Presentation: “The Mid-Term Review,” May 5, 2009 (RSMAS, SLAB130)

The Skits:

Candidate and Chair  
Faculty Meeting

Some audience reactions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions about the sketch and interactions (n = 9 responding)</th>
<th>% agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the sketch and interactions were effective</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issues raised in the sketch were important</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance made me think about some familiar interactions and situations in new ways</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issues raised reflected issues I have observed at UM</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The audience/actor interactive discussion enhanced my understanding of the issues</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was the most significant thing you learned from the performance?

- Importance of the interactions between chair and candidate.
- Importance of communication.
- The interactive nature- in character- after the discussion was interesting- but I am not sure if it got us closer to the goal (Assuming the goal was to understand the tenure & promotion process)
- Scenario was remarkably realistic & close to home
- Outspoken characters can dominate a discussion
- Damage that can be done when chair/candidate interaction are not handled well
• How much personal issues/human reactions is purely professional plus not in the tenure review process
• It was not necessarily about women being held to different standards but more about how social interactions/personalities can overwhelm the evaluation process. This is an issue for everyone. Also, communication: How thoughts can be inappropriately communicated or disguised as other statements and how miss-communication can be the underlying issue to many problems.

**What worked best about the CRLT sketch presentation for you?**

- Inspired dialog among faculty
- Inclusion of intangibles such as social interactions as part of review process. We all like to think we are objective scientists but we are not always.
- It is very useful to have a facilitator
- The realism of Kathy’s reaction to the chair’s explanation. It was exceptional.
- Very impressed with the panelists sense of character.
- Realistic characters – very nuanced (usually). Good actors-very good at staying in character.
- The interaction with the audience

**Do you have advice about how this presentation might be used in the future, particularly settings where it might be usefully presented?**

- To any and all faculty & administration
- Jr. faculty may benefit- but it should be presented, perhaps, with a “good” example as well
- I do like the idea of making this available to junior faculty. Maybe with some comments pertaining to context.
- Pre-tenure faculty: potentially even post docs and PhD students interested in academic careers.
- This particular pairing of skits seems more for the mentors than the junior faculty.
- Excellent to have a mix of tenured and non-tenured faculty in the audience.
- To tenured professors around the time that such meetings are being conducted (early on), to chairs separately to foster dialog on how to become a good chair, to young faculty so they know that there are other issues they need to focus on as they near tenure evaluation