

FACULTY **F**OCUS

Special Report

Faculty Promotion and Tenure: Eight Ways to Improve the Tenure Review Process at Your Institution

Featuring content from

ACADEMIC
Leader

A MAGNA



PUBLICATION

Faculty Promotion and Tenure: Eight Ways to Improve the Tenure Review Process at Your Institution

Few issues have more powder keg potential than academic tenure. Not only is applying for tenure a nerve-racking, time and labor intensive process, but the resulting decisions can cause discontent for tenure candidates and ill will in departments. Tenure even carries the potential for costly lawsuits for institutions.

It's no wonder then, when it comes to faculty promotion and tenure policies, colleges and universities tread lightly while at the same time are always seeking new, better ways to bring more transparency and clarity to this critical system. The new processes, often developed to reflect changing needs (i.e., how to reward online faculty) or dispel old assumptions (i.e., research is more important than teaching and service), cannot and should not be implemented overnight, but they are worth close examination to see if similar processes would make sense for your school.

This Faculty Focus special report features eight thought-provoking articles from *Academic Leader*, and was created to provide you with new perspectives on the promotion and tenure process. Some will challenge your thinking. Others will confirm your suspicions. All will lend valuable perspective to your academic tenure and personnel policies.

Here are just some of the articles you will find in this report:

- Alternate Paths to Tenure: Reward Teaching
- Simple Commitment but Long-Term Challenge: P&T and SoTL
- Improving Documentation for Promotion and Tenure
- Revising Workload, Promotion, and Tenure Policies for Online Faculty
- Rethinking Scholarly Publication for Tenure

We're confident this special report will provide you with practical strategies to help spark discussions on whether to revise the academic tenure processes your school.

Rob Kelly
Editor
Academic Leader

Table of Contents

Improving Documentation for Promotion and Tenure.....4

Simple Commitment but Long-Term Challenge:
Promotion and Tenure, and the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning6

Alternate Paths to Tenure: Reward Teaching8

Faculty Expectations Regarding Personnel Decisions10

Faculty and Administrators Collaborate on Personnel Decisions12

Rethinking Scholarly Publication for Tenure13

Revising Workload, Promotion, and Tenure Policies for Online Faculty14

Collegiality as Selection Criterion in the Search Process.....16



Improving Documentation for Promotion and Tenure

By Jeffrey L. Buller, PhD

At most colleges and universities, the documentation that faculty members submit when applying for tenure or promotion is so massive that it is burdensome for the candidate at the same time that it is often unhelpful to the review committee. It is not at all uncommon for applicants to submit three or more full binders of documentation for a promotion application, including internal and external letters of support, summaries of student course evaluations, syllabi for all courses, copies of all publications, evaluations made by supervisors and peers during all previous academic years, a complete set of annual reviews, an updated résumé, lists of committee assignments and service contributions performed, term-by-term teaching loads, grant proposals submitted, publication contracts for works not yet in print, and a wealth of other documentation. At some schools, faculty members will even include in their portfolios all the thank-you notes and letters of congratulations that they have received from all of their supervisors, colleagues, and students.

The result of this practice is that candidates spend weeks or even months amassing materials, and then promotion and tenure committees have excessive amounts of documentation to read. If you ask about these demands for overwhelming documentation, most committees issue statements along the lines of “We read every single document submitted to

us.” Nevertheless, even that response poses a problem. Either the committee is being disingenuous and not doing what it claims to be doing (thus probably missing important information as it skims through multiple volumes of material) or it actually is reading every word submitted to it (thus spending time reading thank-you notes, multiple copies of nearly identical course syllabi, and duplicates of information that already appears in the candidate’s curriculum vitae, when its members could be devoting that time to teaching and research). In other words, all too many tenure and promotion systems today require candidates to spend far too much time assembling far too much information for committees to review far too little in a process that is far too cumbersome. Is there any alternative?

Administrators can help inspire much-needed reform of the tenure and promotion processes at their institutions if they begin discussions of reducing the workload of both candidates and committees in the following three ways.

1. Institutions should never require candidates to supply information or documentation that can be readily obtained elsewhere. It should go without saying that forcing candidates to gather material that is easily available elsewhere is not the best use of the candidates’ time. But

such a requirement is also detrimental to the committee’s work. For instance, committees may feel obliged to review documentation, not because it is particularly useful or informative, but simply because the candidate has gone to the trouble to collect it. Common examples of information that, at most institutions, candidates should not be asked to gather include aggregated student evaluation scores and term-by-term course loads. Where centralized sources of this information are available, these sources will be far more consistent in the way in which that information is presented; for instance, the office of institutional research is likely to calculate averages or median scores on student evaluations in a consistent manner for all faculty members, whereas individuals may use any number of methods, producing results that are misleading to the committee where they attempt to make comparisons.

2. Candidates should be asked to provide a sampling of material that reflects each candidate’s best contributions. When applicants for promotion or tenure submit large quantities of material, there tends to be very little distinction in their documentation between the extremely important and the relatively insignificant. In an attempt to provide the committee with everything that its members could possibly want, candidates run the risk of having their truly important material become lost in the sheer welter of their documentation. This problem can best be avoided if documentation guidelines are revised so that can-

PAGE 5 ►

didates provide a selection of their materials along with a justification of why those materials are important. For instance, candidates could be asked to list all the products of their scholarship (books, articles, presentations, performances, and the like), but also to submit documentary evidence of their three most important scholarly contributions, along with a statement about why those items are significant. Rather than submitting syllabi for all of their courses, candidates could be asked to provide the three best syllabi they have written, accompanied by a paragraph that explains why these particular examples are of high quality. Focusing requests in this way encourages candidates, not merely to “dump” everything that they have collected onto a review committee, but rather to reflect on what they believe to be important, why it is important, and what constitutes high achievement in their disciplines.

3. Candidates should be asked to supply fewer documents, but they should also be asked to annotate those documents.

Another problem with reviewing multiple binders filled with unedited documents is that, although they contain a great deal of data, they do not always provide a great deal of information. For instance, unless a member of a review committee happens to be very familiar with the discipline in question, he or she is unlikely to know which journals in a field are really important, which conferences do not accept every proposal submitted, and which courses tend to evoke lower scores on

evaluations primarily because students resent having to take them. For this reason, an annotated résumé—one that includes acceptance rates for each journal in which the faculty member has published, essential information about the conferences where the candidate has presented, and background about how the candidate’s courses fit into the overall curriculum of the discipline—can end up revealing far more to the committee than huge stacks of non-annotated documents. In a similar way, an annotated syllabus, describing how and why the instructor has improved the course over time, can tell the committee a great deal about the individual’s quality of instruction and can be much more helpful all those notes from students reading “Good professor! I really liked this class.”

In other words, documentation for promotion and tenure applications can be significantly improved if those who are responsible for setting policies would begin asking, “What insight do we hope to gain from the supporting material provided by the applicant that we simply cannot obtain elsewhere?” This same question should be addressed whenever documentation is requested from any source. For instance, when contacting outside reviews, it is less helpful to ask for a general letter of evaluation than to pose questions that cannot be answered internally. Thus, depending on the size of the program, you may need to ask external reviewers whether the faculty member has been active in the appropriate professional organizations for that discipline. You may need to inquire whether the candidate’s level of research seems suitable for that discipline and whether it is being submitted to the right publishers and

in the right journals. Reviewers may not think of addressing these questions specifically in their letters, unless they are formally asked to do so. You can always include a question like “Is there anything else about this candidate’s professional performance that you would like to bring to the attention of the committee?” as a way of also soliciting a more general type of recommendation.

Most evaluation committees can give thorough attention to perhaps 50 to 75 pages of well-chosen documentation for each candidate they are considering for tenure or promotion. Rarely can committees master the thousands of pages that most applicants tend to gather into multiple binders. As a result, establishing policies so that they have candidates submit a far more focused but far more informative set of materials thus makes the process less burdensome for both candidates and committee alike, at the same time that it helps each candidate make the strongest case possible. For information on one effective way of improving this type of documentation, see Seldin and Miller (2008).

Reference:

Seldin, P., & Miller, J.E. (2008). *The Academic Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Documenting Teaching, Research, And Service*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jeffrey L. Buller is dean of the Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College at Florida Atlantic University. He is the author of The Essential Department Chair: A Practical Guide to College Administration (2006), The Essential Academic Dean: A Practical Guide to College Leadership (2007), and The Essential College Professor: A Practical Guide to an Academic Career (forthcoming). (All are published by Jossey-Bass.) ●

Simple Commitment but Long-Term Challenge: Promotion and Tenure, and the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning

By David Sill

For well over 20 years we have heard that higher education does not reward teaching. We have also heard that research accomplishments come first in determining tenure and promotion decisions, and teaching second. At the same time, the imperative to increase our valuing of teaching continues. The Spellings Commission Report calls for new forms of teaching and directs FIPSE to promote innovative teaching and learning models. Boyer's argument in *Scholarship Reconsidered* for broadening our understanding of faculty work to include forms of scholarship other than discovery, including a scholarship of teaching, underlies much of the conversation regarding faculty roles to this day. Yet acceptable teaching is too often defined as "not disastrous in the classroom," particularly for stellar researchers. If there is no damage, no lawsuit, no newspaper headline about bad teaching, nothing illegal or immoral, then the teaching must be OK if the research record is great.

This leads to an interesting series of questions: What if higher education actually responded to these calls to increase the value of teaching? What if colleges and universities demanded higher levels of teaching performance for tenure, for example? Would that make a difference? Perhaps and perhaps not—making a commitment to higher

levels of performance is one thing, but achieving higher levels of performance is another.

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville made a commitment to meritorious teaching for promotion and tenure in 1994-95 when the faculty senate and the provost negotiated new promotion and tenure policies. The new promotion policy included the following statement: "A candidate for promotion shall demonstrate, at the level commensurate with rank, at least meritorious performance in teaching, and at least meritorious performance in either scholarship or service and satisfactory performance in the other." The commitment to meritorious teaching raised four questions: How would we define meritorious teaching? How should we document it? How could we evaluate it? And how might we help faculty become meritorious teachers?

The four questions turned out to be interconnected, and all four presented challenges. The first question, how to define meritorious teaching, was far more challenging than it first appeared. The problem was that satisfactory teaching at SIUE was considered good teaching. To receive satisfactory rankings, faculty were expected to have strong student course evaluations; stay up to date in the field, incorporating new developments; use appropriate pedagogies;

develop quality syllabi, handouts, and exams; and meet all normal responsibilities such as office hours. The challenge, then, was to determine what was better than good.

If meritorious teaching must be something better than good teaching, is that simply a matter of degree? One could look for higher course evaluations, better or more handouts, more developed syllabi, more office hours, or better class management. But where do we draw the line? Looking for super-quality syllabi or extra-appropriate pedagogies made no sense. The temptation is to slide the scale down so that what had been defined as satisfactory teaching now becomes meritorious, because the difference between quality and super-quality, between appropriate and extra-appropriate, is indefinable.

The same problems arise when looking at the differences between meritorious and satisfactory teaching as a matter of practice or of differences in student learning. Using improvement strategies, involving students in research or engaging activities such as service learning, and demonstrating quality student learning are expectations of satisfactory teaching. All these approaches are suspect when they are used to differentiate between different levels

PAGE 7 ►

FROM PAGE 6

of quality teaching, because they are necessary conditions for good teaching.

The year after SIUE reworked its promotion and tenure policies, faculty began the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Initiative (FRR), part of the Illinois Board of Higher Education's Priorities – Quality – Productivity mandate. FRR developed a multipronged approach to implementing a commitment to meritorious teaching by developing a meaningful peer-review system (course portfolios and reciprocal classroom interviews), exploring broader issues such as technology in the classroom and AAC&U's Greater Expectations, balancing faculty roles, and redefining rigor. Exploring the scholarship of teaching and learning, framing questions of quality teaching in broad intellectual terms, and modeling scholarly pursuit in teaching and learning became the means of defining, documenting, evaluating, and developing meritorious teaching.

FRR adopted the analytical framework from *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* by Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997), which includes six standards for scholarly work that apply both to teaching as a scholarly activity and to a scholarship of teaching and learning. The six standards of scholarly work are clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. Lee Shulman's claim that "intellectual communities form around collections of texts" (*Course Anatomy: The Dissection and Analysis of Knowledge*, AAHE Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1996) provides a useful heuristic at SIUE for making concrete the abstract framework provided by *Scholarship*

Assessed. Peer review activities provide a variety of texts, from course portfolios to published articles, including model promotion-tenure dossiers in the library.

Each year, the dossiers that make the strongest case for promotion or tenure are selected for inclusion in library course reserves. We started with six dossiers the first year, and there are now 25. Some of the early dossiers have been removed because they are no longer models of best

The six standards of scholarly work are clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

practice. Faculty with dossiers in the library participate in workshops and faculty development activities. The professional schools and the College of Arts and Sciences are represented. These dossiers indicate how to document meritorious teaching. The analytical framework answers questions of definition and evaluation. FRR provides assistance for faculty to become meritorious teachers.

Improvements in the quality of student learning are found across SIUE. These are supported by an array of activities and programs, including the commitment to meritorious teaching. One of the strongest contributions from that commitment is the rewarding of faculty who participate in other parts of the array, including internal grant programs, assessment activities, and faculty devel-

opment programs.

While SIUE cannot claim to have found the answer to raising the value of teaching, we have found that there is no single answer. The answers rely on differences in degree, kind, practice, and student learning, but only if they are looked at through the lens of a scholarship of teaching and learning, supported by rich texts and institutional commitment. SIUE's commitment to meritorious teaching was simple compared with the challenge of implementing that commitment. We have made much progress, but also know there is far to go yet.

David Sill is a senior scholar at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. ●

Alternate Paths to Tenure: Reward Teaching

By Rob Kelly

Until recently, George Mason University's tenure requirements were typical of most research institutions: research was the primary activity; teaching and service, though important, were secondary. Over the past six years, GMU has created new paths to tenure that recognize the different types of contributions that faculty can make to the university.

Currently, GMU has four paths to tenure: the traditional research emphasis; one that recognizes "genuine excellence in teaching"; one that is equal parts research, teaching, and administration; and one in which the faculty member splits his or her time within a discipline and at the university level—working on faculty development, grant proposal writing, and other activities that benefit the institution as a whole.

The first two options are open to all tenure-track faculty, and faculty members do not have to formally choose an option until they come up for tenure, "although if they haven't made the decision beforehand, they may find the documentation rather difficult," says Laurie Fathe, associate provost for educational improvement and innovation.

Faculty who choose to take up research as their primary activity comprise the majority of those on the tenure track at GMU, but the number of faculty choosing other options has grown. Currently, about 20 percent of faculty who come up for tenure at

GMU do so in the area of genuine excellence in teaching. These faculty members tend to be in disciplines that emphasize teaching, including the College of Education and a relatively new undergraduate unit called the New Century College, which features integrative interdisciplinary learning communities, portfolio assessment, and other innovations. (Half of New Century College faculty seek tenure on genuine excellence in teaching.)

If a faculty member demonstrates excellence in research and teaching, he or she may be tenured within both categories, provided both the faculty member's department and the provost's office approve. This distinction results in a larger salary increase than for those who get tenured in a single category.

The other two paths are limited to specific faculty members and are negotiated individually based on specific institutional needs. Faculty hired with a significant portion of their jobs represented by administrative duties might fall into the one-third research, one-third teaching, one-third administrative tenure path. Faculty who are on this path include the director of the writing center and the director of the composition program.

The Program for Innovative Education, which began this year, hires faculty specifically for their disciplinary education expertise. Each of these faculty members works half-

time within an academic department on curriculum development, general education classes, and any education issues related to the department. Each also works half-time at the university level on faculty development, grant proposal writing, and other educational issues that affect the university.

"The hope is that at some point all of our significant-sized departments will have one of these people in the department," Fathe says.

Having a faculty member in this category means that the department has a member who focuses on some of the courses that do not always get the attention they deserve, such as general education classes. "You have somebody who's thinking not just about making the class function but making it function well, thinking about assessment, keeping up with [innovations] within the discipline, attending disciplinary education conferences, making presentations at those conferences, and keeping us on the cutting edge on the teaching as well as the research side," Fathe says.

Choosing a tenure path is an individual decision, but it may also be influenced by the norms within the discipline and the department. "There are places where thinking you want to go up for tenure on genuine excellence in teaching would be absolutely normal, and there are places where people would shake their heads about it," Fathe says. "I think some of that is discipline specific, and some of that goes along with the character of the discipline at the institution."

The tenure review process for each tenure path is the same and "would be familiar to anyone in academia. It's just that the content is different," Fathe says.

Each faculty member is required to produce a portfolio of his or her

PAGE 9 ▶

FROM PAGE 8

work, which is judged first at the department level, then at the college level, and finally by the provost. Tenure criteria for the research-intensive path are generated within the department “based on local parameters, local history, and local convention,” Fathe says.

Conversely, the tenure criteria for genuine excellence in teaching are the same across the university and are more clearly defined than the research tenure guidelines in most departments, in part because department chairs asked for specific criteria “to help them help their faculty negotiate the process,” Fathe says. “What we’re talking about here is still so far from the experience of most faculty members that it’s going to be a generation until [tenure based on genuine excellence in teaching] is familiar enough so that people are comfortable in localizing [the criteria].”

According to the university’s guidelines, in order to earn tenure based on genuine excellence in teaching, what the faculty member does in the classroom cannot be limited to just his or her class. It must have a broader impact and must be shared with others at the university, published in journals, and presented at conferences. “If it’s not something somebody else can build on, it’s not useful for tenure—the same as one would say for research,” Fathe says.

Although the number of faculty pursuing tenure on the genuine excellence in teaching path is growing each year, Fathe is not worried that a disproportionate number of faculty members will pursue this path, believing that they will merely follow the path that most closely matches their skills and interests. “There are people in higher education who are phenomenally good researchers, and there are people who are phenome-

nally good teachers. I think the overlap in those two areas is not often as great as purported. And higher education has said everybody should look almost identical to each other, which organizationally doesn’t make a lot of sense,” Fathe says.

Outcomes

Presumably, the new focus on teaching will improve student learning, but “it’s hard to say,” Fathe says. “It’s particularly hard to say at

Providing faculty with different tenure options has allowed faculty to make to the university contributions that more closely match their talents and interests.

this institution because we’re growing by almost a thousand students a year. So any effect from this is almost swamped by institutional growth.”

The effects on faculty and departments are clearer: Providing faculty with different tenure options has allowed faculty to make to the university contributions that more closely match their talents and interests. It also has enabled departments to hire people they might not have been able to hire in the past because their work didn’t fit neatly into the research-focused tenure path.

Advice

The impetus of developing alternate tenure paths came from Peter Stearns, who became provost six years ago, but it wouldn’t have been accepted if it had not met some needs, and it took a while for faculty

to be convinced that the provost was serious about making changes, Fathe says.

Clearly, having an academic leader who champions the idea can make a big difference, but there must be dialogue on campus about this issue before changes can occur. Fathe recommends asking, “What is important on this campus?” and “What are we trying to accomplish?”

“I think a lot of times [the answers to these questions are] assumed, and yet when you have people start to articulate them, you find that there isn’t the common agreement you might have expected. People have a lot of different perspectives on what the institution is doing and what it should be trying to do,” Fathe says.

Alternate tenure paths can come about within departments, “but the broader the participation, the broader the impact,” Fathe says. “I think one of the advantages we had at George Mason was that it happened at the institutional level, so there could not be a perception of a privileged or disadvantaged class.” ●

Faculty Expectations Regarding Personnel Decisions

By Bob Cipriano, EdD, and Richard Riccardi

Department chairs are told to hire the best people and their personnel problems will be minimal. An equally salient comment reflects the ability to nurture a quality faculty member and help the person acquire tenure and promotion in rank. This is especially true in view of the fact that faculty in higher education tend to be older than in other professions. In fact, it is estimated that 50 percent of current faculty will be eligible to retire within five years. Reis (1997) wrote that by 2008, nearly half of the 595,000 full-time college faculty members in the nation are likely to retire. Given the unique structure of the academy (i.e., tenure, academic freedom, peer review, et al.), have we arrived at consensus regarding who is a productive faculty member?

We have conducted two national studies of recreation department chairs (in 2004 and 2006) and a national study of full-time faculty members in recreation and leisure studies departments (2006). Each survey asked the respondents to rate important factors regarding the efficacy of faculty members. More specifically, the survey asked respondents to rate the most important factors for faculty members to possess to be awarded tenure, promotion in rank, and reappointment. The results of these studies are presented in Table 1 on page 11.

The initial 2004 study only had 17 factors to be considered, while the 2006 study had a total of 21 factors to select from and which to rate in a hierarchical format as major factors needed by faculty in achieving tenure, reap-

pointment, and/or promotion in rank. A total of 107 surveys were sent to chairs in 2004 and 74 surveys were returned (69.2 percent return rate). Ninety-eight surveys were sent to chairs in the 2006 study, and 42 were returned (42.9 percent return rate). A total of 196 surveys were distributed to faculty, and 56 returned the survey (28.6 percent return rate). The low return rate for faculty can be somewhat attributed to the methodology followed: chairs were sent a survey to complete, and asked to distribute additional surveys to any two faculty members in their department. Thus, there was no way to determine if faculty members received the surveys or not.

Analysis and discussion

Both the chairs from 2004 and 2006, as well as the faculty, listed as the top three factors to be considered in faculty obtaining tenure classroom teaching, research, and publications. This is certainly no surprise as the above has been articulated as vitally important in personnel decisions in the academy for a long time. What is noteworthy is that 50 percent or more of the chairs from the 2004 study only listed classroom teaching (99 percent), publications (86 percent), and research (85 percent) as major factors to be considered in personnel decisions regarding faculty. In other words, none of the other 14 factors was listed as a major factor in obtaining tenure by half of the chairs responding. In fact, there was a significant difference in the third major factor (research, 85 percent of the chairs

listed this as a major factor) and the fourth major factor (activity in professional societies, 46 percent of the chairs listed this as a major factor).

The results from the 2006 chairs survey indicated that only five factors were listed as major by at least 50 percent of the respondents: classroom teaching (95 percent), publications (81 percent), research (79 percent), service to the department (55 percent), and grants submitted (50 percent). The other 16 factors were listed as major factors by less than 50 percent of the respondents. The faculty from the 2006 study listed eight as major factors to be considered for tenure: classroom teaching (95 percent), research (73 percent), publications (68 percent), interaction with students (61 percent), evidence of students learning (59 percent), service to the department (55 percent), interpersonal attributes/collegiality (54 percent), and grants submitted (52 percent).

It is clear that faculty perceive that there is more for them to do to achieve tenure than do department chairs. Are current faculty members being asked to do more with less to obtain tenure than their colleagues were asked to do when they were awarded tenure? It appears, at first glance, that faculty members do believe that they must do more than the big three: teaching, research, and publications. What are the implications to the academy in view of the synergy of a dearth of doctoral students coupled with the aging of the current crop of faculty? These convergent concepts present unique challenges to department chairs now and in the foreseeable future.

Bob Cipriano is professor and chair of the department of Recreation and Leisure Studies. Richard Riccardi is director of the Office of Management Information and Research. Both are at Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven, Connecticut. ●

Table 1. Recreation Department Comparison

Survey	National Survey of Recreation Department Chairs (2004)	Survey of Recreation Chairs and Faculty (2006)	
		<i>Chairs</i>	<i>Faculty</i>
Factor #1	Classroom Teaching (99 percent)	Classroom Teaching (93 percent)	Classroom Teaching (95 percent)
Factor #2	Publications (86 percent)	Publications (81 percent)	Research (73 percent)
Factor #3	Research (85 percent)	Research (79 percent)	Publications (68 percent)
Factor #4	Activity in Professional (46 percent)	Societies/Service to the Department (55 percent)	Interaction with Students (61 percent)
Factor #5	Grants Submitted (38 percent)	Grants Submitted (50 percent)	Evidence of Student Learning (59 percent)
Factor #6	Length of Service in Rank (36 percent)	Activity in Professional Societies (38 percent)	Service to the Department (55 percent)
Factor #7	Service to the Department (35 percent)	Interpersonal Attributes/Collegiality (38 percent)	Interpersonal Attributes/Collegiality (54 percent)
Factor #8	Service to Community (32 percent)	Length of Service in Rank (38 percent)	Grants Submitted (52 percent)
Factor #9	Public Service (30 percent)	Campus Committee Work (36 percent)	Student Advising (46 percent)
Factor #10	Campus Committee Work (29 percent)	Evidence of Student Learning (36 percent)	Use of Learning Outcomes in Courses (41 percent)
Factor #11	Student Advising (27 percent)	Interaction with Students (33 percent)	Activity in Professional Societies (39 percent)
Factor #12	Investment in University (13 percent)	Public Service (33 percent)	Supervision of Field Experience/Practicum (29 percent)
Factor #13	Supervision of Field Experience/Practicum (11 percent)	Service to Community (33 percent)	Campus Committee Work (27 percent)
Factor #14	Time Spent on Campus (8 percent)	Use of Learning Outcomes in Courses (29 percent)	Service to Community (20 percent)
Factor #15	Use of Technology (7 percent)	Student Advising (26 percent)	Investment in University (20 percent)
Factor #16	Consultation (4 percent)	Investment in University (24 percent)	Public Service (16 percent)
Factor #17	Supervision of Independent Studies (4 percent)	Supervision of Field Experience/Practicum (20 percent)	Length of Service in Rank (16 percent)
Factor #18		Use of Technology (14 percent)	Time Spent on Campus (14 percent)
Factor #19		Time Spent on Campus (12 percent)	Supervision of Independent Studies (9 percent)
Factor #20		Supervision of Independent Studies (12 percent)	Use of Technology (7 percent)
Factor #21		Consultation (0 percent)	Consultation (4 percent)
Surveys Sent	107	98	196
Surveys Returned	74	42	56
Response Rate	69.2 percent	42.9 percent	28.6 percent

Faculty and Administrators Collaborate on Personnel Decisions

By Rob Kelly

Jamestown (New York) Community College uses a joint faculty-administration committee to make all decisions related to faculty hiring, retention, promotion, salary, and tenure. The idea is that the variety of perspectives will help the college make better decisions in these critical areas.

The HRPST (hiring, retention, promotion, salary, and tenure) Committee includes five administrators—vice president and dean of administration, vice president and dean of academic affairs, vice president and dean of student development, vice president and dean of the Cattaraugus County campus (approximately 50 miles from the main campus), and the college president—and five elected faculty members who serve two-year terms. (The terms are staggered to avoid having an entirely new group of faculty on the committee every two years.)

A search committee, which includes department or division members and at least one member from outside the department, identifies a faculty candidate based on telephone and in-person interviews. The candidate then goes through an administrative interview. Once a candidate makes it through that process, he or she is then brought to the HRPST Committee for consideration. That committee looks at credentials and recommended salary. “We try to keep equity based on a

person’s education and experience. Opinions on the committee don’t generally vary that much, because things are looked at pretty closely by the time the candidates get to that point,” says Jean Schrader, assistant dean of science, mathematics, engineering, and technology and HRPST Committee member.

Once a full-time faculty member is hired, he or she comes up for review each year for four years. (The fourth review is the tenure review.) The assistant dean puts together a review packet for each review, which includes a personal data sheet, self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student evaluation, and a written evaluation by the assistant dean. Faculty are reviewed on contributions to the college, the community, and their professional fields.

Although every discipline is different, using the same review standards across the college helps the college work toward improving the educational experience for students. The faculty contract delineates what goes into the HRPST packet.

One of the biggest benefits of the makeup of the committee is that different committee members bring different concerns and perspectives to the evaluation of faculty members. For example, the division evaluator will likely be more knowledgeable about a faculty member’s teaching performance than will the other committee members.

All members have an equal say in the committee’s decisions, and the president doesn’t vote, except to break a tie. “The good thing about this process is that it allows a lot of input,” Schrader says. “I hear that in a lot of colleges, it’s the decision of one person as to whether to keep the candidate or promote him or her or grant tenure. That can’t possibly be good, because all kinds of things can happen if you let one person make the decision. Everybody knows that there is a committee that is going to review the packets, so these things don’t end up happening behind closed doors within a department or division. There are people from other divisions looking at these packets and having discussions about whether the faculty member is doing the kind of job we need him or her to be doing and whether he or she is at the point of doing things we expect of an assistant, associate, or full professor.”

Each review packet has the same type of information, and the process is reviewed regularly by the HRPST Committee and the faculty union. So far the process has remained in place for approximately 40 years. The faculty union has existed for approximately 15 years.

Implementing a similar review process in a unionized institution would be difficult, says Roslin Newton, assistant dean of arts, humanities, and health sciences. “There has to be desire on both sides [administration and faculty]. In those institutions used to the department chair being the person giving a thumbs-up or thumbs-down, the evaluation process often is not clearly laid out or documented. In such institutions, the decisions are made more on a friendly basis rather than a critical basis. And making that switch is very frightening to institutions and

PAGE 13 ►

FROM PAGE 12

faculty who have not had that as part of their history or tradition.”

Although program directors and coordinators are not directly involved in the HRPST Committee, they often serve as peer evaluators. “I was

director for a while, and I made darn sure that I got to be peer evaluator at some point as people were coming through the tenure process,” Schrader says.

In addition to avoiding the “myopic” view of department-only reviews, having faculty collaborate

with the administration on these personnel decisions give faculty a voice in these important decisions and a better understanding of the workings of the college and their own professional growth, Newton says. ●

Rethinking Scholarly Publication for Tenure

By Thomas R. McDaniel, PhD

Well, here we go again. The Daily Princetonian reports on its Web news page a story about the Modern Language Association’s task force recommendation regarding “ways in which universities should rethink how they ‘admit’ professors and later decide on their tenure.” Rosemary Feal, executive director of the MLA, said, “We wanted data that we could analyze in light of the changes in the scholarly community.”

Now, lest you think this is yet another effort to jettison the tenure system from the “scholarly community,” let me hasten to assure you that is not the object of this MLA report. After all, tenure foes are much more likely to come from outside academe than from within—and the MLA is about as “within” as anyone can get. No, this is an effort, as Feal puts it, to respond to the “major changes in the way scholarship is published.”

Because colleges and universities—especially top-tier and/or research-oriented institutions—are increasingly emphasizing scholarship as a condition for tenure, and because it is increasingly difficult for professors to find traditional journals willing and

able to accept narrowly focused research articles (partly a consequence of shrinking library budgets), a broader definition of “publication” is desirable. Princeton itself seems comfortable with its current scholarship requirements (according to Dean of the Faculty David Dobkin) primarily because, as Feal observed, “it can attract the greatest experts in their field,” those who have ready access to scholarly journals for their work.

But what about the lesser lights, those faculty squeezed out of the most prestigious research journals? This problem is what the MLA’s efforts might rectify. We will await the full report and subsequent action following the author’s presentation of results at the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges and Universities in New Orleans in late January 2007. In the meantime, a few “parting shots” seem in order:

First, let us ask if the premise of the report is valid. Logic suggests that it is. No doubt even those non-elite, non-research institutions (including small liberal arts colleges) that populate the higher education landscape in the United States have ratcheted up the scholarly publica-

tions criteria for tenure over the last decade. And no doubt library budgets (and the rising costs of journals) work against the publishing prospects of younger faculty without name recognition in the academy. The squeeze is on!

Second, the alternatives to the prestige print journals—notably, the growing respectability of electronic “online” journals—suggest that the “new media” should not be discounted as legitimate outlets for publication. Peer review is still essential to protect the integrity of the “publication” process, but faster, cheaper (if not better) forms of publication are likely to grow in popularity and respectability.

Third, recall that the MLA is addressing an old problem, not a brand-new phenomenon. At least as far back as 1990, when Ernest Boyer, on behalf of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, published *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, leaders in our field have argued for a broader definition of scholarship itself to reflect the interests and needs of what Boyer termed “a new generation of

PAGE 14 ►

scholars.”

So long as the MLA has reopened this issue, let academic leaders consider not only the means of scholarly publication but also the ends. A rereading of Boyer’s classic text would be a good beginning place for this aspect of the “publish or perish” tenure conundrum for college

professors today.

Given the glut of newly minted humanities Ph.D.s seeking tenure-track positions and the extensive use of adjuncts by cost-conscious institutions, and given the high rate of tenure-track candidates who achieve tenure (about 90 percent by some estimates), there will not likely be much impetus for institutions, especially the most prestigious, to relax or

redefine scholarship requirements. And as for those who would argue for the elimination of tenure altogether? That is an argument for another day.

Thomas R. McDaniel is a professor of education and senior vice president at Converse College in Spartanburg, S.C. ●

Revising Workload, Promotion, and Tenure Policies for Online Faculty

By Rob Kelly

As more and more faculty are being asked to teach online, there is a growing need to address workload, promotion, and tenure policies to reflect the differences between teaching online and teaching face-to-face. Because of the differences among departments and institutions, there is no single solution to these issues. *Academic Leader* recently spoke with Philip DiSalvio, director of SetonWorldWide, Seton Hall University’s online campus, to get a clearer picture of the policy issues involved with online instruction and to explore possible policy action alternatives.

The key question in determining whether there is a need for policy change is whether teaching online is more time consuming than teaching face-to-face. DiSalvio says that offering online courses of a quality equal to or greater than comparable face-to-face courses takes more time.

“I think more and more we’re seeing that online instruction demands more time of the instructor because of the

interaction that’s involved. I’ve taught online and continue to teach online, and most of our faculty do, and they consistently say that it just takes more time because of the interaction.

They’re in the course two or three times a day, and it’s not just sort of floating into class and talking from their lecture notes and having two hours in class. It’s a daily grind, and as such there should be a recognition, I think, and there seems to be a growing recognition that because of those distinctions, there in fact may have to be some differences in the rewards structure when you’re dealing with online instruction.”

A big concern for faculty is how the additional work involved in teaching online will affect their productivity in other aspects of their jobs. The question, DiSalvio says, is this: “Does teaching online reduce your productivity in those areas that will give you tenure or that will give you more compensation or a promotion?” He continues, “Most folks find that [teaching online] is more work, and so

it comes to be seen as a perceived threat to productivity in research and service, and this has implications for compensation, promotion, and tenure.”

Attitudes toward online teaching and its prevalence vary widely across disciplines and institutions. “I think we’re beginning to see, and the data seems to show, that more and more folks are recognizing that online enrollment is going to become a more important part of their overall portfolio. The percentage of schools identifying online instruction as a critical long-term strategy continues to grow. And I see among the staunchest detractors in my university and the folks I talk to around the country that there is a growing acceptance that online instruction is part of the future,” DiSalvio says.

Acknowledging the role that online instruction might play in the future is one step in developing a response to the workload, promotion, and tenure issues. The institution needs to have

PAGE 15 ►

appropriate policies in place, but because of differences among departments an institution-wide policy cannot be the final word on how to address these issues.

“I think it starts with the departmental leadership that either pushes or doesn’t push the department into Web-based teaching. With that has to be a school or college vision that’s consistent with the departmental strategy, and then I think the university has to establish some kind of parameters. Schools are going at different rates, and there are different levels of commitment to online instruction as being an overall strategy. But I think that what we’re beginning to see is more and more a realization that just as technology increasingly becomes a part of our lives, then online instruction is going to as well,” DiSalvio says.

Although many faculty members may feel that online instruction will play a key role in the future of the institution, the climate and culture within the department are more important factors because faculty members often feel closer ties to their departments than to the school, college, or university. And the department chair plays a crucial role in influencing the department. “I think there’s got to be a recognition of the department chair’s pivotal role in setting the direction and establishing a reward system and really articulating how Web-based teaching affects workload, promotion, and tenure,” DiSalvio says.

Whether or not a department chair supports Web-based instruction depends on a myriad of factors. Among them are the following:

- **Departmental culture**—DiSalvio predicts that as older faculty members retire, younger faculty members will likely bring with them Web-based teaching skills, which will increase the recognition of online teaching.

- **Enrollment**—DiSalvio says that some department chairs might look to Web-based instruction as an alternate delivery mechanism that could boost enrollment. (“You don’t want the online program to negatively affect the on-campus program. The fear is that an online program could negatively impact the numbers of the on-campus program because certain students or potential students would prefer to be in the online program because it’s more convenient.”)
- **Incentives**—If the administration wants to encourage Web-based instruction, it could provide money, release time, or even faculty lines to departments willing to participate.

Buy in from the dean is another important ingredient of support for Web-based instruction. It is essential that there are no conflicts of interest between the dean and the department chair, DiSalvio says. In addition, the dean and the chair need incentives so that their interests align.

“One of the things we do is fund faculty lines in certain schools where we have great growth. We’ve seen great growth in our counseling programs and so in order to accommodate that growth and to make sure that there are enough faculty, SetonWorldWide actually funds faculty lines to the deans, and the commitment to teaching would be half for the online program and half for the on-campus program. It’s a way in times of constrained resources to help support the deans, and faculty lines are just so important to deans today,” DiSalvio says.

Currently, each faculty member who creates an online course for SetonWorldWide receives a course author’s fee. “I think that’s going to change down the road. As Web-based courses become part of a university’s portfolio, I think that will change as

faculty contracts call for the development and delivery of online courses,” DiSalvio says.

Before considering this or other policy changes, DiSalvio recommends answering the following questions:

- Is online teaching part of the institution’s vision?
- Do the faculty consider online teaching important?
- How are the faculty distributed across the institution? Is there a greater proportion of tenured or untenured faculty? What might online teaching mean for those who are not yet tenured?
- How will a policy discussion be interpreted?
- Are other challenges or priorities more important than online instruction?

There is no single way to address Web-based teaching policy issues, but DiSalvio offers the following approaches to reaching a solution:

- **Do nothing**—This approach is appropriate if online teaching is not yet a substantial part of the department’s activities or if the faculty are suspicious of the motives for considering policy changes.
- **Revise current policies**—Take this approach if faculty seem open to discussion on these issues and if it seems that faculty would be encouraged to teach online if there were supportive policies.
- **Study the issue**—This approach might be appropriate if faculty do not seem open to discussion but may be so in the future once they’ve had a chance to learn more about online teaching.
- **Avoid policy**—This approach might be appropriate if resources are available to encourage faculty to teach online rather than to avoid such courses out of fear that promotion or tenure might be endangered. ●

Collegiality as Selection Criterion in the Search Process

By Bob Cipriano, EdD, and Peter Madonia, EdD

Universities have long honored the quality that distinguishes academe from other settings: its value and respect for collegiality. It would seem that the practice of collegiality is the cornerstone of efforts to promote the growth and development of individuals, groups, and the organization itself.

With good reason we can point to the work of contemporary organizational theorists such as Robert Owens, who make the case for a deeper respect and appreciation of the importance of understanding how contemporary organizational behavior is challenged by the convergence of what we know or are coming to know about the behavior of people in schools and the impact of changing dynamics in society. When Owens writes of the “business of schools,” he points to the need to develop a culture that not only places a high value on but also supports and enhances openness, high trust, caring and sharing; that strives for consensus but supports and values those who think differently; and that prizes human growth and development above all (Owens 2004).

In this article we examine how these ideas inform us about the work of universities in relation to their beliefs about collegiality, and whether it is possible to identify the defining nature of collegiality in those who seek to enter academe. Our interest in this topic of growing importance and its potential value was first generated by the understanding

that little research exists to support the work of department chairs and search committees in the process of identifying promising new members of the academy.

If the two most critical decisions a university makes are who to hire and who to tenure, then it should follow that the responsibility to foster the climate that nurtures and instills the qualities necessary to successfully realize this goal rests with department chairs, who hold the key to selecting and supporting new personnel in academe. Personnel procedural manuals identify the qualities that characterize the environment in which good decisions about new hires and those who advance to tenure rank are generally achieved—things such as collaborative work, positive attitudes, flexibility, positive interpersonal relationships within the university community, and the demonstration of appropriate levels of responsibility with respect to one’s work in the university. These documents make clear the culture of the university community when it comes to the business of personnel decisions concerning faculty members related to merit pay increases, promotion, reappointment, and tenure.

In judging any individual for reappointment, merit pay increase, tenure, and/or promotion, these important factors weigh heavily on the future success of the individual and also have the potential to greatly impact the work of the department.

There is a growing interest in how factors such as those presented above serve to support a setting in which one’s department is the primary focus of a faculty member’s work. We look to one another as colleagues who are expected to conduct ourselves professionally in support of our students and one another.

Accepting and sharing responsibility for creating a productive work setting within the department and university is viewed in terms of how well we carry our fair share of the workload. The challenges faced by universities in the 21st century cannot be successfully mastered nor the efforts of dedicated professionals sustained when attitudes and dispositions of personnel within departments are divisive, uncompromising, and inflexible or reflect a lesser degree of personal responsibility around a unified purpose. What we are talking about is the importance of that fundamental hallmark of successful interactions in academe that we call collegiality.

Collegiality is reflected in the relationships that emerge within departments. It is often evidenced in the manner in which members of the department show respect, interact, and work collaboratively with a common purpose in mind. Thus in those instances where it is held in high esteem, it may be said that collegiality is the cornerstone of professional work. Yet in other settings the importance attached to it lacks clarity, as evidenced by the range of opinion and response it receives in discussion. In short, it has been celebrated in some settings, undermined in others, and in still other places completely overlooked.

One might conclude that we attach different meanings to the idea of collegiality that raise the specter of this desired state of interaction being the

PAGE 17 ►

unattainable ideal or less so: simply agreement among a group to establish and maintain professionally polite relationships. As a result, one is led to question how to clarify personal and collective perspectives surrounding the nature of this generally acclaimed state of professional interaction. Can qualities of individuals inclined to be collegial be identified prior to or early on in the experience of newcomers to university settings in order to significantly impact the potential contributions of the individual and department members for the betterment of the university?

The 1999 statement of the American Association of University Professors On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation points out that collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of scholarship, teaching, and service. Hence, its capacity lies not in defining it as a singular factor of status but instead, in the virtue of its definition in support of the work of faculty in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service (AAUP, Policy Documents and Reports, 9th ed. [Washington, D.C., 2001], 3). Our effort to further our understanding of the nature of collegiality as a factor of importance takes on greater meaning as evidenced in the work of Mary Ann Connell and Frederick G. Savage, who while pointing out that academics debate the importance of collegiality in faculty personnel decisions, the courts have spoken: They won't protect truculent professors (Academe, "Does Collegiality Count?" 6:37-40; 2001). Finally, four national studies that one of the authors conducted placed collegiality as the fourth most important factor among department chairs across the nation (Cipriano, in press).

While department chairs acknowledge that collegiality is a factor of great importance, little research exists to suggest clarity in the process of identifying how and under what circumstances this factor can be translated into an important decision made long before tenure and promotion, that being who to hire.

Clearly there is a need to address ways to bring clarity and focus to this issue if department chairs and others

In exploratory conversations with colleagues, we have observed that collegiality is becoming a significant issue in departments and universities as a whole.

with important insights about the hiring of personnel are to reap the rewards of difficult decisions generated in the process of recruiting and selecting personnel to fill the ranks of university faculty. Chairs must lead the way in this regard. In exploratory conversations with colleagues, we have observed that collegiality is becoming a significant issue in departments and universities as a whole. The interest of some reflecting the potential value of research that might shed light on the topic was clear and in some instances directly supported with specific questions. Questions were raised regarding the potential value of exploring whether search committee members involved in the hiring process can gain insight about a candidate's perceptions on the value of a "don't-worry-be-happy-why-can't-we-all-just-get-along" frame of mind.

While we know of no magical test

to objectively ascertain how collegial a person is, the authors hoped to better inform the readers about the potential values of exploring new insights related to the topic. We are not suggesting that candidates be given a psychometric assessment such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory or the California Personality Inventory. We are suggesting, however, that there could be universal questions search committee members could ask a candidate that would help to differentiate how collegial a person was, is, and can be.

This seemingly difficult effort to quantify a less-than-objective characteristic presents many significant problems for search committees. Nevertheless, it was clear to us that interpersonal relationships/collegiality (the ability to get along, however defined) has become more important in personnel decisions throughout universities.

Cipriano's finding previously alluded to a series of challenges to departments, search committees, and universities across the country. How can a factor of this level of importance be documented? How can collegiality be operationally defined and objectively measured? How can it be woven into a series of questions to be asked of prospective candidates during the interview process?

Dr. Bob Cipriano is professor and chair of the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies. Dr. Peter Madonia is associate professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, both of Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven, CT. ●



Provide Effective Leadership

Innovative strategies and fresh ideas to advance teaching, scholarship, and service.

From department chairs to provosts, subscribers value the information and insight they find each month in *Academic Leader*. Our own experienced editors, along with contributors from campuses across the country, examine current trends, challenges and best practices, helping to advance teaching, scholarship and service on hundreds of campuses across the country.

***Academic Leader* helps you:**

- Lead and manage change
- Build consensus and promote collaboration
- Promote faculty development
- Set academic priorities
- Champion your programs
- Evaluate faculty effectively and fairly

A must-read publication for:

- Academic Deans
- Department Chairs/Heads
- Provosts
- Academic Vice Presidents
- Others in Academic Leadership Roles

You'll find articles in every issue of *Academic Leader* containing valuable insights and practical advice to help fulfill your institutions' primary missions of teaching and scholarship.

Topics cover such subjects as:

- Curriculum
- Program assessment
- Faculty development
- Pedagogy
- Budgeting
- Leadership methods
- Conflict management
- Promotion and tenure
- Personnel policies
- Adjunct faculty
- Faculty evaluation

Exceptional Value!

12 issues only \$208
Ask about multiple-copy subscriptions. Available in print, online, or both. Choose the online version of *Academic Leader* and enjoy these extras:

- Free access to our full archive of back issues!
- Convenient search capabilities!
- Easy login to your subscription wherever you have a Web connection!

Share this newsletter with your entire staff with a Group Online Subscription. Contact sales@magnapubs.com for more details.

Submission Guidelines:

Please review the author's guidelines at our website or contact the Editorial Department at editor@magnapubs.com or (608) 227-8120.

Don't miss another issue subscribe today! Visit www.magnapubs.com/academicleader



MAGNA

**Magna Publications, Inc.
2718 Dryden Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53704
USA**

www.magnapubs.com