



Pandemic Impacts & Support for Faculty: Review Processes

1.18.2021

Support for Faculty: Review Processes

Goals:

Communicate effectively with and reassure untenured and other faculty about evaluation processes

Communicate to review committees and external reviewers an appropriate framework for considering the changing arc of faculty careers

Consider departmental/unit statements about pandemic impact: what they might include, who would create them, how would they be shared

Review processes: principles

- Reasonable flexibility: how to develop a framework for understanding and achieving it? Should it pertain specifically to research and scholarship; to reviews as a whole?
- Reviews should emphasize quality over quantity, and this should be emphasized for all reviewers. Unit level leaders should be attentive to this and mention it at all stages of review.
- For internal discussion, if not external: discussion of the way teaching demands have impacted research: how should we evaluate or understand evaluations of teaching? How should we understand service roles & responsibilities, including invisible service?
- Ensure that the impacts of this year are not forgotten or discounted by the time people come up for review. Suggestions: note in the department personnel file so future chairs/associate deans will be reminded; reminder in annual guidance from the provost's office on promotion/tenure to take this into account
- For annual reviews, take a multi-year view rather than focus on a single year.

Impact Statements: Principles & Suggestions

- Any statements offered to reviewers should be objective, not including personal information.
- Faculty, especially junior faculty, should not have to prepare impact statements. Unit leaders or others with more seniority should do so. Who would be best placed to write statements; who should recommend language that might be required or recommended?
- Units should think carefully about what kinds of statements are appropriate for internal review, for external reviewers, or for both.
Suggested alternatives:
 - a document that explains the pandemic impact in the field
 - a “fact sheet” that gives objective information—when research was closed, when it reopened, when K-12 schools closed, lab density or access restrictions—so reviewers would have some context for understanding the file
 - a grid with a 1-5 scale on which faculty could rate how work in a discipline/area was impacted by cancellation of conferences, slowdowns in journal/manuscript publication etc.