_15-January-2020_FINAL.pdf

Committee on the Science of Team Science, Board on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, and National Research Council. 2015. *Enhancing the Effectiveness of Team Science*. Edited by Nancy J. Cooke and Margaret L. Hilton. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US). http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK310387/.

Corbyn, Z. Black applicants less likely to win NIH grants. *Nature* (2011). https://doi.org/10.1038/news.2011.485

Cundiff, J. L., Danube, C. L., Zawadzki, M. J., & Shields, S. A. (2018). Testing an Intervention for Recognizing and Reporting Subtle Gender Bias in Promotion and Tenure Decisions. *Journal of Higher Education*, *89*(5), 611–636. https://doi-org.proxy.library.ohio.edu/10.1080/00221546.2018.1437665

DiBenedetto, K., Peters, E. E., & Voight, M. (2021). Ensuring a More Equitable Future: Colleges as Models for Equitable Employment. In *Postsecondary Value Commission*. Postsecondary Value Commission.

Durodoye, J.R., Gumpertz, M., Wilson, A., Griffith, E., & Ahmad, S. (2020). Tenure and Promotion Outcomes at Four Large Land Grant Universities: Examining the Role of Gender, Race, and Academic Discipline. *Research in Higher Education*, *61*(5), 628–651. https://doi-org.proxy.library.ohio.edu/10.1007/s11162-019-09573-9

Eagan Jr., K.M., Garvey, J.C. (2015) Stressing Out: Connecting Race, Gender, and Stress with Faculty Productivity, The Journal of Higher Education, 86:6, 923-954, DOI: 10.1080/00221546.2015.11777389

Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research. 2004. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/11153.

Fountain, J., & Newcomer, K. E. (2016). Developing and sustaining effective faculty mentoring programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, *22*(4), 483-506.

Gordon, Hava Rachel. "Making Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Promotion, Tenure, and Re-Appointment Decisions Visible." VPFA E-Newsletters, May 27, 2021. https://duvpfa.du.edu/2021/05/making-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-in-promotion-tenure-and-re-appointment-decisions-visible/.

Guillaume, R. O., & Apodaca, E. C. (2022). Early career faculty of color and promotion and tenure: the intersection of advancement in the academy and cultural taxation. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *25*(4), 546-563–563. https://doi-org.proxy.library.ohio.edu/10.1080/13613324.2020.1718084

Greenwald, R., (2019) Protecting tenure. *Inside Higher Ed*.

Hockings, C. (2010). Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education: a synthesis of research. EvidenceNet. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/inclusive-learning-and-teaching-higher-education-synthesis-research

Hoppe, Travis A., Aviva Litovitz, Kristine A. Willis, Rebecca A. Meseroll, Matthew J. Perkins, B. Ian Hutchins, Alison F. Davis, et al. "Topic Choice Contributes to the Lower Rate of NIH Awards to African-American/Black Scientists." *Science Advances* 5, no. 10 (October 9, 2019): eaaw7238. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw7238.

Jimenez, M.F., Laverty, T.M., Bombaci, S.P. et al. Underrepresented faculty play a disproportionate role in advancing diversity and inclusion. Nat Ecol Evol 3, 1030–1033 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0911-5

Klein, Julie Thompson, and Holly J. Falk-Krzesinski. 2017. "Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Work: Framing Promotion and Tenure Practices and Policies." *Research Policy* 46 (6): 1055–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2017.03.001.

Kong, H., Martin-Gutierrez, S. & Karimi, F. Influence of the first-mover advantage on the gender disparities in physics citations. *Commun Phys* **5**, 243 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1038/s42005-022-00997-x

Kulp, A. M., Pascale, A. B., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2022). Clear as Mud: Promotion Clarity by Gender and BIPOC Status Across the Associate Professor Lifespan. *Innovative Higher Education*, *47*(1), 73–94. https://doi-org.proxy.library.ohio.edu/10.1007/s10755-021-09565-7

Laursen, S.L., and A.E. Austin. "Strategic Intervention Brief #6: Equitable Processes of Tenure and Promotion." *StratEGIC Toolkit: Strategies for Effecting Gender Equity and Institutional Change. Boulder, CO, and East Lansing, MI.*, 2014. www.strategictoolkit.org.

Mallery, Taniecea A., Ilana S. Mittman, Laura Castillo-Page, Jennifer Eliason, and J. Renee Chapman Navarro. "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, no. 4 (August 1, 2019): 418–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnma.2019.01.012.

Marrero, David G., Emily J. Hardwick, Lisa K. Staten, Dennis A. Savaiano, Jere D. Odell, Karen Frederickson Comer, and Chandan Saha. 2013. "Promotion and Tenure for Community-Engaged Research: An Examination of Promotion and Tenure Support for Community-Engaged Research at Three Universities Collaborating through a Clinical and Translational Science Award." *Clinical and Translational Science* 6 (3): 204–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.12061.

Meredith Minkler, Angela Glover Blackwell, Mildred Thompson, Heather Tamir "Community-Based Participatory Research: Implications for Public Health Funding", American Journal of Public Health 93, no. 8 (August 1, 2003): pp. 1210-1213. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.93.8.1210

Minkler M, Blackwell AG, Thompson M, Tamir H. Community-Based Participatory Research: Implications for Public Health Funding. Am J Public Health. 2003 Aug;93(8):1210–3. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.93.8.1210

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

Misra, J., Kuvaeva, A., O'meara, K., Culpepper, D. K., & Jaeger, A. (2021). Gendered and Racialized Perceptions of Faculty Workloads. *Gender & Society*, *35*(3), 358–394. https://doi.org/10.1177/08912432211001387

Moreno, J. F., Smith, D. G., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., Parker, S., & Teraguchi, D. H. (2006). The revolving door for underrepresented minority faculty in higher education. *The James Irvine Foundation Campus Diversity Initiative Evaluation Project*.

Nakamura, J., Shernoff, D. J., & Hooker, C. H. (Collaborator). (2009). Good mentoring: Fostering excellent practice in higher education. Jossey-Bass.

Nyden, Philip. 2003. "Academic Incentives for Faculty Participation in Community-Based Participatory Research." *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 18 (7): 576–85. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2003.20350.x.

Nyunt, Gudrun, KerryAnn O'Meara, Lauren Bach, and Allison LaFave. 2022. "Tenure Undone: Faculty Experiences of Organizational Justice When Tenure Seems or Becomes Unattainable." *Equity & Excellence in Education* 0 (0): 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2021.2010013.

Ohio University (2023, January). *Ohio University Faculty Handbook.* https://www.ohio.edu/sites/default/files/sites/faculty-senate/files/Faculty%20Senate%20Handbook-revised%20January%202023.pdf

O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A. & Nyunt, G. (2017) Constrained Choices: A View of Campus Service Inequality From Annual Faculty Reports, The Journal of Higher Education, 88:5, 672-700, DOI: 10.1080/00221546.2016.1257312

O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2018. "Accurately assessing engaged scholarship." *Inside Higher Ed.* https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2018/08/22/academe-needs-better-evaluate-engaged-scholarship-opinion

O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2021. "Leveraging, Checking, and Structuring Faculty Discretion to Advance Full Participation." *The Review of Higher Education* 44 (4): 555–85. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2021.0012.

O'Meara, KerryAnn, and Templeton, Lindsey. 2022. "Equity-Minded Reform of Faculty Evaluation." American Council on Education. https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Evaluation-Principles.pdf.

O'Meara, KerryAnn, Culpepper, Dwan, Misra, Joya, and Jaeger, Audrey. 2022. "Equity-Minded Reform of Faculty Workloads: What We Can and Should Do Now." American Council on Education. https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf.

Pascarella, E. T., Martin, G. L., Hanson, J. M., Trolian, T. L., Gillig, B., & Blaich, C. (2014). Effects of diversity experiences on critical thinking skills over 4 years of college. Journal of College Student Development, 55(1), 86-92.

Ross, Matthew B., Britta M. Glennon, Raviv Murciano-Goroff, Enrico G. Berkes, Bruce A. Weinberg, and Julia I. Lane. "Women Are Credited Less in Science than Men." *Nature* 608, no. 7921 (August 2022): 135–45. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04966-w.

Stewart, A. J., & Valian, V. (2018). An inclusive academy: Achieving diversity and excellence. MIT Press.

Strunk, K.K. (2020, March 13). Demystifying and Democratizing Tenure and Promotion. *Insider Higher Education*. https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/03/13/tenure-and-promotion-process-must-be-revised-especially-historically-marginalized

Tierney, W.G. & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe. SUNY Press.

Van Miegroet, Helga, Christy Glass, Ronda Roberts Callister, and Kimberly Sullivan. 2019. "Unclogging the Pipeline: Advancement to Full Professor in Academic STEM." *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal* 38 (2): 246–64. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-09-2017-0180.

"Women Researchers Are Cited Less than Men. Here's Why—and What Can Be Done about It." Accessed December 15, 2022. https://www.science.org/content/article/women-researchers-cited-less-men-heres-why-what-can-done.

Zambrana, R. E., Ray, R., Espino, M. M., Castro, C., Douthirt Cohen, B., & Eliason, J. (2015). "Don't leave us behind" The importance of mentoring for underrepresented minority faculty. *American Educational Research Journal*, *52*(1), 40-72.

Appendix 1.

**REFEREE'S ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATE FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR
AT JOHNS HOPKINS SCHOOL OF MEDICINE** (revised 12/20)

REFEREE: **NAME:**   **Date:**
  TITLE:
      INSTITUTION:

Name of Candidate   **Dept**

1. What is your relationship with the candidate? Please specify: Participated in candidate's training; worked together at same institution or professional organization or funding agency; collaborated on publications or grants or projects; familiar with publications or presentations by the candidate; other (etc)? [No--Yes]

2. Do you support the candidate for promotion or appointment to Professor? Do you think this candidate would be promoted or appointed at this rank at your institution?

    a. If yes, what comes to mind as the major contributions of this candidate to her/his field that may justify promotion or new appointment to Professor?

    b. If no, what comes to mind as the major gaps in this candidate's accomplishments that suggest she/he may not be ready for promotion to Professor?

3. Please provide name, institution and e-mail address of Professors considered among the world's leaders in the candidate's area of expertise.

4. To the best of your knowledge, has this candidate ever acted unprofessionally towards anyone in their role as a healthcare professional at Johns Hopkins (and/or previous institution[s])? [No-Maybe-Yes / Comment]

5. Have you ever seen or heard of this candidate mistreating anyone at Johns Hopkins (and/or previous institution(s)? [No-Maybe-Yes / Comment]

6. If not previously addressed, please comment on the candidate's national and /or international impact, particularly in the areas of research, education, clinical service and program building.

7. If not previously addressed, please comment on collegiality and integrity, independence and main scholarly efforts, performance as a mentor, trajectory, and community service and advocacy work.