

FORWARD Promotion to Professor Panel: Measures of Quality October 3rd, 2013

Attendance

- Forty-five individuals attended the training and 34 completed evaluations.
 - Seven (20.6%) participants identified as administrators, four (11.8%) identified as full professors, 16 (47.1%) identified as associate professors, six (17.6%) identified as assistant professors, and one (2.9%) did not respond.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I feel that my understanding about preparing materials for promotion to full professor at NDSU has improved after today's panel.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	4	11.8	12.1
Agree	16	47.1	60.6
Strongly Agree	10	29.4	90.9
N/A	3	8.8	100.0
Missing Data	1	2.9	
Total	34	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills and/or information about preparing materials to apply for promotion to full professor.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	13	38.2	40.6
Strongly Agree	16	47.1	90.6
N/A	3	8.8	100.0
Missing Data	2	5.9	
Total	34	100.0	

As a result of my participation in this session, I will be able to implement new strategies in my own process toward becoming a full professor.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	14	41.2	42.4
Strongly Agree	9	26.5	69.7
N/A	10	29.4	100.0
Missing Data	1	2.9	
Total	34	100.0	

My understanding of measures of quality in relation to research has increased as a result of attending this panel.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	3	8.8	9.1
Agree	14	41.2	51.5
Strongly Agree	16	47.1	100.0
Missing Data	1	2.9	
Total	34	100.0	

I would recommend this panel discussion to others.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	2.9	3.1
Agree	15	44.1	50.0
Strongly Agree	16	47.1	100.0
Missing Data	2	5.9	
Total	34	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this panel?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Average	7	20.6	21.2
Above Average	11	32.4	54.5
4.50	1	2.9	57.6
Excellent	14	41.2	100.0
Missing Data	1	2.9	
Total	34	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. What questions do you still have after attending this panel? Please list any topics related to the promotion process from associate to full professor that you would like to receive additional information about or items that need further clarification. Your suggestions will be used to structure future sessions on the promotion process to full professor.
 - How to pick external reviewers.
 - An excellent panel discussion – it might be interesting to use the same questions with a campus panel.
 - How can I use the PTE process (assistant to associate) to jumpstart your progress toward full professor? (Tips for late assistant/early associate).
 - Medical profession – clinical practice vs. other disciplines. Bench research – how to determine quality to the profession.
 - Percentage associate professor to be prompted to full professor and why not?
 - Assistant to Associate at NDSU still feels like it is about numbers. Is it different going to full?
 - To challenge for myself that promotions at NDSU has lots of holes.
 - Mentorship is a selective process including only those who benefit (naturally).
 - Relationships between “post tenure review” for associates and promotion to full.
 - Can NDSU consider reviewing NDSU’s PTE guidelines by looking at Iowa State’s?
 - It is intriguing to me that very few of the statements made about female faculty apply to female faculty in my discipline. Eg: they are willing to self-promote.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the panel you attended today?
 - Learning that others have different procedures.
 - Identifying gender bias in letters/review process.
 - I appreciated the comments focused on gender and gender differences.
 - Examples from other places and advice.
 - Variety of experience and ideas.
 - Variety of universities and disciplines.
 - Discussion of online journals and quality of outlet. Importance of citing and promoting ourselves.
 - Discussion of pitfalls to avoid.
 - Documentation of everything.
 - The focus on quality.
 - Diversity of experience.
 - Good to hear their experience and...
 - Discussion of how work is “recognized.”
 - Good discussion of strategic thinking in collaboration and online publishing. [
 - The panelists have a tremendous depth of experience and expertise they shared graciously. They were ideal role models.
 - The subject “measures of quality” was excellent.

3. What is one tip that you learned today that will be useful as you prepare to apply for promotion to full professor?
 - Self promote!
 - Focus more on national impact.
 - Tell story of interdisciplinary participation and make sure chair knows.
 - Get informal feedback.
 - Seek external evaluators from aspiration rather than peer institutions and shopping journal articles (sending letters of inquiry).
 - Self-promotion.
 - Research.
 - Importance of quality as defined by “peer evaluation.”
 - Interdisciplinary research evaluation.
 - Documenting one’s own role especially in collaborative work.
 - Do not count – focus on quality.
 - Document your role in process.
 - Peer-reviewed and be sure to document how the peer-review process was done.

4. How could the panel be improved to be more beneficial to you?
 - No suggestions.
 - More time for audience questions.
 - See response to question #8 (Tips for late assistant/early associate). [How can I use the PTE process (assistant to associate) to jumpstart you progress toward full professor?]
 - Time is too short!
 - Add 1-2 NDSU panelists. Although valuable to get external perspective on PTE, having at least one NDSU representative would improve or complete the conversation.
 - Have one NDSU representative on the panel to make the linkage between some comments and the reality at NDSU.
 - Also include panelists currently undergoing review?
 - Excellent as is.
 - I don’t agree that external letters should mainly be about research.

5. Please provide any additional comments you have about today’s panel discussion and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
 - I found myself hoping the Provost was listening to what the panel said about measures of quality. I think most fear about the process of going for full isn’t at peer, department, or college level, it’s once the materials leave the college.
 - That men cite more men could be partly due to fact that more men have published scholarly work, yes?
 - Idea on how to help women/people get recognized would be helpful here (Penn State).
 - Thanks for welcoming/explicitly inviting assistant professors!
 - Limit responses to each question – five responses not needed.
 - Excellent! Among the best have been here!
 - Why the panel are all female?! Although they were good!
 - Albeit constructive – the gender bias observations seemed skewed. If it exists 2nd class males are lower.
 - Outstanding panel, very articulate with good suggestions.
 - As a man, I hope men change diminish their “shameless self-promotion.” That would be better than having women adopt that behavior!

Questions from participants:

- Talk about the relationships between “post tenure review” (for associate professors) and promotion to full.
- External letters frequently contain “land mines” even if generally positive. These can be quoted by higher level committees or senior administrators to defend a denial. For example: “Dr. Smith certainly deserves tenure at your university but would struggle to achieve tenure at my university.” How can a department head defend against this when soliciting letters?
- Many associate professors are very good in teaching and service, but somehow they missed the time to establish a strong research program. They stayed as associate professors. How do you deal with these situations? Look down on them?

- What is your opinion on peer-reviewed E-journal (open-access)?
- Which is more demanding and why, promotion to associate or full professor?
- The shameless self-promotion which you all seem to take for granted is not normal Great Plains culture. Is there an honorable way to do what historically was considered narcissistic?
- Can you address conflicts between state open records laws and the confidentiality of peer review?
- While gender (unintentional) bias does exist, so does it impact males with a similar (so called) female traitor tendency. My experience is those males are more discriminated against. Comment: mentorship, which good in concept, has become a very selective process which includes females with and stature.
- What is your process for selecting outside evaluators?
- If no confidentiality is possible (open records law ND), would you still value input by outside evaluators? Thank you ☺
- As a chair, it has been very difficult to get external letters. Commonly get the response, sorry no time for that. Any advice on how to effectively extract external letters?
- How do you consider interdisciplinary work with teams of researchers working together?