

Nov. 1, 1989

TO: Ralph Ferretti, Chair
P&T Committee

FROM: Jan H. Blits

I just read _____ letter to you concerning Linda's promotion. I thought I might help set the record straight on the articles she and I have written. None of his criticisms on these articles amounts to anything.

His first point is that we misrepresent the panel's basic finding. Contrary to what we say, he says, the committee did not simply endorse race-norming, but rather endorsed combining race-normed scores with a second, unnormed score: "The committee clearly recommended that total-group norms be used (to report expectancy scores) in addition to separate group norms." _____ like many other readers, is confused on this point. The panel does not recommend the second score for referrals, but rather for selecting candidates who have already been referred on the basis of race-norming alone (as we point out in the Public Interest piece). _____ confusion is easy to understand. The panel obscures the difference between the two steps, treating them (for political reasons) as if they were two parts of a single step.

_____ next accuses us of misrepresenting the committee's effort to distinguish science from politics. This, of course, is hard to answer briefly. The evidence lies in the Public Interest article as a whole. Let me just say that Nathan Glazer asked us to write the piece precisely because he thought the committee had failed to distinguish them. Moreover, at the recent APA meeting _____ an expert in the field of personnel testing gave a paper to the same effect. We are certainly not alone in our conclusion. (Mary Tenopir)

_____ also disputes our assertion that the higher rate of false negatives among minorities is the result simply of their lower scores. _____ may disagree with us, but what we say is in fact exactly what the NAS committee itself says: "Note that these effects are a function of high and low test scores, not racial or ethnic identity" (p.7; also p. 256). _____ quarrel is not with us, but with the committee and others who made the same point.

_____ goes on to say that we're "unscholarly and misleading in many specific respects." First he says that we don't use scholarly references in the articles. That's true, but the reason is that the journals in question don't allow them.

_____ then cites three examples of "erroneous and misleading assertions." The first is that we refer to the "NAS" rather than

the "NRC" report. In fact, in our original draft we referred to the NRC, but changed to the NAS (the umbrella organization) because we wanted to be consistent with other published accounts in Science and elsewhere. Once again, quarrel is not with us, but (this time) with the mainstream of the profession.

The second example is that we misrepresent both the literature on fairness in testing and widespread testing practice when we say that "The panel shows that the unadjusted test scores meet the only widely accepted model of fairness in testing."

criticism here is a good example of his general muddleheadedness. First, he confuses scientific acceptance of a model with ordinary practice. We never deny that various programs use group-parity models of fairness. On the contrary, we emphasize that USES does so. What we deny is that such models are widely accepted in science. however, fails to make that basic distinction. Second, he suggests that there is large body of scientific literature supporting such models. However, no such body exists, and in fact, cites just two works. One is his own work (whose omission may have something to do with his pique) and the other is Jensen's, who takes our position, not

The last example concerns our treatment of Griggs as a legal precedent. says that we are "extremely misleading as to the facts of legal precedent." however, tacitly supports our point even as he attacks us. Our point is that Griggs placed the burden of proof on the employer whose tests produce disparate impact, and this is where it still lies. is correct but misleading when he says that there has been some modification "since 1971." The easing has come only in the last couple of years, but, more importantly, it hasn't changed the basic fact. The standard for proof may have changed (slightly), but what has not changed is where the burden of proof lies. And that's our point.

I heard one of our colleagues describe letter as "detailed and accurate." It may be detailed, but it certainly isn't accurate. At least concerning the two articles I know best, none of his criticisms can withstand scrutiny. On the contrary, they're muddled, misplaced, petty, and often simply ignorant.

I wonder why was asked to review Linda's work. Apart from his intellectual weaknesses, he seems blatantly biased. (Asking him to review Linda's work seems much like asking ETS to review Crouse's.) As he finally acknowledges, what he dislikes about Linda's work is "her apparent lack of charity--with regard to both the other writers whom she would criticize [presumably including himself] and the objects of her social policy analyses." In striking contrast to whose work our Public Interest article directly challenges, lets his political views bias his scientific judgment. (The famous passage he piously quotes from Bacon characteristically omits the

possibility that knowledge could be pursued for the sake of truth.) To his credit, though, (partly) acknowledges his mistake. He concedes that the "shortcoming of charity of spirit is hardly a recognized ground for denial of academic promotion." I'm sure you know that I don't agree that Linda (or I) lacks charity, but I certainly hope that the P&T committee will see -- attack for what it is and give it no more weight than it truly deserves.

Please feel free to use this memo in any way you find helpful. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you might have.

cc: Bob Hampel
David Kaplan
Dick Venezky

Attachment 6

Nov. 3, 1989

Ralph,

A postscript to my letter.

You may recall that _____ criticizes Linda and me for saying that "The panel shows that the unadjusted GATB scores meet the only widely accepted model of fairness in testing." He says that we "misrepresent...the literature in testing," to which he concludes, "It is difficult to attribute B & LG's (or at least LG's) misrepresentation here simply to ignorance since...the group parity literature [has] been discussed in literature that LG has cited elsewhere (Jensen, 1980; and _____ 1981)."

What he says about Linda applies in spades to him. In his 1981 article, he writes: "group-parity models of fair selection... generally seem to have gained little credibility in the testing literature" (American Psychologist, Oct. 1981, p 1032).

letter is a travesty of professional peer review.

cc: Bob Hampel
David Kaplan
Dick Venezky

school seniors" (NMSC, Note 3), a group-parity model of a very primitive sort. Probabilities are not conditioned on any independent criterion of success, as in the parity models discussed in the literature, but instead selection proportions are simply fixed so that around one half of one percent of seniors in each state are designated as semifinalists. The *Guide* to the merit program notes that:

The allocation method of determining semifinalists is used because it ensures the designation of a geographically diversified group representative of the best students in the nation. (NMSC, Note 3).

This raises the interesting question of how it is that while the National Merit competition has employed a primitive group-parity approach (it might even be called a quota system) for more than 20 years, group-parity models of fair selection (including parity in terms of characteristics such as race and sex) generally seem to have gained little credibility in the testing literature. The contrast is especially intriguing for two reasons. First, although the merit qualifying scores have been said to only "vary slightly from state to state" (NMSC, Note 7), the group-parity adjustments implicitly embodied in the equal proportions approach to identifying semifinalists actually are fairly substantial. For the 23rd competition in 1978, qualifying scores between low and high scoring states varied by two thirds of a standard deviation (Educational Testing Service, 1976; NMCS, Note 8). In other words, if a group-parity approach were not used, if a single cutoff score were used nationwide, there would be far fewer Merit semifinalists in some states, and far more in others. Second, on strictly instrumental grounds, it would seem desirable to base group-parity considerations on criteria other than state residence, since surely it is easier to change, and potentially to manipulate, one's official state residence than one's race or sex.

The contrast is, I think, worth pondering. I will not speculate further on it here, except to note that although considerations of group parity and fair selection clearly may reflect historical precedent in selection testing and other factors, it seems safe to say that they ultimately are determined by social and political values. It is merely an illustration of the more basic point that while the social role of standardized testing often is both advocated and challenged in technical terms, the prominent social concerns surrounding standardized testing, both now and in the past, are rooted in matters of social and political values.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Gorth W & Perkins M. A study of minimum competencies. *testis*.
 2. Nairr that i
Projes
in Te
in th
valid
on E1
 3. NMSt
Evans
 4. New
subjec
Comm
mitta
Febru
 5. White
Unpul
 6. Haney
and il
cular
 7. NMSC
Merit
Merit
 8. NMSC
teenth
petitic
porati
- Amrine, I
mentar
Amrine, I
to the
1965, I
Anastasi,
ing. Ar
Anastasi,
[Ed.], *T
the sec
ucator*
356-36
- Angoff, V
gram.
1971.
- Astin, A. I
Journa
- Baird, L.
about a
1-7.
- Baker, F.
In R. TI
ton, D. I
- Bersoff, I
1981, 3
- Black, H.
- Block, N.
York: P
- Bond, L.
makes u
of Educ
- Boorstin, I
York: V
- Buros, O.
Brunswi
- Buros, O. (Ed.). *The eighth mental measurements yearbook*.
Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1978.

From Letter (pp.6-7):

3.2 In making statements like "The panel shows that the unadjusted GATB scores meet the only widely accepted model of fairness in testing" (p. 7 of Public Interest manuscript), B and LG misrepresent both the literature on fairness in testing and widespread testing practice. Regarding the literature, I mention merely the extensive literature on group parity models of fairness in selection... It is difficult to attribute B & LG's (or at least LG's) misrepresentation here simply to ignorance since... the group parity literature... [has] been discussed in literature that LG has cited elsewhere (e.g. Jensen, 1980; and 1981).

Memorandum

DRAFT VERSION

Attachment 7



November 6, 1989

TO: Department of Educational Studies

FROM: Promotion and Tenure Committee

Ralph Ferretti, Chair *L. P. Ferretti*
 Robert Hampel *R. Hampel*
 David Kaplan *D. Kaplan*
 Richard Venezky *R. Venezky*

RE: Promotion of Linda S. Gottfredson to Full Professor

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, after carefully reviewing Dr. Linda S. Gottfredson's promotion dossier, unanimously recommends against promotion to full professor at this time.

We believe that Dr. Gottfredson's service and teaching activities clearly meet department criteria for promotion to full professor. Her service to the profession and the department has been exemplary, and she has provided high quality graduate and undergraduate instruction. However, the Committee has reservations about the quality of Dr. Gottfredson's most recent scholarship, especially as reflected in work published since her appointment to the University of Delaware in 1986. Consequently, the Committee cannot conclude at this time that Dr. Gottfredson should be recommended for promotion to the rank of full professor.

In the following, we analyze Professor Gottfredson's record and identify our reasons for recommending against her promotion to full professor at this time.

Research

For promotion to full professor, the department's criteria require evidence for scholarly contributions "...which address issues or problems of significance and which display the characteristics of scholarly writing; that is, each should be accurate, systematic and thorough, exhibit knowledge relevant to the topic, and demonstrate appropriate analytic ability, depth, and clarity." In addition, "...the candidate's record should indicate that the candidate has sustained an active career of significant scholarship and will continue to make scholarly achievements appropriate to his/her rank." Finally, "...candidates are expected to demonstrate a record of significant



scholarship which is judged to be an important contribution to the candidate's field(s) and which goes beyond the candidate's contributions at previous rank." In the Committee's judgment, Dr. Gottfredson's record of recent scholarship does not fully meet these high standards for promotion to full professor.

The evaluation of Dr. Gottfredson's research is based upon the committees careful reading of her published works since 1980, reviews by well known scholars outside the University who are familiar with one or more of the fields in which she works, and additional descriptive materials submitted by Dr. Gottfredson herself.

The outside reviews consist of letters (1) solicited for the review done of Dr. Gottfredson last year, (2) updates of these letters which the committee requested from these same individuals based upon work completed over the last year, and (3) several new letters solicited from individuals with strong reputations within one or more of the fields in which Dr. Gottfredson works.

Over her entire career, Dr. Gottfredson has maintained a steady output of work, including research reports, review articles, and edited journal issues. She has also organized and participated in symposia, made presentations at professional meetings, and engaged in other professional activities to disseminate the results of her work.

The committee finds strong evidence for significant contributions to scholarship in the early 1980's, particularly in vocational psychology/interest assessment and personnel psychology/ability testing. This work is widely known nationally and has been praised for its originality and insightfulness. Although the volume of her output has continued at a steady rate since 1983, the committee has found a noticeable decline in quality since that date and even more noticeably since her arrival at the University of Delaware in the Fall of 1986.

One problem we find with the quality of her work is her tendency to dismiss, or ignore, without adequate analysis, results and opinions that disagree with her own. For example, in several papers Dr. Gottfredson utilizes F. Schmidt and J. Hunter's estimates of the cost-benefits of employment testing without acknowledging the existence of significant criticisms of these estimates. Another example occurs in Dr. Gottfredson's 1988 "Reconsidering Fairness" paper where she cites J. Carroll's 1987 article on the National Assessment reading scores without acknowledging that the method of analysis he used was severely criticized by the developers of the National Assessment testing scheme. It should be noted that two reviewers, including one who was generally favorable of her work, recognized this same tendency. One reviewer writes "She accepts uncritically the work of one particular camp..." The other reviewer writes "[Dr. Gottfredson] is highly selective in what she seems to digest ... she seems to have ignored significant critiques of both VG

[validity generalization] and Schmidt and Hunter's cost-benefit analyses".

A second problem is that we cannot find in her work, particularly since 1986, sufficient original contributions to merit promotion to full professor. The department's Promotion and Tenure Policy Guidelines, as cited above, and the University's guidelines, as stated in the Faculty Handbook (III.K.1), are clear on this point. Almost all of her work since coming to Delaware has consisted of reviews of other people's work or of her own earlier results. In the words of one outside reviewer, "She appears to be a consumer and synthesizer of other peoples work than an original contributor to the field." The remaining papers are either reviews, syntheses or forewords to special issues of journals she edited. Her two most recent co-authored papers (both in press) are too flawed to be considered original contributions. Furthermore, one appears to be a subset of the other. As one of the most favorable reviews of these two papers stated, "Both articles covered much the same ground, with only minor differences in content and emphasis". Another reviewer referred to these two papers as, among other things, "unscholarly."

A third, and perhaps more serious problem, concerns a recent tendency to misrepresent the positions of other's whom she critiques. We find this in particular in her two most recent papers in the representation of the basic findings of the NRC panel report "Fairness in Employment Testing". The misrepresentaion has to do with the panel's recommendation regarding within-group norming, and the referral process of and score reporting for majority and minority job applicants. These same tendencies were observed by an outside reviewer who wrote "Both articles misrepresent the basic finding of the NRC panel."

To summarize, many elements of Dr. Gottfredson's record meet the requirements for promotion to full professor. Most of the reviewers were highly complimentary of her work. Yet, even within these reviews questions were raised about originality and criticalness. We cannot, however, ignore the Promotion and Tenure guidelines' emphasis on evidence for continued scholarly achievements appropriate to rank. Whether this recent trend represents a true decline in her scholarship or is simply an anomaly remains to be determined. We hope, given additional time at present rank, Dr. Gottfredson will return to the level of scholarship characteristic of her early 1980's work.

Teaching

The department's criteria require "...evidence of high quality teaching" for promotion to full professor. The candidate's student course evaluations should average 3.0 or better on a five point scale. The candidate is also expected to provide other evidence of teaching accomplishments, including advising, course development, and supervision of students.

Dr. Gottfredson documents an impressive range of contributions to the department's instructional program. She has developed and offered courses that serve both undergraduate and graduate programs, played an influential role in the development of programs at all levels of the department, advised many graduate students, and diligently pursued the improvement of her instructional offerings. These accomplishments are evidence of the high quality of Dr. Gottfredson's instructional efforts.

Dr. Gottfredson's primary teaching responsibility is an undergraduate course that supports the Elementary Teacher Education (ETE) program. In addition, she has taught doctoral seminars in the department's Ph.D. program specialization in Educational Policy, statistics and measurement courses for undergraduate and master's students, supervised a student's independent research, and given a number of invited lectures. Dr. Gottfredson organized the College of Education's colloquium mini-series for the 1988-1989 academic year, gave the introductory lecture in the series, and taught a doctoral seminar that accompanied the colloquium series. The series stimulated considerable interest on the part of students and faculty alike. Finally, Dr. Gottfredson was honored as a Distinguished Mentor by the American Psychological Association's Division 17 Mid-Atlantic region in recognition of the contribution of her work to the education of graduate students and new professionals nationwide.

Dr. Gottfredson has assumed great responsibility for developing instructional programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. She currently serves as the coordinator of the department's Counseling Programs, and has been instrumental in redesigning the program's entire curriculum. As coordinator, she directly advises 16 first year counseling students in the program, and is heavily involved in the advisement of all 39 students. Dr. Gottfredson was also instrumental in the development of the department's Ph.D. specialization in Educational Policy, and co-developed a proposal to establish a pilot Writing Program to foster the writing skills of ETE students. These activities have significantly contributed to the quality of department's instructional programs.

Dr. Gottfredson's standard course and instructor evaluations average over 3.0, so they clearly meet the department's Promotion and Tenure criterion. In addition, Dr. Gottfredson recently supplemented the standard course evaluations with data obtained from the nationwide IDEA evaluation system. The IDEA system is

particularly useful because it evaluates students' self-rated progress against important course goals identified by the instructor, and compares the students' evaluations against classes across the nation that are of similar size and motivation level. The most recent data from the IDEA evaluation show that Dr. Gottfredson's EDS258 class was rated at the 94th percentile in the Fall, 1988, and at the 91st percentile in the Spring, 1989. These courses were judged to be demanding and intellectually challenging. Dr. Gottfredson was seen to encourage student expression, and was judged to be concerned about the students' professional development. These judgments were further strengthened by the committee's examination of her course syllabi. We believe that her courses are thorough, have integrity, and have been carefully crafted over time.

Confidential letters of evaluation from a random sample of her students are generally enthusiastic about Dr. Gottfredson's courses. It is clear that Dr. Gottfredson sets high performance standards for students and asks them to think analytically about complicated sociological trends affecting education. One student wrote "...She provided accurate, complex, yet fair material, and seemed to have proper knowledge of the subject matter...On the personal side, she is an approachable person, who can be easily found when guidance is needed." Another student wrote "...I found Dr. Gottfredson to be very effective. Although the course itself points out a lot of negative aspects of the education field, Dr. Gottfredson's hopes and ideas left me with a very positive attitude about becoming a teacher." The Committee believes that the evidence shows that Dr. Gottfredson offers high-quality teaching for the department.

Service

The department's criteria for promotion to full professor call for "...leadership in service to the University and professional societies" over and above the service contributions routinely expected of candidates seeking promotion to Associate Professor. Dr. Gottfredson clearly meets these standards. Her work in the department, the college, and national forums has generated valuable assistance to colleagues near and far.

In the department and college, she deserves credit for three noteworthy accomplishments. For the past three years, she chaired the new Faculty Development Committee, which assists untenured professors through group meetings and a superb 150 page handbook she compiled. Furthermore, she organized the college's 1988-1989 colloquium mini-series, which brought prominent scholars here to discuss "Ability Differences in a Democracy." Most recently, Dr. Gottfredson served on an important ad hoc committee on the reorganization of our graduate counseling program. At the same time, she assumed the duties of coordinator of that popular program. Reviews of her various contributions are uniformly laudatory.

Outside the University, Dr. Gottfredson is well known and respected as a skillful consultant, reviewer, editor, speaker, and disseminator of information. Several different agencies have sought her advice on different projects. She has served on the editorial board of the Journal of Vocational Behavior since 1983, and edited two special issues of that journal ("The g Factor in Employment" and "Fairness in Employment Testing"), both of which attracted much attention according to the letters we solicited to evaluate Dr. Gottfredson's service. With external funding, she co-chairs the Project for the Study of Intelligence and Society, which has disseminated information to several thousand colleagues. There is no question that she is a tireless and forceful voice in a range of visible, national professional settings. Dr. Gottfredson has clearly provided leadership in service to the University and professional societies.

cc: Dr. Gottfredson
Dr. Martuza

Memorandum**RECEIVED**

DEC 1 - 1989

November 6, 1989

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

TO: Victor Martuza, Chair

FROM: Department of Educational Studies

RE: Promotion of Linda S. Gottfredson to Full Professor

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, after carefully reviewing Dr. Linda S. Gottfredson's promotion dossier, unanimously recommends against promotion to full professor at this time. This recommendation has been approved by the Department of Educational Studies faculty by a vote of 17 to 4 with 2 abstentions.

We believe that Dr. Gottfredson's service and teaching activities clearly meet department criteria for promotion to full professor. Her service to the profession and the department has been exemplary, and she has provided high quality graduate and undergraduate instruction. However, the Committee has reservations about the quality of Dr. Gottfredson's most recent scholarship, especially as reflected in work published since her appointment to the University of Delaware in 1986. Consequently, the Committee cannot conclude at this time that Dr. Gottfredson should be recommended for promotion to the rank of full professor.

In the following, we analyze Professor Gottfredson's record and identify our reasons for recommending against her promotion to full professor at this time.

Research

For promotion to full professor, the department's criteria require evidence for scholarly contributions "...which address issues or problems of significance and which display the characteristics of scholarly writing; that is, each should be accurate, systematic and thorough, exhibit knowledge relevant to the topic, and demonstrate appropriate analytic ability, depth, and clarity." In addition, "...the candidate's record should indicate that the candidate has sustained an active career of significant scholarship and will continue to make scholarly achievements appropriate to his/her rank." Finally, "...candidates are expected to demonstrate a record of significant scholarship which is judged to be an important contribution to the candidate's field(s) and which goes beyond the candidate's contributions at previous rank." In the Committee's judgment, Dr. Gottfredson's record of recent scholarship does not fully meet these high standards for promotion to full professor.



The evaluation of Dr. Gottfredson's research is based upon the committee's careful reading of her published works since 1980, reviews by well known scholars outside the University who are familiar with one or more of the fields in which she works, and additional descriptive materials submitted by Dr. Gottfredson herself.

The outside reviews consist of letters (1) solicited for the review done of Dr. Gottfredson last year, (2) updates of these letters which the committee requested from these same individuals based upon work completed over the last year, and (3) several new letters solicited from individuals with strong reputations within one or more of the fields in which Dr. Gottfredson works.

Over her entire career, Dr. Gottfredson has maintained a steady output of work, including research reports, review articles, and edited journal issues. She has also organized and participated in symposia, made presentations at professional meetings, and engaged in other professional activities to disseminate the results of her work.

The committee finds strong evidence for significant contributions to scholarship in the early 1980's, particularly in vocational psychology/interest assessment and personnel psychology/ability testing. This work is widely known nationally and has been praised for its originality and insightfulness. Although the volume of her output has continued at a steady rate since 1983, the committee has found a noticeable decline in quality since that date and even more noticeably since her arrival at the University of Delaware in the Fall of 1986.

One problem we find with the quality of her work is her tendency to dismiss, or ignore, without adequate analysis, results and opinions that disagree with her own. For example, in several papers Dr. Gottfredson utilizes F. Schmidt and J. Hunter's estimates of the cost-benefits of employment testing without acknowledging the existence of significant criticisms of these estimates. Another example occurs in Dr. Gottfredson's 1988 "Reconsidering Fairness" paper where she cites J. Carroll's 1987 article on the National Assessment reading scores without acknowledging that the method of analysis he used was severely criticized by the developers of the National Assessment testing scheme. It should be noted that two reviewers, including one who was generally favorable of her work, recognized this same tendency. One reviewer writes "She accepts uncritically the work of one particular camp..." The other reviewer writes "[Dr. Gottfredson] is highly selective in what she seems to digest ... she seems to have ignored significant critiques of both VG [validity generalization] and Schmidt and Hunter's cost-benefit analyses".

A second problem is that we cannot find in her work, particularly since 1986, sufficient original contributions to merit promotion to full professor. The department's Promotion and Tenure Policy Guidelines, as cited above, and the University's guidelines, as stated in the Faculty Handbook (III.K.1), are clear on this point. Almost all of her work since coming to Delaware has consisted of reviews of other people's work or of her own earlier results. In the words of one outside reviewer, "She appears to be a consumer and synthesizer of other peoples work than an original contributor to the field." The remaining papers are either reviews, syntheses or forewords to special issues of journals she edited. Her two most recent co-authored papers (both in press) are too flawed to be considered original contributions. Furthermore, one appears to be a subset of the other. As one of the most favorable reviews of these two papers stated, "Both articles covered much the same ground, with only minor differences in content and emphasis". Another reviewer referred to these two papers as, among other things, "unscholarly."

A third, and perhaps more serious problem, concerns a recent tendency to misrepresent the positions of others whom she critiques. We find this in particular in her two most recent papers in the representation of the basic findings of the NRC panel report "Fairness in Employment Testing". The misrepresentation has to do with the panel's analysis of within-group norming. These same tendencies were observed by an outside reviewer who wrote "Both articles misrepresent the basic finding of the NRC panel."

To summarize, many elements of Dr. Gottfredson's record meet the requirements for promotion to full professor. Most of the reviewers were highly complimentary of her work. Yet, even within these reviews questions were raised about originality and critical judgment. We cannot, however, ignore the Promotion and Tenure guidelines' emphasis on evidence for continued scholarly achievements appropriate to rank. Whether this recent trend represents a true decline in her scholarship or is simply an anomaly remains to be determined. We hope, given additional time at present rank, Dr. Gottfredson will return to the level of scholarship characteristic of her early 1980's work.

Teaching

The department's criteria require "...evidence of high quality teaching" for promotion to full professor. The candidate's student course evaluations should average 3.0 or better on a five point scale. The candidate is also expected to provide other evidence of teaching accomplishments, including advising, course development, and supervision of students.

Dr. Gottfredson documents an impressive range of contributions to the department's instructional program. She has developed and offered courses that serve both undergraduate and graduate programs, played an influential role in the development of programs at all levels of the department, advised many graduate students, and diligently pursued the improvement of her instructional offerings. These accomplishments are evidence of the high quality of Dr. Gottfredson's instructional efforts.

Dr. Gottfredson's primary teaching responsibility is an undergraduate course that supports the Elementary Teacher Education (ETE) program. In addition, she has taught doctoral seminars in the department's Ph.D. program specialization in Educational Policy, statistics and measurement courses for undergraduate and master's students, supervised a student's independent research, and given a number of invited lectures. Dr. Gottfredson organized the College of Education's colloquium mini-series for the 1988-1989 academic year, gave the introductory lecture in the series, and taught a doctoral seminar that accompanied the colloquium series. The series stimulated considerable interest on the part of students and faculty alike. Finally, Dr. Gottfredson was honored as a Distinguished Mentor by the American Psychological Association's Division 17 Mid-Atlantic region in recognition of the contribution of her work to the education of graduate students and new professionals nationwide.

Dr. Gottfredson has assumed great responsibility for developing instructional programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. She currently serves as the coordinator of the department's Counseling Programs, and has been instrumental in redesigning the program's entire curriculum. As coordinator, she directly advises 16 first year counseling students in the program, and is heavily involved in the advisement of all 39 students. Dr. Gottfredson was also instrumental in the development of the department's Ph.D. specialization in Educational Policy, and co-developed a proposal to establish a pilot Writing Program to foster the writing skills of ETE students. These activities have significantly contributed to the quality of department's instructional programs.

Dr. Gottfredson's standard course and instructor evaluations average over 3.0, so they clearly meet the department's Promotion and Tenure criterion. In addition, Dr. Gottfredson recently supplemented the standard course evaluations with data obtained from the nationwide IDEA evaluation system. The IDEA system is particularly useful because it evaluates students' self-rated progress against important course goals identified by the instructor, and compares the students' evaluations against classes across the nation that are of similar size and motivation level. The most recent data from the IDEA evaluation show that Dr. Gottfredson's EDS258 class was rated at the 94th percentile in the Fall, 1988, and at the 91st percentile in the Spring,

1989. These courses were judged to be demanding and intellectually challenging. Dr. Gottfredson was seen to encourage student expression, and was judged to be concerned about the students' professional development. These judgments were further strengthened by the committee's examination of her course syllabi. We believe that her courses are thorough, have integrity, and have been carefully crafted over time.

Confidential letters of evaluation from a random sample of her students are generally enthusiastic about Dr. Gottfredson's courses. It is clear that Dr. Gottfredson sets high performance standards for students and asks them to think analytically about complicated sociological trends affecting education. One student wrote "...She provided accurate, complex, yet fair material, and seemed to have proper knowledge of the subject matter...On the personal side, she is an approachable person, who can be easily found when guidance is needed." Another student wrote "...I found Dr. Gottfredson to be very effective. Although the course itself points out a lot of negative aspects of the education field, Dr. Gottfredson's hopes and ideas left me with a very positive attitude about becoming a teacher." The Committee believes that the evidence shows that Dr. Gottfredson offers high-quality teaching for the department.

Service

The department's criteria for promotion to full professor call for "...leadership in service to the University and professional societies" over and above the service contributions routinely expected of candidates seeking promotion to Associate Professor. Dr. Gottfredson clearly meets these standards. Her work in the department, the college, and national forums has generated valuable assistance to colleagues near and far.

In the department and college, she deserves credit for three noteworthy accomplishments. For the past three years, she chaired the new Faculty Development Committee, which assists untenured professors through group meetings and a superb 150 page handbook she compiled. Furthermore, she organized the college's 1988-1989 colloquium mini-series, which brought prominent scholars here to discuss "Ability Differences in a Democracy." Most recently, Dr. Gottfredson served on an important ad hoc committee on the reorganization of our graduate counseling program. At the same time, she assumed the duties of coordinator of that popular program. Reviews of her various contributions are uniformly laudatory.

Outside the University, Dr. Gottfredson is well known and respected as a skillful consultant, reviewer, editor, speaker, and disseminator of information. Several different agencies have sought her advice on different projects. She has served on the editorial board of the Journal of Vocational Behavior since 1983,

Linda S. Gottfredson

6

and edited two special issues of that journal ("The g Factor in Employment" and "Fairness in Employment Testing"), both of which attracted much attention according to the letters we solicited to evaluate Dr. Gottfredson's service. With external funding, she co-chairs the Project for the Study of Intelligence and Society, which has disseminated information to several thousand colleagues. There is no question that she is a tireless and forceful voice in a range of visible, national professional settings. Dr. Gottfredson has clearly provided leadership in service to the University and professional societies.

cc: Dr. Gottfredson

Memorandum



November 17, 1989

TO: Victor Martuza, Chair

FROM: Jan H. Blits *Jan Blits*

RE: Promotion of Linda Gottfredson to
Full Professor

I strongly disagree with the Department's decision not to recommend Linda Gottfredson for promotion to Professor.

In filling a minority report, I find myself in an extremely awkward situation. I am Dr. Gottfredson's co-author on her two most recent articles ("Equality at last, or lasting inequality? Race-norming in employment testing" and "The Politicized Science of Employment Testing"), and so I can hardly defend her work without seeming merely to be defending my own. Despite this, however, I write in support of her promotion. I do so because I think the Department's decision was based on a seriously flawed appraisal of her recent research.

The Department's report says that there has been "a noticeable decline in quality since [1983] and even more noticeably since her arrival at the University of Delaware in the Fall of 1986." The evidence does not support this conclusion.

Eight of the external reviewers--all eminent scholars--praised Dr. Gottfredson's work, including her recent work, in the highest terms. One reviewer writes, "She continues to produce the same kind of good work at the same pace." Another, referring to the special issue of the Journal of Vocational Behavior which she edited with James Sharf, writes: "It is safe to say that there is not another book or set of readings one could assemble on this topic that would be of comparable importance or scholarly worth." "[I]t is my judgment," this reviewer continues, "that the most valuable and the most outstanding article in the whole collection is the one written by Dr. Gottfredson....It is probably one of the three or four of the most important publications in Dr. Gottfredson's entire bibliography." The same reviewer also points out that he intends to make the article required reading in one of his graduate courses, "not only for all the information it conveys, but also as a model of how this type of article should be written." Still another reviewer describes Dr. Gottfredson as "one of the top contributors to the field in recent years."

In addition, much of the high praise of Dr. Gottfredson came from reviewers who do not agree with her on policy issues. One

of the reviewers says that he disagrees with her "quite vehemently" on policy issues, particular the National Academy of Science's report Fairness in Employment Testing. Yet, referring to the special issue of the Journal of Vocational Behavior, he says that four papers from this "outstanding collection of papers...including Dr. Gottfredson's" are on his syllabus for his course in Employee Selection this fall. Another, describing himself as sympathizing with the report, says, "I have seen many problems more clearly after reading what Linda had to say....When issues turn on facts and data analysis, Linda can be depended upon to get things straight and to do things right. When issues come down to opinion, I do not always agree with her, but I always pay close attention to her."

The only criticism of Dr. Gottfredson's work came from just one reviewer--a reviewer who is blatantly, and even admittedly, hostile to her because of his policy disagreements. (And even he is not sure that he would vote against her.) What's worse, though, is that this reviewer's criticism are demonstrably inaccurate. He consistently misreads the material, always missing the central point. And at least on one occasion, he shows himself to be either utterly incompetent or grossly dishonest. Two examples will suffice. They are important examples because they are the basis of much of the Department's criticism of Dr. Gottfredson's recent research.

1. In claiming that Dr. Gottfredson "misrepresents the basic finding" of the NAS's report (in "Equality at last, or lasting inequality? Race-norming in employment testing"), the reviewer says that, contrary to what the article says, the NAS panel did not simply endorse race-norming, but rather endorsed combining race-normed scores with a second, unnormed score. "The [NAS] committee clearly recommended that total-group norms be used (to report expectancy scores) in addition to separate-group scores." The reviewer is simply confused. The committee does not recommend the second score for referrals, but, rather, for selecting candidates who have already been referred on the basis of race-norming alone. The NAS report even emphasizes this difference: "The decision concerning what kind of scores to report to employers and job applicants is separate from the choice of methods to use to create the referral pool" (p.12). The distinction is both clear and crucial. Any expert in the field should have recognized it.

2. The reviewer also severely criticizes Dr. Gottfredson for saying that "The panel shows that the unadjusted GATB scores meet the only widely accepted model of fairness in testing." He says that she "misrepresent[s]...the literature in testing," to which he concludes, "It is difficult to attribute [her]... misrepresentation here simply to ignorance since...the group parity literature [has] been discussed in literature that LG cites elsewhere [including an article of his own]." At the very least, one would expect the reviewer's article to contradict Dr. Gottfredson. In fact, just the opposite is the case. In the

article which he cites, he writes: "group-parity models of fair selection...generally seem to have gained little credibility in the testing literature." Although Dr. Gottfredson's work says exactly what he says, he nonetheless accuses her not only of being mistaken, but of deliberately misleading the reader.

By contrast, a reviewer, mentioned above, who sympathizes with the NAS report, writes: "Linda...understood [the NAS report] and in some respects saw through it. Linda is always rational. Her analysis is cogent and perceptive, as always. She helped to clarify a number of issues left murky by the report, with her characteristically thorough analysis."

The Department also criticizes Dr. Gottfredson's two most recent works for being "too flawed to be considered an original contribution" and for being "unscholarly." As to the first criticism, the Department offered no evidence of the papers' "flaws," but once again relied in a general way on the criticisms of her one negative reviewer, all of whose specific criticisms are either extremely petty or (like the two discussed above) patently unfounded. None of the reviewer's criticisms amounts to anything at all and should, if anything, raise questions about his judgment and competency.

As to the second criticism--that the two articles are "unscholarly"--the Department evidently misunderstood the nature of the articles and their intended audience. The articles are scholarly, not in the sense that they are meant only for a specialized audience, but in the sense that they are meant to change the framework of scholarly debate by addressing a broader intellectual audience. Transaction/Society, the journal of record in the social sciences, is centering a scholarly symposium around the article, "Equality at last....," to which various eminent scholars, including members of the NAS panel, will contribute responses. That the Department failed to realize the nature of these articles and their intended audience is surprising, since not only does one of the reviewers explicitly mention it several times, but the Department quotes something else said by that reviewer in the same context.

It is hard for me to understand how the Department, which only a year ago found that Dr. Gottfredson's accomplishments in research "clearly meet the Department's high standards for promotion to Professor," should now find that there has been "a noticeable decline in quality since [1983] and even more noticeably since her arrival at the University of Delaware in the Fall of 1986." What has changed is not her work, but simply the presence of one negative review.

At least once before, the Department faced the problem of having to decide between two diametrically opposites sets of external reviews of a candidate's research. In that case, we decided in favor of one set because the other lacked credibility. In this case, we did just the reverse. We ignored the credible

letters and give sovereign authority to the one letter that demonstrates the author's incompetence and admits his political animus. This is a serious mistake and one that I hope the Department will soon correct.

cc: Dr. Gottfredson ✓
Members of the P&T Committee