

ADVANCE
Project
TRACS

Promotion, Retention, and Tenure
Bias-Literacy Training Guide
*Creating an Inclusive and Equitable Promotion, Retention, and
Tenure Review Process*

Jessi L. Smith
Director, ADVANCE Project TRACS
Professor, Psychology

Ian M. Handley
Co-Director, ADVANCE Project TRACS
Associate Professor, Psychology

Rebecca Belou
Equity Data Analyst, Office of Planning and Analysis

Chatanika Stoop
Project Manager, ADVANCE Project TRACS



Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	3
PROCEDURE	3
RESULTS	4
OUTLINE OF TRAINING	5
FACILITATION GUIDE.....	9
SAMPLE BUDGET	10
PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE.....	11
ABRIDGED DOSSIER PACKET.....	12
SIMULATION SCRIPT.....	17
OBSERVER INSTRUCTIONS	22
POST-MEETING DISCUSSION	22
SAMPLE CODING SHEET - PRT DEPARTMENTAL LETTER	23
REFERENCES.....	26
SURVEY - RPT COMMITTEE MEMBERS TRAINED.....	27

ADVANCE Project TRACS, Montana State University

P.O. Box 173095
Bozeman, MT 59717-3095

This activity was supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under Grant No. 1208831 (ADVANCE Project TRACS). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Copyright 2018 by Montana State University. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America

Suggested citation:

Smith, J.L., Handley, I.M., Belou, R. & Stoop, C. (2018) *Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Bias-Literacy Training Guide*. Montana State University.

Overview

In summer 2017, Montana State University was preparing to implement mandatory Promotion, Retention, and Tenure (PRT) Committee Bias Literacy Training as part of a newly approved MSU Faculty Handbook policy. Inspired by the work of ADVANCE Project TRACS and in collaboration with the Provost's office, the President's Commission on the Status of University Women, and the Office of Planning and Analysis, our research aims are to test the impact and efficacy of the PRT training on committee members and PRT candidates.

We drew from Implicit Bias Theory (Greenwald & Banaji, 2017) and Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000) to design and test the training intervention. This intervention contained an educational component relating to these theories, and a PRT-committee simulation using materials modified from the ADEPT Program* (<http://www.adept.gatech.edu>) of the Georgia Institute of Technology. Implicit bias research sets the foundation for when and why stereotyping happens and offers solutions for how to decrease biased processes. SDT specifies three “needs” that, when supported by a given environment, foster sustainable creativity, performance, persistence, and organizational loyalty. These needs are: **Relatedness** - the experience of having satisfying and supportive social relationships and connections. **Autonomy** - the experience of acting with a sense of choice and volition and fully embracing one's actions. **Competence** - the belief that one has the ability to influence important outcomes.

*Copyright 2004, Georgia Tech Research Corporation, Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0415. All Rights Reserved.

Procedure

We conducted a randomized field experiment with a wait-list control group, blocked by department. We offered the PRT bias-literacy training to randomly selected departmental PRT committees during the summer/early fall semester of 2017. The control group received only the “treatment as usual” procedural training whereas the intervention group additionally received the 2.5-hour bias-literacy training. Through random assignment, a total of 13 committees were trained ($n = 42$ people) and 12 committees were not trained ($n = 39$ people). All remaining units were offered training after data collection was complete in late Fall 2017. College and the University committees were also trained (as their training did not impact the study design).

- See Training Outline (page [5](#))
- See Facilitation Guide (page [9](#))
- See Sample Budget (page [10](#))

Surveys. After department PRT committees and Chairs/Heads submitted their candidate-evaluation letters, we invited all 81 PRT committee members to participate, with a 58% response rate ($n = 23$ trained; $n = 24$ not trained). We also invited all 75 PRT candidates to complete a survey, with a 53% response rate ($n = 18$ candidates who had a committee that was trained; $n = 22$ who had a committee that was not trained). Survey instruments were all well established and validated measures, with the exception of the newly created Diversity Fatigue Survey. Data were collected online using Qualtrics. All survey participants were offered a \$20 gift card in exchange for their time in completing the survey. Responses were anonymous. Two versions of the survey

existed: one for “yes this committee was trained” and one for “no this committee was not trained” to allow for a comparison of the average responses between groups.

- See Sample Survey (page [27](#))

Letters. With consent, PRT candidates were also asked to supply their departmental review committee letters for qualitative coding. A total of 12 participants provided their letters ($n = 7$ from trained and $n = 5$ from untrained committees). Letters were given an ID number, scrubbed for cues about gender/ethnicity, and coded for scope and inclusiveness by a team that included an ethically certified expert from outside the university.

- See Sample Coding Sheet (page [23](#))

Results

Committee experiences. Compared to committee members who received no training, committee members who received the bias-literacy training reported a significantly more supportive committee atmosphere ($d = .61$, $t(45) = 2.10$, $p = .04$). They also reported personally spending a significantly longer time reviewing each dossier ($M = 7.30$ hours) compared to those in the no-training condition ($M = 3.35$ hours), $d = .61$, $t(39) = 1.97$, $p = .05$, and estimated that their committee as a whole spent somewhat longer deliberating each candidate ($d = .56$, $t(45) = 1.93$, $p = .06$). Committee members in the training condition were also inclined to report less diversity fatigue ($d = .51$, $t(45) = 1.71$, $p = .09$), suggesting that the training did not invoke reactance. This newly created 10-item survey was internally reliable with Cronbach’s alpha = .91. No meaningful differences emerged between groups in overall satisfaction with the committee process, in psychological need satisfaction, or the experience of interest during committee meetings. Both groups reported significantly high feelings of collective self-efficacy to advance women ($p < .05$) and minority candidates ($p < .05$), and substantial awareness of implicit bias ($p < .05$).

Candidate experiences. Candidates were blind to committee training condition. Candidates who had trained (vs. untrained) committee members reported significantly less diversity fatigue ($d = .59$, $t(37) = 2.27$, $p = .03$). This newly created survey was again internally reliable with Cronbach’s alpha = .88. No meaningful differences emerged between groups in overall satisfaction with the process or the experience of a positive review atmosphere. Candidates with trained committees reported significantly lower levels of relatedness during the review process compared to those with untrained committees ($d = .75$, $t(38) = 2.34$, $p = .02$), but reported similar feelings of autonomy and competence in completing their dossier. Both groups reported significantly (and comparable) heightened confidence that their committees were capable of advancing women ($p < .05$) and minority candidates ($p < .05$). Candidates with committees who were untrained were significantly more likely to feel that bias-literacy training was important at both the departmental- ($p < .05$) and college-level ($p < .05$) review.

Letters. No meaningful differences were detected between the letters written by trained versus untrained committees. An independent coder could not determine beyond chance if the letter was written by a trained (or not) committee.

Outline of Training

Part 1: Educational Slides

Start out with Autonomous Prime Survey Task – See Participant Questionnaire (page [11](#))

OVERVIEW:

Why is this important:

- Pipeline Metaphor
- Meritocracy in Organizations
- PRT Process

Suggested Readings:

Castilla, E. J., and Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations.

Administrative Science Quarterly, 55(4), 543 – 676.

<https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.4.543>

Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(6), 1267–1278. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003>

How Biases and Norms Impact Judgements:

- Cognitive bias demonstrations
 - Pyramid rotation clip
 - [Frog/Horse rotation clip](#)
 - [Big fish \(dot\) small \(dot\) pond...](#)
- Selective Attention Task - [Basketball video](#)
- Affinity Norm
- Implicit Bias Theory and IAT Work-Life Demo
- System Justification Theory, Status Beliefs, and Bias about Research on Bias

Suggested Readings:

Handley, I. M., Brown, E. R., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Smith, J. L. (2015). Quality of evidence revealing subtle gender biases in science is in the eye of the beholder. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 201510649. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1510649112>

Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16474–16479. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109>

PRT ELEMENTS: RESEARCH, TEACHING, SERVICE/OUTREACH

Research:

- What is “excellent?”
 - Shifting competence standards
 - Rigor and feminized/racialized knowledge

- Masculine/feminine topics predict scientific quality
- Masculine/feminine predicts creative quality judgements
- Evidence for excellence
 - Research funding considerations and biases
 - Art Exhibitions considerations and biases
 - Interdisciplinary, community based research, team science are all more often done by women and typically take longer and results in fewer publications
 - Women receive less recognition for contributions in team collaborations than men
 - Peer reviewer invitations considerations and biases
 - Conference speaker invitations considerations and biases
 - Citations: who is cited and who cites themselves

Suggested Readings:

Biernat, M., Tocci, M. J., & Williams, J. C. (2012). The language of performance evaluations: Gender-based shifts in content and consistency of judgment. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(2), 186-192.

Proudfoot, D., Kay A. C., & Koval, C. Z. (2013). A Gender Bias in the Attribution of Creativity: Archival and Experimental Evidence for the Perceived Association Between Masculinity and Creative Thinking. *Psychological Science*, 26(11), 1751-1761.

Larivière V, Ni C, Gingras Y, Cronin B, Sugimoto CR. (2013). Bibliometrics: global gender disparities in science. *Nature*, 504(7479), 211–213. doi:10.1038/504211a

Teaching:

- Evidence for Excellence:
 - Student Teacher Evaluations – what do they measure?
 - Debate about gender/race/attractiveness/sexuality bias
 - Backlash and communal norms
 - [Teacher rating word database example](#)
 - Search: stupid then dumb (no gender diff) then smart and brilliant (clear difference)
 - Size and type of class matters
 - Faculty-Peer evaluations: Ceiling effects
 - Mentoring and Advising Loads: Differences by gender/race/ethnicity

Suggested Readings:

Travis L. Russ, Cheri J. Simonds, and Stephen K. Hunt (2002). Coming Out in the Classroom...An Occupational Hazard?: The Influence of Sexual Orientation on Teacher Credibility and Perceived Student Learning. *Communication Education*, 51(3), 311–324.

Berk, R., Naumann, P. & Appling, S. (2004). Beyond Student Ratings: Peer Observation of Classroom and Clinical Teaching. *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship*, 1(1). doi:10.2202/1548-923X.1024

Service:

- Does Excellence in Service Matter?
 - Cosmopolitans and Locals: Need both to meet the MSU Mission
 - Gender breakdown of service hours and commitments

- Institutional housekeeping is women's work - and it is often devalued work at PRT time.

Suggested Reading:

Bird, S. & Litt, J. S. & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating Status of Women Reports: Institutional Housekeeping as "Women's Work". *NWSA Journal* 16(1), 194-206. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Reviewing the Evidence

- What are the standards?
 - Ambiguity begets stereotype use the most. PRT Criteria are vague, and process is differently experienced by gender
- The Letter of Hire: Target of Opportunity Hire or Partner Accommodation Resistance
- Years of Service: Stopped the Clock and/or FMLA and the Flexibility Stigma
- The Dossier: Self-promotion and Modesty Norms – Women underselling themselves to avoid backlash
- Awards: Be mindful of how awards are given out, realizing that those decisions can be unintentionally biased as well. The absence of an award is not an indication of anything. Teaching awards do not translate into promotions and women win fewer research/fellow awards (MSU and National data)
- Reading – and Writing - Letters of Evaluation
 - Bias in focus, length, and wording
 - When letters and votes do not line up (Shifting Standards).

Suggested Readings:

Smith, J. L., & Huntoon, M. (2014). Women's Bragging Rights: Overcoming Modesty Norms to Facilitate Women's Self-Promotion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(4), 447 – 459.

Trix, F. & Psenka, C. (2003). Exploring the Color of Glass: Letters of Recommendation for Female and Male Medical Faculty. *Discourse & Society*, 14(2), 191 – 220.

Bias Busters

- Set group norms and ground-rules in committee meetings
 - Avoid colorblind and genderblind approaches - they produce a rebound effect – focus on multiculturalism
- GO SLOW - People who are rushed, stressed, distracted, or pressured are more likely to apply stereotypes
 - Correct yourself and each other
 - Stroop Task
 - Don't get stuck in a rut
 - Priming Task
- Reflect at each stage
 - Perspective Taking - imagine a day in the life of this individual as if you were that person, looking at the world through their eyes and walking through the world in their shoes."
- Take Notes - do not rely on memory

- Document with evidence your reasoning behind every decision. Triangulate your evidence when possible (three examples/sources).

Suggested Readings:

Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 708-724. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.708>

Roediger, H. L., Meade, M. L., & Bergman, E. (2001). Social contagion of memory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 8, 365-371.

Part 2: Simulation

We adapted the materials from the Georgia Institute of Technology [“ADEPT” program*](#). Their activities were “designed to help members of unit-level promotion and tenure committees understand the subtleties of bias in the evaluation process” and include an abridged curriculum vita and narrative synopsis of the external reviews and personal statement (page [12](#)).

*Copyright 2004, Georgia Tech Research Corporation, Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0415. All Rights Reserved.

During this section, the audience will:

- Read over the scenario which includes an abridged Dossier Packet with an abridged CV. (page [12](#)).
- Three people at each table are assigned to speaker roles and will each read a part of the Simulation Script (page [17](#)). Any others at your table are observers and receive instructions to make personal observations of bias and take notes (page [22](#)).
- Then, in their small group, they will discuss observations of the “committee meeting” per the instructions (page [22](#)).
- Interactive report out on group discussion.

Facilitation Guide

This Training should be delivered before committees meet to start discussing cases. We conducted them in the summer and early fall and included department heads with their committees.

- **Group:** Members of the same PRT committee must be trained together as much as possible.
- **Size:** The room must contain several round tables for discussion. The training can accommodate a large group but each committee (department or college) must be at the same table. The university committee must be trained as a group separately.
- **Time:** 2 hours – 1 hour for the Educational Component and 1 hour for Experience Component
- **Trainer:** A trained facilitator, who is tenured and who has served on a PRT Committee in the past. This person will present Part 1 and guide Part 2.
- **Administrative support** – Support for communicating about the trainings and scheduling the rooms, attendees, and arranging hospitality. Support for preparing electronic and printed materials (see below).

Materials and Supplies

Starting survey - White paper (50 copies)

Discussion questions - Light blue (50 copies)

Abridged Dossier & CV - White (20 copies, reusable)

PRT Committee Meeting script - Committee Chair - Purple (4 copies, reusable)

PRT Committee Meeting script - Member 1 - Green (4 copies, reusable)

PRT Committee Meeting script - Member 2 - orange (4 copies, reusable)

Observer Instructions - White (50 copies)

Other materials: Sign-in Sheet for each training, pens, sticky notes, projector, Department table signs.

Agenda

60 min	Educational Section
10 min	BREAK
10 min	Instructions; Read over an abridged Dossier Packet with an abridged CV
10 min	Read Committee Meeting Script
30 min	Discuss the questions and your thoughts as a group
<u>15 min</u>	Report out what your group discussed and suggested to the larger group
135 min	(2 hrs 15 min)

Sample Budget

This budget shows the amount of time and cost of materials needed to implement the outlined trainings. It is based on 15 departments having faculty undergoing review and 8 colleges. The administration time is for support staff to coordinate communications, scheduling and material preparation. The faculty time (facilitator) is estimated for updating materials and delivering the training.

Part	Activity	Item	Hours/ Number	Cost/ Unit	Total
Preparation	Communications about trainings	Admin time	5	\$ 20	\$ 100
	Scheduling trainings	Admin time	7.5	\$ 20	\$ 150
	Room fees	fees	14	\$ 50	\$ 700
	Refreshments	catering	14	\$ 75	\$ 1,050
Educational	Preparation/updating of materials	Facilitator time	6	\$ 100	\$ 600
	Production of materials	Printing	96	\$ 15	\$ 1,440
	Delivery of materials	Facilitator time	14	\$ 100	\$ 1,400
Simulations	Preparation/updating of materials	Facilitator time	6	\$ 100	\$ 600
	Production of materials	Printing	96	\$ 10	\$ 960
	Delivery of materials	Facilitator time	14	\$ 100	\$ 1,400
			TOTAL =		\$ 8,400
Committees			# of committees	Total # of People	Meetings
	4 people per department (with DH)		15	45	5
	6 people per college (with Dean)		8	40	8
	11 people on the University		1	11	1
			TOTAL =	96	
		# of meetings =	14		

Participant Questionnaire

Directions: Please answer the following questions in the space provided. Where indicated, please circle your response.

1. What is your gender identity? _____
2. How many Promotion, Retention, and Tenure committees have you served on? _____
3. What college are you in? _____
4. What is your rank?
Assistant Professor Associate Professor Full Professor Other _____
5. I enjoy relating to people of different groups
Yes, I agree at least somewhat No, I disagree completely
6. Being non-prejudice is important to me
Yes, I agree at least somewhat No, I disagree completely
7. I can freely decide to be a nonprejudiced person
Yes, I agree at least somewhat No, I disagree completely
8. I value diversity
Yes, I agree at least somewhat No, I disagree completely
9. It's fun to meet people from other cultures
Yes, I agree at least somewhat No, I disagree completely
10. It's not important to understand others
Yes, I agree at least somewhat No, I disagree completely
11. Equality and equal rights across cultural groups are important values
Yes, I agree at least somewhat No, I disagree completely
12. I think that issues of diversity are interesting
Yes, I agree at least somewhat No, I disagree completely
13. In the space below, briefly describe why it is personally satisfying to be nonprejudiced

14. In the space below, briefly describe why it is important to be nonprejudiced

15. In the space below, briefly describe why it is enjoyable to be nonprejudiced

ABRIDGED Dossier Packet

Dr. Samia Manasur

Candidate for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

College: Letters & Science

Department: Chemistry

Years of Service at Montana State University: 7

Assignment of Effort: 50% Research, 40% Teaching, 10% Service

Packet Contents

1. Abridged Curriculum Vita
2. Narrative synopsis of KNOX Folders “02ExternalReviews” and “07PersonalStatement”

Samia Manasur
Candidate for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Abridged Curriculum Vita

Educational Background

B.S. Biology, SUNY-Buffalo
Ph.D. Biochemistry, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Post-Doc Biosciences Institute, Oxford University

Academic Employment

Assistant Professor: Current
Department of Chemistry, Montana State University
Post-Doctoral Assistantship
Biosciences Institute, Oxford University

Publications

Refereed: 24 articles, 12 in past two years (with students), 6 from post-doc experience, 3 from Ph.D. work (co-authored with R. Pilkens)

Conference Proceedings: 14, 7 in past two years

Conference Presentations

12 seminars, 8 at other universities

Funding

- Start-up package was used to develop experimental apparatus and acquire supporting computer control and data acquisition.
- Obtained multi-year NSF grant for \$220K in my second year
- Novel Directions Investigator grant of \$100K in my third year
- 5-year, \$500K young investigator grant from NIH in my fourth year.

Research Overview

My doctoral advisor, Dr. Ross Pilkens, is a leading expert in the measurement of electrochemical response of various cells to external stimuli such as mechanical force, imposition of electrical and magnetic fields, and effects of rapid temperature change. I have continued this research in a broad sense, having focused on effects of cryogenic preservation of tissue during my post doc, subsequently delving into development of in situ measurement systems for measuring cell responses under a wide range of stimuli.

Graduate Student and Post Doc Supervision

- 2 postdoctoral researchers
- 3 PhD students in-progress, 1 PhD graduated (recipient of the university's Chapter of Sigma Xi Best PhD Thesis Award)

Teaching

- BIO 272 and BIOCHEM 338, an introductory biological systems course and a mid-level cell biology course, respectively
- BIOCHEM 720, graduate course in mechanics and physiology of cells

Teaching Evaluations

- Many students cite my degree of organization as exemplary, and my teaching evaluations for upper-division and graduate courses are very strong.
- I have received mixed response from students in my introductory level courses, especially during my first year at MSU; several students complained that I seem unaccustomed to American styles and fashion, and that my manner is frustrating in combination with difficulty to comprehend the lectures. I took steps to address those concerns in recent years, and feel my more recent evaluations reflect that effort.

Service

- Chair, Cell Behavior sub-committee, Division of Biochemistry, American Chemists Society
- Organizer of sessions at two major international symposia
- Member, College of Letters and Sciences Committee on Faculty Development
- Member, University Committee on Women in Academia: Future Directions
- Member, University Committee on Understanding Family Issues.
- Member, Research Capacity Team of ADVANCE Project TRACS.

Honors and Awards

- B.F. Sloan Prize for one of five best papers in a given year, Journal of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Manasur, S.R. and C.K. Wyler Affecting Cellular Electrochemical Communication by Mechanical Stimuli
- Voted Best Organized Instructor by School of Biochemistry seniors, annual honors assembly and dinner.

**Narrative Synopsis of KNOX Folders
“02ExternalReviews” and “07PersonalStatement”**

for Dr. Samia Manasur – Department of Chemistry, CLS.

Samia Manasur, Ph.D. in Biochemistry from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, was hired as an assistant professor by the Department of Chemistry at Montana State University. Manasur’s research field has long been central to the university; she joined many colleagues who do similar and complementary work in chemistry and related departments across campus. Her start-up package was slightly better than average; she had four offers to consider at leading universities. During her first semester at MSU, Manasur was immediately asked to participate in a campus committee charged to study why so few women are employed in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields within the university. In her second and third years, she was invited to serve on two similar committees at the university level.

During her first three years at Montana State, Manasur produced an extraordinary number of publications in the top-ranked journals in her field, including one prize-winning paper. She wrote most of her papers with a small group of faculty and graduate students, but some represented collaborations with just one or two individuals, typically graduate students.

Manasur’s funding level as an assistant professor was within the average range for her field and slightly higher than the departmental average. She was able to secure a lab budget based on a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant for new faculty in her area as well as some training grants for individual graduate students. She also partnered with colleagues in developing novel methods of drug delivery on a moderate grant from a pharmaceutical company.

In her third year, she won an NSF Faculty Early Career Development Award, largely for writing one paper that garnered much national attention for its novel approach to a particular problem. Near the beginning of her fourth year, she was notified by the NSF that she was selected as a recipient of the prestigious Presidential Early Career Award (PCASE).

Her undergraduate and graduate students generally awarded her good teaching scores. Evaluations for the intro-level undergraduate course earned some negative comments from a few students about her casual attire; as a result, Manasur upgraded her wardrobe and began to wear tailored clothing. She attracted excellent graduate students to her lab, encouraging some undergraduates to continue graduate study at the university and welcoming new graduate students. At the end of her third year, she was nominated for a college teaching award by the undergraduate coordinator with a recommendation from the graduate director who cited her “dedication” and “long hours of working in her lab along with graduate students.”

In addition to her work on women’s issues, Manasur was appointed to a number of unit and college committees concerning visiting speakers, honors, and searches. She became especially active in networking activities sponsored by the Center for Faculty Excellence for junior faculty in sciences, and she helped organize a training on grant-writing for new faculty. Issues concerning women in her unit, and to some extent in sciences more generally, fell on her shoulders, as manifested by numerous invitations by STEM chairs and deans at MSU to address

student and alumni groups.

Manasur became pregnant during her fourth year and her baby was due in late summer. She consulted with her chair about stopping the tenure clock for the AY immediately following the due date, anticipating significantly less research productivity while she cared for her newborn. He encouraged her to “stop the clock,” and pointed out to her that she had established a body of work and a set of achievements comparable to or exceeding others in her field within the Department of Chemistry and her years of service. He expressed confidence that she would resume her usual level of productivity in her sixth year, and he and Manasur agreed she would stop the clock.

At the beginning of her seventh year, Manasur’s case came up for review in her department. The letters of reference in her promotion and tenure dossier were generally good, except for one taking issue with her celebrated paper. The one negative review avoided addressing Manasur’s entire scholarly output; instead, the reviewer took an extremely hostile approach to the argument of the celebrated paper. One member of the promotion and tenure committee noted that this review was so detailed that it could have been published as an oppositional argument in a journal along with Manasur’s paper. This reviewer also commented negatively about Manasur’s style of presenting papers at meetings of a professional society, raising some suspicions of a personal grudge. Another reviewer commented as much on the value of Manasur’s service to the profession, especially for women in her field, as on the value of her scholarly research.

The departmental promotion and tenure review committee is split about whether to emphasize the negative external review or the one privileging service.

Simulation Script

Your Role: Committee Chair (Terry) – You served as an endowed department chair in the past, and served on many promotion and tenure committees. You considered stopping your tenure clock when you had children years ago, but decided against it. You are fair-minded about the concept of stopping the tenure clock.

PTR Committee Meeting for Samia Manasur

1. **Committee Chair (Terry):** OK, I think that about wraps it up for Johnson’s case. I’m fairly sure I have good notes on everything we just discussed, so I’ll draft up our letter and send it to you both in a day or two. Now let's move on and consider Manasur's case for promotion and tenure.
2. **Member 1 (Alex):** Sounds good to me. Let’s start with her research. From my vantage point, Samia is a good scholar. Look at this award for her research.
3. **Member 2 (Chris):** It's an impressive award, but we should consider the sum total of research.
4. **Committee Chair (Terry):** She has more publications in top-ranked journals than any other untenured biochemistry faculty in our department.
5. **Member 1 (Alex):** Sure, she has significant quantity, but she also had an extra year to get papers out given that “stop the clock” deal. If you average her publication record over the actual time she’s been here, I don’t think it clearly points to future excellence.
6. **Member 2 (Chris):** I don’t think that's how it works, Alex. I doubt the extra time helped *that* much; it’s not like she was getting a lot of writing done with the new baby.
7. **Committee Chair (Terry):** No, that’s definitely not how it works. Stopping the tenure clock means just that, it’s not a bonus year. We must average across 6 years of service, Alex.
8. **Member 1 (Alex):** Fine, fine...maybe we should focus more on quality then. Does her best paper, the prizewinner, represent a significant contribution to the field?
9. **Member 2 (Chris):** Are you suggesting that the paper isn't as good as most reviewers have noted?
10. **Member 1 (Alex):** Let's look at the second reviewer's comments. He doesn't think it contributes much to the field.

11. **Committee Chair (Terry):** All the other reviews are positive. I wonder if the negative reviewer is impartial, given the tone of the letter and his focusing on that one paper. I heard this guy is known for writing negative letters.
12. **Member 1 (Alex):** His review does seem like it's a response to only one of Samia's papers, but the most important consideration ought to concern the range of research products over the *past 7 years*.
13. **Member 2 (Chris):** I agree all reviews have to be weighed carefully. The most positive one spends more time considering Manasur's service to the profession rather than discussing her research. Do we *really* care that she does so much work for that disciplinary organization?
14. **Committee Chair (Terry):** Obviously, good service alone will not earn promotion and tenure. A tenure candidate has to demonstrate a more remarkable profile in research.
15. **Member 2 (Chris):** The letters don't demonstrate that profile of remarkable research. The most positive one is from another former student of her mentor. Other letters praise the research without understanding it. The negative reviewer is the only one who seems to know the area.
16. **Member 1 (Alex):** How do you know the positive reviewer has a personal connection?
17. **Member 2 (Chris):** I sat on an NSF panel with someone who knew Samia from graduate school. I believe this letter is from her.
18. **Member 1 (Alex):** OK, if you all see the negative letter as trumping the other letters, maybe I could go along with that.
19. **Member 2 (Chris):** *Well*, it seems that Manasur's work has yet to prove its value.
20. **Committee Chair (Terry):** Her work is good, but I agree that she needs time to mature. Let's consider teaching.
21. **Member 1 (Alex):** I agree that the general impression of the six letters is that her work is very good.
22. **Member 2 (Chris):** Yes, Manasur's work has clearly been recognized as significant by some in her field, but what about that very negative letter?
23. **Committee Chair (Terry):** Alex is right that the general context of all the letters should be important. The quality of Manasur's work deserves recognition. Let's talk about *teaching*.

24. **Member 1 (Alex):** Yes, even though one person finds one paper to be somewhat controversial, I think we should set aside such an extreme judgment and look at the bigger picture.
25. **Member 2 (Chris):** OK, but does that mean we discount the negative letter?
26. **Committee Chair (Terry):** We can if the reviewer seems to be biased. His basic complaint is that in the celebrated paper Manasur was only re-doing work already done by her mentor, who really deserves credit for her ideas.
27. **Member 1 (Alex):** I think this reviewer can't believe a young woman is capable of scientific insight.
28. **Committee Chair (Terry):** Exactly. The excellence of Manasur's research ought to earn her promotion and tenure. *Let's discuss her teaching.*
29. **Member 1 (Alex):** Yes, I agree that Samia's research is very visible. We need her to keep up momentum in that area. She really puts us on the map.
30. **Committee Chair (Terry):** If she doesn't get tenure here, some other department will hire her. We have to cover her area, or we won't be able to offer the PhD in this area.
31. **Member 2 (Chris):** Alright, if you see this as a strong record, I won't object to a positive assessment of her research. Should we move on to teaching?
32. **Member 1 (Alex):** I can't believe that some students have the audacity to comment on her clothing. Let's make sure we judge her teaching accordingly.
33. **Member 2 (Chris):** The students are right. She's in America, so she should dress like an American. I'm glad she's changed her wardrobe.
34. **Committee Chair (Terry):** Manasur has a teaching award. She's been a good undergraduate teacher, and she is critical to the graduate program. She attracts the best Ph.D. students.
35. **Member 1 (Alex):** She's a good teacher for upper-division undergraduate and graduate students, even if first- and second-year students seem less comfortable with her.
36. **Member 2 (Chris):** Maybe it's her accent that bothers students. I sat in on one intro course, and I had trouble understanding everything she said.
37. **Member 1 (Alex):** We need to calibrate her teaching effectiveness. Considering all course scores, her teaching for the intro courses is average for our department. And, as Terry said, in graduate courses she does very well.

38. **Committee Chair (Terry):** OK, we know she's not going to be the most effective teacher for first-year students, but we agree that in general she is a good teacher. Let's talk about service.
39. **Member 1 (Alex):** Let's remember that her teaching scores have steadily improved over time and that other faculty also have low scores in those introductory courses.
40. **Member 2 (Chris):** I'll concede that her teaching is currently acceptable, but I hope she improves even more. I guess we're moving on to service.
41. **Member 1 (Alex):** Absolutely. Her students' written comments and the peer reviewers make it clear that Manasur has tried some innovative techniques in the classroom.
42. **Committee Chair (Terry):** We can note those details in our letter where we describe her general teaching record as good. Let's discuss her service.
43. **Member 1 (Alex):** Clearly, we don't need to say much about her service, which seems exemplary, both in the university and to the profession.
44. **Member 2 (Chris):** But has she really contributed in any substantial way to influential committees on campus or among her disciplinary peers? All I see is her interest in women's issues, like that ADVANCE stuff, and basically tutoring other junior faculty how to write grants when they should already know how to do that.
45. **Committee Chair (Terry):** Given the underrepresentation of women in this field, women's issues are important. Besides, it was the President who put her on many of these committees, invitations she could hardly refuse.
46. **Member 2 (Chris):** Her committee work has not been on the department's most important committees, but it's been useful for each committee to have a woman.
47. **Member 1 (Alex):** Actually, I think she has been on more university-level committees than others who come up for tenure.
48. **Committee Chair (Terry):** Yes, she has done a better job than most in service and has a mix of average and very good scores in teaching, while she has also made significant national impact in terms of her research. It's clear that her record justifies promotion and tenure.
49. **Member 1 (Alex):** I'm not sure if I *completely* agree, but I don't have time to talk about it now because I have to teach. Terry, I guess we have to meet again before we come to a decision.

50. **Committee Chair (Terry):** I think her service is very valuable, like her research and teaching. I see that the majority of us agree that she should be promoted and tenured.
51. **Member 2 (Chris):** Doesn't it seem like everything is marginal?: mixed teaching scores, ambiguous service, and research that one of the biggest names in the field thinks is imitative and overblown?
52. **Member 1 (Alex):** I disagree with that summary. Terry, I think our review should reflect that we are not in accord.
53. **Committee Chair (Terry):** You and I are more enthusiastic, but 2 of the 3 of us see Manasur's record as appropriate for promotion and tenure. I think our letter should be more positive than negative, even though it will accompany a split vote.
54. **Member 2 (Chris):** I think her service record is marginal, like her teaching. And considering the controversy about her research, don't you both agree we have to give more serious thought to her promotion and tenure?

Observer Instructions

While listening to the meeting, note where in the conversation bias emerged. Take notes below about what happened and why it was a problem. Be prepared to start a discussion after the committee meeting concludes.

Post-Meeting Discussion

“What Biases Emerged?”

As a group, your task is to now develop an “if-then” contingency plan to combat bias you observed in the evaluation of the candidate’s dossier. Led by the observer(s), work together to identify specific instances of bias and how you could have intervened. ***Identify a scribe to focus your group discussion and summarize important discussion points.***

Sample Coding Sheet - PRT Departmental Letter

Number of Positive Words (e.g., stellar, terrific, excellent, good)

Number of Technical Competence Words (e.g., Judgment, productivity, independent, rigorous)

Number of Personality Words (e.g., nice, collegial, team player)

How many pieces of evidence were given in the letter to justify:

Scholarship _____

Teaching _____

Service _____

This letter provides useful formative feedback to improve the candidate's next review stage

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Not at all true Slightly true Somewhat true Very true Completely true

This letter focuses on multiple achievements

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Not at all true Slightly true Somewhat true Very true Completely true

This letter celebrates the candidate's strengths

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Not at all true Slightly true Somewhat true Very true Completely true

This letter is written inclusively

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Not at all true Slightly true Somewhat true Very true Completely true

This letter focuses on the ways this candidate has been successful

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Not at all true Slightly true Somewhat true Very true Completely true

This letter overemphasizes potentially biased metrics of success

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Not at all true Slightly true Somewhat true Very true Completely true

This letter attempts to capture the unique experience of this candidate

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Not at all true Slightly true Somewhat true Very true Completely true

From reading the letter, what is your best guess about this candidate?

Do you think this candidate identifies as a:

Woman ____ Man ____ Nonbinary ____ Cannot tell ____

Do you think this candidate (check all that apply):

Stopped the tenure clock ____ Was a partner hire ____
Was an affirmative action hire ____ Is a primary care-giver at home ____
None of the above ____ Cannot tell ____

Do you think this candidate identifies as:

White ____ Not-White ____ Cannot tell ____

Do you think the committee who wrote this letter was:

Trained ____ Not Trained ____ Cannot tell ____

Other Observations or Comments:

References

- Berk, R., Naumann, P. & Appling, S. (2004). Beyond Student Ratings: Peer Observation of Classroom and Clinical Teaching. *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship*, 1(1). doi:10.2202/1548-923X.1024
- Biernat, M., Tocci, M. J., & Williams, J. C. (2012). The language of performance evaluations: Gender-based shifts in content and consistency of judgment. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(2), 186-192.
- Bird, S. & Litt, J. S. & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating Status of Women Reports: Institutional Housekeeping as "Women's Work". *NWSA Journal* 16(1), 194-206. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Castilla, E. J., and Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(4), 543 – 676.
<https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.4.543>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *J Exp Soc Psychol*, 48(6), 1267-1278. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003
- Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 708-724. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.708>
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2017). The implicit revolution: Reconceiving the relation between conscious and unconscious. *Am Psychol*, 72(9), 861-871.
doi:10.1037/amp0000238
- Handley, I. M., Brown, E. R., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Smith, J. L. (2015). Quality of evidence revealing subtle gender biases in science is in the eye of the beholder. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 201510649. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1510649112>
- Larivière V, Ni C, Gingras Y, Cronin B, Sugimoto CR. (2013). Bibliometrics: global gender disparities in science. *Nature*, 504(7479), 211–213. doi:10.1038/504211a
- Moss-Racusin, C. A. Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty’s subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16474–16479. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109>
- Proudford, D., Kay A. C., & Koval, C. Z. (2013). A Gender Bias in the Attribution of Creativity: Archival and Experimental Evidence for the Perceived Association Between Masculinity and Creative Thinking. *Psychological Science*, 26(11), 1751-1761.
- Roediger, H. L., Meade, M. L., & Bergman, E. (2001). Social contagion of memory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 8, 365-371.
- Smith, J. L., & Huntoon, M. (2014). Women’s Bragging Rights: Overcoming Modesty Norms to Facilitate Women’s Self-Promotion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(4), 447 – 459.
- Travis L. Russ, Cheri J. Simonds, and Stephen K. Hunt (2002). Coming Out in the Classroom...An Occupational Hazard?: The Influence of Sexual Orientation on Teacher Credibility and Perceived Student Learning. *Communication Education*, 51(3), 311–324.
- Trix, F. & Psenka, C. (2003). Exploring the Color of Glass: Letters of Recommendation for Female and Male Medical Faculty. *Discourse & Society*, 14(2), 191 – 220.

Survey - RPT Committee Members Trained

This is an example of the survey the we sent to members of the committees who were trained. Similar surveys were sent to the members of the committees who were not trained and to the all the candidates.

ONLINE CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN HUMAN
RESEARCH AT
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

PROJECT TITLE: The PRT Process

Purpose of the research: The purpose of this study is to gain a clearer understanding of the Promotion, Retention, and Tenure (PRT) process at Montana State University.

Procedures involved: You are asked to complete an online survey regarding your experience with and opinions about the departmental review level of the PRT process. You are asked to complete the survey on your own time. It should take you approximately 10-15 minutes to complete the survey.

Compensation for your time: Each participant will receive a \$20 giftcard. Instructions for collecting the giftcard appears at the end of your survey for you to print out or save.

Risks and Benefits: There are no known risks to you for participating in this research. However, should you feel discomfort you may choose to skip a survey, leave an item blank, and/or terminate the survey session. There are no direct benefits associated with your participation. By participating in this study you will have the opportunity to provide your opinion on the PRT process at MSU.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

Confidentiality: You should know that your identity will remain confidential. Further, there will be no way to tie your name to any of your responses, instead all data is given a random code