To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Judith Elaine Fry entitled "Post-Tenure Review: A Study of Policies and Practices at Colleges and Universities in the United States." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Leadership Studies in Education.

Jeffery P. Aper, Ph.D.
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

E. Grady Bogue, Ed.D.

Mary Jane Connelly, Ed.D.

Lloyd D. Davis, Ed.D.

Accepted for the Council:

C. W. Minkel, Ph.D.
Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of the Graduate School

POST-TENURE REVIEW: A STUDY OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES AT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Education Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Judith E. Fry
May 2000

Copyright © Judith E. Fry, 2000

All rights reserved

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated

in memory of my father, Joseph Singleton White,

and in honor of my mother, Theda Rebecca (Taylor) White,

who, as my first teachers,

lovingly taught me many valuable lessons in life

through their words and actions

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the efforts of hundreds of people, this dissertation would not have been completed. Of that number, I want to acknowledge my deep, heartfelt gratitude to the following people:

Dr. Jeff Aper, Dr. Grady Bogue, Dr. Mary Jane Connelly, and Dr. Lloyd Davis, having graciously agreed to serve as members of my committee, provided immeasurable assistance and encouragement in the completion of this dissertation. My deepest appreciation goes to Dr. Aper, chair of the committee, who mentored me through the many phases of the dissertation with remarkable patience, humor, and scholarship combined with a genuine interest in the project and a sincere desire for its successful completion.

Fellow students have played an important role during the pursuit of this dissertation. Among those, I am particularly indebted to Dr. Marc Cutright, who always kept things going with his quick wit, intellect, and passion for higher education, and Dr. Ruth Liu, who was a calming influence with her gentle demeanor, thoughtful scholarship, and quiet enthusiasm for learning. They made the journey more enjoyable and meaningful.

Diane Welch kept the Academic Personnel office at UTC running smoothly when I needed to be away to work on the dissertation. She was also a constant source of encouragement to me through her unwavering

confidence in my ability to complete the dissertation, as was my sister, Virginia Cole, and my brother, Joe White.

Bob, my husband of 37 years, funded this dissertation—everything from purchasing computer equipment to buying postage stamps used in mailing the surveys. He, along with our grown children, Deborah Lones, Robert M. Fry and Patrice Batchelor; and our grandchildren, Danielle Anderson, Taylor Lones and Presley Batchelor have helped keep my feet firmly planted in the here-and-now while working on the dissertation. Without their love and support, this dissertation would never have been completed.

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of faculty performance has been a part of the teaching profession in the United States, and elsewhere, for as long as higher education has existed. It was not until the 1970s, however, when projections about a slowdown in student enrollment prompted a few institutions, concerned about future finances and the number of tenured faculty, to begin what is known today as a system of post-tenure review. The last few years have seen a dramatic increase in the number of public institutions adopting post-tenure review policies.

The purpose of this study was to discover the degree to which the post-tenure review policies and practices at accredited four-year public and private institutions in the United States conformed with the American Association of University Professors' proposed "Guidelines for Considering the Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty" and the "Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review."

Using a self-designed survey instrument that incorporated and adapted the AAUP's guidelines and standards, the chief academic officers and a faculty representative at 372 institutions in 47 states, selected in a random stratified sample, were asked to respond to questions about the policies and practices at their institutions. The overall findings revealed that prior to an

institution's adoption of a policy: (a) Faculty members were given the primary responsibility for the design of post-tenure review policies in terms of setting the criteria for evaluation. (b) Discussions took into account evaluative procedures and elicited convincing data on what the existing procedures failed to address. (c) An analysis of the costs and benefits was not usually conducted. (d) Post-tenure review was not usually set up on a trial basis to be periodically evaluated with respect to its effectiveness.

The findings also revealed that institutions are generally in conformity with the AAUP's "Standards of Good Practice," except for the provision of financial resources to support post-tenure review's faculty development aspect, which in the survey was presented as "new" financial resources. When asked if new financial resources had been designated to fund faculty development, all seven stratified groups studied—chief academic officers, faculty representatives, public institutions, private institutions, research institutions, doctoral institutions, and master's institutions—reported that new funds had not been designated. Of all the groups studied, the only ones showing a significant difference regarding questions about standards were the responses received from chief academic officers compared to faculty representatives.

This study reveals the perceptions of chief academic officers and faculty representatives regarding post-tenure review. Knowing these perceptions can be useful to both groups when formulating or modifying policies and practices at public and private higher education institutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1.	**INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY**	1
	Background for the Study	2
	Statement of the Problem	5
	Purpose of the Study	6
	Research Questions	6
	Significance of the Study	8
	Delimitations of the Study	9
	Limitations of the Study	9
	Assumptions of the Study	10
	Definition of Terms	10
	Organization of the Study	14
2.	**REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**	16
	Introduction	16
	Definition of Post-Tenure Review	17
	Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review	18
	Emerging Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review	26
3.	**RESEARCH METHODS**	33
	Research Questions	33
	Population and Sample	35
	Research Design	37
	Instrumentation	38
	Validation of the Instrument	39
	Procedure	39
	Data Analysis	42
4.	**FINDINGS OF THE STUDY**	47
	Descriptive Data	47
	Major Findings	51
	Summary	122

5. **SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS** .. 126
Summary of Procedures 128
Summary of Findings 130
Implications for Higher Education..... 146
Recommendations for Further Research 152
Summary and Conclusion 153

REFERENCES 155

APPENDIX 160

VITA 186

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Population and Sample of Institutions	37
2.	Type and Level of Institution	50
3.	Tenure Awarded by Type and Level of Institution	52
4.	Tenure Awarded by Type of Institution	52
5.	Tenure Awarded by Level of Institution	53
6.	Institutions with Post-Tenure Review Policies	55
7.	Post-Tenure Review by Type of Institution	55
8.	Post-Tenure Review by Level of Institution	56
9.	Developing a Post-Tenure Review Policy	58
10.	Developing a Post-Tenure Review Policy at Public and Private Institutions	58
11.	Developing a Post-Tenure Review Policy at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions	59
12.	Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review	61
13.	Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review at Public and Private Institutions	62
14.	Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions	63
15.	Years of Post-Tenure Review Policies	65
16.	Years of Post-Tenure Review Policies at Public and Private Institutions	66

17. Years of Post-Tenure Review Policies at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions 66

18. Type of Review 71

19. Type of Review Used at Public and Private Institutions 72

20. Type of Review Used at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions. 72

21. External Documentation Requirement for Post-Tenure Review 74

22. External Documentation Requirement for Public and Private Institutions 75

23. External Documentation Requirement for Doctoral, Research, and Master's Institutions 76

24. Chief Academic Officers' Reported Congruence With AAUP Guidelines 79

25. Faculty Representatives' Reported Congruence With AAUP Guidelines 80

26. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Designed by Faculty" 82

27. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Designed by Faculty" 83

28. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Designed by Faculty" at Public and Private Institutions 84

29. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Designed by Faculty" at Public and Private Institutions 85

30. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Designed by Faculty" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions 85

31. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Designed by Faculty" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions 86

32. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" 88

33. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" 89

34. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" at Public and Private Institutions 90

35. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" at Public and Private Institutions 91

36. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions 92

37. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions 92

38. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" 94

39. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" 95

40. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" at Public and Private Institutions 96

41. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" at Public and Private Institutions 97

42. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions 97

43. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions 98

44. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated 100

45. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated 101

46. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated" at Public and Private Institutions 102

47. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated" at Public and Private Institutions 102

48. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions 103

49. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions 104

50. Responses Received From Public Institutions 108

51. Responses Received From Private Institutions 109

52. Responses Received From Research Institutions 110

53. Responses Received From Doctoral Institutions 111

54. Responses Received From Master's Institutions 112

55. Results of MANOVA for Carnegie Classification and Public vs. Private Institutions 115

56. Results of MANOVA for Public vs. Private Institutions and Respondent Type 116

57. MANOVA Indicating Significant Differences Between the Responses of Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives 118

58. Responses Received From Chief Academic Officers 119

59. Responses Received From Faculty Representatives 121

60. Highest and Lowest Responses 122

61. Responses of Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives to Steps Taken Prior to the Adoption of Post-Tenure Review 138

62. Highest and Lowest Responses (Public and Private Institutions) 142

63. Highest and Lowest Responses (Research, Doctoral, and Master's) 143

64. Differences and Agreement of Responses of Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives 145

65. Highest and Lowest Means of Responses From Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives 146

66. Academic Freedom Addressed 178

67. Academic Freedom Protected 178

68. Post-Tenure Review Is Not a Retenuring Process 179

69. Published Criteria Developed by Faculty 179

70. Faculty Members Conduct Post-Tenure Review 180

71. Primary Purpose Is Not to Make Personnel Decisions 180

72. Primary Purpose Is Faculty Development 181

73. Primary Purpose Is Combination of Personnel Decisions and Faculty Development 181

74. New Financial Resources Designated 182

75. Standards Are Flexible 182

76. Outcome Is Confidential 183

77. Mutually Negotiated Faculty Development Plans 183

78. Formal Appeals Procedure 184

79. Attempt Less Severe Sanctions 184

80. No Dismissal Without Academic Due Process 185

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Evaluations of faculty performance, in one form or another, have been done for as long as teaching has existed as a profession. However, in the early 1970s, private and public colleges and universities in the United States began using a process of evaluating a tenured faculty member's job performance that has become known as post-tenure review. Post-tenure review is defined by Licata and Morreale (1997) as "a systematic, comprehensive process, separate from the annual review, aimed specifically at assessing performance and/or nurturing faculty growth and development" (p. 1).

The fact that post-tenure review goes beyond the scope of typical annual reviews involving salary decisions or student evaluations of teaching has played an important role in its acceptance as an evaluative method, as well as its rejection. Some interested parties in higher education advocate its use for many reasons including its heralded potential for addressing accountability issues, directing faculty development dollars to those in need of improvement and identifying unproductive, tenured faculty members (Bennett & Chater, 1984; Edwards, 1997; Licata, 1986; Licata & Morreale, 1997). Others have criticized this process because of its potential for having a damaging impact on tenure and academic freedom, wasting administrative

and faculty time needed for other important endeavors, and undermining faculty collegiality (Chater & Bennett, 1984; "On Periodic Evaluation" 1983; Reisman, 1986).

Background for the Study

Perhaps no other professional organization in higher education has raised more concerns about post-tenure review than the American Association of University Professors. The AAUP was founded in 1915 as a general association of faculty that went on to formulate general principles about tenure and the appropriate grounds for dismissal of a professor and to establish a committee charged with the investigation of alleged obstruction of academic freedom by administrators of a college or university (*Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education,* p. 139). The group has shown an ongoing interest in all issues affecting tenure or academic freedom. It was this organization, working with the Association of American Colleges (AAC), that helped frame the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure that is cited in numerous policy manuals at institutions throughout the nation. These principles are considered by many persons in higher education to be the definitive statement on tenure and academic freedom (*Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education,* pp. ix-x). It was the AAUP that joined forces with the American Council on Education (ACE) to host a national discussion on post-tenure review in 1982 at the Wingspread

Conference on Evaluation of Tenured Faculty. It is no small wonder that the AAUP would have a vested interest in the continuation of tenure and academic freedom nor that the organization would view post-tenure review as a potentially troubling change in higher education.

Today, it is apparent that the number of institutions adopting post-tenure review is continuing to grow. Wesson and Johnson reported in 1991 that only seven percent of the top public and private research-level institutions in the American Association of Universities (AAU) had tenure review policies that were separate from annual reviews for salary and promotion purposes. A study conducted by Harris (1996) involving institutions in all 10 Carnegie classifications, "Specialized" through "Research" level, found that 61 percent reported post-tenure review policies of some kind.

Along with the dramatic increase in the number of institutions adopting post-tenure review policies has come a shift in the position of the AAUP from one of opposition in the 1980s to one of realistic acknowledgement that many of the faculty members they represent are currently under the regulations of post-tenure review policies and practices at their institutions (*Academe, 1997*). With this in mind, Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure has studied the pros and cons of post-tenure review and prepared a report in which the issues are debated and recommendations made. The report proposes "Guidelines for Considering the Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty" and "Standards for Good Practice in

Post-Tenure Review" (*Academe, 1997,* p. 49-51). Members of the AAUP voted to the accept the report, with minor changes, at the organization's annual meeting in June, 1998.

Since the AAUP recommendations have emerged after many institutions have already established policies and implemented practices of post-tenure review, it raises questions about the types of policies and practices that are currently in place at institutions, their possible impact on academic freedom and on the long-established policies and processes for terminating tenured faculty members. No research exists at this time that compares the standards of the AAUP with the policies and practices of post-tenure review at public and private institutions.

Secondly, although several studies have been conducted that reported the policies and practices of post-tenure review at public institutions and at a combination of public and private institutions, the literature on post-tenure review treating private institutions as a separate and distinct community within higher education is virtually non-existent, except for a few isolated case studies. Licata (1986) suggested that the type of institution needs to be taken into consideration when contemplating the implementation of a post-tenure review policy. Indeed, type of affiliation can and does make a difference between and among institutions. In 1996, twenty-eight state legislatures were discussing the implications of requiring post-tenure review policies for public institutions within their jurisdictions (Licata & Morreale, 1997). Colorado and

Kentucky were expected to have bills on post-tenure review introduced in 1998 (Healy & Schmidt). The 1998 Kentucky General Assembly passed Senate Bill No. 11 encouraging, but not requiring, the development of post-tenure review (D. McGuffey, personal communication, June 12, 1998). Private institutions and their policies and practices are not usually as directly affected by the actions of state legislatures as public institutions.

A third and final aspect of post-tenure review that needs to be addressed came from the suggestions for further research by Wilson (1995) and Harris (1996). Both researchers suggested that further investigations on post-tenure review need to be conducted that include the perceptions of faculty members since a large, representative group of faculty opinions on these issues had not yet been assessed.

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to determine whether the post-tenure review policies and processes already in place at colleges and universities were congruent with the AAUP's recently proposed guidelines and standards and whether institutional policies differed based on the affiliation—public or private or level of institution—research, doctoral or master's; and whether there were differences in the opinions and perceptions reported by two key groups—chief academic officers and faculty members.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this survey study was to describe post-tenure review policies currently in place and to compare the policies and practices on post-tenure review at public and private colleges and universities with the guidelines for establishing a system of post-tenure review and the standards for good practice in post-tenure review proposed by the AAUP. The survey compared the responses received from respondents at public and private institutions to identify which types and levels of institutions had the greatest extent of congruence with the AAUP guidelines and standards and which ones appeared to show a weakening in the protections regarding academic freedom based on the guidelines and standards.

Research Questions

The study addressed the following research questions based on the responses of chief academic officers and faculty members at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions:

1. To what extent does tenure exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?
2. To what extent do post-tenure review policies exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

3. To what extent are public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions developing post-tenure review policies at this time?

4. What group of stakeholders has provided the primary stimulus for the adoption of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

5. To what extent have post-tenure review policies been adopted in the last 5, 10, 15 or 20 or more years at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

6. To what extent are post-tenure reviews performed automatically for faculty members or triggered by other circumstances at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

7. To what extent is supporting evidence from external sources required in the post-tenure review process at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

8. To what extent were the steps reported as taken prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and institutions congruent with the proposed AAUP "Guidelines for Considering the Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty"?

9. To what extent are the current policies and practices at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and universities congruent with the proposed AAUP "Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review"?

10. What are the differences, if any, in the chief academic officers' reported perceptions and the reported perceptions of faculty members on the practices of post-tenure review at public and private institutions?

Significance of the Study

It was not known at the time of this study whether the guidelines and standards for good practice for post-tenure review, published by the AAUP, were consistent with institutional policies. Furthermore, no national studies on post-tenure review had treated the two major categories of higher education—public and private—separately for reporting purposes, although there are differences in the political and economic climates for each type of institution that could have important effects on their policies and practices.

The results of the study are useful in the following ways: (1) to furnish information about the differences and similarities of post-tenure review policies and practices at public and private institutions, (2) to inform administrators and faculty members about the congruence of current policies and practices with the considered opinion of the AAUP, and (3) to provide information for administrators and faculty members who may be called upon

to help design new policies or modify existing ones or who just want to stay informed about what is happening in institutions similar to their own.

Delimitations of the Study

This nationwide study of colleges and universities was delimited in that only six types of Carnegie classification institutions were chosen for the study. They were: (1) Research Universities I, (2) Research Universities II, (3) Doctoral Universities I, (4) Doctoral Universities II, (5) Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I, and (6) Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities II. Although post-tenure review exists at Baccalaureate Colleges I and II, those types of institutions were outside the scope of this investigation. The study was also delimited to include only the perceptions of chief academic officers and a limited number of faculty members (primarily the perceptions of faculty senate/council presidents and chairs). The study did not include the perceptions of post-tenure review stakeholders such as state legislators or members of college and university boards of trustees.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited by its reliance on the perceptions of chief academic officers and selected faculty members to accurately reflect the facts, as they perceived them. It was recognized that these responses to the

questionnaire may have relied on the respondent's memory, rather than a review of policy statements or minutes of meetings, and their recollections may have created a flawed representation of the facts. The study was also limited to the inclusion of the perceptions of chief academic officers and a limited number of faculty members as generally representative of the viewpoints of other administrators and faculty members

Assumptions of the Study

This study assumed that the chief academic officers and faculty members selected for participation in the study would have either firsthand knowledge or access to verifiable information about the establishment of the post-tenure review policy adopted by their institutions and the practices currently being used in the review process.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms were defined:

1. Academic Due Process – Internal procedures used in handling charges that could lead to the dismissal of a tenured faculty member. The tenured faculty members has the right to an adequate statement of the charges, a hearing by peers, legal counsel, to present evidence, to cross-examine witnesses, for a decision to be made based on the hearing, and to appeal a

dismissal (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, p. 255).

2. Academic Freedom – "The right...whereby members of the academic community are protected in the privilege to receive, discover, convey to others, and, as generally described in the [AAC's and AAUP's] 1940 Statement of Principles, to act upon knowledge and ideas" (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, p. 256).
3. Adequate Cause – "A basis on which a faculty member, either with *academic tenure* or during a *term appointment,* may be dismissed. The term refers especially to demonstrated incompetency or dishonesty in teaching or research, to substantial and manifest neglect of duty, and to personal conduct which substantially impairs the individual's fulfillment of his institutional responsibilities" (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, p. 256).
4. Carnegie Classification – The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies all degree-granting colleges and universities in the United States that are accredited by an agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. Colleges and universities are divided into 10 groups depending on the following factors: The stated mission of the college or university,

the extent to which specific levels of degrees are offered and awarded annually in a specified number of disciplines, the extent of restrictions imposed by admissions policies, and the amount of money received annually from federal support. In 1987, the Carnegie Commission gave the following definitions for the types of institutions relevant to this study:

Research Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually $40 million or more in federal support.

Research Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually between $15.5 million and $40 million in federal support.

Doctoral Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award at least 40 doctoral degrees annually in five or more disciplines.

Doctoral Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award annually at least ten doctorate degrees—in three or more disciplines—or 20 or more doctoral degrees in one or more disciplines.

Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 40 or more master's degrees annually in three or more disciplines.

Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 20 or more master's degrees annually in one or more disciplines (Rodenhouse, p. xliv).

5. Chief Academic Officer – The highest-ranking academic official in a college or university. The primary responsibility of this position is to deal with academic issues. Typical titles for this position are: Vice President or Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Provost, or Dean of the Faculty.

6. Post-Tenure Review – The formal, periodic, systematic, comprehensive evaluation of the job performance of tenured faculty members.
7. Tenure – "An arrangement under which faculty appointments in an institution of higher education are continued until retirement..., subject to *dismissal* for *adequate cause* or unavoidable termination on account of financial exigency or change of institutional program" (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, p. 256).

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 presents the introduction and background to the study, statement of the problem, research questions, purpose of the study, significance of the study, delimitations of the study, limitations of the study, assumptions of the study, definition of terms, and organization of the study. Chapter 2 reviews the relevant literature and is divided into three sections including sections on the definition of post-tenure review, the stimulus for post-tenure review, and emerging guidelines for post-tenure review. Chapter 3 describes the research methods, including the research questions, population and sample, research design, instrumentation, procedure for collection of the data and an analysis of the data. Chapter 4 presents the results of the data analysis. Chapter 5, the final

chapter, provides a summary of the findings of the research, presents some conclusions drawn by the researcher and recommends some areas of post-tenure review needing further study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of Chapter 2 is to examine the literature on post-tenure review regarding its definition, the primary stimulus for adoption, and the emerging guidelines concerning its use.

Introduction

Faculty evaluation is as old as higher education in the United States. However, in the 1970s changes in higher education brought about a new formal system of faculty evaluation known today as post-tenure review. The impetus for the change to a more comprehensive system of evaluation can be traced to the transition of higher education from a time of plenty in the 1960s to a time of conservative administration during the 1970s. A conservative approach was thought to be needed to handle the projected problems associated with lower student enrollment and in meeting the financial obligations of institutions relative to the number of tenured professors and the cost of buildings constructed during the expansion years of the 1960s. Although the lower student enrollment did not materialize to the extent predicted, other problems did emerge over the decades.

One of the problems facing higher education in recent decades has been the growing perception by the public that academic tenure protects

incompetent and unproductive faculty members and that it is a guarantee of lifetime employment—a condition not usually encountered in other professions outside the federal judiciary (Bennett, 1994; Bérubé, 1996; Gilliland, 1997). Increasingly, post-tenure review policies have been adopted at institutions in an effort to assure outside stakeholders that the job performance of tenured faculty members is being systematically evaluated and that tenure does not protect incompetent or unproductive faculty members, nor does it guarantee lifetime employment if there is justifiable cause for dismissal.

From the 1970s to the 1990s, issues related to tenure, academic freedom, accountability, and faculty evaluation have been debated at length and research and experience have contributed to a greater understanding of the term "post-tenure review" as well as the emergence of guidelines for establishing and maintaining effective post-tenure review policies and practices.

Definition of Post-Tenure Review

While many institutions in the 1970s had adopted some form of evaluation process for tenured faculty members, a consensus on its definition had not been reached. Bolden (1979) found that none of the institutions he studied specifically mentioned the use of post-tenure evaluations in their faculty handbooks and that the criteria for evaluation could be applied in like manner to tenured and non-tenured faculty members. Bolden's research in

1979 points to the need for a formal, generally accepted definition of post-tenure review such as those given by Edwards, Applbaum, and Licata and Morreale. Edwards (1997) defines post-tenure review as "evaluations of a tenured faculty member conducted some years apart and focused on long-term or 'career-trajectory' performance rather than year-by-year or short-term achievements" (p. 26). Applbaum (1997) defines post-tenure review as "a formal, periodic review of tenured faculty for the primary purpose of ensuring continued faculty vitality and development" (p. 4). Licata and Morreale (1997) referred to post-tenure review as "a systematic, comprehensive process, separate from the annual review, aimed specifically at assessing performance and/or nurturing faculty growth and development" (p. 1).

Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review

Originally, the primary stimulus for the adoption of a formal post-tenure review policy came from administrators and boards of governors, trustees, or regents with the underlying reason emanating from concerns about the future financial stability of the institution. An example of this is found in the accounts of its adoption at Coe College and at St. Lawrence University.

Like other institutions of higher education in the 1970s, Coe College and St. Lawrence University were coming out of the "golden years" of the 1960s when unprecedented numbers of students enrolled in classes producing the need for new buildings and the hiring of more professors, many

of whom were on the tenure track. As the growth rate in student enrollment began to slow across the nation, the ability of faculty members to move to other institutions in search of better employment diminished. Many tenured and tenure-track faculty members hired during the booming time of the 1960s would remain indefinitely at their current institutions, creating tenured up departments and future long-term salary obligations on their institutions.

Prompted by the seriousness of concerns raised by the presidents and board of trustees regarding the projected financial situation and by the threat of tenure quotas, faculty members at Coe College, a private institution in Iowa, adopted a formal evaluation process for the evaluation of tenured faculty members in 1973. The policy called for comprehensive evaluations of all faculty members (with a few exceptions) to occur every five years and the presentation of a 10-year development plan by the faculty member. The results of the evaluations could not lead automatically to the dismissal of the faculty member (Chait & Ford, 1982).

Likewise, faculty members at St. Lawrence University, a private institution in New York, adopted a "Continuing Evaluation" policy in 1977. The plan called for automatic reviews every four years. However, if the job performance of a faculty member was found to be deficient, and if the deficiency was not corrected in a reasonable amount of time, the dean was authorized to seek a review that could lead to dismissal for cause (Chait & Ford, 1982).

Not only were private institutions affected by the transformation occurring in higher education from the 1960s to the 1970s, but public institutions were also affected by current and projected financial problems, as well. In 1971, a report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education had warned that two-thirds of all institutions had financial problems, and concern about the increasing costs of public higher education caused state legislatures to direct their interest toward investigating how faculty members used their time (Seldin, 1980). It was during these years of the 1970s that some public institutions, including the University of Connecticut and the California State University System, adopted policies on post-tenure review (Licata & Morreale, 1997).

At this point, the primary reason for post-tenure review began to shift from an individual campus issue, concerned with the financial stability of institutions, to a national issue concerned with the quality of higher education and public trust, accountability and productivity. In 1982, the agenda of the National Commission on Higher Education Issues, a group of 57 college presidents, other educators, and business leaders appointed by ten presidential associations of higher education met to discuss improving educational quality and strengthening public trust. One of the topics of discussion for the Commission under "Assuring Standards in Higher Education," was "Tenure and Post-tenure Evaluation." At the close of the meeting, the group recommended the following:

> Campus academic administrators, working closely with appropriate faculty committees, should develop a system of post-tenure evaluation. The process should provide for periodic peer-group reviews to assure that the tenured faculty has maintained the appropriate level of competence and is performing at a satisfactory level. When equitable procedures identify faculty members of "demonstrated incompetency," the administration and faculty's responsibility is to see that the particular problem is remedied and not glossed over. Incompetent faculty members must not be protected at the expense of the students or the maintenance of quality (National Commission on Higher Education Issues, 1982, p. 18).

In 1983, a Wingspread Conference entitled, "On Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty," sponsored jointly by the Johnson Foundation, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), was held. After two days of discussions, approximately 40 attendees agreed that the issues raised by the National Commission regarding post-tenure review were important and that they needed further consideration. The consensus of the Wingspread participants was: (a) They, too, like the Commission were committed to academic tenure and academic freedom; (b) Institutional assessments of academic programs, departments, and schools should be regularly performed; (c) Evaluations of the

performance of faculty members should be done on a continuing basis; (d) Many forms of evaluations of faculty members are currently performed; and (e) Results of the evaluations should not lead to dismissal without first trying to remedy the situation, and dismissals should only be undertaken using procedures of academic due process (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 1983).

Three months later, the AAUP's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure published a report confirming the committee's opposition to post-tenure review based on the belief that it would bring little benefit for the expenditure of faculty time, money, and its impact on creativity and professional relationships. The committee also reiterated the point that decisions emanating from the reviews should not be used as grounds for dismissal (AAUP, 1983, p. 14a).

While debate on the issue continued, some institutions chose to go ahead with plans for adopting post-tenure review policies during the 1980s. Among the earliest institutions enacting policies, for which there are published records of their procedures and outcomes, are the University of Hawaii, Manoa and the University of Colorado System.

The University of Hawaii, Manoa, began post-tenure review in 1987 following a decision by the Hawaii State Supreme Court that had been working its way through the courts for five years. In 1986, the Court upheld the right of the Board of Regents to implement a policy on the periodic review of tenured faculty members (Goodman, 1990). The adoption of the policy at

Manoa was motivated by three major conditions: "Declining budgets," "federally mandated uncapping of the retirement age for college and university faculty," and increasing "public calls for accountability" (Goodman, 1994, pp. 83-84).

Efforts to enact a group of policies at the University of Colorado related to tenure in the early 1980s, including post-tenure review, were led by the President and supported by the Board of Regents, according to Wesson and Johnson (1991). No mention is made in their report to the regents as to why the president sought the adoption of a post-tenure review policy at that time.

The adoption of post-tenure review policies has escalated in recent years, particularly at public higher education institutions. Whereas Wesson and Johnson (1991) reported that 6 percent of the institutions in the American Association of Universities (AAU) in 1989 had post-tenure review policies, Harris (1996) reported post-tenure review policies in effect at 61.1 percent of the institutions in a nationwide study with another 8.8 percent of institutions in the policy development stage.

Some of the same factors driving its adoption in the 1970s and 1980s have continued into the 1990s. According to Edwards (1994) budget cuts, the end of a mandatory retirement age for faculty members, and intensifying demands from persons outside the institution for more accountability on the part of higher education institutions are motivating factors for the adoption of post-tenure review policies.

The increase in the number of institutions adopting post-tenure review in the 1990s is attributable, in part, to the demand by the public and legislators for more accountability in higher education leading some states to enact post-tenure review legislation. In 1996, the South Carolina General Assembly passed Bill 1195 linking post-tenure review to state appropriations for public higher education institutions (T. Mathis, personal communication, June 30, 1998). In 1998, the University of South Carolina adopted its first comprehensive post-tenure review policy (Basinger, 1998). Lawmakers in Texas passed Senate Bill 149 in 1997 requiring governing boards at all public higher education institutions to establish comprehensive performance evaluation procedures for all tenured faculty members (B. Bullock, personal communication, May 28, 1998). In the year preceding this action by the legislature, the Board of Regents for the University of Texas System approved a requirement for tenured faculty members to undergo post-tenure review every five years (Magner, 1996).

Not all policies, however, have been adopted because of pressures brought by administrators, boards, or legislatures. Edwards (1994) cites the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Kentucky, a public institution, as an unusual example of faculty motivation in the adoption of post-tenure review policies. He states that the policy adopted there was "unique because it was UK's faculty that decided to implement it", absent directives from governing boards or top administrators (p. 7). Licata and Morreale (1997) mention the private institutions of Texas Christian University,

Northland College, Pacific Lutheran University and Ithaca College as examples of institutions that were influenced to adopt post-tenure review policies through internal motivators.

Of course, it is one thing for state legislators, boards, and administrators to demand that an institution adopt a post-tenure review policy and quite another for an institution to go through the process of establishing and adopting a policy that will stand the test of time and be deemed successful by those who must participate in its implementation and practices.

Fifteen years of debate on the issues regarding post-tenure review and the experience of institutions adopting policies in the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s have contributed to the emerging guidelines for the establishment and practice of post-tenure review. Among the contributors to the literature is the AAUP, a faculty organization once known as a formidable opponent of post-tenure review. The organization recently published "Guidelines for Deciding Whether or Not to Establish a Formal System of Post-Tenure Review" and "Minimum Standards for Good Practice If a Formal System of Post-Tenure Review Is Established" to assist its members and others who are serving at institutions with post-tenure policies or at institutions that are considering the establishment of a policy (AAUP, 1998, p. 66).

The knowledge gained from these years of experience has produced the following emerging guidelines for post-tenure review.

Emerging Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

Demonstrating Institutional Commitment

When post-tenure review is introduced at an institution, research suggests that it is important that the administration demonstrate commitment to post-tenure review (Licata, 1986). The perception of commitment may be demonstrated through various actions including the provision of training for administrators and faculty members who are participants in the review process and financial support. The research of Harris (1996) suggests that persons involved in conducting the review process need to designate time toward training for their roles, as well as, planning for and following up on numerous procedural issues (Licata & Morreale, 1997). Institutions also need to consider their commitment to financial support for post-tenure review. Bolden (1979), who was among the earliest researchers, and was quick to point out that faculty members receiving poor evaluations needed financial resources to assist them in improving their job performance. Goodman's evaluation of outcomes for post-tenure review at the University of Hawaii, Manoa, in 1994 is supportive of Bolden's assessment. Years of research have confirmed Bolden's earlier findings and have expanded the linkage of financial support and post-tenure review to cover not only poor performers but also faculty members with excellent records (AAUP, 1998; Bennett & Chater, 1984; Harris, 1996; Licata (1986); Portch, 1993; University of Wisconsin Board of Regents, 1992; Wesson & Johnson, 1991).

Designing Effective Reviews

The first step in designing a post-tenure review policy and process is to decide on the purpose of the review; whether it is to be used as a faculty development tool or to provide information for personnel decisions such as merit increases in salary. Secondly, agreement must be reached on who will be primarily responsible for designing the procedures—the faculty, administrators, or both.

Reisman (1986) found that for the 26 institutions selected for his study, performance reviews that were formative—that is, using the reviews as a tool for faculty development in assisting poor performers or recognizing merit in excellent performers—are more compatible with the academic culture than summative reviews that incorporate salary and personnel decisions into their structures. Many scholars would agree with Reisman that the emphasis of post-tenure review should be developmental (AAUP, 1998; Bolden, 1979; Bennett & Chater, 1984; Edwards, 1997; Harris, 1996; Portch, 1993; University of Wisconsin Board of Regents, 1992; Wesson & Johnson, 1991).

Once the purpose has been determined, that purpose should be clearly articulated to everyone involved in the review process according to Licata and Morreale (1997) and the entire review process should be built upon that purpose (Licata, 1986).

Arguments have been made for "triggered" reviews for poor performers as well as "blanket" or "automatic" reviews for all tenured faculty members.

Many policies call for automatic reviews for all tenured faculty members in an effort to avoid attaching a negative stigma to post-tenure review. Edgerton (1993) explains that automatic reviews are used to ensure the productivity of all faculty members, to provide evaluations for those who evaluate others, and to permit everyone to participate in the benefits of reviews. Edwards (1994, 1997) supports triggered reviews for poor performers on the basis of conserving faculty time. He contends that it is not necessary to review all faculty members in an effort to identify poor performers since they are already known to their departments.

Guidelines concerning who should be responsible for the design, once the purpose has been determined fall into two groups—those who think that faculty and administrators should have shared responsibility for its design and those who think that the faculty should have primary responsibility. Bennett and Chater (1984), Johnson (1990), Licata (1986), and Licata and Morreale (1997) contend that the design of post-tenure review should be a shared responsibility between faculty and administrators. Certainly, administrators need to be involved in the design, but Edwards (1997) and the AAUP (1998) insist that faculty members should have the primary responsibility for its design. Edwards (1997) asserts that "Post-tenure review should be constructed as a faculty-owned, faculty-driven, and mainly faculty-operated system" (p. 29).

In addition to other guidelines for the design of post-tenure review, the AAUP (1998) asserts that the door leading to abuses of academic freedom may be opened through post-tenure review procedures. Therefore, the organization insists that the review should ensure the protection of academic freedom by not going so far as to make it a revalidation of tenure or by allowing successive negative reviews to lead to the dismissal of a faculty member without investigating other less severe sanctions or without the institution being held accountable for meeting the standard of dismissal for adequate cause through the use of formal academic due process.

Setting Standards for Evaluation

Researchers of post-tenure review have not established criteria for evaluating individual faculty performance within a department or an institution at this time, but their efforts have resulted in some agreement on the elements for creating and maintaining a positive atmosphere in which the criteria set by faculty members and academic departments can be judged.

Research suggests that prior to the review of a faculty member, the criteria for assessing job performance should be clearly defined and agreed upon by faculty and administrators (Licata, 1986; Wesson & Johnson, 1991). According to Licata (1986) and the AAUP (1998), the criteria should be flexible to incorporate individual differences as disciplines change and faculty members go through various stages of career development. It is also important for faculty members to be made aware of the criteria on which they will be judged according to Wesson and Johnson (1991). Bennett and Chater

(1984) called for these criteria to be clearly articulated and disseminated to all faculty members while the AAUP (1998) suggested the need for the criteria to be revisited periodically for revisions.

The guidelines for establishing quality job performance indicate that multiple sources of documentation should be used by faculty members according to Bennett and Chater (1984) and Licata (1986). Wesson and Johnson (1991), however, recommend that when there is some disagreement about the faculty member's job performance, external reviews should not only be permitted but required.

Providing Effective Feedback

Bennett and Chater (1984) were among the first to suggest that feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of a faculty member's job performance should be provided to the faculty member following a post-tenure review, and plans to correct any problems or increase good performance should be developed. Wesson and Johnson (1991) added that feedback should be given through conferences with the dean and/or the post-tenure review committee accompanied by written reports and recommendations.

If deficiencies are identified and formal plans for correcting them are formulated, the plans should be the result of mutual negotiations between the faculty member and the department head and should be in written form according to Goodman (1994) and the AAUP (1998). Goodman (1994) also suggests that timelines should be set along with an annual review to measure

the progress of the faculty member toward completion of the activities and objectives of the plan.

Taking into consideration that many public institutions are governed by laws granting public access to documents, Bennett and Chater (1984) and the AAUP (1998) recommend that the outcome of evaluations remain as confidential as possible, within the law, between the faculty member being evaluated and persons at the institution involved in the review. Once feedback has been given, the AAUP (1998) recommends that the faculty member should be permitted to appeal the outcome of negative reviews, if desired, through established procedures.

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Post-Tenure Review

Although researchers have pointed to the need for procedures to determine the effectiveness of post-tenure review policies in accomplishing its goals (Johnson, 1990; Licata & Morreale, 1997), few guidelines have been developed to assess effectiveness. In evaluating the effectiveness of a program at the University of Hawaii, Manoa, Goodman (1994) reported the number of poor performers who had successfully completed developmental plans for improvement, accepted other positions, or retired as a result of post-tenure review. Edwards (1997) agreed with the Goodman approach and asserted that the effectiveness of policies could be judged by the number of poor performers who have either "been helped to return to full productivity" or have changed jobs or retired as a result of post-tenure review (p. 31). The AAUP (1998) concept of effectiveness goes beyond the idea of reporting the

effectiveness of post-tenure review on the basis of improvements made by faculty members. In addition to that measure, the organization recommends including a report on the amount of time spent by persons involved in the review process and whether the reviews were maintained as separate entities from formal disciplinary measures.

Scant research exists on evaluating the effectiveness of post-tenure review. However, as many post-tenure review policies and practices that are now in early or developmental stages reach maturity, it is expected that the development of criteria for judging the effectiveness of policies and practices will be an area of continued research.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of Chapter 3 is to present the methods used to carry out the study by listing the research questions and describing the following: (1) the population and sample, (2) the research design, (3) the survey instrument, (4) the validation process, (5) the collection of the data, and (6) the statistical methods used for analyzing the data.

Research Questions

The study examined the following questions:

1. To what extent does tenure exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?
2. To what extent do post-tenure review policies exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?
3. To what extent are public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions developing post-tenure review policies at this time?
4. What group of stakeholders has provided the primary stimulus for the adoption of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

5. To what extent have post-tenure review policies been adopted in the last 5, 10, 15 or 20 or more years at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

6. To what extent are post-tenure reviews performed automatically for faculty members or triggered by other circumstances at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

7. To what extent is supporting evidence from external sources required in the post-tenure review process at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

8. To what extent were the steps reported as taken prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and institutions congruent with the proposed AAUP "Guidelines for Considering the Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty"?

9. To what extent are the current policies and practices at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and universities congruent with the proposed AAUP "Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review"?

10. What are the differences, if any, in the chief academic officers' reported perceptions and the reported perceptions of faculty members on the practices of post-tenure review at public and private institutions?

Population and Sample

The population for the study was composed of all accredited higher education institutions included in the *1997 Higher Education Directory* having The Carnegie Foundation's classification of Research Universities I and II, Doctoral Universities I and II, and Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I and II. The *Directory* listed 742 institutions belonging to one of these six classifications.

The sample size was chosen based on the recommendations of Krejcie and Morgan (1970) who suggest using a simple random sample size of 248 for a population of 700 (35.43 percent) and 254 for a population of 750 (33.87 percent). Interpolating from these figures, a population of 742 should have a sample size of approximately 253 (34 percent). However, this study would use a stratified random sample that would report information in six subgroups based on the affiliation of the institution (public or private) and on the Carnegie classification of the institution (research, doctoral, or master's), the sample would need to be larger to ensure that enough data are captured for meaningful comparisons. Therefore, I decided to increase the sample size to 372 (50.1 percent of the population) so that no portion of the stratified sample would fall below 40 percent of its segment in the population.

This was accomplished by first stratifying the sample into groups that were disproportionate to the population. Based on the institution's designation as a public or private institution, half of the selected institutions

would be from the public sector and half would be from the private sector. One hundred eighty-six public institutions would be included in the sample, representing 45.14 percent of the population of 412 public institutions. Private institutions would account for 186 of the institutions in the sample, representing 56.36 of the population of 330 private institutions.

Secondly, the sample was further stratified on the basis of three Carnegie classifications—research, doctoral, and master's—selecting an equal number of public and private institutions from each of the classifications. However, since there are more public research, doctoral and master's institutions than their counterparts in the private sector, this process yielded a sample in which public and private research, doctoral, and master's institutions were disproportionate to their true representation in the population. The disproportionately stratified sample helped to ensure that even the smallest strata of the population (private research and private doctoral institutions) would be represented in the study.

Using Fraenkel and Wallen's (1996) Table of Random Numbers, a stratified random sample of 372 institutions was selected from the population of 742 institutions. Table 1 shows the population and percentage of institutions in the stratified sample.

Table 1. Population and Sample of Institutions

	Population	Sample	Percentage
Public Research	85	35	41.2
Public Doctoral	62	30	48.4
Public Master's	265	121	45.7
Private Research	40	35	87.5
Private Doctoral	45	30	66.7
Private Master's	245	121	49.4
Total	742	372	50.1

Research Design

The study was designed to use a self-administered cross-sectional survey approach to collect information about post-tenure review from the chief academic officers and faculty representatives at randomly selected public and private research, doctoral, and master's institutions at a particular point in time. The information was collected using a mailed survey. Frankel and Wallen (1996) advise using mailed surveys when their use will allow the researcher to have the advantages of being able to reach a large number of individuals that might not otherwise have been available for an interview, to give participants time to think carefully about their answers before responding to the questions, and to utilize a reasonably inexpensive method of collecting the information. The research design also assured anonymity of the respondents and their institutions.

An overall minimum response rate of 70 percent was considered adequate for the purpose of establishing generalizability of the opinions of the respondents included in the sample to those of the population from which they were drawn.

Instrumentation

The self-designed survey instrument (Appendix A3, p. 165) used in this study was based on the proposed standards identified in 1997 by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) as important criteria for the design and implementation of an effective post-tenure evaluation system. The four-page instrument was divided into three sections. The first section of the instrument, "Section A. General Information," collected information about the institution using a mixture of categorical scales of "yes/no" and the respondent's answers to multiple choice questions to establish the institution's current status of involvement in post-tenure review. The second section, "Section B. Establishment of Your Institution's Review Policy," collected information about the establishment stage of the institution's post-tenure review policy using questions requiring a multiple choice response or a multiple choice and fill-in-the-blank response. The third section, "Section C. Policies and Practices of Post-Tenure Review," collected information about the institution's post-tenure review policies and practices using Likert-type rating scales of "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" to indicate the respondent's opinion of the extent to which the factors listed

exemplified the policies and practices of post-tenure review at his or her institution.

Validation of the Instrument

Before finalizing the survey's format, questions and scales, a panel of experts (Appendix A8, p. 173) reviewed the proposed questionnaire and recommended several useful modifications that were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire. This review helped establish face validity and improved the format as well as the content and clarity of the questions.

Procedure

Before the actual research for this study could begin, The University of Tennessee required the researcher to obtain approval for the research from the UT Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. The Board reviewed proposed research to ensure that the research would be conducted according to established guidelines that protected the participants' rights and met the definition of "informed consent." Anonymity of the participants was preserved through reporting group data instead of individual responses (Appendix A1, p. 162).

Once approval was received to conduct the research, I began the process of compiling the names of the current chief academic officers and the faculty/senate president or chair at each institution selected for the study in an effort to increase the likelihood that more chief academic officers and faculty

representatives would choose to participate in the survey if they received individually addressed letters requesting their participation.

I received the individualized names, titles and addresses by faxing a request for verification of the information to each college or university selected for participation in the study. Faxes were sent over a period of time from February 10 to February 21, 1998, to the campus fax number listed in the *1997 Higher Education Directory* (Appendix A2, p. 164). Responses verifying or modifying the information were received from 208 institutions by March 6, 1998. The remaining 164 institutions for which I had no fax number or from which I had received no response to the request for verification by fax were called by telephone between March 7 and March 20, 1998.

The information obtained by fax and telephone was keyed into a database used for mailing the survey. The few remaining institutions for which I was not able to determine the current office holders were keyed into the database using the chief academic officer's name listed in the *Directory*. In these cases, two cover letters and surveys were sent to the person listed in the *Directory* with a request to pass along one cover letter and survey to the faculty council/senate president or chair or another appropriate representative (Appendix A5, p. 170).

The surveys were color-coded—light gray for chief academic officers and light beige for faculty council/senate presidents and chairs. Each survey was also coded with an identifying number (1 – 372 for chief academic officers and 1001 – 1372 for faculty representatives) to identify the Carnegie

classification of the institution and to track responses if a second mailing to the potential respondent was needed.

A cover letter was prepared using the selected individual's name, title and campus address to accompany each survey (Appendix A4, p. 169). The letter included information on the purpose of the study, requested completion of the survey, described the steps taken to protect the rights of persons who volunteered to participate in the research, and gave instructions for the completion and return of the survey.

Two surveys were sent to each of the 372 institutions included in the study. One survey was sent to the institution's chief academic officer and one to a faculty representative at the same institution. The initial mailing of the cover letter, survey and postage-paid envelope was to 744 persons on April 1, 1998, with a deadline of April 15 for return of the completed survey. Two weeks after the initial mailing, a note was sent to 391 persons who had not already responded requesting that the respondents complete and return the questionnaire (Appendix A6, p. 171). Three weeks after the reminder was mailed, a revised cover letter was prepared, another survey and another postage-paid return envelope was sent to 268 persons who had not returned a completed survey at that time (Appendix A7, p. 172). The new cover letter extended the deadline for returning the survey to May 16. The total time from the initial mailing to the revised deadline was 6½ weeks.

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to perform numerous statistical analyses.

Descriptive statistics of frequencies and percentages were used to summarize the responses to survey items 1 – 8 in Section A and to answer research questions 1 – 7. In addition, chi-square analyses were performed to determine whether there was a significant difference in the frequency of responses given based on the affiliation of the institution (public or private) and by the Carnegie classification (research, doctoral, or master's). A chi-square analysis may be conducted when the researcher wants to compare the frequency of responses to determine if a significant relationship exists between variables.

Survey items 9 – 12, Section B, were used to answer research question 8. The responses were analyzed for congruence with the AAUP's "Guidelines for Considering the Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty" for the group of chief academic officers and the group of faculty representatives by setting a "Yes" response equal to 1.0 and a response of "No" equal to "0." A response of "Yes" was an indication of congruence with AAUP standards. Responses of "Unable to determine" were not included in the analysis. To answer research question 8, means were calculated from responses received from public and private institutions, and means were also calculated from responses received from research, doctoral and master's institutions for each of the survey items 9 – 12. In addition,

each of the research items 9-12 was analyzed using crosstabs and chi-square analyses to determine whether there was a significant difference between the responses received from public institutions compared to those received from private institutions. Crosstabs and chi-square analyses were also conducted comparing the responses received from research, doctoral and master's institutions.

Before an analysis using the responses to survey item 13, Section C was performed to answer research question 9, a reliability test was conducted using SPSS to determine if the 15 parts of the questionnaire item 13 were reliably measuring the same trait. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was used to measure the internal consistency of the responses. A reliability alpha of .7283 was confirmed. According to the American Psychological Association (APA) (1985), a reliability score of .70 is acceptable. The deletion of one or more subparts could have increased the reliability score; however, since the score was within the acceptable guidelines of the APA, I decided to include all 15 parts in the analysis.

For research questions 9 and 10, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed using responses receive to questionnaire item 13. Survey item 13 used a 15 part, Likert-format questionnaire with five possible response options (5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree).

To answer research question 9, MANOVA was used to determine whether there were significant differences in the vector of means for the

responses received from public institutions compared with the vector of means for the responses received from private institutions. Having performed that operation, MANOVA simultaneously compared the vector of means of responses received from research, doctoral, and master's institutions. The interaction of public and private with research, doctoral, and master's institutions was also calculated. A Wilks's lambda statistic was used to determine statistical significance of the difference between the responses of public and private institutions, as well as the statistical significance among research, doctoral and master's institutions and for the interaction effect.

The use of a MANOVA is appropriate, according to Grimm and Yarnold (1998), when the "design involves one or more categorical independent variables and two or more continuous dependent variables" and is a preferred method of analysis when "separate univariate *F* tests can inflate the probability of a Type I error....and more important, it is possible to obtain a significant multivariate effect even though separate ANOVA might indicate that the groups do not differ with respect to any one dependent variable" (p. 15). The appropriate use of MANOVAs assumes the following: "multivariate normality, homogeneity of the covariance matrices, and independence of observation" (Weinfurt in Grimm & Yarnold, 1998, p. 253). Weinfurt posits that MANOVA is robust in the areas of multivariate normality and homogeneity of the covariance matrices, but insists that the independence of observation must not be violated. In this study, the independence of

observation has not been violated because the research design used questionnaires mailed to randomly selected institutions.

To answer research question 10, MANOVA was used to determine whether there were significant differences in the vector of means for the responses received from chief academic officers compared with the vector of means for the responses received from faculty representatives. Having performed that operation, MANOVA simultaneously compared the vector of means of responses received from public institutions compared with the vector of means of responses received from private institutions. The interaction of responses from chief academic officers and faculty representatives with those received from public and private institutions was also calculated. A Wilks's lambda statistic was used to determine statistical significance of the difference between the responses of chief academic officers and faculty representatives, as well as the statistical significance of the responses received from public and private institutions and for the interaction effect.

For added information, the means of responses received to the 15 parts of survey item 13 from each group—public and private institutions; research, doctoral, master's institutions; and chief academic officers and faculty representatives—were calculated and displayed in seven separate tables.

In addition, the frequencies of responses given by chief academic officers and faculty representatives were calculated using a procedure of

SPSS that allowed the responses to be shown for chief academic officers and faculty representatives in the same table for each of the 15 items associated with survey question 13 (Appendix A11, pp. 178-185).

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to gather data from chief academic officers and faculty representatives at public and private higher education institutions regarding the current policies and practices of post-tenure review at their institutions and to compare those policies and practices by type and Carnegie classification to the AAUP's proposed guidelines for considering the establishment of a system of post-tenure review and the organization's proposed standards for good practice in post-tenure review. This chapter presents the findings of the research and an analysis of the data. The results are organized and reported by research question.

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section presents descriptive data about the respondents and their institutions, and the second section presents the major findings of the study. The final section summarizes the findings.

Descriptive Data

Descriptive data were collected from respondents to provide information to formulate a profile for the study. The following section presents the response to the survey by type of respondent (chief academic officer or

faculty representative), type of institution (private or public), and Carnegie classification of institution (research, doctoral or master's).

Survey Response

The study sought to survey at least half of the total population of research, doctoral, and master's degree granting higher education institutions in the United States. A sample of 372 institutions was chosen in a stratified random selection process from a population of 742 institutions (412 public and 330 private). The sample was stratified into groups to ensure that an equal number of public and private research, doctoral and master's level institutions were included in the sample.

Surveys were sent to 35 out of a population of 85 public research institutions (41.2%) and 35 out of a population of 40 private research institutions (87.5%). Thirty out of a population of 62 public doctoral institutions (48.4%) received surveys and 30 out of a population of 45 private doctoral institutions (66.7%) were surveyed. At the master's level, 121 out of a population of 265 public institutions (45.7%) received surveys and 121 out of a population of 245 private institutions (49.4%) were included in the sample for the study. A total of 744 questionnaires were mailed to 372 higher education institutions with two surveys being sent to each of the selected institutions. One survey was sent to the institution's chief academic officer and one to a faculty representative at the same institution.

The sample for this study included institutions from 47 states and the District of Columbia. Responses were received from chief academic officers

in 46 states and the District of Columbia and from faculty representatives in 45 states and the District of Columbia. No institutions were randomly selected to participate in the survey from the states of Nevada, South Dakota or Wyoming. An analysis of responses by state is provided in Appendix A9, pp. 175-176.

Respondent Type

Responses were received from 302 chief academic officers out of 372 included in the survey (81.2%), accounting for 51.7% of the total response. The number of responses received from 372 faculty representatives included in the survey was 282 (75.8%), accounting for 48.3% of the total responses. The overall response to the survey from the 744 surveys mailed was 584 (78.5%).

Public or Private Sector

Respondents were asked to select the designation that best described their type of institution, whether public, private, or private with significant public funding. Responses were received from 302 public institutions out of 372 included in the survey (81.2%) and 282 out of 372 private institutions (75.8%). Public institutions accounted for 302 of the 584 responses received (51.7%), private institutions accounted for 272 responses (46.6%), and private institutions with significant public funding accounted for 10 (1.7%) of the responses received. For the purpose of this study, surveys completed by persons indicating that they were from private institutions with significant public funding were included with the group of surveys from private

institutions, bringing the total responses received from private institutions to 282 (48.3%) compared to 51.7% from public institutions.

Carnegie Classification

Of the 140 surveys mailed to research institutions, 109 (77.9%) were returned completed. Eighty-four surveys were received out of 120 mailed to doctoral institutions (70.0%), and 391 surveys were received out of 484 mailed to master's institutions (80.1%). The total number of responses received was 584 with 109 from research institutions representing 18.7% of the total response, 84 from doctoral institutions (14.4%), and 391 from master's institutions (67.0%). Table 2 shows the total number of responses received from chief academic officers and faculty representatives and the percentage of the total response by type of institution and Carnegie classification.

Table 2. Type and Level of Institution

			Carnegie Level			
			Research	Doctoral	Master's	Total
	Public	Count	59	48	195	302
		Percent	19.5%	15.9%	64.6%	100.0%
	Private	Count	50	36	196	282
		Percent	17.7%	12.8%	69.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	109	84	391	584
		Percent	18.7%	14.4%	67.0%	100.0%

Major Findings

Major findings are presented in association with research questions identified for the study. For each of the research questions 1 – 7 and 9, the data are reported by affiliation of the institution and by Carnegie classification. For question 8, the data are reported by respondent type in addition to affiliation and classification. Question 10 reports the data by respondent type.

Q1. To what extent does tenure exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

Of the 584 responses received, 546 (93.5%) reported that tenure was awarded at their institutions while 38 (6.5%) indicated that it was not awarded at their institutions. Table 3 shows the awarding of tenure by type and Carnegie classification of the institution. A chi-square analysis of public institutions was not conducted because of low cell counts. A chi-square analysis of private institutions revealed that there is significant difference among private research, doctoral and master's institutions (x^2=9.484, df=2, p=<.01).

Table 4 shows that tenure is awarded by 99.3% of public institutions while 87. 2% of private institutions award tenure. A chi-square analysis revealed that there is a significant difference between public and private institutions in the awarding of tenure (x^2=35.118, df=1, p=<.001).

Table 3. Tenure Awarded by Type and Level of Institution

				Award Tenure		
				Yes	No	Total
Public		Research	Count	59	-	59
			Percent	100.0%		100.0%
		Doctoral	Count	48	-	48
			Percent	100.0%		100.0%
		Master's	Count	193	2	195
			Percent	99.0%	1.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	300	2	302
			Percent	99.3%	.7%	100.0%
Private		Research	Count	50	-	50
			Percent	100.0%		100.0%
		Doctoral	Count	29	7	36
			Percent	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
		Master's	Count	167	29	196
			Percent	85.2%	14.8%	100.0%
	Total		Count	246	36	282
			Percent	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%

Table 4. Tenure Awarded by Type of Institution

			Award Tenure		
			Yes	No	Total
	Public	Count	300	2	302
		Percent	99.3%	.7%	100.0%
	Private	Count	246	36	282
		Percent	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	546	38	584
		Percent	93.5%	6.5%	100.0%

Table 5 shows the percentage of institutions awarding tenure by Carnegie level. While 92.1% award tenure at the master's level and 91.7% award tenure at the doctoral level, all the respondents from research institutions indicated that their institutions awarded tenure. A chi-square analysis revealed that there was a significant difference among Carnegie levels of institutions in the awarding of tenure (x^2=9.346, df=2, p=<.01).

Table 5. Tenure Awarded by Level of Institution

			Award Tenure		
			Yes	No	Total
	Research	Count	109	-	109
		Percent	100.0%		100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	77	7	84
		Percent	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	360	31	391
		Percent	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	546	38	584
		Percent	93.5%	6.5%	100.0%

Q2. To what extent do post-tenure review policies exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

Of the 550 participants who responded to the survey question regarding the presence of post-tenure review at their institutions, 255 (46.4%) indicated that their institutions have post-tenure review, and 295 (53.6%) marked that their institutions did not have post-tenure review. Table 6 indicates the presence of post-tenure review policies at a greater percentage of public institutions than private institutions and private research institutions having the least percentage of policies. A chi-square analysis of public institutions revealed no significance difference among research, doctoral, and master's institutions. However, a chi-square analysis of private institutions revealed a significant difference among the three levels (x^2=21.522, df=2, p=<.001).

Table 7 shows that public institutions have a greater percentage of post-tenure review policies than private institutions. A chi-square analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between the two types of institutions concerning the presence of post-tenure review policies (x^2=38.233, df=1, p=<.001).

Table 6. Institutions with Post-Tenure Review Policies

				Have Post-Tenure Review		
				Yes	No	Total
Public	Research		Count	35	24	59
			Percent	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%
	Doctoral		Count	28	20	48
			Percent	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	Master's		Count	113	82	195
			Percent	57.9%	42.1%	100.0%
	Total		Count	176	126	302
			Percent	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
Private	Research		Count	3	47	50
			Percent	6.0%	94.0%	100.0%
	Doctoral		Count	8	22	30
			Percent	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%
	Master's		Count	68	100	168
			Percent	40.5%	59.5%	100.0%
	Total		Count	79	169	248
			Percent	31.9%	68.1%	100.0%

Table 7. Post-Tenure Review by Type of Institution

			Have Post-Tenure Review		
			Yes	No	Total
	Public	Count	176	126	302
		Percent	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	Private	Count	79	169	248
		Percent	31.9%	68.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	255	295	550
		Percent	46.4%	53.6%	100.0%

As shown in Table 8, the percentage of institutions with post-tenure review policies is greater at the master's level than the doctoral. There is also a greater percentage of institutions with post-tenure review policies at doctoral institutions than at research institutions. A chi-square analysis revealed that there is a significant difference in the presence of tenure review policies among Carnegie classifications (x^2=7.586, df=2, p=<.05).

Table 8. Post-Tenure Review by Level of Institution

			Have Post-Tenure Review		
			Yes	No	Total
	Research	Count	38	71	109
		Percent	34.9%	65.1%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	36	42	78
		Percent	46.2%	53.8%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	181	182	363
		Percent	49.9%	50.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	255	295	550
		Percent	46.4%	53.6%	100.0%

Q3. To what extent are public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions developing post-tenure review policies at this time?

Respondents who marked that their institutions did not have a post-tenure review policy were asked to indicate whether a policy was being developed at this time. Two hundred eighty-two respondents completed the question with 84 (29.8%) indicating that their institutions were developing a policy and 198 (70.2%) marking that a policy was not being developed at their institutions. Developmental activities are most prevalent at public research institutions followed by public master's and private doctoral institutions. The least amount of activity in developing a policy is found at private research institutions. Table 9 shows the frequencies and percentages of responses by affiliation and Carnegie level of the institution. A chi-square analysis indicated that there was no significant difference among the numbers of research, doctoral, or master's levels in the public sector or the private sector currently developing post-tenure review policies.

Table 10 shows that public institutions are approximately twice as likely to be in the developmental phase of establishing a post-tenure review policy as private institutions. A chi-square test shows that there is a significant difference between the two sectors of higher education, public and private institutions (x^2=15.485, df=1, p=<.001).

Table 9. Developing a Post-Tenure Review Policy

			Developing Policy		
			Yes	No	Total
Public	Research	Count	13	9	22
		Percent	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	5	15	20
		Percent	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	33	46	79
		Percent	41.8%	58.2%	100.0%
	Total	Count	51	70	121
		Percent	42.1%	57.9%	100.0%
Private	Research	Count	6	36	42
		Percent	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	8	12	20
		Percent	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	19	80	99
		Percent	19.2%	80.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	33	128	161
		Percent	20.5%	79.5%	100.0%

Table 10. Developing a Post-Tenure Review Policy at Public and Private Institutions

		Developing Policy		
		Yes	No	Total
Public	Count	51	70	121
	Percent	42.1%	57.9%	100.0%
Private	Count	33	128	161
	Percent	20.5%	79.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	84	198	282
	Percent	29.8%	70.2%	100.0%

Table 11 shows the responses received, based on Carnegie level of the institution, concerning the development of a post-tenured review policy. Although the previous table indicated that there was a significant difference between public and private institutions, the table shows that there is little difference among varying levels of institutions with approximately 3 out of 10 institutions at each level developing a policy. A chi-square analysis revealed no significant difference in the number of research, doctoral, and master's level institutions currently developing a post-tenure review policy.

Table 11. Developing a Post-Tenure Review Policy at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Developing Policy		
			Yes	No	Total
	Research	Count	19	45	64
		Percent	29.7%	70.3%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	13	27	40
		Percent	32.5%	67.5%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	52	126	178
		Percent	29.2%	70.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	84	198	282
		Percent	29.8%	70.2%	100.0%

Q4. What group of stakeholders has provided the primary stimulus for the adoption of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

The AAUP's proposed "Guidelines for Considering the Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty" began with the following statement.

AAUP Guideline:

- "Consideration of whether or not to establish a system of post-tenure review at a given institution ought properly to take place as a result of campus initiative, rather than legislative, governing board or administrative mandate" (AAUP, 1997, p. 49).

This statement was removed from the wording of the revised and approved "Guidelines" adopted by the AAUP in 1998.

Of 225 valid responses received, 124 (55.1%) identified "Initiatives led by faculty or administrators" as the primary cause; 43 (19.1%) indicated that "Actual or anticipated state legislative action" was the reason for the adoption of a policy; and 58 (25.8%) pointed to "Actual or anticipated governing board action" as their driving force. No private institutions marked "Actual or anticipated state legislative action" as their stimulus. For the purpose of this study, the 28 responses indicating that the participant was "Unable to determine" the primary stimulus for adoption of their institutions' policy were not included in the statistical analysis.

Table 12 shows that five out of six groups (public research and master's institutions and private research, doctoral and master's institutions) were most influenced by "initiatives led by faculty or administrators." Public doctoral institutions pointed most often to "actual or anticipated governing board action" as their impetus for writing a policy. A chi-square analysis of the public sector revealed no significant differences among public institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted for private institutions because of low cell counts.

Table 12. Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review

				Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review			
				Initiatives led by faculty or administrators	Actual or anticipated state legislative action	Actual or anticipated governing board action	Total
Public	Research		Count	19	3	8	30
			Percent	63.3%	10.0%	26.7%	100.0%
	Doctoral		Count	7	8	9	24
			Percent	29.2%	33.3%	37.5%	100.0%
	Master's		Count	37	32	30	99
			Percent	37.4%	32.3%	30.3%	100.0%
	Total		Count	63	43	47	153
			Percent	41.2%	28.1%	30.7%	100.0%
Private	Research		Count	3	-	-	3
			Percent	100.0%			100.0%
	Doctoral		Count	7	-	-	7
			Percent	100.0%			100.0%
	Master's		Count	51	-	11	62
			Percent	82.3%		17.7%	100.0%
	Total		Count	61	-	11	72
			Percent	84.7%		15.3%	100.0%

A chi-square analysis comparing public and private institutions in Table 13 shows that there is a significant difference between the two sectors of higher education relative to the adoption of post-tenure review policies with the private sector (x^2=41.610, df=2, p=<.001). While both sectors have been most heavily influenced by initiatives led by faculty and administrators, the public sector indicates that actual or anticipated state legislative action has been a stimulus for 28.1% of the respondents while respondents from private institutions indicated no influence from this source.

Table 13. Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review
at Public and Private Institutions

			Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review			
			Initiatives led by faculty or administrators	Actual or anticipated state legislative action	Actual or anticipated governing board action	Total
	Public	Count	63	43	47	153
		Percent	41.2%	28.1%	30.7%	100.0%
	Private	Count	61	-	11	72
		Percent	84.7%		15.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	124	43	58	225
		Percent	55.1%	19.1%	25.8%	100.0%

When the responses were examined according to Carnegie level, more than 1 out of 3 respondents at every level indicated that campus initiatives led by faculty or administrators had not been the primary motivation for developing a post-tenure review policy. As Table 14 shows, the least influence from outside forces had been experienced by research institutions (33.3%) followed by master's institutions (45.3%) and doctoral institutions (54.8%). A chi-square analysis revealed no significant difference among the three levels of institutions regarding the stimulus for the development of a post-tenure review policy.

Table 14. Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Stimulus for Post-Tenure Review			
			Initiatives led by faculty or administrators	Actual or anticipated state legislative action	Actual or anticipated governing board action	Total
	Research	Count	22	3	8	33
		Percent	66.7%	9.1%	24.2%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	14	8	9	31
		Percent	45.2%	25.8%	29.0%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	88	32	41	161
		Percent	54.7%	19.9%	25.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	124	43	58	225
		Percent	55.1%	19.1%	25.8%	100.0%

Q5. To what extent have post-tenure review policies been adopted in the last 5, 10, 15 or 20 or more years at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

Of the 250 valid responses to the survey item for this question, over half (n=130, 52.0%) indicated that post-tenure review policies have been adopted in the last five years or less. The other 48.0% have been adopted as follows: Fourteen percent adopted policies between 6 and 10 years ago, 13.2% between 11 and 15 years ago, 8.4% between 15 and 20 years ago and 12.4% have been in existence for more than 20 years. Table 15 shows the years since adoption of the policies by type of institution and by Carnegie level. The cells have been collapsed into three categories because of low cell counts in the 5 categories of the survey. As the table shows, the growth of post-tenure review policies during the last 5 years or less at all Carnegie levels of public institutions is more than the "6-15 years" and the "over 15 years" periods of time combined. A chi-square analysis showed no significant difference among levels of institutions in the public sector. Growth in the private sector shows an increase in the last 5 years, but for private research and private master's institutions, more growth occurred 6-15 years ago than in the last 5 years. A chi-square analysis was not conducted for private institutions because of low cell counts.

Table 15. Years of Post-Tenure Review Policies

			Post-Tenure Review Policy in Effect			
			5 years or less	6-15 years	Over 15 years	Total
Public	Research	Count	21	6	8	35
		Percent	60.0%	17.1%	22.9%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	15	5	7	27
		Percent	55.6%	18.5%	25.9%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	68	26	19	113
		Percent	60.2%	23.0%	16.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	104	37	34	175
		Percent	59.4%	21.1%	19.4%	100.0%
Private	Research	Count	-	2	1	3
		Percent		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	4	3	1	8
		Percent	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	22	26	16	64
		Percent	34.4%	40.6%	25.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	26	31	18	75
		Percent	34.7%	41.3%	24.0%	100.0%

Table 16 indicates that while the number of policies in the public sector has accelerated in the last five years, more policies were adopted by the private sector for the 9-year period of "6 to 15 years" ago. A chi-square analysis revealed a significant difference between public and private institutions in the number of years a post-tenure review policy has been in effect (x^2=14.586, df=2, p=<.001).

When institutions are compared by Carnegie level as shown in Table 17, the data reveal that at every level more than half of the policies have become

Table 16. Years of Post-Tenure Policies at Public and Private Institutions

			Post-Tenure Review Policy in Effect			
			5 years or less	6-15 years	Over 15 years	Total
	Public	Count	104	37	34	175
		Percent	59.4%	21.1%	19.4%	100.0%
	Private	Count	26	31	18	75
		Percent	34.7%	41.3%	24.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	130	68	52	250
		Percent	52.0%	27.2%	20.8%	100.0%

Table 17. Years of Post-Tenure Review Policies at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Post-Tenure Review Policy in Effect			
			5 years or less	6-15 years	Over 15 years	Total
	Research	Count	21	8	9	38
		Percent	55.3%	21.1%	23.7%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	19	8	8	35
		Percent	54.3%	22.9%	22.9%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	90	52	35	177
		Percent	50.8%	29.4%	19.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	130	68	52	250
		Percent	52.0%	27.2%	20.8%	100.0%

effective in the past five years. A chi-square analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in the adoption of policies among research, doctoral or master's institutions.

Q6. To what extent are post-tenure reviews performed automatically for faculty members or triggered by other circumstances at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

The AAUP suggested in the proposed guidelines that each institution must decide, based on several factors including "size, mission, and the needs and preferences of the faculty, as well as on the resources that it can bring to bear in the area of faculty development," its position on some relevant issues that should be addressed prior to the establishment of a policy on post-tenure review (AAUP, 1997, p. 50). Issues and questions to be asked prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy include the following:

AAUP Guideline:

- "Whether the review should be 'blanket' for all tenured faculty or focused on problematic cases" (AAUP, 1997, p. 50).

According to data collected from 255 respondents, the most common procedure for determining who will be reviewed is one of periodic, "automatic" reviews. Reviews that are automatically done accounted for 92.8% of all responses to the question. Included in this procedure was "All tenured faculty" with 88.4% (n=222) of the total response and "All tenured faculty except _____" with 4.4% (n=11) of the total response. Comments made by participants who filled in the blank are as follows, "All tenured faculty except _____":

- administrators—faculty holding administrative appointments.
- those who have gone on to be administrators (deans, registrars, etc.).
- non-teaching administrators.
- those who are administrators.
- administrators (more than half-time administrators).
- administrators/deans.
- those holding administrative appointments beyond the departmental level. They are subject to administrative review until they return to faculty. The administrative review involves faculty.
- full professors.
- (a) those who undergo/satisfy a review for promotion in the same period as post-tenure review; (b) exemptions for "special service, health problems, etc.).
- those applying for promotion or professional advancement.
- those waived by President for being within three years of retirement.

Another procedure, known as "triggered" reviews, is used by some institutions to limit post-tenure review to certain circumstances that can cause

a post-tenure review to be initiated for a tenured faculty member. Triggered reviews were used at 7.2% of the respondents' institutions. Sixteen respondents (6.4%) selected "Only faculty members with a record of poor performance." Two other respondents (.8%) indicated that their institutions chose to review "Only tenured faculty members with a record of poor performance and _____." The blanks were filled in with the following statements:

- those who failed to meet minimum levels of performance.
- those had two out of three consecutive years of unsatisfactory performance.

Four respondents (1.6%) selected the "Other _____" category, three of whom filled in the blank. The following comments were given in this category:

- all tenured faculty who have not received a performance review or promotion for five years.
- only tenured faculty who have applied for faculty merit awards.
- faculty who have selected an alternative to tenure status.

For the purposes of this study, the responses of the four participants indicating "Other _____" were not included in the statistical analysis. Also, for the purpose of analysis, both of the automatic review categories were collapsed into one category, and both of the triggered categories were

collapsed into one category. Table 18 indicates the number of responses received for triggered and blanket types of review. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Although triggered reviews are uncommon, Table 19 shows that they are more prevalent in public than in private institutions with approximately 1 in 9 public institutions using triggered reviews. A chi-square analysis revealed no significant difference between public and private institutions.

Table 18. Type of Review

				Type of Review		
				Automatic	Triggered	Total
Public		Research	Count	32	3	35
			Percent	91.4%	8.6%	100.0%
		Doctoral	Count	23	5	28
			Percent	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
		Master's	Count	103	8	111
			Percent	92.8%	7.2%	100.0%
	Total		Count	158	16	174
			Percent	90.8%	9.2%	100.0%
Private		Research	Count	3	-	3
			Percent	100.0%		100.0%
		Doctoral	Count	8	-	8
			Percent	100.0%		100.0%
		Master's	Count	64	2	66
			Percent	97.0%	3.0%	100.0%
	Total		Count	75	2	77
			Percent	97.4%	2.6%	100.0%

Table 19. Type of Review Used at Public and Private Institutions

			Type of Review		
			Automatic	Triggered	Total
	Public	Count	158	16	174
		Percent	90.8%	9.2%	100.0%
	Private	Count	75	2	77
		Percent	97.4%	2.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	233	18	251
		Percent	92.8%	7.2%	100.0%

As Table 20 shows, automatic reviews are used at more than 1 out of 9 research and master's institutions. Doctoral institutions also use automatic reviews at 1 out of 8 institutions, making more use of triggered reviews than research or master's institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 20. Type of Review Used at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Type of Review		
			Automatic	Triggered	Total
	Research	Count	35	3	38
		Percent	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	31	5	36
		Percent	86.1%	13.9%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	167	10	177
		Percent	94.4%	5.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	233	18	251
		Percent	92.8%	7.2%	100.0%

Q7. To what extent is supporting evidence from external sources required in the post-tenure review process at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

A recent survey conducted by the Carnegie Foundation found that 100% of research institutions, 71% of doctoral institutions, and 25% of master's institutions generally used outside scholars to judge research conducted by faculty members at their institutions (Glassick, Huber, Maeroff, 1997). However, in response to this question, this study found that only 25% of research institutions, 2.8% of doctoral institutions, and 6.9% of master's institutions responding to the survey item require supporting evidence from outside scholars as a part of the post-tenure review documentation. Two hundred forty-seven valid responses were received for this question with 22 respondents (8.9%) indicating that outside documentation is required and 225 respondents (91.1%) marking that it was not required at their institutions. As shown in Table 21, public research institutions rely more heavily on supporting evidence from colleagues who are external to the institution for post-tenure documentation when compared to all other types and levels of institutions. A chi-square analysis conducted for the levels of institutions within the public sector shows a significant difference among levels of institutions (χ^2=13.913, df=2, p=<.01). A chi-square analysis for the levels of institutions within the private sector was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 21. External Documentation Required for Post-Tenure Review

			External Documentation Required		
			Yes	No	Total
Public	Research	Count	9	24	33
		Percent	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	1	27	28
		Percent	3.6%	96.4%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	7	103	110
		Percent	6.4%	93.6%	100.0%
	Total	Count	17	154	171
		Percent	9.9%	90.1%	100.0%
Private	Research	Count	-	3	3
		Percent		100.0%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	-	8	8
		Percent		100.0%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	5	60	65
		Percent	7.7%	92.3%	100.0%
	Total	Count	5	71	76
		Percent	6.6%	93.4%	100.0%

While approximately 9 out of 10 institutions do not require documentation from outside the institution, public institutions are more likely to require it than private institutions. Table 22 shows that 9.9% of public institutions require outside documentation compared with 6.6% of private institutions. A chi-square analysis indicated no significant difference in the documentation requirements of public and private institutions.

Table 22. External Documentation Required at Public and Private Institutions

			External Documentation Required		
			Yes	No	Total
	Public	Count	17	154	171
		Percent	9.9%	90.1%	100.0%
	Private	Count	5	71	76
		Percent	6.6%	93.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	22	225	247
		Percent	8.9%	91.1%	100.0%

Table 23 shows whether outside documentation is required at research, doctoral and master's institutions. The data suggest that outside documentation is more likely to be required at research institutions than other levels of institutions. A chi-square analysis of the data revealed that there is a significant difference among Carnegie levels of institutions concerning the requirement for outside documentation (x^2=14.064, df=2, p=<.01).

Table 23. External Documentation Required at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			External Documentation Required		
			Yes	No	Total
	Research	Count	9	27	36
		Percent	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	1	35	36
		Percent	2.8%	97.2%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	12	163	175
		Percent	6.9%	93.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	22	225	247
		Percent	8.9%	91.1%	100.0%

Q8. To what extent were the steps reported as taken prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and institutions congruent with the proposed AAUP "Guidelines for Considering the Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty"?

While the issue of whether to adopt a policy on post-tenure review is still under discussion or before the design stage begins at an institution, the AAUP does not limit the list to the following topics, but suggests that institutions discuss these issues and others:

AAUP Guidelines:

- "[T]he faculty is the appropriate body to take a leadership role in designing additional procedures for the evaluation of faculty peers" (AAUP, 1997, p. 49).
- "Any discussion of the evaluation of tenured faculty should take into account the procedures that are already in place for that purpose....The discussions should elicit convincing evidence on what it is that existing procedures fail to address" (AAUP, 1997, p. 50),
- "Whether a cost-benefit analysis shows that institutional resources can adequately support a meaningful and constructive system for post-tenure review without damage to other aspects of the

academic program and to the recognition of faculty merit...." (AAUP, 1997, p. 50).

- "Any new system of post-tenure review should initially be set up on a trial basis and, if continued, should itself be periodically evaluated with respect to its effectiveness in supporting faculty development and redressing problems of faculty performance, the time and cost of the effort required, and the degree to which in practice it has been effectively cordoned off—as it must be if it is to be constructive—from disciplinary procedures and sanctions" (AAUP, 1997, p. 50).

Congruence with AAUP guidelines for the purpose of this study for each of the four parts listed above was determined by designating a "Yes" response as conformity with the guidelines (equal to 1.0), and a "No" response as non-conformity (equal to 0). Each of the four parts was examined in light of the responses received from chief academic officers and from faculty representatives. The overall responses received from chief academic officers and faculty representatives were very similar, as the following discussion and tables show.

Table 24 indicates the average of "Yes" and "No" responses received from chief academic officers to four of the AAUP guidelines. The mean for having the post-tenure review policy designed primarily by faculty members who served as members of a group that set the criteria for evaluation is .90,

Table 24. Chief Academic Officers' Reported Congruence With AAUP Guidelines

	N	Mean
Designed by Faculty	129	.90
Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures	102	.76
Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated	112	.11
Post-Tenure Review Policy Periodically Evaluated	125	.14

Note: "Yes" response = 1.0, "No" response = 0
Mean=Average of responses

according to the responses of the chief academic officers. The mean for discussing existing evaluative procedures and eliciting convincing data on what the existing procedures failed to address is .76, indicating less congruence with AAUP guidelines than the congruence reported for having faculty design the post-tenure review policy. The last two items, costs versus benefits analyses and having the post-tenure review policy set up on a trial basis to be periodically evaluated with respect to its effectiveness, show a lack of congruence with the AAUP guidelines. For the analysis of costs versus benefits, the mean was .11, and the mean for periodically evaluating the post-tenure review policy was .14.

An analysis of the responses of faculty representatives in Table 25 shows similar results. The mean for having the post-tenure review policy designed by faculty members is .83 according to the responses of the faculty representatives. The mean for discussing existing evaluative procedures is

Table 25. Faculty Representatives' Reported Congruence With AAUP Guidelines

	N	Mean
Designed by Faculty	95	.83
Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures	78	.76
Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated	89	.10
Post-Tenure Review Policy Periodically Evaluated	100	.14

Note: "Yes" response = 1.0, "No" response = 0
Mean=Average of responses

the same as that reported by chief academic officers at .76, indicating less congruence with AAUP guidelines than having post-tenure review designed by faculty members. The last two items, costs versus benefits and having the post-tenure review policy periodically evaluated for effectiveness show a lack of congruence with the AAUP guidelines with a mean for costs versus benefits of .10 and the mean for periodically evaluating the post-tenure review policy at .14, the same figure recorded for the chief academic officers.

The four elements of the question were also examined separately from the perspective of chief academic officers and from the perspective of faculty representatives.

Designed by Faculty

One hundred thirty-nine chief academic officers responded to the first element of this question by indicating whether faculty members had primary responsibility for the design of the post-tenure review policy at their

institutions. Of these, the 10 responses marked "unable to determine" whether faculty members were primarily responsible for the design were not included in the analysis. Of the valid responses, 89.9% indicated that faculty members had primary responsibility in the design of their institution's post-tenure review policy, and 10.1% marked that they did not have primary responsibility for its design.

When the same question was posed to faculty representatives, 123 responded with 18 reporting that they were "unable to determine" whether faculty members had primary responsibility for the design. The 18 responses were not included in the analysis. Of the valid responses, 83.2% indicated that faculty members had primary responsibility for the design of the post-tenure review policy at their institutions while 16.8% marked that faculty members did not have primary responsibility.

As shown in Table 26, according to the report of chief academic officers, it is more likely that faculty members will have primary responsibility for the design of a post-tenure review policy at private institutions than at public institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 26. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Designed by Faculty"

			Designed by Faculty		
			No	Yes	Total
Public	Research	Count	2	15	17
		Percent	11.8%	88.2%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	1	11	12
		Percent	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	9	47	56
		Percent	16.1%	83.9%	100.0%
	Total	Count	12	73	85
		Percent	14.1%	85.9%	100.0%
Private	Research	Count	-	1	1
		Percent		100.0%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	-	3	3
		Percent		100.0%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	1	39	40
		Percent	2.5%	97.5%	100.0%
	Total	Count	1	43	44
		Percent	2.3%	97.7%	100.0%

Table 27 shows the response of faculty representatives to the same question posed to chief academic officers. The faculty representatives confirmed the primary involvement of faculty members in the design of post-tenure review policies. The data suggest that faculty members at private institutions are more likely to be involved as primary contributors than at public institutions, though not to the extent reported by the chief academic officers. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 27. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Designed by Faculty"

			Designed by Faculty		
			No	Yes	Total
Public	Research	Count	1	13	14
		Percent	7.1%	92.9%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	2	9	11
		Percent	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	11	34	45
		Percent	24.4%	75.6%	100.0%
	Total	Count	14	56	70
		Percent	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
Private	Research	Count	-	2	2
		Percent		100.0%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	-	3	3
		Percent		100.0%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	2	18	20
		Percent	10.0%	90.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	2	23	25
		Percent	8.0%	92.0%	100.0%

Table 28, based on the response of chief academic officers, shows that faculty members at private institutions were more likely to have primary responsibility for the design of the post-tenure review policy at their institutions by serving as members of a group that set the criteria for evaluation than their counterparts at public institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell count.

Table 28. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Designed by Faculty" at Public and Private Institutions

			Designed by Faculty		
			No	Yes	Total
	Public	Count	12	73	85
		Percent	14.1%	85.9%	100.0%
	Private	Count	1	43	44
		Percent	2.3%	97.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	13	116	129
		Percent	10.1%	89.9%	100.0%

An examination of the responses of faculty representatives, Table 29, shows that faculty members are primarily responsible for the design of post-tenure review, but not to the extent reported by the chief academic officers. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

The chief academic officers' responses are shown in Table 30 for categories based on the Carnegie classification of institutions. The data suggest that doctoral institutions are not significantly more likely to involve faculty members as the primary designers of post-tenure review policies than research or doctoral institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 29. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Designed by Faculty" at Public and Private Institutions

			Designed by Faculty		
			No	Yes	Total
	Public	Count	14	56	70
		Percent	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	Private	Count	2	23	25
		Percent	8.0%	92.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	16	79	95
		Percent	16.8%	83.2%	100.0%

Table 30. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Designed by Faculty" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Designed by Faculty		
			No	Yes	Total
	Research	Count	2	16	18
		Percent	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	1	14	15
		Percent	6.7%	93.3%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	10	86	96
		Percent	10.4%	89.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	13	116	129
		Percent	10.1%	89.9%	100.0%

According to the data collected from faculty representatives, research institutions are slightly more likely to involve faculty members as the primary designers of post-tenure review policies, as shown in Table 31. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 31. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Designed by Faculty" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Designed by Faculty		
			No	Yes	Total
	Research	Count	1	15	16
		Percent	6.3%	93.8%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	2	12	14
		Percent	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	13	52	65
		Percent	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	16	79	95
		Percent	16.8%	83.2%	100.0%

Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures

The second part of this section of survey questions asked respondents to indicate whether discussions about a proposed policy on post-tenure review at their institutions took into account evaluative procedures that were already in place and elicited convincing data on what the existing procedures failed to address.

The total response from chief academic officers was 138. Thirty-six respondents were "unable to determine" whether the discussions had taken

place. Data for these respondents were not included in the analysis. Of the 102 valid responses, 76.5% indicated that their institutions had examined existing evaluative procedures before establishing a post-tenure review policy and 23.5% did not.

Thirty-five of the 113 faculty representatives were "unable to determine" whether discussions had taken place regarding existing evaluative procedures. Their responses were not included in the analysis. Of the 78 valid responses, 75.6% marked that discussions had taken place and 24.4% indicated that they had not.

Table 32 shows the response of chief academic officers at research, doctoral and master's institutions. The data suggest that institutions most in agreement with this AAUP guideline would be found within public and private research institutions and private doctoral institutions. The least compliant groups would be found within public doctoral and master's institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Faculty representatives gave a slightly different response to that of the chief academic officers concerning discussions about existing evaluative procedures prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy. Table 33 shows that faculty representatives from public research institutions were more likely to discuss existing evaluative procedures prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review than their counterparts at public

Table 32. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures"

				Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures	
				No	Yes	Total
Public		Research	Count	-	12	12
			Percent		100.0%	100.0%
		Doctoral	Count	3	7	10
			Percent	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
		Master's	Count	15	32	47
			Percent	31.9%	68.1%	100.0%
	Total		Count	18	51	69
			Percent	26.1%	73.9%	100.0%
Private		Research	Count	-	1	1
			Percent		100.0%	100.0%
		Doctoral	Count	-	3	3
			Percent		100.0%	100.0%
		Master's	Count	6	23	29
			Percent	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%
	Total		Count	6	27	33
			Percent	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%

Table 33. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures"

			Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures		
			No	Yes	Total
Public	Research	Count	2	10	12
		Percent	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	3	7	10
		Percent	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	10	29	39
		Percent	25.6%	74.4%	100.0%
	Total	Count	15	46	61
		Percent	24.6%	75.4%	100.0%
Private	Doctoral	Count	2	1	3
		Percent	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	2	12	14
		Percent	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
	Total	Count	4	13	17
		Percent	23.5%	76.5%	100.0%

doctoral or master's institutions. No responses were received from faculty representatives at private research institutions. The responses that were obtained from the private sector suggest that discussions are more likely to take place at private master's institutions than at private doctoral institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 34 shows that of the 69 valid responses received from chief academic officers at public institutions, 73.9% reported that their institutions discussed existing evaluative procedures prior to the establishment of a

Table 34. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" at Public and Private Institutions

			Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures		
			No	Yes	Total
	Public	Count	18	51	69
		Percent	26.1%	73.9%	100.0%
	Private	Count	6	27	33
		Percent	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	24	78	102
		Percent	23.5%	76.5%	100.0%

post-tenure review policy while 81.8% of the 33 valid responses from respondents at private institutions reported indicated that discussions were held. A chi-square analysis showed that there was no significant difference between public and private institutions.

Faculty representatives at public and private institutions reported similar results to those reported by the chief academic officers. As shown in Table 35, 75.4% of faculty representative at public institutions and 76.5% of faculty representatives at private institutions indicated that existing evaluative procedures were discussed prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy at their institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 35. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" at Public and Private Institutions

			Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures		
			No	Yes	Total
	Public	Count	15	46	61
		Percent	24.6%	75.4%	100.0%
	Private	Count	4	13	17
		Percent	23.5%	76.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	19	59	78
		Percent	24.4%	75.6%	100.0%

When the question of whether existing evaluative procedures were discussed prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy was examined by Carnegie classification, data from chief academic officers revealed that all of the respondents from research institutions discussed existing procedures compared with 76.9% from doctoral institutions and 72.4% from master's institutions, as shown in Table 36. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Faculty representatives from research institutions also reported a greater percentage of institutions being involved in discussions about existing evaluative procedures than did respondents from doctoral (61.5%) or master's (77.4%) institutions, as shown in Table 37. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 36. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures		
			No	Yes	Total
	Research	Count	-	13	13
		Percent		100.0%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	3	10	13
		Percent	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	21	55	76
		Percent	27.6%	72.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	24	78	102
		Percent	23.5%	76.5%	100.0%

Table 37. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Discussed Existing Evaluative Procedures		
			No	Yes	Total
	Research	Count	2	10	12
		Percent	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	5	8	13
		Percent	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	12	41	53
		Percent	22.6%	77.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	19	59	78
		Percent	24.4%	75.6%	100.0%

Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated

The third of the four questions related to preparations made by institutions prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy asked whether a cost/benefits study had been conducted prior to the adoption of a policy. Responses were received from 140 chief academic officers. Of those, 28 were "unable to determine" whether a cost versus benefit analysis had been conducted at their institutions. Their responses were not included in the analysis, leaving 112 valid responses. Of those respondents, 89.3% indicated that their institutions had not undertaken a study, while 10.7% signified that their institutions had conducted a study.

Of the 114 faculty representatives who responded to the survey, 89.9% checked that a cost versus benefits study had not been conducted at their institutions prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy while 10.1% indicated that their institutions had conducted a study. Twenty-five faculty representatives were "unable to determine" whether a cost versus benefit study had been conducted by their institution. Their responses were not included in the analysis of the data.

Reported in Table 38 are the responses of the chief academic officers. While all respondents at public doctoral institutions reported that a cost versus benefits study had not been conducted at their institutions, private doctoral institutions were split with one conducting a study and the other reporting that a study had not been done. Respondents reported cost/benefit

Table 38. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated"

			Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
Public	Research	Count	12	1	13
		Percent	92.3%	7.7%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	10	-	10
		Percent	100.0%		100.0%
	Master's	Count	45	4	49
		Percent	91.8%	8.2%	100.0%
	Total	Count	67	5	72
		Percent	93.1%	6.9%	100.0%
Private	Research	Count	1	-	1
		Percent	100.0%		100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	1	1	2
		Percent	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	31	6	37
		Percent	83.8%	16.2%	100.0%
	Total	Count	33	7	40
		Percent	82.5%	17.5%	100.0%

studies to be most prevalent at private master's institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted for the levels of institutions within the public or private sectors because of low cell counts.

According to the responses received from faculty representatives, Table 39, cost/benefit studies are most prevalent at private doctoral institutions followed by public research institutions. No responses were received from private research institutions. Approximately 1 out of 10

Table 39. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated"

			Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
Public	Research	Count	12	2	14
		Percent	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	10	1	11
		Percent	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	38	4	42
		Percent	90.5%	9.5%	100.0%
	Total	Count	60	7	67
		Percent	89.6%	10.4%	100.0%
Private	Doctoral	Count	3	-	3
		Percent	100.0%		100.0%
	Master's	Count	17	2	19
		Percent	89.5%	10.5%	100.0%
	Total	Count	20	2	22
		Percent	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%

respondents from public doctoral and master's institutions and from private master's institutions report having conducted a cost versus benefits study prior to the adoption of a post-tenure review policy. A chi-square analysis was not conducted for the levels of institutions within the public or private sectors because of low cell counts.

Table 40 shows the responses of chief academic officers by type of institution, public or private. The responses indicate that cost versus benefit studies were more than twice as likely to be conducted at private institutions

Table 40. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" at Public and Private Institutions

			Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
	Public	Count	67	5	72
		Percent	93.1%	6.9%	100.0%
	Private	Count	33	7	40
		Percent	82.5%	17.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	100	12	112
		Percent	89.3%	10.7%	100.0%

than at public institutions. A chi-square analysis was not performed because of low cell counts.

Data gathered from faculty representatives, Table 41, show that public institutions are slightly more likely to conduct a cost/benefits study prior to adopting a post-tenure review policy than private institutions with approximately 1 out of every 10 institutions conducting a study. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

When the data are examined on the basis of Carnegie classification, the chief academic officers indicate that cost/benefit studies are more likely to take place at master's institutions, as shown in Table 42. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 41. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" at Public and Private Institutions

			Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
	Public	Count	60	7	67
		Percent	89.6%	10.4%	100.0%
	Private	Count	20	2	22
		Percent	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	80	9	89
		Percent	89.9%	10.1%	100.0%

Table 42. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
	Research	Count	13	1	14
		Percent	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	11	1	12
		Percent	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	76	10	86
		Percent	88.4%	11.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	100	12	112
		Percent	89.3%	10.7%	100.0%

Faculty representatives report that a cost/benefit study is most likely to be conducted at research institutions when the data are examined on the basis of Carnegie level, as shown in Table 43. A chi-square analysis was not performed because of low cell counts.

Table 43. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Cost vs. Benefits Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
	Research	Count	12	2	14
		Percent	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	13	1	14
		Percent	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	55	6	61
		Percent	90.2%	9.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	80	9	89
		Percent	89.9%	10.1%	100.0%

Post-Tenure Review Periodically Evaluated

The last guideline for which information was sought from the respondents concerned whether post-tenure review was set up on a trial basis to be periodically evaluated with respect to its effectiveness. Responses were received from 139 chief academic officers. Of those, 14 were "unable to determine" whether the policy had been set up on a trial basis. These responses were not included in the analysis. Of the 125 valid

responses, 86.4% indicated that the post-tenure review policy had not been set up on a trial basis while 13.6% checked that it had not been set up on a trial basis.

Faculty representatives had a total response to the question of 113, but 13 of those respondents were "unable to determine" whether the post-tenure review policy had originally been set up on a trial basis. These responses were not included in the analysis. Of the 100 valid responses, 86.0% indicated that post-tenure review had not been set up on a trial basis with periodic reviews concerning its effectiveness while 14.0% marked that it had been set up on a trial basis at their institutions.

Table 44 shows information gathered from chief academic officers. No responses were received from respondents at private research institutions. The data suggest that public and private master's institutions are more likely to set up post-tenure review policies on a trial basis with periodic reviews than are research or doctoral institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Faculty representatives, when asked whether post-tenure review had been set up on a trial basis at their institutions, indicated that it was least likely to be done at public doctoral and private research institutions, as shown in Table 45, and most likely to occur at private doctoral institutions and public master's institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 44. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated"

			Post-Tenure Review Is Periodically Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
Public	Research	Count	15	1	16
		Percent	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	10	1	11
		Percent	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	49	8	57
		Percent	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	74	10	84
		Percent	88.1%	11.9%	100.0%
Private	Doctoral	Count	2	-	2
		Percent	100.0%		100.0%
	Master's	Count	32	7	39
		Percent	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
	Total	Count	34	7	41
		Percent	82.9%	17.1%	100.0%

Table 45. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated"

			Post-Tenure Review Is Periodically Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
Public	Research	Count	13	2	15
		Percent	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	12	-	12
		Percent	100.0%		100.0%
	Master's	Count	38	8	46
		Percent	82.6%	17.4%	100.0%
	Total	Count	63	10	73
		Percent	86.3%	13.7%	100.0%
Private	Research	Count	2	-	2
		Percent	100.0%		100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	3	1	4
		Percent	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	18	3	21
		Percent	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	Total	Count	23	4	27
		Percent	85.2%	14.8%	100.0%

The data in Table 46 show the responses of chief academic officers based on affiliation, public or private institution. The data suggest that post-tenure review policies are more likely to be set up on a trial basis with periodic evaluations of their effectiveness at private institutions. A chi-square analysis indicated that there is no significant difference between public and private institutions.

Table 46. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated" at Public and Private Institutions

			Post-Tenure Review Is Periodically Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
	Public	Count	74	10	84
		Precent	88.1%	11.9%	100.0%
	Private	Count	34	7	41
		Precent	82.9%	17.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	108	17	125
		Precent	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%

Based on the responses of faculty representatives at public and private institutions, 14.8% of private institutions and 13.7% of public institutions set up their post-tenure review policy to be periodically evaluated. Table 47 indicates the responses of faculty representatives. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 47. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated" at Public and Private Institutions

			Post-Tenure Review Is Periodically Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
	Public	Count	63	10	73
		Percent	86.3%	13.7%	100.0%
	Private	Count	23	4	27
		Percent	85.2%	14.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	86	14	100
		Percent	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%

Table 48 divides the responses of chief academic officers by Carnegie classification of their institutions. The data show that the highest incidence of post-tenure review policies being established on a trial basis with periodic reviews of their effectiveness was at master's institutions. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

The data from faculty representatives indicate that more policies have been set up on a trial basis at research institutions than that reported by chief academic officers and that master's institutions are more likely to set up post-tenure review on a trial basis. Table 49 shows the response of faculty representatives. A chi-square analysis was not conducted because of low cell counts.

Table 48. Chief Academic Officers' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Post-Tenure Review Is Periodically Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
	Research	Count	15	1	16
		Percent	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	12	1	13
		Percent	92.3%	7.7%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	81	15	96
		Percent	84.4%	15.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	108	17	125
		Percent	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%

Table 49. Faculty Representatives' Response to "Post-Tenure Review is Periodically Evaluated" at Research, Doctoral, and Master's Institutions

			Post-Tenure Review Is Periodically Evaluated		
			No	Yes	Total
	Research	Count	15	2	17
		Percent	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
	Doctoral	Count	15	1	16
		Percent	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%
	Master's	Count	56	11	67
		Percent	83.6%	16.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	86	14	100
		Percent	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%

Q9. To what extent are the current policies and practices at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and universities congruent with the proposed AAUP "Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review"?

The following AAUP "Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review" were adapted for the 15-part survey question 13 used in collecting data for research questions 9 and 10.

AAUP Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review:

1. Post-tenure review must ensure the protection of academic freedom as defined in the 1940 *Statement of Principles.*
2. Post-tenure review must not be a reevaluation or revalidation of tenured status as defined in the 1940 *Statement.*
3. The written standards and criteria by which faculty are evaluated should be developed and periodically reviewed by faculty. The faculty should also conduct the actual review process.
4. Post-tenure review should be developmental and supported by institutional resources for professional development or a change of professional direction.
5. Post-tenure review should be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.

6. The outcome of evaluations should be confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate college or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated, released only at the discretion or with the consent of the faculty member.
7. If the system of post-tenure review is supplemented, or supplanted, by the option of a formal development plan, that plan cannot be imposed on the faculty member unilaterally, but must be a product of mutual negotiation....The standard here should be that of good faith on both side—a commitment to improvement by the faculty member and to the adequate support of that improvement by the institution—rather than the literal fulfillment of a set of non-negotiable demands or rigid expectations, quantitative or otherwise.
8. A faculty member should have the opportunity to respond to evaluations and development plans, and if either leads to a negative outcome he or she should have the right to appeal the findings through a grievance procedure that offers the opportunity to correct the record.
9. In the event that recurring evaluations reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that do not lead themselves to improvement after several

efforts, and that call into question his or her ability to function in that position, then other possibilities, such as a mutually agreeable separation settlement or reassignment to other duties, should be explored.

10. The standard for dismissal or severe sanction remains that of adequate cause, and the mere fact of successive negative reviews does not in any way diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause for dismissal in a separate forum before an appropriately constituted hearing body of peers convened for that purpose (AAUP, 1997, pp. 51-52).

A few of the 1997 proposed standards were reworded prior to the adoption of the standards at the June 1998 meeting of the AAUP. However, the changes were minor. The survey used a 5-part Likert-type scale to allow respondents to indicate their opinions of the policies and practices at their own institutions using the following scale: "5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, or 1=Strongly Disagree" for each of the 15 statements associated with one of the AAUP's proposed standards. For congruence with the AAUP standards, each statement needed a mean equal to or greater than 3.01. The following tables, Tables 50 - 54, show the number of responses and the mean for each of the 15 statements by affiliation of the institution, whether public or private and by Carnegie classification, whether research, doctoral or master's level.

Table 50. Responses Received from Public Institutions

		N	Mean
Public	Policy addresses academic freedom	173	3.33
	Practices protect academic freedom	172	4.28
	Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	171	4.01
	Published criteria for evaluation was developed by faculty	172	3.53
	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	174	4.39
	Primary purpose is not to make personnel decisions	173	4.00
	Primary purpose is faculty development	172	3.31
	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	170	3.05
	New financial resources have been designated	174	2.48
	Standards are flexible	174	4.28
	Outcome is confidential	174	4.11
	Faculty development plans are mutually negotiated	171	3.89
	A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review	174	3.94
	Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal	171	4.07
	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	174	4.28

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

Table 51. Responses Received from Private Institutions

		N	Mean
Private	Policy addresses academic freedom	78	3.37
	Practices protect academic freedom	78	4.37
	Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	75	4.01
	Published criteria for evaluation was developed by faculty	77	3.97
	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review.	79	4.35
	Primary purpose is not to make personnel decisions	73	3.84
	Primary purpose is faculty development	74	3.84
	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	73	3.14
	New financial resources have been designated	78	2.76
	Standards are flexible	79	4.32
	Outcome is confidential	79	4.46
	Faculty development plans are mutually negotiated	79	4.01
	A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review	78	3.62
	Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal	75	4.20
	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	76	4.08

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

Table 52. Responses Received from Research Institutions

Carnegie Level		N	Mean
Research	Policy addresses academic freedom	36	3.53
	Practices protect academic freedom	35	4.34
	Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	36	4.39
	Published criteria for evaluation was developed by faculty	36	3.86
	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	37	4.51
	Primary purpose is not to make personnel decisions	36	3.64
	Primary purpose is faculty development	36	3.44
	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	35	3.34
	New financial resources have been designated	37	2.32
	Standards are flexible	37	4.57
	Outcome is confidential	37	3.95
	Faculty development plans are mutually negotiated	36	3.92
	A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review	37	4.27
	Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal	37	4.22
	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	37	4.51

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

Table 53. Responses Received from Doctoral Institutions

Carnegie Level		N	Mean
Doctoral	Policy addresses academic freedom	36	3.25
	Practices protect academic freedom	36	4.22
	Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	36	4.19
	Published criteria for evaluation was developed by faculty	34	3.88
	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	36	4.58
	Primary purpose is not to make personnel decisions	33	3.82
	Primary purpose is faculty development	34	3.44
	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	35	3.14
	New financial resources have been designated	36	2.50
	Standards are flexible	36	4.39
	Outcome is confidential	36	4.36
	Faculty developrnent plans are mutually negotiated	35	4.26
	A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review	36	3.75
	Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal	35	4.26
	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	36	4.53

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

Table 54. Responses Received from Master's Institutions

Carnegie Level		N	Mean
Master's	Policy addresses academic freedom	179	3.32
	Practices protect academic freedom	179	4.32
	Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	174	3.89
	Published criteria for evaluation was developed by faculty	177	3.59
	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	190	4.31
	Primary purpose is not to make personnel decisions	177	4.04
	Primary purpose is faculty development	176	3.48
	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	172	3.01
	New financial resources have been designated	179	2.63
	Standards are flexible	180	4.21
	Outcome is confidential	180	4.25
	Faculty development plans are mutually negotiated	179	3.87
	A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review	179	3.77
	Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal	174	4.06
	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	177	4.09

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

The four statements reflecting the greatest amount of congruence with AAUP standards as shown in Table 50 for respondents from public institutions were as follows: (a) "Faculty members conduct post-tenure review," (b) "Practices protect academic freedom," (c) "Standards are flexible," and (d) "Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process." The four statements representing the lowest congruence were as follows: (a) "New financial resources have been designated," (b) "Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development," (c) "Primary purpose is faculty development," and (d) "Policy addresses academic freedom."

The four statements reflecting the greatest amount of congruence with AAUP standards as shown in Table 51 for respondents from private institutions were as follows: (a) "Outcome is confidential," (b) "Practices protect academic freedom," (c) "Faculty members conduct post-tenure review," and (d) "Standards are flexible." The four statements representing the lowest congruence were as follows: (a) "New financial resources have been designated," (b) "Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development," (c) "Policy addresses academic freedom," and (d) "A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review."

The four statements reflecting the greatest amount of congruence with AAUP standards as shown in Table 52 for respondents from research institutions were as follows: (a) "Standards are flexible," (b) "Faculty members conduct post-tenure review," (c) "Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process," and (d) "Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process." The four statements representing the lowest congruence were as follows: (a) "New financial resources have been designated," (b) "Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development," (c) "Primary purpose is faculty development," and (d) "Policy addresses academic freedom."

The four statements reflecting the greatest amount of congruence with AAUP standards as shown in Table 53 for respondents from doctoral institutions were as follows: (a) "Faculty members conduct post-tenure review," (b) "Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process," (c) "Standards are flexible," and (d) "Outcome is confidential." The four statements representing the lowest congruence were as follows: (a) "New financial resources have been designated," (b) "Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development," (c) "Policy addresses academic freedom," and (d) "Primary purpose is faculty development."

The four statements reflecting the greatest amount of congruence with AAUP standards as shown in Table 54 for respondents from master's institutions were as follows: (a) "Practices protect academic freedom," (b)

"Faculty members conduct post-tenure review," (c) "Outcome is confidential," and (d) "Standards are flexible." The four statements representing the lowest congruence were as follows: (a) "New financial resources have been designated," (b) "Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development," (c) "Policy addresses academic freedom," and (d) "Primary purpose is faculty development."

A general linear multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to simultaneously examine the responses given by 214 participants representing 31 research, 29 doctoral, 154 master's institutions as well as 155 public and 59 private institutions who answered all 15 parts of the survey question. The results of the multivariate analysis indicated that there was no significant difference among Carnegie levels of institutions. Furthermore, there was no significant difference based on the affiliation of the institutions, whether public or private. Lastly, there was no significant difference when Carnegie level and affiliation of the institution were examined together. Table 55 shows the exact statistics recorded for the MANOVA.

Table 55. Results of MANOVA for Carnegie Classification and Public vs. Private Institutions

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
INSTLEV	Wilks' Lambda	.846	1.126	30.000	388.000	.300
PUB_PRIV	Wilks' Lambda	.907	1.323	15.000	194.000	.191
INSTLEV * PUB_PRIV	Wilks' Lambda	.821	1.337	30.000	388.000	.115

Note: N=214

Q10. What are the differences, if any, in the chief academic officers' reported perceptions and the reported perceptions of faculty members on the practices of post-tenure review at public and private institutions?

A general linear multivariate analysis (MANOVA) was used to simultaneously examine the responses given by 214 participants representing 155 public and 59 private institutions as well as 116 chief academic officers and 98 faculty representatives who answered all of the 15 parts of the survey question. The results of the multivariate analysis indicated that there was no significant difference between public and private institutions. Furthermore, there was no significant difference when the affiliation of the institution, public or private, was examined along with the respondent type, chief academic officer or faculty representative. However, the MANOVA did indicate significant differences between the responses given by respondent types ($F(df15, df196)=2.474$, $p=.002$). Table 56 shows the exact statistics recorded for the MANOVA.

Table 56. Results of MANOVA for Public vs. Private Institutions and Respondent Type

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
PUB_PRIV	Wilks' Lambda	.896	1.509	15.000	196.000	.105
RESPONDE	Wilks' Lambda	.841	2.474	15.000	196.000	.002**
PUB_PRIV * RESPONDE	Wilks' Lambda	.920	1.131	15.000	196.000	.331

Note: N=214, **p<.01

Table 57 shows the results of a MANOVA comparing the responses of chief academic officers with faculty representatives for all 15 subparts of survey item 13.

Although the MANOVA indicated significant differences in the responses of the chief academic officers and the faculty representatives, overall, the responses were congruent with the AAUP "Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review." Responses associated with this question were reported using a 5-part Likert scale to allow respondents to indicate their opinions of the policies and practices at their own institutions and the following scale: "5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, or 1=Strongly Disagree" for each of the 15 statements associated with one of the AAUP's proposed standards. For congruence with the AAUP standards, each statement needed a mean equal to or greater than 3.01.

The four statements reflecting the greatest amount of congruence between the AAUP standards and the chief academic officers, as shown in Table 58, were as follows: (a) "Practices protect academic freedom," (b) "Faculty members conduct post-tenure review," (c) "Standards are flexible," and (d) "Outcome is confidential." The four statements representing the lowest congruence were as follows: (a) "New financial resources have been designated," (b) "Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development," (c) "Policy addresses academic freedom;" and (d) "Primary purpose is faculty development."

Table 57. MANOVA Indicating Significant Differences Between the Responses of Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives

Respondents	Dependent Variable	F	Sig.
	Policy addresses academic freedom	.107	.744
	Practices protect academic freedom	8.090	.005 **
	Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	.751	.387
	Published criteria for evaluation was developed by faculty	1.921	.167
	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	1.712	..192
	Primary purpose is not to make personnel decisions	.288	.592
	Primary purpose is faculty development	9.026	.003 **
	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	2.801	.096
	New financial resources have been designated	1.918	.168
	Standards are flexible	10.851	.001 **
	Outcome is confidential	1.657	.199
	Faculty development plans are mutually negotiated	3.840	.051
	A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review	.635	.427
	Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal	4.851	.029 *
	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	.980	.323

Note: N=214, *p<.05, **p<.01

Table 58. Responses Received from Chief Academic Officers

		N	Mean
Chief Academic Officer	Policy addresses academic freedom	138	3.39
	Practices protect academic freedom	138	4.55
	Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	136	4.08
	Published criteria for evaluation was developed by faculty	137	3.82
	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	141	4.52
	Primary purpose is not to make personnel decisions	138	4.01
	Primary purpose is faculty development	137	3.68
	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	134	3.22
	New financial resources have been designated	140	2.67
	Standards are flexible	141	4.48
	Outcome is confidential	141	4.32
	Faculty development plans are mutually negotiated	138	4.07
	A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review	139	3.84
	Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal	137	4.23
	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	138	4.18

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

The four statements reflecting the greatest amount of congruence between AAUP standards and faculty representatives, as shown in Table 59, were as follows: (a) "Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process," (b) "Faculty members conduct post-tenure review," (c) "Outcome is confidential," and (d) "Standards are flexible." The four statements representing the lowest congruence were as follows: (a) "New financial resources have been designated," (b) "Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development," (c) "Primary purpose is faculty development," and (d) "Policy addresses academic freedom."

Table 60 compares the highest and lowest responses of the chief academic officers and faculty representatives to the 15-part survey question 13.

Tables 66–80 (Appendix A11, pp. 178-185) show the actual responses of chief academic officers and faculty representatives to each of the 15 statements relative to the AAUP's proposed standards.

Table 59. Responses Received from Faculty Representatives

		N	Mean
Faculty Representative	Policy addresses academic freedom	113	3.28
	Practices protect academic freedom	112	4.01
	Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	110	3.92
	Published criteria for evaluation was developed by faculty	110	3.47
	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	112	4.21
	Primary purpose is not to make personnel decisions	108	3.87
	Primary purpose is faculty development	109	3.21
	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	109	2.90
	New financial resources have been designated	112	2.43
	Standards are flexible	112	4.05
	Outcome is confidential	112	4.10
	Faculty development plans are mutually negotiated	112	3.76
	A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review	113	3.83
	Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal	109	3.95
	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	112	4.26

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

Table 60. Highest and Lowest Responses

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS		FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES	
Highest			
	Mean		Mean
Practices protect academic freedom	4.55	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	4.26
Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	4.52	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	4.21
Standards are flexible	4.48	Outcome is confidential	4.10
Outcome is confidential	4.32	Standards are flexible	4.05
Lowest			
Primary purpose is faculty development	3.68	Policy addresses academic freedom	3.28
Policy addresses academic freedom	3.39	Primary purpose is faculty development	3.21
Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	3.22	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	2.90
New financial resources have been designated	2.67	New financial resources have been designated	2.43

Summary

This study revealed that there is a significant difference in the percentage of institutions that have adopted post-tenure review policies based on the type of institution (public or private) with 58.3% of public institutions having post-tenure review policies and 31.9% of private institutions. There is also a significant difference in the percentage of institutions with post-tenure review policies based on Carnegie level with

34.9% of research institutions, 46.2% of doctoral institutions and 49.9% of master's institutions having policies. In addition, chief academic officers and faculty representatives reported that 29.8% of institutions without post-tenure review policies were developing a policy with a significant difference in the number of public institutions developing policies compared to private institutions.

As expected, the stimulus for post-tenure review is significantly different when public and private institutions are compared, particularly since private institutions reported that their motivation relative to post-tenure review was never driven by "actual or anticipated state legislative action," whereas public institutions reported that 28.1% of policies had been motivated by this factor. "Actual or anticipated governing board action" was also greater for public institutions (30.7%) compared to private institutions (15.3%).

A significant difference was also found between public and private institutions in the number of years in which institutions have had formal post-tenure review policies. Public institutions showed rapid growth during the past five years or less with 59.4% of the policies adopted during that time period compared with 34.7% at private institutions. Private institutions showed steady growth over the past years with 24.0% occurring 15 or more years ago and 41.3% occurring over a period of 6 to 15 years ago.

There was no significant difference between public and private institutions based on the type of review—whether automatic for all faculty members or triggered for some. Automatic reviews for all tenured faculty

members (with some exceptions) were reportedly used at 92.8% of all institutions and triggered reviews were used at 7.2% of all institutions.

External documentation is not required for post-tenure review by 91.1% of institutions and required by 8.9% of institutions. The study revealed that there is a significant difference based on Carnegie level among public institutions, however, with 27.3% of research institutions requiring it while only 3.6% of doctoral institutions require external documentation and 6.4% of master's institutions.

Faculty members and chief academic officers provided similar results in response to questions about steps taken prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy at their institutions. Although AAUP guidelines and standards were not issued until October 1997, respondents reported conformity with the pre-establishment guidelines in two areas and the lack of conformity in two areas. They were in agreement that faculty members had been primarily responsible for the design of the policy's criteria for evaluation and that prior to adopting a policy, existing evaluative procedures had been discussed that took into account the evaluative procedures already in place and elicited convincing information on what the existing procedures failed to address. They also agreed that a cost/benefit study had not been conducted prior to adopting a policy and that their policies had not been set up on a trial basis at their institutions to be periodically evaluated for their effectiveness.

On the question of "Standards for Good Practice of Post-Tenure Review," chief academic officers and faculty representatives reported

congruence with AAUP standards on all items with the exception of "New financial resources have been designated." Significant differences were found between the responses given by chief academic officers and faculty representative on four of the 15 items: (a) "Standards are flexible," (b) "Primary purpose is faculty development," (c) "Practices protect academic freedom," and (d) "Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal."

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to gather data from chief academic officers and faculty representatives at public and private higher education institutions regarding the current policies and practices of post-tenure review at their institutions and to compare those policies and practices by type and Carnegie classification to the proposed guidelines and standards of the AAUP for considering the establishment of a system of post-tenure review and for good practice in post-tenure review.

This chapter presents a summary of the findings of the research, draws conclusions based on the research, and makes recommendations for further study.

The following research questions guided the study.

1. To what extent does tenure exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?
2. To what extent do post-tenure review policies exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

3. To what extent are public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions developing post-tenure review policies at this time?

4. What group of stakeholders has provided the primary stimulus for the adoption of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

5. To what extent have post-tenure review policies been adopted in the last 5, 10, 15 or 20 or more years at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

6. To what extent are post-tenure reviews performed automatically for faculty members or triggered by other circumstances at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

7. To what extent is supporting evidence from external sources required in the post-tenure review process at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

8. To what extent were the steps reported as taken prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and institutions congruent with the proposed AAUP "Guidelines for Considering the

Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty"?

9. To what extent are the current policies and practices at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and universities congruent with the proposed AAUP "Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review"?

10. What are the differences, if any, in the chief academic officers' reported perceptions and the reported perceptions of faculty members on the practices of post-tenure review at public and private institutions?

Summary of Procedures

The study used a self-administered cross-sectional survey approach to collect information about post-tenure review from the chief academic officers and faculty representatives in a stratified random sample of public and private institutions and research, doctoral, and master's institutions.

The *Survey on Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices* was developed by the researcher. After having a panel of experts review the instrument for content validity, the researcher modified the survey and mailed it to potential participants. The survey contained three major sections: (A) General Information, (B) Establishment of Your Institution's Review Policy, and (C) Policies and Practices of Post-Tenure Review. Items 1 – 8 of section

A addressed research questions 1 – 7. Items 9 – 12 of section B addressed research question 8, and the 15-part item 13 in section C addressed research questions 9 and 10.

The population for the study included all 742 institutions that were listed as four year accredited institutions listed in the *1997 Directory of Higher Education* with a Carnegie classification of either Research I or II, Doctoral I or II, and Master's (Comprehensive) I or II. The sample was comprised of 372 institutions (412 public and 330 private), or 50 percent plus 1. A stratified random sample was drawn from the population using a spreadsheet randomization process.

Each institution selected received two surveys, one for the chief academic officer and one for a faculty representative. Thus, a total of 744 surveys were mailed. One mailing, a reminder note, and a second mailing produced an overall response of 584 completed and returned surveys (78.5 percent), a response that was sufficient to establish the generalizability of the opinions of the respondents to those of the population from which they were drawn.

A software package spreadsheet was used to record the data from the responses to the survey questions. This information was then transferred to a data file using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). This software program was used to produce descriptive statistics and frequency tables, to conduct chi-square analyses, and to perform analyses using MANOVAs.

Summary of Findings

The overall response to the survey from the 744 surveys mailed was 584 (78.5 percent).

Responses were received from 302 chief academic officers out of 372 included in the survey (81.2 percent), accounting for 51.7 percent of the total response. The number of responses received from 372 faculty representatives included in the survey was 282 (75.8 percent), accounting for 48.3 percent of the total responses.

Public institutions accounted for 302 of the 584 responses received (51.7 percent), private institutions accounted for 272 responses (46.6 percent), and 10 responses (1.7 percent) were received from private institutions with significant public funding. For the purpose of this study, surveys completed by persons indicating that they were from private institutions with significant public funding were included with the group of surveys from private institutions, bringing the total responses received from private institutions to 282 (48.3 percent) compared to 51.7 percent from public institutions.

Of the 140 surveys mailed to research institutions, 109 (77.9 percent) were completed and returned. Eighty-four surveys were received out of 120 mailed to doctoral institutions (70 percent), and 391 surveys were received out of 484 mailed to master's institutions (80.1 percent). The total number of responses received was 584 with 109 from research institutions representing 18.7 percent of the total response, 84 from doctoral institutions (14.4 percent),

and 391 from master's institutions (67.0 percent). Table 1 shows the number of responses received and percentages by type and Carnegie classification.

The following section summarizes the findings of the study by research question based on the responses given to items listed in the survey and an analysis of the data.

Q1. To what extent does tenure exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

Five hundred forty-six (93.5percent) of the 584 responding to the survey reported that tenure was awarded at their institutions. The percentage was more at public institutions (99.3 percent) than at private institutions (87.2 percent) and at research institutions (100.0 percent) compared with 91.7 percent at doctoral institutions and 92.1 percent at master's institutions. Private doctoral institutions had the least percentage of tenure with 80.6 percent awarding it.

There was a significant difference between public and private institutions in the awarding of tenure and among Carnegie levels of institutions.

Q2. To what extent do post-tenure review policies exist at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

Of the 550 respondents, 255 (46.4 percent) indicated that their institutions have post-tenure review. However, there is a significant difference between public and private institutions concerning the presence of post-tenure review policies and also a significant difference among research (34.9 percent), doctoral (46.2 percent) and master's (49.9 percent) institutions. The incidence of post-tenure review is greater at public institutions (58.3 percent) than at private institutions (31.9 percent). A closer look revealed that there was no significant difference between Carnegie levels of institutions within the public sector, but there was a significant difference between levels within the private sector with the master's institutions being more likely to have post-tenure review (40.5 percent) and the research level the least likely to have it (6.0 percent).

Q3. To what extent are public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions developing post-tenure review policies at this time?

Responses received from 282 participants who did not have a post-tenure review policy in place at their institution showed that 29.8 percent were in the process of developing a policy while 70.2 percent

indicated that a policy was not being developed. Among public institutions, there was no significant difference in the number of respondents reportedly in the policy developmental phase among the three Carnegie levels of institutions. Likewise, there was no significant difference among private research, doctoral, or master's institutions. However, there was a significant difference between public and private institutions with 42.1 percent of the respondents from public institutions and 20.5 percent of respondents from private institutions reporting that policies were being developed at their institutions. When analyzed from the standpoint of Carnegie classifications, there were no significant differences among institutions.

Q4. What group of stakeholders has provided the primary stimulus for the adoption of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

Five out of six groups of respondents revealed that the primary stimulus for adopting a post-tenure review policy at their institution came from initiatives led by faculty or administrators. The only exception was public doctoral institutions whose primary stimulus was actual or anticipated governing board action. A closer look at the data showed that while private institutions had not been affected by actual or anticipated state legislative action, public master's institutions had been

as reported by the following percent of respondents: public master's (32.33 percent), public doctoral (33.3 percent), and public research (10.0 percent). Public institutions had also been more affected by actual or anticipated governing board action with 26.7 percent of respondents from public research institutions selecting this motivating factor for their institution's adoption of a post-tenure review policy while 37.5 percent of those from public doctoral institutions pointed to this reason, as did 30.3 percent of public master's institutions. Only 17.7 percent of respondents from private master's institutions selected this reason and none from private doctoral or research institutions. Of course, no private institutions reported being motivated to adopt post-tenure review through actual or anticipated state legislative action. Thus, initiatives led by faculty and administrators accounted for 84.7 percent of motivating factors for private institutions compared with 41.2 percent of public institutions—a significant difference.

Q5. To what extent have post-tenure review policies been adopted in the last 5, 10, 15 or 20 or more years at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

Over half of the respondents (52.0 percent) indicated that a post-tenure review policy had been adopted at their institutions in the last five years or less and 48.0 percent adopted during all the other

years combined. The data show that 59.4 percent of the policies now in effect at public institutions have been adopted in the last five or less years compared with 34.4 percent at private institutions. Respondents from private institutions indicated that more proliferation of policies took place in the last 6 – 15 years (40.6 percent) than at any other time period. There was a significant difference between public and private institutions in the number of years post-tenure policies have been in effect. However, when comparisons are made by Carnegie level, there is no significant difference between research, doctoral or master's levels.

Q6. To what extent are post-tenure reviews performed automatically for faculty members or triggered by other circumstances at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

Two hundred thirty-three (91.4 percent) of the 255 participants responding to the survey item requesting information concerning who is reviewed under their institution's post-tenure review policy indicated that automatic reviews are conducted while 7.1 percent marked that triggered reviews were used at their institutions. Triggered reviews were most prevalent at public institutions, particularly doctoral institutions (17.9 percent) and least in use at private research and private doctoral institutions with no respondents indicating their use.

There was no significant difference between public and private institutions. Low cell counts prevented a statistical analysis comparing the responses received based on the Carnegie classification of the institutions surveyed.

Q7. To what extent is supporting evidence from external sources required in the post-tenure review process at public and private research, doctoral and master's (comprehensive) institutions?

Supporting evidence from sources outside the institution as a documentation requirement for post-tenure review was reported by 22 (8.9 percent) of the 247 of the participants responding to survey items associated with this question. Respondents from public research institutions indicated that 27.3 percent expect outside documentation. Their counterparts at private research institutions indicated that it was not a requirement, as did respondents from private doctoral institutions. Private master's institutions are the next most likely to require outside documentation (7.7 percent), followed by public master's institutions (6.4 percent) and public doctoral institutions (3.6 percent). There was no significant difference between public and private institutions. However, there was a significant difference between research, doctoral, and master's institutions.

Q8. To what extent were the steps reported as taken prior to the establishment of a post-tenure review policy at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and institutions congruent with the proposed AAUP "Guidelines for Considering the Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty"?

This question was separated into four parts dealing with four of the AAUP guidelines and then analyzed based on the responses of two groups of respondents, the chief academic officers and the faculty representatives. A response of "Yes" was given a 1.0 and a response of "No" was given a 0. The target mean for congruence with AAUP guidelines was set at 1.0. The following table shows the similar responses of chief academic officers and faculty representatives to survey items 9 through 12 used to answer research question 8. The data indicate that most institutions are giving faculty members the primary responsibility for the design of the post-tenure review policy in setting the criteria for evaluation. It also shows that discussions were held prior to the adoption of a policy on post-tenure review that took into account procedures for faculty evaluation and evoked convincing data on what those procedures failed to address. However, the responses also indicated that a cost and benefits analysis was not conducted at most of the institutions, and the policies have not been set up on a trial basis with periodic evaluations made with respect to

their effectiveness. Table 61 shows the responses of the chief academic officers and faculty representatives of steps taken prior to the adoption of post-tenure review at their institutions.

The responses based on the affiliation of the institution (public or private) and the Carnegie classification (research, doctoral, or master's) indicate that the least likely institutions to have faculty members assume primary responsibility for the design of a post-tenure review policy are public master's institutions (16.1 percent) and public

Table 61. Responses of Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives to Steps Taken Prior to the Adoption of Post-Tenure Review

Selected AAUP Guidelines (Adapted)	Mean of Chief Academic Officer's Responses	Mean of Faculty Representative's Responses
Faculty members had primary responsibility for the design of the post-tenure review policy.	.90	.83
Prior to adopting a post-tenure review policy, discussions about the proposed policy took into account evaluative procedures already in place and elicited convincing data on what the existing procedures failed to address.	.76	.76
Prior to adopting a post-tenure review policy, an analysis was conducted to evaluate the costs (in time and personnel) and the benefits of post-tenure review to the academic program.	.11	.10
Post-tenure review was set up on a trial basis to be periodically evaluated with respect to its effectiveness.	.14	.14

Note: "Yes" response = 1.0, "No" response = 0
Mean = Average of responses

research institutions (11.8 percent). Faculty representatives indicated that faculty members are most likely to have primary responsibility at public master's institutions and, secondly, public doctoral institutions (18.2 percent). While chief academic officers at public institutions showed that faculty members had primary responsibility at 85.9 percent of the institutions, private institutions reported that 97.7 percent use faculty members as the primary designers. This compares with the response of faculty representatives at public institutions who marked that faculty members had primary responsibility (80.0 percent) and at private institutions the response given was 92.0 percent).

Item 10 of this section of the survey asked respondents to indicate whether discussions about a proposed policy on post-tenure review at their institutions took into account evaluative procedures that were already in place and elicited convincing data on what the existing procedures failed to address. All of the chief academic officers at research institutions, as well as those at private doctoral institutions reported that this had been done. The least likely place for the discussions to have taken place were at public master's institutions, followed by public doctoral institutions. Faculty representatives at private master's institutions indicated that this was done 85.7 percent of the time followed by representatives at public research institutions

(83.3 percent). Responses of chief academic officers indicated that there was no difference between public and private institutions.

Conducting a cost and benefit study prior to the adoption of a post-tenure review garnered the least congruence of any of the four pre-establishment items included in the study from the proposed guidelines of the AAUP.

The data suggest that an analysis of the cost (in time and personnel) and the benefits of post-tenure review to the academic program are not being conducted at 89.9 percent of the institutions prior to the adoption of a post-tenure review policy. This is confirmed by data collected from chief academic officers and faculty representatives. Chief academic officers at public institutions reported that 93.1 percent did not conduct a study of costs and benefits compared with 89.6 percent reported by faculty representatives. Chief academic officers at private institutions reported that 82.5 percent do not conduct studies while 90.9 percent of the faculty representatives reported that no studies were conducted. According to chief academic officers, research institutions are the most likely not to have carried out a study while faculty representatives indicate studies are least likely to be conducted at doctoral institutions.

Data collected about setting up post-tenure review on a trial basis to be periodically evaluated with respect to its effectiveness suggest that this pre-establishment guideline is not usually followed.

According to the data, only 13.6 percent of the respondents reported that post-tenure review had been set up on a trial basis at their institutions. Public institutions are less likely, according to chief academic officers and faculty representatives, to set up a policy on a trial basis and review its effectiveness than private institutions. Research institutions are least likely to adopt a policy on a trial basis, according to chief academic officers, while faculty representatives point to doctoral institutions as the least likely place for policies to be adopted on a trial and review basis.

Q9. To what extent are the current policies and practices at public and private research, doctoral and master's colleges and universities congruent with the proposed AAUP "Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review"?

Respondents from public and private institutions gave the following responses indicating highest and lowest congruence with AAUP standards, as shown in Table 62:

Table 62. Highest and Lowest Responses
(Public and Private Institutions)

PUBLIC		PRIVATE	
Highest			
	Mean		Mean
Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	4.39	Outcome is confidential	4.46
Practices protect academic freedom	4.28	Practices protect academic freedom	4.37
Standards are flexible	4.28	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	4.35
Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	4.28	Standards are flexible	4.32
Lowest			
Policy addresses academic freedom	3.33	A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal the outcome of reviews	3.62
Primary purpose is faculty development	3.32	Policy addresses academic freedom	3.37
Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	3.05	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	3.14
New financial resources have been designated	2.48	New financial resources have been designated	2.76

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

Respondents from research, doctoral, and master's institutions gave the following assessment, as shown in Table 63.

Table 63. Highest and Lowest Responses
(Research, Doctoral, and Master's)

RESEARCH		DOCTORAL		MASTER'S	
Highest					
	Mean		Mean		Mean
Standards are flexible	4.57	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	4.58	Practices protect academic freedom	4.32
Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	4.51	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	4.53	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	4.31
Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	4.51	Standards are flexible	4.39	Outcome is confidential	4.25
Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	4.39	Outcome is confidential	4.36	Standards are flexible	4.21
Lowest					
Policy addresses academic freedom	3.53	Primary purpose is faculty development	3.44	Primary purpose is faculty development	3.48
Primary purpose is faculty development	3.44	Policy addresses academic freedom	3.25	Policy addresses academic freedom	3.32
Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	3.34	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and development	3.14	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	3.01
New financial resources have been designated	2.32	New financial resources have been designated	2.50	New financial resources have been designated	2.63

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

A MANOVA conducted on the responses to the 15-part survey question 13 indicated no significant difference between public and private institutions or among research, doctoral, and master's institutions. The interaction between public and private institutions and research, doctoral and master's institutions also showed no significant differences.

Q10. What are the differences, if any, in the chief academic officers' reported perceptions and the reported perceptions of faculty members on the practices of post-tenure review at public and private institutions?

A MANOVA conducted to simultaneously analyze the responses given by chief academic officers and faculty representatives to the 15-part survey question 13 indicated a significant difference between the two groups. Table 64 shows the areas of significant differences and of most agreement between the chief academic officers and faculty representatives.

An analysis of the means for each respondent group revealed the following, as shown in Table 65.

Table 64. Differences and Agreement of Responses of Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives

Significant Differences	
	Sig.
Standards are flexible	.001 **
Primary purpose is faculty development	.003 **
Practices protect academic freedom	.005 **
Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal	.029 *
Most Agreement	
Policy addresses academic freedom	.744
Primary purpose is not to make personnel decisions	.592
A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal outcome of review	.427
Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process	.387

*p<.05, **p<.01

Table 65. Highest and Lowest Means of Responses From Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS		FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES	
Highest			
	Mean		Mean
Practices protect academic freedom	4.55	Post-tenure review cannot lead to dismissal without using academic due process	4.26
Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	4.52	Faculty members conduct post-tenure review	4.21
Standards are flexible	4.48	Outcome is confidential	4.10
Outcome is confidential	4.32	Standards are flexible	4.05
Lowest			
Primary purpose is faculty development	3.68	Policy addresses academic freedom	3.28
Policy addresses academic freedom	3.39	Primary purpose is faculty development	3.21
Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	3.22	Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development	2.90
New financial resources have been designated	2.67	New financial resources have been designated	2.43

Note: Mean of 3.01 or higher indicates congruence with AAUP standards.

Implications for Higher Education

The results of this study provide documentation from chief academic officers and faculty representatives on steps taken in the establishment of post-tenure review policies as well as information on their perceptions of

current post-tenure review policies and practices at public and private research, doctoral, and master's institutions.

Since tenure continues to be almost universal in academia, with 93.5 percent of institutions awarding it, by association, then, post-tenure review with issues related to tenure and academic freedom, is a vital issue for most colleges and universities. Based on the data collected from this study, 46.4 percent of institutions have post-tenure review policies and another 15.2 percent are developing policies. Fifty-two percent of the policies in existence have been adopted in the last five years. There are significant differences in the perceptions of chief academic officers and faculty representatives concerning post-tenure review when compared with the AAUP's guidelines and standards adopted by the organization in June 1998. This study gives a basis on which to address areas of significant differences identified by the groups of respondents as well as areas of agreement that show a lack of congruence with AAUP guidelines and standards.

The following implications are offered, based on the collection of data from the seven groups involved in this study.

The motivation for adopting a post-tenure review policy is different for public and private institutions. When comparing the two sectors of higher education, this needs to be taken into consideration. The pressures from state legislatures have been felt by public institutions, either directly or indirectly, and much more so than at private institutions. This pressure has

played a role in the proliferation of post-tenure review policies at public institutions. This needs to be taken into consideration when comparing post-tenure review policies and practices within the two sectors of higher education.

With as much research as colleges and universities conduct on numerous topics and for various constituencies, it seems that they would be more likely to conduct studies relative to changes in policies or new procedures than any other institution or business. Yet, when asked if cost and benefits studies had been conducted or if post-tenure review had been adopted on a trial basis to be periodically evaluated with respect to its effectiveness, the data on post-tenure review show that institutions have not conducted studies on themselves relative to post-tenure review. Of course, outside pressures to adopt a policy in a brief period of time (regardless of whether it can be proven to be cost effective and beneficial), not having data on how to judge its effectiveness, and the costs in scarce resources of time and personnel to conduct the studies may all be factors contributing to the lack of studies. Nevertheless, data need to be collected and analyzed to determine the actual costs and benefits that post-tenure review brings to an institution and faculty members and as a way of documenting the pros and cons of its use.

All seven groups analyzed (chief academic officers; faculty representatives; public, private, research, doctoral and master's institutions)

agreed that new financial resources have not been designated by institutions for use with the faculty development aspect of post-tenure review. Perhaps some institutions have redirected resources from other sources to faculty development, but it is clear from the data that new financial resources have not been directed for this purpose. If the institutions are using post-tenure review to improve the performance of faculty members, it seems reasonable that financial resources would need to be directed for that purpose—ideally, without having a deleterious affect on other programs.

The data suggest that there is a lack of agreement concerning the primary purpose of post-tenure review, whether it is faculty development, to make personnel decisions, or a combination of the two. Although the preference of the AAUP is to have faculty development as the primary purpose, each institution needs to consider the primary purpose of its policy before designing and implementing a policy. The purpose of the policy needs to be clearly stated and understood by those affected by its use.

For all seven groups in the study, 13 of the 15 subparts of survey question 13 on Policies and Practices of Post-Tenure Review show positive congruence with AAUP standards (mean responses of 3.01 and above). Although there were no significant differences between public and private institutions or among research, doctoral, or master's institutions, there were significant differences in the perceptions of chief academic officers and faculty representatives relative to their institution's implementation of

post-tenure review. The two groups, though on the positive side of conformity to the standards, reported a difference in the degree to which four of the subparts—(a) Standards are flexible, (b) Primary purpose is faculty development, (c) Practices protect academic freedom, and (d) Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal—were implemented through their post-tenure review policies. The chief academic officers report more conformity to the standards than do their counterparts, the faculty representatives, in the areas of having flexible standards for post-tenure review at their institutions, post-tenure review practices that protect academic freedom, and attempts of less severe sanctions prior to dismissal. The reason for the difference in perceptions could be attributable to the lack of communication between administrators and faculty members or the lack of data from studies that show that these are standard practices at institutions. On the other hand, faculty representatives may be more sensitive to actual deficiencies in these four areas than are administrators.

Of the remaining 11 subparts of survey item 13, there was no significant difference between the responses of the chief academic officers and the faculty representatives. However, there are areas where improvements can be made. Based on the results of this study, all seven groups agreed that new financial resources had not been designated to support the post-tenure review program at their institutions. A prior study conducted by Wesson and Johnson (1991), concluded that one of the

problems hampering the success of the post-tenure review policy adopted at the University of Colorado in 1982 was the lack of designated financial resources for faculty development. The adopted post-tenure review standards of the AAUP (1997, 1998) point out that institutional resources should not only be used to improve faculty performance, but to recognize outstanding performance, as well.

In addition to indicating that, in general, new financial resources have not been designated for post-tenure review, other areas where overall responses of chief academic officers fell between 4.0 and 3.01 (Agree) were as follows: (a) Policy addresses academic freedom, (b) Published criteria for evaluation was developed by faculty, (c) Primary purpose is faculty development, (d) Primary purpose is combination of personnel decisions and faculty development, and (e) A formal procedure exists for faculty to appeal the outcome of the review. It would seem that many of these issues are within the prerogative of the institutions to address and to amend the policy if such critical standards have been overlooked.

Standards receiving an overall response between 4.0 and 3.01 (Agree) from faculty representatives indicate areas where improvements in communication between administrators and faculty members at an institution may be warranted. They were as follows: (a) Post-tenure review is not equal to a retenuring process, (b) Primary purpose is not to make personnel decision, (c) Faculty development plans are mutually negotiated, and (d)

Institution attempts less severe sanctions prior to dismissal. If faculty members at an institution think that post-tenure review is a retenuring process in that the burden of proof falls on the tenured faculty member to show cause for continuation rather than the burden for non-continuation being on the institution, that the primary purpose is to make personnel decisions, that plans for their improvement are being forced on them, and that the institution is not willing to attempt less severe sanctions prior to dismissal, there could be a significant morale problem in the offing for the institution.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made for further research:

1. Replicate this study five years from now paying particular attention to changes in tenure award patterns, the number of institutions with post-tenure review, and responses given to items in survey sections B and C.

2. Investigate the criteria used by institutions with post-tenure review polices to identify faculty members whose job performance needs improvement, and whether the use of post-tenure review leads to improvement in their job performance.

3. Explore the costs and benefits of post-tenure review on campuses with established post-tenure review policies.

4. Conduct case studies investigating the "pressures" used by states to enact a new policy at public higher education institutions without actually passing legislation.

5. Gather information from institutions that periodically evaluate their post-tenure review policies and practices for their effectiveness in addressing problems of faculty performance.

6. Conduct a study to document the costs and benefits of "triggered" post-tenure reviews versus "automatic" reviews in terms of time, money, personnel, sensitivity issues, and improved job performance.

7. Conduct a study in which the reasons for the termination of tenured faculty members are compared from five to ten consecutive years before and after the establishment of a post-tenure review policy at public and private institutions.

Summary and Conclusion

This study has provided the first nationwide examination of the perceptions of faculty representatives compared to chief academic officers, and of private research, doctoral, and master's institutions compared to public research, doctoral, and master's institutions, concerning the AAUP's

guidelines and standards for good practice in post-tenure review. In light of this study and other emerging research on the topic, highlighting successes and failures of post-tenure review policies and practices, institutions have the opportunity to review their own policies and to correct any deficiencies in an effort to improve higher education for the current generation of students, faculty members and administrators, as well as for those who follow in our footsteps.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors. (1983). On periodic evaluation of tenured faculty. *Academe, 69* (6), 1a-14a.

American Association of University Professors. (1997). On post-tenure review. *Academe, 83* (5), 44-51.

American Associaton of University Professors. (1998) Post-tenure review: An AAUP response. *Academe, 84* (5), 61-67.

American Psychological Association. (1985). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.* Washington, DC: Author.

Applbaum, R. L. (1997). The Elephant in the room: Post-Tenure Review. *JACA 26* (1), 1-9.

Basinger, J. (1998, May 29). South Carolina starts post-tenure reviews. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. A15.

Bennett, A. (1994, October 10). Tenure: Many will decry it, few deny it. *The Wall Street Journal,* p. B1.

Bennett , J. B., & Chater, S. S. (1984). Evaluating the performance of tenured faculty members. *Educational Record, 65,* 38-41.

Bérubé, M. (1996). Public perceptions of universities and faculty. *Academe (82)* 4, 19-17.

Bolden, S. H. (1979). *Current status, policy and criteria for the evaluation of tenured faculty in Alabama's four-year public institutions of higher education.* Doctoral dissertation. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Chait, R. P., & Ford, A. T. (1982). *Beyond traditional tenure.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education. (1973). *Faculty tenure: A report and recommendations by the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Edgerton, R. (1993). The Re-examination of faculty priorities. *Change, 25* (4), 10-16, 20-23, 25.

Edwards, R. (1994). Toward constructive review of disengaged faculty. *AAHE Bulletin 47*, 6-7, 11-12, 16.

Edwards, R. (1997). Can post-tenure review help us save the tenure system? *Academe 83* (3), 26-31.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1996). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gilliland, M. W. (1997). Organizational change and tenure: We can learn from the corporate experience. *Change 29* (3), 30.

Glassick C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Evaluation of the professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodman, M. J. (1990). The review of tenured faculty: A collegial model. *The Journal of Higher Education, 61* (4), 408-424.

Goodman, M. J. (1994). The review of tenured faculty at a research university: Outcomes and appraisals. *The Review of Higher Edcucation 18* (1), 83-94.

Grimm, L. G., & Yarnold, P. R. (Eds.). (1998). *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Harris, B. J. (1996). The relationship between and among policy variables, type of institution, and perceptions of academic administrators with regard to post-tenure review. Doctoral dissertation, University of West Virginia, Morgantown. Ann Arbor, MI: *UMI Dissertation Services.* (UMI Number: 9624093)

Healy, P. & Schmidt, P. (1998). Public colleges seek major increases from legislatures in 1998 sessions. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* pp. A36, A39.

Johnson, G. E. R. (1990). *The innovation process in organizations: A look at post-tenure faculty evaluation.* Doctoral dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30,* 608.

Licata, C. M. (1986). *Post-tenure evaluation: Threat or opportunity?* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education-ERIC.

Licata, C. M., & Morreale, J. C. (1997). *Post-Tenure Review: Policies, Practices, precations.* AAHE New Pathways Working Paper Services, No. 12. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Magner, D. K. (1996, December 20). U. of Texas, with an eye on the legislature, starts a system of post-tenure reviews. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* pp. A10-A11.

National Commission on Higher Education Issues. (1982). *To strengthen quality in higher education.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 646).

Portch, S. R., Kaufman, N. J., & Ross, J. R. (1993). From frog to prince: From post-tenure review to faculty roles, development, and rewards. *Change 25* (4), 17.

Reisman, B. (1986). Performance evaluation for tenured faculty: Issues and research. *Liberal Education, 72* (1), 73-87.

Rodenhouse, M. P. (Ed.). (1997). *1997 Directory of higher education.* Falls Church, VA: Higher Education Publication.

Seldin, P. (1980). *Successful faculty evaluation programs.* New York: Coventry Press.

The University of Wisconsin Board of Regents. (1992). Guidelines for tenured faculty review and development. [On-line], Available: http://www.uwsa.edu/rpd/rpd92-5.htm.

Weinfurt, K. E. (1998). Multivariate analysis of variance. In Grimm, L. G., & Yarnold, P. R. (Eds.). *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics.* (pp. 245-276). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wesson, M. & Johnson, S. (1991). Post-tenure review and faculty revitalization. *Academe, 77* (3), 53-57.

Wilson, S. J. (1995). *Faculty post-tenure review: Perceptions of chief academic officers of public four-year colleges and universities within the region of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.* Doctoral dissertation. University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

APPENDIX

CONTENTS—APPENDIX

A1. Form A—College of Education 162
A2. Fax to Verify Names of Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives 164
A3. Survey on Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices 165
A4. Cover Letter Mailed to Prospective Participants 169
A5. Note Mailed to Chief Academic Officers to be Passed Along to Faculty Representative 170
A6. Note Mailed to Non-Respondents 171
A7. Cover Letter to Prospective Participants, Second Mailing 172
A8. Panel of Experts 173
A9. Number of Respondents Listed by State 175
A10. List of Abbreviations 177
A11. Responses of Chief Academic Officers and Faculty Representatives to Question 13 of the Post-Tenure Review Survey
Table 66. Academic Freedom Addressed 178
Table 67. Academic Freedom Protected 178
Table 68. Post-Tenure Review Is Not at Retenuring Process 179
Table 69. Published Criteria Developed by Faculty 179
Table 70. Faculty Members Conduct Post-Tenure Review 180
Table 71. Primary Purpose Is Not to Make Personnel Decisions 180
Table 72. Primary Purpose Is Faculty Development 181
Table 73. Primary Purpose Is Combination of Personne9 Decisions and Faculty Development 181
Table 74. New Financial Resources Designated 182
Table 75. Standards Are Flexible 182
Table 76. Outcome Is Confidential 183
Table 77. Mutually Negotiated Faculty Development Plans 183
Table 78. Formal Appeals Procedure 184
Table 79. Attempt Less Severe Sanctions 184
Table 80. No Dismissal Without Academic Due Process 185
A12. Vita 186

FORM A—COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

IRB # _____

Certification for Exemption from IRB Review
for Research Involving Human Subjects

Date received in OR _____

A. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(s) AND/OR Co-PI(s): (For student projects, list both the student and the advisor.)

Mrs. Judith E. Fry (Doctoral Student)
Dr. Jeffery Aper (Advisor, Chair of Doctoral Committee)

B. UNIT: Leadership Studies

C: COMPLETE MAILING ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER OF PI(s) and CO-PI(S):

Mrs. Judith E. Fry
3321 Rondaboo Drive
Chattanooga, TN 37419
Home # (423) 825-5590 Work # (423) 755-4460
Fax: (423) 825-5466 e-mail: JEF4UTC@aol.com

Dr. Jeffery Aper
College of Education
Claxton Addition 233
UT CAMPUS
Phone: 974-6142 e-mail: Aper@utk.edu

D: TITLE OF PROJECT: Post-Tenure Review: A Study of Policies and Practices at Colleges and Universities in the United States

E: EXTERNAL FUNDING AGENCY AND ID NUMBER (if applicable): N/A

F: GRANT SUBMISSION DEADLINE (if applicable): N/A

G. STARTING DATE: March 1998 (NO RESEARCH MAY BE INITIATED UNTIL CERTIFICATION IS GRANTED.)

H. ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE (Include all aspects of research and final write-up.): July 1998

I. Objective(s) of Project (Use additional page, if needed.):

The purpose of the study is: (1) To describe and compare the policies and practices on post-tenure review in higher education through responses collected from a questionnaire sent to the chief academic officer and a key faculty representative at public and private research, doctoral and comprehensive colleges and universities, and (2) to compare responses from these two groups with the guidelines for establishing a system of post-tenure review and the standards for good practice in post-tenure review that have recently been proposed by the American Association of University Professors.

II. Subjects (Use additional page, if needed.):

The subjects for the study will be the chief academic officers and a key faculty representative at 186 public and 186 private research, doctoral and comprehensive colleges and universities. A total of 744 persons will be asked to respond to the questions on a survey instrument designed to gather information about post-tenure review policies and practices on their campuses and the opinions about post-tenure review policies and practices at their campus. The institutions in the study will be randomly selected from the population of all research, doctoral and comprehensive colleges and universities (742) listed in the *1997 Higher Education Directory* with equal proportions of institutions chosen based on their affiliation (public or private) and their Carnegie classification (Research Universities I and II, Doctoral Universities I and II, and Comprehensive Colleges and Universities I and II). The chief academic officer, by virtue of his or her administrative position, at each selected institution will be asked to complete a questionnaire. Also, a key faculty representative at the same institution will be asked to complete a questionnaire. In most cases this person will be the faculty senate/council president/chair, when there is such an organization on a selected campus, or if there is no one who holds that office, the chief academic officer will be asked to select a key faculty member for participation in the study. The questionnaire will take between two and ten minutes to complete, and once it has been returned to the researcher, the respondents involvement with the research will end—unless the respondent has requested that the results of the study be sent to him or her. If the request has been made, a copy of the results will be mailed to the person and no further contact will be made by the researcher.

III. Methods or Procedures (Use additional page, if needed.):

A questionnaire will be mailed to 744 subjects along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope from the researcher to expedite the return of the completed forms. Data obtained from the questionnaires will be reported in aggregate form to ensure confidentiality, and no identifying characteristics such as the respondent's name or the name of his or her college or university

will be used in reporting the results of this study. The answers to the questionnaire will be keyed into the researcher's personal computer and analyzed by the researcher. Data will be available only to the researcher and the chair of her doctoral committee. Participation in the research should pose no risk to the respondent since their responses to the survey questions will be kept confidential. The respondents will be assured that their participation is voluntary and that they may choose not to participate in the study without penalty. A code in the upper right-hand corner of the survey instrument will be used to identify the Carnegie classification of the respondent's institution and to track responses in case a second mailing is necessary. At the conclusion of the study, all completed questionnaires and the data stored on computer disk(s) will be stored in the researcher's home safe for a period of two years. At the end of that time, all questionnaires will be destroyed by machine shredding and ~~computer disk(s) will be reformatted to erase all data~~. Completing the questionnaire and returning it to the researcher will constitute informed consent by the respondent to participate in the study. Participants will be told that if they have questions or want additional information, they may reach the researcher at her work number or the UT Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at (423) 974-3466). Results of this research may benefit both public and private institutions, their chief academic officers and faculty members by providing information on current post-tenure review policies and practices and the impact these policies are having on evaluation practices, faculty development, academic freedom and dismissal for cause in higher education. It may also help administrators and faculty members who may be called upon in the future to assist in the design of new post-tenure review policies or the modification of existing policies.

Will keep separate data for later analysis. E. Fry

2

IV. CATEGORY(s) FOR EXEMPT RESEARCH PER 45 CFR 46 (see reverse side for categories): _____

CERTIFICATION: The research described herein is in compliance with 45 CFR 46.101 (b) and presents subjects with no more than minimal risk as defined by applicable regulations. ***The signature of the researcher indicates a willingness to uphold the standards of the Belmont Report.***

Principal Investigator	Judith E. Fry Name	Judith E. Fry Signature	3/13/98 Date
Student Advisor	Dr. Jeffery Aper Name	Jeffery P. Aper Signature	3/16/98 Date
Unit Leader	JEFF APER Name	Jeffery P. Aper Signature	3/16/98 Date
APPROVED:			
~~College~~ Unit Review Comm. Chair	GRADY BOGUE Name	Grady Bogue Signature	3/16/98 Date

Rev. 02/97

DJ Dickinson for Carol Kasworm 3/31/98

Fax

To:	Person Who Can Assist Me	**From:**	Mrs. Judy Fry
Fax:	«Fax_»	**Pages:**	1
Phone:	«Telephone_»	**Date:**	
Re:	Verification of Names and Addresses	**Return:**	Fax Number: ( ) -

☐ **Urgent** ☐ **For Review** ☐ **Please Comment** ✓ **Please Reply** ☐ **Please Recycle**

I have obtained the following information from the *1997 Higher Education Directory*; however, I need additional information and I want to verify the accuracy of the information I already have before mailing a survey related to a nationwide doctoral study that I am planning to conduct in a few weeks.

Is the correct name, title and mailing address of your institution's chief academic officer as follows? If not, please indicate the change.

«Prefix» «First_Name» «Middle_Name» «Last_Name» «Suffix»

«Position»

«Name_of_CollegeUniversity»

«Street_Address»

«City», «State» «Postal_Code»

Please complete the information below that was not available in the *Directory*. I need to know the name and address of the person who currently serves as Faculty Senate/Council President/Chair at your institution. If no one serves in this capacity at your campus, please list the person who is recognized as a faculty spokesperson.

Name Prefix: _____ Name: _____

Title of Position: _____

Campus Office Address: _____

Thank you.

SURVEY ON POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICIES AND PRACTICES

#_____

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Which designation best describes your institution?

   ❒ Public ❒ Private ❒ Private with significant public funding

2. Does your institution award tenure? ❒ Yes ❒ No

If you answered "NO" to question 2 above, please STOP at this point and return the survey in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope by APRIL 15, 1998. Thank you for participating in this study. An executive summary of the results will be sent to all participants at the conclusion of the study.

3. Colleges and universities evaluate tenured faculty members using many methods. Post-tenure review is one method of evaluation. Post-tenure review may incorporate information from various sources such as annual reviews, student evaluations and peer evaluations. Reviews may be automatically conducted for all tenured faculty members or triggered by other events. Post-tenure review is usually independent from promotion considerations and goes beyond the traditional periodic assessments of a faculty member's short-term goals and job-related activities by examining the faculty member's teaching, research and service over an extended period of time, typically every 2 to 5 years.

   Does your institution have a post-tenure review policy for conducting a formal, periodic, systematic and comprehensive evaluation of the job performance of tenured faculty members? ❒ Yes ❒ No

4. If you answered "No" to question 3, is your institution developing such a policy at this time? ❒ Yes ❒ No

If you answered "NO" to question 3 above, please STOP at this point and return the survey in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope by APRIL 15, 1998. Thank you for participating in this study. An executive summary of the results will be sent to all participants at the conclusion of the study.

5. Which of the following provided the primary stimulus for the adoption of a post-tenure review policy at your institution? Check one.

   a. ❒ Initiatives led by faculty or administrators at the campus or system level
   b. ❒ Actual or anticipated state legislative action
   c. ❒ Actual or anticipated governing board action
   d. ❒ Unable to determine

6. How long has your institution had a post-tenure review policy?

   ❒ 5 years or less ❒ 11-15 years ❒ More than 20 years
   ❒ 6-10 years ❒ 15-20 years

7. Who is reviewed under your institution's post-tenure review policy? Check one. Fill in the blank, if applicable.

a. ❒ All tenured faculty
b. ❒ All tenured faculty except _____
_____
c. ❒ Only tenured faculty who have a record of unsatisfactory performance
d. ❒ Only tenured faculty who have a record of unsatisfactory performance and
_____
e. ❒ Other _____
_____

8. Does the post-tenure review documentation at your college or university require supporting evidence from colleagues who are *external* to your institution of a faculty member's ongoing contributions to higher education? ❒ Yes ❒ No

---

B. ESTABLISHMENT OF YOUR INSTITUTION'S REVIEW POLICY

9. Did faculty members have primary responsibility for the design of the post-tenure review policy by serving as members of a group that set the criteria for evaluation?
❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Unable to Determine

10. Prior to adopting a post-tenure review policy, did discussions about the proposed policy take into account evaluative procedures already in place and elicit convincing data on what the existing procedures failed to address?
❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Unable to Determine

11. Prior to adopting a post-tenure review policy, was an analysis conducted by your institution to evaluate the costs (in time and personnel) and the benefits of post-tenure review to the academic program? ❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Unable to Determine

12. Was post-tenure review set up on a trial basis to be periodically evaluated with respect to its effectiveness? ❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Unable to Determine

C. POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF POST-TENURE REVIEW

13. Please indicate your opinion of the extent to which each of the following factors exemplifies the policies and practices of post-tenure review at your institution. (Circle one answer for each item.)

5=Strongly Agree 4=Agree 3=Undecided 2=Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree

a.	My institution's written post-tenure review ***policy*** specifically addresses the concept of academic freedom.	5	4	3	2	1
b.	The post-tenure review ***practices*** at my institution protect academic freedom.	5	4	3	2	1
c.	Post-tenure review evaluations are broad and thorough at my institution, but the reviews are not equal to a retenuring process.	5	4	3	2	1
d.	My college, school, and/or department has specific, published criteria to be used in post-tenure review that have been developed by faculty members and are periodically reviewed by faculty members.	5	4	3	2	1
e.	Faculty members help conduct post-tenure reviews.	5	4	3	2	1
f.	The **primary purpose** of post-tenure review at my institution is to make personnel decisions such as salary, promotion, etc.	5	4	3	2	1
g.	The **primary purpose** of post-tenure review at my institution is faculty development.	5	4	3	2	1
h.	The **primary purpose** of post-tenure review at my institution is a combination of faculty development and making personnel decisions.	5	4	3	2	1
i.	The faculty development aspect of post-tenure review at my institution has been supported by the designation of new financial resources in the budget to fund faculty development.	5	4	3	2	1

5=Strongly Agree 4=Agree 3=Undecided 2=Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree

j.	The evaluative standards used in post-tenure review are flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.	5	4	3	2	1
k.	The outcome of evaluations is known only to the appropriate college or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated and released only at the discretion or with the consent of the faculty member.	5	4	3	2	1
l.	All formal faculty development plans for an individual faculty member relative to post-tenure review are the product of mutual negotiations between the faculty member and administrators or colleagues.	5	4	3	2	1
m.	The written post-tenure review policy at my institution provides a formal procedure to appeal the outcome of reviews and to change the record.	5	4	3	2	1
n.	Before a tenured faculty member is dismissed or another severe sanction is imposed because of continuing and persistent problems of poor job performance, my institution attempts other less severe solutions to the problem (i.e., a mutually agreeable separation settlement or reassignment to other duties, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
o.	Recurring negative post-tenure reviews cannot lead to the dismissal of a tenured faculty member without the utilization of academic due process procedures in which the burden to show adequate cause for termination remains on the institution.	5	4	3	2	1

Thank you for participating in this study. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope by APRIL 15, 1998. An executive summary of the results will be sent to all participants at the conclusion of the study.

March 31, 1998

«Prefix» «First_Name» «Middle_Name» «Last_Name»«Suffix»
«Position»
«Department_Address»
«Name_of_CollegeUniversity»
«Street_Address»
«City», «State» «Postal_Code»

Dear «Prefix» «Last_Name»:

I am a doctoral student at The University of Tennessee, and I am seeking your help with a nationwide study on post-tenure review policies and practices at higher education institutions. The purpose of this study is to assess the status of post-tenure review policies and practices. At this time, no nationwide survey has reported post-tenure review policies and practices at public and private institutions as two distinctly different categories. Also, no nationwide survey has reported information about post-tenure review from the dual perspectives of chief academic officers and faculty members.

Data obtained from the enclosed questionnaire will be reported in aggregate form to ensure confidentiality, and no identifying characteristics such as your name or the name of your randomly selected college or university will be used in reporting the results of this study. Data will be available only to the researcher and the chair of her doctoral committee. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may choose not to participate in the study without penalty. The code in the upper right-hand corner of the survey is to identify the Carnegie classification of your institution and to track responses in case a second mailing is necessary. Two years after the conclusion of the study, all completed questionnaires will be destroyed. Completing the questionnaire and returning it to me constitutes informed consent by you to participate in this study.

Completion of the enclosed survey will take from 1 to 10 minutes. Your contribution will make a significant difference in the quality of the study. Would you please complete the questionnaire and return it to me no later than **April 15, 1998?** An executive summary of the results will be sent to all participants at the conclusion of the study.

If you have questions or want additional information, you may reach me at ( ) - or the UT Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at (423) 974-3466. Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,

Judith E. Fry
Doctoral Candidate

(Outside)

The University of Tennessee

(Inside)

March 31, 1998

Dear «Prefix» «Last_Name»:

I have enclosed an envelope that includes a cover letter and questionnaire to be completed by a faculty representative at your institution, such as the chair or president of your Faculty Senate, Faculty Council or Academic Assembly, etc. Since I do not know the name of the person who should receive this information, would you mind passing along the enclosure to the appropriate faculty member?

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Judy Fry
Doctoral Candidate

(Outside)

The University of Tennessee

(Inside)

April 16, 1998

Dear «Prefix» «Last_Name»:

Recently, I sent a "Survey on Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices" to you along with a request for your help in providing the needed information. If you have already completed the survey and mailed it back to me, thank you for participating.

If you have not had a chance to complete it, please take a few minutes to do so today. Your contribution will make a significant difference in the quality of the study. If you need another copy of the survey, please send an e-mail message to me at _____ using the subject line "PTR Survey" or fax your request to me at ( ) - .

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Judy Fry
Doctoral Candidate

«Skip Record If...»

May 6, 1998

«Prefix» «First_Name» «Middle_Name» «Last_Name» «Suffix»
«Position»
«Name_of_CollegeUniversity»
«Street_Address»
«City», «State» «Postal_Code»

Dear «Prefix» «Last_Name»:

You are one of the 372 chief academic officers and 372 faculty members at 186 public and 186 private research, doctoral and comprehensive colleges and universities that were randomly selected for inclusion in a nationwide survey on post-tenure review policies and practices--the topic of study for my dissertation at The University of Tennessee. At this time, I have not received a completed questionnaire from you; however, I realize that the end of the academic year is filled with many activities and that you may not have had time to complete the survey. Because I believe that your participation will increase the quality of the study, I have extended the deadline for responses to **May 16** and have included another copy of the survey for your convenience in responding. If you have mailed a completed questionnaire to me recently, I sincerely appreciate your participation; and I will have registered your response by the time you receive this letter. An executive summary of the results will be sent to all participants at the conclusion of the study.

As I stated in the first mailing, data obtained from the enclosed questionnaire will be reported in aggregate form to ensure confidentiality, and no identifying characteristics such as your name or the name of your randomly selected college or university will be used in reporting the results of this study. Data will be available only to the researcher and the chair of her doctoral committee. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may choose not to participate in the study without penalty. The code in the upper right-hand corner of the survey is to identify the Carnegie classification of your institution and to track responses in case a second mailing is necessary. Two years after the conclusion of the study, all completed questionnaires will be destroyed. Completing the questionnaire and returning it to me constitutes informed consent by you to participate in this study.

If you have questions or want additional information, you may reach me at ( ) - or the UT Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at (423) 974-3466. Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,

Judith E. Fry
Doctoral Candidate

PANEL OF EXPERTS

During the construction of the survey, the following persons reviewed the format of the "Survey on Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices" and critiqued its questions and statements for content and clarity. The panel was comprised of doctoral committee members and persons who hold administrative or faculty positions similar to those included in the survey.

Dr. William C. Aiken
Acting Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, TN 37403

Dr. Jeffery P. Aper
Associate Professor
Educational Administration and Cultural Studies
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996

Dr. Bert C. Bach
Vice President of Academic Affairs
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN 37614

Dr. E. Grady Bogue
Professor
Educational Administration and Cultural Studies
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996

Dr. Mary Jane Connelly
Associate Professor
Department of Education in Science,
Math, Research and Technology
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996

Dr. D. Peter Consacro
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Tennessee Board of Regents
Nashville, TN 37217

Panel of Experts (Continued)

Dr. Lloyd D. Davis
Guerry Professor of Education, Graduate Studies Division
College of Education and Applied Professional Studies
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, TN 37403

Dr. Paul Gaston
Provost
Kent State University
P. O. Box 5190
Kent, Ohio 44242-0001

Dr. Richard Gruetzemacher
Director of Planning, Evaluation and Institutional Research
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, TN 37403

RESPONDENTS BY STATE				
STATE	MAILED	CHIEF ACAD. OFFICERS	FACULTY REPS.	PERCENT RESPONSE
Alabama	12	5	4	75.00
Alaska	6	3	1	66.67
Arizona	2	1	1	100.00
Arkansas	8	4	4	100.00
California	54	23	21	81.48
Colorado	6	0	2	33.33
Connecticut	6	3	2	83.33
Delaware	2	1	1	100.00
District of Columbi	8	1	3	50.00
Florida	20	6	9	75.00
Georgia	22	10	9	86.36
Hawaii	4	2	1	75.00
Idaho	4	2	1	75.00
Illinois	32	14	13	84.38
Indiana	16	7	5	75.00
Iowa	14	6	6	85.71
Kansas	10	4	4	80.00
Kentucky	16	6	7	81.25
Louisiana	12	6	5	91.67
Maine	6	3	3	100.00
Maryland	14	5	3	57.14
Massachusetts	44	17	19	81.82
Michigan	24	8	9	70.83
Minnesota	10	4	2	60.00
Mississippi	6	3	3	100.00
Missouri	20	7	6	65.00
Montana	6	3	3	100.00
Nebraska	4	2	0	50.00
Nevada	0	0	0	0.00
New Hampshire	4	1	2	75.00
New Jersey	22	9	6	68.18
New Mexico	2	1	1	100.00
New York	66	21	21	63.64

RESPONDENTS BY STATE				
STATE	MAILED	CHIEF ACAD. OFFICERS	FACULTY REPS.	PERCENT RESPONSE
North Carolina	20	8	7	75.00
North Dakota	6	3	3	100.00
Ohio	32	14	15	90.63
Oklahoma	12	4	6	83.33
Oregon	10	4	5	90.00
Pennsylvania	44	16	18	77.27
Rhode Island	6	2	3	83.33
South Carolina	6	3	0	50.00
South Dakota	0	0	0	0.00
Tennessee	12	5	6	91.67
Texas	52	26	21	90.38
Utah	4	2	2	100.00
Vermont	6	2	2	66.67
Virginia	16	8	6	87.50
Washington	12	6	2	66.67
West Virginia	8	4	3	87.50
Wisconsin	16	7	6	81.25
Wyoming	0	0	0	0.00
TOTAL	**744**	**302**	**282**	**78.49**

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAC	Association of American Colleges
AAHE	American Association of Higher Education
AAUP	American Association of University Professors
ACE	American Council on Education
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

Table 66. Academic Freedom Addressed

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	22	15.9
	Disagree	24	17.4
	Undecided	17	12.3
	Agree	28	20.3
	Strongly Agree	47	34.1
	Total	138	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	15	13.3
	Disagree	24	21.2
	Undecided	16	14.2
	Agree	30	26.5
	Strongly Agree	28	24.8
	Total	113	100.0

Table 67. Academic Freedom Protected

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	2	1.4
	Disagree	1	.7
	Undecided	4	2.9
	Agree	43	31.2
	Strongly Agree	88	63.8
	Total	138	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	3	2.7
	Disagree	8	7.1
	Undecided	17	15.2
	Agree	41	36.6
	Strongly Agree	43	38.4
	Total	112	100.0

Table 68. Post-Tenure Review Is Not a Retenuring Process

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	3	2.2
	Disagree	7	5.1
	Undecided	15	11.0
	Agree	62	45.6
	Strongly Agree	49	36.0
	Total	136	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	7	6.4
	Disagree	8	7.3
	Undecided	15	13.6
	Agree	37	33.6
	Strongly Agree	43	39.1
	Total	110	100.0

Table 69. Published Criteria Developed by Faculty

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	6	4.4
	Disagree	17	12.4
	Undecided	19	13.9
	Agree	48	35.0
	Strongly Agree	47	34.3
	Total	137	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	11	10.0
	Disagree	18	16.4
	Undecided	15	13.6
	Agree	40	36.4
	Strongly Agree	26	23.6
	Total	110	100.0

Table 70. Faculty Members Conduct Post-Tenure Review

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	3	2.1
	Disagree	5	3.5
	Undecided	3	2.1
	Agree	35	24.8
	Strongly Agree	95	67.4
	Total	141	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	6	5.4
	Disagree	10	8.9
	Undecided	4	3.6
	Agree	27	24.1
	Strongly Agree	65	58.0
	Total	112	100.0

Table 71. Primary Purpose Is Not to Make Personnel Decisions

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	7	5.1
	Disagree	13	9.4
	Undecided	11	8.0
	Agree	47	34.1
	Strongly Agree	60	43.5
	Total	138	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	7	6.5
	Disagree	13	12.0
	Undecided	13	12.0
	Agree	29	26.9
	Strongly Agree	46	42.6
	Total	108	100.0

Table 72. Primary Purpose Is Faculty Development

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	6	4.4
	Disagree	23	16.8
	Undecided	18	13.1
	Agree	52	38.0
	Strongly Agree	38	27.7
	Total	137	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	13	11.9
	Disagree	24	22.0
	Undecided	18	16.5
	Agree	35	32.1
	Strongly Agree	19	17.4
	Total	109	100.0

Table 73. Primary Purpose Is Combination of Personnel Decisions and Faculty Development

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	21	15.7
	Disagree	23	17.2
	Undecided	21	15.7
	Agree	44	32.8
	Strongly Agree	25	18.7
	Total	134	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	21	19.3
	Disagree	26	23.9
	Undecided	21	19.3
	Agree	25	22.9
	Strongly Agree	16	14.7
	Total	109	100.0

Table 74. New Financial Resources Designated

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	31	22.1
	Disagree	45	32.1
	Undecided	15	10.7
	Agree	37	26.4
	Strongly Agree	12	8.6
	Total	140	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	33	29.5
	Disagree	32	28.6
	Undecided	20	17.9
	Agree	20	17.9
	Strongly Agree	7	6.3
	Total	112	100.0

Table 75. Standards Are Flexible

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Disagree	4	2.8
	Undecided	5	3.5
	Agree	52	36.9
	Strongly Agree	80	56.7
	Total	141	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	4	3.6
	Disagree	9	8.0
	Undecided	4	3.6
	Agree	55	49.1
	Strongly Agree	40	35.7
	Total	112	100.0

Table 76. Outcome Is Confidential

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	4	2.8
	Disagree	2	1.4
	Undecided	9	6.4
	Agree	56	39.7
	Strongly Agree	70	49.6
	Total	141	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	6	5.4
	Disagree	2	1.8
	Undecided	13	11.6
	Agree	45	40.2
	Strongly Agree	46	41.1
	Total	112	100.0

Table 77. Mutually Negotiated Faculty Development Plans

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	3	2.2
	Disagree	14	10.1
	Undecided	9	6.5
	Agree	57	41.3
	Strongly Agree	55	39.9
	Total	138	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	8	7.1
	Disagree	7	6.3
	Undecided	19	17.0
	Agree	48	42.9
	Strongly Agree	30	26.8
	Total	112	100.0

Table 78. Formal Appeals Procedure

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	8	5.8
	Disagree	23	16.5
	Undecided	10	7.2
	Agree	40	28.8
	Strongly Agree	58	41.7
	Total	139	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	8	7.1
	Disagree	11	9.7
	Undecided	14	12.4
	Agree	39	34.5
	Strongly Agree	41	36.3
	Total	113	100.0

Table 79. Attempt Less Severe Sanctions

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Disagree	7	5.1
	Undecided	19	13.9
	Agree	46	33.6
	Strongly Agree	65	47.4
	Total	137	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	2	1.8
	Disagree	4	3.7
	Undecided	25	22.9
	Agree	44	40.4
	Strongly Agree	34	31.2
	Total	109	100.0

Table 80. No Dismissal Without Academic Due Process

		Frequency	Percent
Chief Academic Officer	Strongly Disagree	8	5.8
	Disagree	10	7.2
	Undecided	6	4.3
	Agree	39	28.3
	Strongly Agree	75	54.3
	Total	138	100.0
Faculty Representative	Strongly Disagree	3	2.7
	Disagree	2	1.8
	Undecided	9	8.0
	Agree	47	42.0
	Strongly Agree	51	45.5
	Total	112	100.0

VITA

Judith Elaine (White) Fry was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and moved to Chattanooga, Tennessee, as a child. She attended public schools in Chattanooga and graduated from Central High School in 1962. In 1975, she entered college as a freshman at The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. She earned a bachelor of science degree (magna cum laude) in secondary education, home economics, in 1980, and a master of science degree in educational administration and supervision in 1986.

In 1977, she began employment at The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga where she currently serves as Director of Academic Personnel. She attained national certification as a Senior Professional in Human Resources (SPHR) from the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) in 1996.

Work toward a doctorate in education began in 1993 through the Leadership Studies unit of the College of Education at The University of Tennessee. She was awarded a doctoral degree on May 12, 2000.