



March 2010

# Commission for Women - CFW Review of UT's Office of Institutional Research Report "Data on Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Termination at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville," undated

Follow this and additional works at: [http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_womiss](http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_womiss)



Part of the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

University of Tennessee Commission for Women. N. D. "CFW Review of UT's Office of Institutional Research Report 'Data on Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Termination at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.'"

This Issues, Proposals, and Recommendations is brought to you for free and open access by the Commission for Women at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Issues, Proposals, and Recommendations by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

Review of "Data on Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Termination at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville -- Office of Institutional Research Report

The report is difficult to understand for several reasons. One, the authors state "It was decided that use of a 'rate' study, as described in Revised Order 14 (now superseded) of HEW would provide a basis for reviewing available data and determining elements which should be included in studies of promotion and tenure proposed to be made on a regular basis." Without more information on superseded Order 14, the reader has very little insight into what procedures were followed. The report assumes the reader understands why anything less than a 20% difference by sex is insignificant. Although such a "cut-off" point appears to be reasonable, a footnote should be provided to explain why it was chosen. Some aspects of the charts are unfathomable without additional footnotes and further elaboration in the narrative portion of the report. For example, Chart I raises various questions. Why are the data summarized from 1974-78 and 1975-78? Why don't the numbers in the 1974-78 summary match the total obtained if the numbers by year (e.g., 1974-75 + 1975-76 + 1976-77 + 1977-78) are summed? The narrative suggests that only individuals on campus in 1974 are included in the analysis. Yet, (Chart 4) there are three women without tenure in 1974 in Business Administration and 4 in 1976. The populations being examined seem to change between and within charts--this is very confusing to the reader.

The figures seem to present a clearer picture than the charts--in part because they summarize across all UTK categories. They should be given wide distribution. They will be more useful if at each data point (Figures II, III-C, III-B, III-A) the N and standard deviation are noted.

#### Key Findings

UTK does not have enough women in many colleges to make comparisons--recruitment of female faculty is imperative.

Figure I graphically demonstrates that there are serious problems in particular units. No tenured women: Agriculture, Biomedical Sciences, Engineering

Tenure granted to women a significant number of years later than to men:  
Architecture, Communications, Liberal Arts: Humanities, Liberal Arts:  
Natural Sciences and Nursing.

Women faculty who are being rewarded apparently do not leave the university. No women faculty members employed in 1974 who received tenure and/or promotion during the period 1974-78 left the university.

Past hiring practices lead to quite different patterns of female and male attrition. Between 1974 and 1978, 45% of the number of male faculty employed in 1974 and 63% of the number of female faculty employed in 1974 left the university. More males than females left due to retirement, "since the preponderance of female faculty members are concentrated well below retirement age."

Employed in 1974/ Not Employed in 1978:

Attrition for males was primarily (61%) from the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor, while for females it was from the Instructor (45%) and Assistant Professor (36%) ranks.

Any subsequent version of the report should explain the role of female instructors on this campus.

Some of the data suggest male/female differentials became worse in 1978-79--this potential problem should be explored.