

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AND AMONG POLICY VARIABLES,
TYPE OF INSTITUTION, AND PERCEPTIONS OF
ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS WITH REGARD TO POST-TENURE REVIEW

DISSERTATION

Submitted to .

The College of Human Resources and Education

of

West Virginia University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree of Doctor of Education

by

Beverly Jo Harris

Morgantown

West Virginia

1996

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Completion of this doctoral program could not have been possible without the support, understanding, and encouragement of many individuals. My sincerest appreciation is extended:

To my doctoral committee chairperson, Dr. Ronald Childress, for serving as an exemplary committee chair who guided me methodically through the numerous details involved in completion of the study;

To my doctoral committee, Dr. John Andes, Dr. Anne Cavalier, Dr. Kurt Olmosk, and Dr. Powell Toth, for providing their constant support and encouragement, along with their expertise;

To Dr. James Ranson, for providing technical assistance on statistical analyses with patience and skill;

To Dr. Christine Licata, for befriending me in my quest for information and for providing me with invaluable advice and assistance;

To Regina Hudson, Pattye Lewis, and Connie Fox, for taking on an extra load during my sabbatical;

To Dr. Michelle Klenk and Dr. Martha Shouldis, for providing constant assurances that this goal was possible;

To fellow students in the comprehensive examination study group and summer research critique group, for keeping me motivated.

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, Carl, my strength in life, who sacrificed so much during the completion of my doctoral program; to my

two special daughters, Valerie and Vanessa, my joy in life, who accepted my attention to coursework and dissertation without complaint; to my father, who instilled in me the values of hard work and kindness; and posthumously to my mother, who was my constant source of love and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical Framework	3
Background	7
Post-Tenure Review	9
Types of Institutions	15
Statement of Problem	18
Research Questions	18
Definitions	20
Significance of Study	21
Limitations of Study	23
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	24
Theoretical Framework	24
Post-Tenure Review	32
History of Post-Tenure Review	33
Policy Variables	37
Types of Institutions	52
III. METHODOLOGY	56
Research Questions	56
Population and Sample	57
Research Design	58

Instrumentation	59
Validation of Instrument	61
Procedure	62
Data Analysis	62
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	64
Descriptive Data	64
Survey Response	64
Institutional Demographic Data	66
Major Findings	70
Question 1	70
Question 2	73
Question 3	88
Question 4	94
Question 5	97
Question 6	114
Question 7	122
Question 8	139
Summary of Findings	160
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	163
Summary of Procedures	164
Summary of Findings	166
Descriptive Data	166

Post-Tenure Review Policy Variables	167
Problems and Benefits of Post-Tenure Review	176
Conclusions	178
Question 1	179
Question 2	179
Question 3	181
Question 4	182
Question 5	182
Question 6	184
Question 7	185
Question 8	186
Implications	187
Recommendations for Further Research	191
BIBLIOGRAPHY	193
APPENDICES	201
A. The <u>Post-tenure Review Survey</u>	201
B. Letter for Use Specific Survey Items	206
C. Panel of Experts	208
D. Cover Letter, First Mailing	210
E. Cover Letter, Second Mailing	212
F. Distribution of Responses by State	214
G. Distribution of Tenure by Type of Institution	216

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Comparison of Population and Sample by Type of Institution	58
2 Comparison of Population, Sample, and Respondents by Type of Institution	66
3 Public or Private Designation	67
4 Percentage of Tenured Faculty	68
5 Institutions Conducting Evaluations	69
6 Status of Formal, Written Post-Tenure Review Policies	70
7 Stated Primary Purpose by Type of Institution	72
8 Involvement of Individuals in Development of Policy by Type of Institution	75
9 Method of Selection by Type of Institution	78
10 Timeframe by Type of Institution	80
11 Use of Improvement Plans by Type of Institution	82
12 Involvement of Individuals in Improvement Plan Development by Type of Institution	85
13 Use of Follow-up for Improvement Plans by Type of Institution	87
14 Components of Post-Tenure Review Policies	92
15 Actual and Desired Purpose by Type of Institution	96
16 Actual and Desired Involvement of Individuals in Development of Policy by Type of Institution	100
17 Actual and Desired Method of Selection by Type of Institution	103
18 Actual and Desired Timeframe by Type of Institution	105
19 Actual and Desired Use of Improvement Plans by Type of Institution	107

20	Actual and Desired Involvement of Individuals in Improvement Plan Process by Type of Institution	111
21	Actual and Desired Use of Follow-up for Improvement Plans by Type of Institution	113
22	Actual and Desired Components of Post-Tenure Review Policies by Type of Institution	120
23	Analysis of Variance: Problem 1 and Type of Institution	124
24	Analysis of Variance: Problem 2 and Type of Institution	126
25	Analysis of Variance: Problem 3 and Type of Institution	128
26	Analysis of Variance: Problem 4 and Type of Institution	130
27	Analysis of Variance: Problem 5 and Type of Institution	132
28	Analysis of Variance: Problem 6 and Type of Institution	134
29	Analysis of Variance: Problem 7 and Type of Institution	136
30	Analysis of Variance: Problem 8 and Type of Institution	138
31	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 1 and Type of Institution	141
32	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 2 and Type of Institution	143
33	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 3 and Type of Institution	145
34	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 4 and Type of Institution	147
35	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 5 and Type of Institution	149
36	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 6 and Type of Institution	151
37	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 7 and Type of Institution	153
38	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 8 and Type of Institution	155
39	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 9 and Type of Institution	157
40	Analysis of Variance: Benefit 10 and Type of Institution	159

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Post-tenure review has become an important topic in higher education. According to Edwards (1994) three changing circumstances increase the need for post-tenure review: (a) budget cuts have left public institutions with little money for new faculty positions; therefore, best use must be made of every existing faculty member; (b) the federal ban on mandatory retirement has expired; and (c) there are escalating external demands for greater accountability. Additionally, Licata (1986) reported that approximately 85 percent of faculty are tenured at institutions where tenure is operative and that the modal age of tenured faculty will be between 55 and 65 by the year 2000 (p. 2).

Administrators must address many issues concerning aging faculty, the most important of which is maintaining faculty vitality. This is essential, not only for individual faculty members but also for development of the institution. Baldwin (1984) suggested that three persons on the college campus have primary responsibility for providing incentives for faculty vitality: the department chair, the dean or provost, and the director of faculty development. Murphy (1990) asserted that college administrators have noted changes in supervisory activities in the past five years as a result of the increased attention to faculty evaluation.

Evaluation policies must be adopted that will be appropriate for the tenured faculty member as well as for the nontenured. Van Alstyne (in Smith, 1983) noted that "while the pre-tenure review and screening system appears to function with reasonable efficiency, more attention should be devoted to the problem of post-tenure decline" (p. 93). Craver (1990) suggested that institutions should adopt and consistently apply performance review procedures that do not abolish or modify existing tenure policies.

Much has been written on the concepts of academic tenure and faculty evaluation (Shaw, 1971; Blackburn, 1972; Commission on Academic Tenure, 1973; Miller, 1972; Miller, 1975). Johnson (1990) noted, however, that there has been very little research conducted on evaluation of tenured faculty. Goodman (1990) stated that few studies compare the models of post-tenure evaluation programs across the country. Reisman (1986) asserted that the literature on the subject of performance evaluation for tenured faculty was not abundant and suggested experimentation with performance-focused review of tenured faculty. Licata (1986) indicated that there is a need to expand research on the status, the practices, and the effectiveness of current post-tenure evaluation plans and that type of institution and mission should be examined when studying tenured faculty evaluation.

This chapter presents the theoretical framework and the background for the study, citing literature on post-tenure review as a form of faculty

evaluation and development. Research questions are presented and significance and limitations of the study are noted.

Theoretical Framework

Raufman (1991) asserted that faculty development fosters organizational development. The theoretical concept of organizational development (OD) encompasses the process of managing change and providing opportunity for growth. Schmuck and Runkel (1985) contended that organizational development was a process which integrates individual desires for growth and development with organizational goals. They stated that organizational development is a planned change effort related to the organization's mission. Gibson, et al. (1973) defined organizational development as

"a planned, systematic program . . . with the aim of making the organization more adaptable to present or future change through the use of a variety of methods designed to change knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviors, and structure, and based upon the assumption that organizational effectiveness in the sense of adaptability to change is enhanced to the extent that the process facilitates the integration of individual and organizational objectives" (p. 342).

Although organizational development has its roots in business and industry in the mid-1950s, Schmuck and Runkel (1985) explained its application to educational institutions. The chief goal for organizational

development is "that the school achieve a sustained capacity for solving its own problems. Such a school monitors its environment and takes action to control inputs from the environment" (p. 10). Organizational development in schools aims "at improving the interpersonal and group procedures used by administrators, teachers, students, and parents to reach their educational objectives" (p. 11).

Organizational development strives to change norms, roles, structures, and procedures so that institutions can experience renewal. Schmuck and Runkel (1985) defined a norm as something that exists "when, within a collection of people, certain ranges of behavior are approved, others are disapproved, and still others are neither approved nor disapproved" (p. 19). They defined roles as "norms about how a person in a particular organizational position should perform" (p. 19). Structures were stated as being "norms about roles assigned to several interrelated jobs, about performance in those jobs, and responsibilities among jobs" (p. 19). Procedures were explained as "the way we do things around here" (p. 19). Procedures can be "formal or informal, and they are held in place by norms" (p. 19). Post-tenure review policies are formal evaluation procedures that define the roles, or expectations, of how a tenured faculty member should perform in an institution of higher education. Berquist and Sullivan (1975) contended that the role of evaluation in bringing about change in an organization is widely recognized and supported.

The philosophy or mission of institutions influences the role that evaluation plays in maintaining vitality (Baldwin, 1984). The type of institution denotes the structure, or the norms and roles, assigned to interrelated jobs. This structure defines performance expectations and responsibilities in interrelated jobs. Baldwin (1984) cited the need for higher education institutions to offer personnel policies and a comprehensive work environment that not only encourages but compels faculty members to perform at high levels of excellence. He suggested that administrators in higher education be sensitive to developmental issues of faculty and direct energies in ways which are "mutually beneficial to the individuals and the institution" (p. 66). Moreover, Baldwin noted that studies should shift from focusing exclusively on development of the person or development of the institution to designs that account for interactions between individuals and their environment. Jensen (1980) asserted that organizational and personal development are both served when reasonably high goals are set and achieved.

Performance evaluation is one procedure that can assist in both setting and recognizing the achievement of goals or standards and can, therefore, promote both the development of the organization and the personal development of individuals (Keig and Waggoner, 1994). Performance appraisals that genuinely encourage career growth demonstrate that an organization is doing its share to help individuals advance in their careers. Formative types of evaluation can lead to development of faculty. Proponents

of formative evaluation believe that it is a more promising method of motivating faculty than is summative evaluation. In formative evaluation, the emphasis is on development. According to Menges (1985) development is "highly individual; it proceeds differently from person to person and from setting to setting" (p. 181). Exposure to theory, provision for practicing new approaches and receiving feedback, and opportunities to be coached are conditions necessary for faculty development to occur. Keig and Wagonner (1994) observed that a number of scholars now recognize the need for formative as well as summative evaluation, noting that "many of them recommend that the two functions be kept distinctly separate. Others believe that information gathered in summative evaluation can be used for formative evaluation" (p. 13). Aubrecht noted, however, that "very few institutions are making good use of their faculty evaluation systems for development purposes" (p. 88).

Berquist and Phillips (1975) predicted in the early 1970s that harsh realities of decreased funding, steady-state or declining enrollment, declining faculty mobility, and demands for accountability by students, parents, and state and federal officials would make faculty development an important concept for faculty and administrators. This study will examine components of post-tenure review policies, by type of institution, that set forth expectations designed to foster development of tenured faculty.

Background

Evaluation designed to foster the development of tenured faculty is a relatively new issue in higher education. In 1971, the Association of American Colleges (AAC) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) sponsored the Commission on Academic Tenure (Bennett and Chater, 1984). The Commission suggested several recommendations for correcting deficiencies of the tenure system in higher education, but these suggestions were ignored until the 1980s, when accountability came to the forefront in education. In 1982, the National Commission on Higher Education Issues maintained that post-tenure faculty evaluation was a vital issue for higher education. Declines in revenues and enrollment, a larger number of older and tenured faculty, and criticism that the tenure system adversely affected faculty productivity were cited as reasons for making post-tenure evaluation a necessity (National Commission, 1982).

Post-tenure review policies are being developed to encourage faculty renewal. Edwards (1994) stated that the challenge to higher education institutions is to develop a post-tenure review system that "results in useful and effective intervention to restart stalled careers" (p. 8). Johnson (1993) observed that faculty may be spurred to "maintain and upgrade their level of competence" (p. 19). She suggested that post-tenure review would result in the creation of new and better ideas. Miller (1972) asserted that every effort should be made to renew and energize faculty who are not demonstrating

success in their area of responsibility. Post-tenure review is not in opposition to the principles of tenure and to AAUP policy statements about tenure, provided that the evaluation is not used as grounds for dismissal and that any recommended dismissal is subject to normal academic due process (Licata, 1984).

Because tenure is coming under attack from many constituencies, a closer examination of the principles of tenure is occurring. Magner (1995) reported several such occurrences. A state lawmaker in South Carolina has introduced legislation that would eliminate tenure at the state's public colleges; in Arizona, discussion is being held on whether a new university will offer tenure to faculty members. The University of California has recently broadened criteria for tenure, and at least six colleges have, in the past two years, eliminated tenure. Webster University has offered faculty members an alternative to tenure since 1971, and 78% of them have taken it in return for more frequent opportunities for sabbaticals. The American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) is beginning a two-year study that will reexamine tenure, according to Magner. One part of the study will examine post-tenure review policies and creation of career options for professors. These efforts are indicative of actions being discussed or implemented by institutions and associations across the country. With the increased number of aging, tenured faculty on college campuses, attention is being directed to post-tenure review as a process essential for maintenance of institutional vitality.

Post-Tenure Review Policy Variables

Evaluation of tenured faculty performance and assessment of faculty vitality are critical processes to institutional development (Licata, 1986). To develop a process to evaluate tenured faculty or to review current evaluation policies, administrators and faculty at colleges and universities should examine several factors. The purpose of tenured faculty evaluation must be determined, processes and procedures should be established, and specific components or criteria used during the evaluation process must be formulated.

Purpose

The "overarching purpose" of any evaluation or appraisal effort is to "improve organizational performance" (Hammons, 1983, p. 50). Improved organizational performance has been brought to the forefront of higher education through calls for accountability from both internal and external constituencies. These calls have encouraged initiation of programs for post-tenure review at a growing number of institutions. The emerging conceptualization of post-tenure review has incorporated Geis's idea (1977) of formative evaluation, a process that provides feedback for improvement, rather than summative evaluation, or procedures used to reach final decisions such as tenure or promotion recommendations. The review emphasizes what Larsen (1983) described as "post-tenure development," a process that does not aim at the removal of unproductive faculty, but development of tenured

faculty (p. 10a). Several proponents agree that post-tenure evaluation must be viewed as a formative way to reinforce faculty growth and to improve instruction (Edwards, 1994; Johnson, 1990; Licata, 1986; Bennett and Chater, 1984). Moses (1985) concurred that adopting a professional development perspective would help to distinguish post-tenure review from an assault on tenure.

Use of the term "post-tenure development" suggests that the focus of post-tenure reviews should be on the establishment of goals to improve faculty performance. Several theorists have agreed on the importance of goal-setting for adults, noting that adults go through a series of sequential life stages (Super, 1980; Levinson, et al., 1978; Gould, 1978; Sheehy, 1976; Hall and Nougaim, 1968). Levinson et al. (1978) described adulthood as a series of stable and transitional periods; during stable periods the adult has fairly clear goals, but periodically the individual must reorder priorities and change behavior. Super (1980) described an individual's career as an evolutionary process, proceeding through career choice, successes and disappointments in the career, loss of driving quality of goals, static status, and gradually disengagement from career in favor of other interests. To alleviate or lessen disengagement, post-tenure review is being examined as a means to maintain faculty vitality over the span of the faculty career.

Administrators and faculty must decide on the purpose of evaluation of tenured faculty at their particular institution (Licata, 1986). Decisions

regarding the summative or formative nature of reviews should be made. All other aspects of the evaluation plan, such as process and components, should connect directly with the purposes established.

Process

Many variations exist in processes, or methods, of conducting post-tenure reviews. Involvement of faculty in the design of tenured faculty review procedures is essential (Bennett, 1985; Licata, 1986; Dellamura, 1986; Kleingartner, 1984; Heller, 1985). Goodman (1990) outlined steps devised in the post-tenure review process at the University of Hawaii. Faculty in each department or division developed specific statements of tenured faculty expectations by rank, which were reviewed by the academic dean to ensure that department expectations were consistent with institutional guidelines.

Individuals involved in developing the process for post-tenure review must determine whether the review of tenured faculty will be voluntary or mandatory. This decision can be a sensitive issue. Dellamura (1986) recommended a balance between voluntary and mandatory participation. Miller (1975) emphasized that before an evaluation system be made mandatory, the administration and a significant number of the faculty be in favor of such a plan and sufficient human and material resources be available to implement the plan.

Sufficient standardization of procedures must be designed to achieve some comparability. Mandatory evaluations often specify timeframes for

review cycles. Some suggest that reviews occur every three to five years (Bennett, 1985; Shapiro, 1983). Edwards (1994), however, recommended a process whereby only tenured faculty who have consistently low ratings on evaluations participate in post-tenure review procedures. In a voluntary setting, tenured faculty are evaluated if and when they choose.

In addition to determination of when evaluations occur, decisions must be made regarding who participates in the process of evaluating tenured faculty. Multiple sources of input are advocated by Licata (1986). Miller (1975) suggested that attention be given to the issue of interpretation of results and who will be responsible for the interpretation. Most policies include administrator, peer, and student evaluations as part of the procedure. Others may have the faculty member prepare a self-evaluation as part of the process (Reisman, 1986).

After policies are formulated with decisions made as to participants in the evaluation and how often they occur, determination of how results will be used must be made (Miller, 1972). Some policies incorporate improvement plan strategies, or growth contracts, with tenured faculty, while others do not (Edwards, 1994; Goodman, 1990). The incorporation or exclusion of improvement plans should be studied when examining post-tenure review. Edwards (1994) defined an improvement plan as a "narrative statement of expectations" (p. 10). Licata (1986) suggested that growth contracts deserved attention in the formulation of post-tenure review plans. Decisions regarding

who will participate in the post-tenure review process, how often reviews will take place, and whether to incorporate improvement plans as part of the process must be made in conjunction with the objective of the policy (Licata, 1986). Evaluation plans that are formative will contain processes that differ from those that are summative in nature.

Components

Although many variations exist in the purposes and processes of post-tenure review, similarities exist in the components, or evaluative criteria, used in established evaluation policies for both the tenured and nontenured faculty member (Andrews & Licata, 1989). Teaching ability, research ability, and service were found to be common components in policies established for the initial granting of tenure (Shaw, 1971). Cuneo (1972) listed standards to be considered in assessing faculty as (a) research, (b) teaching and training, (c) contribution to the intellectual community, and (d) service. Miller (1975) expanded these areas, noting that evaluation of overall faculty performance should consider nine categories: classroom teaching, advising, faculty service and relations, management, performing and visual arts, professional services, publications, public service, and research. Even though various criteria are used by institutions, these criteria are often categorized into the three broad areas of teaching, research or scholarly activity, and service. Evaluative criteria established for post-tenure review policies are often articulated as

teaching, research, and service components (Edwards, 1994; Goodman, 1990; Andrews and Licata, 1989; Licata, 1986; Reisman, 1986).

Given that teaching, research, and service are commonly accepted criteria by which faculty are evaluated, the importance, or influence, of selected criteria rests upon the nature of the institution, the needs and directions of the academic department, and the interests and abilities of the individual (Miller, 1972). In many studies regarding policies and practices in faculty evaluation, teaching has been ranked as having the most influence (Edgerton, 1993; Gustad, 1961; Hildebrand & Wilson, 1971; McKeachie, 1959). Four types of assessment used to examine the component of teaching in post-tenure review polices are student evaluations, administrator evaluations, peer evaluations, and self-evaluations. Much has been written on the use of these types of assessments in the evaluation of faculty (Edgerton, 1993; Goodman, 1990; Andrews & Licata, 1989; Reisman, 1986; National Commission, 1982; Miller, 1972).

A second area common to faculty evaluation is scholarly activity, or research. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (1987) classified scholarly activity into three categories: research, scholarship, and creative endeavor. Research, according to the association, orients faculty "toward new knowledge . . . toward utilization of that knowledge. . . and toward methods of teaching and learning" (p. 4); scholarship refers to "updating and extending an area of study within the professional life of the

faculty member" (p. 5); creative endeavor is the "result of the production of creative work by faculty" (p. 5).

In addition to teaching and scholarly activity, service activities are often considered in evaluation of faculty. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (1987) stratifies service into three areas: institutional service, professional service, and community service. Institutional service is defined as "serving on departmental, school and university committees. . . teaching in continuing education credit and non-credit programs. . . and completing special studies and projects for the university" (p. 6); professional service consists of "serving in some official capacity" for a professional society or organization related to some degree of the discipline and establishing consulting relationships with external agencies (p. 6); and community service includes the "remainder of the myriad of activities that faculty perform for the local and regional community" (p. 7).

Evaluation of the teaching, research, and service roles of faculty is common prior to and during the tenure decision. The role that each of these components play in post-tenure review should be considered by administration and faculty based on the philosophy or mission of the institution (Licata, 1986).

Types of Institutions

Post-tenure review policy purposes, processes, and components will vary with the type of institution. Dressel (1976) contended that every

institution should develop its own tenure policies on the basis of its own philosophy. He stated that an institution would benefit by knowing if its tenure policies are consistent with those of other institutions with which it must compete for faculty. The Carnegie Commission developed a classification of colleges and universities that categorizes institutions on the basis of philosophy or mission ("How Classifications were Determined," 1987). The typology is follows:

(a) Research Universities I offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree and give high priority to research, receiving at least \$33.5 million in federal support for research and development and award at least 50 Ph.D. degrees per year.

(b) Research Universities II offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree and give high priority to research, receiving annually between \$12.5 million and \$33.5 million in federal support for research and development and award at least 50 Ph.D. degrees per year.

(c) Doctorate-granting Universities I offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree, awarding at least 40 Ph.D. degrees in five or more disciplines per year.

(d) Doctorate-granting Universities II offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree, awarding 20 or more Ph.D. degrees in at least one discipline or 10 or more Ph.D. degrees in three or more disciplines per year.

(e) Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I offer baccalaureate programs and, with few exceptions, graduate education through the master's degree. More than half of their baccalaureate degrees are awarded in two or more occupational or professional disciplines such as engineering or business administration and enroll at least 2,500 full-time students.

(f) Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II award more than half of their baccalaureate degrees in two or more occupational or professional disciplines, such as engineering or business administration and enroll between 1,500 and 2,500 full-time students.

(g) Liberal Arts Colleges I are highly selective institutions that are primarily undergraduate and award more than half of their baccalaureate degrees in arts and sciences.

(h) Liberal Arts Colleges II are primarily undergraduate that are less selective and award more than half their degrees in liberal arts fields.

(i) Two-year colleges and institutes offer certificate or degree programs through the Associate of Arts level and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees.

(j) Professional Schools and Other Specialized Institutions offer degrees ranging from the bachelor's to the doctorate, with at least 50% awarded in a single specialized field such as theology, medicine, law, engineering, business, art, music, design, and teaching (p. A14).

The philosophy and mission of institutions differ by category. Research and doctoral-granting colleges and universities may stress scholarship as their primary focus; comprehensive colleges and universities may strive for a balance between teaching, research, and service; the community colleges may emphasize teaching in their mission statement. Whatever the mission of the institution may be, the evaluation policy must be linked to that mission (Licata, 1986).

Post-tenure review policies, when coupled with the mission of the institution, can provide or fail to provide a suitable environment for tenured faculty vitality and professional growth. Baldwin (1984) emphasized that faculty development efforts should strive to create a work environment that encourages and rewards continuing growth by faculty of all ages and

experience and be flexible enough to respond to career growth objectives at successive career stages. Smith (in Clark, 1985) noted that "the excellence of a university is the excellence of the faculty" (p. 9).

Given that many institutions have a growing number of aging, tenured faculty, the excellence of the institution is directly related to the excellence of tenured faculty. Academic personnel policies, such as post-tenure review, should be studied to determine if they promote continuing growth and development of faculty.

Statement of the Problem

As indicated by the literature review, there is a need to determine what institutions are doing in the area of tenured faculty evaluation. To date, there has been no national study of the purposes, process, and components of post-tenure review policies compared by type of institution.

This investigation will identify similarities and differences in post-tenure review policies by type of institution. Purposes, processes, and components of evaluation policies will be identified, and perceptions of chief academic administrators regarding post-tenure review will be explored.

Research Questions

The study will examine the following research questions:

1. What are the differences, if any, in the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review policies between and among selected types of institutions?

2. What are the differences, if any, in processes used in post-tenure review between and among selected types of institutions?
3. What are the differences, if any, in components of post-tenure review policies between and among selected types of institutions?
4. What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding the primary purpose of post-tenure review policies and the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review policies at selected types of institutions?
5. What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding the processes used in post-tenure review and actual processes used in review at selected types of institutions?
6. What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding components of post-tenure review policies and actual components of post-tenure review policies at selected types of institutions?
7. What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of problems associated with post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?
8. What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of benefits associated with post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions will be used:

1. Post-tenure review policy variables. The following variables, as identified by academic administrators, will be examined:
 - (a) Purpose. Administrators' response as the primary reason for post-tenure review policy. Selection will be from the following categories: information used primarily for salary, merit pay, or promotion decisions; or information used to assist in faculty growth and development.
 - (b) Process. Administrators' response for the methods or procedures used in the review process. Areas of process will include participants in the development of the policy, mandatory or voluntary nature of review, length of review cycles, participants in the review process, and inclusion or exclusion of improvement plans.
 - (c) Components. Administrators' response for the criteria used to review tenured faculty. Categories include administrator, student, peer, and self-evaluation of teaching; research, publications, creative endeavors, and professional development activities; and institutional, professional, and community service.
2. Type of institution. Administrator's response indicating public or private and Carnegie classification.

3. Chief academic administrator. Officer with primary responsibility of dealing with academic issues at an institution; e.g., vice president of academic affairs or dean/provost of academic affairs.

Significance of Study

Very little research has been conducted specifically on post-tenure review policies. Johnson (1990) expressed the need for additional examination of post-tenure review in the nation's colleges and universities. This study will contain an analysis of the purpose, processes, and components of existing policies that will be useful to administrators as they review existing policies or develop new policies addressing tenured faculty evaluation.

Institutional type and mission are important considerations in the development of post-tenure review policies (Licata, 1986). Information collected on components of post-tenure review policies stratified by type of institution would be helpful for institutions to compare their specific policy on post-tenure review with that of similar types of institutions (Licata, 1984).

No study could be located that compared components of post-tenure review policies by type of institution; however, studies have investigated policies at similar types of institutions. Separate studies have examined post-tenure review in four-year colleges and community colleges (Goodman, 1990, Johnson, 1990; Andrews and Licata, 1989; Reisman, 1986). Mortimer (1986)

reviewed four-year colleges and universities and found that systematic review of tenured faculty occurred in slightly more than half of those types of institutions. In 1989, a study was conducted by Andrews and Licata of the members of the North Central Community and Junior Colleges. Johnson (1990), Goodman (1990), and Reisman (1986) conducted case studies on post-tenure review policies at four-year colleges and universities. This study will compare similarities and differences of policies at research institutions, doctorate-granting institutions, comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, two-year community and junior colleges and institutes, and specialized and professional schools.

In 1982, the National Commission on Higher Education Issues identified post-tenure evaluation as one of the most pressing issues facing higher education (Licata, 1987). Systematic review of tenured faculty occurs in slightly more than half of the four-year colleges and universities (Mortimer, 1986). For institutions that are in the design stage of such policies, this study can provide guidance in determining essential elements for inclusion in post-tenure review policies according to institution type.

Essential to the success of any institutional policy is the examination of the benefits and problems that may result upon implementation of the policy. This study will collect data regarding administrators' perceptions of the problems and benefits that might occur with implementation of a post-tenure review policy. Findings regarding perceptions of problems and benefits will

provide individuals involved in the development of policies both the positive and negative ramifications of implementing post-tenure review. To know what others perceive as being problem areas can assist developers of policies in avoiding those problems at their institutions. Likewise, knowing perceived benefits can strengthen policy development.

Limitations of Study

Because of the nature of this research study, some limitations exist. The following limitations are noted:

The survey design of this study may result in respondent and/or instrument bias (Kerlinger, 1986).

The random sample may not produce equal numbers of cases in the cells of the factorial design (Kerlinger, 1986).

The study will examine only perceptions of chief academic administrators regarding post-tenure review policies. These perceptions may not be generalizable to other administrators and faculty.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of Chapter 2 is to present a literature review of organization and professional development, along with an examination of literature on post-tenure review policies in colleges and universities.

Theoretical Framework

Organizational theory was ignored by educational institutions for many years. Most theories in organizational development had their origins in business. Prior to 1950, the dominant organizational theory was that of scientific management, credited to Frederick Taylor. Taylor (1947) believed that a good organization was a productive one, and he conducted time-and-motion studies looking for the one best way to accomplish tasks in an organization. This view was weakened, however, after studies were made at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company between 1924 and 1932. Several social scientists interpreted those experiments showing that workers would be more productive when there was increased attention from supervisors and managers. These studies lead to theorizing that became part of the human relations movement, which, in turn, became a impetus for organizational development theory. The acceptance of organizational development was, in part, a reaction against scientific management theory (Schmuck and Runkel, 1983).

The concept of organizational development has been used by industry and government since the 1950s; however, the theory has been more recently adopted by educational institutions, with research on organizational development in schools beginning in the 1960s. A three-year project on organizational development in schools was launched at Teachers' College, Columbia University, that provided establishment of credibility and legitimacy for the use of organizational development techniques in education (Schmuck and Runkel, 1983).

Several modifications have been made in the original concept of organizational development as it has been adapted to educational environments. Fullen, Miles, and Taylor (1980) summarized the definition of organizational development (OD) in a school setting as:

... a coherent, systematically planned, sustained effort at system self-study and improvement, focusing explicitly on change in formal and informal procedures, processes, norms, or structures, and using concepts of behavioral science. The goals of OD are to improve organizational functioning and performance. OD in schools has a direct focus on educational issues. (p. 135)

Contemporary organizational development gives balanced attention to both the technical and human side of work. Organizational development honors people's feelings when they are relevant to work, as these feelings are one of many interpersonal conditions that affect the course of action people

choose. People are more likely to carry out actions when they understand the implications of a decision and when they have committed themselves publicly to fulfilling their obligations in order to help accomplish the task (Schmuck and Runkel, 1983).

Goal setting may contribute to an individual's commitment to fulfill an obligation (Latham, Erez, and Locke, 1988). Some theorists have studied the effect that individual goal-setting has on motivation (McClelland, 1961; Latham, Erez, and Locke, 1988). McClelland (1961) asserted that individuals act to maximize their chances of taking initiative and being successful (the achievement motive), of enjoying friendship (the affiliation motive), and of exercising influence over their own fate (the power motive). Locke (1968) proposed that intentions to work toward a goal are a major source of work motivation. He believed that specific goals increase performance; they act as an internal stimulus. Difficult goals, when accepted, result in higher performance than do easy goals; once an individual accepts a hard task, he or she will exert a high level of effort until it is achieved, lowered, or abandoned.

Mixed evidence has been discovered regarding the superiority of participative over assigned goals (Latham, Erez, and Locke, 1988). In some cases, superior performance was attained when individuals participated in setting goals; in others, individuals performed best when assigned goals by superiors. A major advantage of participation is that of increasing acceptance

of the goal itself as a desirable one to work toward. Resistance is greater if a goal is difficult. Participation does increase the probability that more difficult goals will be agreed to and acted upon by individuals. Goal-setting can lead to effective career development for faculty. In establishing career goals, both faculty and administrators should be aware of the stages of career development. Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) studied 106 male college faculty members from twelve liberal arts colleges in the Midwest to determine career development or evolution for professors. Five career stage subgroups were established. Stable characteristics found in all five stages included pressure from workload, the high importance of teaching, allocation of time, and a high value on scholarship. There was considerable agreement on two periods of difficulty in the faculty career: during the first one to three years of teaching and when new or added responsibilities were added. Service to college evolved rapidly in the early stages and increased slowly in later years. Early difficulty with teaching evolved into becoming comfortable with instruction; however, pleasure from teaching steadily declined.

Most dimensions studied by Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) fluctuated throughout the stages of the faculty career. Participation in professional development activities followed a U-shaped curve. Periods of reassessment were most intense during the late assistant professor and continuing full professor stages. Faculty described these experiences attributable to mid-career crises, loss of interest, lack of recognition, and dissatisfaction.

Continuing full professors reported the need to weigh alternatives between remaining primarily classroom teachers or diversifying responsibilities to maintain professional vitality. Critical events that significantly influenced careers were reported as opportunities for professional growth, such as sabbaticals, workshops, research projects, and independent study grants. A response from 91 percent of continuing full professors indicated that the opportunities for professional growth were essential. Variety, change, and a sense of progression during an academic career were viewed as necessary in maintaining vitality.

In discussing developmental theory of the faculty career process, Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) asserted that college and university administrators, as well as individual faculty, must pay attention to each phase of the academic career and provide appropriate services and opportunities to faculty. Every professor must be treated as a unique individual. Flexibility that encourages professional growth must be maintained by institutions. Kanter (1979) wrote of the negative impact of being stuck in a vocation. Lowered aspirations and occupational disengagement can be prevented if colleges and universities provide opportunities for meaningful career growth. Gould (1978) suggested that a growth ideology must be prevalent. Colleges and universities must be willing to invest resources to stimulate genuine professional development.

Developmental research helps identify strengths and weaknesses prevalent at different stages in the career of the professor. This information allows administrators to capitalize on the expertise, knowledge, and interest of professors. Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) suggested using senior, veteran professors as mentors or consultants to part-time faculty or to long-range planning, studies of attrition, and working with alumni groups. Specialized, upper level courses might be assigned to a new faculty member who has up-to-date knowledge, rather than overloading the novice with introductory courses. Funding, facilities, and release time for mid-career faculty could renew enthusiasm for research. Administrators should also recognize that faculty change in their preference for professional development activities. Younger professors enjoy seminars and workshops, and senior faculty seem to prefer growth opportunities that they can design and carry out at their own pace. Flexible leave policies, early retirement programs, temporary administrative roles, and retraining for growing teaching areas are options that could serve developmental needs of faculty.

Raufman (1991) studied models of effective faculty development programs and assessed contributions of the organizational environment to establishing innovative comprehensive faculty development programs. A shared vision by all administrators and faculty that faculty development fostered organizational development was found to be an essential characteristic of effective programs. Gibaldi (1988) asserted that faculty

development programming should be among the necessary features of any college plan for addressing the needs of its faculty and students and fulfilling its mission.

Administrators of colleges and universities have expressed concern over the issue of viability of current faculty and how to assist tenured faculty to remain current. Belker (1982) identified over twenty-five colleges and universities that had some form of professional development program. Findings of the study indicated that most programs geared toward faculty renewal operate under the traditional concepts of faculty development, where the individual faculty member decided what to do for development, and that most programs concentrated on the development of new faculty members, such as mentoring programs and orientations. A difference between the way two-year colleges and four-year institutions viewed professional reeducation was noted. There were a few colleges and universities which had expanded their understanding of faculty development to include an institutional perspective. Instances were cited where some universities had encouraged senior faculty to explore alternative fields when their teaching area was either antiquated or had progressed beyond the faculty member's knowledge level. Some institutions had released faculty so that they could study a new field, and a few provided assistance to faculty to develop materials and presentation skills.

Blackburn, Behymer, and Hall (1980) determined that faculty development programs often have little relationship to the defined needs of professors. Based on a study at Virginia Commonwealth University, Wergin, Mason, and Munson (1976) offered similar insight. They concluded that knowledge of faculty motivations, talents, and deficiencies is fundamental to an effective program of faculty development. However, Gross (1977) asserted that professional growth could be a viable solution to the problem of aging faculty. He noted that if professors can constantly renew their subject-matter competence, improve their teaching, and continue to produce significant research throughout their careers, the overall quality of the professorate will be maintained. To accomplish an exemplary program for professional development, significant intervention on a national scale must prompt the movement. Cooperation among state officials, college personnel, professional associations and union representatives must be achieved. Belker (1982) concluded that "underlying any professional growth program aimed at the older, more resistant faculty, there needs to be appropriate leadership at all levels" (p. 70).

College educators should take responsibility for their career growth and advancement by regularly assessing what faculty have achieved professionally and determining where they are and where they would like to be. Faculty who plan career development strategies are more likely to maintain steady, professional growth (Baldwin and Blackburn, 1981). Berquist

and Phillips (1975) noted that both personal and organizational development are essential to faculty development. A comprehensive approach to faculty development through development of methods of evaluation and diagnosis and exploration of new approaches to instructional improvement must be explored. Coupling faculty development with evaluation ensures that "gains made in the organizational effectiveness will be maintained" (Hammons, 1983, p. 50.).

Post-Tenure Review

As an approach to tenured faculty development, establishment of post-tenure review policies is being supported by several constituencies. State legislatures, coordinating and governing boards, accrediting agencies, administrators, faculty, students, and the general public are seeking methods to ensure vital, productive institutions of higher education (Edwards, 1994; Edgerton, 1993; Johnson, 1990; Licata, 1986; Reisman, 1986). Berquist and Phillips (1975) predicted in the early 1970s that harsh realities of decreased funding, steady-state or declining enrollment, declining faculty mobility, and demands for accountability by students, parents, and state and federal officials would make faculty development an important concept for faculty and administrators. Licata (1986) noted that evaluation of faculty performance and assessment of faculty and institutional vitality are processes critical to institutional livelihood and renewal. Periodic review of tenured faculty

performance has become an issue confronting administrators in colleges and universities today.

The History of Post-Tenure Review

The major impetus for evaluation of tenured faculty came from discussions held at the 1983 Wingspread Conference, cosponsored by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), entitled "On Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty" (American Association of University Professors, 1986). A debate over the need for such evaluation ensued. A major concern of educators was that post-tenure review was a perceived threat to tenure.

Tenure was established as a means of ensuring academic freedom and of providing sufficient economic security to make the academic profession attractive to qualified individuals. In 1915, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was founded, and a committee formulated a statement relating to academic freedom and tenure entitled "A Declaration of Principles." This statement expressed concern for academic freedom and tenure, for proper procedures, and for professional responsibility. The statement was endorsed at the second annual meeting of the AAUP December 31, 1915, through January 1, 1916. In 1925, another statement was prepared at a meeting of the American Council on Education, the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Again in 1940, following a number of conferences that began in 1934, representatives of the

Association of American Colleges and the AAUP agreed upon a Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and upon three interpretations. This 1940 statement has received subsequent endorsements from many other organizations and is the current accepted statement defining tenure (Shaw, 1971).

The principle of tenure was founded upon the premise that the common good depends upon the free search for truth; freedom in research is fundamental for advancement of truth; academic freedom is fundamental for protection of the right of the teacher to teach and of the student to learn. In order to ensure these freedoms, procedures were established to protect faculty. According to the 1940 statement, "after the expiration of a probationary period" faculty members should have "permanent or continuous tenure" and that their service should be terminated "only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies" (Shaw, 1971, p. 3). The Commission on Academic Tenure expanded the original definition of tenure, stating that faculty appointments should be "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" (AAUP/AAC, 1973, p. 256).

Since the beginning of the tenure concept, adversaries have blamed ineffective teaching, decreased faculty productivity, and general diminished

performance of faculty on the tenure process. Several researchers have concluded, however, that there is no correlation between ineffective teaching and tenure (Habecker, 1981; McKeachie; 1983; Blackburn, 1972; Eble, 1971). Others have studied the effect of tenure on faculty productivity. Orpen (1982), Walden (1979), Bayer and Dutton (1977), and Trow (1977) determined that scholarly activity did not decline after the award of tenure.

Even though research has disputed the negative effects of tenure on teaching and productivity, concerns still exist. Individuals question the inflexibilities of the existing policy of tenure (Shapiro, 1983). Over the years, proposals have been made to modify tenure, including non-tenure-track appointments, tenure quotas, extended probationary periods, and dissolution of the up-and-out rule (Licata, 1987). Calls for review of the concept of tenure, or at least for the periodic review of tenured faculty, became prevalent in the 1980s. Habecker (1981) concluded that "nowhere . . . did any of the proponents of tenure argue for the concept of tenure as lifetime employment or sinecure not subject to review or performance evaluation" (p. 60). Bevan (1980) noted, however, that "for all intents and purposes, formal evaluation ends where tenure begins" (p. 15). The National Commission on Higher Education Issues suggested that the process of post-tenure evaluation should "assure that the tenured faculty has maintained the appropriate level of competence" (1982, p. 10).

Opposing views were expressed on the value of post-tenure evaluation policies at the Wingspread conference in 1983. Shapiro (1983) declared that such reviews are "simply good personnel policy" (p. 7a), but noted that such evaluations should be removed from the question of tenure itself. One critic, Larsen, (1983) argued that such evaluations would do irreparable damage to academic freedom and that they were not consistent with academe's commitment to free inquiry. Larsen conceded, however, that if such evaluations were focused on the positive implementation of goals for faculty support and improvement, rather than simply used as a review to determine if faculty should maintain tenure, such a system could be beneficial to faculty. He used the term "post-tenure development" (p. 10a). Kears (1983) claimed that post-tenure review would have a "chilling effect" on activities and behaviors of faculty (p. 8a). He reminded participants of the wide range of existing formal and informal procedures, such as review of research grants, student evaluations, and recommendations for salary increases and promotions, that monitor the activities of tenured faculty. Following the conference, AAUP issued the following statement:

The Association believes that periodic formal institutional evaluation of each postprobationary faculty member would bring scant benefit, would incur unacceptable costs, not only in money and time but also in dampening of creativity and of collegial relationships, and would threaten academic freedom (p. 14a).

Johnson (1990) surmised that the debate about the viability of post-tenure review remains unresolved in the nineties. A "handful of higher education institutions have implemented systems of post-tenure review, but for the most part these are exceptions rather than the norm" (p. 4). Even though most colleges and universities have some form of evaluation for their faculty, many of these types of appraisals do not constitute any of the commonly held definitions of post-tenure review. The two generally accepted definitions of post-tenure review are post-tenure legalism and post-tenure development (Felicetti, 1989). Post-tenure legalism is the use of evaluation as a "prerequisite for subsequent due process pre-legal hearings . . . that are intended to determine whether a tenured faculty member should be dismissed either for cause or financial exigency" (Johnson, 1990, p. 4). Post-tenure developmentalism centers on the use of evaluation processes to "enhance faculty development and to serve as a basis for decisions about rewards" (Johnson, 1990, p. 4) In defining post-tenure review for this study, the developmentalism definition, which emphasizes the use of tenured faculty evaluation for the main purpose of ensuring faculty vitality, will apply.

Policy Variables

Several variables affect the structure of post-tenure review policies. The purpose, processes used in development and implementation, and components established for evaluation are important elements of post-tenure review policies.

Purpose

Before implementation of a post-tenure review policy, a very important decision must be made by administrators and faculty: the purpose of the review or evaluation. Evaluations are categorized in two classifications, formative and summative. The concept of using reviews as a formative evaluation rather than as a summative evaluation has been the most convincing justification for a tenured faculty evaluation system. Geis (1977) compared formative evaluation and summative evaluation, stating that formative evaluation was a mechanism to provide feedback and to guide faculty, whereas summative evaluation was aimed at making a final decision on something. Keig and Waggoner (1994) found that most scholars recognize a need for both types of evaluation; however, most recommend that the two functions be kept separate. Scholars almost unanimously agree that is not acceptable to use information collected in formative evaluation procedures in making personnel decisions. In explaining why summative and formative evaluation require different types of information, Weimer, Kerns, and Parrett (1988) reiterated the differences in purpose of the two types of evaluation. The purpose of summative evaluation is to provide comparative data for subsequent use in personnel decisions, consisting of items that describe teaching and performance in global terms. Formative evaluation, on the other hand, is used to provide data, "diagnostic and descriptive feedback, with which to improve instruction . . ." (Weiner, Kerns, Parrett, 1988, p. 286).

Academicians are "far from agreement" about the purpose of formal procedures for post-tenure review (Licata, 1986, p. 29). In a survey of 199 community and junior colleges within the North Central region, Andrews and Licata (1989) found that approximately 70 percent of respondents indicated that a formal evaluation system for tenured faculty existed on campus. A majority of administrators (59%) and faculty leaders (50%) agreed that the stated primary purpose of the evaluation was to encourage faculty development and improvement; 29 percent of administrators and 24 percent of faculty noted that the evaluations provided information to assist in making promotion, retention, dismissal and salary decisions.

Purpose was also noted in the development of a post-tenure review policy in Wisconsin. In an attempt to promote continual growth and development in faculty professional skills and to provide assurances of accountability to the public, the University of Wisconsin adopted the Tenured Faculty Review and Development Policy in May 1992 (The University of Wisconsin, 1992). The stated purpose of this policy was to assure that talents of each faculty member were used in the best interests of the students, institution, the academic discipline, and the individual faculty member.

In a 1986 study, Reisman investigated summative and formative purposes of performance evaluation of tenured faculty (PETF). The more typical approach was defined as formal or summative and was used primarily for determining salary. Tenured faculty were reviewed in the same manner as

nontenured faculty. The dean and department chair were typically involved in this type of review and results were included in personnel files. The formative, or developmental, approach was designed specifically for tenured faculty. Its intent was to provide a systematic process for feedback to improve performance and clarify career goals. Reviewers generally included senior faculty and often the department chair; the dean was not a part of the process. Results had no bearing on salary and were shared only with the review panel and the professor. Twenty-six colleges and universities were part of the study. Twenty institutions were selected because they were similar to Brandeis University (private, relatively small, research schools), and six were chosen because they had a known existent program for evaluating tenured faculty. The most common pattern found was that performance reviews were conducted in a decentralized, nonformal, unsystematic manner, which was viewed as appropriate in an organization such as a college or university that must achieve a blend between autonomy and collegiality with accountability.

In the Reisman study (1986), respondents from universities using the formative method provided more favorable responses to performance evaluation of tenured faculty (PETF) than those using the summative method. Twice as many respondents from universities using the formative approach answered "definitely yes" to the question of whether the benefits of their program outweighed the costs as did faculty from schools using the

summative approach. The summative approach was described as pressure-laden and superficial. The periodic formative method was viewed as being more in the spirit of collegiality and was not as threatening to the faculty member because neither tenure nor salary was affected. None of the respondents with PETF programs considered the program as a threat to tenure.

The Brandeis study affirmed the important finding that performance evaluation of tenured faculty (PETF) does not jeopardize tenure (Reisman, 1986). In regard to improving faculty performance, the study indicated that periodic performance reviews might give incentive and direction to professors for increasing their research and writing, but it was less clear that PETF would have any significant impact on improving teaching or service. The data also suggested that, contrary to some opinions, PETF could be a means of addressing the problem of unproductive faculty. Performance evaluations had some effect on high-performing and average faculty but was least effective in influencing low-performing faculty. Responses indicated that there was skepticism about PETF, but there was also a dissatisfaction with the status quo. In view of the costs in time and energy of implementing a review program, coupled with only moderate results expected, respondents questioned whether it would be worthwhile to pursue such a program. However, a more positive view of PETF was found in respondents who had directly experienced PETF. Where the primary objective for the review of

tenured faculty was to improve performance, the data suggested that this could be accomplished through a program that concentrates on providing professors with feedback on teaching, research, and service and left decisions about salary and unsatisfactory performance to other university procedures.

Process

Once the purpose of post-tenure review policies has been established by institutions, processes and procedures must be devised to implement the policies. Participants involved in the development of the review process, the method of selection for individuals to be reviewed, scheduled timeframes for review, and the inclusion or exclusion of improvement strategies must be discussed.

To increase faculty members' commitment to the institutional policies, it is important for campus leaders to strive for participatory policy decision making. Moore and Gardner (1992) found that faculty want and need a productive environment for quality teaching, research, and service and a stronger voice in the decision-making process. Seldin (1984) noted that the cornerstone of a faculty evaluation program is its acceptance by the faculty, which rests on their confidence in the integrity of the program. This in turn depends partly on the active participation of faculty in the development of the program. The performance review approach should recognize the autonomy

of the professor to be reviewed, specify how results would be shared, and have very little administrative involvement.

In a review of over 50 campus task forces considering evaluation of tenured faculty, Edgerton (1993) found that mandated reviews every five years for full professors was common. The objective of these reviews was to assure productivity and to permit senior faculty to remain within reach of the reward system of the college or university. Evidence to justify recommendations and decisions about faculty performance was varied. Faculty were asked to provide a more cumulative picture of activities and performance; some were asked to refer only to current performance, using no reference to previously reviewed material. Because student evaluations were considered insufficient for rating teaching, a number of campuses requested faculty to prepare teaching portfolios to present their method of teaching for review. Few campuses seemed to be rethinking criteria and methods for evaluating research and scholarly activity. In his study, Edgerton found no evidence of universities bringing an end to reliance on quantitative standards for measuring research productivity or asking questions about all scholarly performance.

When establishing post-tenure review processes in Wisconsin, the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin system provided the following guidelines to institutions within the Wisconsin system to assist with the development of post-tenure review policies: (a) provide a review of

tenured faculty at least once every five years in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and institution; (b) include effective criteria against which to measure progress and accomplishments and a description of methods for conducting the evaluations; (c) link the merit process and faculty review and development in the plan; (d) describe the procedures for remediation of problems when deficiencies are noted; (e) provide a written record of each faculty review; and (f) delineate accountability measures to ensure full implementation of the plan (Portch, Kaufman and Ross, 1993).

Different processes were instituted for post-tenure review in Hawaii. Goodman (1990) reported on the post-tenure evaluation system in place at the University of Hawaii, Manoa Campus. In 1985, the University adopted a plan to strengthen faculty development and to stimulate faculty potential and creativity. In an early meeting, it was agreed that the evaluation of tenured faculty would not become a re-tenuring process but would permit evaluation to be linked to faculty development activities. Guidelines established required that procedures must provide for safeguards for academic freedom, participation of faculty peers in the process, evaluation of every faculty member at least once every five years, and exemption of faculty who had undergone review for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit salary during the five-year period. A campus-wide committee drafted procedures that permitted the review to reflect the nature of the individual's field of work. The procedures conformed to expectations recognized by faculty peers,

represented no threat to any individual's tenure, and encouraged professional growth.

Procedural steps for post-tenure evaluation at the University of Hawaii begin with faculty members providing a routine, annual collection of information in the form of resumes, curriculum vitae, or academic profiles. The department chair and faculty member together review accomplishments within established department expectations. If the faculty member has met expectations, the dean is notified and the review is complete; if deficiencies are found, a mutually agreeable faculty development plan is developed to address deficiencies. If no agreement can be reached, the dean will assist in finalizing a plan. If this plan does not meet with agreement, the question is referred to a campus-wide faculty evaluation review committee for a decision, which is binding. These procedures were widely circulated and discussed (Goodman, 1990).

During the first complete review cycle, 1987-1988, Goodman (1990) reported that 245 full-time tenured faculty were reviewed; 81 percent of these were associate or full professors, and 75 percent were classified as instructional rather than research, specialist or library faculty. Before completion of the cycle, 37 faculty (15%) retired or indicated an intention to retire. The number of extramural research and training grant proposals rose 5.7 percent, as compared with a nearly level plateau in the preceding two years. Funding from these grants rose 17.4 percent, as compared with an

annual growth rate of less than 3 percent over the preceding eight years. Of the 206 faculty who were evaluated, 70 percent were found to have no deficiencies. Development plans were approved by the department chair for 22 percent of faculty found to have deficiencies in teaching, research, or service. The remaining 8 percent were found to have deficiencies but disagreed with development plans. From these 16 faculty, 7 agreed to work out a plan with the campus review committee, 5 took retirement, 3 were found not deficient by the campus committee, and 1 was reassigned (p. 416-417). Goodman emphasized that the success of post-tenure review depended upon applying principles of fairness and respect for dignity of faculty and having shared recognition of the value of professionalism.

Post-tenure review is required by policy and contract for faculty members in the California State University System (Galm, 1989). Anyone who had not been reviewed for five years was subject to review of teaching and scholarship by a committee of his peers and an appropriate administrator. As a part of the process, participants were permitted to choose seminar topics for discussion during review sessions. The experience of getting together senior faculty who showed concern for teaching and demonstrated accumulated skill helped provide a sense of collegiality that was not apparent before the post-tenure review process.

Throughout colleges and universities in the United States, many different processes have been established to conduct post-tenure review. The

procedures established by campuses vary widely regarding who participates in the review, how often it is conducted, and how follow-up is accomplished.

Components

In any review policy, evaluative criteria must be established. Faculty evaluation policies have most often considered teaching, research, and service as necessary components of review. Several initiatives have drawn attention to the components of teaching, research and service. Edgerton (1993) cited the Pister report at the University of California Berkeley, which called for a different balance among categories of scholarly activity, respect for broader forms of scholarship, and peer review of teaching. Boyer (1991), in redefining scholarship roles, provided a catalyst for all colleges and universities to re-examine faculty priorities. Faculty roles were defined in relation to four basic tasks, rather than the usual teaching, research, and service: advancing knowledge, synthesizing and integrating knowledge, applying knowledge, and representing knowledge through teaching. This definition of roles presented teaching and service as expressions of scholarly work rather than add-ons to scholarship (Edgerton, 1993).

Edgerton (1993) reported another study regarding the prioritization of teaching, research, and service at Syracuse University. Faculty, chairs, and deans responded that research was too heavily emphasized. In an extended project, Diamond surveyed 46 other research institutions and found that every campus favored a more equal balance between teaching and research. In

1987, McShane and Douzenis conducted a similar survey to determine faculty attitudes about research, teaching and community service as criteria for evaluating college faculty. Findings indicated that 63.5 percent of the males surveyed rated research and publication highly as criteria, compared to only 33.3 percent of the females; more of the younger faculty (71%) were interested in a university-sponsored personal development program to improve teaching style than were older faculty (47.1%); those with doctoral degrees assigned a higher level of priority to research than those with master's degrees; and most tenured faculty felt that the administration assigned a low priority to classroom teaching.

In an additional study designed to examine faculty satisfaction with the evaluation process, McCabe (1980) found that faculty from the University of Virginia displayed some dissatisfaction with their evaluation systems. Faculty reported that they preferred a broad-based evaluation system. They were especially dissatisfied with the relative lack of influence of faculty-student interaction criteria in areas such as teaching, student advising, and supervision of student research.

Given that institutions are reviewing faculty priorities in order to arrive at a balance between teaching, research, and service, Edgerton (1993) provided fourteen points that colleges and universities should examine; five dealt with changing expectations, five with faculty evaluation, and four with shifts in faculty incentives and rewards. Edgerton observed that, to set new

expectations, there must be clarification of what faculty should be working on, the status of teaching must be elevated, more inclusive definitions of teaching and research must be applied, service must be differentiated by creating a distinction between service activities based in scholarly expertise from general citizenship activities, and professional societies must redefine expectations and rewards. Hollander (1992) asserted that, in setting any standards for review of tenured faculty, care must be taken not to end up with two sets of criteria, one for tenured and one for nontenured.

Edgerton (1993) reiterated a speech made by Kennedy, president of Stanford University, during a 1990 address to faculty, in which Kennedy called for professors to become recommitted to teaching. In 1991, he announced changes in the faculty reward system, which included ending quantitative standards for measuring research productivity, extending the definition of scholarship to include creative work beyond refereed journals, using peer review to evaluate teaching effectiveness, and implementing flexible approaches for faculty careers.

Even though teaching is a common criteria used in most reviews, Riesman (1986) found that research is the function most frequently chosen as being influenced by performance reviews. Respondents in this study indicated that because of the ease in measuring research output and productivity, this area of performance was more amenable for review. Berquist and Sullivan

(1975) noted that research is often given first priority in institutions because it is a "prized enterprise" that has tangible results (p. 187).

Unlike research, teaching does not allow for easy comparisons. Hollander (1992) stated that evaluating teaching is particularly difficult. Colleges and universities often struggle on how to measure effective teaching. Criteria and methodology should be agreed upon in advance. Some departments use updated course descriptions, syllabi, textbook reviews, and active signs of advising when assessing teaching. However, the most common form of measuring teaching effectiveness is student evaluations. These evaluations are inexpensive, they involve expendable student time rather than valuable faculty time, and they are easily quantified and computerized. If used as the only means of feedback for a faculty member, however, student evaluations are a disservice. Discrete information is not typically provided by results of the questionnaires, and usefulness of the information generated is often questionable. However, student evaluations do enhance accountability and may provide a medium for student-faculty interaction (Berquist and Sullivan, 1975).

Another emerging pattern in the process of faculty evaluation is that of peer review. Edgerton (1993) noted that students can evaluate certain aspects of teaching, such as clarity of presentation, but that only other faculty are qualified to judge proper course content and methodology. Even though peer review is considered by many college and university officials as

essential, the process of performing such reviews is uncertain. Time constraints are also an issue. Berquist and Sullivan (1975) advocated peer review as an essential component of instructional evaluation. To be an effective mechanism, however, peer review must be seen as a relatively low-threatening means of improving instruction. Berquist and Sullivan suggested rotating class assignments, team teaching, and peer evaluation of both junior and senior faculty as methods for lessening the threatening aspects of peer review.

Self-evaluation has been suggested as another important component in the review of teaching. Faculty must have an opportunity to assess their own strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. Berquist and Sullivan (1975) recommended that the faculty member fill out the same evaluation instrument as his peers or students and then compare discrepancies. In the Reisman study (1986), respondents rated self-completed reports (SCR) by faculty as somewhat effective. When asked if benefits outweighed costs of self-evaluation in performance evaluation of tenured faculty (PETF), 89 percent responded yes for SCR and 92 percent for PETF. Ninety-four percent (94%) of the people in universities with PETF indicated that benefits outweighed costs, whereas only 40 percent of people in universities that did not have PETF indicated the effectiveness of evaluations. This difference was statistically significant and suggested that direct experience with PETF increases the likelihood of a positive estimate of benefits.

The benefits of post-tenure review rely on the consideration given to the weight or value of teaching, research, and service at individual colleges and universities. The values assigned to each of these components and how they are measured are determined by the mission or type of institution.

Types of Institutions

Satisfaction with results from evaluation programs varies with the stated purpose of the review, the processes established to implement the review, and the components or criteria used to evaluate faculty. In addition, the philosophy or mission of an institution can affect the nature of evaluation policies and faculty development activities.

In his study of faculty development programs from 135 research, doctorate-granting, and comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges, Rubino (1994) found that research and doctorate-granting universities considered instructional and research development programs to be of equal importance, whereas research universities offered instructional development programs most frequently. Doctorate-granting universities offered organizational development programs most frequently. Comprehensive universities considered instructional and curriculum development programs to be of equal importance but offered personal development programs most frequently, and liberal arts colleges considered academic advising and instructional development programs to be of equal importance and offered instructional development programs most frequently. Differences were found

among universities and colleges in relation to (a) the frequency of offering of instructional development programs; (b) the importance and frequency of offering of research development programs; and (c) the importance of academic advising development programs. Findings indicated that universities and colleges evaluate faculty development practices by measuring (a) participant satisfaction, (b) the effects of the practices on the organization, (c) on-the-job behaviors, and (d) participant learning.

Faculty development practices in community colleges were explored by Raufman (1991). In California community colleges, faculty were asked to rank colleges high, medium, and low in effective program practices. Quantitative methods were used to compare the frequency and effectiveness ratings given each practice, followed by semi-structured interviews at the nine colleges. Findings indicated five organizational openness factors that are conducive to creating effective, innovative faculty development programs: adaptiveness, centralization, stability, systematization, and communications. The three colleges with the highest effectiveness ratings shared the following characteristics: (a) a history of commitment to faculty development; (b) shared vision by all that faculty development fostered organizational development; (c) program administrators with sufficient time and funding; (d) program goals related to college goals; (e) organizational structure jointly satisfying both college and individual needs; and (f) effective communication, feedback, and change procedures.

There is a difference between the way two-year colleges and four-year institutions view professional development, according to Belker (1982). In research conducted at 25 colleges and universities having professional development programs, Belker concluded that faculty at two-year institutions were more concerned with improving their instructional techniques than were faculty in four-year institutions. Findings suggested that although most colleges and universities still view professional development from the traditional individual approach, some institutions are attempting to relate the goals of the individual with the goals of the institution.

To maintain vitality, the continuing professional education of professors has become an issue for administrators who are confronting a work force that "will not significantly change for the next ten to fifteen years " (Belker, 1982, p. 68). Educators are not as free to relocate as before, opportunities to recruit new faculty will decline in the 1990s, and fiscal restraints will contribute to a decline in the traditional means of sustaining intellectual vitality, such as visiting professorships, attendance at professional meetings, sabbatical leaves and funds for research (Baldwin, et al. 1981). Clark et al. (1985) cited the definition of institutional vitality as the quest to "create and sustain the organizational strategies that support the continuing investment of energy by faculty and staff both in their own career and in the realization of the institution's mission" (p. 9). In a project designed to define and assess vitality, Centra (1985) summarized responses to conditions for institutional vitality:

openness to innovation and experimentation; concern for sound undergraduate instruction, participatory campus governance, staff loyalty to institutional objectives, communication among students, faculty, and administrators, intellectual orientation and growth in students; close student-faculty relationships; faculty scholarship and research; nature and quality of faculty.

Quality faculty are essential for institutional vitality. If institutions are serious about excellence, efforts must be made to adopt a formalized professional development program that will embrace a "proactive approach" to develop human and organizational resources (Mott, p. 151). The development of faculty is necessary to foster scholarship among faculty ranks. Examination of post-tenure review programs may be beneficial to colleges and universities as a means to encourage professional development of tenured faculty.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of Chapter 3 is to state the research questions, describe the population and sample, and identify research procedures, instrumentation, and the statistical methods that were used for data analysis.

Research Questions

The study will examine the following research questions:

1. What are the differences, if any, in the stated purpose for post-tenure review policies between and among types of institutions?
2. What are the differences, if any, in processes used in post-tenure review policies between and among types of institutions?
3. What are the differences, if any, in components of post-tenure review policies between and among types of institutions?
4. What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding the primary purpose of post-tenure review policies and the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review policies at selected types of institutions?
5. What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding the processes used in post-tenure review and actual processes used in review at selected types of institutions?
6. What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding components of post-tenure review

policies and actual components of post-tenure review policies at selected types of institutions?

7. What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of problems of post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

8. What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of benefits of post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Population and Sample

Chief academic administrators of research institutions, doctoral-granting institutions, comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, two-year community and junior colleges and institutes, and specialized and professional schools constituted the population for this study. The Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education directory was used for acquiring the number of accredited, degree-granting colleges and universities. A random sample of institutions was selected by assigning each of the 3,402 institutions in the directory a number. From this listing, a sample of 20 percent of the population, or 680 colleges and universities from the 50 states and the District of Columbia was chosen. The random sample was accomplished through the use of the random feature of spreadsheet software. Kerlinger (1986) advocates use of a large sample; a large sample gives randomness an opportunity to work.

This study was designed to investigate post-tenure review at 20 percent of the accredited colleges and universities across the United States. Table 1 shows the comparison of the total population, as categorized by type of institution with the random sample selected for the study.

Table 1

Comparison of Population and Sample by Type of Institution

Type of Institution	Population		Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Research I/II	123	3.6	26	3.8
Doctoral I/II	116	3.4	34	5.0
Comprehensive I/II	518	15.2	116	17.1
Liberal arts I/II	616	18.1	134	19.7
Two-year colleges	1418	41.7	258	37.9
Specialized	611	18.0	112	16.5
Total	3402	100.0	680	100.0

Research Design

The study used a one-shot case study design to investigate academic administrators' perceptions of post-tenure review policies. The one-shot case

study occurs when a single group is studied only once. Data were collected through the use of self-reported survey questionnaire procedures. Survey research is a type of methodology used frequently in educational research (Kerlinger, 1986). Use of the survey for this study allowed collection and comparison of data from a large number of chief academic administrators throughout the United States. Administrators were assured both individual and institutional anonymity. According to Babbie (1973), assurance of anonymity will increase the likelihood of accurate responses. Kerlinger (1986) asserted that a minimum response rate of 50 percent plus one should be sought in survey research.

Instrumentation

The study used a three-part survey instrument to collect data and perceptions regarding post-tenure review (See Appendix A, Post-Tenure Review Survey). The instrument was designed based on careful review of relevant literature. Permission was received to use selected survey items from the 1989 Andrews and Licata study (see Appendix B, Permission to Use Survey Items). Specific items relevant to the research questions posed in this study were integrated, and a general framework for the survey was provided by the Andrews and Licata instrument.

Section I of the instrument collected general information regarding demographic data. The Carnegie classification of the institution, whether the institution was public or private, and the percentage of tenured faculty were

requested. If tenure was operative at institutions, participants were asked if an official policy regarding evaluation of tenured faculty existed. If an affirmative response was made to this question, Sections II and III of the instrument was completed. If a negative response was chosen, the respondent was directed to Section III of the survey. Responses to demographic questions provided data that permitted analysis of administrator perceptions by type of institution.

Section II collected information regarding the purpose, processes, and components of post-tenure review policies at institutions where official policies were in effect. This section was completed only by individuals whose institutions had a formal, written post-tenure review policy. Data collected in Section II provided information regarding the actual stated purpose, processes, and components of existing post-tenure review policies.

Section III was composed of questions eliciting opinions of all chief academic administrators of institutions where tenure was operative. At these institutions, a post-tenure review policy may be in place, may be in the development stages, may not exist but a policy does exist addressing merit pay, or may not exist in any form. The questions in this section corresponded directly with the questions in Section II, having the same response selections available. Two additional questions were added to this opinion section to solicit perceptions regarding problems and benefits of post-tenure review.

The type of alternatives provided for response to each question in the instrument varied. Some non-demographic items were designed to allow the

respondent one choice only; others were designed to permit a check of all applicable items. In several questions, an "other" category was included with a blank beside the option for clarification of the response. Questions 20 and 21 employed a Likert-type scale for responses.

Validation of the Instrument

The instrument was reviewed for content and face validity by a panel of experts. Appendix C lists the names and positions of the panel of experts used to review the questionnaire. Content validity is the representativeness or adequacy of the content of a measuring instrument (Kerlinger, 1986). The panel of experts critiqued the format of the instrument and the clarity of statements.

Several changes were made based on input by the panel of experts. In Section I, the addition of a choice involving merit pay policies was made to Question 5. In Questions 6 and 14, a third response regarding teaching effectiveness was removed and "other" was substituted. The word "rating" was changed to "level" in Questions 8 and 16. In the component questions Questions 13 and 21, "scholarship" was determined to be an ambiguous term; "professional development" was substituted. The "levels of importance" scale in Question 21 was changed to four levels rather than three to allow for more conciseness and to be consistent with scales in Questions 22 and 23. After modification of these specific items and with improvement in formatting, the

instrument was reviewed by the specific individuals on the panel and approved for distribution to the sample.

Procedure

The instrument was presented to the panel of experts the first week of October, 1995, with responses received by the second week of October. Recommendations were reviewed and the instrument was modified to improve content validity. The modified instrument was mailed to the random sample the first week of November, 1995, with requests for responses to be returned by November 25, 1995. A cover letter, the questionnaire, and a business reply envelope, which was included to increase response rate, were sent to 680 colleges and universities (See Appendix D, Cover Letter, First Mailing).

After receiving 182 responses from the first mailing (a 27% response rate), a follow-up was conducted during the first week of December, 1995. A second mailing to 498 institutions was completed, with a new cover letter, another questionnaire that had the return date changed to December 15, 1995, and a business reply envelope (See Appendix E, Cover Letter, Second Mailing). Data collection was completed by the second week of January, 1996, with 347 responses (51%) received.

Data Analysis

A number of statistical analyses were employed to examine data, using the Statistical Analysis Systems (SAS). Frequencies and percentages were

determined for each item on the survey instrument. During these analyses, verification of data was made, ensuring that directions were followed by respondents in answering specific items. Chi square analysis was performed to determine significance of differences by type of institution. Chi square should be used "to test whether or not an observed frequency of occurrence differs significantly from the frequency expected on the basis of chance" (Sprinthall, 1990, p. 307) when nominal data which are completely independent of each other have been identified.

The Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test was applied in examining three research questions. This statistical method indicates agreement or disagreement between change scores of matched-subjects designs. The change scores are independent of each other, thereby meeting the criteria for independent samples (Sprinthall, 1990).

Factorial Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the specific data generated by respondents. Factorial ANOVA must be used when the experimental design contains more than one independent variable. This technique permits discovery not only of whether independent variables taken separately have an effect, but also whether the independent variables are interacting and having a cumulative effect (Sprinthall, 1990). Post hoc analyses were performed using the Duncan Multiple Range test.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences existed in the purposes, process, and components of post-tenure review policies by type of institution. Perceptions of chief academic administrators regarding problems and benefits of post-tenure review were also investigated. This chapter is a presentation and analysis of data collected in the research. The results are organized and reported by research question.

The chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) descriptive data, (2) major findings reported by research question, and (3) a summary of the chapter.

Descriptive Data

Descriptive data were collected from respondents to provide a profile for the study. These findings will be presented in the following subsections: (1) survey response and (2) institutional demographic data.

Survey Response

The sample for this study included colleges and universities from the 50 states and the District of Columbia. A total of 680 questionnaires were mailed to the random selection. From this, 347 usable responses were received, yielding a 51 percent response rate. Six additional responses were received after compilation of statistical data. Responses were received from 47 states and the District of Columbia, with the largest frequency of

responses coming from California. Appendix F provides an analysis of responses by state.

Table 2 compares the population, sample and respondents by type of institution. The sample was comprised of 680 institutions, with 258 (37.9%) surveys mailed to two-year colleges and institutes, 134 (19.7%) to liberal arts colleges, 116 (17.1%) to comprehensive colleges and universities, 112 (16.5%) to specialized and professional schools, 34 (5.0%) to doctorate-granting institutions, and 26 (3.8%) to research colleges and universities. The largest percentage of responses was from the two-year college and institute category, with 120 (34.6%) responses being received. This response rate was slightly below the 41.7 percent share of the population. Responses from comprehensive colleges and universities ($n = 78$, 22.5%) and liberal arts colleges ($n = 74$, 21.3%) were slightly greater than their respective shares of the population, as were responses from doctorate-granting ($n = 17$, 4.9%) and research ($n = 14$, 4.0%) institutions. The response rate from specialized and professional schools ($n = 44$, 12.7%) was slightly below the 18 percent share of the population. Differences between population and response rate correlate with differences between population and the size of the random sample, in addition to prevalence of tenure by type of institution.

Table 2

Comparison of Population, Sample, and Respondents by Type of Institution

Type of institution	Population		Sample		Respondents	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Research I/II	123	3.6	26	3.8	14	4.0
Doctoral I/II	116	3.4	34	5.0	17	4.9
Comprehensive I/II	518	15.2	116	17.1	78	22.5
Liberal arts I/II	616	18.1	134	19.7	74	21.3
Two-year colleges	1418	41.7	258	37.9	120	34.6
Specialized	611	18.0	112	16.5	44	12.7
Total	3402	18.0	680	100.0	347	100.0

Institutional Demographic DataPublic or Private Designation

As illustrated in Table 3, 52.2 percent (n = 181) of responses were from public institutions and 47.8 percent (n = 166) were from private colleges and universities. The response rate from public institutions was slightly higher than the 46 percent share of the population; the response rate from private institutions was slightly lower than the 54 percent share of the population.

Table 3

Public or Private Designation

Type of institution	Frequency	Percent (%)
Public	181	52.2
Private	166	47.8
Total	347	100.0

Percentage of Tenured Faculty

Respondents were asked to report the percentage of tenured faculty at their institutions. Two hundred thirty-four of the 347 (67.4%) respondents reported that tenure was operative at their institutions. As shown in Table 4, 113 (32.6%) respondents reported that tenure was not operative. At institutions where tenure was operative, 67 respondents (19.3% of total respondents) reported that 60 - 69 percent of their faculty were tenured; 52 (15.0%) reported that 70 - 70 percent were tenured; 36 (10.4%) reported that 50 - 59 percent were tenured; 34 (9.8%) reported that 80 - 89 percent were tenured; 16 (4.6%) reported that 90 percent or more were tenured; 29 (8.4%) that 50 percent or fewer were tenured at their institutions. Appendix G provides an overall distribution of tenure by type of institution.

Table 4

Percentage of Tenured Faculty

Percentage of tenured faculty	Frequency	Percent (%)
90% or above	16	4.6
80 - 89%	34	9.8
70 - 79%	52	15.0
60 - 69%	67	19.3
50 - 59%	36	10.4
Below 50%	29	8.4
Tenure not operative	113	32.6
Total	347	100.0

Evaluations of Tenured Faculty

Respondents from institutions where tenure was operative (n = 234), were requested to provide data regarding evaluations of tenured faculty on their campuses. Two hundred four (87.2%) of these respondents indicated that some type of tenured faculty evaluation was conducted at their institutions; 30 (13.8%) reported that no type of tenured faculty evaluation was performed (see Table 5).

Table 5

Institutions Conducting Evaluations

Evaluations conducted	Frequency	Percent (%)
Yes	204	87.2
No	30	12.8
Total	234	100.0

Formal Policies

Respondents from institutions where tenure was operative ($n = 234$) were asked whether a formal, written post-tenure review policy was in place at their college or university and, if not, whether such a policy was in development or whether tenured faculty reviews were conducted for determination of merit pay. A total of 146 respondents (61.1%) indicated that a formal, written policy existed for post-tenure review, with 21 respondents (8.8%) indicating that a written policy was in the development stages. Merit pay policies existed at 37 (17.6%) institutions. Table 6 provides a breakdown of policy status.

Table 6

Status of Formal, Written Post-Tenure Review Policies

Status of policies	Frequency	Percent (%)
Policy in effect	146	61.1
Policy in development	21	8.8
Merit pay policy	37	17.6
No policy	30	12.5
Total	234	100.0

Major Findings

Major findings from data collection are presented in relation to the research questions posed in the study. The overall distribution of responses to each question is reported, followed by an analysis of responses by type of institution for each research question.

Q1: What are the differences, if any, in the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review policies between and among selected types of institutions?

As illustrated in Table 7, in the 146 institutions where post-tenure policies were in effect, 102 (69.9%) administrators reported that the stated primary purpose of the policy was to assist in faculty growth and development. Respondents from 31 institutions (21.1%) indicated that the

primary purpose of post-tenure review was to provide information used primarily in salary, retention, or promotion decisions. Of the 13 responses (8.9%) to the other category, 6 indicated that both were important and no distinction could be made as to the primary purpose.

With the exception of institutions in the research category, the majority of respondents indicated that the stated primary purpose of established post-tenure review policies was faculty growth and development. Forty-two (79.25%) respondents at two-year institutions, 27 (67.50%) at comprehensive, 20 (62.50%) at liberal arts, 7 (87.50%) at specialized, and 4 (57.24%) at doctoral institutions reported faculty growth and development as the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review. Respondents at research institutions reported an even distribution among the three categories provided.

Chi square analysis among types of institutions demonstrated no significance in the frequency of responses regarding the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review at institutions where formal, written policies are in effect. The calculated chi square value of 13.71 (10 df) was below the chi square value of 18.31 (10 df) required for significance at the .05 level.

Table 7

Stated Primary Purpose by Type of Institution

Purpose	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 40		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 146	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Salary, promotion, retention decisions	2	(33.33)	3	(42.86)	10	(25.00)	9	(28.13)	6	(11.32)	1	(12.50)	31	(21.23)
Faculty growth and development	2	(33.33)	4	(57.14)	27	(67.50)	20	(62.50)	42	(79.25)	7	(87.50)	102	(69.86)
Other	2	(33.33)	0	(0.00)	3	(27.50)	3	(9.38)	5	(9.43)	0	(0.00)	13	(8.90)

Note. Chi square value of 18.31 required for significance at .05 level with 10 df.

Chi square = 13.761. $p = 0.184$. Not significant at .05 level.

Q2: What are the differences, if any, in the processes used in post-tenure review between and among selected types of institutions?

Several elements of process for post-tenure review were investigated: individuals involved in the development of policies, the method of selection for faculty members, scheduled timeframe for reviews, and the inclusion or exclusion of improvement plans in policies. Findings regarding each of the process elements are examined separately in this section.

Individuals involved in development of policy. Respondents from the 146 institutions that had post-tenure review policies in effect were asked to report all groups of individuals that were involved in the development of post-tenure review policies (see Table 8). The most common response was faculty, with 135 respondents (92.5%) reporting faculty participation in the development of the policy. Respondents at 129 (88.40%) reported involvement of academic administrators. Sixty-two (42.5%) respondents reported involvement of governing boards, 16 (11.00%) reported involvement of students, and 4 (2.7%) reported involvement of legislators. Eleven (7.50%) responses were reported in the other category, 6 of which specified union representatives.

In examining responses by type of institution, a majority of the respondents at each institutional type reported that academic administrators and faculty were involved in the development of post-tenure review policies. Involvement of academic administrators was reported at all specialized

schools (n = 8), 48 (90.57%) two-year, 34 (85.00%) comprehensive, 28 (87.57%) liberal arts, 6 (85.71%) doctoral, and 5 (83.33%) research institutions. Involvement of faculty was reported at all liberal arts (n = 32), specialized (n = 8), and doctoral (n = 7) institutions and at 47 (88.68%) two-year, 36 (90.00%) comprehensive, and 5 (83.33%) research institutions. Involvement of governing boards in the development of post-tenure review policies was reported by respondents at 3 research (50.00%), 19 liberal arts (35.85%), and 4 specialized (50.00%) schools. Respondents at each institutional type reported that legislators and students were not generally involved in the development of post-tenure review policies. Involvement of legislators was reported at 2 (5.00%) comprehensive and 2 (3.77%) two-year institutions. Involvement of students was reported at 8 two-year (15.09%), 3 (7.50%) comprehensive, and 2 (28.57%) doctoral institutions. Only one respondent each at research, liberal arts, and specialized institutions reported involvement of students.

Chi square analysis indicated no significance in the frequency of responses. Table 8 reports the calculated chi square value for each group of individuals involved in the development of post-tenure review policies. Each chi square value was below the chi square value of 11.07 (5 df) required for significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 8

Involvement of Individuals in Development of Policy by Type of Institution

Individuals	Response	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 40		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 146		Chi square value
		n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	
Administrators	Yes	5	(83.33)	6	(85.71)	34	(85.00)	28	(87.50)	48	(90.57)	8	(100.00)	129	(88.36)	1.961
	No	1	(16.67)	1	(14.29)	6	(15.00)	4	(12.50)	5	(9.43)	0	(0.00)	17	(11.64)	
Faculty	Yes	5	(83.33)	7	(100.00)	36	(90.00)	32	(100.00)	47	(88.68)	8	(100.00)	135	(92.47)	5.988
	No	1	(16.67)	0	(0.00)	4	(10.00)	0	(0.00)	6	(11.32)	0	(0.00)	11	(7.53)	
Boards	Yes	3	(50.00)	2	(28.57)	18	(45.00)	16	(50.00)	19	(35.85)	4	(50.00)	62	(42.47)	2.677
	No	3	(50.00)	5	(71.43)	22	(55.00)	16	(50.00)	34	(64.15)	4	(50.00)	84	(57.53)	
Legislators	Yes	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(5.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(3.77)	0	(0.00)	4	(2.74)	2.472
	No	6	(100.00)	7	(100.00)	38	(95.00)	32	(100.00)	51	(96.23)	8	(100.00)	142	(97.26)	
Students	Yes	1	(16.67)	2	(28.57)	3	(7.50)	1	(3.13)	8	(15.09)	1	(12.50)	16	(10.96)	5.877
	No	5	(83.33)	5	(71.43)	37	(92.50)	31	(96.88)	45	(84.91)	7	(87.50)	7	(87.50)	
Other	Yes	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	5	(12.50)	2	(6.25)	4	(7.55)	0	(0.00)	11	(7.53)	3.203
	No	6	(100.00)	7	(100.00)	35	(87.50)	30	(93.75)	49	(92.45)	8	(100.00)	135	(92.47)	

Note. Respondents selected all applicable categories.

Chi square value of 11.07 required for significance of .05 level with 5 df. Not significant at .05 level.

Method of selection. Chief academic administrators at the 146 institutions where post-tenure review policies were in effect indicated what method of selection was used to determine the tenured faculty members to be evaluated. As shown in Table 9, the most frequent response was that the review was mandatory at periodic intervals. Respondents at 142 (97.26%) of the 146 institutions indicated use of mandatory review. Only 7 (4.79%) respondents indicated that faculty were selected for review only if performance fell below an acceptable level. Post-tenure review was not a voluntary process at any institution.

In examining selection processes by institutional type, respondents reported that mandatory post-tenure review occurred at 100 percent of research (n = 6), liberal arts (n = 32), two-year (n = 53), and specialized (n = 8) schools. Ninety-five percent (n = 38) of the respondents at comprehensive institutions reported mandatory review selection, and 71.43 percent (n = 5) of respondents at doctoral institutions (n = 5, 71.43%) reported use of mandatory reviews at periodic intervals. Selection of tenured faculty for review if performance fell below an acceptable level was reported at only 4 (7.55%) two-year, 2 (28.57%) doctoral, and 1 (2.50%) comprehensive institution.

Chi square analyses were performed for three methods of selection. Analysis was not performed in the voluntary category due to nonresponse. The calculated chi square value of 21.085 (5 df) was above the chi square value of 15.09 (5 df) required for significance at the .01 level for the

mandatory review method of selection. The calculated chi square value of 12.327 (5 df) was above the chi square value of 11.07 (5 df) required for significance at the .05 level for the method of selection dependent upon performance. The chi square value for other did not meet the value required for significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 9

Method of Selection by Type of Institution

Method of Selection	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 40		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 146		Chi square value
	Response	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Mandatory at periodic intervals	Yes	6 (100.00)	5 (71.43)	38 (95.00)	32 (100.00)	53 (100.00)	8 (100.00)	142 (97.26)	21.085**						
	No	0 (0.00)	2 (28.57)	2 (5.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (2.74)							
Dependent upon performance	Yes	0 (0.00)	2 (28.57)	1 (2.50)	0 (0.00)	4 (7.55)	0 (0.00)	7 (4.79)	12.327*						
	No	6 (100.00)	5 (71.43)	39 (97.50)	32 (100.00)	49 (92.45)	8 (100.00)	139 (95.21)							
Voluntary	Yes	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	--						
	No	6 (100.00)	7 (100.00)	40 (100.00)	32 (100.00)	53 (100.00)	8 (100.00)	146 (100.00)							
Other	Yes	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.50)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.68)							
	No	6 (100.00)	7 (100.00)	39 (97.50)	32 (100.00)	53 (100.00)	8 (100.00)	145 (99.32)	2.668						

Note. Respondents selected all applicable categories.

Chi square value of 11.07 required for significance at .05 level (5 df). Chi square value of 15.09 required for significance at the .01 level (5 df).

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

Timeframe. Data summarizing the frequency of responses regarding the timeframes used in post-tenure review are provided in Table 10. Reviews scheduled every year were the most common timeframes established for post-tenure review, with 47 administrators (32.2%) reporting the use of annual reviews. Individuals at 45 institutions (30.8%) reported that reviews were scheduled on a 4- or 5-year cycle. The third most frequent response was a 2- or 3-year cycle, with 43 (29.5%) respondents indicating this timeframe. No one reported that reviews were voluntarily established by faculty; however, two administrators (1.4%) reported that reviews were dependent upon performance levels. Respondents recorded 9 responses (6.2%) in the other category.

In terms of variations of timeframes used by institutional type, the 4- or 5-year timeframe was reported as the most common timeframe used at comprehensive (n = 17, 53.13%) and liberal arts (n = 17, 53.13%) schools. Annual reviews were reported as the most common timeframe used at research (n = 4, 66.67%), doctoral (n = 3, 42.86%), two-year (n = 17, 32.08%) and specialized (n = 4, 50.00%) institutions.

Chi square analysis performed on timeframes used for post-tenure review indicated that frequencies reported differed significantly from those due to chance. The calculated chi square value of 81.773 (20 df) was well above the chi square value of 37.57 (20 df) required for significance at the .01 level.

Table 10

Timeframe by Type of Institution

Timeframe	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 40		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 146	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
Every year	4	(66.67)	3	(42.86)	12	(30.00)	7	(21.88)	17	(32.08)	4	(50.00)	47	(32.19)
2- or 3-year cycle	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	8	(20.00)	5	(15.63)	29	(54.72)	1	(12.50)	43	(29.45)
4- or 5-year cycle	2	(33.33)	1	(14.29)	17	(42.50)	17	(53.13)	5	(9.43)	3	(37.50)	45	(30.82)
Dependent on level	0	(0.00)	2	(28.57)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(1.37)
Voluntary	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)
Other	0	0.00	1	14.29	3	7.50	3	9.38	2	3.77	0	0.00	9	6.16

Note. Chi square value of 37.57 required for significance at the .01 level. Chi square = 81.773 with 20 df.

**p < .01.

Improvement Plans. Table 11 reports the distribution of responses regarding inclusion or exclusion of improvement plans at the conclusion of post-tenure review. Out of the 146 responses from individuals at institutions with post-tenure review policies, 109 (74.66%) respondents indicated that improvement plans were established for tenured faculty at the conclusion of the post-tenure review process. Administrators from 37 (25.34%) colleges and universities reported that no official improvement plans were established at their institutions.

In examining the inclusion or exclusion of improvement plans by type of institution, all respondents from research colleges and universities reported that improvement plans were included at the conclusion of the post-tenure review process. A majority of respondents at doctoral ($n = 6$, 85.71%), liberal arts ($n = 26$, 81.25%), two-year ($n = 43$, 81.13%), specialized ($n = 5$, 62.50%), and comprehensive ($n = 23$, 57.50%) institutions indicated use of improvement plans. Chi square analysis conducted on use of improvement plans indicated that frequencies reported differed significantly from those due to chance. The calculated chi square value of 11.246 (5 df) is slightly above the chi square value of 11.07 (5 df) required for significance at the .05 level.

Table 11

Use of Improvement Plans by Type of Institution

Improvement Plans	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 40		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 146	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
Yes	6	(100.00)	6	(85.71)	23	(57.50)	26	(81.25)	43	(81.13)	5	(62.50)	109	(74.66)
No	0	(0.00)	1	(14.29)	17	(42.50)	6	(18.75)	10	(18.87)	3	(37.50)	37	(25.34)

Note. Chi square value of 11.07 required for significance at .05 level with 5 df. Chi square = 11.247 with 5 df.

*p < .05.

Individuals involved in development of improvement plans. From the 109 institutions that used improvement plans at the conclusion of the post-tenure review process, the majority of respondents indicated that the faculty member, chair of the department, and dean were involved in development of plans (see Table 12). Respondents at 91 (83.49%) institutions reported involvement of faculty members in the development of improvement plans. Involvement of department chairs was reported at 73 (66.97%) institutions. Respondents at 70 (64.22%) institutions reported involvement of deans in development of improvement plans. Involvement of peers in the development of improvement plans for tenured faculty was reported by only 30 (27.52%) respondents.

When examining involvement of individuals in development of improvement plans by type of institutions, more than 75 percent of respondents at each type of institution reported involvement of faculty members. Involvement of department chairs was reported less often at two-year institutions ($n = 25$, 58.14%) than at other types of institutions. Involvement of deans was reported at 50 percent of research and doctoral institutions, while 60 percent or more of the respondents at comprehensive, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized institutions reported involvement of deans. Peer involvement was reported at 39.13 percent ($n = 9$) of comprehensive colleges and at 38.46 percent ($n = 10$) of liberal arts colleges, with less peer involvement indicated at the other types of institutions.

Chi square analyses were performed on each group of individuals to determine if significant differences existed among types of institutions. Table 12 shows calculated chi square values for all groups. All values were below the chi square value of 11.07 (5 df) required for significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 12

Involvement of Individuals in Improvement Plan Development by Type of Institution

Individuals	Response	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 6		Comprehensive n = 23		Liberal arts n = 26		Two-year n = 43		Specialized n = 5		Total n = 109		Chi square value
		n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	
Faculty member	Yes	6	(100.00)	5	(83.33)	20	(88.35)	20	(76.92)	36	(83.72)	4	(80.00)	91	(83.49)	2.246
	No	0	(0.00)	1	(16.67)	3	(13.04)	6	(23.08)	7	(16.28)	1	(20.00)	18	(16.51)	
Department chair	Yes	6	(100.00)	4	(66.67)	18	(78.26)	16	(61.54)	25	(58.14)	4	(80.00)	73	(66.97)	6.532
	No	0	(0.00)	2	(33.33)	5	(21.74)	10	(38.46)	18	(41.86)	1	(20.00)	35	(33.03)	
Peers	Yes	1	(16.67)	1	(16.67)	9	(39.13)	10	(38.46)	9	(20.93)	0	(0.00)	30	(27.52)	6.658
	No	5	(83.33)	5	(83.33)	14	(60.87)	16	(61.54)	34	(79.07)	5	(100.00)	79	(72.48)	
Dean	Yes	3	(50.00)	3	(50.00)	16	(69.57)	19	(73.08)	26	(60.47)	3	(60.00)	70	(64.22)	2.532
	No	3	(50.00)	3	(50.00)	7	(30.43)	7	(26.92)	17	(39.53)	2	(40.00)	39	(35.78)	
Other	Yes	0	(0.00)	2	(33.33)	3	(13.04)	3	(11.54)	5	(11.63)	0	(0.00)	13	(11.93)	4.142
	No	6	(100.00)	4	(67.77)	20	(86.96)	23	(88.46)	38	(88.37)	5	(100.00)	96	(88.07)	

Note. Respondents selected all applicable categories.

Chi square value of 11.07 required for significance at .05 level with 5 df. Chi square values not significant.

Follow-up of improvement plan. Follow-up to evaluate progress toward meeting goals of improvement plans was reported as a common element of process in post-tenure review policies (see Table 13). From respondents at the 109 institutions where improvement plans were elements of the post-tenure review process, 86 (78.90%) respondents indicated that follow-up was conducted to evaluate progress toward meeting goals.

In examining the inclusion or exclusion of follow-up by type of institution, data indicated that all respondents at research institutions (n = 6) and a majority of respondents at doctoral (n = 4, 57.14%), comprehensive (n = 20, 90.91%), liberal arts (n = 19, 73.08%) and two-year (n = 35, 81.40%) institutions included follow-up as an element of the post-tenure review process. Fewer respondents from specialized (n = 2, 40.00%) institutions included follow-up as an element of the post-tenure review process.

Chi square analysis conducted on use of follow-up indicated that reported frequencies were not significantly different than those that occur by chance. The calculated chi square value of 10.736 (5 df) was less than the chi square value of 11.07 (5 df) required for significance at the .05 level.

Table 13

Use of Follow-up for Improvement Plans by Type of Institution

	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 22		Liberal arts n = 26		Two-year n = 43		Specialized n = 5		Total n = 109	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
Yes	6	(100.00)	4	(57.14)	20	(90.91)	19	(73.08)	35	(81.40)	2	(40.00)	86	(78.90)
No	0	(0.00)	3	(42.86)	2	(9.09)	7	(26.92)	8	(18.60)	3	(60.00)	23	(21.10)

Note. Chi square value of 11.07 required for significance at .05 level with 5 df. Chi square = 10.736 with 5 df. Not significant at .05 level.

Q3: What are the differences, if any, in the components used in post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Table 14 provides data regarding components of post-tenure review. To investigate the components used to evaluate teaching during the post-tenure review process, respondents reported the types of evaluations stipulated in policies at their respective institutions. Individuals indicated whether or not administrator evaluations, student evaluations, classroom observations by peers, peer review committees, or self-evaluations were elements of the post-tenure review process. To determine components of post-tenure review policies used to evaluate scholarship, respondents reported if research activities, publications, creative endeavors, and professional development activities were elements of tenured faculty evaluation. To investigate service components, respondents reported on the use of institutional service, professional service, and community service in post-tenure review policies.

In the overall distribution of responses regarding the type of evaluations included in post-tenure review policies, student evaluations received the most frequent number of responses. One hundred thirty-two (91.03%) of the 145 respondents at institutions that have post-tenure review policies in effect reported use of student evaluations as a component of policies. Self-evaluations were reported at 119 institutions (82.07%), and administrator evaluations were reported as a component at 109 (75.17%) institutions. Less

consistency was reported in use of classroom observation by peers; only 55.86 percent (n = 81) of respondents indicated use of classroom observations. Use of peer review committees was reported at 46.90 percent (n = 68) of the institutions as a component of post-tenure review.

When examining scholarship components of tenured faculty evaluation, professional development was reported as a component of post-tenure review more frequently than research activities, publications, or creative endeavors. Respondents at 113 (77.93%) institutions reported use of professional development activities. Creative endeavors were reported as a component to evaluate scholarship at 86 (59.31%) institutions, research activities were reported at 84 (57.93%) institutions, and publications were reported at 83 (57.24%) institutions.

In investigating service components of post-tenure review policies, institutional service activities and professional service activities were more frequently reported as components than community service. Respondents at 113 (77.93%) institutions indicated use of institutional service and respondents at 104 (71.72%) institutions reported use of professional service as components of post-tenure review. Community service was reported as a component of post-tenure review at 97 (66.90%) institutions.

In analyzing components of post-tenure review by institutional type, more than 75 percent of respondents at each type of institution reported student evaluations and self-evaluations as components used to evaluate

teaching. Administrator evaluations were reported as components less often at liberal arts (n = 21, 65.63%) and specialized schools (n = 4, 50.00%) than at other types of institutions. Classroom observation by peers was reported as a component in slightly more than half of the comprehensive (n = 24, 61.54%), liberal arts (n = 18, 56.25%), and two-year (n = 29, 54.72%) institutions. Use of peer review committees was reported more often at doctoral and research institutions than at other types of institutions.

In examining variations of scholarship components by institutional type, respondents from research, doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, and specialized institutions reported use of professional development activities as a component at more than 80 percent of their institutions. Research activities were used more frequently at research (n = 6, 100.00%), doctoral (n = 7, 100.00%), and comprehensive (n = 37, 94.87%) institutions than at other types. Publications were reported as components more often at research (n = 6, 100.00%), doctoral (n = 7, 100.00%), comprehensive (n = 35, 89.74%), liberal arts (n = 21, 65.63%), and specialized (n = 7, 87.50%) institutions than at two-year institutions (n = 7, 13.21%). Use of creative endeavors was also less common at two-year institutions (n = 15, 28.30%) than at other types of institutions as a component in post-tenure review.

When investigating service components by type of institution, respondents at two-year colleges reported less use of institutional service, professional service, and community service as components of post-tenure

review than other types of institutions. With the exception of two-year institutions, more than 75 percent of institutions in each category reported use of institutional service and professional service as components of post-tenure review. Use of community service as a component of post-tenure review was more common at research ($n = 6, 100.00\%$) and comprehensive ($n = 33, 84.62\%$) colleges and universities than at other types of institutions.

Chi square analyses were performed on each component of post-tenure review policies. The calculated chi square values of all five types of evaluations used as components for evaluation of teaching were below the chi square value of 11.07 (5 df) required for significance at the .05 level. The calculated chi square values of all scholarship components were greater than the chi square value of 15.09 (5 df) required for significance at the .01 level. Chi square values for research, publications, and creative endeavor components were higher than those for professional service. The calculated chi square values of all service components were also greater than the chi square value of 15.09 (5 df) required for significance. Table 14 provides specific chi square values for each component of post-tenure review.

TABLE 14

Components of Post-Tenure Review Policies

Components	Response	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 39		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 145		Chi square value
		n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	
<u>Teaching components</u>																
Administrator evaluations	Yes	5	(83.33)	5	(71.43)	29	(74.36)	21	(65.63)	45	(84.91)	4	(50.00)	109	(75.17)	7.250
	No	1	(16.67)	2	(28.57)	10	(25.64)	11	(34.38)	8	(15.09)	4	(50.00)	36	(24.83)	
Student evaluations	Yes	6	(100.00)	6	(85.71)	36	(92.31)	31	(96.88)	45	(84.91)	8	(100.00)	132	(91.03)	5.476
	No	0	(0.00)	1	(14.29)	3	(7.69)	1	(3.13)	8	(15.09)	0	(0.00)	13	(8.97)	
Classroom observations	Yes	3	(50.00)	3	(42.86)	24	(61.54)	18	(56.25)	29	(54.72)	4	(50.00)	81	(55.86)	1.215
	No	3	(50.00)	4	(57.14)	15	(38.46)	14	(43.75)	24	(45.28)	4	(50.00)	64	(44.14)	
Peer review committees	Yes	4	(66.67)	5	(71.43)	21	(53.85)	17	(53.13)	19	(35.85)	2	(25.00)	68	(46.90)	8.026
	No	2	(33.33)	2	(28.57)	18	(46.15)	15	(46.88)	34	(64.15)	6	(75.00)	77	(53.10)	
Self-evaluations	Yes	5	(83.33)	7	(100.00)	32	(82.05)	26	(81.25)	42	(79.25)	7	(87.50)	119	(82.07)	1.998
	No	1	(16.67)	0	(0.00)	7	(17.95)	6	(18.75)	11	(20.75)	1	(12.50)	26	(17.93)	
<u>Scholarship Components</u>																
Research activities	Yes	6	(100.00)	7	(100.00)	37	(94.87)	22	(68.75)	6	(11.32)	6	(75.00)	84	(57.93)	81.017**
	No	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(5.13)	10	(31.25)	47	(88.68)	2	(25.00)	61	(42.07)	
Publications	Yes	6	(100.00)	7	(100.00)	35	(89.74)	21	(65.63)	7	(13.21)	7	(87.50)	83	(57.24)	72.442**
	No	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	4	(10.25)	11	(34.38)	46	(86.79)	1	(12.50)	62	(42.76)	
Creative endeavors	Yes	6	(100.00)	7	(100.00)	33	(84.62)	21	(65.63)	15	(28.30)	4	(50.00)	86	(59.31)	41.199**
	No	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	6	(15.38)	11	(34.38)	38	(71.70)	4	(50.00)	59	(40.69)	

(Table Continued)

Components	Response	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 39		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 145		Chi square value
		n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	
Professional development activities	Yes	5	(83.33)	6	(85.71)	34	(87.18)	29	(90.63)	32	(60.38)	7	(87.50)	113	(77.93)	15.208**
	No	1	(16.67)	1	(14.29)	5	(12.82)	3	(9.38)	21	(39.62)	1	(12.50)	32	(22.07)	
<u>Service Components</u>	Yes	6	(100.00)	6	(85.71)	35	(89.74)	29	(90.63)	30	(56.60)	7	(87.50)	113	(77.93)	22.551**
	No	0	(0.00)	1	(14.29)	4	(10.25)	3	(9.38)	23	(43.40)	1	(12.50)	32	(22.07)	
Institutional service	Yes	6	(100.00)	6	(85.71)	33	(84.62)	28	(87.50)	25	(47.17)	6	(75.00)	104	(71.72)	25.962**
	No	0	(0.00)	1	(14.29)	6	(15.38)	4	(12.50)	28	(52.83)	2	(25.00)	41	(28.28)	
Professional service	Yes	6	(100.00)	5	(71.43)	33	(84.62)	25	(78.13)	23	(43.40)	5	(62.50)	97	(66.90)	23.672**
	No	0	(0.00)	2	(28.57)	6	(15.38)	7	(21.88)	30	(56.50)	3	(37.50)	46	(33.10)	
Community service	Yes	1	(16.67)	1	(14.29)	6	(15.38)	2	(6.25)	2	(3.77)	1	(12.50)	13	(8.97)	4.810
	No	5	(83.33)	6	(85.71)	33	(84.62)	30	(93.75)	51	(96.23)	7	(87.50)	132	(91.03)	

Note. Respondents selected all applicable categories.

Chi square value of 11.07 (5 df) required for significance at .05 level. Chi square value of 15.09 (5 df) required for significance at .01 level.

**p = .01.

Q4: What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding the primary purpose of post-tenure review policies and the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review policies at selected types of institutions?

Table 15 provides data that compare the differences between the actual stated primary purpose of post-tenure review and the desired purpose of post-tenure review as perceived by chief academic administrators. Only administrators at the 146 institutions where post-tenure review policies were in effect reported this data. Faculty growth and development was reported as the stated primary purpose at 69.86 percent (n = 102) of the 146 institutions; 78.10 percent (n = 114) of the administrators reported that faculty growth and development should be the primary purpose of post-tenure review. At 31 institutions (21.23%), respondents reported that the stated primary purpose for post-tenure review was to provide information for salary, retention, or promotion decisions. Nineteen (13%) administrators responded that the primary purpose of post-tenure review should be to provide information for salary, retention, or promotion decisions.

When examining variations in differences between the actual and desired purposes of post-tenure review by institutional type, faculty growth and development was reported as the desired purpose by a majority of administrators at all six types of institutions. Respondents at 44 (83.02%) two-year, 30 (75.00%) comprehensive, 24 (75.00%) liberal arts, 7 (87.50%)

specialized, 5 (71.43%) doctoral, and 4 (66.67%) research institutions reported faculty growth and development as the desired purpose of post-tenure review. Respondents at 2 (28.57%) doctoral, 7 (17.50%) comprehensive, 6 (18.75%) liberal arts, 3 (5.66%) two-year, and 1 (12.50%) specialized institution reported use of information acquired through post-tenure review for salary, promotion, and retention purposes as the desired primary purpose for post-tenure review.

The Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test for chi square analysis was performed on the dependent samples to determine differences in change scores between actual and desired purpose of post-tenure review. The calculated chi square value of 27.190 (2 df) was greater than the chi square value of 6.64 (2 df) required for significance at the .01 level.

Table 15

Actual and Desired Purpose by Type of Institution

Purpose	Response		Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 40		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 146	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
Salary, promotion, retention decisions	Actual	2 (33.33)	3 (42.86)	10 (25.00)	9 (28.13)	6 (11.32)	1 (12.50)	31 (21.23)								
	Desired	0 (0.00)	2 (28.57)	7 (17.50)	6 (18.75)	3 (5.56)	1 (12.50)	19 (13.00)								
Faculty growth and development	Actual	2 (33.33)	4 (57.14)	27 (67.50)	20 (62.50)	42 (79.25)	7 (87.50)	102 (69.86)								
	Desired	4 (66.67)	5 (71.43)	30 (75.00)	24 (75.00)	44 (83.02)	7 (87.50)	114 (78.10)								
Other	Actual	2 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	3 (27.50)	3 (9.38)	5 (9.43)	0 (0.00)	13 (8.90)								
	Desired	2 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	3 (7.50)	2 (6.25)	6 (11.32)	0 (0.00)	13 (8.90)								

Note. Chi square value of 6.64 required for significance at .01 level with 1 df. Chi square value = 27.190

**p < .01

Q5: What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding the processes used in post-tenure review and actual processes used in review at selected types of institutions?

In Table 16, data regarding actual and desired processes of post-tenure review policies are provided. Only administrators at the 146 institutions that reported post-tenure review policies in effect provided data for this part of the study. Several elements of process were investigated: individuals involved in the development of policies, the method of selection for faculty members, scheduled timeframe for reviews, the inclusion or exclusion of improvement plans in policies, individuals involved in development of improvement plans, and use of follow-up. Findings regarding each process are examined separately in this section.

Individuals involved in development. Administrators were asked to report all groups of individuals that were involved and that should be involved in the development of post-tenure review policies. Faculty received the greatest number of responses. One hundred thirty-five (92.50%) respondents reported that faculty participated in development of policies and 143 (97.28%) indicated that they should be involved in development. The second most common response was academic administrators. Respondents at 129 (88.40%) institutions reported involvement of administrators, and even more indicated that administrators should be involved in the process (n = 138, 94.52%). Involvement of governing boards was reported with the third highest

frequency. Respondents at 62 (42.5%) institutions reported actual use of boards in development of policies; however, fewer (n = 46, 31.51%) indicated a desire to involve governing boards. The greatest variation between actual and desired involvement was reported in the student category. Respondents at only 16 institutions (10.96%) indicated involvement of students; however, 53 (36.30%) indicated that students should be involved in the development of policies. Administrators at 4 (2.74%) institutions reported actual involvement of legislators, and even fewer respondents (n = 2, 1.37%) indicated a desire for involvement of legislators in the development of post-tenure review policies.

In examining variations of actual and desired involvement of individuals in the development of policies by institutional type, very few differences were reported at research, doctoral, liberal arts and specialized colleges and universities (see Table 15). The greatest difference in actual and desired involvement was reported at comprehensive and two-year colleges in the student category. Three (7.50%) respondents at comprehensive colleges and universities indicated that students were involved in the development, and 20 (50.00%) reported that they should be involved. At two-year institutions, 8 administrators (15.09%) indicated actual involvement of students, while 23 (43.40%) reported that students should be involved in the development of post-tenure review policies.

Because dependent samples were used, the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test for chi square analysis was conducted to determine differences in change scores between actual and desired involvement of individuals in development of post-tenure review policies. As shown in Table 16, the calculated chi square values of all groups were greater than the chi square value of 6.64 (1 df) required for significance at the .01 level. Analyses indicated that the difference was greatest in the governing board category.

TABLE 16

Actual and Desired Involvement of Individuals in Development of Policy by Type of Institution

Individuals	Response	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 40		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 146		Chi square value
		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)			
Administrators	Actual	5 (83.33)	6 (85.71)	34 (85.00)	28 (87.50)	48 (90.57)	8 (100.00)	129 (88.36)	29.710**							
	Desired	6 (100.00)	6 (85.71)	37 (92.50)	31 (96.88)	50 (94.34)	8 (100.00)	138 (94.52)								
Faculty	Actual	5 (83.33)	7 (100.00)	36 (90.00)	32 (100.00)	47 (88.68)	8 (100.00)	135 (92.47)	9.762**							
	Desired	6 (100.00)	7 (100.00)	39 (97.50)	32 (100.00)	51 (96.23)	8 (100.00)	143 (97.28)								
Boards	Actual	3 (50.00)	2 (28.57)	18 (45.00)	16 (50.00)	19 (35.85)	4 (50.00)	62 (42.47)	54.307**							
	Desired	0 (0.00)	2 (28.57)	13 (32.50)	11 (34.38)	16 (30.19)	4 (50.00)	46 (31.51)								
Legislators	Actual	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (5.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (3.77)	0 (0.00)	4 (2.74)	8.751**							
	Desired	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (5.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (1.37)								
Students	Actual	1 (16.67)	2 (28.57)	3 (7.50)	1 (3.13)	8 (15.09)	1 (12.50)	16 (10.96)	29.050**							
	Desired	2 (33.33)	2 (28.57)	20 (50.00)	4 (12.50)	23 (43.40)	2 (25.00)	53 (36.30)								
Other	Actual	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	5 (12.50)	2 (6.25)	4 (7.55)	0 (0.00)	11 (7.53)	0.140							
	Desired	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.50)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.01)								

Note. Respondents selected all applicable categories.

Chi square value of 3.84 (1 df) required for significance at .05 level. Chi square value of 6.64 (1 df) is required for significance at .01 level.

**p < .01.

Methods of selection. The distribution of responses regarding actual and desired methods of selection of tenured faculty for participation in the review process is illustrated in Table 17. Respondents at 142 institutions (97.26%) indicated mandatory review of tenured faculty occurred at periodic intervals and 143 (97.95%) reported desired use of mandatory selection. Only 7 (4.79%) respondents reported selection of faculty for review if performance fell below an acceptable level, and 11 (7.53%) indicated desired use of this method of selection. No respondents reported actual use of voluntary reviews, and no respondents reported that voluntary reviews should be used as a method of selection of tenured faculty for participation in post-tenure review.

When examining actual and desired methods of selection by institutional type, mandatory review was reported in use at 100 percent of research, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized schools; and 100 percent of respondents at research, doctoral, liberal arts, and specialized institutions desired use of the mandatory method of selection. Thirty-eight (95.00%) administrators at comprehensive institutions reported use of mandatory selection methods, and 39 (97.50%) reported a desire for use of mandatory selection. Selection of tenured faculty for participation in post-tenure review when performance fell below an acceptable level was reported used at 4 (7.55%) two-year institutions, 2 (28.57%) doctoral institutions, and 1 (2.50%) comprehensive institution. Desired use of this method was reported by 5

respondents at two-year institutions and 2 respondents each at doctoral, comprehensive, and specialized institutions.

Chi square analyses using the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test for dependent samples were performed on the mandatory method of selection and the method of selection that was dependent upon performance. The analyses were conducted to determine differences in change scores between actual and desired methods of selection. The calculated chi square value of mandatory reviews was 1.754 1 (df), which was below the chi square value of 3.84 required for significance at the .05 level. The calculated chi square value of the method of selection dependent upon performance was 12.692, which was well above the 6.65 chi square value required for significance at the .01 level (see Table 17).

TABLE 17

Actual and Desired Method of Selection by Type of Institution

Method of Selection	Response	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 40		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 146	Chi square value
		n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)		
Mandatory at periodic intervals	Actual	6	(100.00)	5	(71.43)	38	(95.00)	32	(100.00)	53	(100.00)	8	(100.00)	142	(97.26)
	Desired	6	(100.00)	6	(100.00)	39	(97.50)	32	(100.00)	52	(98.11)	8	(100.00)	143	(97.95)
Dependent upon performance	Actual	0	(0.00)	2	(28.57)	1	(2.50)	0	(0.00)	4	(7.55)	0	(0.00)	7	(4.79)
	Desired	0	(0.00)	2	(28.57)	2	(5.00)	2	(6.25)	5	(9.43)	0	(0.00)	11	(7.53)
Voluntary	Actual	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)
	Desired	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)
Other	Actual	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	1	(2.50)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	1	(0.68)
	Desired	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)

Note. Respondents selected all applicable categories.

Chi square value of 3.84 (1 df) required for significance at .05 level. Chi square value of 6.64 (1 df) required for significance at .01 level.

**p < .01

Timeframe. As shown in Table 18, three timeframes were reported as commonly used and desired at most institutions. Forty-six (31.94%) respondents indicated actual use of annual reviews for tenured faculty evaluation, 43 (29.86%) reported use of 2- or 3-year timeframes, and 44 (30.56%) indicated use of 4- or 5-year timeframes. In reporting timeframes desired, 52 (36.11%) respondents selected the 4- or 5-year cycle, 46 (31.94%) indicated desired use of the 2- or 3-year cycle, and 36 (25.00%) reported desired use of annual reviews.

In examining data for variations among institutional types, a desire to decrease use of annual reviews was reported by respondents at all six types of institutions. Respondents at comprehensive (n = 17, 43.59%), liberal arts (n = 20, 62.50%), two-year (n = 8, 15.38%), and specialized (n = 4, 50.00%) institutions indicated a desire to increase use of 4- or 5-year cycles for reviews. Respondents at research (n = 2, 33.33%) and doctoral (n = 1, 14.29%) institutions reported a desire to increase use of 2- or 3-year cycles. Only one respondent (14.29%) at doctoral institutions and two (3.85%) respondents at two-year institutions reported a desire to increase use of reviews scheduled when performance fell below an acceptable level.

The Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test for chi square analysis was conducted to determine change scores between actual and desired timeframes. The calculated chi square value of 65.220 (1 df) was well above the chi square value of 6.64 (1 df) required for significance at the .01 level.

Table 18

Actual and Desired Timeframe by Type of Institution

Timeframe	Response		Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 39*		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 52*		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 144	
			n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
Every year	Actual		4	(66.67)	3	(42.86)	12	(30.77)	7	(21.88)	16	(30.77)	4	(50.00)	46	(31.94)
	Desired		2	(33.33)	2	(28.57)	13	(33.33)	5	(15.63)	11	(21.11)	3	(37.50)	36	(25.00)
2- or 3-year cycle	Actual		0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	8	(20.51)	5	(15.63)	29	(55.77)	1	(12.50)	43	(29.86)
	Desired		2	(33.33)	1	(14.29)	8	(20.51)	5	(15.63)	29	(55.77)	1	(12.50)	46	(31.96)
4- or 5-year cycle	Actual		2	(33.33)	1	(14.29)	16	(41.03)	17	(53.13)	5	(9.43)	3	(37.50)	44	(30.56)
	Desired		2	(33.33)	1	(14.29)	17	(43.59)	20	(62.50)	8	(15.38)	4	(50.00)	52	(36.11)
Dependent on performance	Actual		0	(0.00)	2	(28.57)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(1.39)
	Desired		0	(0.00)	1	(14.29)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(3.85)	0	(0.00)	3	(2.08)
Voluntarily established	Actual		0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)
	Desired		0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	1	(2.56)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	1	(0.70)
Other	Actual		0	(0.00)	1	(14.29)	3	(7.50)	3	(9.38)	2	(3.77)	0	(0.00)	9	(6.25)
	Desired		0	(0.00)	2	(28.57)	0	(0.00)	2	(6.25)	2	(3.85)	0	(0.00)	6	(4.17)

Note. Chi square value of 6.64 (1 df) required for significance at the .01 level. Chi square = 65.220 (1 df).

*Frequency missing = 1.

**p < .01.

Improvement plans. As illustrated in Table 19, 108 (77.14%) respondents at 140 institutions reported use of improvement plans, or growth contracts, as a process in post-tenure review. Desired use of improvement plans was reported by 138 (98.57%) administrators.

When examining use of improvement plans by institutional type, respondents at comprehensive and two-year institutions reported a greater difference between actual and desired use of improvement plans than respondents at other types of institutions. Twenty-three (62.16%) administrators at comprehensive colleges reported actual use of improvement plans, and 37 (100.00%) indicated a desire to use improvement plans during post-tenure review. Respondents at 42 (80.77%) two-year colleges reported actual use of improvement plans, and 52 (100.00%) indicated desired use of improvement plans during post-tenure review.

Table 19 provides results of chi square analysis using the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test for dependent samples on data regarding actual and desired use of improvement plans during post-tenure review. The calculated chi square value of 0.398 (1 df) was less than the chi square value of 3.84 (1 df) required for significance at the .05 level.

Table 19

Actual and Desired Use of Improvement Plans by Type of Institution

Improvement Plans	Response		Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 37 ^a		Liberal arts n = 31 ^b		Two-year n = 52 ^b		Specialized n = 7 ^b		Total n = 140	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
Yes	6	(100.00)	6	(85.71)	23	(62.16)	26	(83.87)	42	(80.77)	5	(71.43)	108	(77.14)		
Desired	6	(100.00)	7	(100.00)	37	(100.00)	29	(93.55)	52	(100.00)	7	(100.00)	138	(98.57)		
No	0	(0.00)	1	(14.29)	14	(37.84)	5	(16.13)	10	(19.23)	2	(28.57)	32	(22.86)		
Desired	0	(0.00)	0	(100.00)	0	(100.00)	2	(6.45)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(1.43)		

Note. Chi square value of 3.84 (1 df) required for significance at .05 level. Chi square value = 0.398 (1 df). Not significant at the .05 level.

^a Frequency missing = 3

^b Frequency missing = 1

Individuals involved in development of improvement plans. Actual and desired involvement of individuals in the development of improvement plans during post-tenure review is provided in Table 20. Respondents from 91 of the 108 (84.26%) institutions that used improvement plans indicated that the faculty member was involved in the development of the plan. Seventy-two (66.67%) respondents reported involvement of the department chair, and 69 (63.89%) reported involvement of the dean in the development of improvement plans for tenured faculty. An even greater number of administrators indicated that the faculty member (n = 102, 94.44%), chair of the department (n = 86, 79.63%), and dean (n = 82, 75.93%) should be involved in the development of improvement plans. Thirty (27.78%) respondents reported involvement of peers, and 49 (45.37%) indicated desired involvement of peers in the development of improvement plans.

In examination of variations between actual and desired involvement of individuals in the development of improvement plans by institutional type, respondents at doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, and two-year institutions reported the desire for more frequent use of the faculty member in development of improvement plans. The greatest difference between actual and desired involvement of faculty was reported at two-year and doctoral institutions. Thirty-six (83.33%) respondents at two-year institutions reported actual involvement of faculty, and 42 (100.00%) indicated desired involvement of faculty in the development of improvement plans. The same percentages

were reported by respondents at doctoral institutions. Similar findings were reported regarding actual and desired involvement of department chairs in the development of improvement plans. Twenty-four (57.14%) respondents at two-year institutions reported actual involvement of department chairs, and 33 (78.57%) reported desired involvement of department chairs. Four (66.67%) respondents at doctoral institutions reported actual involvement of department chairs in the development of improvement plans, and six (100.00%) indicated desired involvement of department chairs. Involvement of deans in development of improvement plans was desired more often than used at doctoral, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized institutions. The greatest increase in the number of respondents desiring more involvement of deans occurred at two-year institutions, where 25 (59.52%) respondents reported actual involvement of deans in development of improvement plans and 31 (73.81%) indicated desired involvement of deans. Involvement of peers, although less frequently used and desired in the development of improvement plans than other individuals at all types of institutions, was desired more often than used at research ($n = 3$, 50.00%), comprehensive ($n = 10$, 43.48%), liberal arts ($n = 16$, 61.54%), and two-year ($n = 25$, 59.52%) institutions. The greatest difference between actual and desired involvement of peers occurred at research institutions.

Chi square analyses using the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test for dependent samples was performed to determine differences in change scores

between actual and desired involvement of individuals in the development of improvement plans during post-tenure review. The calculated chi square value in all categories was well above the chi square value of 6.64 (1 df) required for significance at the .01 level. Table 20 provides chi square values for each group of individuals.

TABLE 20

Actual and Desired Involvement of Individuals in Improvement Plan Process by Type of Institution

Individuals	Response	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 6		Comprehensive n = 23		Liberal arts n = 26		Two-year n = 42*		Specialized n = 5		Total n = 108		Chi square value
		n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	
Faculty member	Actual	6	(100.00)	5	(83.33)	20	(88.35)	20	(76.92)	36	(83.33)	4	(80.00)	91	(84.26)	15.626**
	Desired	6	(100.00)	6	(100.00)	22	(95.65)	22	(84.62)	42	(100.00)	4	(80.00)	102	(94.44)	
Department chair	Actual	6	(100.00)	4	(66.67)	18	(78.26)	16	(61.54)	24	(57.14)	4	(80.00)	72	(66.67)	37.043**
	Desired	6	(100.00)	6	(100.00)	19	(82.61)	18	(69.23)	33	(78.57)	4	(80.00)	86	(79.63)	
Peers	Actual	1	(16.67)	1	(16.67)	9	(39.13)	10	(38.46)	9	(21.43)	0	(0.00)	30	(27.78)	45.222**
	Desired	3	(50.00)	1	(16.67)	10	(43.48)	16	(61.54)	19	(45.24)	0	(0.00)	49	(45.37)	
Dean	Actual	3	(50.00)	3	(50.00)	16	(69.57)	19	(73.08)	25	(59.52)	3	(60.00)	69	(63.89)	34.035**
	Desired	3	(50.00)	5	(83.33)	16	(69.57)	22	(84.62)	31	(73.81)	5	(100.00)	82	(75.93)	
Other	Actual	0	(0.00)	2	(33.33)	3	(13.04)	3	(11.54)	5	(11.90)	0	(0.00)	13	(12.03)	21.907**
	Desired	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(8.70)	1	(3.85)	2	(4.76)	0	(0.00)	5	(4.63)	

Note. Respondents selected all applicable categories.

*Frequency missing = 1.

Chi square value of 6.64 (1 df) required for significance at .01 level.

**p < .01.

Follow-up of improvement plan. Table 21 provides data regarding the actual and desired use of follow-up to evaluate progress toward meeting goals of improvement plans. Respondents at 85 of the 108 (78.70%) institutions where improvement plans were used reported that follow-up was incorporated as part of the post-tenure review process, and 106 (98.15%) indicated a desire to use follow-up during the post-tenure review process.

When comparing use of follow-up by type of institution, respondents at doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized institutions reported a desire to increase the use of follow-up during post-tenure review. Actual use of follow-up was reported at 57.14 percent ($n = 4$) of doctoral institutions, 90.91 percent ($n = 20$) of comprehensive institutions, 80.95 percent ($n = 34$) of two-year institutions, and 40 percent ($n = 2$) of specialized institutions; and desired use of follow-up was reported at 100 percent at each of these types of institutions. Only 2 respondents (7.69%) at liberal arts colleges indicated that follow-up was not desired.

Chi square analysis using the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test for dependent samples was conducted to determine differences in change scores between actual and desired use of follow-up during post-tenure review. The calculated chi square value of 5.655 (1 df) was above the chi square value of 3.84 (1 df) required for significance at the .05 level.

Table 21

Actual and Desired Use of Follow-up for Improvement Plans by Type of Institution

Follow-up	Response		Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 22		Liberal arts n = 26		Two-year n = 42 ^a		Specialized n = 5		Total n = 108	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
Yes	Actual	6	(100.00)	4	(57.14)	20	(90.91)	19	(73.08)	34	(80.95)	2	(40.00)	85	(78.70)	
	Desired	6	(100.00)	7	(100.00)	22	(100.00)	24	(92.31)	42	(100.00)	5	(100.00)	106	(98.15)	
No	Actual	0	(0.00)	3	(42.86)	2	(9.09)	7	(26.92)	8	(18.60)	3	(60.00)	23	(21.10)	
	Desired	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(7.69)	0	(0.00)	0	(0.00)	2	(1.85)	

Note. Chi square value of 3.84 (1 df) required for significance at .05 level. Chi square = 5.655 (1 df).

^aFrequency missing = 1.

*p < .05.

Q6: What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding components of post-tenure review policies and actual components of post-tenure review policies at selected types of institutions?

To determine the differences between actual use of components of post-tenure review policies and desired use of components, responses from Question 13, which requested that respondents check all components that were included in institutional policies, were compared with responses from Question 21, which asked respondents to indicate the importance those same components should have in evaluating tenured faculty. Responses indicating high or moderate importance were tabulated as desired (see Table 22).

In examining the variations between actual and desired use of components to evaluate teaching, an increase in use of all five types of evaluations was reported as desired. Student evaluations were reported as the most frequently used and most frequently desired type of evaluation, with 126 out of 138 (91.30%) respondents reporting actual use of student evaluations in post-tenure review, and 133 out of 138 (96.38%) indicating desired use. Self-evaluations were reported as the second most frequently used and desired component to evaluate teaching, with 113 out of 139 (81.29%) respondents reporting actual use and 126 out of 139 (90.65%) indicating desired use of self-evaluations. Use of administrator evaluations was reported as being used at 106 out of 138 (76.81%) institutions and as desired at 124 of the 138 (89.86%) institutions. Peer involvement through

classroom observation or peer review committees was reported less frequently used and less frequently desired than other types of evaluation. Respondents reported actual use of classroom observations at 80 out of 138 (57.97%) institutions and desired use at 110 out of 138 (79.71%) institutions. Actual use of peer review committees as a component to evaluate teaching during post-tenure review was reported at 64 out of 132 (48.48%) institutions, and desired use was indicated at 104 out of 132 (78.79%) institutions.

When investigating differences between actual and desired use of scholarship components, professional development activities were reported as the most frequently used and most frequently desired scholarship component of post-tenure review. Respondents at 108 out of 140 (77.14%), institutions indicated actual use of professional development activities as a component of review policies, and 134 out of 140 (95.71%) indicated desired use. Creative endeavors were reported as the second most frequently used and desired scholarship component. Respondents from 82 out of 136 (59.42%) institutions reported actual use of creative endeavors as a component of review policies, and 122 out of 136 (88.41%) indicated desired use of creative endeavors. Use of publications as a component to evaluate scholarship was reported at 65 out of 136 (47.79%) institutions, and desired use was indicated at 82 out of 136 (60.29%) institutions. The only scholarship component that was reported less often as desired was the research component. Use of research activities as a component to evaluate scholarship was reported at 80 out of

136 (58.82%) institutions, while 72 out of 136 (52.94%) indicated desired use of research activities.

Upon examination of differences between actual and desired service components of post-tenure review policies, institutional service was reported as the most frequently used and the most frequently desired service component of post-tenure review policies, followed by professional service and community service. Respondents at 109 out of 140 (77.86%) institutions indicated actual use of institutional service as a component of post-tenure review, and 127 out of 140 (90.71%) reported desired use. Use of professional service as a component of post-tenure review was reported by 100 of the 138 (72.46%) respondents, and desired use was indicated by 116 of the 138 (84.06%) respondents. Community service was the only service component that was reported as desired less often than used; 91 out 133 (68.42%) respondents indicated use of community service and 89 out of 133 (66.92%) indicated desire use of community service as a component of post-tenure review.

Table 22 reports variations in actual and desired use of teaching, scholarship, and service components by type of institution. Respondents at research institutions reported the greatest difference between actual and desired use in the area of community service: 5 out of 5 (100%) respondents indicated community service was a component of post-tenure review; however, only 2 out of 5 (40%) reported this component as desired.

At doctoral institutions, the greatest difference between actual and desired components occurred in two categories: classroom evaluation by peers and peer review committees. Of the 7 administrators responding in these two categories, 3 (42.86%) reported classroom observations being used and 5 (71.43%) indicated use of peer review committees; however, 100 percent of the respondents reported desired use of both components.

Respondents at comprehensive colleges and universities reported a desire for more frequent use of all five types of evaluations used to evaluate teaching and a desire for more frequent use of creative endeavors and professional development activities to evaluate scholarship. The greatest difference between actual and desired use of these components was reported in the use of peer review committees: 20 out of 37 (55.56%) respondents reported actual use of peer review committees as a component to evaluate teaching, and 28 out of 37 (77.78%) respondents desired use of peer review committees. Less frequent use of research activities and community service activities was desired at comprehensive institutions. Community service was in use at 32 out of 37 schools (86.49%), but only 24 out of 37 (64.87%) respondents indicated desired use of community service as a component for tenured faculty evaluation. Research activities were reported as a component at 35 out of 37 (95.59%) comprehensive institutions and were desired at 30 out of 37 (81.08%). The same trends between actual and desired use were reported at liberal arts colleges (see Table 22).

Respondents at two-year colleges and institutes reported the greatest differences between actual and desired use in the following categories: peer review committees, creative endeavors, professional development activities, institutional service, professional service, and community service. Use of peer review committees as a component to evaluate teaching was reported at 20 out of 37 (55.56%) institutions and was desired at 28 out of 37 (77.78%). Creative endeavors were used as a component to evaluate scholarship at 14 out of 49 (28.57%) institutions and were desired at 46 out of 49 (73.47%), while professional development was reported as a component to evaluate scholarship at 29 out of 50 (58.00%) institutions and desired at 49 out of 50 (98.00%) two-year institutions. Respondents at 28 out of 50 (56.00%) two-year institutions reported actual use of institutional service as a component of post-tenure review, and desired use was reported at 45 out of 50 (90.00%) two-year institutions. Professional service was used as a component at 23 out of 50 (46.00%) institutions and desired at 40 out of 50 (90.00%) schools. Use of community service was reported at 21 out of 49 (42.86%) institutions, and desired use was indicated at 36 out of 49 (73.47%) two-year colleges and institutes.

At specialized and professional schools, the greatest differences between actual and desired use of components were reported in the use of classroom observation by peers, peer review committees, and creative endeavors. Classroom observation by peers was reported in use at 4 out of 7

(57.14%) specialized institutions and desired at 7 out of 7 (100.00%). Use of peer review committees as a component in post-tenure review was reported at 1 out of 7 (16.67%) institutions and was desired at 5 out of 7 (83.34%). Respondents indicated actual use of creative endeavors as a component of post-tenure review at 4 out of 8 (50.00%) institutions and desired use at 7 out of 8 (87.50%) specialized institutions. Less frequent use of research activities and community service activities was reported by administrators at specialized institutions (see Table 22).

Chi square analyses using the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test for dependent samples was conducted on differences between the actual and desired use of each component of post-tenure review. The calculated chi square values of peer review committees (27.622), administrator evaluations (23.603), research activities (14.097), publications (12.559), community service (10.086), student evaluations (9.981), self-evaluations (8.728), and creative endeavors (8.156) were greater than the chi square value of 6.64 (1 df) required for significance at the .01 level. The calculated chi square value of professional service (5.905) was greater than the chi square value of 3.84 (1 df) required for significance at the .05 level. No significant differences were found for professional development activities and institutional service.

TABLE 22

Actual and Desired Components of Post-Tenure Review Policies

Components	Response	Research n = 6		Doctoral n = 7		Comprehensive n = 40		Liberal arts n = 32		Two-year n = 53		Specialized n = 8		Total n = 146		Chi square value	
		n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)		
<u>Teaching components</u>																	
Administrator evaluations	Actual	5/6	(83.33)	5/7	(71.43)	28/37	(75.68)	20/31	(64.52)	44/50	(88.00)	4/7	(57.14)	106/138	(76.81)	23.603**	
	Desired	6/6	(100.00)	6/7	(85.72)	32/37	(86.49)	26/31	(83.87)	47/50	(94.00)	7/7	(100.00)	124/138	(89.86)		
Student evaluations	Actual	6/6	(100.00)	5/6	(83.33)	34/37	(91.89)	30/31	(96.77)	43/50	(86.00)	8/8	(100.00)	126/138	(91.30)	9.981**	
	Desired	6/6	(100.00)	5/6	(83.33)	35/37	(94.60)	30/31	(96.77)	49/50	(98.00)	8/8	(100.00)	133/138	(96.38)		
Classroom observations	Actual	3/6	(50.00)	3/7	(42.86)	23/37	(62.16)	18/31	(58.06)	29/50	(58.00)	4/7	(57.14)	80/138	(57.97)	18.431**	
	Desired	4/6	(66.67)	7/7	(100.00)	28/37	(75.68)	24/31	(77.42)	40/50	(80.00)	7/7	(100.00)	110/138	(79.71)		
Peer review committees	Actual	4/5	(80.00)	5/7	(71.43)	20/37	(55.56)	16/31	(53.33)	18/50	(37.50)	1/7	(16.67)	64/132	(48.48)	27.622**	
	Desired	5/5	(100.00)	7/7	(100.00)	28/37	(77.78)	26/31	(86.66)	33/50	(68.75)	5/7	(83.34)	104/132	(78.79)		
Self-evaluations	Actual	5/6	(83.33)	6/6	(100.00)	30/37	(81.08)	25/31	(80.65)	40/51	(78.43)	7/8	(87.50)	113/139	(81.29)	8.728**	
	Desired	5/6	(83.33)	5/6	(83.33)	35/37	(94.60)	30/31	(96.76)	43/51	(84.91)	8/8	(100.00)	126/139	(90.65)		
<u>Scholarship components</u>																	
Research activities	Actual	6/6	(100.00)	7/7	(100.00)	35/37	(94.59)	21/31	(67.74)	51/47	(10.64)	6/8	(75.00)	80/136	(58.82)	14.097**	
	Desired	6/6	(100.00)	7/7	(100.00)	30/37	(81.08)	15/31	(48.39)	61/47	(12.76)	8/8	(100.00)	72/136	(52.94)		
Publications	Actual	6/6	(100.00)	7/7	(100.00)	33/37	(89.19)	20/31	(64.52)	61/47	(12.77)	7/8	(87.50)	65/136	(47.79)	12.559**	
	Desired	6/6	(100.00)	7/7	(100.00)	26/37	(70.27)	12/31	(38.71)	71/47	(14.89)	7/8	(87.50)	82/136	(60.29)		
Creative endeavors	Actual	6/6	(100.00)	6/6	(100.00)	32/38	(84.62)	20/31	(64.52)	14/49	(28.57)	4/8	(50.00)	82/138	(59.42)	8.156**	
	Desired	6/6	(100.00)	6/6	(100.00)	36/38	(94.74)	21/31	(67.74)	46/49	(73.47)	7/8	(87.50)	122/138	(88.41)		
Professional development	Actual	5/6	(83.33)	6/7	(85.71)	33/38	(86.84)	28/31	(90.32)	29/50	(58.00)	7/8	(87.50)	108/140	(77.14)	3.305	
	Desired	5/6	(83.33)	6/7	(85.71)	37/38	(97.36)	29/31	(93.55)	49/50	(98.00)	8/8	(100.00)	134/140	(95.71)		

(Table Continued)

Q7: What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of problems associated with post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Chief academic administrators from all institutions where tenure was operative (n = 234) were asked to report their perceptions of problems associated with post-tenure review. Through the literature review, eight problem areas were identified and a Likert-type scale was provided for response. A major problem was represented with the numerical value of 4; a moderate problem, 3; a minor problem, 2; and not a problem was represented with the numerical value of 1. Perceptions of each problem area are examined in separate sections.

Problem 1: Process viewed as a threat to tenure. As illustrated in Table 23, administrators from 221 colleges and universities reported perceptions of post-tenure review as a process viewed as a threat to tenure. When Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Problem 1 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 2.51, which was statistically significant at 0.0311. This level exceeded the 0.05 level of significance. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated into three groupings where means within the groups were found not to be significantly different. Means ranged from 2.9412 to 2.281 in the highest mean extent grouping. The mid-range mean grouping was comprised of means ranging between 2.6154 and 2.1034.

Table 23

Analysis of Variance: Problem 1 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	16.77581173	3.35516235	2.51	0.0311
Error	215	287.39613398	1.33672620		
Total	220	304.17194570			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Problem 1

Type of institution	Frequency n = 221	Mean	Duncan's grouping		
Doctoral	17	2.9412	A		
Research	13	2.6154	A	B	
Comprehensive	66	2.5455	A	B	C
Liberal arts	57	2.2281	A	B	C
Two-year	58	2.1034		B	C
Specialized	10	1.8000			C

Note. Means with same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 215.

MSE = 1.336726.

Problem 2: Excessive paperwork and time required. Chief academic administrators at 223 institutions reported perceptions of excessive paperwork and time required as a problem of post-tenure review (see Table 24). When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Problem 2 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 1.30, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated into two groupings where means of responses within the groups were found not to be significantly different. Means ranged from 3.1000 to 2.5758 in the higher mean extent grouping and from 2.8305 to 2.4615 in the lower mean extent grouping. Mean response scores of two-year, doctoral, liberal arts, and comprehensive institutions overlapped into both groupings. The mean score of specialized institutions was categorized in the high extent grouping, and the mean score of research institutions was categorized in low extent grouping.

Table 24

Analysis of Variance: Problem 2 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	4.93556163	0.98711233	1.30	0.2641
Error	217	164.50838456	0.75810315		
Total	222	169.44394619			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Problem 2

Type of institution	Frequency n = 223	Mean	Duncan's Grouping	
Specialized	10	3.1000	A	
			A	
Two-year	59	2.8305	A	B
			A	B
Doctoral	17	2.6471	A	B
			A	B
Liberal arts	58	2.5862	A	B
			A	B
Comprehensive	66	2.5758	A	B
				B
Research	13	2.4615		B

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 217.

MSE = 0.758103.

Problem 3: Difficulty in measurement of competence. As illustrated in Table 25, administrators from 222 schools reported perceptions of difficulty in measurement of competence as a problem of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Problem 3 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 4.08, which was statistically significant at the 0.001 level of significance. Means ranged from 3.0000 at specialized institutions to 1.9231 at research institutions. By conducting Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated and indicated that the mean response score of research institutions was significantly different from mean scores of other types of institutions. Duncan's grouping reported that responses from specialized, two-year, liberal arts, comprehensive, and doctoral institutions were not significantly different.

Table 25

Analysis of Variance: Problem 3 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	15.12719640	3.02543928	4.08	0.0015
Error	216	160.24667747	0.74188277		
Total	221	175.37387387			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Problem 3

Type of institution	Frequency n = 222	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Specialized	10	3.0000	A
Two-year	59	2.9492	A
Liberal arts	58	2.8966	A
Comprehensive	65	2.6462	A
Doctoral	17	2.4706	A
Research	13	1.9231	B

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 216.

MSE = 0.741883.

Problem 4: Lack of resources for funding faculty development needs.

Table 26 provides data regarding perceptions of chief academic administrators from 221 colleges and universities regarding lack of resources for funding faculty development needs as a problem of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Problem 4 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 0.69, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Means ranged from 2.7647 at doctoral institutions to 2.3000 at specialized institutions. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the separated means indicated that no responses predicted significantly different means by type of institution.

Table 26

Analysis of Variance: Problem 4 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	3.41652465	0.68330493	0.69	0.6319
Error	215	213.05406359	0.99094913		
Total	220	216.47058824			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Problem 4

Type of institution	Frequency n = 221	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Doctoral	17	2.7647	A
Two-year	59	2.7627	A
Comprehensive	65	2.6923	A
Liberal arts	57	2.5430	A
Research	13	2.4615	A
Specialized	10	2.3000	A

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 215.

MSE = 0.990949.

Problem 5: Ineffective implementation of faculty development plan. As illustrated in Table 27, administrators from 219 institutions reported perceptions of ineffective implementation of faculty development plans as a problem of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Problem 5 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 1.48, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Means ranged from 2.9000 at specialized institutions to 2.3438 at comprehensive institutions. By conducting the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the separated means indicated that no responses predicted significantly different means by type of institutions.

Table 27

Analysis of Variance: Problem 5 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	6.40260563	1.28052113	1.48	0.1976
Error	213	184.29145830	0.86521811		
Total	218	190.69406393			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Problem 5

Type of institution	Frequency n = 219	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Specialized	10	2.9000	A
Doctoral	17	2.7059	A
Two-year	59	2.6441	A
Research	12	2.4167	A
Liberal arts	57	2.3509	A
Comprehensive	64	2.3438	A

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 213.

MSE = 0.865218.

Problem 6: Lack of training for evaluators. Administrators from 223 colleges and universities reported perceptions of lack of training for evaluators as a problem of post-tenure review (see Table 28). When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Problem 6 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 2.93, which was statistically significant at the 0.01 level of significance. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated into three groupings where means of responses within the groups were found not to be significantly different. Mean scores ranged from 3.0000 to 2.5932 in the highest mean extent grouping, from 2.5932 to 2.1765 in the mid-range grouping, and from 2.3485 to 1.8462 in the lowest mean extent grouping. Overlap in more than one grouping occurred in responses from four types of institutions. The mean response score of two-year institutions fell within both the high and mid-range groupings; mean scores of comprehensive, liberal arts, and doctoral institutions fell within both the mid-range and low groupings. The mean score of specialized institutions was reported as significantly different from the mean score of research institutions.

Table 28

Analysis of Variance: Problem 6 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	13.00162278	2.60032456	2.93	0.0138
Error	217	192.29882565	0.88616970		
Total	222	205.30044843			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Problem 6

Type of institution	Frequency n = 223	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Specialized	10	3.0000	A
Two-year	59	2.5932	A B
Comprehensive	66	2.3485	C B
Liberal arts	58	2.1897	C B
Doctoral	17	2.1765	C B
Research	13	1.8462	C

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 217.

MSE = 0.88617.

Problem 7: Lack of relationship to reward system. As illustrated in Table 29, respondents from 221 institutions indicated perceptions of lack of relationship to a reward system as a problem of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Problem 7 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 1.35, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Means ranged from 2.9138 at two-year institutions to 2.2000 at specialized institutions. By conducting the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the separated means indicated that no responses predicted significantly different means among types of institutions.

Table 29

Analysis of Variance: Problem 7 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	7.79438290	1.55887658	1.35	0.2432
Error	215	247.66263068	1.15191921		
Total	220	255.45701357			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Problem 7

Type of institution	Frequency n = 221	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Two-year	58	2.9138	A
Doctoral	17	2.8235	A
Comprehensive	68	2.7077	A
Research	13	2.6154	A
Liberal arts	58	2.5000	A
Specialized	10	2.2000	A

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 215.

MSE = 1.151919.

Problem 8: Negative effect on collegiality among faculty. Table 30 presents perceptions of chief academic administrators from 221 institutions regarding the negative effect on collegiality among faculty as a problem of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Problem 8 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 0.95, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Means ranged from 2.2586 at liberal arts institutions to 1.8000 at specialized institutions. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the separated means indicated that no responses predicted significantly different means among types of institutions.

Table 30

Analysis of Variance: Problem 8 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	3.87085183	0.77417037	0.95	0.4527
Error	215	176.11104862	0.81912116		
Total	220	179.98190045			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Problem 8

Type of institution	Frequency n = 221	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Liberal arts	58	2.2586	A
Research	12	2.0833	A
Two-year	58	2.0690	A
Comprehensive	66	1.9848	A
Doctoral	17	1.8824	A
Specialized	10	1.8000	A

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 215.

MSE = 0.819121.

Q8: What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of benefits associated with post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Chief academic administrators at all institutions where tenure was operative (n = 234) were asked to provide perceptions of benefits of post-tenure review. Ten benefits were identified through the literature review, and a Likert-type scale was provided for response. A major benefit was represented with the numerical value of 4; a moderate benefit, 3; a minor benefit, 2; and not a benefit was represented with the numerical value of 1. Perceptions of each benefit are examined in separate sections.

Benefit 1: Institutional accountability, integrity, and public confidence enhanced through process. As shown in Table 31, administrators from 224 institutions reported perceptions of enhancement of institutional accountability, integrity, and public confidence as a benefit of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 1 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 0.95, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated into two groupings where means of responses within the groups were found not to be significantly different. Means ranged from 3.7692 to 3.4706 in the higher mean extent grouping and from 3.5263 to 3.2000 in the lower grouping. Overlap occurred in four types of institutions. The mean response

scores of liberal arts, two-year, comprehensive, and doctoral institutions fell within both the high and low groupings. The mean score of research institutions was reported in the high extent grouping, and the mean score of specialized institutions was reported in the low extent grouping.

Table 31

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 1 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	1.94227173	0.38845435	0.80	0.5518
Error	218	106.05326398	0.48648286		
Total	223	107.99553571			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 1

Type of institution	Frequency n = 224	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Research	13	3.7692	A
Liberal arts	57	3.5263	A B
Two-year	60	3.5167	A B
Comprehensive	67	3.4776	A B
Doctoral	17	3.4706	A B
Specialized	10	3.2000	B

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 218.

MSE = 0.486483.

Benefit 2: Information acquired for use in personnel decisions such as promotion and merit pay. Administrators at 223 institutions reported if information acquired for use in personnel decisions such as promotion and merit pay was a benefit of post-tenure review (see Table 32). When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 2 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 5.71, which was statistically significant at the 0.0001 level of significance. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated into three groupings where means of responses within the groups were found not to be significantly different. Means ranged between 3.6154 and 3.1765 in the highest mean extent grouping, between 3.1765 and 2.7000 in the mid-range grouping, and between 2.9298 and 2.3559 in the lowest mean extent grouping. Overlap into more than one grouping occurred in three types of institutions. The mean response score of doctoral institutions fell within both the high and mid-range groupings, and mean of liberal arts and specialized institutions fell within both the mid-range and low groupings. The mean score of research institutions was significantly different from means of comprehensive, liberal arts, specialized, and two-year schools. The mean score of comprehensive institutions was significantly different from research and two-year institutions; the mean score of two-year institutions was significantly different from research, doctoral, and comprehensive institutions.

Table 32

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 2 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	25.9239101	5.18478204	5.71	0.0001
Error	217	196.89223329	0.90733748		
Total	222	222.81614350			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 2

Type of institution	Frequency	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Research	13	3.6154	A
Doctoral	17	3.1765	A B
Comprehensive	67	3.0000	B
Liberal arts	57	2.9298	B
Specialized	10	2.7000	C B
Two-year	59	2.3559	C B

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 217.

MSE = 0.907337.

Benefit 3: Improved teaching by tenured faculty. Table 33 provides perceptions of academic administrators at 224 institutions regarding improved teaching by tenured faculty as a benefit of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 3 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 1.50, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Means ranged from 3.6491 at liberal arts institutions to 3.2308 at research institutions. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated, indicating that responses predicted no significantly different means among types of institutions.

Table 33

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 3 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	3.39343234	0.67868647	1.50	0.1908
Error	218	98.60210338	0.45230323		
Total	223	101.99553571			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 3

Type of institution	Frequency n = 224	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Liberal arts	57	3.6491	A
Doctoral	17	3.6471	A
Comprehensive	67	3.5075	A
Two-year	60	3.4167	A
Specialized	10	3.3000	A
Research	13	3.2308	A

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 218.

MSE = 0.45303.

Benefit 4: Increased faculty activity in research. As shown in Table 34, administrators at 223 institutions indicated if increased faculty activity in research was a benefit of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 4 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 22.93, which was statistically significant at the 0.0001 level of significance. The means separated into three groupings using the Duncan Multiple Range Test. A significantly higher mean (3.5882) was found at doctoral schools, and a significantly lower mean (1.6271) was reported at two-year institutions than at other types of institutions. Mean responses from research, specialized, comprehensive, and liberal arts institutions were not significantly different from each other and were categorized in the mid-range grouping.

Table 34

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 4 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	75.28092128	15.05618426	22.93	0.0001
Error	217	142.45898903	0.65649304		
Total	222	217.73991031			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 4

Type of institution	Frequency n = 223	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Doctoral	17	3.5882	A
Research	13	3.0769	B
Specialized	10	2.9000	B
Comprehensive	67	2.7463	B
Liberal arts	57	2.5614	B
Two-year	59	1.6271	C

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 217.

MSE = 0.656493.

Benefit 5: Increased faculty participation in institutional and public service activities. As illustrated in Table 35, administrators at 223 institutions indicated if increased faculty participation in institutional and public service activities was a benefit of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 5 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 2.40, which was statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated into three groupings where means within each group were found not to be significantly different. Means ranged from 3.0625 to 2.5833 in the highest mean extent grouping, from 2.8772 to 2.5000 in the mid-range grouping, and from 2.7612 to 2.2308 in the lowest mean extent grouping. Overlap into more than one grouping occurred in mean scores of four types of institutions. The mean response score of liberal arts institutions fell within both the high and mid-range groupings, scores of comprehensive and two-year institutions fell within all three groupings, and the mean score of specialized institutions fell within both the mid-range and low groupings. The mean score of doctoral institutions was significantly different from means of specialized and research schools, and the mean score of research institutions was significantly different from doctoral and liberal arts institutions.

Table 35

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 5 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	8.11435084	1.62287017	2.40	0.0381
Error	217	146.64798100	0.67579715		
Total	222	154.76233184			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 5

Type of institution	Frequency n = 223	Mean	Duncan's grouping		
Doctoral	16	3.0625		A	
				A	
Liberal arts	57	2.8772	B	A	
			B	A	
Comprehensive	67	2.7612	B	A	C
			B	A	C
Two-year	60	2.5833	B	A	C
			B		C
Specialized	10	2.5000	B		C
					C
Research	13	2.2308			C
					C

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 217.

MSE = 0.675797

Benefit 6: Linkage of faculty goals and institutional goals. Chief academic administrators at 223 institutions indicated if linkage of faculty goals and institutional goals was a benefit of post-tenure review (see Table 36). When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 6 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 0.9814, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Means ranged from 3.4030 at comprehensive institutions to 3.2353 at doctoral institutions. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated, showing that no responses predicted significantly different means among types of institutions.

Table 36

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 6 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	0.39270566	0.07854113	0.14	0.9814
Error	217	117.71491766	0.54246506		
Total	222	118.10762332			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 6

Type of institution	Frequency n = 223	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Comprehensive	67	3.4030	A
Specialized	10	3.4000	A
Research	13	3.3846	A
Two-year	59	3.3729	A
Liberal arts	57	3.3684	A
Doctoral	17	3.2353	A

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 217.

MSE = 0.542465.

Benefit 7: Improved collegiality among faculty. As shown in Table 37, administrators at 220 institutions reported if improved collegiality among faculty was a benefit of post-tenure review. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 7 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 3.23, which was statistically significant at the 0.001 level of significance. Means ranged from 2.6271 at two-year institutions to 1.6154 at research institutions. The means separated using the Duncan Multiple Range Test and indicated that responses predicted a significantly lower mean (1.6154) at research institutions than at other types of institutions. Mean responses from two-year, liberal arts, comprehensive, specialized, and doctoral institutions were not significantly different from each other and fell within the higher mean extent grouping.

Table 37

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 7 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	11.97753333	2.39550667	3.23	0.0079
Error	214	158.82246667	0.74216106		
Total	219	170.80000000			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 7

Type of institution	Frequency n = 220	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Two-year	59	2.6271	A
Liberal arts	56	2.4643	A
Comprehensive	65	2.3538	A
Specialized	10	2.3000	A
Doctoral	17	2.2353	A
Research	13	1.6154	B

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 214.

MSE = 0.742161.

Benefit 8: Faculty development viewed as a continual expectation.

Table 38 presents data reporting 223 administrators' perceptions regarding the benefit that faculty development is viewed as a continual expectation upon implementation of post-tenure review policies. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 8 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 0.93, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Means ranged from 3.7000 at specialized institutions to 3.4118 at doctoral institutions. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated, showing that no responses predicted significantly different means at the six types of institutions.

Table 38

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 8 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	1.52206675	0.30441335	0.93	0.4647
Error	217	71.31201397	0.32862679		
Total	222	72.83408072			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 8

Type of institution	Frequency n = 223	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Specialized	67	3.7000	A
Research	10	3.6923	A
Comprehensive	13	3.6866	A
Liberal arts	59	3.6316	A
Two-year	57	3.5424	A
Doctoral	17	3.4118	A

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 217.

MSE = 0.542465.

Benefit 9: Identification of faculty deficiencies and development of improvement plans. Chief academic administrators at 222 institutions reported on identification of faculty deficiencies and development of improvement plans as a benefit of post-tenure review (see Table 39). When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 9 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 0.20, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Means ranged from 3.4138 at two-year institutions to 3.2353 at doctoral institutions. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated and showed that no responses predicted significantly different means at the six types of institutions.

Table 39

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 9 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	0.52071583	0.10414317	0.20	0.9621
Error	216	112.36667156	0.52021607		
Total	221	112.88738739			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 9

Type of institution	Frequency n = 222	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Two-year	58	3.4138	A
Specialized	10	3.4000	A
Comprehensive	67	3.3582	A
Liberal arts	57	3.3333	A
Research	13	3.3077	A
Doctoral	17	3.2353	A

Note. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 217.

MSE = 0.328627.

Benefit 10: Multiple sources provide input to evaluation process. As illustrated in Table 40, administrators at 217 institutions indicated if a benefit of post-tenure review was that multiple sources provide input to the evaluation process. When ANOVA was applied using type of institution as the independent variable and Benefit 10 as the dependent variable, the F-value for the difference between the means was 1.36, which was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Means ranged from 3.3559 at two year institutions to 2.9462 at research institutions. Using the Duncan Multiple Range Test, the means separated and showed that no responses predicted significantly different means at the six types of institutions.

Table 40

Analysis of Variance: Benefit 10 and Type of Institution

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	4.08456366	0.81691273	1.36	0.2392
Error	211	126.39469901	0.59902701		
Total	216	130.47926267			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Benefit 10

Type of institution	Frequency n = 217	Mean	Duncan's grouping
Two-year	59	3.3559	A
Comprehensive	64	3.2344	A
Specialized	10	3.2000	A
Liberal arts	54	3.1296	A
Doctoral	17	3.0000	A
Research	13	2.9462	A

Note: Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Alpha = 0.05.

df = 211.

MSE = 0.599027.

Summary of Findings

Chief academic administrators at 347 colleges and universities participated in this study. Responses were returned from 47 states and the District of Columbia. A representative stratification of the percentage of types of institutions across the United States was obtained. An assessment of the eight research questions stated in the study was accomplished through analyzing responses on the Post-tenure Review Survey. This instrument requested the following demographic information: Carnegie classification, public or private designation, percentage of tenured faculty, use of post-tenure reviews, and the status of formal, written post-tenure review policies.

Respondents at the 146 institutions that had formal, written policies in effect provided non-demographic data to respond to Research Questions 1 through 3. These research questions addressed the stated purpose, processes, and components of existing post-tenure review policies by type of institution. Statistically significant differences in responses among types of institutions occurred in the three process variables: (a) method of selection, (b) timeframes, and (c) use of improvement plans. Component variables that revealed statistical significance among types of institutions included the following: (a) research activities, (b) publications, (c) creative endeavors, (d) professional development activities, (e) institutional service, (f) professional service, and (g) community service.

Data were collected to compare differences in chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding actual and desired purposes, processes, and components of post-tenure review in Research Questions 4 through 6. Statistically significant differences between actual and desired process variables were found in several areas: (a) involvement of academic administrators, faculty, governing boards, legislators, and students in the development of post-tenure review policies, (b) the method of selection that was mandatory when tenured faculty performance fell below an acceptable level, (c) involvement of faculty members, department chairs, peers, and deans in development of improvement plans, (d) use of follow-up for improvement plans. Component variables that provided statistically significant frequencies between actual and desired use included (a) administrator evaluations, (b) student evaluations, (c) classroom observations, (d) peer review committees, (e) self-evaluations, (f) research activities, (g) publications, (h) creative endeavors, (i) professional service, and (j) community service.

Problems and benefits were examined in Research Questions 7 and 8. Academic officers at all institutions where tenure was operative were asked to respond to these questions. Statistically significant differences among types of institutions were found in the following problem areas: (a) process viewed as a threat to tenure, (b) difficulty in measurement of competence, and (c) lack of training for evaluators. Benefits that were found to be statistically significant

included the following: (a) information acquired for use in personnel decisions such as promotion and merit pay; (b) improved teaching by tenured faculty; (c) increased faculty participation in institutional and public service activities; (d) increased faculty activity in research; and (e) improved collegiality among faculty.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations derived from the study. The purpose of the study is provided, followed by a brief description of procedures employed. Summaries of findings regarding descriptive demographic data, post-tenure policy variables, and problems and benefits of post-tenure review are also presented. The chapter ends with conclusions and recommendations for further study.

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the relationship between and among post-tenure review policy variables and types of institutions, as perceived by chief academic administrators at colleges and universities across the United States. The policy variables included the following: (a) stated purpose, (b) processes, and (c) components of post-tenure review. Perceptions of problems and benefits of post-tenure review were also investigated.

The following specific research questions guided the study:

1. What are the differences, if any, in the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review policies between and among selected types of institutions?
2. What are the differences, if any, in processes used in post-tenure review between and among selected types of institutions?

3. What are the differences, if any, in components of post-tenure review policies between and among selected types of institutions?

4. What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding the primary purpose of post-tenure review policies and the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review policies at selected types of institutions?

5. What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding the processes used in post-tenure review and actual processes used in review at selected types of institutions?

6. What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding components of post-tenure review policies and actual components of post-tenure review policies at selected types of institutions?

7. What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of problems associated with post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

8. What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of benefits associated with post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Summary of Procedures

The study employed a one-shot case study research design to examine post-tenure review policy variables by type of institution. Development of the

theoretical framework for the study was accomplished through examination of the literature on post-tenure review and organizational development.

The Post-tenure Review Survey used to collect data for the study was a three-part questionnaire developed by the researcher using a conceptual design similar to a questionnaire used by Andrews and Licata (1989). The survey was formatted specifically to address the eight research questions of this study. Content validity was established by a panel of experts.

The population for the study was 3,402 accredited colleges and universities listed in the Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education directory. The sample was comprised of 680 colleges and universities, or 20 percent, of all accredited institutions. Colleges and universities were selected randomly from the Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education directory by using a spreadsheet randomization process. Two mailings yielded a response rate of 51 percent ($n = 347$), which met the 50 percent plus one accuracy requirement for survey studies (Kerlinger, 1986).

Data from the returned surveys were recorded into a text file and transferred to the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) program. This program was used to produce frequency tables, means, chi square analyses, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) between policy variables and type of institution. The Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test was employed to determine change scores between actual and desired policy variables. Post-hoc analyses were conducted using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Summary of Findings

Descriptive Data

Demographic data collected by the survey included Carnegie classification of each institution, public or private designations, and percentage of tenured faculty. Respondents at institutions where tenure was operative were asked to confirm if tenured faculty evaluation occurred at their institutions, if there was a formal, written post-tenure review policy in effect or in the development stages, or if evaluations were used for determination of merit pay.

The percentage of total respondents from research, doctoral, comprehensive and liberal arts colleges and universities was slightly higher in each category than percentages by institution type in the total population. Research institutions comprised 4 percent ($n = 14$) of the responses included in the study, compared to 3.6 percent nationally; doctoral institutions, 4.9 percent ($n = 17$), compared to 3.4 percent nationally; comprehensive colleges and universities, 22.5 percent ($n = 78$), compared to 15.2 percent nationally; and liberal arts colleges, 21.3 percent ($n = 74$) compared to 18.1 percent nationally. A slightly lower percentage of total respondents as compared to total population was received from two-year colleges and institutes and specialized or professional schools. Two-year schools made up 34.6 percent ($n = 120$) of the response rate, compared to 41.7 percent nationally; specialized and professional schools, 12.7 percent ($n = 44$), compared to 18

percent nationally. Respondents from public institutions comprised 52.2 percent (n = 181) of the returns, and respondents from private institutions made up 47.8 percent (n = 166) of the total.

At the 234 institutions (67.4%) where tenure was operative, 67 (19.3%) had 60 to 69 percent tenured faculty; 52, (15%), 70 to 79 percent; 36 (10.4%), 50 to 59 percent; 34 (9.8%), 80 to 89 percent; 29 (8.4%) below 50 percent; 15 (4.6%) 90 percent or above. Tenure was not operative at 113 (32.6%) institutions.

Two hundred four (87.2%) of the respondents from the 234 institutions where tenure was operative reported that evaluation of faculty existed in some manner. Formal, written post-tenure review policies were in effect at 146 (61.1%) of the institutions. Tenured faculty were evaluated to determine merit pay at 37 (17.6%) institutions, and post-tenure policies were in development stages at 21 (8.8%) institutions.

Post-tenure Review Policy Variables

Purpose

Faculty growth and development was the stated primary purpose for post-tenure review at 102 (69.9%) institutions. Administrators at 31 (21.1%) institutions indicated that information acquired through post-tenure review was used primarily for salary, promotion, and retention purposes. Chi square analysis indicated no significant differences among types of institutions regarding the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review.

Administrators at 114 (78.10%) institutions reported faculty growth and development as the desired purpose of post-tenure review. Use of post-tenure review to provide information for salary, promotion, and retention decisions was desired by 19 (13.00%) administrators. Upon investigation of variations between actual and desired primary purpose by type of institution, desired use of post-tenure review for salary, promotion, and retention decisions was less frequent than actual use at all six types of institutions. Faculty growth and development as the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review was desired more than used at research, doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, and two-year institutions. Chi square analysis indicated significant differences between actual and desired purposes for post-tenure review policies by type of institution.

Processes

Individuals involved in development of policies. Faculty were involved in development of post-tenure review policies at 135 (92.47%) institutions, and academic administrators were involved at 129 (88.36%) institutions. Involvement of governing boards occurred at 62 (42.47%) colleges and universities. Only 16 institutions included students in the development of policies, and only 4 included legislators in the development phase of post-tenure review. Chi square analysis indicated no significant differences among types of institutions regarding individuals involved in the development of post-tenure review policies.

Involvement of faculty in the development of post-tenure review policies was desired by 143 (97.28%) academic administrators, and involvement of administrators was desired by 138 (94.52%) academic administrators. Governing board involvement was desired by 46 (31.51%) administrators. Desire for involvement of students in development of post-tenure review was reported by 53 (36.30%) administrators, and desire for involvement of legislators was desired by 2 (1.37%) administrators. In examining variations by type of institution, minimal differences in actual and desired involvement of individuals in the development of post-tenure review policies was found at research, doctoral, liberal arts, and specialized colleges and universities. Administrators from comprehensive and two-year colleges, however, desired more involvement by students. In all categories, chi square analyses indicated significant differences by type of institution between actual and desired involvement of individuals in the development of post-tenure review policies.

Methods of selection. Mandatory review of tenured faculty at periodic intervals was the method of selection used by 142 (97.26%) institutions. Participation in reviews was not voluntary at any type of institution, and only 7 (4.79%) institutions selected faculty for review if performance fell below an acceptable level. All research, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized schools used mandatory review, and a majority of comprehensive and doctoral institutions required mandatory periodic evaluation. Chi square analyses indicated significant differences among types of institutions in two methods of

selection: mandatory reviews at periodic intervals and selection if performance fell below an acceptable level.

Mandatory selection at periodic intervals was the desired method of selection by 143 (97.95%) administrators. Use of selecting faculty for review if performance fell below an acceptable level was desired by 11 (7.53%) administrators. Voluntary participation in reviews was not desired as a method of selection for participation in reviews by any administrator. In investigating variations among types of institutions, a slightly larger number of administrators from comprehensive, liberal arts, and two-year institutions desired participation of tenured faculty when performance fell below an acceptable level. Chi square analyses determined no significant differences by type of institution between actual and desired use of mandatory reviews for tenured faculty and determined significant differences between actual and desired use of selecting tenured faculty for review if performance fell below an acceptable level.

Timeframes. Reviews scheduled every year occurred at 47 (32.29%) institutions; 4- to 5-year cycles occurred at 45 (30.82%) schools; 2- to 3-year cycles occurred at 43 (29.45%) colleges and universities. Annual reviews were most common at research, doctoral, and specialized institutions, while comprehensive and liberal arts institutions reported the 4- or 5-year cycle more often. The 2- to 3-year cycle was most prevalent at two-year colleges.

Chi square analysis found significant differences among types of institutions in timeframes used during post-tenure review.

Desired use of annual reviews for post-tenure review was indicated by 36 (25%) administrators. A 4- to 5-year cycle was desired by 46 (31.94%) administrators, and a 2- to 3-year cycle was desired by 46 (31.94%). Reviews that were dependent on performance level were desired by 3 (2.08%) administrators. Only 1 (0.70%) administrator desired use of voluntary reviews. When examining variations by institutional type, annual reviews were used more often than desired at all types of institutions except comprehensive schools. A 4- to 5-year cycle was desired more often than used at comprehensive, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized institutions; and a 2- to 3-year cycle was desired more often than used at research and doctoral institutions. Chi square analysis found significant differences by type of institution regarding actual and desired timeframes for tenured faculty evaluation.

Use of improvement plans. One hundred nine (74.66%) institutions included improvement plans as part of the post-tenure review process. Research, doctoral, liberal arts, and two-year institutions included improvement plans more often than comprehensive and specialized schools. Chi square analysis determined significant differences among types of institutions regarding use of improvement plans during post-tenure review.

Use of improvement plans was desired by 138 (98.57%) administrators. Chi square analysis determined no significant differences between actual and desired use of improvement plans by type of institution.

Individuals involved in the development of improvement plans. At the 109 institutions that used improvement plans, faculty members were involved in development of the plans at 91 (83.49%) institutions; chairs of departments, at 73 (66.97%); and deans, at 70 (64.22%). Peers were involved in the development of plans at 30 (27.52%) institutions. Chi square analysis found no significant differences among types of institutions regarding involvement of individuals in the development of improvement plans.

Use of faculty in development of improvement plans was desired by 102 (94.44%) administrators. Involvement of department chairs was desired by 86 (79.63%) administrators, and involvement of deans was desired by 82 (75.93%). Involvement of peers in the development of improvement plans was desired by 49 (45.37%) administrators. In investigating variations among types of institutions, faculty involvement was more often desired than used at doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, and two-year institutions; dean involvement was more often desired than used at doctoral, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized schools; and involvement of department chairs was desired more often than used at doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, and two-year institutions. Peer involvement was desired more often than used at doctoral, comprehensive, two-year, and specialized institutions. Chi square

analyses determined significance by type of institution between actual and desired involvement of individuals in the development of improvement plans in all categories.

Use of follow-up. Use of follow-up plans was reported at 86 of the 109 institutions (78.90%) that incorporated improvement plans into post-tenure review. Follow-up plans were more frequent at research, comprehensive, liberal arts, and two-year colleges than at doctoral and specialized institutions. Chi square analysis found no significant differences among types of institutions in the use of follow-up to evaluate progress toward meeting goals of an improvement plan.

Use of follow-up plans was desired at 106 (98.15%) institutions. Follow-up plans were desired at all six types of institutions. Chi square analysis indicated significant differences by type of institution between actual and desired use of follow-up to evaluate progress toward meeting goals of improvement plans.

Components

Teaching. Student evaluations were used as a component to evaluate teaching at 132 (92.03%) institutions, self-evaluations at 119 (82.07%), and administrator evaluations at 109 (75.17%) colleges and universities. Institutions were less likely to involve peers in the post-tenure review process. Classroom observation by peers occurred at 82 institutions (55.86%), and peer review committees were used at 68 (46.90%) colleges and universities.

at research, doctoral, specialized, and comprehensive colleges and universities; creative endeavors were components most often at research, doctoral, comprehensive, and liberal arts institutions. Professional development activities were commonly used components at all types of institutions. Chi square analyses determined significant differences among types of institutions in all components relating to scholarship.

Use of publications as a component to evaluate scholarship was desired at 83 out of 136 (60.29%) institutions. Creative endeavors were desired as a component at 122 out of 138 (88.41%) institutions, and professional development activities were desired at 134 out of 140 (95.71%) colleges and universities. Research activities were desired at 71 out of 136 (52.94%) institutions. In investigating variations by institutional type, research activities and publications were desired less often than used at comprehensive and liberal arts institutions. Creative endeavors and professional development activities were desired more often than used by administrators at comprehensive, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized colleges and universities. Chi square analyses found significant differences between actual and desired use of the following scholarship components by type of institution: research activities, publications, and creative endeavors. No significant differences were determined for professional development.

Service. Institutional service was a component of post-tenure review at 113 (77.93%) colleges and universities; professional service at 104 (71.72%),

and community service at 97 (66.90%). Institutional, professional, and community service were components at most research, doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, and specialized schools, but were less likely to be components at two-year institutions. Chi square analyses found significant differences among types of institutions in all service components.

Use of professional service was desired at 116 out of 138 (84.06%) institutions, institutional service was desired at 127 out of 140 (90.71%), and community service was desired at 89 out of 133 (66.92%) colleges and universities. Professional service activities were desired more often than used at two-year and specialized schools; institutional service was desired more often than used at liberal arts, two-year, and specialized institutions. Community service was desired less often than used at research, comprehensive, liberal arts, and specialized schools.

Chi square analyses determined significant differences by type of institution between actual and desired use of the following service components: professional service and community service. No significant differences were found among types of institutions in institutional service.

Problems and Benefits of Post-tenure Review

Problems

Analysis of variance determined significant differences among types of institutions for the following problems associated with post-tenure review, (a) the process is viewed as a threat to tenure, (b) difficulty in measurement of

competence, and (c) lack of training for evaluators. Post-tenure review being perceived as a threat to tenure was more of a problem at doctoral institutions ($\underline{M} = 2.9412$) and less of a problem at specialized schools ($\underline{M} = 1.8000$) than at other types of institutions. Difficulty in measurement of competence was less of a problem at research institutions ($\underline{M} = 1.9231$) than at other types of institutions. Lack of training for evaluators was more of a problem at specialized institutions ($\underline{M} = 3.0000$) and less of a problem at research institutions ($\underline{M} = 1.8462$) than at other types of institutions.

Analysis of variance determined no significant differences among types of institutions for the following problems associated with post-tenure review: (a) excessive paperwork and time required; (b) lack of resources for funding faculty development needs; (c) ineffective implementation of faculty development plans; (d) lack of relationship to reward system; and (e) negative effective on collegiality among faculty.

Benefits

Analysis of variance found significant differences among types of institutions for the following benefits of post-tenure review: (a) information acquired from the review can be used in personnel decisions such as promotion and merit pay; (b) increased faculty participation in institutional and public service activities; (c) increased faculty activity in research; and (d) improved collegiality among faculty. Use of information acquired through post-tenure review in personnel decisions such as promotion and merit pay was a

greater benefit at research institutions ($M = 3.6154$) and doctoral institutions ($M = 3.1765$) than at other types of institutions. Increased faculty activity in research was a greater benefit at doctoral institutions ($M = 3.5882$) and less of a benefit at two-year institutions ($M = 1.6271$) than at other types of institutions. Increased faculty participation in institutional and public service activities was more of a benefit at doctoral institutions ($M = 3.0625$) and less of a benefit at research institutions ($M = 2.2308$) than at other types of institutions. Improved collegiality among faculty was less of a benefit at research institutions ($M = 1.6154$) than at other types of institutions.

Analysis of variance determined no significant differences among types of institutions for the following benefits associated with post-tenure review: (a) enhancement of institutional accountability, integrity, and public confidence; (b) improved teaching by tenured faculty; (c) linkage of faculty goals and institutional goals; (d) faculty development viewed as a continual expectation; (e) identification of faculty deficiencies and development of improvement plans; and (f) multiple sources provide input to evaluation process.

Conclusions

Analysis of data collected during this study permitted the following conclusions to be made regarding post-tenure review.

Q1: What are the differences, if any, in the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review policies between and among selected types of institutions?

No significant differences existed among types of institutions in the stated, primary purpose of post-tenure review. Faculty growth and development was reported most frequently as the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review and use of information for personnel decisions was reported less often.

Q2: What are the differences, if any, in processes used in post-tenure review between and among selected types of institutions?

Individuals involved in development of post-tenure review. No significant differences existed among types of institutions regarding individuals involved in the development of post-tenure review. Faculty and administrators were most often involved in development, involvement of governing boards occurred less often, and students and legislators were rarely involved.

Method of selection. Significant differences existed among types of institutions regarding method of selection of tenured faculty for evaluation. Mandatory review at periodic intervals was the most commonly used method of selection at a large majority of colleges and universities. This method of selection was more common at research, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized schools than at comprehensive and doctoral institutions.

Timeframe. Significant differences existed among types of institutions in timeframes used during post-tenure review. Annual reviews, reviews

scheduled every 4 to 5 years, and reviews scheduled every 2 to 3 years were used most often in most colleges and universities. However, annual reviews were more frequent at research, doctoral, and specialized institutions; 4- to 5-year cycles were more common at comprehensive and liberal arts schools; and 2- to 3-year cycles occurred more often at two-year institutions.

Improvement plans. Significant differences existed among types of institutions in the use of improvement plans. Improvement plans were established at the conclusion of post-tenure review at a majority of institutions; however, they were less common at comprehensive and specialized schools than at other types of institutions.

Individuals involved in development of improvement plans. No significant differences existed among types of institutions regarding involvement of individuals in the development of improvement plans. Faculty members, deans, and department chairs were most often involved at all types of institutions; peer involvement occurred less often in improvement plan development.

Follow-up of improvement plans. No significant differences existed among types of institutions regarding use of follow-up plans to evaluate progress toward meeting goals of an improvement plan. A majority of all types of institutions incorporated follow-up as a process during post-tenure review.

Q3: What are the differences, if any, in the components used in post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Teaching. No significant differences existed among types of institutions in the use of student evaluations, self-evaluations, administrator evaluations, classroom observations by peers, and peer review committees as components to evaluate teaching during post-tenure review. Student evaluations were the most commonly used type of evaluation at all types of institutions, followed by self-evaluations and administrator evaluations. Classroom observation by peers and peer review committees were less often used in evaluation of teaching at all types of institutions.

Scholarship. Significant differences existed among types of institutions in the use of research activities, publications, creative endeavors, and professional development activities as components to evaluate scholarship during post-tenure review. Professional development activities were more commonly used than research, publications, and creative endeavors at all types of institutions. However, research activities were components more often at research, doctoral, and comprehensive schools than at other types of institutions. Publications and creative endeavors were more commonly used at research, doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts and specialized institutions than at two-year institutions.

Service. Significant differences existed among types of institutions in the use of service components. Institutional service was used more frequently

than professional service or community service at all types of institutions. However, liberal arts colleges used all three service components less often than other types of institutions.

Q4: What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding the primary purpose of post-tenure review policies and the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review policies at selected types of institutions?

No significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired purpose for post-tenure review. Increased use of faculty growth and development and less use of information for personnel decisions was desired at all types of institutions.

Q5: What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding processes used in post-tenure review and actual processes used in review at selected types of institutions?

Significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired involvement of individuals in the development of post-tenure review policies. More involvement of faculty and administrators was desired by administrators at all types of institutions. More involvement of students was desired at comprehensive and liberal arts colleges than at other types of institutions.

No significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired methods of selection for

participation of tenured faculty in the review process. Mandatory review at periodic intervals was both the actual and desired method of selection for post-tenure review at all types of institutions.

Significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired timeframes for post-tenure review. Increased use of 4- to 5-year cycles was desired at two-year, specialized, liberal arts, and comprehensive institutions; and increased use of 2- to 3-year cycles was desired at research and doctoral institutions.

Significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired use of improvement plans during post-tenure review. Increased use of improvement plans was desired at a majority of institutions, but the greatest difference occurred at comprehensive, two-year, and specialized institutions.

Significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired involvement of individuals in development of improvement plans. More involvement of faculty was desired at doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, and two-year institutions; more involvement of department chairs was desired at doctoral and two-year institutions; and more involvement of deans was desired at doctoral, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized schools. Peer involvement was desired by less than one-half of all institutions. An increase in the use of peers was desired, however, at research, liberal arts, and two-year colleges.

Significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired use of follow-up to determine progress toward goals established in improvement plans. More use of follow-up was desired at doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized institutions.

Q6: What are the differences, if any, between chief academic administrators' perceptions regarding components of post-tenure review policies and actual components of post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired teaching components of post-tenure review. A greater increase in the use of student evaluations was desired at two-year institutions than at other types; a greater increase in the use of self-evaluations was desired at comprehensive, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized institutions.

Significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired scholarship components of post-tenure review. Less use of research activities and publications was desired at comprehensive and liberal arts institutions. Increased use of creative endeavors and professional development activities was desired at comprehensive, liberal arts, two-year, and specialized schools.

Significant differences existed between chief academic administrators' perceptions of actual and desired professional service and community service

components of post-tenure review. Use of professional service was desired more often at two-year and specialized schools and less often at comprehensive schools. Use of community service was desired less often at research, comprehensive, liberal arts, and specialized schools and more often at two-year institutions.

Q7: What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of problems associated with post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Significant differences existed among types of institutions for the following problems associated with post-tenure review: (a) the process is viewed as a threat to tenure, (b) difficulty in measurement of competence, and (c) lack of training for evaluators. Post-tenure review as a perceived threat to tenure was a greater problem at doctoral institutions and less of a problem at specialized schools than at other types of institutions. The problem of difficulty in measurement of competence was less of a problem at research institutions than at any other type of institution. Lack of training for evaluators was a greater problem at specialized schools and less of a problem at research universities than at the other types of institutions.

No significant differences existed among types of institutions for the following problems associated with post-tenure review: (a) excessive paperwork and time required, (b) lack of resources for funding faculty development needs, (c) ineffective implementation of faculty development

plans, (d) lack of relationship to reward system, and (e) negative effective on collegiality among faculty.

Q8: What are the differences, if any, in chief academic administrators' perceptions of benefits associated with post-tenure review at selected types of institutions?

Significant differences existed among types of institutions for the following benefits of post-tenure review: (a) information acquired from the review can be used in personnel decisions such as promotion and merit pay, (b) increased faculty participation in institutional and public service activities, (c) increased faculty activity in research, and (d) improved collegiality among faculty. The use of information acquired through post-tenure review in personnel decisions such as promotion and merit pay was a greater benefit at research and doctoral institutions and a less of a benefit at two-year schools than at other types of institutions. Increased faculty activity in research was a greater benefit at doctoral and research institutions and less of a benefit at two-year schools than at other types of institutions. Increased faculty participation in institutional and public service activities was more of a benefit at doctoral schools and less of a benefit at research schools than at other types of institutions. Improved collegiality among faculty was less of a benefit at research institutions than at any other type of institution.

No significant differences existed among types of institutions for the following benefits associated with post-tenure review: (a) enhancement of

institutional accountability, integrity, and public confidence; (b) improved teaching by tenured faculty; (c) linkage of faculty goals and institutional goals; (d) faculty development viewed as a continual expectation; (e) identification of faculty deficiencies and development of improvement plans; and (f) multiple sources provide input to evaluation process.

Implications

The results of this study indicate that post-tenure review is an issue that should be addressed at all types of institutions. Formal post-tenure review policies are in effect at approximately 60 percent of institutions where tenure is operative. Concern with tenured faculty evaluation has caused internal and external constituencies to consider development of post-tenure review policies. Analysis of data from this study indicates that significant differences exist in several post-tenure review policy variables by type of institution. The purpose, processes, and components of post-tenure review policies must reflect the mission or philosophy of the institution. The following specific implications of data are offered.

Decisions regarding the formative or summative nature of post-tenure review must be made during the initial stage of policy development. Use of post-tenure review as a formative method of evaluation is recommended, with faculty growth and development stated as the primary purpose. The data support the findings of Andrews and Licata (1989) and Reisman (1986) in which faculty and administrators recommended formative evaluations.

During the development of post-tenure review policies, participatory decision-making should occur. Findings support the participation of faculty in development of policies, which was identified as essential by Moore and Gardner (1992) and Seldin (1984). Findings also support involvement of administrators in development of the plan, refuting Seldin's recommendation of very little administrative involvement.

In determination of the method of selection for participation in post-tenure review, data from this study suggest that all tenured faculty should be required to participate at periodic intervals. Reviews dependent upon performance or voluntary reviews are not suggested. Neither the findings in this study nor the findings of Portch, Kaufman and Ross (1993), Edgerton (1993), and Goodman (1990) present clear evidence on specific timeframes to use during post-tenure review, but both this study and the literature support mandatory periodic evaluation at some established interval. A 4- to 5-year timeframe is recommended as this interval, based on concerns of excessive paperwork and time required to conduct post-tenure review.

Improvement plans should be formulated between faculty and department chairs, and follow-up should be integrated as part of the post-tenure review process. Findings were consistent with studies by Edwards (1994), Portch, Kaufman, and Ross (1993), and Goodman (1990), which indicated the importance of these plans as part of a formative policy. Improvement plans provide an opportunity to examine individual faculty needs

and talents and to formulate a statement of expectations for development.

In assessment of teaching, reliance on student evaluations alone is not recommended. Use of student evaluations, self-evaluations, and administrator evaluations is suggested, while use of classroom observations by peers and peer review committees is not. Data refute findings of Berquist and Sullivan (1975), which identified peer review as an essential component of instructional evaluation and support Edgerton's (1993) premise that use of peer reviews is uncertain.

In evaluating scholarship, mission is particularly significant. College- or department-specific definitions of scholarship are recommended. Professional development activities are used most often as a component to evaluate scholarship at all types of institutions. Less consistency is evident, however, in use of other scholarship components. Findings imply greater emphasis on research activities at research, doctoral, and comprehensive institutions and greater emphasis on publications and creative endeavors at research, doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts and specialized institutions than at two-year colleges. Data confirm findings of Rubino (1994) and Belker (1982), which determined that scholarship components varied by type of institution. Data refute Edgerton's (1993) opinion that more of a balance between teaching, research, and service is desired and confirm his opinion that department- or college-specific definitions of scholarship should be generated.

Use of service components is also dependent upon mission. College-

or department-specific definitions of service are recommended. Institutional service is used more commonly than professional service or community service at all types of institutions; however, liberal arts colleges use all service components less often than other types of institutions. Data confirm Edgerton's (1993) findings that campuses are struggling with the issue of service.

Post-tenure review is implemented at institutions based on the perceptions of benefits that will accrue with the implementation of a policy. Problems inherent with the implementation also should be considered. Perceptions of benefits and problems vary by type of institution. The major problems of post-tenure review at research institutions are the process being viewed as a threat to tenure and lack of relationship to the reward system; the major benefits are enhancement of accountability, integrity, and public confidence and faculty development being viewed as a continual expectation. The same two problem areas are prevalent at doctoral institutions; however, improved teaching and increased faculty activity in research are the major benefits. Lack of resources for funding faculty development needs and lack of relationship to the reward system are most commonly expressed problems at comprehensive institutions, while improved teaching and faculty development being viewed as a continual expectation are major benefits. The most prevalent problems of post-tenure review in liberal arts colleges are difficulty in measurement of competence and lack of resources for funding faculty

development needs; the most common benefits are improved teaching and faculty development being viewed as a continual expectation. The primary problems at two-year institutions are difficulty in measurement of competence and lack of relationship to the reward system; primary benefits are improved teaching and faculty development being viewed as a continual expectation. Excessive paperwork and time required, difficulty in measurement of competence, and lack of training for evaluators are the major problems at specialized institutions; major benefits are faculty development being viewed as a continual expectation, linkage of faculty goals and institutional goals, and development of improvement plans to meet faculty needs.

Every institution must weigh the problems and benefits that are likely to occur with post-tenure review. For policies to be effective at any type of institution, the following suggestions are made: (a) faculty should be assured of the formative nature of post-tenure review; (b) excessive paperwork should be avoided; (c) evaluator training should be conducted; (d) standards of measurement should be agreed upon; (e) resources should be provided to implement faculty development plans; and (f) a linkage between the review and rewards should be established. With a viable post-tenure review policy in effect, public confidence in higher education will increase as institutions hold tenured faculty more accountable for growth and development.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, it is recommended

that additional research be conducted comparing tenured faculty's perceptions of post-tenure review with academic administrators' perceptions of the process. This study collected perceptions from chief academic administrators only. A comparison of perceptions would provide a broader perspective of post-tenure review.

A study that compares the purposes, processes, and components of non-tenured faculty evaluation with tenured faculty evaluation is recommended. This type of study would be useful to administrators in determining whether two separate faculty evaluation policies should exist at colleges and universities.

Case studies examining the effectiveness of improvement plans or growth contracts would provide useful information to administrators involved in post-tenure review. This study should provide recommendations for action when improvement plans are fulfilled or not fulfilled. There is a paucity of literature regarding this issue.

Alternatives to tenure are being implemented or explored at higher education institutions. Research that investigates the proliferation and effectiveness of these alternatives would provide a needed addition to the literature base.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AAUP/AAC Commission on Academic Tenure (1973). Faculty tenure: a report and recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Alfred, R. L., & Nash, N.S. (1983). Faculty retraining: a strategic response to changing resource and technology. Community College Review 11, 3-8.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (1987). The core of academe: teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Washington, DC: Gilbert.
- American Association of University Professors (1983, November/December). On periodic evaluation of tenured faculty. Academe, 69, 1a - 14a.
- Andrews, H., & Licata, C. (1989). The state of faculty evaluation in community, technical, and junior colleges with the North Central Region 1988-1989. Illinois: Council of North Central Community and Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 204)
- Astin, A. (1991). The American college teacher. National norms for the 1989-90 HERI faculty survey. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Aubrecht, J.D. (1984). Better faculty evaluation systems. In Seldin, P. (Ed.), Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation (pp. 87-89). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Babbie, E. R. (1973), Survey research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Baldwin, R. (1984). The changing development needs of an aging professorate. In R. Baldwin, J. (Ed.), Incentives for faculty vitality, 51. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Baldwin, R., & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process: implications for higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 52 (6), 598-613.
- Bayer, A. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1977). Career age and research—professional activities of academic scientists. Journal of Higher Education, 48, 259-282.

- Belker, J. (1982). The education of mid-career professors: is it continuing? College Teaching, 33 (2), 68-71.
- Bennett, J. & Chater, S. (1984). Evaluating the performance of tenured faculty members. Educational Record, 65, 38-41.
- Bennett, J. (1985) Faculty evaluation: the roles of the department chair. The Department Advisor, 1, 1-5.
- Berquist, W. H. & Phillips, S. R. (1975). Components of an effective faculty development program. Journal of Higher Education, 46 (2), 177-179.
- Bevan, J. M. (1980). Faculty evaluation and institutional rewards. AAHE Bulletin, 33 (12) 1-15.
- Blackburn, R. T. (1972). Tenure: aspects of job security on the changing campus. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 068 005)
- Blackburn, R. T., Behymer, C. E., & Hall, D. E. (1978). Research not: correlates of faculty publications. Sociology of Education, 51, 132-141.
- Boyer, E. (1991). Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Centra, J. A. (1985). Maintaining faculty vitality through faculty development. In Clark, M. & Lewis, D. (Eds.) Faculty vitality and institutional productivity: critical perspectives for higher education (pp. 141-156). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clark, S., Boyer, C. & Corcoran, M. (1985). Faculty and institutional vitality in higher education. In Clark, S. & Lewis, D. (Eds.). Faculty vitality and institutional productivity: critical perspectives for higher education (pp. 157-168). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clark, S. & Corcoran, M. (1985). Individual and organizational contributions to faculty vitality: an institutional case study. In Clark, S. & Lewis, D. (Eds.) Faculty vitality and institutional productivity: critical perspectives for higher education (pp. 112-138). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, A. & Brawer, F. (1989). The American community college. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Craver, C. (1990). The implications of the elimination of mandatory retirement for professors. Journal of College and University Law, 16 (3), 343-72.
- Cuneo, P. (ed.). (1972). Are these criteria for hiring and firing faculty the same as yours? College Management, 7, 16-20.
- Dellamura, M.H. (1986). An analysis of the use of faculty development principles in two year colleges. Dissertation Abstracts. (University Microfilms No. AAC 8626266)
- Dressel, P. L. (1961). The essential nature of evaluation. In Dressel, P. L. & Associates (Eds.), Evaluation in higher education (pp.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dressel, P. L. (1976). Handbook of academic evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eble, K. E. (1971). Teaching: despite attacks on tenure, there is no evidence that it actually leads to ineffective teaching. Chronicle of Higher Education, 8.
- Edgerton, R. (1993, July/August). The re-examination of faculty priorities Change, 25, 10-25.
- Edwards, R. (1994, October). Toward constructive review of disengaged faculty. AAHE Bulletin, 6, 7, 11, 16.
- Felicetti, D. (1989). Post-tenure review as a termination mechanism. Journal for Higher Education Management, 4, (2) 51-65.
- Fullen, M., Miles, M. B., & Taylor, G. (1980). Organizational development in schools: the state of the art. Review of Educational Research, 50, 121-183.
- Fulton, O. & Trow, M. (1974). Research activity in American higher education. Sociology of Education, 46, 29-73.
- Galm, J. A. (1985). Welcome to post-tenure review. College Teaching, 33 (2), 65-67.
- Geis, G. L. (1977). Evaluation: definitions, problems, and strategies. In Knapper, C. K., G. L. Geis, C. E. Pascal, & B. M. Shore (Eds.), If teaching is important: the evaluation of instruction in higher education (pp. 8-41). Toronto, Ontario: Clarke, Irwin.

- Gibaldi, C.P. (1988). Faculty development practices at undergraduate colleges or schools of business administration in the New York City metropolitan area. Dissertation Abstracts. (University Microfilms No. AAC 8906455)
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M. & Donnelly, Jr., J. H. (1973). Organizations structure, processes, behavior. Dallas: Business Publications, Inc.
- Goodman, M. J. (1990). The review of tenured faculty: a collegial model. Journal of Higher Education, 61 (4), 408-424.
- Gould, R.L. (1978). Transformations. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Gross, A. (1977). Twilight in academe: the problem of the aging professorate. Phi Delta Kappan, 58, 752-754.
- Gustad, A. (1977). Policies and practices in faculty evaluation. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Committee on College Teaching.
- Habecker, E. B. (1981). A systematic approach to the study of benefits and detriments of tenure in American higher education: an analysis of the evidence. Unpublished paper. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 208)
- Hall, D. T. & Nogaim, K. (1968). An examination of Maslow's need hierarchy in an organizational setting. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3, 12-35.
- Hammons, J. (1983). Faculty development: a necessary corollary to faculty evaluation. In Smith, A. (Ed). New dimensions for community colleges, 41. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Hollander, P. A. (1992, June 17). Evaluating tenured professors. Chronicle of Higher Education, A44.
- How classifications were determined: text of the category definitions. (1987, July). Chronicle of Higher Education, A14.
- Johnson, G. (1990). The innovation process in organizations: a look at post-tenure faculty evaluation. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. AAC9117700)
- Johnson, G. (1993). Post-tenure review: practical considerations. Journal for Higher Education Management, 8, 19-29.

- Kanter, R. M. (1979). Changing the shape of work: reform in academe. In Edgerton, R. (Ed.), Current issues in higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Kearl, B. (1983). Remarks. Academe, 69, 8a-10a.
- Keig, L. & Waggoner, M. D. (1994). Collaborative peer review: the role of faculty in improving college teaching. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1, 1994. Washington, DC: The George Washington University Press.
- Kerlinger, F. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. (3rd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kleingartner, A. (1984, November). Post-tenure evaluation and collective bargaining. Paper presented at the ACE Conference, Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty, Miami FL.
- Larsen, C. (1983). Remarks. Academe, 69, 10a-11a.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H. & McKee, B. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Licata, C. (1984). An investigation of the status of post-tenure evaluation in selected community colleges in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University.
- Licata, C. (1986). Post-tenure faculty evaluation: threat or opportunity? (Report No. EDO-HE-87-6). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 529)
- Locke, E. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3, (157-189).
- Magner, D. K. (1995, March 31). Tenure re-examined. Chronicle of Higher Education, A17-18.
- McCabe, M. V. (1980). Evaluation for advancement: the university faculty point of view. Dissertation Abstracts, (University Microfilms No. AAC8102611)

- McClelland, D. (1961). The achieving society. Preiceton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McKeachie, W. (1983). Faculty as a renewable resource. In Baldwin, R. G. & Blackburn, R. T. (Eds.). College faculty: versatile human resources in a period of constraint. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 40. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- McShane, K. & Douzenis, C. (1987, November). Evaluation and reward: is research the only way? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-south Educational Research Association. Mobile, AL.
- Menges, R. J. (1985). Career span faculty development, College Teaching, 33, 181-84.
- Miller, R. (1972). Evaluating faculty performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, R. (1975). Developing programs for faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Moore, K. & Gardner, P. (1992). Faculty in a time of change: job satisfaction and career mobility. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Collegiate Employment Research Institute.
- Mortimer, K. (1986). Flexibility in academic staffing. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 523)
- Moses, I. (1985). What academics think about regular reviews of performance. Australian Universities' Review, 28, 34-40.
- Mott, M. (1994). REFRAME: A model for promoting faculty/staff vitality and excellence. The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, 11 (3), 151-160.
- Murphy, M. (1990). The role of the dean in improving teaching in the colleges. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. AAC9030297)
- National Commission on Higher Education Issues (1982). To strengthen quality in higher education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 646)

- Orpen, C. (1982). Tenure and academic productivity: another look. Improving College and University Teaching, 30, 60-62.
- Portch, S. R., Kaufman, N.J., & Ross, J. R. (1993). From frog to prince: from post-tenure review to faculty roles, development, and rewards. Change, July/August, 17.
- Raufman, C. L. (1991). Dimensions of faculty development: organizational factors related to creating effective faculty development programs in selected California community colleges. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. AAC 9135183)
- Reisman, B. (1986). Performance evaluation for tenured faculty: issues and research. Liberal education, 72:73-87.
- Robbins, Stephen. (1993). Organizational behavior. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Rubino, A.N. (1994). Faculty development programs and evaluation in American colleges and universities. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. AAC 9433203)
- Rue, L. & Byars, L. (1992). Management skills and application. Illinois: Irwin.
- Schmuck, R. A. & Runkel, P. J. (1985). The handbook of organizational development in schools. Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Seldin, P. (1984). Changing practices in faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shaw, B. N. (1971). Academic tenure in American higher education. Chicago: Adams Press.
- Shapiro, H. T. (1983, November/December). The privilege and the responsibility. Academe, 69, 3a - 7a.
- Sheey, G. M. (1976). Passages: predictable crises of adult life. New York: P. Dutton.
- Sprinthall, R. C. (1990). Basic Statistical Analysis. (3rd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 282-298.

Taylor, F. (1947). Scientific Management. New York: Harper.

Tenured faculty review and development: guidelines amended and adopted by the Board of Regents. Executive Summary (1992). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Trow, M. (1977). Aspects of American Higher Education 1969-1975: a report for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 085)

Van Alstyne, A. (1983). Tenure system at the University of Utah. In Smith, B.(Ed.), The tenure debate (pp.74-96). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Walden, T. (1979). Tenure and academic productivity. Improving College and University Teaching, 27, 154-57.

Wergin, J. F., Mason, E. J., & Munson, P. J. (1976). The practice of faculty development: an experience-derived model. Journal of Higher Education, 47, 289-308.

Weimer, M, Kerns, M. & Parrett, J. L. (1988). Instructional observation: caveats, concerns, and ways to compensate. Studies in Higher Education, 13, 285-93.

APPENDIX A
THE POST-TENURE REVIEW SURVEY

POST-TENURE REVIEW SURVEY

The primary objective of this study is to determine the purposes, processes, and components used in post-tenure review at colleges and universities across the country. In addition, **your opinions** regarding post-tenure review are being sought. Post-tenure review is defined as a formal, systematic process designed to evaluate tenured faculty.

Section I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What is the Carnegie classification of your institution?
 Research Institution I or II Liberal Arts College I or II
 Doctoral Institution I or II 2-Year Community College, Junior College or Institute
 Comprehensive College or University I or II Specialized or Professional School
2. Is your institution considered a public or private institution?
 Public Private
3. What is the approximate percentage of faculty tenured at your institution?
 90 percent or more 60 - 69 percent
 80 - 89 percent 50 - 59 percent
 70 - 79 percent Below 50 percent
 Institution does not grant tenure
(STOP here if tenure is NOT granted and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope)
4. Are evaluations of tenured faculty conducted at your institution?
 Yes No
5. Is there a formal, written policy for post-tenure review?
 Yes (Please complete Sections II and III)
 No, but a written policy is in development (* Section III)
 No, but evaluations occur for determination of merit pay (* Section III)
 No (* Section III)

Section II. CONTENT OF EXISTING POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

6. Which one of the following statements best describes the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review at your institution: (Check one)
 It provides information used primarily in salary, retention, or promotion decisions
 It provides information to assist in faculty growth and development
 Other _____
7. Who was involved in the development of the post-tenure review policy? (Check all that apply)
 Academic administrators Governing boards Students
 Faculty Legislators Other _____
8. How are tenured faculty selected to be reviewed?
 The review is mandatory for all tenured faculty at periodic intervals
 The review is mandatory if performance falls below acceptable level
 The review is voluntary and performed when requested by tenured faculty
 Other _____

9. What is the scheduled timeframe for review of tenured faculty?
- Every year
 4- or 5-year cycle
 2- or 3-year cycle
 Dependent upon performance levels
 Voluntarily established by faculty
 Other _____
10. Are improvement plans established at the conclusion of the review process?
- Yes
 No (see No. 13)
11. Who is involved in developing improvement plans? (Check all that apply)
- Faculty member
 Peer or group of peers
 Chair of department
 Dean
 Other (Please specify) _____
12. Is there follow-up at any time that evaluates progress toward meeting goals of the improvement plan?
- Yes
 No
13. Which of the following are included as components of the post-tenure review policy? (Check all that apply)
- Administrator evaluations
 Creative endeavors
 Student evaluations
 Professional development activities
 Classroom observation by peers
 Institutional service
 Peer review committees
 Professional service
 Self-evaluations
 Community service
 Research activities
 Other _____
 Publications

Section III. OPINIONS REGARDING POST-TENURE REVIEW--Please check the responses that describe your opinions regarding post-tenure review.

14. Which of the following should be the primary purpose of post-tenure review? (Check one)
- Reviews should be used to provide information for salary, retention, or promotion decisions
 Reviews should be used to provide information to assist in faculty growth and development
 Other _____
15. Who should be involved in the development of post-tenure review policies? (Check all that apply)
- Academic administrators
 Governing boards
 Students
 Faculty
 Legislators
 Other _____
16. How should tenured faculty be selected for review?
- The review should be mandatory for all tenured faculty at periodic intervals
 The review should be mandatory if performance falls below acceptable level
 The review should be voluntary and performed when requested by tenured faculty
 Other _____

17. What timeframe do you consider appropriate for evaluation of tenured faculty? (Check one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Every year | <input type="checkbox"/> 4- or 5-year cycle |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2- or 3-year cycle | <input type="checkbox"/> Dependent on performance level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntarily established by faculty | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify) _____ | |

18. Should improvement plans for tenured faculty be established at the conclusion of the review process?

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No (see No. 21) |
|------------------------------|--|

19. Who should be involved in developing improvement plans for tenured faculty? (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty member | <input type="checkbox"/> Peer or group of peers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Department chair | <input type="checkbox"/> Dean |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify) _____ | |

20. Should there be follow-up to evaluate progress toward meeting goals of the improvement plan?

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|

21. Please indicate the importance each of the following components should have in evaluating tenured faculty, using the following scale in providing your response. (Circle your choice)

LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE: 4 = HIGH 3 = MODERATE 2 = LITTLE 1 = NO IMPORTANCE

a.	Administrator evaluations	4	3	2	1
b.	Student evaluations	4	3	2	1
c.	Classroom observation by peers	4	3	2	1
d.	Peer review committees	4	3	2	1
e.	Self-evaluations	4	3	2	1
f.	Research activities	4	3	2	1
g.	Publications	4	3	2	1
h.	Creative endeavors	4	3	2	1
i.	Professional development activities	4	3	2	1
j.	Institutional service	4	3	2	1
k.	Professional service	4	3	2	1
l.	Community service	4	3	2	1
m.	Other _____	4	3	2	1

22. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following is a problem area associated with post-tenure review, using the following scale in providing your response. (Circle your choice)

4 = MAJOR PROBLEM 3 = MODERATE PROBLEM 2 = MINOR PROBLEM 1 = NOT A PROBLEM

a.	Process viewed as a threat to tenure	4	3	2	1
b.	Excessive paperwork and time required	4	3	2	1
c.	Difficulty in measurement of competence	4	3	2	1
d.	Lack of resources for funding faculty development needs	4	3	2	1
e.	Ineffective implementation of faculty development plan	4	3	2	1
f.	Lack of training for evaluators	4	3	2	1
h.	Lack of relationship to reward system	4	3	2	1
g.	Negative effect on collegiality among faculty	4	3	2	1
h.	Other _____	4	3	2	1

23. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following is a benefit associated with post-tenure review, using the following scale in providing your response. (Circle your choice)

4 = MAJOR BENEFIT 3 = MODERATE BENEFIT 2 = MINOR BENEFIT 1 = NOT A BENEFIT

a.	Institutional accountability, integrity, and public confidence enhanced through process	4	3	2	1
b.	Information acquired for use in personnel decisions such as promotion and merit pay	4	3	2	1
c.	Improved teaching by tenured faculty	4	3	2	1
d.	Increased faculty activity in research	4	3	2	1
e.	Increased faculty participation in institutional and public service activities	4	3	2	1
f.	Linkage of faculty goals and institutional goals	4	3	2	1
g.	Improved collegiality among faculty	4	3	2	1
h.	Faculty development viewed as a continual expectation	4	3	2	1
i.	Identification of faculty deficiencies and development of improvement plans	4	3	2	1
j.	Multiple sources provide input to evaluation process	4	3	2	1
k.	Other _____	4	3	2	1

This completes the survey. THANK YOU for participating! Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by November 25, 1995, to Jo Harris, WV Institute of Technology, Montgomery, WV 25136-1003.

If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please enclose your business card.

APPENDIX B

LETTER FOR USE OF SPECIFIC SURVEY ITEMS



West Virginia Institute of Technology
Montgomery, West Virginia 25116

Community and Technical College

February 26, 1996

Dr. Christine Licata
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Rochester Institute of Technology
52 Lomb Memorial Drive
Rochester, NY 14623-5604

Dear Dr. Licata

I am writing for two reasons: to thank you for all your assistance with my study on post-tenure review and to officially notify you of the items I modified from your questionnaire. I certainly appreciate all the advice you have provided me during the course of my dissertation process.

Your willingness to share your insight and knowledge in the area of post-tenure review helped me conceptualize my study. By talking with you many times, I was finally able to focus my work. As I am sure you realized from our first conversation, I had chosen post-tenure review as a topic, but I had not yet determined the specific direction the study should take. Your conversations with me were instrumental in refining my topic.

From the many facsimile copies and telephone conversations with you regarding my survey instrument, I did incorporate or modify a few items from your 1987-88 study with Dr. Andrews. Even though you provided permission verbally to modify items from your instrument, I am sending this letter to confirm what I did use. From your questionnaire to administrators, I used Question 4 and modified Questions 5, 6, and 7 in Part 1; from Part 2, Questions 6 and 8 were used as a basis for two items on my instrument. From the faculty questionnaire, Questions 11 and 13 from Part 1 were modified. Although I used neither instrument verbatim, the construction design and topics included in your survey provided me with a conceptual framework with which to work when designing my instrument.

I am currently analyzing the findings from my respondents; a total of 347 individuals responded from 47 states and the District of Columbia. As soon as I have completed my analysis, I will provide you with a summary of data. Again, thank you so much for your help. Your expertise in the area of post-tenure review was so beneficial, and your willingness to discuss different approaches to the study was invaluable.

Sincerely

Jo Harris

APPENDIX C
PANEL OF EXPERTS

PANEL OF EXPERTS

The panel of experts used to review the Post-tenure Review Survey was comprised of academic administrators similar to those surveyed in the study, a noted researcher in the field of post-tenure review, higher education faculty who were involved as committee members for the study, and members of a research support group who met regularly in Charleston, West Virginia, to critique work on doctoral dissertations in the field of educational administration.

Dr. Christine Licata
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Rochester Institute of Technology
National Technical Institute for the Deaf
52 Lomb Memorial Drive
Rochester, NY 14623-5604

Dr. Franklin Gilmore
Vice President for Academic Affairs
West Virginia Institute of Technology
Montgomery, WV 25136

Dr. Martha Shouldis
Provost, Community and Technical
College
West Virginia Institute of Technology
Montgomery, WV 25136

Ms. Ellen McLaughlin
Assistant Professor, Education
University of Charleston
Charleston, WV 25303

Ms. Donna Edwards
Accreditation Specialist
West Virginia Department of Education
Charleston, WV 25303

Mr. Michael Ditchen
Assistant Professor, Printing
West Virginia Institute of Technology
Montgomery, WV 25136

Dr. Ronald Childress
Professor, Education
West Virginia Graduate College
100 Angus E. Peyton Drive
South Charleston, WV 25303-1600

Dr. John Andes
Professor, Educational Administration
West Virginia University
509 Allen Hall
Morgantown, WV 26502

Dr. Kurt Olmosk
Dean, School of Business
West Virginia Graduate College
100 Angus E. Peyton Drive
South Charleston, WV 25303-1600

Dr. Powell Toth
Professor, Educational Administration
West Virginia Graduate College
100 Angus E. Peyton Drive
South Charleston, WV 25303-1600

Dr. Anne Cavalier
Vice President for Institutional
Advancement
West Virginia Institute of Technology
Montgomery, WV 25136



APPENDIX D
COVER LETTER, FIRST MAILING



Education Administration

West Virginia University

College of Human Resources and Education

November 1, 1995

Dear Chief Academic Officer

I am seeking your help in a doctoral study that will examine the purpose, processes, and components of post-tenure review policies in colleges and universities across the country. The enclosed survey is being sent to chief academic officers like yourself at 680 institutions to determine common practices of evaluation of tenured faculty by type of institution.

This study will be the first nationwide investigation of post-tenure review policies by type of institution. During my research, I found that the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) is conducting a two-year forum on tenure, and I have agreed to share data I collect through this study with the AAHE panel. By completing the enclosed survey, you can add needed information to the knowledge base regarding post-tenure review.

Because the study will report aggregate data, your responses will be anonymous and individual institutions will not be identified in the presentation of the findings; information will be presented by Carnegie classification. The survey is coded numerically. however, to assist in follow-up for the large sample.

If you elect to participate in the doctoral study, please respond by November 25, 1995. Your participation is voluntary, and you have the right to not respond to every item. Enclosed is a business reply envelope for your convenience in returning the questionnaire.

Post-tenure review has become a very important issue to higher education institutions today. Your participation is important and appreciated. I will be glad to share findings with you if you enclose a business card with your response. Thank you for your assistance in this project.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jo Harris".

Jo Harris

Enclosure

APPENDIX E
COVER LETTER, SECOND MAILING



December 1, 1995

Dear Chief Academic Officer

Many academic administrators have completed and returned the Post-Tenure Review Survey that is enclosed. Your response, however, has not been received as of this date. If you recently mailed the questionnaire, please disregard this reminder and accept my thanks. With Thanksgiving vacation and approaching end-of-term activities, I realize you may have been too busy to provide information requested or the original survey form may have been misplaced. A second copy of the questionnaire is attached for your convenience in replying, and the deadline for mailing your response has been extended to December 19. I hope the extension will give you time to participate in this doctoral study.

Your responses to the questionnaire will remain anonymous; individual institutions will not be identified in the presentation of data. Only aggregate information will be reported. Data will be compiled by type of institution based on Carnegie classification. The instrument is coded numerically to assist in follow-up from the 680 institutions surveyed.

Evaluation of tenured faculty has become an extremely important issue for colleges and universities today. This study will examine the purposes, processes, and components of post-tenure review at institutions that have implemented policies. Information collected will assist college personnel who are charged with the development or revision of post-tenure review policies by providing an analysis of what is being done on campuses similar to their own and what administrators like yourself perceive to be effective. I will be glad to send you summary data upon completion of my dissertation; simply enclose your business card with the form.

Your response to the survey will be sincerely appreciated. For an accurate examination of post-tenure review policies and practices nationwide, your response is needed. Thank you for your attention to this study.

Sincerely

Jo Harris

Enclosure

APPENDIX F
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY STATE

Distribution of Responses by State

State	Received	Sent	State	Received	Sent
Alabama	5	18	Missouri	8	18
Arizona	3	11	Montana	7	8
Arkansas	2	2	Nebraska	1	4
Alaska	0	1	Nevada	0	1
California	36	79	New Hampshire	4	7
Colorado	4	9	New Jersey	7	13
Connecticut	3	13	New Mexico	2	4
Delaware	0	1	New York	15	42
District of Columbia	2	3	North Carolina	11	19
Florida	11	24	North Dakota	1	4
Georgia	9	14	Ohio	17	30
Hawaii	1	2	Oklahoma	1	3
Idaho	1	2	Oregon	5	7
Illinois	14	23	Pennsylvania	11	38
Indiana	20	26	Rhode Island	1	2
Iowa	8	10	South Carolina	8	9
Kansas	4	9	South Dakota	2	2
Kentucky	5	14	Tennessee	12	21
Louisiana	2	4	Texas	21	33
Maine	5	9	Utah	3	5
Maryland	4	11	Vermont	2	6
Massachusetts	13	27	Virginia	12	21
Michigan	9	15	Washington	4	7
Minnesota	9	16	West Virginia	6	7
Mississippi	5	8	Wisconsin	9	15
			Wyoming	2	3

APPENDIX G
DISTRIBUTION OF TENURE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Distribution of Tenure by Type of Institution

Type of Institution	Total Number of Respondents	Frequency of Respondents having Tenure	Percent of Respondents having Tenure
Research	14	14	100.0
Doctoral	17	17	100.0
Comprehensive	78	69	88.5
Liberal arts	74	59	79.7
Two-year	120	62	51.7
Specialized	44	13	29.5
Total	347	234	67.4

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AND AMONG
POLICY VARIABLES, TYPE OF INSTITUTION,
AND PERCEPTION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS
WITH REGARD TO POST-TENURE REVIEW

Beverly Jo Harris

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to examine the relationship between and among post-tenure review policy variables and types of institutions, as perceived by chief academic administrators at colleges and universities across the United States.

Chief academic administrators at 680 randomly selected accredited institutions were mailed the Post-tenure Review Survey, an instrument designed by the researcher. A total of 347 (51%) administrators returned the survey.

Demographic data indicated that tenure was operative at 67.4 percent of the institutions. Tenured faculty evaluation was reported by 87.2 percent of the institutions where tenure was operative. Formal, written post-tenure review policies were in effect at 61.1 percent of the institutions.

Data were analyzed using the General Linear Model of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Analysis of the data provided the following major findings:

No significant differences were found among types of institutions regarding the stated primary purpose of post-tenure review. Faculty growth

and development was both the stated and desired purpose of tenured faculty evaluation.

No significant differences were found among types of institutions regarding the following processes: individuals involved in the development of policies, individuals involved in the development of improvement plans, and use of follow-up. Significant differences were determined among types of institutions for the following processes: methods of selection, timeframes, and use of improvement plans.

No significant differences were identified among types of institutions in use of the following teaching components of post-tenure review: student evaluations, self-evaluations, administrator evaluations, classroom observation by peers, and peer review committees. Significant differences were found in all components related to scholarship and service.

Significant differences were found between actual and desired use of the following processes: individuals involved in development of policies, timeframes, individuals involved in development of improvement plans, use of follow-up. Significant differences were found between actual and desired use of the following components: all types of evaluations to assess teaching, research activities, publications, creative endeavors, professional service and community service.

Significant differences were identified among types of institutions for the following problems: the process is viewed as a threat to tenure, difficulty

in measurement of competence, and lack of training for evaluators.

Significant differences were determined among types of institutions for the following benefits: information acquired from the review can be used in personnel decisions such as promotion and merit pay, increased faculty participation in institutional and public service activities, increased faculty activity in research, and improved collegiality among faculty.

The study concluded that variations occur by type of institution in post-tenure review policy purposes, processes, and components. Philosophy and mission of an institution should provide the framework for post-tenure review policy variables.

APPROVAL OF EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Dr. John Andes

Dr. Anne Cavalier

Dr. Kurt Olmosk

Dr. Powell Toth

Date

Dr. Ronald Childress
Chairperson