To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Myra Kay Peavyhouse entitled "Post-Tenure Review; A Case Study of Practices at Dalton State College." I have examined the final paper 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 Educational Administration and Policy Studies.

Jeffrey P. Aper, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

E. Grady Bogue

Mary Jane Connelly

Patricia A. McClam

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Provost and Dean of
Graduate Studies

POST-TENURE REVIEW: A CASE STUDY OF PRACTICES AT DALTON STATE COLLEGE

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

Myra Kay Peavyhouse
August 2002

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Ray and Jean Peavyhouse, who supported and encouraged me throughout this endeavor.

Thank you for being there every step of the way.

I love you both very much.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Jeffrey Aper, my major professor, for his advice and guidance. As I completed the dissertation, he provided much needed encouragement and support throughout the process. I would also like to express my gratitude to the other members of my doctoral committee, Dr. E. Grady Bogue, Dr. Mary Jane Connelly and Dr. Tricia McClam, for their insights and guidance during this study.

Next, I owe a great deal of gratitude to the administration of Dalton State College, primarily President James A. Burran and Academic Vice-President John B. Black, who graciously permitted me to study post-tenure policies and practices on their campus. I would also like to thank the faculty of Dalton State who shared their insights and actively participated in the study. In addition to Dalton State's administrators and faculty, I want to recognize the tireless efforts of Ms. Deby West, Secretary to the Academic Vice-President, who scheduled interview sessions, provided correspondence, and kept in direct contact with me regarding implementation of the study. Her efforts made my work at Dalton State a pleasant experience.

I would also like to acknowledge the support of my colleagues at Roane State Community College who encouraged me from the beginning. I would especially like to thank Mrs. Sue Christopher, Dr. M. A. Kirkpatrick, and Dr. Cathy L. Day for their continuous support throughout the process.

Most importantly, I want to thank my family and friends, without whose support I would not have had the courage to see this study through to completion. Thank you for believing in me.

ABSTRACT

This case study focused on the experiences and understanding of faculty with regard to post-tenure review policies and practices at Dalton State College, a public two-year institution located in Dalton, Georgia. The purposes of this study were to determine the evolution of the institution's post-tenure review policy and describe faculty experiences, attitudes and interpretations of it. The study also described how the process and policy affected faculty, and the policy design faculty would prefer and how it would work. Data were collected from a total of twenty-eight individual interviews with faculty and seventy-four survey respondents, and documentary evidence was also analyzed.

This study revealed that all Dalton State College faculty, once tenured, must adhere to a well-structured post-tenure review process, which occurs on a five-year cycle. Regardless of years of service, no tenured faculty are exempt from this requirement. Also, the Dalton State post-tenure policy is automatic in design in that it occurs every five years, and developmental in nature because it encourages both faculty and administrators to work together to develop quality performance. Furthermore, if given an opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, Dalton State faculty would continue to follow the present policy's procedures although they would reduce the amount of administrative control.

Implications, such as process development, opinions regarding implementation, and faculty perceptions and preferences, are included for public two-year institutions of higher education. Also discussed are recommendations for further research, including a study to determine the impact of pre-tenure review procedures as well as faculty governance upon the post-tenure review process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	**INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY**	1
	Background for the Study	2
	Statement of the Problem	6
	Purpose of the Study	7
	Research Questions	7
	Assumptions of the Study	8
	Significance of the Study	8
	Delimitations of the Study	8
	Limitations of the Study	9
	Research Methods, Procedures and Analysis	9
	Methods	9
	Procedures	10
	Data Analysis	10
	Definition of Terms	12
	Organization of the Study	14
II.	**REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**	15
	Chapter Preview	15
	Concepts of Tenure	16
	The Development of Academic Freedom	18
	Methods of Tenure Acquisition	21
	Factors Influencing Tenure Acquisition	22
	An Historical Overview of Tenure in Higher Education	23
	The Current Tenure Debate	27
	Post-tenure Review Defined	31
	An Historical Overview of Post-tenure Review	32
	Philosophical Implications of Post-tenure Review	35
	Implications of Post-tenure Review for the Community College	35
	Evaluation Criteria	36
	Higher Education's Response to Post-tenure Review	38
	Conclusion	39
III.	**RESEARCH DESIGN, METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES**	40
	Introduction	40
	Design of the Study	41
	Methods and Procedures of Data Collection	43
	Selection of Site	43
	Collection of Documents	44
	Individual Interviews	44
	Questionnaires	47
	Human Subjects Process	49
	Data Analysis	50
	Documents	50

	Interviews	50
	Questionnaires	55
	Limitations of the Study	58
	Triangulation of Data	60
IV.	**DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**	62
	Introduction	62
	Presentation of Findings	64
	Research Question One	65
	History of the University of System of Georgia	65
	University System of Georgia Mission	65
	History of Dalton State College	66
	Institutional Mission	67
	System-wide Mandate for Post-Tenure Review	67
	Implementation of Post-Tenure Review at Dalton State College	73
	Research Question Two	76
	Demographics of Survey Respondents	77
	No Opinion of the Process	77
	Positive Impact of the Post-Tenure Review Process	78
	Policy Perceptions	79
	Process Outcomes	84
	Negative Impact of the Post-Tenure Review Process	89
	Mixed Reviews	93
	Research Question Three	94
	Process's Impact upon Interviewees: No Opinion	95
	Post-Tenure Review: A Positive Experience	95
	Opinions of Reviewed Faculty	97
	Little Impact upon Interviewees	98
	Negative Impact upon Interviewees	100
	No Opinion of Process's Impact upon Colleagues	102
	Positive Impact upon Colleagues	102
	No Impact	104
	Negative Impact upon Colleagues	107
	Faculty Question Need for Process	113
	Research Question Four	115
	Preferred Post-Tenure Review Policy	115
	Perceptions of the Policy	115
	Faculty Evaluation Process	121
	Administrative Input	123
	Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee	128
	Other Suggested Revisions	131
	Overview of Findings	137
V.	**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**	139
	Introduction	139
	Reflections on the Study	140
	Findings	142

Conclusions 143
Discussion 145
Implications of the Study 147
Recommendations for Further Research 149
Summary 151

LIST OF REFERENCES 152

APPENDICES 160

APPENDIX A: Letter Requesting Access 161

APPENDIX B: Document Summary Form 163

APPENDIX C: Interview Guide 165

APPENDIX D: Cover Letter for First Mailing of Survey 167

APPENDIX E: Survey 169

APPENDIX F: Postcard for Second Mailing 175

APPENDIX G: Follow-up Letter for Third Mailing 177

APPENDIX H: Consent Form 179

APPENDIX I: Dalton State College Approval Letter 181

APPENDIX J: Human Subjects Form B 183

APPENDIX K: IRB Approval Letter 193

VITA 195

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
TABLE III-1:	Sources of Documentary Data	51
TABLE III-2:	Interview Participants by Gender and Academic Rank	52
TABLE III-3:	Number of Survey Respondents by Academic Rank and Tenure Status	55
TABLE III-4:	Number of Survey Respondents by Academic Rank and Years of Full-time Employment	56
TABLE IV-1:	Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Policy Orientation	79
TABLE IV-2:	Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Policy Design	80
TABLE IV-3:	Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Process Management	81
TABLE IV-4:	Survey Respondents' Perceptions of the Timing of the Review	82
TABLE IV-5:	Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Contingency Events	83
TABLE IV-6:	Survey Respondents' Perceptions of the Frequency of Review	83
TABLE IV-7:	Survey Respondents' Perceptions of the Impact of Review	88
TABLE IV-8:	Timing of Review Preferred by Survey Respondents	117
TABLE IV-9:	Contingency Events Preferred by Survey Respondents	117
TABLE IV-10:	Frequency of Review Preferred by Survey Respondents	118
TABLE IV-11:	Policy Orientation Preferred by Survey Respondents	125
TABLE IV-12:	Policy Design Preferred by Survey Respondents	125
TABLE IV-13:	Process Management Preferred by Survey Respondents	126
TABLE IV-14:	Impact of Review Preferred by Survey Respondents	132

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

As higher education faculty and administrators prepare to meet the educational demands of the 21st century, a number of concerns have surfaced with regard to faculty tenure and related practices and policies. "While the issues on the minds of state legislatures, policymakers, and trustees differ from region to region, the underlying theme is a heightened focus on quality and outcomes" (Licata & Morreale, 1997, p.1). Thus, in effort to address these concerns before policies are suggested by external agencies, several institutions have made the commitment to become more actively involved in setting their own procedures to evaluate educational quality and outcomes. Furthermore, many post-secondary educational institutions have adopted, or are considering the adoption of, post-tenure review policies. Because such policies provide for the close examination of faculty performance, many institutions and state policymakers see them as opportunities to affect educational quality and outcomes at a variety of levels.

As the direct result of such concerns, college and university faculty who are tenured are now finding their own academic performance and accomplishments scrutinized as much, if not more, than prior to receiving tenure (Gorman, 1997). Likewise, "driven in large part by shrinking budgets, spiraling costs, the need for greater flexibility, and the elimination of mandatory retirement, institutions are being forced to reexamine their expectations regarding faculty responsibilities, performance, rewards, and long-term career development" (Licata & Morreale, 1997, p. 1). Hence, formal procedures for more in-depth evaluation of tenured faculty,

often called post-tenure review, have been adopted by an increasing number of higher education institutions, including 29 percent of the 280 four-year institutions that responded to a 1995 AAHE-sponsored survey (Trower, 1996). According to Licata and Morreale (1997), post-tenure review is "a systematic, comprehensive process, separate from the annual review, aimed specifically at assessing performance and/or nurturing faculty growth and development" (p. 1). Thus, in an effort to assess faculty performance, policies of post-tenure review have become increasingly common in higher education.

Background for the Study

Post-tenure review practices were first introduced in the mid-1980s. In 1983, at the request of the National Commission on Higher Education, the Wingspread Conference on Evaluation of Tenured Faculty studied a proposal for the development of post-tenure evaluation. "At the time, it was referred to as the 'periodic evaluation of tenured faculty' " (Report of Committee A, 1997, p. 44). However, once conference participants were convened, they determined that no additional procedures were needed, and the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) then issued a statement which indicated that post-tenure evaluation would bring no benefit to faculty, incur unnecessary costs, and jeopardize academic freedom (Report of Committee A, 1997).

In contrast to the above recommendations, increased numbers of institutions have implemented various procedures for post-tenure review since the 1983 Wingspread Conference. For instance, in 1989, only six percent of the prestigious public and private research-level institutions in the American Association of

Universities (AAU) had policies of tenure review that were independent of those annual reviews for salary and promotion (Wesson & Johnson, 1991). Although few institutions had policies of tenure review during this time, the number of those implementing some type of tenure review policy began to rise during the 1990s. For example, in 1995, an AAHE-supported study of 1,200 four-year college and university provosts was conducted, indicating that post-tenure review had been adopted at 29% of responding institutions, while increased numbers of institutions were considering some sort of tenure reform. In addition, at least 28 states were either discussing or implementing the process (Licata & Morreale, 1996). In a later study involving institutions in all ten Carnegie classifications, 61 percent of those colleges and universities studied in a sample indicated that post-tenure review policies were in place at their institutions (Harris, 1996). Furthermore, Licata (1998) discovered that, as a system or state policy, "post-tenure review is in either the discussion or implementation stage in more than 30 states" (p. 4).

According to its initial Report of Committee A (1997), the AAUP suggested that two main types of policy and practice undergird the concept of post-tenure review programs. While the two models suggested by the AAUP are the most common, a third has recently been in operation on some campuses (Licata, 1998).

First are those programs are that considered "developmental" in nature. Developmentally-based post-tenure review programs involve both "institutions and faculty members who seek to improve the quality of teaching, research, and service, at all levels of performance" (p. A15). In these policies, faculty and administrators work together to develop, redesign, and enhance faculty performance and

productivity. They also have a plan in place to address issues of concern to both groups.

The second aim of post-tenure review, as described by the AAUP in the Report of Committee A, is more "managerial" in nature and is seen as "an effort by administrators and boards of trustees to impose a corporate model of financing and administration on colleges and universities" (p. A16). Although initially against the concept of post-tenure review, the AAUP, in its 1998 follow-up response, now states that due to increasing numbers of institutions adopting or considering post-tenure review policies, "it has become necessary to reaffirm the principles of the 1983 statement, but also to provide standards which can be used to assess the review process when it is being considered or implemented" (Report of Committee A, 1998, p. 1). Licata and Morreale (1997) indicate that although the intent of a majority of such reviews is developmental in nature, a 1995 AAHE-sponsored study of 1,200 four-year college and university provosts revealed that all reviews contain some aspects of the summative (managerial) component, one which is used to make personnel decisions (p. 5). Furthermore, a 1995 AAHE-sponsored study "revealed that post-tenure review has been mandated by legislatures or governing boards in some states, or has been strongly encouraged by boards of trustees at many institutions" (Trower, 1996, p.1).

More recently a third model, known as substantive annual review, has been adopted by some campuses. As a component of the model, "the annual review process is expanded beyond the usual perfunctory administrative assessment and raised to a systematic and comprehensive level by the inclusion of significant peer review, long-term professional-development goals, and provision for appropriate

action if performance is below standard" (Licata, 1998, p. 4). Thus, in an effort to retain internal control in the presence of such criticism, institutions are finding themselves becoming more active in the post-tenure debate. Therefore, "for faculty and administrators, the motivating spirit behind post-tenure review has been 'let's do unto ourselves before someone does into us' " (Licata, 1998, p. 1).

Although post-tenure review policies are rapidly developing for four-year institutions, information is limited with regard to the practices found within public two-year institutions (Licata, 1984a; Licata & Andrews, 1990). Despite such limited information, in a 1984 study of nine member institutions of the League for Innovation in the Community College, seven of the nine or "77% of all respondents surveyed indicated that formal post-tenure evaluation did exist at their institution" (Licata, 1984b, 1985).

In 1997, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) conducted preliminary studies in the area of post-tenure review for post-secondary education in Arizona. Although the report's primary focus centered on the post-secondary level, ECS felt that the findings were highly applicable for both elementary and secondary educational levels; therefore, the results were made available to educators considering changes in tenure at the K-12 level (Education Commission of the States, 1999). Specifically, as one of ten potential actions listed in the report, ECS recommended that each institution or district within the Arizona Board of Regents "provide for a second tenure review (post-tenure review) which would occur several years after tenure was granted" (p. 1). In the event a faculty member failed the second review, the faculty member could face termination. This second review would "serve as a safeguard against teachers whose performance declined after

being awarded tenure" (p. 1). Although ECS proposed ten recommendations, the Arizona Board of Regents chose to adopt only two. These required that "categories for 'just cause' were directly related to faculty performance" and provided for " 'Tenure Audits' to be performed and published in an easily-accessible forum" (p. 1).

In 2000, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), in conjunction with the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), conducted a study of chief academic officers and chief faculty senate leaders of all community colleges to assess the status of post-tenure review within these institutions in the United States. Specifically, this national survey would determine if a formal post-tenure evaluation plan existed at two-year colleges and, if in place, assess the purpose and content of such policies. In addition to a section focused on merit recognition programs, the survey instrument also sought input on twelve statements on tenure and post-tenure. Such data permitted both the AACC and AAHE to help inform national conversations on this topic.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is that very little is known about how post-tenure review impacts two-year college faculty--the rank and file at whom it is directed. Furthermore, policies and directives are in place, but there is little empirical evidence of how a post-tenure review policy affects its target population, the faculty, and how they understand, interpret, and implement it. Thus, a case study that will complement the AACC and AAHE project currently in progress is warranted, since

the experiences and understandings of faculty with regard to post-tenure review have not yet been explored in depth.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this case study were to: (1) determine the evolution of the post-tenure review policy at a two-year college; (2) describe faculty experiences and attitudes toward the post-tenure review process at this institution; (3) determine how they interpret the process and policy; (4) describe how the process and policy affect their practices, status, and roles within the institution; and (5) describe the policy design faculty would prefer and how it would work.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How did the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolve? Who were the principal players in the process?
2. How do Dalton State College faculty interpret the post-tenure review policy? What are their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation?
3. Do Dalton State College faculty members think post-tenure review affects their practices? Their status? Their roles within the institution?
4. If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be the preferences of Dalton State College faculty members? How would such a policy be different?

Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that those faculty who participated would have personal knowledge of post-tenure review at their institution, or they would have access to such information used in the post-tenure review process. It was also assumed that these individuals would respond accurately and in a timely manner, and that the case study can elicit valuable data. Finally, it is assumed that the case study will provide meaningful insight and contribute to a greater understanding of post-tenure review at public two-year institutions.

Significance of the Study

Although the survey method has been utilized in most studies of the post-tenure review process, no case studies of faculty have been conducted with regard to post-tenure review practices at two-year colleges in the United States. Therefore, because the case study would probe more deeply, an investigation of post-tenure review at such an institution provided valuable insight for those faculty and administrators considering its adoption and/or revision. As a result of such faculty insight, a better informed decisionmaking process can help educational leaders and faculty to work together develop and/or revise post-tenure review policies in the future.

Delimitations of the Study

This case study of Dalton State College was delimited to a public two-year college in the southeastern United States that was selected for the study.

Furthermore, the case study was delimited to include only the responses of selected faculty during the fall 2000 academic term.

Limitations of the Study

This case study was limited in that it only reviewed survey responses, historical documents and interview data from one institution. Other limitations included the study's lack of statistical generalization, amount of documentation, and overall quality. A final limitation concerned the researcher's role in the study. For instance, since the researcher was a tenured community college faculty member and had also served in an administrative capacity during her academic career, she realized she could have been subject to biases.

Research Methods, Procedures and Analysis

Methods

The case study method was selected for the study because it permitted the researcher "to study a multitude of factors in-depth" (Mason & Bramble, 1997, p. 41). Utilization of a mixed method design was advantageous because it permitted the researcher to incorporate both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods (Creswell, 2002). Specifically, since statistics elicited via a survey study only provided limited quantitative data, the case study provided an avenue by which the researcher used a variety of qualitative tools to probe more deeply into issues, many of which would have otherwise been inaccessible.

Procedures

Dalton State College, a Georgia public community college and member of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), was selected as the site for the case study. In order to gain access to the institution, the researcher made a formal written request to the college's chief academic officer (See Appendix A, Letter Requesting Access). Once approval was been granted by UT's Institutional Review Board and Dalton State College, the researcher proceeded with the study.

The researcher then utilized three primary data collection methods-- documentary evidence, faculty interviews and a brief questionnaire-- to study faculty experiences and understandings of the post-tenure review process at Dalton State College.

Data Analysis

In an effort to analyze documentary evidence, the researcher completed a document summary form for each document reviewed (See Appendix B, Document Summary Form). This process assisted the researcher as she summarized each document, placed it in context, determined its significance, and organized the data she collected (Miles & Huberman, 1998).

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), a computer software package, was used to analyze the data collected from the survey. Data analysis included the reporting of cross-tabulations to show relationships between survey questions as well as the calculation of frequencies and percentages per question. Responses listed in "other (please specify)" items were examined for content, and then analyzed for themes or categories that accurately characterized such

responses. Furthermore, by means of color-coding the survey items in relation to categories that emerged from the interview data, the researcher correlated quantitative and qualitative data obtained from both the survey and interviews.

Interview data were analyzed as well. As soon as possible after each interview was conducted, the researcher utilized a word processor to convert the taped interview into a written transcript, assigned pseudonyms to each transcript to conceal the identity of the participant, and included any reflective remarks she took in the form of raw field notes during the interview process. Once the interview was transcribed and the researcher began to interpret the written transcript, along the left margin of the transcript she included codes, "tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during the study" (Miles & Huberman, 1998, p. 56). Along the right margin of the transcript she included her written ideas and observations in the form of marginal remarks, and then created a series of pattern codes to "identify an emergent theme, configuration, or explanation" (Miles & Huberman, 1998, p. 69). After pattern codes were determined, the researcher used memoing to "tie together different pieces of data into a recognizable cluster" (p. 72). The use of such memoranda permitted the researcher to make written notes to herself regarding the codes and their relationships to one another as they occurred. Once transcript data, codes, reflective and marginal remarks, pattern codes, and memos were analyzed, propositions were developed in an effort to answer the representative research questions.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined for the purpose of this study:

1. **Automatic Post-tenure Review** - An evaluation process that occurs at a specific time, as indicated by the institution. The typical evaluation cycle occurs every academic year.
2. **Developmental Post-tenure Review** - The policy encourages faculty and administrators to work together to develop the quality of performance at all levels - teaching, research, and institutional service.
3. **Formative Post-tenure Review** - In an effort to encourage faculty development and growth, the policy emphasizes career development and integrates developmental goals with departmental goals and objectives. This form of review rarely results in personnel action.
4. **Managerial Post-tenure Review** - The policy allows administrators to make managerial decisions and to ascertain if faculty should be rewarded or penalized for their performance.
5. **Orientation** - A philosophical basis for an action.
6. **Post-tenure Review** - "A systematic, comprehensive process, separate from the annual review, aimed specifically at assessing performance and/or nurturing faculty growth and development" (Licata & Morreale, 1997, p. 1). Also known as "comprehensive review of sustained performance," "tenured faculty review and development," "periodic evaluation (review) of tenured faculty," "continuing and enhanced review," and "extended review" (Licata, 1998, p. 4).

7. **Substantive Annual Review** - "The annual merit review process is expanded beyond the usual perfunctory administrative assessment and raised to a systematic and comprehensive level by the inclusion of significant peer review, long-term professional-development goals, and provision for appropriate action if performance is below standard" (Licata, 1998, p. 4).

8. **Summative Post-tenure Review** - "Actual consequences from the review are made explicit and include but are not limited to preparation of a long-term professional-development plan, reward and recognition measures, and formulation of an improvement plan when deficiencies are noted" (Licata, 1998, p. 4).

9. **Tenure** - "An arrangement under which faculty appointments in an institution of higher education are continued until retirement for age or physical disability, 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).

10. **Triggered/Contingent** - An evaluation process that occurs as the result of an event. Examples include "two consecutive annual evaluations of unsatisfactory performance, or failure to receive a merit increase two years in a row" (Licata & Morreale, 1997, p. 1).

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters followed by a list of references and appendices.

Chapter I includes the introduction and background for the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, delimitations and limitations of the study, research methods, procedures, analysis, assumptions of the study, definitions of terms, and organization of the study.

Chapter II reviews the related literature. This includes historical background on post-tenure review and the current debate surrounding its use.

Chapter III describes the research methodology used in the study. Also addressed are the research questions, sample selection, and analysis of the data.

Chapter IV states the findings of the study.

Chapter V summarizes the first three chapters, expands the research findings addressed in Chapter IV, offers conclusions, and makes appropriate recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

With the arrival of the 21st century, higher education faculty and administrators are facing increased expectations from private as well as public groups for accountability with regard to the present tenure system for faculty. Such calls for accountability have developed from a variety of entities--both internal and external to higher education--and include faculty, administrators, and members of the business and legislative community. Thus, in an effort to assess faculty performance and address growing concerns of accountability, many educational administrators are considering the use of evaluative tools that go beyond traditional forms of review. One such tool is post-tenure review, a process currently used by thousands of colleges and universities in the United States and under consideration by many others. Community and junior colleges are also impacted by such decisions.

Chapter Preview

In this chapter, the researcher will address the concepts of tenure, the development of academic freedom, methods of tenure acquisition and the factors influencing it, along with an historical overview of tenure in higher education and the current tenure debate. Moreover, within the confines of this chapter, the researcher will address the concept of post-tenure review as well as its historical significance and philosophical implications. Finally, the chapter will focus upon implications for the community college, evaluation criteria and higher education's response to post-tenure review, and offer a conclusion.

Concepts of Tenure

According to William R. Keast, chair of the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, "tenure is an arrangement under which faculty appointments in an institution of higher education are continued until retirement for age or physical disability, 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).

Furthermore, in *Exploring the Heritage of American Higher Education*, Bogue and Aper (2000) indicate that modern tenure policies appeared due to the following:

> To guarantee the independence of faculty in their search for truth, to assure them of due process, to offer a degree of employment security as a partial compensation for the relatively low salaries associated with work of the mind, and to protect them from the caprice of the politically and financially motivated, mostly external to the campus and the narrowness and meanness of colleagues who hold different views. (p. 171)

Most often, faculty see tenure as a reward, and believe it is a recognition they have earned and are entitled to. Cohen, Brawer, & Associates (1994) state, "For the community college instructor whose destiny is that of teaching throughout the service career and who cannot attain promotions in rank as do cousins in universities, this [tenure] is perhaps the most rewarding official honor the institution can bestow" (pp. 374-375).

In American colleges and universities tenure is almost universal, thanks in part to the presence of the AAUP, the influential professional higher education organization of which numerous faculty are members. Since its inception in 1915, the AAUP has continued to be one of the strongest voices for higher education

faculty, especially with regard to matters involving tenure and academic freedom. From policy statements first issued in 1940 to the 1998 *Report of Committee A,* tenure has been a significant issue to the association.

Also notable is the AAUP's widely publicized list of censured administrations, currently 51 institutions which, according to the AAUP, have violated principles of academic freedom and tenure set forth in the 1940 statement. Finally, Miller (1987) observed that "tenure has been an integral part of academe since World War II; about 85 percent of all colleges and universities in the United States have some form of tenure" (p. 96).

Furthermore, tenure guarantees academic freedom, a right that is protected by the First Amendment [i.e., *Keyishian v. Board of Regents* 385 U.S. 589 (1967)]. Kaplin and Lee (1995) report that, due to this Supreme Court ruling, many institutions have adopted AAUP's 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings* to help them deal with dismissal. Although the process of tenure is widely accepted by colleges and universities in the United States, post-tenure review is seen by some as a threat to academic tenure and by others as a way of modernizing university and college personnel policies. Thus, with the relentless support of the AAUP and its powerful faculty membership, and the First Amendment rights that support academic freedom, the system of tenure that exists today is utilized in a large majority of U.S. colleges and universities. For higher education, an essential component of the tenure process is academic freedom (Alstete, 2000).

The Development of Academic Freedom

One of the most important factors to influence the concept of academic tenure in higher education has been the concept of academic freedom. With its roots in the 19th century, the concept of academic freedom was first introduced in German universities in an effort to uphold the principle known as "*Lehrfreiheit*, or the freedom to teach without interference from ecclesiastical and government influences" (Alstete, 2000, p. 6). Specifically, Germans believed freedoms such as these were necessary, not only for the teaching profession, but for any entity known as a university (Alstete, 2000). However, such freedoms only applied to the university and not to the lower schools or society generally.

As institutions of higher education were initially created in the United States and for some time thereafter, "professors labored under employment law doctrine holding that private and public employees had no right to object to conditions placed upon the terms of employment, including restrictions on free expression" (Hamilton, 1997, p. 17). Thus, members of the professorate could not freely voice opinions and were especially discouraged from speaking on the behalf of the institution by which they were employed. However, in the late 1880s, greater numbers of professors began to question traditional practices regarding the restriction of free speech.

Then, in the early 20th century, as faculty began to join together to form special interest groups, one such group, the AAUP (American Association of University Professors, founded in 1915), made several statements with regard to faculty rights as teachers and researchers. Once such definitive policy, the AAUP's *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, addressed three

basic freedoms that its members believed all faculty should be granted by the academy. First is the freedom to conduct research and publish the findings of such research. Thus, faculty should be allowed to participate in research activities without fear of reprisal. Also, by means of academic freedom, faculty should have the freedom to teach as well as discuss their subject matter in the classroom. However, they must careful not to espouse controversial ideas not related to the subject matter. Finally, academic freedom, as protected by the Ist Amendment, should give faculty the opportunity to speak as individual citizens, whose views are free from censorship (AAUP, 1970).

Although academic freedom has been recognized for some time, its use has not gone unchallenged. Early attacks on academic freedom were motivated by such factors as "the unfettered capitalism of trustees at the turn of the century, patriotism in World War I, and anti-communism prior to World War II" and during the post-war years (Hamilton, 1997, p. 17).

Perhaps one of the greatest threats to academic freedom in the last fifty years came in the 1940s and later in the1950s, when Senator Joseph McCarthy created a national stir in his search for communists and a movement known as McCarthyism was born. As a result, many scholars chose to flee higher education rather than risk being labeled communists for airing leftist views (Hamilton, 1997; Woodward, 1997). However, others chose to fight in the courts. One such case was *Sweezy v. New Hampshire*, 354 U.S. 234 (1957). In this case, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of Paul Sweezy, a professor at the University of New Hampshire. The court ruled that Paul Sweezy was denied "due process of law under the 14th Amendment after he was held in contempt of court for refusing to answer questions

concerning the contents of one of his lectures and his knowledge of the Progressive Party of the State and its members" (Poch, 1993, p. 17). More importantly, the Court indicated that a university has the right to four key freedoms: "'to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted for study'" (Bogue & Aper, 2000, p. 40).

Academic freedom of thought and speech endured additional attacks during the 1960s and 1970s, as students, inspired by faculty-espoused views, held protest rallies and resorted to violence on university campuses (Hamilton, 1997; Woodward, 1997). Concerns soon began to surface regarding academic freedom and its impact upon the personal lives of educators. One such landmark case was *Shelton v. Tucker*, 364 U.S. 479 (1960), where the Supreme Court "invalidated a state statute that compelled public school and college teachers to reveal all organizational affiliations or contributions for the previous five years" (Kaplin & Lee, 1995, p. 301).

A final threat to academic freedom is ongoing--one which comes from within academe itself. In the words of Bogue and Aper (2000), "intellectual narrowness and rigidity, unwillingness to admit error, personal jealousy, academic prejudice, political difference, and personal animosities may create internal climates confining and even demeaning to academic freedom" (p. 169). Thus, academic freedoms concerning research, classroom subject matter and public speech must also endure debate at the hands of the academy--the very entity such freedoms were established to protect. Despite such challenges, the right to speak freely within the academy continues to be a guiding force in higher education today, especially with regard to academic tenure.

Methods of Tenure Acquisition

Faculty may acquire tenure in a variety of ways, but three are most common. The first type is known as instant tenure, a rare situation that occurs when an individual is awarded a permanent faculty position without the completion of a probationary period. In most cases, faculty who are awarded tenure upon employment have been previously tenured at another institution and are recognized for their academic scholarship. Thus, the institution, acting in good faith, believes that upon employment, the individual will continue to maintain the same level of professional commitment and scholarship displayed at the previous institution. With regard to the community college, "in some states tenure is awarded simultaneously with a full-time teaching contract" (Cohen & Brawer, 1996, p. 85). Thus, the typical probationary period is waved at the time of employment and the faculty member receives academic tenure without regard to tenure previously earned at another institution or the level of scholarship attained.

Automatic acquisition is the second type of tenure awarded to the majority of college and university educators. Faculty who acquire tenure via this avenue have only done so after completing a required number of years of uninterrupted employment with the institution and, in some cases, attaining a particular rank. After tenure has been awarded, traditional reviews of professional growth, institutional service, performance evaluations (i.e., annual review), and other components continue to be conducted.

The third most common way of acquiring tenure is through an evaluative process. Unlike the automatic process, a faculty member is not tenured after completing a probationary period or attaining a particular rank. As a component of

the evaluative process, faculty are required to undergo a comprehensive review by their supervisors, and often by their peers, prior to the award. After ensuring that faculty have completed all the tenure requirements--probationary period, specified academic rank, and service to the institution and community--as set forth by the institution, tenure is then awarded upon approval of the institutional administration and ultimately the governing body. Finally, in the community college setting, faculty tenure is often an item included in contract bargaining agreements (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). For instance, prior to accepting a faculty position, the individual may request that the employment contract include a statement that guarantees the individual a tenure-track position. In other words, the employee will have the opportunity, by means of the legal contract, to earn tenure in the position (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Factors Influencing Tenure Acquisition

Tenure decisions can be greatly influenced by other factors as well. These include credit for previous service, the probationary period, the "up-or-out" rule, and the "tenure-or-out" rule.

A majority of colleges and universities require faculty to undergo a probationary period prior to tenure eligibility (Chait & Ford, 1984). During this period, faculty progress is carefully reviewed and monitored via such techniques as peer mentoring, classroom observations, evaluations, and formal reviews. Although probationary periods vary, institutions may require faculty to remain in a particular rank for a number of years (i.e., seven years to reach the Associate Professor rank) before they are eligible for tenure review.

Also of importance is credit for previous service. Some institutions may grant as many as three years of service at other institutions toward tenure eligibility, enabling the faculty member to reduce the required number of years served before tenure is awarded. According to Cohen & Brawer (1996), "tenure patterns in community colleges more closely resemble those in the lower schools [elementary and secondary schools] than they do the procedures in universities" (p. 84). A major difference can be seen in the required number of probationary years. On occasion, tenure may be awarded after one year, or after a two to three-year probationary period, with the probationary period in community colleges rarely ever reaching the length of time seen in universities (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Another component influencing the tenure process is the "up-or-out" rule. This policy stipulates that a faculty member must achieve a particular rank within a specific period, or leave the institution (Huer, 1991). A similar series of restrictions apply to the "tenure-or-out" rule. Specifically, prior to or at the completion of a probationary period, a faculty member must earn tenure or face automatic termination of employment with the institution.

An Historical Overview of Tenure in Higher Education

The tenure system found in today's colleges and universities has a colorful history. "From the time it emerged in the middle ages to the time it was reshaped by the Reformation, teaching in a *studium generale* or university was a highly privileged occupation" (Commission, 1973, p. 94). One of the first systems of awarding merit to scholars can be traced back to 1158, when Frederick Barbarosa, a medieval European emperor, issued a statement which promised safe haven for

scholars residing in his kingdom. This decree included protection from opposing armies and reimbursement for unlawful investigation (Commission, 1973). Although scholars were awarded such benefits, the governing body held the power to withdraw the privileges at any time.

Because learning and learners were respected during this period, medieval scholars were also held in high esteem. As counselors and advisors, they assisted their communities with the understanding of a variety of significant issues, including canon and civil law, logic, and religious faith. For instance, in the fourteenth century, "the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris became the leading arbiter of doctrinal issues before the Church" (Commission, 1973, p. 98). In addition to their work in the community, faculty sought immunity as well as a sense of autonomy from those in authority (Commission, 1973).

As time passed, the tenure system continued to evolve. In 1716, Harvard established three-year assignments for tutors. Then, in 1760, Harvard saw a need to limit the length of time a tutor could be employed at that level. A policy was soon implemented which stated that the time spent as a tutor could not exceed eight years of service (Chait & Ford, 1982). At the conclusion of the eighth year, the tutor's employment with the institution would be terminated.

In 1790, an early academic lawsuit was filed in which a dismissed faculty member brought suit against a higher education institution. In the case, Reverend John Bracken sued the visitors (governing board) of William and Mary College for having "deprived him of his professorship without a trial and thus of his rights as a member of the corporation" (Commission, 1973, p. 114). The Virginia Court ruled in favor of William and Mary College, and control remained with the visitors.

By the 19th century, two separate tracks, one for tutors and another for professors, became evident. By 1820, Harvard had established temporary tracks for tutors and permanent tracks for faculty (Chait & Ford, 1982). The contracts of the tutors could be renewed indefinitely, but promotions were not possible. Although tutors were not afforded certainty of stability in employment, a professor's place in the institution was considered permanent, and attainment of a higher rank was very likely. Chait and Ford see these tracks as the "distant forerunners of probationary and tenured faculty" (1982, p. 91).

Perhaps the most well-known event in the early history of academic freedom and tenure is the case of Edward Ross, a Stanford University economics professor. First hired by the university in 1896, Ross' employment was terminated four years later because his views were deemed too controversial for Mrs. Jane Stanford, wife of Leland Stanford, university founder and patron (Bogue & Aper, 2000; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). His views included advocacy of the free coinage of silver, support of the 1898 railway union strike, and criticism of the anti-immigrant labor movement. At the time, "these causes were essentially socialist, overtly political, and definitely aberrant for a professor at Stanford University" (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996, p. 24). Although Ross soon obtained employment elsewhere, his case would prove to have a lasting impact upon higher education. Tierney and Bensimon (1996) indicate that "the summary dismissal of Ross and others prompted various groups to debate what academic freedom meant and how it ought to be protected" (p. 24). One such educator was Arthur Lovejoy, a young Stanford professor. Lovejoy, who submitted his resignation and moved to Johns Hopkins University, soon began to lead efforts to organize professors (Huer, 1991).

As lawsuits such as Ross vs. Stanford University became increasingly common in higher education, strife between faculty and administrators rose, causing several educational associations, including the AAUP, to join forces. In 1915, the AAUP developed an initial response to academic freedom and tenure. Then, in 1940, the organization produced its definitive *Academic Freedom and Tenure: Statement of Principles*, which provides the basis for the current tenure system:

> Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and society. (1970, p. 27)

At this time, the AAUP endorsed a probationary period of eight years for all college and university faculty; however, in 1940, the organization reduced the number of probationary years to seven. The association also supported a one-track tenure system with a definite period of probation, rather than a two-track system--one track leading to the awarding of academic tenure and the other simply consisting of yearly re-appointments with no opportunity to earn tenure (Chait & Ford, 1982).

During the 1960s, higher education expanded tremendously; thus, faculty who sought positions within colleges and universities had no difficulty securing employment. Such rapid growth soon created a shortage of individuals needed to teach the growing numbers of students. Moreover, "it was in the 1960s that the new principle of academic freedom and permanent tenure became the standard, primarily to attract qualified teachers" (Huer, 1991, p. 9). During this time, professors who were hired also expected their benefit packages to include tenure.

As a result, many individuals were tenured, including those who did not meet qualifications (Huer, 1991).

In the 1970s, due to growing political unrest, tenure and academic freedom were under attack. Outspoken professors, students, and legislators protested both systems--tenure and academic freedom. Also active in the controversy were proponents of academic freedom and tenure; as a result, numerous demonstrations occurred on college campuses, in the streets, and in public forums because both groups wanted their causes to be heard (Huer, 1991). Throughout the 1980s, Huer (1991) notes that tenured professors were rarely dismissed. Then, in 1990s, post-tenure review began to emerge.

The Current Tenure Debate

In the 21st century, the tenure debate continues. Is tenure supposed to reward true scholarship in teaching and research, or is it simply a form of compensation taken too lightly by those in academe? And, does the security tenure affords reward those who are not properly qualified to teach and research but who have simply fulfilled institutional probationary period requirements? Such questions have led educators as well as the public to look closely at the process of tenure, and its opponents are demanding a sweeping overhaul or elimination of the present system (Trower, 1996; Hamilton, 1997; Chait, 1998). Other individuals, especially those holding administrative positions in higher education, are calling for post-tenure review; a way to evaluate those faculty who have already been awarded academic tenure and to determine if they meet institutional performance standards (Trower, 1996).

Critics and defenders alike continue to debate the necessity of tenure, despite its prevalence in higher education. Those most critical "claim that tenure shelters incompetent teachers and that it prevents the flexibility needed to make cutbacks in response to shrinking budgets, changing student interests, or revised institutional missions" (Roworth, 1998, p. 1).

For example, O'Toole argues that "the practice of tenure actually *undercuts* academic quality, *abridges* academic freedom and *short-circuits* the chances of professors to have satisfying and productive careers" (as cited in Miller, 1987, p. 97). As another vocal but extreme opponent of the process, Huer believes tenure "is acquired chiefly by luck (being in the right place at the right time), by connivance (expanding one's vita, not one's scholarship), or by demonstrating an infinite capacity for humility (sometimes called collegiality)" (1991, p. 4). As a result, tenure becomes irrelevant because some faculty may not be truly deserving of it.

In addition, Solomon and Solomon, in their text *Up the University,* argue that tenure is not appropriate for higher education and should be abolished. They state that, "like some ancient versions of paradise, the blessings of tenure turn out not to be fair compensation for the sacrifices and humiliation it takes to get there" (1993, p. 293). For instance, faculty will often subject themselves to additional duties, which include serving on numerous committees, teaching an overloaded schedule of classes at various locations and attending a multitude of professional development activities. As faculty overextend themselves, they are soon consumed by their self-imposed obligations to the institution but will do what is necessary to prove they are worthy of tenure. Despite their efforts, faculty may still be denied tenure.

Others worry that current tenure practices may prevent new talent from entering some academic programs because the tenure system promotes lifetime employment (Miller, 1987; Wilke, 1979). Thus, faculty turnover rates are reduced considerably as faculty, once tenured, believe that such an award indicates that they have continued employment with a given institution. Another frequently cited concern involves tenured faculty whose post-tenure performance may not merit lifetime employment with the institution. In other words, "the institution finds its faculty deteriorating because some professors on tenure may get lazy, stale, and dull" (Finkin, 1996, p. 11). For instance, some faculty, once tenured, may not update their lecture materials, engage in professional development, attend faculty meetings or maintain office hours, and become in academe what is called 'deadwood'.

The public sector is also critical of the current tenure system. According to Magner (1995), "tenure has lately been targeted as a culprit in criticisms of higher education" (p. A17). Such negative viewpoints further degrade the tenure process. According to Bogue and Aper (2000), "tenure has come to be viewed by some as an instrument that shields the uncaring, incompetent, slothful, and duplicitous from corrective action" (pp. 171-172).

For instance, in a 1995 American Association for Higher Education (AAHE)-sponsored interview, Richard Chait contends that three significant pressures presently influence public attitudes about tenure. First of all, the public cannot understand why, in a time of such economic difficulty, faculty should be afforded lifetime employment security. Also, Chait indicates that more and more citizens have started to question the viability of a one-track tenure system. In other words,

once employed, faculty earn tenure or are dismissed. Still, the public questions the infrequent use of other options. Finally, Chait states that "a third pressure is more managerial; tenure does not allow institutions to be as nimble as some managers, especially managers of institutions under financial stress, think they should be" (Edgerton, 1995, p. 4).

Furthermore, according to Burgan, "opponents have based their arguments primarily upon economic and managerial assumptions" (1998, p. 1). Those opposed to tenure argue that the process is not valid since it removes opportunities for faculty competition, " substitutes the ideal of security" for the truth of the good of modern America "as a basis for faculty employment," and "involves individual autonomous employees in making decisions that should be retained by a centralized management for flexibility and efficiency" (Burgan, 1998, p. 1).

Although academic tenure is frequently under attack from entities external to higher education, the system has garnered support from a variety of avenues. For instance, Matthew Finkin, in his text *The Case for Tenure* (1996), believes that the presence of academic tenure guarantees academic due process. More specifically, he states that "tenure provides only that no person continuously retained as a full-time faculty member beyond a specified lengthy period of probationary service may thereafter be dismissed *without adequate cause* " (pp. 3-4). Also, defenders of tenure also believe the system promotes institutional stability, encourages faculty to unite as an independent body, assures that professional judgments are made about faculty performance, and assists institutions with faculty re-appointment decisions (Commission, 1973). Finally, William Plater (2001) points to three positive benefits of tenure: (1) gives faculty and administrators the opportunity to work alongside

one another as well as together, (2) gives meaning to the community in which it exists, and (3) outlines clear responsibilities for both faculty and administrators alike.

The current tenure debate has spawned additional concerns. First of all, as external pressures for accountability build, tenured faculty are finding that their work is increasingly scrutinized by the public sector or agencies external to higher education (Licata, 1998). Furthermore, the "continuous quality improvement" and the need for "additional flexibility" present additional challenges to the present tenure system as each institution strives "to maintain the professional and career vitality of its senior faculty" (Licata, 1998, p. 3). Thus, in an effort to address such concerns, an increasing number of higher education institutions have adopted post-tenure review practices, which are formal procedures for more in-depth evaluation of tenured faculty.

Post-tenure Review Defined

What is post-tenure review? According to Licata and Morreale (1997), post-tenure review is "a systematic, comprehensive process, separate from the annual review, aimed specifically at assessing performance and/or nurturing faculty growth and development" (p. 1). Other phrases used to represent the process include " 'comprehensive review of sustained performance,' 'tenured faculty review and development,' 'periodic evaluation (review) of tenured faculty,' 'continuing enhanced review,' and 'extended review' " (Licata, 1998, p. 4). In a research project for AAHE, Trower discovered that "the average post-tenure review cycle is five years, ranging from as often as every two years to as infrequently as every ten years" (1996, p. 1). Reviews may occur in one of three ways--automatically, triggered, or

at the request of the faculty member (Licata & Morreale, 1997). Faculty whose reviews are automatic in design undergo evaluation at a specific time, as indicated by the institution. A review may also be triggered by "two consecutive annual evaluations of unsatisfactory performance, or failure to receive a merit increase two years in a row" (p.1). A final type of post-tenure review is one requested by the faculty member (Trower, 1996).

An Historical Overview of Post-tenure Review

The first national discussion of tenured faculty originated in 1983, when, at the request of the National Commission on Higher Education, a proposal for the development of post-tenure evaluation was reviewed by the Wingspread Conference on Evaluation of Tenured Faculty and co-sponsored by the AAUP. During this time, post-tenure review "was referred to as the 'periodic evaluation of tenured faculty' " (Report, 1997, p. 44). Upon examination of the proposal, those in attendance concluded that no further procedures were needed, and the following statement was then issued by the AAUP (American Association of University Professors):

> The American Association of University Professors welcomes the Statement issued by the participants in the Wingspread Conference on Evaluation of Tenured Faculty [1983]. The Association believes that periodic formal evaluation of each post-probationary faculty member would bring scant benefit, would incur unacceptable costs, not only in money and time but also in a dampening of creativity and of collegial relationships, and would threaten academic freedom. (p. 45)

Since the 1983 Wingspread Conference, the number of colleges and universities implementing various procedures for post-tenure review has risen significantly. For example, in a 1989 University of Colorado study, Wesson and

Johnson discovered that "of the 46 institutional members of the American Association of Universities (AAU) considered to be peer institutions of the University of Colorado," only "3 institutions (6%) had a formal post-tenure review process separate from their annual salary review process" (as cited in Licata & Morreale, 1997, pp. 2-3).

Although early investigations indicated a minimal existence of such policies in colleges and universities, additional studies conducted in the 1990s began to reveal the increasing development of post-tenure review in such institutions. For instance, a 1995 AAHE-sponsored study of 1,200 four-year college and university provosts revealed that 23% of responding institutions had in place a process of post-tenure review and 6% indicated that such a policy was under review (Trower, 1996). Likewise, Chait and Ross discovered that tenure reform was under investigation by policymakers in seven states (as cited in Licata & Morreale, 1997). Additional work by Licata & Morreale (1997) revealed that a system of post-tenure review was "in the discussion or implementation stage in state institutions in twenty-eight states" (p. 3). More recently, post-tenure review was found to be under discussion in more than thirty states and implemented in several state university systems, including Virginia, California, North Carolina, Texas and Wisconsin (Licata, 1998).

In 1998, fifteen years after initially addressing the post-tenure review concept at the Wingspread Conference on Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, the AAUP issued a second, more in-depth, response. Most importantly, the organization "adopted a new policy on post-tenure reviews, for the first time offering guidance on how such a system should be set up, while insisting that it should not be used to revoke tenure" (Leatherman, 1998, p. 1). Committee A's latest 21-page report,

developed to guide those institutions "where post-tenure review is being considered or put into effect," was organized by the following principles:

> Post-tenure ought to be aimed at not accountability, but at faculty development. Post-tenure review must be developed and carried out by faculty. Post-tenure review must not be a reevaluation of tenure nor may it be used to shift the burden of proof from an institution's administration (to show cause for dismissal) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why he or she should be retained). Post-tenure review must be conducted according to standards that protect academic freedom and the quality of education. (1998, p. 1)

Of particular significance within the AAUP's follow-up response was the inclusion of a section to address minimum standards for good practice, such as written standards and criteria by which faculty members are evaluated, if a formal system of review is implemented (p. 8). In summary, the AAUP recommends that post-tenure review should (1) protect academic freedom, (2) not be used to reevaluate tenure status, (3) involve the faculty in its development and review, (4) be developmental in structure and "supported by institutional resources for professional development or a change of direction", (5) be flexible, (6) stress confidential outcomes, (7) be the product of negotiation between faculty and administration if supplemented by a formal development plan, (8) allow the faculty member to respond to the process outcome and have the right to appeal, (9) explore other options for faculty whose performance indicates persistent concerns, and (10) convene a peer forum to hear appeals in the event adequate cause for dismissal is present (pp. 9-10).

Philosophical Implications of Post-tenure Review

Post-tenure review policies or proposed policies pose several philosophical and practical implications for higher education. According to the Report of Committee A of the AAUP (1997, 1998), post-tenure review policies are based upon one of two orientations--developmental or managerial. First are those which are considered "developmental" in nature. Within developmentally-based post-tenure review programs, "institutions and faculty members themselves seek to improve the quality of teaching, research, and service, at all levels of performance" (p. A15). Because this orientation fosters communication, it encourages both faculty and administrators to work in conjunction with one another to develop, redesign and enhance faculty performance and productivity. Another purpose of post-tenure review, according to the AAUP, is more "managerial" in orientation and is perceived as "an effort by administrators and boards of trustees to impose a corporate model of financing and administration on colleges and universities" (p. A16). Even though the philosophy behind such reviews seems to be primarily developmental in nature, all reviews contain some managerial aspects, which are used to make personnel decisions (Licata & Morreale, 1997). "Regardless of the model, all processes build on the annual review and almost all new policies emphasize faculty development as a goal" (Licata, 1998, p. 4).

Implications of Post-tenure Review for the Community College

The implementation of post-tenure review presents implications for two-year community college faculty and administration as well. However, most of the focus has centered upon post-tenure practices at four-year college and universities.

Despite such limited information, a 1984 research study involving "1,290 tenured and non-tenured faculty and 421 administrators" of nine member institutions of the League for Innovation in the Community College revealed that formal post-tenure review did exist on community college campuses. Specifically, "77% of the respondents indicated that formal post-tenure evaluation existed at their institution" (Licata, 1984b, 1985). Moreover, a majority of those faculty and administrators surveyed believed that a system of post-tenure review was warranted in an effort to foster faculty development and improvement (Licata, 1984b, 1985, 1986; Licata & Andrews, 1990).

In a similar study of faculty and administrators of 305 community, technical and junior colleges within the 19-state North Central Region, Licata and Andrews (1990) discovered that approximately 70% of those surveyed have formal systems of post-tenure review, with most formative in design. In addition, classroom effectiveness proved to be the most important criterion used for evaluation purposes in those institutions surveyed (Licata, 1984a; Andrews & Licata, 1989). Findings of the study also reveal that most post-tenure review plans indicate evaluation at pre-determined time periods; however, reviews are normally conducted on a yearly basis, with input from administrators and students alike (Andrews & Licata, 1989).

Evaluation Criteria

Although post-tenure review practices exist in selected community colleges, the evaluation criteria differ in focus from that used by four-year colleges and universities. Unlike four-year institutions, where research and publishing are the

foremost priorities, classroom teaching effectiveness is the top criterion used in post-tenure review in the community college because classroom instruction is a primary responsibility of community college faculty (Licata, 1984a; Licata, 1986; Licata & Andrews, 1990). Other criteria that have been used are: (1) "course or curriculum development; (2) contributions to department; (3) campus committee work; (4) innovation in teaching methods; (5) attendance and reliability" on the job (Licata, 1984a, p. 189; Licata & Andrews, 1990, p. 45).

In addition to addressing the above criteria via a process of post-tenure review, Licata and Andrews (1990), also found that community college faculty and administrators of the nineteen-state North Central Region, when surveyed, agreed that steps should be in place not only to reward outstanding performance (i.e., merit incentives) but also to assist those faculty whose reviews indicate their performance is inadequate. Of utmost concern, however, is that the current evaluation of tenured faculty "is generally perceived by both faculty and administrators as ineffective or of little benefit because the evaluation outcomes are minimized by a lack of the system's clout to reward performance, help improve performance, or take action when poor performance is long-standing" (Licata & Andrews, 1990, p. 48).

Due to this scarcity of resources, faculty and administrators are skeptical of such an evaluation system. Also of concern is the lack of training in place for evaluators who conduct the reviews (Andrews & Licata, 1989). Specifically, evaluators, who most often hold administrative positions within the institution, are capable of assessing managerial skills but lack the training to effectively evaluate academic instruction and remediate poor performance. Thus, critics believe that

training of evaluators is necessary to achieve an equitable system of evaluation for all faculty.

Higher Education's Response to Post-tenure Review

The growing post-tenure debate has introduced a variety of related issues as well, including justification for the review, degree of effectiveness, interests and costs (Report, 1997, 1998). Despite the controversy, educational administrators believe post-tenure review will enable their institutions to be more accountable to the public, and such detailed accountability will permit them to defend the concept of lifetime job security afforded to tenured faculty members, a concept often questioned by the public (Magner, 1995). Most importantly, many administrators see post-tenure review as a managerial and developmental way to actively assist those in the professorate who are experiencing problems in their chosen profession (Magner, 1995).

Many faculty, on the other hand, question the need for post-tenure review. "Professors say they aren't afraid of evaluation. They just question the need for more of it" (Magner, 1995, p. A13). Other faculty see post-tenure review as a time-wasting process used to pacify higher education's critics and believe "the reviews pose a serious threat to tenure" (Magner, 1995, p. A13). At the community college level, faculty concerns point primarily to the design of evaluation forms used in the process, frequency of evaluation, fear of retaliation, lack of discussion following evaluation, lack of recognition of achievement levels, and lack of consequences of the procedure (Andrews & Licata, 1989).

Despite these claims, supporters of post-tenure review believe it can strengthen tenure; however, they worry that the process, if not managed properly, will fail to promote teacher effectiveness and improvement (Magner, 1995). Specifically, they believe that the system pays only "lip service" to the improvement of faculty performance, and there are no measures in place to determine competence or incompetence (Andrews & Licata, 1989; Licata, 1986). Still, "post-tenure evaluation--when driven by faculty input, accompanied by adequate institutional resources, and designed specifically for the purpose of faculty development--finds support among community college faculty/administrators and is seen as a viable strategy for institutional renewal" (Licata, 1985, p. 13).

Conclusion

In conclusion, as educators prepare for the challenges that await them, they will be faced with growing issues of institutional accountability and faculty productivity. As a result, academic tenure and post-tenure review will continue to be two of the most significant issues facing higher education. In the interest of institutional effectiveness, administrators and faculty must be adequately prepared to address these issues, and they need to better understand how these processes work. Therefore, a study of a community college with post-tenure review is a valuable addition to this growing body of literature.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN, METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study focused on the experiences and understanding of faculty with regard to post-tenure review policies and practices at Dalton State College, a public two-year institution located in Dalton, Georgia. The purposes of this case study were to: (1) determine the evolution of the post-tenure policy at a two-year college; (2) describe faculty experiences and attitudes toward the post-tenure review process at this institution; (3) determine how they interpreted the process and policy; (4) describe how the process and policy affected their practices, status and roles within the institution; and (5) describe the policy design faculty would prefer and how it would work.

The research questions which framed this study were:

1. How did the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolve? Who were the principal players in the process?
2. How do Dalton State College faculty interpret the post-tenure review policy? What are their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation?
3. Do Dalton State College faculty members think post-tenure review affect their professional practice? Their status? Their roles within the institution?

4. If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be the preferences of Dalton State College faculty members? How would such a policy be different?

This chapter provides information regarding the research methods, sample selection and analysis of the data.

Design of the Study

The case study method was selected for the study because it permitted the researcher to utilize both quantitative and qualitative techniques in the research process. According to Creswell (2002), a mixed method design enables the researcher to build upon both types of data, develop a comprehensive portrait of the research problem, and incorporate "a qualitative component into an otherwise quantitative study" (p. 568). Furthermore, its use enabled the researcher to conduct a more in-depth study of faculty experiences and attitudes toward post-tenure review policies and practices at a public two-year institution. Moreover, "the case study offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon" (Merriam, 1998, p. 41). Therefore, because its use permitted the researcher to conduct an in-depth study, the case study method was an effective tool in the investigation of faculty experiences and attitudes toward post-tenure review practices at a public two-year institution. The case study method also "allows an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events" (Yin, 1994, p. 3).

For the purposes of this study, document review, faculty interviews and a survey instrument comprised the three primary methods of data collection. The

review of documentary evidence served as a means to corroborate, or triangulate data gathered via the interviews and surveys. Because the researcher utilized a list of open-ended questions, individual interviews provided a wealth of data concerning various faculty opinions and views of post-tenure review policies and practices. The survey instrument also proved to be a valuable tool since it was used as a follow-up to the interviews and was distributed to a greater number of participants.

The researcher was also aware of possible limitations related to case study methods. According to Merriam (1998), one such limitation included the risk of producing a study that was "too lengthy, too detailed or too involved" for anyone to take the time to read it (p. 42). Most importantly, however, the researcher could have been subject to "biases that may affect the final product" and to concerns of "reliability, validity and generalizability" (pp. 42-43). First of all, the researcher recognized that she could have been subject to biases because she was a tenured community college faculty member and had also served in an administrative capacity during her academic career. Second, the researcher had to insure that data for the study were reliable and could be replicated, and its findings could be applied to other areas. Thus, data triangulation was used in an effort to bolster internal validity and reliability (Merriam, 1998, p. 207). Specifically, by means of a "triangulation mixed method design," the researcher used multiple data collection methods--documentary evidence, individual interviews, and a brief questionnaire--to investigate relationships between both quantitative and qualitative data and more effectively understand the findings produced by the study (Creswell, 2002).

Methods and Procedures of Data Collection

Selection of Site

Dalton State College, a Georgia public community college and member of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), was selected as the site for the study. As the result of a University System of Georgia (USG) policy mandate for all System institutions, Dalton State College had in place a formal post-tenure review process for faculty in 1997. Furthermore, Dalton State College was the closest and most convenient of the USG institutions to study since its main campus was located less than a two-hours drive from the researcher's home.

After determining which institution would serve as the focus of the study, the researcher made a formal written request to Dr. John B. Black, Vice President of Academic Affairs at Dalton State College, and asked permission to conduct research on campus. Upon invitation, the researcher then met with Dr. Black in October of 2000 to discuss the proposed study. Also present for the discussion was Dr. David H. Wycherley, Professor of Physics and Mathematics, who had chaired the institution's Pre/Post-Tenure Review Committee for three years. At the conclusion of the meeting and at the suggestion of Dr. Black, the researcher also met with Dr. Henry M. Codjoe, Director of Institutional Research and Planning at Dalton State College.

Upon approval by Dalton State College's Council of Chairs, the Pre/Post Tenure Review Committee and the Human Subjects Committee, full approval to conduct the proposed study on the Dalton State College campus was given by Dr. Black in December of 2000. Drs. Black, Codjoe and Wycherley were to serve as points of contact for the researcher (see Appendix I, Dalton State College Approval

Letter). Dr. Black also requested that the researcher complete a Policy for Protection of Human Subjects form for their records. On December 4, 2000, the researcher was granted full approval by the UT Institutional Review Board to conduct the study (See Appendix K, IRB Approval Letter). Finally, in January of 2001, the researcher corresponded with Dr. Black to determine a timetable for project implementation and the interview process began the following month.

Collection of Documents

Documents from a variety of sources were reviewed during the summer and fall 2000 terms (See Appendix B, Document Summary Form). Such materials were seen as important sources of data, which would complement, verify, and/or explain the information obtained through the interviews and surveys (see Table III-1, Sources of Documentary Data). The documents included the Dalton State College catalog, faculty handbook, memos, correspondence, policy documents, and reports. These items provided insight into the history and mission of the college, its academic programs, and initiatives at both the campus and system levels. Also of importance were formal post-tenure review documents from the University System of Georgia, the entity that governed Dalton State. Overall, documentary evidence helped give context and meaning to data which resulted from the faculty interviews and surveys.

Individual Interviews

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the post-tenure review process as it existed at Dalton State College and to follow up on the questionnaire, audiotaped interviews were conducted on campus with selected faculty during the Spring 2001

term (see Appendix C, Interview Guide) and then personally transcribed by the researcher. A total of twenty-eight individual faculty were interviewed. Faculty from each of the seven academic divisions volunteered to participate and comprised the sample. Following a campus-wide e-mail request from the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs, twenty-eight faculty members volunteered to participate in interviews.

At this time, an effort was made to interview four faculty members from each of the seven divisions--one instructor, one assistant professor, one associate professor and one professor--to obtain a sample representative of the entire college faculty. However, there were divisions with fewer than four faculty members and those that did not have faculty at all four ranks; therefore, another request was made from the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and additional faculty agreed to participate. Ultimately, though, this selection method still permitted the researcher to grasp a broader range of data (i.e., rank, tenure status, years of service, and field of study). Furthermore, the relationship between years of service and rank enhanced reasonable representativeness of the full college.

An interview schedule was then developed by Ms. Deby West, Secretary to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and two private conference rooms, both located on the second floor of the Liberal Arts Building, were secured in which to conduct the interviews. During the interview process, each conference room permitted the researcher to talk privately and confidentially with each interview participant in a closed yet comfortable environment.

A pre-determined list of questions guided the individual interview sessions with faculty (see Appendix C, Interview Guide). Developed by the researcher and

based upon her research questions, the list of eight open-ended questions allowed participants to discuss their experiences with and understanding of the current Dalton State College post-tenure review policy as well as what they would prefer if they could design an ideal post-tenure review policy. Examples of the kind of questions that were asked were: "How did the Dalton State post-tenure review policy evolve? Who were the principal players in its development?", "How has post-tenure review affected you?", and "If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be your preferences? How would such a policy be different?" Such prompts encouraged participants to freely express their views and permitted the researcher to follow-up on the participants' answers. Individual interview sessions were scheduled in one-hour blocks.

The interview sessions then enabled the researcher to determine the faculty's understanding of and experiences with the current Dalton State College post-tenure review policy. Also, the researcher inquired as to what Dalton State College faculty preferred if they could have designed the ideal post-tenure review policy.

At the beginning of each interview session, the researcher discussed the purpose of the study, the format of the interview session and what would occur at the conclusion of the session. Consent forms were then signed by all participants, indicating their willingness to participate in the study and permit the researcher to audio tape the interview session, transcribe the audiotapes and use the information in writing her dissertation (See Appendix H, Consent Form). Two of the twenty-eight participants asked the researcher to take written notes of their comments in lieu of the audiotape, and the researcher complied with their requests.

Prior to the interview session, participants were also given an opportunity to ask questions, and they were informed that they could refuse to answer any question at any time and could withdraw without penalty from the interview process at any time. The researcher also informed the participants that once the audiotapes were transcribed, they would receive a copy for review, along with a cover letter and a copy of the signed consent form. Furthermore, upon review of the transcripts, the participants were encouraged to submit revisions and/or comments, if any, to the researcher. Once the researcher was given written permission to audiotape the interview session, transcribe the audiotape and use the information in writing the dissertation, the formal interview process began.

After mailing a packet of these materials to each of the interview participants for review, the researcher received revisions and/or comments from seven of the twenty-eight interview participants. Such member checks assisted the researcher with validity of data collected during the interview sessions. In an effort to clarify each interview transcript, the researcher also eliminated any repeated and inaudible words and phrases that occurred during the interview sessions.

Questionnaires

A ten item, three-part survey instrument, which was based upon and developed from interviews as well as established AAUP guidelines for effective post-tenure review policies and practices, was developed by the researcher (see Appendix E, A Survey of Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices at Dalton State College), and served to complement, verify, and/or explain the interview data. The first part of the survey instrument requested demographic information about the respondent

while the second section asked respondents to provide additional information with respect to the post-tenure review process at Dalton State. The final section asked respondents about their preferences concerning an ideal post-tenure review policy in the event they had the opportunity to revise one.

During the spring 2001 term, surveys were mailed to all 106 full-time Dalton State College faculty who were identified by the Office of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs (See Appendix E, A Survey of Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices at Dalton State College). For the purposes of this study, full-time faculty were those individuals teaching a minimum of nine credit hours during the fall 2000 academic term. In addition to the survey instrument, each participant received a cover letter, which briefly explained the researcher's study, use of data obtained via the questionnaire, and how the researcher could be contacted in the event a participant required additional information (See Appendix D, Cover Letter for First Mailing of Survey). An enclosed envelope addressed to the researcher's Dalton State campus mailbox was also provided so that participants could return the instrument to the researcher upon completion. Respondents were given two weeks to respond or return the questionnaire.

In an effort to track responses in the event a second mailing was necessary, a serial number was placed in the upper right-hand corner of the survey instrument. If the response to the first mailing failed to elicit responses from at least 70% of the full-time faculty, a postcard was sent to each non-respondent to encourage his or her participation in the study (See Appendix F, Postcard for Second Mailing). If this failed to produce a response after ten days, an additional cover letter (See Appendix G, Follow-up Letter for Third Mailing), questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed

envelope were mailed to all non-respondents to encourage their participation (Babbie, 1990). Such actions are necessary in order to increase the response rate, and "a second follow-up letter may be necessary to get the response rate up and if matters are desperate, a third, though it is widely accepted that appeals beyond the first follow-up decrease rapidly in effectiveness" (Verma & Mallick, 1999, p. 122). Moreover, two to three weeks is an appropriate period of time between follow-up mailings (Babbie, 1990). When these efforts were exhausted or an adequate number of questionnaires were returned, data entry and analysis began.

Human Subjects Process

An essential component of this study was the protection of participant confidentiality. Thus, in order to protect the identity of interview participants, the researcher assigned pseudonyms to participants during all phases of research and analysis. Also, at the request of the Dalton State academic division chairpersons, no characteristics of any kind were used to identify the seven individual academic divisions. Instead, the researcher utilized a coding system when referring to academic divisions. Completed surveys were sealed inside specially marked envelopes and mailed by respondents to the researcher via the Dalton State College campus mail system. All letters of consent were maintained in a locked file at a University of Tennessee location while all audiotapes, transcripts and surveys were secured in the researcher's home office. After three years, these materials will be destroyed. The approved UT IRB Human Subjects Form B is found in Appendix J.

Data Analysis

Documents

Documents were collected from a variety of sources and analyzed. Table III-1 categorizes the materials by location.

The materials were read, and appropriate information was gathered and then categorized based on topics related to post-tenure review at both the University System of Georgia and Dalton State College levels. Most importantly, however, documentary data were utilized to identify the process of post-tenure review at Dalton State College itself. Primarily, the researcher noted the Dalton State College history and mission, University System of Georgia history, USG directives regarding post-tenure review, development and continuance of the Dalton State College post-tenure review process, faculty and administrative responsibilities, faculty evaluation process, and Pre/Post-Tenure Review Committee formation and directives.

Interviews

As is indicated in Table III-2, a total of twenty-eight interviews were conducted for this study. Table III-2 categorizes interview participants by gender and academic rank.

The relationships of data to the research questions were:

Research Question One: How did the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolve? Who were the principal players in the process?

In interview sessions with faculty, the researcher asked open-ended questions to determine how the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolved (See

Table III-1

Sources of Documentary Data

Location	Document
Dalton State College Website	Faculty Handbook
	Mission Statement
	Occasional Statistical Digest
	Office of Inst. Res. and Planning Statistics
	Campus Directory--Faculty and Staff
Dalton State College 2000-2001 Catalog	College History
	Statement of Purpose
	The University System of Georgia History
	DSC Administration, Faculty and Staff
Dalton State Memoranda	Pre-/Post-Tenure Rev. Comm. Memoranda
	PPTRC History
	Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Policy
	DSC Faculty Standards
	Guidelines for Peer Eval. Subcommittees
	Analysis of Post-Tenure Review Process
University System of Georgia Website	USG Academic Affairs Handbook
	USG Board of Regents Policy Manual
	System Supplement: USG Regents Reports
	USG Board of Regents Meeting Minutes
Other Documents	Dalton State Faculty Listing, 2000-2001

Table III-2

Interview Participants by Gender and Academic Rank

Participants by Freq. & Percent	Male	Female	Total
Instructor	0 (00.0)	2 (7.1)	2 (7.1)
Assistant Professor	3 (10.7)	9 (32.1)	12 (42.8)
Associate Professor	6 (21.4)	3 (10.7)	9 (32.1)
Professor	3 (10.7)	2 (7.1)	5 (17.8)
Total	12 (42.8)	16 (57.1)	28 (100.0)

Total # of interview participants: 28

Appendix C, Interview Guide). The interview process permitted the researcher to determine the principal players in the process. Examples of the kind of questions asked included: "How did the Dalton State post-tenure review policy evolve?" and "Who were the principal players in its development?" Once the interviews were completed, they were transcribed by the researcher and interpreted. Codes were then formulated and assigned to text segments in an effort to organize the transcript data.

Research Question Two: How do Dalton State College faculty interpret the post-tenure review policy? What are their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation?

In interview sessions with faculty, the researcher asked open-ended questions to determine how faculty at an institution with post-tenure review interpreted the policy. The interview process also permitted the researcher to determine their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation. Examples of the kind of questions asked included: "What does post-tenure review mean to you as a faculty member?", "When did you first learn about post-tenure review?", and "How do you perceive the Dalton State post-tenure policy?" Once the interviews were completed, they were transcribed by the researcher and interpreted. Codes were then formulated and assigned to text segments in an effort to organize the transcript data.

Research Question Three: Do Dalton State College faculty members think post-tenure review affects their professional practice? Their status? Their roles within the institution?

In interview sessions with faculty, the researcher asked open-ended questions to determine how they think post-tenure review has affected their practices, status, and roles within the institution. Examples of questions asked included: "How has post-tenure review affected you? Tell me about your experiences." and "In your opinion, how has post-tenure review affected your colleagues?" Once the interviews were completed, they were transcribed by the researcher and interpreted. Codes were then formulated and assigned to text segments in an effort to organize the transcript data.

Research Question Four: If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be the preferences of Dalton State College faculty members? How would such a policy be different?

In interview sessions with faculty, the researcher asked open-ended questions to determine the components of an ideal policy if they could revise one and how such a policy would be different. Examples of questions asked included: "If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be your preferences? How would such a policy be different?" Once the interviews were completed, they were transcribed by the researcher and interpreted. Codes were then formulated and assigned to text segments in an effort to organize the transcript data.

All interview sessions were audio taped and transcribed by the researcher. Then, interview transcripts, along with a cover and a signed copy of the consent form, were mailed to individual participants. In an effort to ensure validity of interview data, participants were also asked to review their transcripts and submit any revisions and/or comments to the researcher. Of the twenty-eight interview participants, only seven elected to return revisions and/or comments.

Upon reviewing the transcripts multiple times and creating a series of pattern codes to indicate concepts and ideas, the researcher began to identify emerging themes such as "Impact of Post-Tenure Review on Faculty", "Process Outcomes", "Policy and Process Formation", "Faculty Interpretations of Post-Tenure Review" and "Opportunities for Policy Revision." These items helped the researcher to develop propositions in order to answer the research questions which framed this study.

Questionnaires

One hundred-six full-time faculty members were asked to complete the questionnaire. Two of these were eliminated since one faculty member surveyed was no longer employed by the institution and another was now employed on a part-time basis. Thus, the total number of questionnaires distributed was adjusted to 104.

Table III-3 shows the number and category of survey respondents by academic rank and tenure status. Table III-4 indicates the number and category of survey respondents by academic rank and number of years employed as a full-time faculty member at Dalton State College.

Table III-3

Number of Survey Respondents by Academic Rank and Tenure Status

Participants by Freq. & Percent	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Non-Tenure Track	Total
Instructor	0 (00.0)	5 (6.7)	3 (4.1)	8 (10.8)
Assistant Prof.	17 (23.0)	9 (12.2)	5 (6.7)	31 (42.0)
Associate Prof.	16 (21.6)	2 (2.7)	5 (6.7)	23 (31.1)
Professor	11 (14.8)	1 (1.4)	0 (00.0)	12 (16.2)
Total	44 (59.4)	17 (23.0)	13 (17.5)	74 (100.0)

Total # of survey participants: 74

Table III-4

Number of Survey Respondents by Academic Rank and Years of Full-time Employment

# of Years by Freq. & Percent	0-10 years	11-20 years	21-30+ years	Total
Instructor	8 (10.8)	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	8 (10.8)
Assistant Prof.	19 (25.7)	9 (12.2)	3 (4.1)	31 (42.0)
Associate Prof.	7 (9.4)	10 (13.5)	6 (8.1)	23 (31.0)
Professor	2 (2.7)	3 (4.1)	7 (9.4)	12 (16.2)
Total	36 (48.6)	22 (29.8)	16 (21.6)	74 (100.0)

Total # of survey participants: 74

The surveys provided an avenue for the collection of quantitative data. Thus, each questionnaire item was analyzed based on the status and number of respondents who selected a particular response. If a respondent did not mark a question, that item was not included in the analysis. The researcher also used specific survey data to answer selected research questions. The representative research questions were:

Research Question One: How did the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolve? Who were the principal players in the process?

Respondents' answers to survey items 4, 5, and 6 were used to determine how the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolved. Questions 4, 5, and 6 were used to determine the evolution of the Dalton State College post-tenure

review policy and the identities of the process's principal players. Frequencies and corresponding percentages of total responses were reported for each of the categories listed in survey items 4, 5, and 6. Content listed in the "other (please specify)" answers for 6 "a" was examined for content, and the responses were analyzed for themes or categories that accurately characterized the responses.

Research Question Two: How do Dalton State College faculty interpret the post-tenure review policy? What are their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation?

Respondents' answers to survey items 4, 5, and 6 were used to determine how the Dalton State College faculty interpreted the post-tenure review policy. Questions 4, 5, and 6 were used to determine how Dalton State faculty interpreted the institution's post-tenure review policy, and also to disclose their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation. Frequencies and corresponding percentages of total responses were reported for each of the categories listed in survey items 4, 5, and 6. To enhance validity and to ascertain the relationship, if any, between rank and attitude, cross-tabulations of data were conducted. Content listed in the "other (please specify)" answers for 6 "a" was examined for content, and the responses were analyzed for themes or categories that accurately characterized the responses.

Research Question Three: Do Dalton State College faculty members think post-tenure review affects their professional practice? Their status? Their roles within the institution?

Respondents' answers to survey items 4, 5, and 6 were used to determine how the Dalton State post-tenure review policy has affected faculty practices, status, and roles within the institution. Frequencies and corresponding percentages of total responses were reported for each of the categories listed in survey items 4, 5, and 6. Content listed in the "other (please specify)" answers for 6 "a" was examined for content, and the responses were analyzed for themes or categories that accurately characterized the responses.

Research Question Four: If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be the preferences of Dalton State College faculty members? How would such a policy be different?

Respondents' answers to survey items 7, 8, and 9 were used to determine how faculty, if given the opportunity, would revise a post-tenure review policy. Question 7 showed its orientation, while data obtained from Question 8 revealed how such a policy was different. Question 9 indicated the timing of the preferred policy. Frequencies and corresponding percentages of total responses were reported for each of the categories listed in survey items 7, 8, and 9. Content listed in the "other (please specify)" answers for 9 "a" were examined for content, and the responses were analyzed for themes or categories that accurately characterized the responses.

Limitations of the Study

This case study was limited in that it only reviewed survey responses, historical documents and interview data from one institution. The accuracy of such

data rested with those respondents as they related information, some of which was possibly from memory, and the researcher as she interpreted the data. Thus, these responses may have incorrectly represented the faculty's views and experiences.

Not only was accuracy of responses of concern to the researcher, another limitation involved the researcher's role in the study. According to Yin (1994), the researcher had to avoid careless work which allowed "equivocal evidence or biased views to influence the directions of the findings and conclusions" (p. 9). Specifically, in an effort to avoid confirmation bias, the researcher should not have let her prior knowledge of post-tenure review in the two-year college influence the study's outcome. Thus, the researcher should have carefully reported all evidence fairly and without bias.

Furthermore, since case study research provides an avenue for in-depth study of a limited number of cases, the lack of statistical generalization was an additional limitation to some people. Specifically, case studies are only "generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes" (Yin, 1994, p. 10).

Additional limitations pointed to the duration of the case study, the amount of documentation it elicits, and its overall quality (Yin, 1994). First, in order to conduct the study in a timely manner, the researcher established and worked toward a well-organized, goal-oriented time frame. Such efforts insured that the study was conducted and completed as planned. However, because the case study is such an in-depth process, it often requires time and money that the researcher may not be able to provide (Merriam, 1998). Thus, it was imperative that the researcher used her resources wisely and gathered data carefully, giving attention to the pre-planned

time frame. Also, despite the number of data the study produced, the researcher brought all the material together to formulate a well-written, concise document, one that was not "too lengthy, too detailed, or too involved" for readers to read and utilize (Merriam, 1998, p. 42). In other words, because the case study method involved such a complex project, the researcher had to determine when data collection efforts were exhausted and formal analysis could begin.

Triangulation of Data

An effort was made to complement quantitative data obtained from the survey with qualitative data gathered from interviews and documents. To do so, the researcher color-coded the survey items in relation to categories that emerged from the interview data and documentary evidence. Thus, through data triangulation, the researcher utilized such emergent themes, including "Impact of Post-Tenure Review on Faculty" and "Policy and Process Formation", to show how the three data collection methods complement one another and strengthen the outcomes of the study. According to Denzin (1989), "multiple methods should be used in every investigation, since no method is free from rival causal factors" (p. 25). Most importantly, single methods could have caused the researcher to experience personal biases.

In an effort to avoid such biases, Denzin (1989) promotes four basic types of triangulation methods--data, investigator, theory and methodological--that are most useful in research studies, and he states that the use of multiple triangulation methods "remains the soundest strategy of theory construction" (p.236). For instance, in order to utilize data triangulation, the researcher would consult

"dissimilar comparison groups" as data were collected; however, to apply investigator triangulation, he would incorporate multiple observers to collect data. Theory triangulation, the third type, is best used when "facts are determined by theory" and only data are included that have application to such theory. Thus, data not applicable to the theory are cast aside (Denzin, 1989). Of the four types, between-method, or across method, methodological triangulation was most useful for this study because it permitted the researcher to utilize multiple data sources--surveys, interviews and documents--to gain a more precise picture of post-tenure review practices at Dalton State College. According to Creswell (2002), an additional advantage of the triangulation mixed method design "is that one data collection form supplies strengths to offset the weaknesses of the other form" (p. 565). For instance, the use of qualitative data collection methods may strengthen the study because the researcher can probe more deeply via interview sessions than by means of a questionnaire. Likewise, quantitative data collection methods can provide the researcher with a much broader perspective than can be obtained via interview sessions. Most importantly, through the use of between-method triangulation "observers can achieve the best of each [method] while overcoming their unique deficiencies (Denzin, 1989, p. 244).

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to examine the experiences and understanding of faculty with regard to post-tenure review policies and practices at a public two-year community college. The research questions posed were:

1. How did the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolve? Who were the players in the process?
2. How do Dalton State College faculty interpret the post-tenure review policy? What are their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation?
3. Do Dalton State College faculty members think post-tenure review affects their professional practice? Their status? Their roles within the institution?
4. If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be the preferences of Dalton State College faculty members? How would such a policy be different?

The methods used to collect data involved individual interviews, documentary evidence and a survey instrument. Data were collected from a total of twenty-eight individual interviews with faculty and seventy-four survey respondents at Dalton State College.

Interviews were held with faculty members on the campus of Dalton State. An effort was made to obtain a sample representative of the entire college faculty

and the institution's seven academic divisions. Transcripts were made of each interview, and were read and re-read. Information gathered therein which answered the research questions was coded by the researcher and then used to represent themes that emerged from the data.

A three-part survey instrument, which was based upon and developed from interviews as well as established AAUP guidelines for effective post-tenure review policies and practices, was developed by the researcher and administered to 106 full-time faculty members along with a self-addressed stamped envelope. The surveys, which provided quantitative data, were analyzed by dividing the respondents into two entities--tenured faculty and non-tenured faculty. Each survey was analyzed based on the categories of limitation that emerged from the study. Furthermore, the findings between the two groups were compared, and frequency distribution and percentages were determined for each survey item.

An initial component of the survey instrument, Section A, addressed the respondents' demographic data, including faculty rank, tenure status, tenure type and years of service at Dalton State College. Furthermore, the identifying numeric code placed in the upper right hand corner of the instrument was used to determine the gender of the respondents, and is included in the analysis. If a respondent did not mark a question, that item was not included in the analysis.

The second component of the survey instrument, Section B, was designed to determine how Dalton State College Faculty perceived the current institutional post-tenure review policy. Therefore, reflected in this section were questions regarding the perceived post-tenure review policy's orientation, design, process management, impact and timing. Opportunities were also available to respondents to list within a

particular question additional responses via a category marked "Other (Please specify.)"

The third component of the survey instrument, Section C, was designed to determine the preferences of Dalton State College Faculty in the event they were given an opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy. Therefore, reflected in this section were questions regarding the preferred post-tenure review policy's orientation, design, process management, impact and timing. Opportunities were also available to respondents to list within a particular question additional responses via a category marked "Other (Please specify.)"

Documentary evidence--including the Dalton State College catalog, faculty handbook, college mission statement, USG Board of Regents policy manual, PPTRC memoranda and other relevant campus documents--were reviewed by the researcher. When utilized in conjunction with interview and survey data, documentary evidence fostered triangulation of the data.

The findings of the study are presented in this chapter. The first component of the chapter includes a description of the findings, which are based upon documentary evidence, faculty interviews, and surveys. The second component of the chapter focuses on additional findings that emerged from the triangulation of data.

Presentation of Findings

Data collected from documentary evidence, faculty interviews and a survey instrument were used to answer each of the following research questions.

Research Question One

How did the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolve? Who were the players in the process?

History of the University System of Georgia

Founded in 1932, the University System of Georgia [USG] serves as the governing body of all public institutions of higher education in the state of Georgia. Included within the System's domain are four research universities, two regional universities, thirteen state universities, two state colleges, and thirteen associate degree colleges--all governed by a sixteen-member constitutional Board of Regents. Members of the Board, who are initially appointed by the Governor and then confirmed by the State Senate, typically serve seven-year terms.

The Regents themselves determine leadership within the Board. Such positions include the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and other officers. Although not a member of the Board, the Chancellor is the Board's chief executive officer as well as the University System's chief administrator (Dalton State College, 2000).

University System of Georgia Mission

The University System promotes three primary components in its mission: instruction, public service/continuing education, and research. In order to achieve its instructional mission, the System maintains a variety of programs of study, including those leading to the completion of certificates as well as academic degrees. The System's public service/continuing education component provides for non-degree activities in addition to special college-degree-credit courses. Research, the final component, allows for academic investigations, the majority of which are conducted

through the System's universities and selected senior institutions (Dalton State College, 2000).

History of Dalton State College

In 1963, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia first chartered Dalton Junior College, the early forerunner of what is now known as Dalton State College and located in Dalton, Georgia.

In the fall of 1967, Dalton Junior College, the 24th institution to open within the University System of Georgia, boasted a first quarter enrollment of more than 500 students as well as five campus facilities. Increases in enrollment created a need for additional facilities; therefore, in the 1970s, several campus buildings were constructed and others were renovated. As student enrollment began to increase, a Technical Division was soon approved by the University System of Georgia in conjunction with the State Department of Education and opened in 1976.

By the fall of 1987, the University System of Georgia dropped the term "Junior" from all institutions under its domain and Dalton Junior College became formally known as Dalton College. Enrollment continued to increase during this time.

Then, in the fall of 1998, the College adopted the semester academic calendar as directed by USG policy and continued to expand its academic programs as well as its facilities. In September of that same year, USG authorized the College to develop its own bachelor's degrees so that classes could be offered the next fall term. Moreover, in November of 1998, the College name was changed to Dalton State College, and in that same year Dalton State College also became a senior

institution and received approval from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to offer the bachelor's degree (Dalton State College, 2000).

Institutional Mission

Since its inception in the late 1960s, Dalton State College has continued to serve the Northwest Georgia area through its commitment to higher education. As a significant component of that effort, the institution offers associate, certificate and limited bachelor's programs, and promotes community service activities as well as continuing education programs.

As a member of the University System of Georgia, the mission of Dalton State College upholds ten core characteristics or purposes to: (1) strive for excellence, (2) promote an environment conducive to teaching and learning, (3) advance an outstanding general education program, (4) promote a limited number of bachelor's degree programs, (5) encourage community service and economic development, (6) assure academic scholarship, (7) maintain a supportive campus environment, (8) advance multicultural awareness, (9) provide technology to advance educational services, and (10) foster collaboration with other agencies. "In all that it does, Dalton State College strives for the highest possible standards of quality and excellence and systematically assesses and evaluates its effectiveness" (Dalton State College, 2000, p. 12).

System-wide Mandate for Post-Tenure Review

Beginning in March of 1995, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia implemented multiple level recommendations in an effort "to place the

entire University System at the forefront of new educational technologies, to educate students for a global, intercultural world, and to work in effective partnerships with the DTAE [Department of Adult and Technical Education] and K-12 institutions" (University System of Georgia Board of Regents, 1995, p. 3). According to one long-term Dalton State faculty member who participated in the interview process,

> The discussion regarding the review of tenured faculty developed because of a national concern over the quality of education and concerns that we have old faculty who were sitting around and not doing anything. And, all that trickled down, hit the Legislature, hit the Chancellor's office. In anticipation of the Legislature having a concern and might somehow impact the University System, the Chancellor and the Board of Regents mandated we would do this.

At this time, the Board also established eleven goals, which it set forth in its *Faculty/Staff Development Policy Directive*, dated March 8, 1995. Moreover, through this supplementary Board of Regents' publication, faculty within the System first became aware of post-tenure review and its potential impact. The first objective was to establish post-tenure review policies and practices. Specifically, an investigation would occur of both peer and administrative input into the process, and in order to foster performance development, faculty evaluation procedures would also be reviewed. A significant component involved the review of possible outcomes of the post-tenure review process. Moreover, the Board requested implementation of the process by fall of 1996 (University System of Georgia Board of Regents, 1995, p. 2).

Then, the Board directed Dr. Stephen Portch, Chancellor of the University System, to address faculty and staff development through the formation of a System-wide task force whose membership would include "administrators, both

tenured and non-tenured faculty, professional and support staff, persons with relevant expertise (such as personnel officers), and representation or other appropriate input from students and the business sector, configured into appropriate sub committees" (University System of Georgia Board of Regents, 1995, p. 5). Of the nine tasks related to the Board's eleven goals, one concerned post-tenure review, another pertained to evaluations of all pre-tenured faculty and a third involved annual performance evaluations. The other six tasks concerned general personnel practices, tenure for administrators, tenure upon employment for senior faculty, career ladder policies, tuition reimbursement for employees and professional development funds.

A significant task concerned the recommendation for "System policy and institutional guidelines for multi-year post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty," to include the following: (1) faculty to be reviewed; (2) time period involved; (3) written criteria; (4) accountability and documentation; (5) input from administrators, peers and students; (6) outcomes tied to merit raises and professional development; (7) a plan of development when deficiencies are noted and not remediated; (8) links to assessment and program review; and (9) assurance of academic freedom. An additional related area included a recommendation for multi-year evaluations, including those for pre-tenured faculty as they work toward the completion of a probationary period, those applying for promotion or reassignments, and anyone else who may desire an evaluation (University System of Georgia Board of Regents, 1995, pp. 5-6).

The Chancellor then appointed the newly-formed Task Force on Faculty and Staff Development to address the nine tasks. Prior to the fall 1996 deadline for

implementation, the Chancellor would report back to the Board for final approval (University System of Georgia Board of Regents, 1995).

In an April 1996 meeting, the Georgia Board of Regents continued to discuss post-tenure review and prepared to make final recommendations in May of that same year. Specifically, "in a move aimed at ensuring that Georgia's public colleges and universities maintain a world-class, diverse faculty and staff, the Task Force on Faculty and Staff Development, which met from June 1995 to February 1996," set forth a proposal for post-tenure review of tenured faculty at all USG institutions (Georgia Board of Regents, 1996, p. 2). With approval, the first 20% of faculty would go through the review process in the spring of 1997, and 20% of the remaining cohort would be reviewed per year for the next four years until all tenured faculty had been reviewed and the cycle could begin again (Georgia Board of Regents, 1996). Above all, the proposal sought "to invest in the System's human capitals, reward high performance, and to provide opportunities for continual professional development" (Georgia Board of Regents, 1996, p. 3).

One long-term Dalton State faculty member who participated in the interview component remarked that the post-tenure review process "was part of this ongoing concern that the Board of Regents had about assessment and accountability." More specifically, he stated that a goal of such a policy was to "help the professor to fulfill their full potential." Of the twenty-eight faculty members who were interviewed, only three believed post-tenure review was established within the University System of Georgia for that specific purpose.

Then, in a July 1, 1996, memorandum to all USG Presidents, Chancellor Portch addressed a system-wide mandate for post-tenure review and also explained

the policy, its focus and procedures necessary for the review to occur. Through the interview process, fifteen of twenty-eight faculty interview participants clarified that the existence of post-tenure review at Dalton State was the direct result of a "system-wide initiative" or mandate by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. One faculty member further explained the evolution of the policy in this manner:

> Post-tenure review was mandated down from the Board of Regents and I think that was probably close to three to four years ago. And, it [the Board of Regents' mandate] said that every system institution was going to have to have a policy and procedure for post-tenure.

As the mandate's first directive, each USG institution would conduct post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty, with each review to occur five years after promotion or personnel action. Furthermore, the reviews would continue to occur at the conclusion of every five-year period thereafter, unless another promotion occurred to restart the period of time. Ultimately, all institutional post-tenure review policies and procedures would be monitored by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (University System of Georgia, 1996).

Then, as faculty became more aware of the process, informal discussions began to occur within institutions. Although twenty-seven of the twenty-eight faculty who were interviewed did not cite a specific cause for the system-wide mandate, one faculty member with years of service to the College shared,

> There was some talk about senior faculty members at various schools, full Professors and things like that; who apparently...their teaching had slipped or they weren't really doing any teaching anymore. And, so it came down from the Board of Regents that all schools would do pre and post-tenure review. And that was the first I heard of it [post-tenure review] when I read it in there [the supplement].

Another faculty member noted dialogue on campus soon increased, and that faculty soon "found out more about it [post-tenure review] because it was perceived as a threat in many ways. A lot of people would be talking about it, and saying, 'Well, this is the first step in a way to get rid of tenure.'" All in all, twelve of the twenty-eight faculty members who were interviewed indicated they and their colleagues felt threatened by the post-tenure review process.

The primary focus of such post-tenure reviews is to assist tenured faculty as they seek "opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contributing to system institutions" (University System of Georgia, 1996, p. 1). Also, the post-tenure review is simply one of several evaluations utilized within the System, but the post-tenure review provides a "longer term perspective" than the annual review, and it is "both retrospective and prospective" in design with regard to the employment history of faculty (University System of Georgia, 1996, p.1).

Finally, distinct steps should be followed in the post-tenure review process. These include the following tenets: (1) all tenured faculty will be reviewed; (2) a minimum of three peers shall serve on a committee to conduct the review, with the institution to determine committee formation and member selection; (3) in accordance with System guidelines, each institution will develop its own post-tenure process; (4) faculty must provide a vitae, annual performance reviews, a narrative listing of accomplishments and goals, and documentation of teaching effectiveness; (5) the review will focus on professional growth, teaching, research (if applicable), and institutional service; (6) feedback must be provided to the faculty member and the corresponding department chair; (7) a plan of development must be implemented if the review brings to light deficiencies and a faculty member has three

years to rectify such deficiencies; and (8) the results of the review should be connected to a process of rewards and development (University System of Georgia, 1996).

Implementation of Post-Tenure Review at Dalton State College

In response to the Board of Regents' 1996 mandate that all USG institutions would put into place a system for evaluating all tenured faculty, Dr. James Burran, President of Dalton State College, and Dr. Greg Labyak, Academic Dean, prepared to disseminate the information to DSC faculty. In an effort to implement the Board's directive, according to one faculty member, Drs. Burran and Labyak attended "a series of meetings and then they met with the Teaching and Learning Committee, which was also a Board of Regents' initiative that has sort of gone by the wayside." Furthermore, a faculty member added that after meeting with the members of the Teaching and Learning Committee, "the President and Dean [Labyak] presented it [the post-tenure review mandate] at a faculty meeting." Another seasoned faculty member explained the next steps in the process:

> We had several groups of people who got together in their divisions and talked about this [post-tenure review]. We had a big meeting of the faculty. We had workshops for faculty members. We probably had a half dozen of those at least meeting at different times of the day, usually on Friday afternoons because that's about the only time everybody could get together. Where we talked about the process and how it might work, suggestions people might have, concerns they might have.

After holding various meetings and workshops with faculty, Dr. Burran created an Ad Hoc Committee (1996-1997) to formulate and then recommend institutional policies as well as procedures regarding the College's implementation of

post-tenure review. Faculty were asked to participate in the process by joining the Committee. According to one faculty member, under the direction of the Board of Regents,

> a committee [Ad Hoc Committee] was appointed by the President...and the Academic Dean to basically review [the post-tenure review process]. There were some general guidelines of things that had to be included within the process that came down from the Board of Regents and then basically this committee looked at what had to be in there [the policy] and our structure and what we did and then how to incorporate those and then a policy and process procedure for Dalton State College.

Furthermore, a faculty member with several years of service to the College remarked that the newly formed Ad Hoc Committee "basically marched through his committee in a form that sort of took on a life of its own as time went on. I mean, some of the things that happened were clearly a reflection of internal activities of the committee." Chaired by Academic Dean Dr. Greg Labyak, the Ad Hoc Committee included administrative as well as faculty representation--Dr. David Wycherley, Natural Science/Mathematics; Dr. John Hutcheson, Business/Social Science; Dr. Neal McKenzie, Business/Social Science; Ms. Sally Addis, Physical Education; Ms. Trudy Swilling, Nursing; and Dr. Cordia Starling, Nursing.

One faculty member believed that members of the Ad Hoc Committee were given little direction from the Board of Regents. Specifically, he said that committee members "were supposed to develop the procedure for it [post-tenure review] because the Regents don't usually mandate how anything should be done. They just say it [the directive] will be done and then it is up to each individual school to discover how they are going to do it." In order to have a clearer understanding of

post-tenure review and what the process involved, a long-term faculty member and former member of the Ad Hoc Committee stated that

> the committee [Ad Hoc Committee] sat down and we looked at other models at other places, how they formulated their own. And then, you know, we just put together the process that we have now, and the forms that went with it, and the timetable that would occur every year and how they would determine who was picked. And, see the problem at first was when you first start doing it [the reviews], you have rafts of people who are eligible.

Despite the fact that the members of the Ad Hoc Committee were charged with the actual development of the post-tenure review process at Dalton State, faculty indicated that their ideas were met with resistance, especially from Academic Dean Dr. Greg Labyak. Although Dr. Labyak held sessions with all academic divisions in an effort to explain the process, a faculty member with many years of teaching experience remarked that Dr. Labyak initially "wanted to have people ranked," which greatly concerned faculty. Furthermore, according to the same faculty member, Dr. Labyak advocated a system of merit that encouraged PPTRC members to award individual rankings of

> top, average, below average. And, that was rejected and the people on the PPTRC Committee just said, 'Look, you've got to do that. You're the Dean. We're not going to rank. We're not going to send you people ranked.' And he kind of insisted that, 'Look, this is what the Board of Regents wants,' or whoever instituted this...whoever imposed this on us, cause they wanted some kind of ranking and the people on the committee rejected that and the people that went to these meetings rejected it, too. And, I think basically what we said was, 'Look, we just want pass/fail.' The people on the [PPTRC] committee, I think, basically they wanted just to send him [Labyak] the report and say, 'Well, this person does this in class and the committee says that they do a good job teaching and their handouts are good and their exams are good.' And let him make the decision--is this a top person?

Of those faculty members who were interviewed, only four indicated a dislike for Dr. Labyak's proposed system of merit. Moreover, as one seasoned faculty member explained, that "most people felt like these were judgments that most people on the committee [PPTRC] weren't really competent to make. And, we didn't appreciate the stress that it was causing." Despite such concerns, in the opinion of one professor, "an overwhelming majority" of Dalton State faculty members were able to defeat Dr. Labyak's proposal to award individual rankings, but "he did not appreciate being defeated."

The resulting post-tenure review procedures were later revised by both the 1997-1998 and the 1998-1999 Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committees (PPTRC), with each of the six faculty members holding committee appointments representing a different academic division. Of those faculty serving on the PPTRC, Dr. David Wycherley, Professor of Physics, served on the AD Hoc Committee from 1996-1997, and then chaired the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee the next three years. PPTRC appointments were also made for the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 academic years, with faculty representation by the institution's current seven academic divisions--Natural Science/Mathematics, Humanities, Social Science, Physical Education, Nursing, Technical, and Business and Technology (Dalton State College, 2001).

Research Question Two

How do Dalton State College faculty interpret the post-tenure review policy? What are their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation?

Demographics of Survey Respondents

A total of seventy-four faculty members responded to the three-part survey instrument. Of these, 59% (n=44) were male and 41% (n=30) were female. With regard to faculty rank, 10.8% (n=8) identified themselves as Instructors, 41.9% (n=31) as Assistant Professors, 31.1% (n=23) as Associate Professors, and 16.2% (n=12) as Professors. Furthermore, of those faculty who responded to the survey instrument, 82% (n=61) were tenured while 18% (n=13) were not. Then, of those tenured, 72% (n=43) held tenure while 28% (n=17) held tenure-track appointments. All survey respondents noted their years of service with the College as follows: 5 years or less, 27% (n=20); 6-10 years, 21.6% (n=16); 11-15 years, 17.6% (n=13); 16-20 years, 12.2% (n=9); 21-25 years, 9.5% (n=7); 26-30 years, 9.5% (n=7); and more than 30 years, 2.75 (n=2). Overall, the majority of survey respondents were male, had earned tenure and the rank of Assistant Professor, and had been employed by the College five years or less.

No Opinion of the Process

When asked to disclose their attitudes and experiences regarding Dalton State College's post-tenure review process, several faculty members offered no opinion because they believed they had little to no knowledge of the process. For instance, one long-term faculty member expressed this viewpoint,

> I'm not sure what they're trying to do with it on post-tenure review. [In reference to] the administration or the University System. I just don't know. I've never known. Maybe they're trying to see that teachers are still on the ball, so to speak, and learning new methods and whatever. I don't know if that shows that or not. Sometimes I think it does, but I'm not sure. We weren't really given the reason why or what they were looking for, just the fact that you would have

> to undergo it [post-tenure review] and then you sign off on whatever they find or you appeal it [the findings] if you don't like it. You have three years to correct it [documented deficiencies] if there is something really bad there. And, then I don't know. I guess you're let go. Post-tenure, that's what it's for, or pre-tenure for people trying to get tenure.

Furthermore, one faculty member who had taught at the institution for less than five years was unable to provide an opinion because he had no knowledge of the process, and another with limited years of teaching experience at the College said, "I don't know the procedure, so I can't give an opinion."

Positive Impact of the Post-Tenure Review Process

While several faculty members did not express opinions of the process, others readily shared their impressions of the Dalton State post-tenure review policy. A majority of these opinions were positive in nature and addressed the procedure's purposes as well as outcomes.

According to a number of faculty members, the post-tenure review policy is "fine" and they do not have any concerns with it. For instance, a long-term faculty member stated, "I think the idea of having something structured, if it's done properly, is probably a good idea. Not leaving things to be too informal, not that that is always bad, it's just that I think it can lead to inequities. If this is done properly, it should work out. So, I'm not opposed to it." Likewise, a faculty member with less than five years of service said that she was not opposed to being reviewed or undergoing an assessment of performance before or after tenure. Furthermore, one faculty member with limited years of service voiced her support for the procedure as she remarked,

> I think it's excellent because tenure, from what I've heard from other people, is you're pretty well locked into your position. It's almost like being a civil service employee; you can't be gotten rid of. And, I think that it could be real easy for certain people to slack off their standards and not be as good if we didn't have these policies.

And, yet another seasoned professor believed that the process was "positive" and stated that "business and industry does yearly reviews, [and gives] 360 degree feedback. It's just a fact of life and a necessary one. I think employees should want feedback about how they are doing, how they might improve."

Policy Perceptions

When asked to indicate what they perceived as the College's post-tenure review policy orientation, 42% (n=24) of survey respondents believed the post-tenure review policy was developmental in orientation, 26% (n=15) remarked it was managerial, and 32% (n=18) noted it was a combination of developmental and managerial (See Table IV-1).

Survey respondents indicated as many as seven possible policy design perceptions. With regard to what entities had been responsible for policy design,

Table IV-1

Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Policy Orientation

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Developmental	24 (42.1)
Developmental/Managerial Combination	18 (31.6)
Managerial	15 (26.3)

43% (n=26) of respondents indicated first and foremost that Dalton State's process was developed by faculty as well as administrators. Thirty-nine percent (n=24) believed that the process was designed solely by faculty while only 18% (n=11) indicated that the process's design was the responsibility of administrators. Of the remaining tenets of design, 69% (n=42) of respondents indicated that the College's policy was "based on peer review," 52% (n=32) indicated that the policy "contains a statement of purpose," 34% (n=20) indicated that the policy "establishes clear performance standards," and 26% (n=16) indicated that the policy "protects academic freedom" (See Table IV-2).

Survey respondents also indicated as many as five possible policy management perceptions. With regard to the entities selected most often by 39% (n=20) believed it "provides flexible/decentralized departmental control." Of

Table IV-2

Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Policy Design

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Based on Peer Review	42 (68.9)
Contains Statement of Purpose	32 (52.5)
Designed by Faculty and Administrators	26 (42.6)
Designed by Faculty	24 (39.3)
Establishes Clear Performance Standards	20 (32.8)
Protects Academic Freedom	16 (26.2)
Designed by Administrators	11 (18.0)

respondents, 39% (n=20) indicated process management "provides training," and the remaining three areas, 32% (n=16) indicated the process management "utilizes sound evaluation measures, 29% (n=15) indicated that it "provides for centralized control," and 22% (n=11) believed that it "provides institutional support" (See Table IV-3).

When asked to identify the perceived timing of Dalton State's post-tenure review process, 90% (n=56) of survey respondents stated the review occurred at a designated time. None of the respondents indicated that the timing of the review was due to a negative action, and only 10% (n=6) stated the timing was "neither of the above" (See Table IV-4).

Only nine survey respondents indicated contingency events they perceived important to the post-tenure review process at Dalton State College. Of the seven options listed on the survey instrument, the majority were listed in the "other" category. The following remarks were noted: "Only happens annually as scheduled;"

Table IV-3

Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Process Management

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Provides Training	20 (39.2)
Provides Flex./Decentralized Dept. Control	20 (39.2)
Utilizes Sound Evaluation Measures	16 (31.4)
Provides for Centralized Control	15 (29.4)
Provides Institutional Support	11 (21.6)

Table IV-4

Survey Respondents' Perceptions of the Timing of the Review

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Occurs Regularly at a Designated Time	56 (90.3)
Neither of the Above	6 (9.7)
Result of a Negative Action	0 (00.0)
Total	62 (100.0)

"Amount of time employed;" "Don't know;" "Mine was after year four of a tenure-track;" and "Years in rank." The remaining categories, which were selected by one or two respondents, simply did not provide significant data. For instance, two respondents indicated poor classroom effectiveness was an important concern. Receiving only one vote each were the other tenets--unsatisfactory events, failure to receive merit raises, lack of contributions to the department, poor attendance and reliability, and a lack of innovation. (See Table IV-5).

Survey respondents were also given an opportunity to indicate how they perceived the frequency of Dalton State's post-tenure review policy. Of those providing a response, 77% (n=43) stated that the process occurred after four to five academic years. Others believed that the process followed another frequency cycle. For instance, 16% (n=9) of the respondents indicated the process occurred after more than five academic years had passed while 5% (n=3) indicated the process took place after two to three academic years and 2% (n=1) said the process occurred every academic year (See Table IV-6).

Table IV-5

Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Contingency Events

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Other	5 (55.6)
Poor Classroom Effectiveness	2 (22.2)
Unsatisfactory Events	1 (11.1)
Failure to Receive Merit Raises	1 (11.1)
Lack of Contributions to Department	1 (11.1)
Poor Attendance/Reliability	1 (11.1)
Lack of Innovation	0 (00.0)

Table IV-6

Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Frequency of Review

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
After 4 to 5 Academic Years	43 (76.8)
More than 5 Academic Years	9 (16.1)
After 2 to 3 Academic Years	3 (5.4)
Every Academic Year	1 (1.8)

Process Outcomes

A number of those interviewed indicated that they had undergone the post-tenure review process and shared their experiences. Of these, several long-term faculty spoke favorably of their own post-tenure review processes. For instance, one mentioned that the post-tenure review process he followed was rewarding because "it was kind of friendly toward the faculty member." Furthermore, this important, those who observed his teaching "gave their comments and their adept professor believed the way he "experienced the review was great." Most importantly, those who observed his teaching "gave their comments and their assessments" and "then they got together with the rest of the committee." Also, the same faculty member said,

> The Peer Evaluation Chair met with us, those who were being reviewed, and discussed things and discussed the reports. He compiled the report and the committee [PPTRC] met with all documentation things that had been done and we discussed the things. It [the review] was not anything that a person should be concerned about. I guess anyone, if they're doing the job, they've got to do this [post-tenure review] anyway. See, that's a part of the redundancy. It helped me with my annual report but you know if anybody is doing their job, it shouldn't be a problem to go through this process at all. If you're doing the job, you do those things that you...you know, every term. You look at what you've done and you look at what you can do and so forth to improve the quality of this.

Other faculty who had served the College for more than fifteen years expressed similar comments. For instance, one such faculty member was not at all distressed about the process because at one time he had served as a member of the PPTRC. In his words, "Well, you know a lot of people have a lot of apprehension about it. It really didn't bother me because I knew how it was going to work since I was on the committee [PPTRC]." Another faculty member remarked, "I don't see

any difficulty with it." And, a final long-term professor felt that he had not experienced any anxiety regarding post-tenure review because he had earned tenure and the rank of Professor prior to undergoing the process. He stated,

> I don't have any concerns about my position at the college. If I had concerns, it [post-tenure review] would bother me a lot, but I don't have. I'm a full Professor and I get good student reviews. I publish and I do all this stuff I'm supposed to do. And, so for me, it's not something that's a real concern. It's really just, you know, it's my turn so I'll do it.

What's more, not only was the process free from punishment or intimidation, it was simply a task faculty had to address. As an example, one professor with more than twenty years of service to the College said,

> It's [post-tenure review] just something we have to do; we do it and we're through with it. And you don't feel like there will be reprisals if you do less than this, and we have put in some guidelines so that you can go back and make corrections if the committee [PPTRC] sees that there are corrections that need to be made. If you're not doing your job, then you need to know about it. And, you give them a certain time to get up to snuff or then their job would be in jeopardy. And, of course, anything they [PPTRC members] need to do to help you get up to snuff, in standard, they would do.

Also, the process at Dalton State "doesn't appear to be punitive." As the faculty member continued, "I like that aspect of it [a plan of development], that we were allowed to do that. If we've got to do this, we will do it but let us do it ourselves." Another long-term member of the faculty indicated that she "didn't really have any problems with it." One of the major benefits she received from the process itself involved the opportunity for self-analysis. In her words,

> I just think it [the process] helps me to figure out what I'm doing. It gives me a chance to be a little bit more objective, to get other people's opinions about what I'm doing. And, I'm the first to admit it is a little unnerving to have somebody [an observer] else in your classroom. I mean, that was kind of a little nerve-racking. Once you get through about the first five minutes you're fine.

Outcomes are important to faculty and help them to shape their opinions of the process. Perhaps one of the most significant process outcomes pertains to the feedback faculty receive. For example, an individual who had taught at the College for a number of years said, "I think it is a good policy and my attitude is very good about it. I think it's a really good thing. I think that it does give me some feedback that I very much need from my peers." Such feedback is necessary if faculty are to benefit from the process and have the opportunity for reflection. One faculty member with many years of service to Dalton State remarked,

> We [faculty] get limited feedback from the students but we seldom get feedback from our peers. And, if you want to improve, people should visit your class and you know they should look at your service to the community, service to the campus and some bit of scholarship to show you're staying current in your discipline. Because our disciplines change so rapidly, maybe this [post-tenure review] is the only way to assess that.

Above all, a great number of faculty saw post-tenure review process as a tool to help faculty to make strides in the profession. Such beneficial outcomes included opportunities for skill improvement and professional advancement. First and foremost, post-tenure review became, for some faculty, "an opportunity for people who are deserving to get tenure, to get recognition, to get academic promotions and additional pay raises." The process presents a system of checks and balances, and as an example, a long-term faculty member gave this response,

> I think it is a situation where they [administrators] develop this [post-tenure review]. This is just my thinking, to kind of draw in some of the folks who have been here years and years and years and just kind of coasting and maybe possibly not doing anything to develop further and laying back and doing the day to day. Maybe as a kind of check and balance to reel these folks in to see if they can help them get back on task and maybe, I don't know if 'scare' is the word, but you

> know put a little fire under them to motivate them to fall back in order to improve themselves and their teaching of students.

Furthermore, faculty believe that if their colleagues are aware of such checks and balances, they will react to the review in a positive manner. For instance, in the words of one experienced professor,

> I think it's [post-tenure review] good because I've seen over the years people get very comfortable in their position and I think it eventually gets to the point they become stagnant. They become stagnant when the student is not getting what he or she needs from us, so I think this [post-tenure review] is just a check and balance to make sure that we are still providing quality education. So, I'm in favor of it [post-tenure review].

Moreover, if post-tenure review is used to improve their performance, faculty are more accepting of the process. And, if "it's used wholly and strictly to improve teaching," one faculty member said she did not have a problem with the post-tenure review requirement. Not only can the review process help faculty to improve their teaching skills; it is an effective tool to update them on issues of importance to the education profession. According to another professor who has been a member of the DSC faculty for several years, post-tenure review "is a good policy for keeping the faculty updated on current changes in teaching techniques in their respective disciplines, to continue improving teaching effectiveness as well as service to the institution and the professional development." And, the process is also "a good objective tool to use for the summative evaluation as well as this peer review of colleagues for consideration of promotion and merit pay."

As shown in Table IV-7, faculty indicated how they perceived the impact of the post-tenure review process. Seventy-three percent (n=43) of survey

Table IV-7

Survey Respondents' Perceptions of the Impact of Review

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Offers Feedback to Faculty Member	44 (74.6)
Both Fac. Mbr. and Supervisor See Review	43 (72.9)
Dev. Plan Created by Supervisor/Fac. Mbr.	24 (40.7)
Dev. Plan Created by Faculty Member	13 (22.0)
Provides for a Penalty	13 (22.0)
Auth. Supervisor to Monitor Dev. Plan	12 (20.3)
Only Faculty Member Sees Review	11 (18.2)
Authorizes Fac. Mbr. to Monitor Dev. Plan	9 (15.3)
Provides for a Reward	8 (13.6)
Authorizes Peers to Monitor Dev. Plan	5 (8.5)
Only Supervisor Sees Review	3 (5.1)
Dev. Plan Created by Supervisor	2 (3.4)

respondents said that both the faculty member and the supervisor saw the review, while only 19% (n=11) indicated that only the faculty member saw the review. A remaining 5% (n=3) believed that only the supervisor saw the review.

Of the remaining nine areas, survey respondents offered various responses. Seventy-four percent (n=44) indicated that the process offered feedback to the faculty member. Forty-one percent (n=24) of respondents believed in the existence of a development plan, which had been created by both the faculty member and the supervisor. Still yet, 22% (n=13) indicated the development plan had been created by the faculty member, while 3% (n=2) believed the plan had been created by the supervisor. Furthermore, according to 20% (n=12) of respondents, monitoring of such a plan was the responsibility of the supervisor. Fifteen percent of respondents (n=9) felt monitoring the development plan fell to the faculty member and 8% (n=5) believed such responsibility was the job of peers. Finally, 22% (n=13) of respondents stated that the current process provided for a penalty. Likewise, 14% (n=8) believed the process also provided for a reward (See Table IV-7).

Negative Impact of the Post-Tenure Review Process

Although a number of interviewees' reflections of the review process were positive in nature, other observations were not so favorable. Faculty indicated that the policy was too time-consuming, required too much paper work, caused undue stress and intimidation, had no justifiable purpose and was simply a formality.

In the first place, faculty declared that Dalton State's post-tenure review policy consumed entirely too much of their time, especially since they had many

documents to assemble for the review. For example, a long-term faculty member said,

> It [documentation] is very time-consuming. It involves such things as typing up five years' worth of student evaluations and such things as that. Collecting all sorts of documentation, some of which we keep anyway. Some of which has to be assembled. And, it is an enormous time-consuming task for both the individual faculty member and for the members of the committee [PPTRC].

Another professor indicated that adequate time was not available to assemble the documentation. Since this faculty member was not notified of the review several months in advance, preparation time was limited. Specifically, the faculty member's reflections were, "I was depressed. I had a very short time to get my documentation in. I found out back...it was just about around Christmas time or maybe in December. The documentation was due, I think, in January."

Others clearly felt that the post-tenure review process required faculty to assemble too much paperwork when they were inundated with work. One seasoned professor remarked, "You get to do a lot of paperwork" and another indicated that he had seen his supervisor "on the floor pulling out massive files." Furthermore, the same faculty member stated, "I commented and said he [the supervisor] was about to do post-tenure reviews. He has to submit part of it and you know he rolled his eyes and shook his head." Therefore, not only are faculty members required to compile the documents necessary for the review, supervisors must also supplement the faculty member's materials. In addition, a faculty member with five years of service to the College said, "I also think it [post-tenure review] adds an incredible amount of work to administrators, not the high administrators but our division chairs

because they would get to sit down and read a lot of this as if they don't have anything else to do." Another provided this insight:

> I think it's a lot of work for no real reason. I think I have seen what they [those undergoing review] have had to do. I mean, notebooks this thick [approximately three inches] full of stuff that I am told that they [PPTRC members] don't really even look through. I don't know if that is true or not, but they [those under review] have to assemble just massive amounts of paperwork and I don't see the point of it. And, I don't think people who have gone through it see the point in it [the amount of paperwork] either.

Not only did faculty members indicate that the process was too time-consuming and required additional paperwork, they felt that it caused undue stress and intimidation. Because the review process occurred during the academic term, faculty found that they experienced additional stress. According to one professor, in addition to

> consuming most of the semester's time to put the material together, at the same time we were undergoing some other major changes and it was very stressful because of that. And, the fact that it [portfolio development] took place in the fall term made it much more stressful trying to finish up within the fall term.

With regard to the review of documents by peers, one faculty member remarked, "I think it is intimidating that your peers would have to come and look over your last evaluations and that type of thing. I mean, I find that intimidating. Course you'd want it but you wouldn't want it."

Others expressed concerns that the post-tenure review process had no justifiable purpose or value. For example, one professor indicated that as the process exists at Dalton State College, post-tenure review has no real purpose but it will be difficult to remove. Another with many years of service to the College gave a similar response and added,

> I just didn't think it [post-tenure review] was valuable because I don't ever recall getting any feedback that I thought was useful. And, it just seemed like this [the process] wasn't really a faculty decision; there wasn't a faculty initiated to do it. It [the mandate] came from the top down; it didn't come from the bottom up. We were forced to do it, so we did it. We played the game, but you know I just don't feel like most people felt like...It wasn't like I had anything particular to hide. I was just...and I think most people were concerned about how would the information be used, particularly if we had done it [the process] the way Dean Labyak wanted us to do it where there were essentially two different passing grades and one failing grade.

Not only did the faculty disagree with assigning a series of ranks to post-tenure review outcomes, they believed the process had "no impact" upon performance. One experienced faculty member, who was also a former PPTRC member, remembered his reaction to an overview of PPTRC members' responsibilities in the review process. He stated,

> we were told at the time that our job [as PPTRC members] was to go through and evaluate but whatever we came up with did not have any bearing on the individual getting tenure, getting raises, getting out, etc. And, my first thought on this, excuse my saying so, but the first thing I thought was 'What the hell are we doing here? Why are we even doing this? If it is not going to matter, why do it?' No impact and I just don't like busy work. And this was a very involved process, taking up every Friday or whatever, for a couple three hours many times for either six, seven, eight, nine, ten weeks. We'd have somebody come in [to be reviewed] and we'd give you thirty minutes to an hour. And, then we'd have another person [to review] and we'd do two.

Moreover, faculty saw no viable purpose in reviewing the performance of their colleagues because they felt that the outcome of the review was "just a pat on the head" and the process had no value. As one recently hired professor said, "It [Post-tenure review] doesn't go anywhere. It's not tied in to our promotion or tenure in any way, shape or form" and another indicated that

> they're [administration] not going to get rid of anybody because of post-tenure review. And the people who go through post-tenure

> review, I mean, they're all good teachers, and to have to take away hours of their time and you know hundreds of pages of copying just to say they've done it. I really don't see the point.

Thus, several faculty could not understand why they were required to complete the post-tenure review process when they could not see any justifiable purpose in doing so.

A couple of other faculty members also added the process was simply a formality created by the System that they had no choice but to follow. Upon reflecting that the process was simply another way for administrators to assess faculty productivity, one long-term faculty member remarked, "I think it's [post-tenure review] another form of assessment, and we've got layers and layers and layers and layers and layers of assessment. It's just something you do." Likewise, another interviewee who had taught at DSC for many years said, "In a sense it's [post-tenure review] a little bit redundant" because "when I did my post-tenure review documentation, my annual report was finished. It's been my opinion that over the years, the annual report covered a lot of the same things." The classroom observations were the only additional items that the faculty member had to include in the post-tenure review documentation sent to the PPTRC.

Mixed Reviews

A final group of faculty regarded Dalton State's post-tenure review process as a positive as well as a negative procedure that faculty had to undergo. Such sentiments caused one long-term faculty member to state,

> I have mixed feelings about it [post-tenure review]. On positive, once again, you know, hopefully it [the review] would demonstrate just because someone is tenured doesn't mean that person can just walk

> in and not do his or her job. Because that's not right. That, to me, is not what tenure should be. Tenure shouldn't be a license to say, 'Oh, wow! Now I can quit teaching and relax and float in here and not help anyone and not do my job!' On the other hand, it bothers me that we are not trusted enough to come in as professionals and do what we are paid to do. And, I think it's one thing [requirement] that hurts the education field in general, and it keeps a lot of good people out of it. It's this constant 'You know, oh they're not doing their job,' 'Oh, we must review them,' 'Oh, we must do this and that' because no one wants someone doing that when it is all said and done.

Another seasoned member of the DSC faculty also remarked, "I have sort of mixed feelings. We are in a process of change, okay, with administration and review...pre and post-tenure review." This process of rigorous evaluation, according to yet another faculty member with many years of teaching experience, is

> in some ways, it [post-tenure review] is a good idea, but in some ways it [the process] isn't carried out very correctly. And, it's almost like to me, it's almost like the SACS review where in principle it's a good idea and improvements can be made. But then after awhile you just start doing the minimum effort and it ends up being paperwork, and I haven't seen anything positive come out of it. I haven't seen anything negative come of it. It just becomes a kind of pro forma. It just becomes kind of a paperwork thing that there are papers now in somebody's files and I've been reviewed.

Ideally, in the opinion of one faculty member with more than ten years of service to the College, the process "could have some positive effects, but in reality personally, I think it is just another paper tiger we have to chase."

Research Question Three

Do Dalton State College faculty members think post-tenure review affects their professional practice? Their status? Their roles within the institution?

Process's Impact upon Interviewees: No Opinion

When asked how the post-tenure review process had impacted their lives, only one of the twenty-eight faculty interviewed gave no opinion or offered no response to the question.

Post-Tenure Review: A Positive Experience

For six of the twenty-eight faculty members interviewed, the impact of the post-tenure review process has been a positive experience. Along with the process have come a number of benefits, and these faculty cite a thorough review of their performance, a knowledge of peer accomplishments and an awareness of their own professional activities as three of the most noteworthy.

To begin, an experienced faculty member said of the post-tenure review process,

> It's just made me want to just examine my own philosophy toward teaching and to find ways to adopt more effective means of teaching for better student learning outcomes in my classes. And, to serve the college more and to develop more professionally in conducting the classroom studies and trying to publish reports--all for my own tenure review process to report before the committee [PPTRC] when my time comes.

For this individual, such a process evoked self-evaluation in all areas of service, not just classroom teaching performance. And, faculty realized other benefits as well, especially with regard to the classroom observation component. As an example, one faculty member with many years of teaching experience noted,

> On the positive side, again, I was just tickled to death to have a peer review and to have their evaluation and their suggestions. That was just tremendously useful and I have found the summary of what I've been doing for the last five years kind of useful, too. So, my overall impression is good.

Likewise, not only did faculty realize benefits from having their classes observed by their peers; they also benefited from serving on their colleagues' peer observation committees. In such settings, observers were given opportunities to see how their colleagues grew within the teaching profession, contributed to the institution and served the community. As one long-term faculty member stated,

> I think the other thing that I actually liked about it [post-tenure review] is that I've found out so much more about other people. And what they do not only in the classroom, how they teach and everything, the activities they're involved in [within] the community and a lot of their academic endeavors as far as like books and presentations. So, I've actually become impressed with my colleagues and all the things that they have done.

Such opportunities to observe the work of others enable faculty to reflect upon their own performance. That includes noting activities and keeping documentation up-to-date so the information is available in the event it is necessary for post-tenure review. As another seasoned faculty member indicated,

> I'm more cognizant of trying to have documentation that would show that I've done this, that or the other, so if I get some kind of letter stating 'Well, we appreciate you serving on this, that or the other,' then I will stick that in a folder for future use.

Thus, now more than ever, faculty are aware that they must keep accurate records of their professional performance and activities if they are to provide clear post-tenure review documentation. And, for two faculty members who were interviewed, such rigorous documentation is "the biggest change" brought about by post-tenure review.

Opinions of Reviewed Faculty

Of those faculty interviewed, three indicated that they had undergone the post-tenure review process at Dalton State. For them, the experience was both a rewarding but yet an enormous task. For one, the post-tenure review process was "painless" and involved such activities as "getting paperwork, going to the meetings, talking with the committee, signing papers and turning papers in." Other items that the faculty member had to assemble for the review included "teaching evaluations, a statement of teaching philosophy and a vita." And, after completing the process, the same faculty member said, "It's [post-tenure review] become so painless; it doesn't really matter if it comes up again." Another indicated that he had just gone through the procedure and created a "little portfolio," and the Peer Evaluation Committee had completed a "peer review" of his classroom performance. A final faculty member with many years of service to the institution indicated that although he had completed the post-tenure review process, it had not significantly affected his performance. He also said that while he "appreciated some of the comments that did happen from the classroom visitation," the process did not really have a bearing upon his professional life. In his opinion, the process was "effective" but such benefits were also difficult to determine.

Overall, those faculty who completed the review process seemed to feel more comfortable once the review had been conducted. Although the three faculty members were required to compile a tremendous amount of material, they indicated they were not afraid to subject themselves to such a process again.

Little Impact Upon Interviewees

While the post-tenure review process was personally beneficial to only six of the faculty interviewed, eight others believed that the procedure offered little, if any, personal impact. That was due, in part, to the fact that several interviewees had not personally experienced the post-tenure review process. For example, one faculty member with approximately six years of teaching experience said, "You know, it [post-tenure review] hasn't really affected me personally at all yet because I just got tenure at the end of last year. So, I haven't had a post-tenure review. I haven't even had a meeting with my division chair since I've had tenure." That same faculty member went on to say that he did not believe that post-tenure review would impact his life whenever he was required to complete the process.

Even though the majority of faculty who were interviewed were already tenured or were following a tenure track, one long-term faculty member indicated he would never be awarded tenure because he did not hold a tenure track position. As a result, the process's impact upon his life amounted to "almost nothing" and he was pleased that he "did not have to worry about it."

Sixteen of the twenty-eight faculty who were interviewed shared they had not been affected in any way by the post-tenure review process because they "had not gone through it" or did not have tenure. One of these individuals indicated that post-tenure review was, at best, a future requirement because she had not even been awarded tenure. She remarked, "I'm so far from it to be honest that it's a long way out there because I would still need to go up for pre-tenure review and then be tenured. So, this is way out there. So, to be honest, in a sense, I'm not as much affected by post-tenure as I am pre-tenure." Then, another faculty member said of

the process, "Other than a tremendous number of meetings, I would say in a sense [I have been impacted] very little." Still yet three others stated, "It [post-tenure review] actually hasn't [affected me]. I'm not at that point and I haven't really moved one way or another;" "I can't say honestly that is has [affected me];" and "It really hasn't."

Although eight faculty interviewees were not eligible for post-tenure review at the time, one faculty member with less than five years teaching experience expressed concerned about what could happen once she was eligible for review. She remarked, "It [the review process] hasn't [affected me] in any way, shape or form because I'm not there. Am I concerned about it? Oh yeah, for a variety of reasons, but you know in every job you've got, there are politics." Likewise, when asked how he would be affected by post-tenure review, another faculty member who had limited years of service to the College said that he did not think the process would impact his professional life. Specifically, he stated,

> Personally, I don't think it [post-tenure review] will change the way I'm conducting my professional life. I try to do a good job in the classroom. I'm sure there are probably some areas of weakness. You know, none of us is perfect. And, that may be uncovered, and if so, then it would, you know, help me to improve that area. You know, I try to be of service both to the college and to the community. I seek out ways in which I can serve. Perhaps not always feverishly or aggressively, but I'm asked to do something, I usually do it and in the community I usually try to find some ways that I can volunteer for things. If I've got in the back of my mind that the review would use that [community service] as a component subconsciously, up front I would be looking for ways to make sure I've got that.

Thus, the faculty member is not uncomfortable with the process but he would plan accordingly for his future review by giving attention to all areas that could be addressed.

Negative Impact upon Interviewees

With regard to the personal impact of the post-tenure review policy, eight of the twenty-eight faculty members who were interviewed expressed negative comments. Their primary concerns pertained to the time and effort required to complete the process as well as the amount of stress that the process produced.

First, four faculty indicated that an enormous amount of time was required in order to complete the process. For instance, these faculty members thought that entirely too much time was required to gather and assemble materials for the review. One professor with several years of dedicated service to the institution said, "I guess other than being involved with it [post-tenure review] from the inception and then throughout time-wise, it is a process that takes a lot of time and effort." Another long-term faculty member indicated that such demands upon his time caused him to experience a great deal of added stress, and still another stated,

> I still enjoy going in and being with the students more than anything else and anything that hampers that I resent. Whether I have to do it [post-tenure review] or not, I resent it taking away time from that [teaching] and this sort of does. It takes away from prep time; it takes away from anything else, getting all the materials that you need to get together, sitting down and writing out, which I still have yet to do, my teaching philosophy. All those sorts of things almost seem absurd. I mean, what is my goal? My goal is to be the best teacher I possibly can. What other goal do we need as teachers? And, when you have to sit down and do all these goals and assessments and...To me, that's a waste of time. I'm looking for us to have lesson plans next at the collegiate level. I really am.

Along with the time and effort involved in the process, stress proved to be a major disadvantage for those who were required to undergo the post-tenure review process. In the case of one faculty member, the process created an undue amount of stress when she was already busy with course preparations for the semester. The

same individual shared these reflections: "It [post-tenure review] has affected me personally in that it's been a real pain in the rear this semester. It's a lot of extra work and so in that way it's been negative." Furthermore, such stress was difficult for faculty to bear because they were also required to perform other assessments. For example, another faculty member who had been employed by the institution for a number of years said,

> Well, it [post-tenure review] has put stress on me because at the same time we have so many other assessment things going on at this time; it's really too much. And, then SACS is coming up and we're dealing with that. If we weren't doing other things, it [the review process] would be just like the annual review at the end and getting your resume' together and that sort of thing. But, it's [post-tenure review] a little bit more than that because that's in addition to that [the annual review].

Not only were faculty concerned about the amount of stress the process created, they were also concerned about what the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee might note via the review. As an example, one interviewee remarked,

> It [the process] is disconcerting at first and you always think 'Oh my goodness. If they [PPRTC] leave no stone unturned, what might they uncover?' Yet, at the same time, you think, 'So what if they do uncover something?' I mean, they would give you a chance to fix it [the problem] if it needs fixing.

For two others, an unappealing component of the post-tenure review process most certainly was amount of the negativity that was heard on campus. One such faculty member, who also happened to have several years of teaching experience, stated that he remembered "having to listen to people grumble about [the process] during lunch or something," and he did not enjoy the complaints. Thus, the aspects of the post-tenure review process that most affected those faculty who were interviewed pertained primarily to time expended and stress experienced.

No Opinion of Process's Impact upon Colleagues

When asked how the post-tenure review process had impacted lives of their colleagues, one of the twenty-eight faculty who were interviewed gave no opinion or offered no response to the question.

Positive Impact upon Colleagues

Nine of the twenty-eight faculty members who were interviewed commented positively about the post-tenure review process at Dalton State College. They believed their colleagues benefited from the process in a variety of ways, including the provision for feedback to enhance classroom performance and encourage professional development.

In the first place, faculty believed that post-tenure review made their colleagues "more accountable;" as a result, their colleagues were more likely to become actively involved in College service. One of the nine faculty members remarked,

> I think it [post-tenure review] has made them [faculty] more accountable. I think that I have seen a higher level of activity in that they know that, you know, at some point they're going to have to, you know, get under the gun. And, so I've seen a lot of them that maybe six years ago they were not functioning at the level they are now. They're helping out more with recruitment, visitation, and committee work. We volunteer for committees once a year, and it seemed sort of like the same people would get the hard committees that meet, you know, once a week. Now, I think the workload is a little more shared because used to you would have a lot of times, I think, tenured faculty who would come in, teach their classes and leave. And, you know, a lot of them or some of them--not all of them--weren't even keeping adequate office hours.

When asked how the post-tenure review process had impacted her colleagues, another faculty member with approximately five years of service to the College said,

"I really don't have an opinion, but I would assume it would to some extent." Furthermore, this individual felt that her colleagues "might update their lectures a bit more, start class on time and not cancel class meetings" once they knew that their performance would be closely scrutinized.

Four others believed that post-tenure review made faculty more aware of their performance; as a result, more were apt to enhance their service to the institution and community. As an illustration, one long-term faculty member stated,

> I think all of them [faculty] are just more cognizant of their performance as teachers and they try to be more effective by using the current techniques to develop greater student learning outcomes. I believe they are [attending professional development activities] since we've started tenure review. Since we're reviewed for professional development, these kinds of activities are important in this professional development, attending seminars and conferences.

Another individual with many years of service to the institution indicated that faculty "feel strongly that this [post-tenure review] is useful" and "the process has made people more conscious of what they're doing."

In the opinion of two faculty members, process outcomes provided additional positive impact. In the first place, upon conclusion of the review, the post-tenure review process offers a plan of development for those faculty in need of assistance. Furthermore, one faculty member remarked, "They [PPTRC members] give you three years to do it, correct it, whatever that you want to do. Three years, to me, is fair time." For another faculty member with many years of teaching experience, post-tenure review is simply a task that has been mandated; therefore, faculty just complete the process as instructed. The most positive aspect, however, it that faculty actually benefit from such thorough reflection. Specifically, one long-term professor said,

> I don't consider post-tenure to be some earth shattering sort of experience. It's something that you do. It's something that you're expected to do and you may not want to hash through all those forms again and get all that stuff together again. And, yet while you're doing it, I think it helps you organize yourself, your life, your teaching a little bit more than you would if you didn't have to.

Although faculty must compile numerous documents in preparation for the review, they "are probably not benefiting as much from the process as they will once they go through it one time." Not only did faculty see the process as a task they simply had to complete, they did not complain to a great extent. According to the same faculty member,

> I think people that I have talked to have not fussed too much about it. That's what we really expected when we started this, a certain amount of complaining and I'm sure there was that. But, everybody I've talked with who has gone through it [the process] said, 'It wasn't as bad as I thought it would be.'

Regardless of how the policy is perceived, faculty realize "they might as well get as much from it [the process]" because they are required to complete the review.

No Impact

Regarding the affect of the College's post-tenure review policy upon their colleagues, twelve of the twenty-eight faculty who were interviewed suggested the process had no impact upon their co-workers. Beyond having to complete the post-tenure review process, seven of the twelve faculty members had not noted any significant changes in the behavior of their colleagues.

Three faculty members simply did not have knowledge of what their colleagues had experienced because the process had not been discussed in their presence. As an example, one professor said, "I know some folks who have gone

through it [post-tenure review], but I really haven't talked to them about it." Likewise, another recently hired faculty member indicated he had "no sense one way or another" regarding how his colleagues had been impacted by the process because the topic "has not come up or been discussed with anyone."

Another long-term faculty member was assured that her colleagues knew post-tenure review was merely a task that had to be completed and they had told her so. In her words,

> I think for most of us it [post-tenure review] is just, in fact, everybody I've talked to; it's simply one of those things. 'Oh, yeah, this year I've got to do it.' Now the first year, there was a lot of concern about it because the question was, you know, 'Is this going to be used to fire people?' And, it wasn't and it's not and I just don't see. The concern I see is, it's another thing I have to do among all the various things that I have to do.

Likewise, "some have viewed it [the process] as a bump in the road; it's a hurdle to jump over." Six faculty members also noted that they "had not observed any changes in practices other than perhaps being a little more aware of the need to document what they've done." As one interviewee reflected upon the process's impact upon his colleagues, he added,

> I don't really think so [that the process has changed faculty]. And, I might be naïve or whatever, but I really believe Dalton State College is an excellent school and that pretty much by far those people that teach, teach well and do a good job in the first place. And, they care about their students, they care about the community, and they are involved and active, and they care about their scholarship and keep that up. So, I really don't see that most of them have had to change because they were doing these things all along.

Moreover, faculty believed their colleagues had not been professionally affected by the presence of the post-tenure review process. Furthermore, one faculty member

with many years of service said that he had noted "no impact upon academic freedom" since the process's implementation.

Five faculty members indicated they "did not know" how their colleagues had been affected by the post-tenure review process, or they had not observed any notable changes. According to a faculty member with years of service to the institution, "Really, I hear next to nothing on campus anymore about pre- and post-tenure. I think it is still going on, but it's certainly not visible and it is not something I hear people wringing their hands about. And, I couldn't even tell you 100% if we're even still doing it." The same individual indicated that faculty no longer recognized the post-tenure review process as a menace to the education profession. He stated, "I don't hear many people being concerned certainly about post-tenure review. I don't think people see it as any kind of a threat." Also, in agreement were two other faculty members whose comments included, "I don't know that anyone has been adversely affected by it [post-tenure review]," and "I haven't noticed any differences in my colleagues since I've been here." And, finally, one long-term faculty member shared her reflections that despite post-tenure review outcomes, a majority of faculty have not changed their behavior. In her opinion,

> I've always been kind of the opinion that once people, once instructors, or teachers if you will, get into a groove and find something that works and it's obvious that it has been working because of test feedback and verbal comments, student ratings and so forth, that...I may be wrong. I may be way off base here, but I don't think people do a lot of changing. Given those three things and thirty more, maybe that are all positive, or for the most part positive, I don't think people do a lot of changing as a result of a review on paper or post-tenure review or anything else. They might temporarily and I may very well be wrong in this whole thing, but I think basically they slide back into the same groove. So, if it [post-tenure review] changes anyone, I don't know who that would be.

Thus, it is the opinion of those faculty members who shared their comments that Dalton State's post-tenure review process has not had much of an impact upon the professional lives of their colleagues. They have noted no noticeable difference in their classroom performance or professional demeanor.

Negative Impact upon Colleagues

Although twelve faculty members indicated that the process had little to no impact at Dalton State College, twenty-one of the twenty-eight faculty members who were interviewed expressed that the process had caused negative repercussions for their colleagues. Such concerns ranged from apprehension and resistance to stress and paranoia, and affected many faculty from the time the process was introduced to its implementation.

According to one faculty member, when the post-tenure review process was presented to faculty, "it created a lot of talk at first." Then, when the process was put into place, quite a bit of apprehension was clearly evident. As a result, "first-year paranoia was rampant" and "there was a lot of uneasiness at first" for faculty. As an illustration, one long-term faculty member said, "I can tell you that when it [post-tenure review] was implemented maybe three or four years ago, it was a huge deal with much wringing of hands and gnashing of teeth kind of thing." Furthermore, a professor noted, "I've heard them talk about it [post-tenure review]. I know they know it exists and I've heard just sort of rumblings" regarding the process at Dalton State. Such concerns were apparent as faculty attempted to deal with a policy that, once implemented, would review their performance. As another faculty member with many years of teaching experience pointed out, "A lot of people, I think, were

threatened by [the process] at first, so you had a lot of apprehension, a lot of resistance to it."

Moreover, faculty believed that their colleagues felt threatened because the policy was imposed upon them and it was not one that Dalton State faculty had initiated. For example, in the words of one faculty member, "I think initially that when it [the policy] was first coming about and, of course, things that get mandated to you a lot of times you kind of feel threatened. And, of course, when you have people looking at your teaching, sometimes that makes you feel threatened." Also, a faculty member said,

> Everybody hates it [post-tenure review]. No one wants it because once again, it is taking accountability too far in the sense of...Does someone really need to come into someone's classroom and watch and see to make sure that person's teaching? Well, hopefully you would know that person was teaching and doing a good job by other factors besides that [a classroom observation].

Others noted their colleagues were also worried that something negative would be discovered during the review. For instance, a faculty member with several years of teaching experience at DSC said,

> I think what was going on was they [senior faculty] were probably a little afraid of what folks might find out if they cruise along and hide from people. And, I guess no one likes to be exposed. And, they felt like all of their personal privacies were going to be analyzed and evaluated as part of it [the review process]. I guess they were afraid of receiving poor remarks. 'After I have been here many years; that must be good enough.'

Moreover, the process created an "apprehensive situation" for many faculty members primarily because they did not have an indication of how the findings would be utilized. Some even believed that such a process of review "was some kind of witch-hunt to get rid of people." Specifically, one long-term faculty member added,

> They [faculty] see it [the process] as something of an unknown even though it is still a very user-friendly kind of thing. Again, being involved in the process has helped my outlook cause I've seen it. I know how they [PPTRC members] look at things, how they operate, etc. I know what the interview process is like and those sorts of things, so I have no concern whatsoever. But for other people, it [the review] is really intimidating in many respects because they don't know what the committee is looking for. 'Are they looking for a way to get rid of me?' 'Why are we doing this?' 'What is the impact of this?'

An individual who was active in the College's post-tenure review process noted other evidence of apprehension among his colleagues. For example, this faculty member said,

> I've been on the committee [PPTRC] actually and observed several people, and I know the ones that could be isolated examples, but the ones I've worked with and had to observe, I've had to try to calm them because they've been extremely apprehensive about it. I think they feel like they're being grilled to some extent. I don't know. And, you know they resent it, I think.

Not only were faculty apprehensive of the process, they also resented the fact that their documented years of outstanding service were simply set aside in lieu of a new review process. As an illustration, a faculty member with more than fifteen years of service to the institution remarked,

> After having been here many years and gotten good student reviews and basically have a good work record, you know, very few sick days, it's obvious that they're doing their job in the classroom because students are being employed. They've got feedback from those students saying, 'You know, you really prepared me,' and then all of a sudden this [post-tenure review] hits them. And, they take it, I think, some of them now as kind of a slap in the face. That's the impression I've gotten. Everybody that I've watched when we have done the pre- and post-tenure review, when it comes down to the paperwork and that interviewee coming into the room, they're not the person I've known for x-number of years. Or, it doesn't appear [that way]. They're nervous. I think they're on pins and needles. To me, it's like appearing in front of a jury and you've not been [found guilty] and they're still trying you. I've known a lot of people for a long time, and I just know that it is a different person at the end of the table when

> they come in for that [the review]. I'm not a psychologist. I couldn't tell you why or how disturbed they are or to what extent. But, it's not the same person.

In fact, the presence of apprehension and resentment toward the review process "created added stress" for faculty. Such stress caused a great deal of anguish for faculty as they tried to perform their day-to-day tasks, especially those necessary for classroom instruction. In particular,

> Some of them [faculty] really get stressed about it [the review process]. People [peers] come into their classrooms [to observe] and it's not really disturbing. It's just that you know that somebody is there and they're writing things about you, which you notice. Or, they're taking notes. I think a lot of them I guess they're stressed out about it and more so. I don't know if it was because they were having to do the whole process, or it was just having somebody come to their class that made them nervous.

Likewise, another seasoned faculty member noted that her colleagues had experienced a great deal of stress due to the presence of post-tenure review. She said, "it's just stress; it is just one of those things [faculty have to do]," and "most people [faculty] dread it." One other professor indicated that his colleagues were not at all pleased with the process as he noted,

> Oh, generally speaking, I think the reaction has been, 'Oh no, something else we [have] got to do.' My general sense has been that they [colleagues] have been not real happy about it [the review process]. I guess right off hand that most of them are a little bit less happy with it than I would be. But, then I would probably be fussing as much as anybody who has to go through the process.

Faculty simply did not appreciate the additional time-consuming assignments that the process entailed or the stress which resulted.

One of the most significant concerns noted by interviewees pertained to how their colleagues viewed the evaluation of senior faculty members--those with twenty-five years or more of service to the institution. In order to offer an

illustration, one long-term faculty member said, "We had really veterans who had been here. I remember that first group [of reviewees]; a particular professor was part of it. He had been here at the time twenty-five, twenty-six years and full Professor. I don't know if he was full Professor. He certainly had tenure for ages." Others indicated that their senior colleagues, some of whom were close to retirement, were offended by the fact that they were expected to complete the process in the first place. For instance, a faculty member with many years of teaching experience said,

> One of the folks I work with, actually a number of them were very close to retirement and could retire at any moment seem to be very offended by it. They felt like once you put in many years of teaching, what's the point? 'You can't teach an old dog new tricks and I'm not changing what I'm doing.' I've heard that kind of attitude.

Furthermore, a faculty member remarked that he actually knew "people to retire not to have to do it."

Not only were their colleagues uncomfortable with the evaluation of senior faculty members, faculty indicated they were dissatisfied with the amount of paperwork required to complete the post-tenure review process. As an illustration, one faculty member remarked, "We have so much paperwork right now that we have to do. Every time we turn around, we're having to write a new report." Likewise, another indicated that her colleagues had been inundated with paperwork and she had heard several comments, including "'I have to fill out all of these forms,' and 'I have to get all of this stuff together.'"

With regard to the amount of time required to assemble the portfolio, she had also heard her colleagues say, 'I don't have time;' 'I have to teach;' 'When am I going to have time to write a teaching philosophy?' Furthermore, faculty asserted

"there was a lot of grumbling" among their colleagues because they were required to provide "documentation" of institutional service, professional growth and community involvement. Another indicated that she had overheard her colleagues "gossiping at the water fountain" and knew that "some of them gripe about it." In fact, gathering such documentary evidence caused a tremendous amount of additional work for faculty as they assembled their evaluation materials. For instance, one professor remarked, "Well, it's [the process] always something that adds to our already overloaded agenda of work. That's the biggest part of this." Moreover, in the opinion of another long-term faculty member, the process is simply a "paper chase" for those who undergo review. For others, putting forth the extra time and effort to assemble the enormous amount of documentation has been a great concern. Specifically, one faculty member who has devoted many years of service to the College noted that his colleagues gave up quite a bit of time to prepare for the review. He said,

> Again, merely I think in terms of giving up the time to get this done [has affected my colleagues most]. One colleague on a similar level is assembling all this material and again, spring is better than fall since we're teaching on a five and four basis in the fall. But, it's still very much of a strain when there's a lot of paperwork with the courses, and the fact that we teach day, night and off-campus. And, any extra is really a burden in many cases. And, with personal and confidential materials, it's a little more difficult because that means we have the assemble them, type them or put them in digital format, print up the final copy or have a secretary, depending on the level of confidentiality and trust involved, do that for us.

And, once the materials were put into portfolio format, faculty found that their colleagues were concerned that no one seemed to examine their documentation, despite the time spent gathering it. As an illustration, one faculty member stated,

> I have heard stories of people who were doing post-tenure and they have said that they compiled this huge packet of information and no one even looked at it. It was barely glanced at, barely scrutinized and I, on the one hand, know they didn't want somebody sitting down with a magnifying glass. But, on the other hand, I don't think they wanted to do all that for nothing just to say, 'Oh, I have jumped through this hoop again.'

Additionally, a number of faculty were concerned that they had done all this work for no reason and with little personal benefit. For instance, one remarked that post-tenure review was simply a process that his colleagues began to "dread" from its inception as well as its implementation. He also stated,

> It's something that people dread because it is so much work and then just to compile the materials and then once it's done, it becomes...Part of me wonders if it's almost something that is done and it's just another thing to do without, you know, much emphasis. I know the emphasis is there, but I think for most people...for someone in a particular division is that terrible of an instructor or professor, the chair is probably going to know it before this [the review] ever happens.

With regard to review outcomes, one long-term faculty member noted that PPTRC and Peer Evaluation Committee members did not want to appear too critical.

Faculty Question Need for Process

As faculty expressed how they and their colleagues had been affected by Dalton State College's policy of post-tenure review, they frequently questioned why they were still required to complete the process. Primarily, faculty were concerned about the basis for Dalton State's post-tenure policy as well as its perceived lack of impact. During one interview session, a long-term faculty member reflected on her colleagues' reactions to the process and said, "I think most of them got over the initial 'Woo!' horror of it, kind of the idea that you were going to be paraded before a

committee [PPTRC], and they were going to make some decision about were you meeting certain standards or not. I think most people have gotten past that." Another professor with several years of teaching experience indicated that a number of her colleagues questioned the purpose of the review. Accordingly, she remarked, "'What does it matter?' 'Why are we doing it?' 'Why are [we] forced to do this paperwork when it goes nowhere?' is the consensus I get." Furthermore, one long-term faculty member felt the review had "no teeth" whatsoever; therefore, she could see no point in requiring faculty to undergo such a time-consuming process when "it disappears into the Black Hole again." Also concerned by the process's perceived lack of impact, another interviewee said,

> I don't see any affect really in terms of 'Well, it's just something you have to go through.' You turn in the papers and you go through the committee meetings. I think one of the problems with tenure is that the people on the committee itself are colleagues and they're a little bit...How should I say this? They're a little bit shy of being overly critical. And, I've seen critical things come into some of these committees, either directly or indirectly, but nothing negative. I haven't seen anything negative. I haven't seen anybody face any consequences other than, you know, the term that has been used a couple of times. It's just you're rubber-stamped. Everybody passes. Everybody is just fine and I think it's probably just because the people are colleagues and that they know that, 'Well, maybe next year I'll come up for review and some of the people I reviewed will be on the committee. So, I don't want to say anything negative because I don't want to get a negative review or I don't want to have any bias when I come up for review.'

All in all, several faculty could not understand why they had been required to complete a process that, at times, seemed to have no purpose whatsoever. Furthermore, these faculty members were concerned that the process had no impact.

Research Question Four

If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be the preferences of Dalton State College faculty members? How would such a policy be different?

Preferred Post-Tenure Review Policy

If Dalton State College faculty members were given the opportunity to revise the Institution's post-tenure review policy, they would implement a number of noteworthy modifications to the current policies and procedures for post-tenure review. Precisely, they would improve the perceptions of the policy, revise the faculty evaluation process, review the extent of administrative involvement, and revamp the Pre-and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PPTRC).

Perceptions of the Policy

To begin, faculty would like to improve how the current post-tenure review policy is perceived. For instance, six of the twenty-four faculty who were interviewed addressed a need for reducing the amount of apprehension faculty experience when they undergo the process. For some faculty, having an indication or "more notice" of the immediacy of the review could greatly reduce the tension they experience when they realize their performance is going to be evaluated. Such alleviation of anxiety could possibly come in the form of a "five-year plan" so that faculty could anticipate the occurrence of the reviews and prepare accordingly.

When asked to identify the preferred timing of a policy of post-tenure review, 77% (n=50) of survey respondents stated that the review should occur at a designated time. Twelve percent (n=8) of respondents indicated the timing of the

review should be due to a negative action, and 11% (n=7) gave responses listed in a category marked "other." Of these, the most frequency cited were that the review would occur "randomly," "every five years," or "by request of either the faculty member or the department chair, but not necessarily based on a negative event." Another respondent said that administrators should "circulate a calendar of who must undergo a review a year in advance." Still, others would simply "replace [the process] with existing annual evaluations," or they would eliminate the policy entirely. No respondents stated that the timing should be "Neither of the Above" (See Table IV-8).

Of the thirty-two survey respondents who shared their preferences regarding the importance of contingency events upon review, 88% (n=28) indicated that the review should occur due to "unsatisfactory events." With regard to the other events listed, 84% (n=27) selected "poor attendance/reliability;" 78% (n=25) indicated "poor classroom effectiveness;" 47% (n=15) selected "lack of contributions to the department;" 25% (n=8) noted "lack of innovation;" 16% (n=5) indicated "failure to receive merit raises;" and 6% (n=2) noted "other" events. The two responses that were added in the "other" events category stated that the events should be "random with everyone having an equal chance of being reviewed" and no contingent events should be necessary (See Table IV-9).

Survey respondents were also given an opportunity to indicate their preferred frequency of review. Of those providing a response, 45% (n=27) stated that the process should occur after four to five academic years. Others believed that the process should follow another frequency cycle. For instance, 37% (n=22)

Table IV-8

Timing of the Review Preferred by Survey Respondents

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Occurs Regularly at a Designated Time	50 (76.9)
Result of a Negative Action	8 (12.3)
Other	7 (10.8)

Table IV-9

Contingency Events Preferred by Survey Respondents

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Unsatisfactory Events	28 (87.5)
Poor Attendance/Reliability	27 (84.4)
Poor Classroom Effectiveness	25 (78.1)
Lack of Contributions to Department	15 (46.9)
Lack of Innovation	8 (25.0)
Failure to Receive Merit Raises	5 (15.6)
Other	2 (6.3)

of the respondents indicated the review should occur after more than five academic years had passed, while 13% (n=8) indicated the process should take place after two to three years and 5% (n=3) said the process should occur every academic year (See Table IV-10).

Furthermore, with regard to the structure of the post-tenure review evaluation session, one long-term faculty member included this recommendation:

> I would like to see a more relaxed atmosphere when the interviewee comes in [to meet with PPTRC members] other than people sitting around the table and leaving the chair at the end empty. Maybe holding it in the Faculty Lounge or something that's a little bit more comfortable setting for the interviewee to kind of take...to make his mind at ease.

Another faculty member remarked,

> I would try to remove any threat from it [post-tenure review] for one thing; I have seen individuals react badly to it as a threat, as a suggestion that they weren't doing a good job, and that part of it needs not to be.

For some, such a threat could be viewed as "detrimental to that semester's teaching

Table IV-10

Frequency of Review Preferred by Survey Respondents

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
After 4 to 5 Academic Years	27 (45.0)
More than 5 Academic Years	22 (36.7)
After 2 to 3 Academic Years	8 (13.3)
Every Academic Year	3 (5.0)

or...even drive some away from teaching." Finally, a suggestion was made to exclude from the post-tenure review process those faculty with multiple years of service to the institution. Since the institution has been in existence for a number of years, the College has employed a number of individuals for an extended period of time. In some cases, faculty have served the institution for twenty-five or more years. A long-term faculty member shared this final thought:

> We're going backwards here. We've got people here with twenty-five years, twenty years, fifteen, and ten. And, I do tend to agree that those with twenty-five years need to be left alone and let them slide and then go back to the twenty, fifteen, ten if that's a policy.

Thus, the post-tenure review process at Dalton State College needs to be re-structured in such a way as to alleviate faculty intimidation, fear and stress.

Next, faculty indicated a need to reduce the amount of paperwork required for the post-tenure review process. Specifically, eight faculty members who were interviewed believed that such paperwork made the review process too time-consuming; therefore, an effort should be made to keep "documentation short" so as "not to impose so much additional work." One faculty member who had been through the post-tenure review process noted, "I would have less paperwork." Others suggested ways that the amount of paperwork could be decreased. One such way involved streamlining the College's evaluation processes. For instance, a faculty member with several years of teaching experience stated:

> You are gathering the same kind of data and information from year to year for your annual review that also will be used when you go through, you know, post-tenure review. That seems like you would be beating yourself up [trying to create] two separate things.

Thus, faculty are required to submit two different packages of material--one for the annual review and the other for post-tenure review--when they believe one

could suffice for both evaluations. Likewise, a comment was made that College administrators need

> to figure out some way of reducing the redundancy of evaluations that we're already doing here. The idea of having an annual report and student evaluations and the review evaluations...you know, a number of the same things are being used in all of them. Then it means that we, as faculty, are having to come up with more and more paperwork reports for essentially the same thing.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee is one group charged with reviewing the College's current system of evaluation, and one of the committee's goals is to look closely at the process for faculty and recommend revisions. According to one faculty member, the members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee are currently reviewing "how people are going to do their annual reports, what they're going to be based on, and the whole process starting from beginning to end." As a component of their work, committee members are

> hoping in hindsight to go back and dovetail the whole thing into one process. Instead...because so much of evaluation is redundant. You know, the reports. You start saying, 'Didn't I just write this?' You know, they ask you about this and you write that, and here comes another one they ask you about. It's like the same thing. You feel like, 'Well, I could just XEROX it and change the headings.'

As a part of this concept to re-structure the evaluation process, one long-term faculty member suggested that the post-tenure review process "ought to be part of the process of review in an overall sense." Another simply indicated that he would prefer "to combine both the pre- and post-tenure review processes with the annual evaluation process as well," thereby streamlining all evaluation procedures and at the same time reducing excess paperwork.

Faculty Evaluation Process

Three faculty members also provided insight as to how they believed they could benefit from changes in the faculty evaluation process. First of all, one faculty member remarked that faculty evaluations should be numerical in design, with the percentages of evaluation areas established well in advance. If given the opportunity, this individual

> would put into place an annual review that was number-based. That where everybody walking in [to the review] knew what the criteria were, knew what the percentages were, that your evaluation was based on teaching, community service, professional development and so on.

With such a model in place, faculty could clearly establish goals, which would indicate how they would address a particular area of service during a given academic year. More importantly, because faculty set their own weighted percentages, such a process "takes power away from the Administration and gives it to faculty." Then,

> post-tenure review would simply be the regular review of several years of those. Call it whatever number of years you want--4 years, 5 years, 6 years. I don't care, but you know if it is a five-year program that's fine. That every five years we would do a major review of how you have done over these five years based upon the information we've gotten out of your annual review. It's more timely. It's more relevant.

Not only was a numerical-based evaluation instrument suggested, one faculty member also remarked that presently

> student evaluations are weighed too lightly in our post-tenure review criteria. I think they should be more heavily weighed, you know, what ratings that you get from your students, you know. I think it's just going to be very lightweight and I think they should be more heavily weighted if possible. If you get bad student evaluations and then everything else is great, it doesn't mean that we can go right along and not be effective in the classroom, and that's what we're here to do.

Ultimately, faculty evaluation procedures, once modified, would impact the post-tenure review process because faculty evaluation is one of the components open for discussion during the review process.

Then, several revisions to the Peer Evaluation Committee were suggested and included committee composition, training, number and frequency of observed classroom sessions, amount of feedback, and use of findings. To begin, one long-term faculty member indicated that members of the Peer Evaluation Committee had to be carefully selected and then adequately trained prior to conducting classroom observations. For instance, the professor said, "I feel very strongly that our peer review committee should have at least one person on it who is not in your [teaching] field because we are all teaching [the same course]." Another believed the classroom observation process "might be easier done by a department or an instructional resources group because some people are quite intimidated by it." Yet another reflected upon the problems of evaluator bias. In order to eliminate favoritism, "peer reviewers should be unbiased, not with an opinion or already a friend/buddy. A person will not give a friend a bad review regardless."

Once an individual has been selected to participate on a given Peer Evaluation Committee, training must be provided. And, such training should be required of administrators as well. Specifically,

> I think your chairs, or the people who are doing the evaluations because in some cases it's not the chair, ought to be trained as to what to look for and they ought to give their subjects...their employees, for example. I work for my division chair as far as I'm concerned cause he's the one who evaluates me. We [division faculty] ought to have a clear understanding of what he expects and what is needed for the College.

After peers are trained in classroom observation techniques, they should view multiple sessions--perhaps "five or six classes rather than one." Too often, an observer's evaluation of a particular faculty member's teaching ability is based upon a single classroom observation. However, if faculty could anticipate regular observations throughout a given academic term, one professor with many years of service to the College believes faculty would greatly benefit. For instance,

> to have someone who is like coming on a more regular basis to just kind of watch you would be even more valuable. You know, someone who you don't have...you know they're not coming just once. So, you don't have to be afraid that if they see you on a bad day, it's going to look bad for you. You know but someone is going to be seeing you often enough that it's okay for them to see you on a bad day, so they can offer you some advice.

In addition to multiple peer observations, one recently hired faculty member suggested that those who are undergoing the post-tenure review have opportunities for "more hands-on with colleagues" and "more face-to-face interaction." As a result, faculty would be able to learn from one another in an effort to enhance their teaching abilities and instructional methods.

Ultimately, in the eyes of one long-term faculty member, if more emphasis were placed upon the faculty evaluation process and "a much stronger peer evaluation part of the process" were implemented as well; the College's post-tenure review process, particularly its outcomes, would be strengthened significantly.

Administrative Input

Another point addressed by several faculty members concerned the extent of administrative involvement in the post-tenure review process. From direct

involvement to little or no involvement, faculty expressed concerns related to the role of administrators in the process.

When asked to indicate a post-tenure review policy orientation they would prefer, 84% (n=56) respondents selected a policy that was developmental in orientation and 16% (n=11) selected a policy that was both developmental and managerial. None of the respondents indicated that the preferred policy had a managerial orientation, however (Table IV-11).

Then, as shown in Table IV-12, survey respondents indicated as many as seven possible policy design preferences. Of the tenets available, 88% (n=61) of respondents indicated that they preferred a post-tenure review policy which "Establishes Clear Performance Standards," 81% (n=56) preferred a policy which "Contains a Statement of Purpose," and 80% (n=55) preferred a policy which "Protects Academic Freedom." In addition, respondents also indicated a preference for the following: "Based Upon Peer Review," 71% (n=49); "Designed by Faculty and Administrators," 58% (n=40); and "Designed by Faculty," 45% (n=31). None of the respondents, however, indicated that administrators would design the preferred policy .

Survey respondents also indicated as many as five possible policy management preferences. With regard to the tenets that had been selected most often by respondents, 39% (n=20) of respondents indicated that a preferred process management "Provides Training," and 39% (n=20) of respondents indicated that such a process "Provides Flexible/Decentralized Departmental Control." Of the remaining three areas, 31% (n=16) believed that process management "Utilizes

Table IV-11

Policy Orientation Preferred by Survey Respondents

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Developmental	56(83.6)
Developmental/Managerial Combination	11 (16.4)
Managerial	0 (00.0)

Table IV-12

Policy Design Preferred by Survey Respondents

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Establishes Clear Performance Standards	61 (88.4)
Contains Statement of Purpose	56 (81.2)
Protects Academic Freedom	55 (79.7)
Based on Peer Review	49 (71.0)
Designed by Faculty and Administrators	40 (58.0)
Designed by Faculty	31 (44.9)
Designed by Administrators	0 (0.00)

Sound Evaluation Measures," 29% (n=15) indicated that it "Provides for Centralized Control," and 22% (n=11) believed that it "Provides Institutional Support" (See Table IV-13).

Next, a suggestion was made to increase the active participation of administrators within the post-tenure review process. For instance, one faculty member with numerous years of teaching experience commented:

> I think the division chairs ought to go in and watch the people [faculty] teach. That has been suggested, but never implemented because the division chairs say they have too much work to do, which is true. My division chair has tons of paperwork, which comes from the administrators. If they [administration] would cut down on some of that, I think that they [division chairs] would be able to go into the classrooms. I think that is more important to see if you're really teaching. Anybody can put together and copy material, but you know this institution constantly says we are a teaching institution. That's our most important focus. We need to be good teachers, but no body ever checks up on the issue.

Not only would administrators observe faculty in the classroom, they would also provide much needed feedback to those same faculty members at the conclusion of

Table IV-13

Process Management Preferred by Survey Respondents

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Provides Training	20 (39.2)
Provides Flex./Decentralized Dept. Control	20 (39.2)
Utilizes Sound Evaluation Measures	16 (31.4)
Provides for Centralized Control	15 (29.4)
Provides Institutional Support	11 (21.6)

each observation session. In the words of one faculty member,

> I think it [classroom observation] would be good, you know; they [administrators] could come to the classrooms and watch the person teach, but also conduct maybe an interview with them to talk about their teaching or what they're doing. I think you could get a better sense then.

Furthermore, if administrators held supplementary discussions and observations with individual faculty members, "they would know what is going on better than what is being put on your paper [evaluation materials] about everybody." Likewise, a newly hired professor commented: "I think a department chair should know or would hopefully know what kinds of things that person is doing, what kind of job they are doing." And, still yet another remarked, "the alternative to that [peer review and observation] might be to have administrators do that main reviewing, the main critical analysis of things." As a result, communication is enhanced between faculty and administration, and both groups benefit from an increase in interaction.

Although three of the twenty-four faculty members interviewed believed administrators should be active participants in the post-tenure review process, five other professors did not share such views. To illustrate, one faculty member indicated that the department chair's opinion should not influence the post-tenure review process; as a result, this individual "would take out the input from the department chair." Furthermore, another's comment was,

> I would not have maybe the department chairs sit in [on the review] cause I think this [post-tenure review] is a view from your peers. How do they perceive you as a colleague? The department head or chair may like you quite a lot, but it may not be a reflection on how you work with your colleagues. Do you pull your weight on committees, on teams, on teaching? So, I think it's best to come from a jury of your peers if you will and I think it can be. It doesn't have to be

> negative. I mean, it can be a nice pat on the back if you've done a good job.

Thus, if the emphasis of the administrator's opinion were removed, those comments would not be considered when the PPTRC makes its final decision.

Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee

Faculty offered various revisions with regard to the purpose, policy directives and outcomes associated with the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PPTRC). In an effort to clarify the responsibilities of the PPTRC, the post-tenure review policy must be "tied to the mission and goals of the college and of the various departments." Along with a consideration of departmental as well as institutional mission statements, the PPTRC should consider the adoption of discipline-specific policies since no two disciplines are truly alike. One long-term faculty member said, "You cannot rate a particular class the same way you rate another course. You can't do that. It's apples and oranges." Such consideration of discipline and division would foster interaction between faculty, departments and the institution. Furthermore, in order to diversify the committee's composition, a plan to rotate committee membership should be utilized. For example,

> The same people always do this [serve on the PPTRC] year after year after year. I think they [administration] should have rotated people around and they just more or less ended up with the same people because they didn't mind doing it. It was a lot of extra work for those people on that committee [PPTRC].

Therefore, College administration must develop an effective rotation plan to allow other faculty to participate on the PPTRC. One faculty member also suggested that

"the people who do the evaluating should almost be outsiders" because peer evaluators could feel "inhibited" knowing colleagues will "see the comments."

With regard to the post-tenure review policy, six faculty members indicated that the policy ought to be defined so that both faculty and administrators have a clearer understanding of policy expectations and requirements. One faculty member suggested that the process provide "a role model and it [the outcome of the review] should be a check, kind of a yes/no thing as opposed to even a necessarily poor ratings scale." The model could then provide useful information for both faculty and administrators as they implement the process.

More importantly, faculty need clear knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses; therefore, the process must provide useful outcomes. For instance, a faculty member said, "I would like very much for if you're going to have to go through it [post-tenure review], I'd like for it to really mean something." Therefore, the process should be worth the time and effort it takes for implementation, and faculty should be rewarded, in a sense, with viable, specific feedback after the process has been completed. Also, evaluation documents that have been prepared for the PPTRC should have an impact upon the review and should not just simply be brushed aside. To illustrate, one long-term faculty member said,

> Your chairperson's report on you to the PPTRC Committee really should have an impact. It should have something to do with it [the review's outcomes], so I think it almost becomes not so much favoritism or personalities or who doesn't like who, or whatever, but it just becomes a matter of well, who knows whom.

Not only must each post-tenure review document have an impact upon the review itself; the review should provide specific, not vague, responses to those documents. A comment by one faculty member addressed this as follows:

> The bottom line is, it's got to be objective versus subjective. You've got to be able to state categorically this, this, this and this, and be able to quantify as opposed to 'I like this person' or 'I don't [like] their personality.' Cause whether I like your personality or not has nothing to do with your ability to teach.

Thus, an objective review is one way to standardize process findings and prevent subjective responses by individuals who may not be able to appropriately make such assessments. Also, faculty require a clearer understanding of how such findings will be utilized; hence, such information must be provided at the beginning of the review process. In the words of one professor,

> So, when you [administrators] set up something like post-tenure review, and you may have all the pie in the sky and the good ideas, if you don't tell them [faculty] how it's going to be used, and if there is no point to it, they're not going [to accept it]. And, if you force them into it, you're going to get something you don't really want. In the front, you ought to say, 'Okay, we're doing this because we want you to self-assess, to improve, or to maintain, whatever.' But, state up front what you're trying to do with it and then state it again at the end.

Last, the post-tenure review process must provide clear outcomes in an effort to encourage faculty to grow within the teaching profession. According to one faculty member, the process must "do what the original Regents' directive said: Try to help a tenured faculty [member] to reach his/her full potential." Likewise, another professor remarked that if the policy were to be revised,

> I would want it to be useful for suggesting where faculty members could improve, suggesting where students are not getting what they came here to get. I think almost anyone who is here to the point of tenure is dedicated enough to teaching to pay attention to new techniques, new trends, new ideas, new technologies and to try to make things better each class, but there may be people who don't.

Via the survey instrument, faculty shared additional preferences regarding the impact of the post-tenure review process. Eighty-seven percent (n=59) of

respondents said that both the faculty member and the supervisor should see the review, while only 13% (n=9) indicated that only the faculty member should see the review. None of the respondents believed that only the supervisor should see the review (Table IV-14).

Of the remaining nine areas, survey respondents offered various responses. Eighty-seven percent (n=59) indicated that the process offered feedback to the faculty member. Sixty-five percent (n=44) of respondents preferred a development plan, which was created by both the faculty member and the supervisor. Furthermore, 31% (n=21) indicated they preferred a development plan, which had been created by the faculty member. None of the respondents, however, indicated they preferred a development plan created by the supervisor. Furthermore, according to 49% (n=33) of respondents, monitoring of such a plan should be the responsibility of the faculty member. Thirty-seven percent of respondents (n=25) felt monitoring the development plan should fall to the supervisor and 16% (n=11) of respondents believed such responsibility should be given to peers. Finally, 69% (n=47) of respondents stated that a preferred process provided for a reward, and 37% (n=25) believed the process should also provide for a penalty (See Table IV-14).

All in all, the College's policy of post-tenure review must benefit faculty and assist them as they strive to serve the institution in the future.

Other Suggested Revisions

Several additional revisions were recommended, which included the use of mentors and special assignments. To begin, one faculty member with more than

Table IV-14

Impact of Review Preferred by Survey Respondents

Tenets	Frequency and Percentage
Both Fac. Mbr. and Supervisor See Review	59 (86.8)
Offers Feedback to Faculty Member	59 (86.8)
Provides for a Reward	47 (69.1)
Dev. Plan Created by Supervisor/Fac. Mbr.	44 (64.7)
Authorizes Fac. Mbr. to Monitor Dev. Plan	33 (48.5)
Auth. Supervisor to Monitor Dev. Plan	25 (36.8)
Provides for a Penalty	25 (36.8)
Dev. Plan Created by Faculty Member	21 (30.9)
Authorizes Peers to Monitor Dev. Plan	11 (16.2)
Only Faculty Member Sees Review	9 (13.2)
Only Supervisor Sees Review	0 (00.0)
Dev. Plan Created by Supervisor	0 (00.0)

twenty years of service to the College suggested the implementation of a mentoring program for all new faculty. Specifically, the faculty member would

> assign a mentor, an older faculty member, to mentor them [newly hired faculty] for at least two years and tell them what they are supposed to do, what they are not supposed to do, what they should be doing as far as outside of know things that are right here on the college campus itself. And, maybe some help in their classes with set up, start their classes and also even a lot of people set up web sites. Maybe even give them some guidance on how to set up their web site.

Consequently, in an effort to acclimate new faculty to institutional policies and procedures, including those for evaluation and tenure, mentors would be assigned to faculty in an effort to provide effective one-on-one assistance.

An additional recommendation concerned the development of new faculty members. For instance, a suggestion was made to

> let them go one semester somewhere and do something special, come back, and give a program about it to the division or the evaluate...the tenure committee. You know, something like that. That would be more helpful to them and their classes and their students.

Hence, the new faculty member would have an opportunity to broaden his or her horizons and at the same time grow professionally within the education field.

Seven of the twenty-eight faculty who were interviewed concluded that they were unable to suggest revisions to the College's post-tenure review policy for a variety of reasons. For example, four of the seven faculty members indicated they did not have knowledge of the policy; therefore, they could not recommend changes. Remarks included the following statements: "I don't really know what our post-tenure review policy is," "I don't really know enough to make a comment about that," and "I just don't have any sense of what post-tenure review is like. I don't and

that awaits." Another faculty member had no sense of what revisions to suggest and stated accordingly:

> I don't know that [what revisions to suggest]. I don't know because we've never done anything like this [post-tenure review] before. It's so new to us that it hasn't been in place long enough that I would even know what differences that I would want to include, if any. And, not having gone through it [the review] myself yet, but in the process, I don't know the answer to that. Now maybe if you come back in six months I might could tell you. 'I've been through it' and say, 'Well, I don't think this was necessary or that was necessary.' Or, whether too much emphasis maybe was put on this or that.

Two other faculty members simply said they had "no" revisions to suggest. And, one said that

> I really can't think of anything right now. I think it [post-tenure review] goes along pretty well with what is done as far as evaluation of faculty, you know, yearly and those kind of things and what we say in our statutes and about teaching at Dalton State College.

Furthermore, two of the twenty-eight faculty who were interviewed suggested the elimination of Dalton State College's policy of post-tenure review. These professors were not pleased because tenured faculty had to undergo an additional evaluation process when they believed that the current evaluation system had been effective for many years. For instance, one individual who had been a DSC faculty member for many years expressed this viewpoint,

> I would, if I could, I would eliminate it [post-tenure review]. And, you know, we survived for who knows how many years without it and nothing significant, positive or negative, seems to be coming from it. Like I say, most faculty members just have, now that we are in our fourth year of doing it [review process] or third year or whatever we are, that it's gotten to the point to where when it comes up, people say, 'Oh, are we still doing that? Are we still having to do that?'

Another long-term faculty member, who also believed that the post-tenure review policy ought to be eliminated, expressed a similar comment. However, the individual

had no idea what could replace the review process. To illustrate, the same faculty member said,

> Based on what I know, if I could do anything, I would abolish it [post-tenure review]. I would say...yeah, I don't know what I would do in its place. I realize something probably needs to be there but there is too much pressure already put on people. There is already too much paperwork and there is a lot of repetitive...a repetition in all these things. And, it just seems like there could be a way that was less cumbersome and that was not as intrusive to do so.

Likewise, a single survey respondent was entirely dissatisfied with Dalton State's post-tenure review policy and simply wanted to eliminate it. As an example, he shared these reflections,

> I am opposed to post-tenure reviews of any type on the grounds of protecting academic freedom. The only grounds for directing or dismissing a professor, after tenure has been granted, should be the laws governing everyone in society. For example, a law must be broken and a person found guilty before he or she is punished in some way. The question of encroaching on the tenure protections of academics should not arise until that extremity. Tenure rights are an invaluable protection for academic free speech and such speech is vital for a democratic society.

Therefore, in the opinion of this survey respondent, post-tenure review at Dalton State College should be eliminated in order to protect academic freedom and all it entails.

Also, three DSC faculty members shared that their experience with the post-tenure review process was, at best, limited. For instance, one individual said, "I am so new to DSC that I cannot answer the questions in this questionnaire. My knowledge of the process is not known." Another expressed similar remarks as he stated, "I have only been at the college a few months and know little to nothing about the tenure policy. I did not feel I could effectively answer Section B." Furthermore, a faculty member who did not have tenure said, "Responses are based

on information gathered from listening to comments from other faculty, not personal history." Thus, these individuals believed they had little to contribute to the survey distributed to Dalton State faculty.

Other survey respondents offered comments regarding the process of post-tenure review, which were based upon their own observations and experiences. For one faculty member, the process provided a positive experience as he explained, "The process was useful in assessing performance and effectiveness as a teacher." However, other individuals were not in such agreement. For example, in the opinion of one respondent, "Ours [the process] has improved in the last three years; prior to that time, we didn't have a clear plan and some faculty members were overlooked by supervisors."

Regarding process outcomes, one faculty member remarked, "Currently our pre-post tenure review is punitive, offering no positive incentive." Another expressed a concern about the current policy's lack of penalty. As an illustration, he said,

> We already have annual reviews. The pre- and post-tenure process at DSC has been very much of a rubber stamp process because other faculty members do the evaluation and they know they will come up for review eventually. I've never heard of any negative comments in anyone's review. Review by administrators wouldn't be much more effective--they already do it, formally and informally.

For these faculty members, a process must have an effective penalty component.

Overall, DSC faculty had several ideas with regard to revision of the College's post-tenure review policy--from no revisions needed to elimination of the policy.

Overview of Findings

A brief summary of the most significant findings that emerged from the data follows. A discussion of each of these findings will be presented in Chapter V.

In 1996, Dalton State College's post-tenure review policy began to evolve when USG Chancellor Stephen Portch mandated that all USG institutions would develop procedures and policies for post-tenure review. As a result, DSC President James Burran held several college-wide meetings and then established an Ad Hoc Committee to develop institution post-tenure review policies. Then, the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PPTRC) was formed to conduct the reviews that began in the fall of 1996. In addition to Dr. Burran, key players in the development of Dalton State's post-tenure review process were Dr. Greg Labyak, former Academic Dean; Dr. David Wycherley, Ad Hoc Committee Chair and former PPTRC Chair; Dr. John Black, present Academic Dean; Dr. Mary Kate Kramp, Distinguished Professor; Dr. Cordia Starling, Associate Professor of Nursing and current PPTRC Chair; and Dr. Henry Codjoe, Director of Institutional Research and Planning.

Since implementation of the post-tenure review process at Dalton State, faculty have utilized their own experiences to interpret the policy. For some, the process has been a positive experience because they believed the policy was well-structured, for it contained a statement of purpose, established clear performance standards and protected academic freedom. Furthermore, several faculty noted the process was free from intimidation and it contained a well-monitored development plan. For others, however, the College's post-tenure review policy was too time-consuming, required too much paper work, caused undue stress and intimidation, had

no justifiable purpose and was simply a formality. Some faculty had mixed views because they noted advantages as well as disadvantages to the policy.

In addition to providing an interpretation of the post-tenure review policy, faculty shared how the process had affected them and their colleagues. Although some faculty members offered no opinion or indicated that the process had little impact, others shared that the process had been a positive experience because it had fostered professional growth, produced helpful feedback, and enabled them to learn from their peers. On the other hand, faculty members most often cited the addition of stress, apprehension, paranoia and resistance as process disadvantages. The process also created negative experiences for faculty because it required a great deal of time and effort to assemble the paperwork. Furthermore, some faculty members questioned the need for the process.

Finally, if faculty were given an opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, they would improve the perceptions of the policy, revise the faculty evaluation process, review the extent of administrative involvement, and revamp the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PPTRC). In addition, faculty would ensure that the post-tenure review policy was developmental in orientation, established clear performance standards, contained a statement of purpose and protected academic freedom. Faculty also preferred a policy that provided training, utilized sound evaluation measures, was based on peer review, provided a development plan occurred at a designated time and would be contingent upon specific events. Most importantly, faculty wanted to have input in process design. Overall, faculty wanted to remove as much of the supervisor's sole control of the review process as possible in order to maintain more control of the process.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to examine the experiences and understanding of faculty with regard to post-tenure review policies and practices at a public two-year community college.

Given this purpose, four research questions guided this study. They were:

1. How did the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolve? Who were the principal players in the process?
2. How do Dalton State College faculty interpret the post-tenure review policy? What are their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation?
3. Do Dalton State College faculty members think post-tenure review affects their professional practice? Their status? Their roles within the institution?
4. If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be the preferences of Dalton State College faculty members? How would such a policy be different?

The population of the study consisted of full-time faculty at Dalton State College, a two-year public institution located in Dalton, Georgia. Interviews were held with individual faculty members on the campus of Dalton State, and an effort was made to obtain a sample representative of the entire college faculty and the institution's seven academic divisions. Thus, data were collected from a total of

twenty-eight individual interviews with faculty for whom numerical pseudonyms were assigned. The researcher spent several days collecting data on campus. In addition, seventy-four surveys were returned from one hundred and four full-time faculty participants. Data from the interviews, survey, and documents were analyzed and formed the basis of the findings for this study.

Although a portion of the research study was qualitative in nature, the survey instrument provided meaningful quantitative data. The surveys were analyzed by determining frequency distributions and percentages for each survey item. Along with data obtained from faculty interviews and the survey instrument, the researcher utilized documentary evidence to gain a sense of Dalton State's post-tenure review process.

Common themes and patterns emerged from the many data collected. When used in conjunction with one another, these themes and patterns led to the development of a case study profile for Dalton State College. Furthermore, the researcher's interview, documentary, and survey data were analyzed and provided a thorough understanding of the DSC post-tenure review process.

This chapter presents the reflections on the study, findings, conclusions, discussion, implications of the study, recommendations for further research and a summary.

Reflections on the Study

This study grew out of the researcher's interest in issues related to tenure acquisition and faculty productivity as well as a personal commitment to education at the two-year college level. Moreover, the study became very meaningful and

rewarding for the researcher as she combined these interests. It was also surprising to learn that the post-tenure review process had not yet been explored in-depth at the two-year level.

Likewise, there is little doubt that post-tenure review is a growing topic of concern among college faculty and administrators as well as external agencies. As state budgets are tightened and policies are scrutinized, educational administrators must learn to utilize to the fullest all resources they are given. And, now that administrators are held to greater standards, College faculty, especially those who have received tenure, are finding that they also are expected to attain as well as maintain certain principles to reach their full potential. For tenured faculty, such accountability is seen in the form of post-tenure review.

Of special interest to the researcher were the post-tenure review procedures Dalton State faculty followed as directed by the College's administration. Not only were tenured faculty obligated to undergo a yearly evaluation, they were also required to complete the post-tenure process on a five-year cycle. That ruling was applicable to all tenured faculty, even those with more than twenty-five years of service to the College.

Furthermore, for faculty who were reviewed, a great deal of work was required to assemble a portfolio and have their teaching practices observed. Likewise, faculty who served as peer reviewers also exhausted quite a bit of time and effort as they observed their colleagues' classes, provided a written review of the activities they witnessed, and discussed their findings with individual faculty members.

Also of importance were those faculty members who represented their academic divisions as they served on the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PPTRC). These individuals accepted demanding roles which required them to give unselfishly of their time as they reviewed many documents and other materials found within the portfolios, held review sessions with individual faculty, and made decisions regarding the performance of those under review.

Findings

A list of the most significant findings that emerged from the data follows. A discussion of each of these findings has been presented in Chapter IV.

1. The post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College is the result of a System-wide mandate from the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia to promote faculty development.
2. An Ad Hoc Committee was created at Dalton State College to investigate as well as develop institutional post-tenure review policies.
3. All Dalton State College faculty, once tenured, must follow a well-structured post-tenure review process developed by an Ad Hoc Committee. Regardless of years of service, no tenured faculty are exempt from this requirement, which occurs on a five-year cycle.
4. With regard to the post-tenure review process, no formal training is provided for administrators, peer observers or members of the Pre-and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PPTRC).
5. The Dalton State post-tenure review policy is automatic in design and developmental in nature, and follows a five-year evaluation cycle.

6. Dalton State College faculty appreciate as well as condemn the institution's post-tenure review policy.

7. Dalton State faculty indicate that the post-tenure review process has had varying degrees of impact upon their professional practices, status and roles within the institution.

8. No formal entity for faculty governance exists at Dalton State College.

9. As a whole, if Dalton State College faculty have an opportunity to change the post-tenure review policy, they would still prefer to follow the present policy's procedures although they would reduce the amount of administrative control.

Conclusions

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are:

1. The members of the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PPTRC) exhaust a great deal of time in the evaluation of their peers. Surprisingly, faculty who serve as PPTRC members are not compensated in any way. Such statements are also applicable to those who conduct formal classroom observations.

2. Peer observation creates tension for both observers and those under review, and a lack of training inhibits whatever benefits could result from the observation sessions.

3. Because Dalton State faculty resent administrative involvement in a faculty-

driven post-tenure review policy, they prefer to reduce the degree to which administrators are involved in the review process, and they want to know to what extent and in what ways the review will be utilized.

4. The fact that no faculty governance exists on campus has not hindered Dalton State faculty when policies have been discussed and then implemented on campus. Instead, Dalton State faculty readily worked together in a timely manner to tackle all issues and were not encumbered by the lack of a formal entity to address faculty issues, including the post-tenure review process.

5. Dalton State faculty are subjected to a multitude of separate evaluation processes, when such processes could be streamlined and combined. Thus, faculty exhaust an exorbitant amount of time during the evaluation cycle on account of redundancy.

6. The function of Dalton State's post-tenure review policy does not equate with the policy's intent.

7. No clear outcomes are evident in the post-tenure review process at Dalton State because there are no rewards or sanctions.

8. Faculty are reluctant to give negative recommendations when evaluating the performance of their peers.

9. The post-tenure review process is redundant in that it repeats a great deal of the annual performance review required of all faculty.

Discussion

By means of documentary, interview and survey data, the study permitted the researcher to gain helpful insight into Dalton State's post-tenure review policies and procedures. An effort has been made to link the study's findings to the literature.

To begin, "the average post-tenure review cycle is five years, ranging as often as every two years to as infrequently, as every ten years" (Licata, 1999, p. 1.) Thus, Dalton State College's policy of post-tenure review is typical of those policies frequently in place in institutions of higher education as the College follows a five-year cycle. Moreover, since the College's post-tenure reviews occur automatically, the policy is consistent with those found in other institutions in that it follows one of three policy designs--automatic, triggered, or at the request of the faculty member (Licata & Morreale, 1997). To date, however, there have been no known instances at Dalton State College where a review has been triggered by a contingent event, or at the request of a faculty member. Moreover, the Dalton State post-tenure review policy is developmental in design, which is a principle readily suggested by Committee A of the AAUP (1997, 1998).

Also, according to the AAUP statement issued as a result of the Wingspread Conference on Evaluation, the Association believed that policies of post-tenure review would hinder faculty and foster tension among all groups (Report, 1997). Such has been the case at Dalton State as faculty both abhor and appreciate the policy, and are ultimately concerned as to how these evaluations will be utilized. For five faculty members who were interviewed, the information gathered via the review simply goes down a "black hole" never to re-appear again. Furthermore, a 1999

study conducted by Fry suggests that "post-tenure review has been more ritual than substantive and more driven by politics and appearances than by deeply rooted intentions to change the status of the faculty within the academy" (Aper & Fry, in press). Thus, the process of evaluating tenured faculty is regarded as simply a formality.

With regard to post-tenure review policies mandated by the University System of Georgia, the primary focus of such post-tenure reviews is to assist tenured faculty as they seek "opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contributing to system institutions" (University System of Georgia, 1996, p. 1). Likewise, in accordance with policy guidelines put forth by the AAUP's Committee A, "post-tenure review ought to be aimed at not accountability, but at faculty development" (1998, p.1). Thus, the System directive does support the AAUP's recommendation and is evident within the Dalton State post-tenure review policy.

Furthermore, the AAUP's response to the evaluation of tenured faculty indicates that policies of post-tenure review should follow a set of specific tenets, several of which are included in the Dalton State process. Primarily, the AAUP indicates that faculty should be involved in the process's development and review. As was evident throughout the study, an Ad Hoc Committee was created at Dalton State College to investigate and then develop institutional post-tenure review policies. Other tenets recommended by the AAUP and found within the DSC process include avenues for a formal development plan, appeals process and peer forum (Committee A, 1998).

Also of immediate concern is the lack of training in place for evaluators who conduct the reviews (Andrews & Licata, 1989). Such concern is readily seen at Dalton State College, where classroom observers and members of the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Committee have not undergone any formal means of training prior to fulfilling their duties. This also applies to administrators who are actively involved in providing the necessary evaluative documentation required for the reviews.

Implications of the Study

The study has several significant implications for public two-year institutions of higher education. First, this study has identified how a particular post-tenure review process developed at the two-year level. From statewide mandate to institutional directives, faculty and educational administrators can have a more accurate view of how the process evolved at one institution of higher education. Thus, such information can assist faculty as well as administrators who are considering the adoption of such an evaluation tool.

This study also identifies the opinions of faculty with regard to the post-tenure review process utilized at Dalton State College. Regardless if they hold faculty or administrative appointments, those in charge of developing and/or revising policy tenets must have an accurate perspective of faculty perceptions and preferences regarding the post-tenure review process. Surprisingly, most components faculty perceived as part of Dalton State's post-tenure policy were the same they would prefer if they could change it, indicating that faculty saw value in the present policy. For instance, according to DSC faculty, the post-tenure review

policy was perceived as developmental in orientation, and faculty also indicated they preferred that type if they were given an opportunity to revise a policy.

Next, faculty indicated that they did not perceive as much administrative input into current policy design nor did they prefer administrative input in the event they could revise a policy. The entities surrounding process management, the next area of concern, were ranked identically with regard to what faculty perceived as well as preferred.

Specifically, faculty desired a process management that would provide training, flexible/decentralized control and institutional support, and also utilize sound evaluation. Again, faculty preferred a policy that did not permit administrative or centralized control. Furthermore, faculty perceived that the current process offered feedback to the faculty member and permitted the faculty member as well as the supervisor to see the review. Those two components were also given the highest ratings by faculty who noted what a preferred impact of review would entail.

Also, faculty perceived that post-tenure review did occur regularly at a designated time and should continue to do so. Moreover, in the event that the process was triggered by contingency events, faculty stated the review should occur primarily due to poor classroom effectiveness. However, if given the opportunity to revise such a policy, faculty indicated that a review should be triggered by three main events: unsatisfactory events, poor attendance/reliability and poor classroom effectiveness. Finally, according to faculty, the frequency of the review currently occurred after every four to five years, and faculty preferred that evaluation cycle.

Two-year college administrators must also consider faculty input when developing and/or revising a policy of post-tenure review. Thus, this study may

foster dialogue between faculty and administrators. In order to garner faculty support for the post-tenure review process, it is vital that administrators actively engage in open discussion with faculty regarding the evaluation policies and procedures. Such sessions should be both formal and informal to allow faculty to pose questions as well as express their individual opinions.

Most significantly, this study has identified how a post-tenure review policy affects its target population, the faculty, and how they understand, interpret, and implement it. Such information is vital since the experiences and understandings of faculty with regard to post-tenure review have not previously been explored in depth.

The literature review revealed that increasing numbers of higher education institutions are considering post-tenure review, especially as internal and external issues of institutional accountability and faculty productivity continue to increase. According to Licata and Morreale (2002), "post-tenure review, as we know it today, grew in numbers because such reviews represented intentional and deliberate efforts to ensure that tenured faculty were performing at institutional standards and in accordance with tenure expectations" (pp. 2-3). Although post-tenure review has frequently been the focus of four-year colleges and universities, it is important that community college faculty and administrators alike take an active role in the discussion and implementation, if necessary, of such policies.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this study suggest the following recommendations for further research:

1. This study should be replicated to include multiple two-year public institutions. This would further determine if the findings could be generalized to encompass a greater number of full-time faculty and two-year public institutions. Such replication would significantly inform the findings that emerged in the present study.
2. Further research should focus on those faculty who have completed the post-tenure review process. A greater understanding of the experiences of tenured faculty who have completed the post-tenure review process can help to shape future process revisions.
3. Further research should focus specifically on the roles and perceptions of administrators in the post-tenure review process. Such information can assist faculty and administrators alike in the development and/or revision of post-tenure review policies and procedures.
4. Further research should focus on the impact of faculty governance upon the post-tenure view process. An understanding of how, via faculty governance such as a faculty council or senate, faculty can affect post-tenure policies and procedures is warranted.
5. Further research should focus on the impact of pre-tenure review procedures upon the post-tenure review process. Knowledge of how such policies of pre-tenure review affect the post-tenure review process can assist both faculty and administrators in the development and/or revision of post-tenure review policies and procedures.
6. Using the survey developed by the researcher, a follow-up study should

collect data from randomly selected faculty at each of the member colleges in the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). Such data would affirm, refute, clarify, or add to the findings in the present study.

Summary

In conclusion, by means of a mixed method design, the researcher has gained a greater understanding of how two-year college faculty are affected by an institutional post-tenure review policy; and how they comprehend, interpret and implement such policies and procedures. Most importantly, the study provides meaningful data, offers valuable insight for those faculty and administrators considering its adoption and/or revision, and contributes to an increased awareness of the post-tenure review process at public two-year institutions.

REFERENCES

Alstete, J. W. (2000). *Post tenure faculty development: Building a system of faculty improvement and appreciation.* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Volume 27, Number 4). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American Association for University Professors. (1970, March). Academic freedom and tenure: 1940 statement of principles--proposed interpretive comments. *AAUP Bulletin, 56* (1), 26-29.

American Association of University Professors. Report of Committee A, 1996-1997. (1997). On post-tenure review. *Academe 83* (5), 44-51.

American Association of University Professors. Report of Committee A, 1996-97. (1998, June 18). Post-tenure review: An AAUP response. *On-line Academe Today: Document Archive.* Available: http://www.chronicle.com/che-data/focus.dir/0615.98/aaup.htm

Andrews, H. A., & Licata, C. M. (1989). *The state of faculty evaluation in community, technical, and junior colleges within the North Central Region, 1988-1989.* A research study conducted in conjunction with the Council of North Central Community and Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 204)

Aper, J. P., & Fry, J. E. (in press). Post-tenure review at graduate institutions in the US: Recommendations and reality. *Journal of Higher Education.*

Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods.* (2nd ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bogue, E. G., & Aper, J. P. (2000). *Exploring the heritage of American higher education: The evolution of philosophy and policy.* Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Burgan, M. (1998, February 28). Tenure and the management of higher education. *On-line AAUP Home Page.* Available: http/:www.igc.apc.org/aaup/fnmbart.htm

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

Chait, R. P. (1998). *Ideas in incubation: Three possible modifications to traditional tenure policies.* (Inquiry #9). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). *The American community college.* (3rd. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., Brawer, F. B., and Associates. (1994*). Managing community colleges: A handbook for effective practice.* 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.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Dalton State College. (2000). *Dalton State College: University System of Georgia 2000-2001 Catalog and student handbook.* Vol.28. No.1. Dalton, GA: Dalton State College.

Dalton State College. (2001). *PPTRC committee history.* Dalton, GA: Dalton State College.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Edgerton, R. (1995, June). From tenure to...new pathways: Reframing the debate. *On-line AAHE Bulletin.* Available: http://www.aahe.org/bulletin/

Education Commission of the States. (1999, July 15). Model language for post-tenure review. *On-line ECS Information Clearinghouse.* Available: http://www.ecs.org/ecs/ecsweb.nsf/e2addb66bd0b131587256770005fd465/

Finkin, M. W. (1996). *The case for tenure.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fry, J. E. (1999). *Post-tenure review: A study of policies and practices at colleges and universities in the United States.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Georgia Board of Regents. (1996, April). Regents set FY '97 Tuition, consider post-tenure review. *Online The System Supplement: A Report of the Georgia Board of Regents.* Available: http://www.usg.edu/pubs/sys_supp/apr96/

Gorman, R. (1998, February 27). The AAUP and post-tenure review. *On-line AAUP Home Page.* Available: http://www.igc.apc.org/aaup/fnrgwart.htm

Hamilton, N. W. (1997, May-June). Peer review: The linchpin of academic freedom and tenure. *Academe 83* (5), 14-19.

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. *UMI Dissertation Services,* No. 9624093.

Huer, J. (1991). *Tenure for Socrates: A study of the betrayal of the American professor.* New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (1995). *The law of higher education: A comprehensive guide to legal implications of administrative decision making.* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leatherman, C. (1998, June 26). AAUP offers guidance on post-tenure reviews, but faculty group insists that they should not be used to revoke a professor's tenure. *On-line The Chronicle of Higher Education: The Faculty.* Available: http://chronicle.com/search97cgi

Licata, C. M. (1984a). An investigation of the status of post-tenure evaluation in selected community colleges in the United States (Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University, 1984). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 45-11A,* 3288.

Licata, C. M. (1984b). Post-tenure faculty evaluation in community colleges: Anomaly or reality? *Innovation Abstracts, 6(29),* 1-2. Austin: University of TX, National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 152)

Licata, C. M. (1985, March). *An investigation of the status of post-tenure faculty evaluation in selected community colleges.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 635)

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

Licata, C. M., & Andrews, H. A. (1990, Winter). The status of tenured faculty in the community college. *Community College Review, 18* (3), 42-50.

Licata, C. M., & Morreale, J. C. (1997). *Post-tenure review: Policies, practices, precaution.* (Inquiry #12). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Licata, C. M. (1998, June). Post-tenure review: At the crossroads of accountability and opportunity. *AAHE Bulletin, 50* (10), 3-6.

Licata, C. M., & Morreale, J. C. (2002). *Post-tenure faculty review and renewal: Experienced voices.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Magner, D. K. (1995, July 21). More colleges conduct post-tenure reviews. *On-line Academe Today: Chronicle Archive.* Available: http://chronicle.com/data/articles.dir/art-41.dir/issue-45.dir/45a01301.htm

Magner, D. K. (1995, March 31). Tenure re-examined: Association hopes 2-year study will lead to more flexibility in academic careers. *On-line The Chronicle of Higher Education: Past Chronicle Issues.* Available: http://chronicle.com/search97cgi/

Mason, E. J., & Bramble, W. J. (1997). *Research in education and the behavioral sciences.* Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Miller, R. I. (1987). *Evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Plater, W. M. (2001). A profession at risk: Using post-tenure review to save tenure and create an intentional future for academic community. *Change, 33(4)*, 53-57.

Poch, R. K. (1993). Academic freedom in American higher education: Rights, responsibilities, and limitations. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4). Washington, D. C.: George Washington University.

Roworth, W. W. (1998, February 28). Why is tenure being targeted for attack? *On-line AAUP Home Page.* Available: http/:www.igc.apc.org/aaup/fnwrwart.htm

Solomon, R., & Solomon, J. (1993). *Up the university.* New York: Addison-Wesley.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Trower, C. A. (1996). *Tenure snapshot.* (Inquiry #2). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

University System of Georgia. (1996, July 1). Post-tenure review procedures. *On-line Academic Affairs Handbook, Section 4.04.03.* Available: http://www.peachnet.edu/admin/accaff/handbook/section4/4.04/4.04.03.html

University System of Georgia Board of Regents. (1995, March 8). Faculty/staff development policy directive. Available: http://www.usg.edu/admin/oc/directives/facdev.html

Verma, G. K., & Mallick, K. (1999). *Researching education: Perspectives and techniques.* Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

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

Wilke, A. S. (Ed.). (1979). *The hidden professoriate: Credentialism, professionalism, and the tenure crisis.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Woodward, C. V. (1997). Academic freedom: An analysis of two breaches. *Academic Questions, 10*(4), 71-74.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods.* (2nd. ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER REQUESTING ACCESS

Post Office Box 209
Spring City, Tennessee 37381-0209
July 20, 2000

Dr. John B. Black
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dalton State College
213 North College Drive
Dalton, GA 30720-3797

Dear Dr. Black:

I am a doctoral student at The University of Tennessee, and I am seeking your assistance with a case study on post-tenure review in public two-year institutions. I wish to conduct an in-depth study of the post-tenure review process at Dalton State College.

The purpose of this study is to better understand the policies and practices associated with post-tenure review, and how they have influenced faculty activities and efforts. Up to now, no case studies of public two-year institutions have been conducted. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine in-depth faculty experiences with and understanding of the post-tenure review process.

As a component of my research, I am requesting permission to gather data on campus during the Fall 2000 semester. Tentatively, my visits to the campus will begin in early August and conclude in early December, and will include a review of campus documents, interviews with several faculty and a survey of all DSC faculty members. For your information, a copy of my Institutional Review Board compliance document is enclosed.

If you have questions or require additional information, you may contact me at (865) 354-3000, Ext. 4317; or my doctoral committee chair, Dr. Jeff Aper, at (865) 974-6152. Inquiries may also be sent to the attention of Dr. Aper at The University of Tennessee, Department of Educational Administration and Cultural Studies, 238 Claxton Addition, Knoxville, Tennessee, 37996. Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,

Myra K. Peavyhouse
Doctoral Candidate

Dr. Jeffery P. Aper
Doctoral Committee Chair

Enclosure

APPENDIX B

DOCUMENT SUMMARY FORM

Document Summary Form

DOCUMENT FORM

Location: _____
Document No.: _____
Date received or picked up: ___

Name or description of document:

Document's date: _____
Event or contact, if any, with which the document is associated:

Document's significance or importance:

Summary of contents:

Other:

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interview Guide

"Post-Tenure Review at Dalton State College"

1. What does post-tenure review mean to you as a faculty member?

2. When did you first learn about post-tenure review? Tell me about it.

3. How did the Dalton State post-tenure review policy evolve? Who were the principal players in its development?

4. What is your attitude toward/opinion of the Dalton State post-tenure policy?

5. How has post-tenure review affected you? Tell me about it.

   Probes: Practices
   Status
   Roles within the institution
   Academic freedom
   Effect on tenure
   Faculty governance

6. In your opinion, how has post-tenure review affected your colleagues?

   Probes: Practices
   Status
   Roles within the institution

7. If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be your preferences? How would such a policy be different?

8. Is there anything I haven't asked you about that you think would help me in understanding the situation regarding post-tenure review at Dalton State?

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER FOR FIRST MAILING OF SURVEY

Post Office Box 209
Spring City, Tennessee 37381-0209
October 16, 2000

Dear Faculty Member:

I am a doctoral student at The University of Tennessee, and I am seeking your assistance with research on post-tenure review in public two-year institutions. The purpose of my study is to assess the experiences and understanding of faculty with regard to post-tenure review policies and practices. At this time, no case studies of faculty experiences at public two-year institutions have been conducted.

Having been employed at a community college for the past 15 years, I am aware that you are working extended hours to fulfill your professional job responsibilities, and I would appreciate your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire. By participating, you will serve a key role in improving public understanding of the experiences of faculty with regard to post-tenure-review at two-year colleges. The questionnaire will take about 10 minutes to complete. Would you please take a few minutes to complete it and return it to me no later than **October 30, 2000**?

The data obtained from the enclosed questionnaire will be confidential and reported only in aggregate form so that no identifying characteristics of any kind will be used. Data will be accessible only to the researcher and the chair of her doctoral committee. At the conclusion of the study, all completed questionnaires and the computer data will be destroyed. Participation in this research should pose no risk to you since your responses to the survey questions will be kept confidential. Your participation is voluntary, and there is no penalty if you choose not to participate in the study. The serial number in the upper right hand corner of the survey is simply to follow responses in case a second mailing is necessary. Completing the questionnaire and returning it to me constitutes informed consent by you to participate in this study.

If you have questions or require additional information, you may contact me at (865) 354-3000, Ext. 4317; the UT Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at (865) 974-3466; or my doctoral committee chair, Dr. Jeff Aper, at (865) 974-6152. Inquiries may also be sent to the attention of Dr. Aper at The University of Tennessee, Department of Educational Administration and Cultural Studies, 238 Claxton Addition, Knoxville, Tennessee, 37996. Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,

Myra K. Peavyhouse
Doctoral Candidate

Dr. Jeffery P. Aper
Doctoral Committee Chair

APPENDIX E

A SURVEY OF POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICIES AND PRACTICES AT DALTON STATE COLLEGE

____

SURVEY OF POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICIES AND PRACTICES

AT DALTON STATE COLLEGE

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What faculty rank do you hold within the institution? (Please circle one.)

   a. Instructor
   b. Assistant Professor
   c. Associate Professor
   d. Professor

2. Do you hold tenure or a tenure-track appointment? (Please circle one.)

   a. Yes

      If so, which one? (Please circle one.)
      1. Tenure
      2. Tenure-track appointment

   b. No

3. How many years have you been employed as a full-time faculty member at Dalton State College? (Please circle one.)

   a. 5 years or less
   b. 6-10 years
   c. 11-15 years
   d. 16-20 years
   e. 21-25 years
   f. 26-30 years
   g. More than 30 years

B. DALTON STATE'S POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

4. How would you classify the actual orientation of Dalton State College's post-tenure review policy? (Please circle one.)

   a. The policy encourages faculty and administrators to work together to develop the quality of performance at all levels - teaching, institutional service, and professional growth.

b. The policy allows administrators to make managerial decisions and to ascertain if faculty should be rewarded or penalized for their performance.
c. The policy encourages the development of faculty performance but also provides for managerial decisionmaking.

5. How has post-tenure review worked at Dalton State College?

Policy Design: (Please circle all that apply.)
a. Designed largely by faculty
b. Designed largely by administrators
c. Designed equally by both faculty and administrators
d. Protects academic freedom
e. Contains a statement of purpose
f. Based on peer review
g. Establishes clear standards for satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance

Process Management: (Please circle all that apply.)
a. Provides institutional support for the review (i.e., budgeted funds)
b. Provides training for reviewers
c. Utilizes valid, technically sound evaluation measures
d. Provides for flexible and decentralized control at the division/department level
e. Provides for centralized control

Impact of Review: (Please circle all that apply.)
a. Entitles only faculty member to see the review
b. Entitles only the supervisor to see the review
c. Entitles both the faculty member and supervisor to see the review
d. Offers feedback to the faculty member
e. Provides for a professional development plan created by faculty member
f. Provides for a professional development plan created by the supervisor
g. Provides for a professional development plan created by the faculty member and supervisor
h. Authorizes faculty member to monitor professional development plan
i. Authorizes peers to monitor professional development plan
j. Authorizes supervisor to monitor professional development plan
k. Provides for a reward (i.e., merit pay)
l. Provides for a penalty (i.e., revision of assignments, termination, paycut)

6. How would you describe the timing of Dalton State College's post-tenure review policy? (Please circle one.)

a. Occurs as the result of some negative action or event in the faculty member's performance
b. Occurs regularly at a designated time, based on an institutional calendar
c. Neither of the above

If the review is contingent upon other events, which types of circumstances can trigger the review? (Please circle all that apply.)

1. Unsatisfactory evaluations (i.e., yearly review by supervisor)
2. Failure to receive merit raises
3. Poor classroom effectiveness (i.e., student ratings of instruction)
4. Lack of innovation in teaching methods and materials
5. Lack of contributions to department
6. Poor attendance and reliability (i.e., in class, at meetings)
7. Other (Please specify.) _____

If the review occurs automatically, what is the frequency of review for individual faculty members? (Please circle one.)

1. Every academic year
2. After two to three academic years
3. After four to five academic years
4. More than five academic years

C. PREFERRED POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

7. If you could revise a post-tenure review policy, how would you classify its ideal orientation? (Please circle one.)

   a. The policy would encourage faculty and administrators to work together to develop the quality of performance at all levels - teaching, institutional service, and professional growth.
   b. The policy would allow administrators to make managerial decisions and to ascertain if faculty should be rewarded or penalized for their performance.
   c. The policy would encourage the development of faculty performance but also provide for managerial decisionmaking.

8. How would an ideal post-tenure review process work?

   Preferred Policy Design: (Please circle all that apply.)
   a. Would be designed largely by faculty
   b. Would be designed largely by administrators
   c. Would be designed cooperatively by both faculty and administrators
   d. Would protect academic freedom
   e. Would contain a statement of purpose
   f. Would be based upon peer review
   g. Would establish clear standards for satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance

Preferred Process Management: (Please circle all that apply.)

a. Would provide institutional support for the review (i.e., budgeted funds)
b. Would provide training for reviewers
c. Would utilize valid, technically sound evaluation measures
d. Would provide for flexible and decentralized control at the division/department level
e. Would provide for centralized control

Preferred Impact of Review: (Please circle all that apply.)

a. Would entitle only faculty member to see the review
b. Would entitle only the supervisor to see the review
c. Would entitle both the faculty member and supervisor to see the review
d. Would offer feedback to the faculty member
e. Would provide for a professional development plan created by faculty member
f. Would provide for a professional development plan created by the supervisor
g. Would provide for a professional development plan created by the faculty member and supervisor
h. Would authorize faculty member to monitor professional development plan
i. Would authorize peers to monitor professional development plan
j. Would authorize supervisor to monitor professional development plan
k. Would provide for a reward (i.e., merit pay)
l. Would provide for a penalty (i.e., revision of assignments, termination, paycut)

9. How would you describe the ideal timing of a post-tenure review policy? (Please circle one.)

a. Would occur as the result of some negative action or event in the faculty member's performance
b. Would occur regularly at a designated time, based on an institutional calendar
c. Other (Please specify.)_____

If the review is contingent upon other events, which types of circumstances would trigger the review? (Please circle all that apply.)

1. Unsatisfactory evaluations (i.e., yearly review by supervisor)
2. Failure to receive merit raises
3. Poor classroom effectiveness (i.e., student ratings of instruction)
4. Lack of innovation in teaching methods and materials
5. Lack of contributions to department
6. Poor attendance and reliability (i.e., at class, in meetings)
7. Other (Please specify.) _____

If the review occurs automatically, what would be the ideal frequency of review for individual faculty members? (Please circle one.)

1. Every academic year
2. After two to three academic years
3. After four to five academic years
4. More than five academic years

10. Additional comments

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for participating in this study. Please use the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to return the completed questionnaire by <u>October 30, 2000.</u> If you would like to have a summary of the results of this study, please enclose your business card and e-mail address.

APPENDIX F

POSTCARD FOR SECOND MAILING

Post Office Box 209
Spring City, Tennessee 37381-0209
October 19, 2000

Dear Faculty Member:

Ten days ago, you received a questionnaire designed to assess the status of post-tenure review policies and practices at Dalton State. Unfortunately, I have not yet received a completed survey from you. Your participation is crucial and your input very valuable.

Would you take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it to me no later than **November 6, 2000?** Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,

Myra K. Peavyhouse
Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX G

FOLLOW-UP LETTER FOR THIRD MAILING

Post Office Box 209
Spring City, Tennessee 37381-0209
November 6, 2000

Dear Faculty Member:

On September 10, you received a questionnaire designed to assess the status of post-tenure review policies and practices at Dalton State. Unfortunately, I have not yet received a completed survey from you. Your participation is crucial and your input very valuable. In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, I have enclosed an additional copy for your completion.

As indicated in the first letter, the questionnaire will take only a few minutes to complete. Would you please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me no later than **November 16, 2000?**

If you have questions or require additional information, you may contact me at (865) 354-3000, Ext. 4317; or the UT Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at (865) 974-3466. Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,

Myra K. Peavyhouse
Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX H

CONSENT FORM

POST-TENURE REVIEW AT DALTON STATE COLLEGE

CONSENT FORM

The purpose of this study is to assess the experiences and understanding of faculty with regard to post-tenure review policies and practices. The central questions of this study are:

1. How did the post-tenure review policy at Dalton State College evolve? Who were the principal players in the process?
2. How do Dalton State College faculty interpret the post-tenure review policy? What are their experiences and attitudes regarding the policy and its implementation?
3. Do Dalton State College faculty members think post-tenure review affects their practices? Their status? Their roles within the institution?
4. If given the opportunity to revise a post-tenure review policy, what would be the preferences of Dalton State faculty members? How would such a policy be different?

With your permission, interviews will be audiotaped. Measures will be taken to assure that your responses will be kept confidential. Pseudonyms will be used to protect your confidentiality unless you express a wish to be identified as the source. A written transcript will be made of your interview. The audiotapes and transcripts will be secured in the researcher's home office; however, the letters of consent will be stored in a locked file at a University of Tennessee location.

There are minimal foreseeable risks and direct benefits to you as a result of your participation in this study. It is hoped that your participation will serve a key role in improving public understanding of the experiences of faculty with regard to post-tenure review at two-year colleges.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may choose not to answer any specific questions or may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

If you have questions, please contact the researcher, Myra Peavyhouse, at (865) 354-3000, ext. 4317 or the doctoral committee chair, Dr. Jeff Aper, at (865) 974-6152. Inquiries may also be sent to Myra Peavyhouse, Post Office Box 209, Spring City, TN 37381-0209.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

I fully understand the explanation of this study and I agree to participate. I give permission for Myra Peavyhouse to transcribe the audiotape and use the information that I provide in writing a dissertation.

Name _____ Signature _____Date _____

APPENDIX I

DALTON STATE COLLEGE APPROVAL LETTER

DSC
DALTON STATE
COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

December 1, 2000

Ms. Myra Peavyhouse
P.O. Box 209
Spring City, TN 37381-0209

Dear Ms. Peavyhouse:

Your request to conduct your study on the Post Tenure Review process at Dalton State College has been approved by the Council of Chairs, the Pre/Post Tenure Review Committee and the Human Subject Committee.

Dr. Codjoe, Dr. Wycherley, and I will serve as points of contact for you. As soon as your tentative schedule is available, I suggest we meet again to discuss implementation.

Sincerely,

John B. Black
Vice President for Academic Affairs

dw

c: Dr. Burran
Dr. Codjoe
Dr. Wycherley

213 NORTH COLLEGE DRIVE • DALTON, GEORGIA • 30720-3797 • 706-272-4436 • FAX 706-272-4588 • 800-829-4436
AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM INSTITUTION

APPENDIX J

HUMAN SUBJECTS FORM B

FORM B

IRB# _____

Date Received in OR _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Application for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects

I. IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECT

1. Principal Investigator/Co-Principal Investigator:

Myra K. Peavyhouse
Post Office Box 209
Spring City, TN 37381-0209
(423) 365-5287 (home)
(865) 354-3000, ext. 4317 (office)
Email: Peavyhouse_M@rscc.cc.tn.us

Faculty Advisor:

Dr. Jeffery P. Aper
Associate Professor
Educational Administration and Policy Studies
Department of Educational Administration and Cultural Studies
238 Claxton Addition
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996
(865) 974-6152
Email: Aper@utkux.utcc.utk.edu

Department/Unit: Educational Administration and Cultural Studies

2. Project Classification: Dissertation

3. Title of Project: POST-TENURE REVIEW: A CASE STUDY OF PRACTICES AT DALTON STATE COLLEGE

4. Starting Date: "Upon IRB Approval"

5. Estimated Completion Date: March 30, 2001

6. **External Funding**: N/A

II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The purposes of this case study are to: (1) determine the evolution of the post-tenure review policy at a two-year college; (2) describe faculty experiences and attitudes toward the post-tenure review process at this institution; (3) determine how they interpret the process and policy; (4) describe how the process and policy affect their practices, status, and roles within the institution; and (5) describe the policy design faculty would prefer and how it would work.

III. DESCRIPTION AND SOURCE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS:

1. Full-time faculty at Dalton State College will serve as participants for the research study.
2. In order to gain access to the institution and participants, the researcher will make a formal written request to the college's chief academic officer (See attachment - Appendix A).
3. Only full-time Dalton State College faculty members will be asked to participate; all other individuals will be excluded. First, thirty-six Dalton State faculty members, four per each of the nine academic divisions, will be individually interviewed by the researcher. Specifically, the four faculty members per division--one instructor, one assistant professor, one associate professor, and one professor--will be randomly selected since they will be representative of the four academic ranks. Then, approximately 133 full-time faculty members will be asked to complete the survey questionnaire (See attachment - Appendix E).
4. The anticipated number of participants who will be asked to complete the survey questionnaire is 133, thirty-six of whom will first be interviewed.

IV. METHODS AND PROCEDURES:

Methods

The case study method has been selected for the study because it permits the researcher "to study a multitude of factors in-depth" (Mason & Bramble, 1997, p. 41). Since statistics elicited via a survey study only provide limited quantitative data, the case study provides an avenue by which the researcher can use a variety of qualitative tools to probe more deeply into issues, many of which would otherwise be inaccessible. Moreover, "the case study offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon" (Merriam, 1998, p. 41). Therefore, because its use permits the researcher to conduct an in-depth study, the case study method will be an effective tool in the investigation of faculty experiences and attitudes toward post-tenure review practices at a public two-year institution. The case study method also "allows an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events" (Yin, 1994, p. 3).

Procedures

Dalton State College, a Georgia public community college and member of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), has been selected as the site for the case study. In order to gain access to the institution, the researcher will make a formal written request to the college's chief academic officer (See Appendix A, Letter Requesting Access). Once approval has been granted by UT's Institutional Review Board and Dalton State College, the researcher will proceed with the study.

The researcher will then utilize three primary data collection methods to study faculty experiences and understandings of the post-tenure review process at Dalton State College. These include the use of historical as well as current documents, faculty interviews and a brief questionnaire.

First, documentary evidence will be reviewed during the summer and fall 2000 terms (See Appendix B, Document Summary Form). Such documents, including minutes of Faculty Senate and administrative council meetings, the faculty handbook, correspondence, memos, email, speeches, policy documents and reports, should be readily available on campus at Dalton State College, and will address institutional policy directives. Also of importance are formal post-tenure review documents from the University System of Georgia, the entity which governs Dalton State. The current Dalton State catalog will be reviewed as well. Perusal of the catalog will permit the researcher to gain insight into such factors as institutional history and mission.

Second, in order to gain a deeper understanding of the post-tenure review process as it exists at Dalton State College and to follow up on the questionnaire, audiotaped interviews will be conducted on campus with selected faculty during the fall 2000 term (See Appendix C, Interview Guide) and then personally transcribed by the researcher. Specifically, thirty-six Dalton State faculty members, four per each of the nine academic divisions, will be individually interviewed by the researcher. In order to obtain a greater understanding of the faculty view at Dalton State College, the four faculty members per division--one instructor, one assistant professor, one associate professor, and one professor-- will be randomly selected since they will be representative of the four academic ranks. This selection method will also permit the

researcher to grasp a broader range of data (i.e., rank, tenure status, years of service, and field of study). Furthermore, the relationship between years of service and rank should enhance reasonable representativeness of the full college.

Ultimately, the interview sessions will enable the researcher to determine the faculty's understanding of and experiences with the current Dalton State College post-tenure review policy. Also, the researcher will inquire as to what Dalton State College faculty would prefer if they could design the ideal post-tenure review policy.

At the start of the interview session, each participant of the study will be asked to sign a consent form and the explanation thereof will precede the actual interview as well as the participants' signatures on the consent form (See Appendix H, Consent Form). During this process, participants will be asked to give the researcher written permission to audiotape the interview sessions and then personally transcribe the audiotapes. They will also be given an opportunity to ask questions prior to the interviews. Furthermore, they will be informed that they may refuse to respond to any questions and may withdraw from the study at any time they choose without penalty. Once the researcher has been given written permission to audiotape the interview session, transcribe the audiotape and use the information provided in writing the dissertation, the formal interview process will begin.

Finally, survey evidence will be utilized. Specifically, a cover letter, survey instrument and return envelope will be distributed to all 133 full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty at Dalton State College during the fall 2000 academic term (See Appendix D, Cover Letter for First Mailing of Survey; Appendix E, A Survey of Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices at Dalton State College). The questions

developed for the survey instrument are based upon post-tenure review guidelines recommended by the AAUP. For the purposes of this study, full-time faculty are those individuals teaching a minimum of nine credit hours during the fall 2000 academic term. Respondents will be given two weeks to respond or return the questionnaire. In an effort to track responses in the event a second mailing is necessary, a serial number will be placed in the upper right-hand corner of the survey instrument. If the response to the first mailing fails to elicit responses from at least 70% of the full-time faculty, a postcard will be sent to each non-respondent to encourage his or her participation in the study. If this fails to produce a response after ten days, an additional cover letter and questionnaire will be mailed to all non-respondents to encourage their participation (Babbie, 1990). Such actions are necessary in order to increase the response rate, and "a second follow-up letter may be necessary to get the response rate up and if matters are desperate, a third, though it is widely accepted that appeals beyond the first follow-up decrease rapidly in effectiveness" (Verma & Mallick, 1999, p. 122). Moreover, two to three weeks is an appropriate period of time between follow-up mailings (Babbie, 1990). When these efforts have been exhausted or an adequate number of questionnaires have been returned, data entry and analysis will begin.

The survey instrument, which is based upon established AAUP guidelines for post-tenure review, is divided into three sections (See Appendix E, A Survey of Post-Tenure Review Policies and Practices at Dalton State College). The first section of the instrument will solicit general information about the institution. The second section will ask respondents to provide additional information about post-tenure review at Dalton State. The final section will ask respondents about their

preferences regarding a post-tenure review policy. Surveys will be mailed to respondents with a cover letter (See Appendix D, Cover Letter for First Mailing of Survey) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. In the event a second mailing is necessary, postcard reminders will be mailed to all non-respondents (See Appendix F, Postcard for Second Mailing). If the second mailing fails to elicit an appropriate response, surveys will be mailed to all non-respondents with a follow-up letter (See Appendix G, Follow-up Letter for Third Mailing) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

V. SPECIFIC RISKS AND PROTECTION MEASURES:

There are no anticipated risks expected to be encountered by the participants while engaged in this study. Pseudonyms will be used to ensure confidentiality. All audiotapes, transcripts, and surveys will be stored in a secure area in the researcher's home office. The letters of consent will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Office of Educational Administration and Cultural Studies, 238 Claxton Addition, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996.

VI. BENEFITS: The risks to those participating in this research study are minimal. By participating, participants will serve a key role in improving public understanding of the experiences of faculty with regard to post-tenure review at two-year colleges.

VII. METHODS FOR OBTAINING "INFORMED CONSENT" FROM PARTICIPANTS:

The research involves no more than minimal risk to the participants. In order to gain access to the institution and the participants, the researcher will first make a formal written request to the college's chief academic officer. At the start of the interview session, each participant of the study will be asked to sign a consent form and the explanation thereof will precede the actual interview as well as the participants' signatures on the consent form (See Appendix H, Consent Form). Participants will be given an opportunity to ask questions prior to the interviews. They will also be informed that they may refuse to respond to any questions and may withdraw from the study at any time they choose without penalty. Also, completing the survey questionnaire and returning it to the researcher constitutes informed consent by the participant to participate in the study (See attachments - Appendix A, Letter Requesting Access; Appendix D, Cover Letter for First Mailing of Survey). The signed consent documents will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Office of Educational Administration and Cultural Studies, 238 Claxton Addition, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996.

VIII. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE INVESTIGATOR TO CONDUCT RESEARCH:

The principal investigator, Myra K. Peavyhouse, is an Ed.D. candidate in the Department of Educational Administration and Cultural Studies of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, College of Education. She has previously conducted survey and interview research within the confines of doctoral-level courses she has successfully completed at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. This

project will be conducted under the direct supervision of Dr. Jeff Aper, doctoral committee chair and specialist in the area of educational administration.

IX. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT TO BE USED IN THE RESEARCH:

Permission to conduct the study will be obtained from Dalton State College's chief academic officer, and research will be conducted on the Dalton State College campus located in Dalton, Georgia. The researcher will provide her own equipment for storage and analysis of data.

APPENDIX K

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Office of Research
404 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-0140
PHONE: (865) 974-3466
FAX: (865) 974-2805
URL:http://research.utk.edu/ora/

December 4, 2000

IRB #: 5910 B

Title: Post-Tenure Review: A Case Study of Practices at Dalton State College

Myra K. Peavyhouse
Educational Administration &
Cultural Studies
P.O. Box 209
Spring City, TN 37381-0209

Dr. Jeffery Aper
Educational Administration &
Cultural Studies
238 Claxton Addn.
Campus

This letter serves as acknowledgment of the receipt of the letter of permission to conduct the above research project at Dalton State College. The receipt of this letter removes the contingency originally placed on the above project on July 14, 2000. Your project is now in full compliance.

The enclosed informed consent has been approved for use in the above project.

If you have any question, or if I can be of further assistance, please contact my office.

Sincerely,

Brenda Lawson

Brenda Lawson
Compliances

Enclosures

VITA

Myra Kay Peavyhouse was born in Dayton, Tennessee on April 18, 1962, to Ray Myron Peavyhouse and Shelby Jean Armes Peavyhouse. She graduated in 1980 from Princess Anne High School in Virginia Beach, Virginia. In 1983, she graduated from Roane State Community College, Harriman, with an A.S. in Biology. She also received a B.S. in Biology from Tennessee Wesleyan College, Athens, in 1985, and a B. A. in English from Tennessee Wesleyan College in 1987. In 1988, she completed her certification as a Developmental Education Specialist from the Kellogg Institute at Appalachian State University, in Boone, North Carolina. She also earned a Masters of Arts in English from East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, in 1991, and a Doctor of Education degree, with a major in Educational Administration and Policy Studies, from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 2002.

In 1985, she began her career in education when she joined the faculty of Roane State Community College, Harriman. In 1992, she became Associate Dean of Academic Development at Roane State and served in this capacity until 1996. Currently, she holds the rank of Associate Professor of English at Roane State Community College, which is located in Harriman, Tennessee.