

Dossier Review Cheat Sheet

Identify Common Sources of Bias that Impact BIPOC Faculty in T&P

Category	Question to Ask	Examples to Look For
Nontraditional Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the candidate publish in nontraditional venues? If so, do promotion and tenure requirements explicitly provide guidance for how to evaluate this work? Does the candidate's personal statement provide more context around these publications and how to evaluate them? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open-access journals Digital journals Journals or conferences related to diversity within the field Journalistic publications Publications for nonprofits/NGOs or institutes Government publications (city/town, state, national, or international agencies)
Community Engaged Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the candidate participate in community-engaged scholarship? If so, can this scholarship be evaluated as part of the candidate's overall record of contributions to the field? What evidence can be used to evaluate this scholarship (for example, published policies or research, input from community partners)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crafting policy for a community-based organization Pro-bono research or consulting Working on a project where a non-faculty community member is a co-researcher Leadership role (e.g., board member) in a community organization
Student Evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the candidate's student evaluations are weaker than expected, have we looked at the qualitative comments and accounted for bias against BIPOC faculty and other underrepresented groups in evaluations? What other measures could be used to evaluate the candidate's teaching? Did the candidate provide peer reviews, evidence of learning outcomes, examples of course materials, etc.? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on a professor's appearance or physical characteristics Broad descriptive terms without concrete evidence: 'unprofessional', 'angry', 'intimidating', etc. Evaluation scores strongly correlated with student performance: students who received lower grades rate teaching lower, etc.
Changing Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the candidate's evaluation criteria been consistent throughout their pretenure years, or have they changed? If so, how can previous criteria be taken into account during the evaluation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serving in a cluster or center/institute Other interdisciplinary appointments Changes to departmental promotion and tenure requirements
Invisible Labor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the candidate's listed course and committee assignments capture their full service workload, or are there additional types of work that are not captured in their CV? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serving on multiple hiring committees Informally advising students outside of an assigned advising caseload Frequent meetings with prospective students or faculty Informally supporting a standing committee or taskforce as an expert
Rater Bias	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are we allowing the tenure candidate's similarity or difference to the committee members' viewpoints, backgrounds, or working and communication styles to affect the tenure decision? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussing a candidate's 'personality fit' within a department Basing a tenure decision on similarity to the tenure committees' work or viewpoints Bringing up a commonality between the candidate and a committee member (e.g., "we got our PhDs at the same institution, so I trust their work")
Halos and Horns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are we basing the decision on one specific instance of achievement or failure, or looking at the whole CV/dossier? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basing the tenure decision on one publication or grant

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing one student evaluation to drive the discussion, even if it is significantly more positive/negative than others
Groupthink	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are we requiring total consensus to reach a decision? • Have we given equal weight to each committee member's perspective? • Can we allow discussions to move forward even if there is some dissent? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not allowing discussion to move forward until the entire committee has agreed • Allowing one committee member to dominate the discussion: "committee member X feels most strongly about this, so we'll agree with them" • Comparing notes rather than each committee member coming to an individual decision
Recency Effect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have we considered the candidate's entire dossier/CV equally, avoiding giving too much weight to the most recent year of work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denying tenure because the candidate's last year of research output was less productive than previous years • Penalizing a candidate for stopping the tenure clock or taking leave • Weighting recent student evaluations or service commitments more heavily than those earlier in the candidate's CV • Ignoring a meaningful achievement because "that was in the past"