

Review of: "Developing and Supporting High-Performing Faculty Teams in Engineering Institutions"

Augusto Ciuffoletti¹

¹ University of Pisa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

There is a contradiction between the title and the content of the paper. On one side, the author announces results about fostering the development and support of good teachers. On the other, he concentrates on avoiding the exclusion of promising candidates in favor of others that exploit the recruiting system's weaknesses. Both topics are relevant, but the one in the title should align with the main one.

Section 2 starts with a program of four points, the first being a mix of two different attitudes to contrast the issue. On one side, the intent is to understand the problem with a survey; on the other, it proposes ways to improve the recruitment process. Since a misguided system will probably invest in the wrong people, I suggest that the first step should consist only of a survey of the current state, identifying the reasons that simplify ungrounded careers. The second part of the first point should take place only when issues are well-understood, probably at the end of your program.

The above suggestion is in line with the concept of affirmative action, which mandates going "beyond simple termination" of the evil practice. Therefore the action should follow the stage of terminating the issue. However, the "synthesis of findings" consists of a list of uncommented statements without looking for a relationship with the situation under study. For instance, after the first point about high-stakes tests, there should be a discussion of existing literature (the running list above is not very explanatory) and, more importantly, an analysis of the high-stake tests in a successful curriculum and how they can favor the wrong people.

Among the nine points listed, some spot potential issues in the current systems, while others suggest measures before assessing the issues to contrast (e.g., "develop a sector integrity plan").

Section 3.4 reports a story and concludes with a suggestion in five points. Overall the discussion is superficial, and the reader does not find any clue about the mechanisms that fostered such devastating effects. Such dynamics should be dealt with by the second point in your program in sect 2: "Assess the root causes".

In section 4, there are the results of a poll presented to faculty members. I cannot conceal the suspect that they are those

with a brilliant carrier in the system under study. The poll results analysis finds the best and worst measures as indicated by the faculty members in the sample and, in a two lines interpretation, suggests that administrators are misguided. The paper is closed with a suggestion articulated in 20 points. Among them, we find one saying: "Eliminating all kinds of Discriminations/Corruption in all Academic Activities". Such a statement is the issue the paper wants to solve and cannot stay among the solutions.

In conclusion, the paper is relevant since it witnesses an effort toward resolving a situation that precludes the cultural growth of a country. However, with the limitations inherent to the sensitive issues involved, it should be more analytic and constructive. Item lists may guide a discussion but do not mean a conclusion. A list of 20 goals dilutes the effort in too many actions, each of which is a determinant for success.