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and department documentation and evaluation process that values the time, effort, and outcomes of the technology enhancement process.

Institutions should recognize and support instructional research. By striving to raise it to the same plane as other more traditionally accepted research, legitimizing the role of pedagogy as part of the promotion and tenure process, institutions will be able to determine the instructional value of technology enhancements and engage in a never-ending cycle of implementation, research and improvement.

Goals for faculty professional development programs should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills in at least the following areas: (1) teaching, learning, and evaluation theories and methods; (2) curriculum design theories and techniques; (3) basic use of technology; and (4) strategies for design of new applications for existing technologies.
Faculty Review Policies

Faculty Performance Review
and the Public Trust

Faculty review processes were placed in the public spotlight only within the past decade, as questions arose about the circumstances under which a tenured faculty member could be dismissed for poor performance. Colleges and universities, when pressed for details about how many tenured faculty they had ever dismissed for cause, found themselves awkwardly explaining that, as in Lake Wobegone, all tenured faculty were consistently judged to be "above average." In response, the public, acting through state legislators, began to call for evidence that post-tenure reviews were conducted and that consistent poor performance was dealt with in a consequential and timely fashion. The result was that many states passed legislation requiring the creation and implementation of post-tenure review policies at public colleges and universities.

Post-tenure review demonstrates higher education's commitment to high levels of performance even within the guarantees of tenure. It can be an effective strategy for increasing public trust in higher education.

Fairness is also at issue. With post-tenure review a matter of public policy, tenure itself becomes somewhat more palatable to those outside academia who, lacking such job protection themselves, may be vulnerable to downsizing or restructuring even after years of good performance. Finally, now that post-tenure review is effectively in place, the public has more expectations that higher education will be able to respond to change more quickly since it is not encumbered by poor-performing faculty.

Beyond post-tenure review, however, there is little public awareness of how quality in higher education is ensured. The absence of political pressure and public outcry could tempt us to ignore the fact that improved faculty evaluation systems offer a means of achieving substantive change without relying exclusively on program cuts and closures. In reality, learning to better manage our human resources will prove the best opportunity for widespread change.

Even this will not be sufficient if all new hiring opportunities are not immediately scrutinized at the highest institutional levels and new human capital defined, directed, and deployed with originality and attention to institutional mission. If the system is to retain its collegiality, everyone must participate in appropriate decision-making with courage and a primary commitment to high-quality education.

It is imperative that higher education consider these issues in a candid, forthright manner. Acceptance of our institutional responsibility to identify, retain, and develop the appropriate faculty will provide us with the flexibility to respond to the new mandates of higher learning in the coming century.

Overarching Themes

Numerous overarching themes underlie the policy recommendations that follow.

◆ Reviews should be efficient, professional, and consequential. Such reviews are an essential component of all forms of institutional accountability.

◆ All effective faculty performance reviews are contingent upon clear institutional mission statements, explicit job expectations, acknowledgment of the value of collective effort and achievement, and attention to student learning outcomes. All reviews must work to the benefit of the institution and the individual.

◆ All review systems must have clearly defined purposes and detailed implementation guidelines. The scope of possible outcomes should be clearly defined, and the associated consequences, both positive and negative, should be made known to all participants.

◆ All reviewers should be selected on the basis of their ability to evaluate specific performance areas.

◆ As more faculty employment arrangements are developed to respond to new forms of course delivery and to disappearing boundaries of time and space, appropriate forms of performance review must be implemented.

◆ All faculty reward systems should promote clear and high standards in all areas of faculty work; where possible, they should provide rewards for high performance.
- Our institutions of higher learning have a collective responsibility to nurture an appreciation and respect for the benefits inherent in our increasingly diversified culture. Institutional diversity goals should be reflected in criteria and standards of faculty performance. Faculty evaluation can be utilized by an institution to strategically reinforce its goals and values.

- Self-evaluation, an important facet of faculty performance reviews, should reflect the cycles of professorial life and should lead to appropriately differentiated assignments over one's career.

- Academic freedom serves society by ensuring that knowledge can be pursued and that controversial ideas can be tested and discussed. Such protection must be assured in all faculty review processes.

- Institutions must have in place an effective and accessible appeal and grievance procedure to which all faculty review systems are subject. The procedure must be limited to alleged procedural violation(s) or discrimination, not professional judgments of academic merit by the evaluators.

- Development of and revisions to faculty performance review policies must involve institutional faculty.

- Accrediting agencies must actively support new institutional strategies for the deployment of intellectual capital.
Reports and Policy Recommendations

Efficiency of Reviews
The development and retention of high-quality faculty must be the central focus of performance reviews.

In creating performance evaluation processes, a direct link between the mission of the institution and the role of individual faculty members must be expressed and understood. This link is articulated by establishing goals and objectives on an individual basis for every faculty member. The individual’s performance, goals, and expectations must complement the mission of the institution and the goals of the unit. The review process must be flexible enough to address the different contributions of individual faculty members.

Beyond delineating the process and guidelines, institutions must be cognizant of the “hidden costs” of evaluation—especially those associated with the time and effort candidates, peers, and administrators commit to preparing for and participating in the evaluation process.

Institutional criteria and expectations should be clearly presented to faculty members. All faculty should present a professional development plan that outlines how they will make original, substantive contributions to their disciplines and how such scholarly vitality can keep their teaching current and enhance the academic reputation of their department.

There also must be a direct, understandable correlation between faculty members’ performance goals and the purpose, criteria, and consequences of evaluation. Annual reviews for merit pay increases, for example, usually focus on short-term goals whereas performance reviews for retention, tenure, and promotion are summative and focus on long-term accomplishments of scholarship and productivity.

When possible, evaluations addressing different purposes should be combined or substituted to minimize redundancy and promote efficiency. A single evaluation of a probationary faculty member should provide the basis for multiple decisions—for example, those regarding merit pay, service step increases, and retention status. Likewise, consideration for promotion to full professor should obviate the requirement for a post-tenure review in the same year. Creating separate processes to evaluate the various purposes of an individual faculty member’s performance increases the danger of encumbering efficacy and communication.

The following guidelines serve as best practices in the development of a functioning performance evaluation policy:

✦ Faculty development along with the retention of high-quality faculty must be the central focus of performance reviews.

✦ Published criteria for any evaluation must be provided in advance to all participants.

✦ Annually, each full-time faculty member must establish short-range goals compatible with the mission of the institution and its strategic initiatives, as well as with the individual’s long-range professional development plan. Part-time faculty should establish short-range goals annually. Faculty goals and professional development plans are subject to review and approval by the appropriate administrator.

✦ Evaluations serving different purposes, e.g., annual merit pay and retention status of a probationary faculty member, must be combined, and in some cases substituted, to increase efficiency and minimize redundancy.

✦ Consequential reviews must occur at regular intervals throughout a faculty member’s entire career.

✦ Professional development plans must be revised following summative reviews and should vary according to the individual’s career progression.

✦ Summative reviews must include input from stakeholders—for example, students, alumni, and those with appropriate expertise; assessment of pedagogy by distinguished teachers; peer review by members of the academic discipline; and, when appropriate, peer review by the scholarly community of the discipline.

✦ When unsatisfactory performance is documented, specific goals consistent with the individual’s professional development must be affirmed in writing.
Policy Recommendation

37. Colleges and universities must review all faculty evaluation processes, take steps to eliminate redundancy, and ensure that all reviews are consequential. In devising effective and efficient review systems that best meet their needs, institutions must aim for the best possible reviews at the lowest possible cost.

Annual Evaluations and Merit Pay Reviews

Virtually every college and university has a system of annual evaluation of faculty, primarily for the purpose of annual salary adjustment. These systems are based on performance in teaching, research/scholarship and service. Boyer (Scholarship Reconsidered, 1989) found that the value placed upon each of these varies substantially by Carnegie classification; this is true particularly with regard to the balance between teaching and research. Further, the difficulty in identifying reliable means of evaluating each often results in over-reliance on the research component, whether or not that is most highly valued by the institution. This is because research/scholarship is easy to measure. As institutions increasingly have moved toward acknowledging teaching as a more significant component of faculty work, new means have been explored to measure performance in teaching. But the reward system has been slow to respond to this shift in institutional priority.

The traditional evaluation, ranking, and reward system at most research universities is based on a standard distribution of time (40 percent teaching, 40 percent research, 20 percent service). An emerging trend is to supplement the traditional system with one that relies on the collective achievement of departmental goals by coordinating individual strengths and talents, areas of interest, and stages in academic careers. Ultimately, a collaborative atmosphere may replace one of competition, and institutions' human resources may be allocated to more effectively support their missions.

The movement toward collective achievement requires that multiple criteria be employed to evaluate each aspect of faculty work. This is especially true in the area of teaching effectiveness, the evaluation of which should include validated student rating data as well as classroom observations by both a "master teacher" and a content specialist. Evaluation should be based on individualized goals and expectations established by the department head and faculty member; these goals should be consistent with the mission and objectives of the academic unit rather than the ranking of faculty in comparison to one another.

The annual cycle of establishing goals and objectives, performing evaluations based on those goals and objectives, and determining salary increases is a process of allocating resources (faculty time) as well as evaluating and rewarding performance.

The process should be based on the assumption that faculty will meet its objectives collectively and consequently capitalize on the combination of individual strengths. The evaluation should include both data and narrative and should provide formative and summative information to the individual and the institution.

Key in the effort to reestablish public trust in higher education has been a focus on building and maintaining the highest quality faculty. The process used to hire and reappoint faculty is at the core of this effort. Traditionally, peers are involved in the earliest stages of the process. Individuals in one's academic discipline at the departmental level are in the best position to evaluate credentials in a particular discipline. These are also the individuals who will work on a daily basis with the faculty member they are evaluating and whose future they are determining with regard to reappointment and tenure decisions. As we seek to establish multiple criteria for evaluating the different components of faculty work and to incorporate peer input based on different areas of expertise (such as content and pedagogy), institutions may wish to consider more internal interdisciplinary first-semester peer review committees.

Merit Pay

Once an institution has in place a reliable system for annually evaluating its faculty, merit pay can be an effective means of enhancing outcomes, further restoring public trust in higher education, and enhancing institutional flexibility.
However, merit pay generates tension between the institution's need to direct limited financial resources to support its mission and the faculty's concern that those most favored by the administration will be the principal beneficiaries of a performance-based compensation system. Nevertheless, many institutions have incorporated merit pay into compensation plans, in addition to such traditional means of recognition as promotion, travel funds, institutional support for research and scholarship, etc. According to advocates of merit pay, annual increases in compensation based on longevity alone promote mediocrity and discourage highly motivated and performing faculty.

Faculty associations and bargaining representatives generally have not supported merit pay, but the model has wide public and institutional support. Some faculty representatives suggest that merit pay, if considered at all, must be in addition to competitive base salaries; must include opportunities for all faculty to obtain higher salaries and career advancement; must involve faculty in the development of the plan; must be based on objectives agreed to in advance; must include developmental opportunities where appropriate; and must be appealable.

It is also important that criteria be well communicated and clearly understood by all parties. Institutions should inventory all forms of recognition and reward utilized; these forms should be augmented if appropriate. They should be based on criteria developed for this purpose and should be implemented in a fair and impartial manner. Further, the institution must consider whether to provide merit pay in the form of increases to base salary (a method which has long-term financial consequences) or as one-time cash bonuses (to reward accomplishment) or a combination of the two. Consideration should be given to publicizing recipients' names both within the institution and externally, if appropriate. Finally, an approach to merit pay based on the individual accomplishments and interests of faculty, which, in turn advance the collective effort of academic units and the institution, warrants serious consideration. Collaborative or group rewards, including merit pay for achievement of strategic institutional goals are a logical follow-up.

### Policy Recommendations

38. All postsecondary institutions must have an effective annual performance evaluation system. As their mix of full-time, part-time, adjunct, and other employment arrangements is developed, it is critical that institutions integrate effective annual performance evaluation into faculty roles and reward systems—both for its stand alone value and as a foundation for all other types of performance review. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 26, 27, 44 and 46.)

39. Reviews for determination of merit pay must be linked directly to institutional goals and mission. A strategic variety of rewards for merit should be considered, and particular attention should be paid to both individual and collective achievements.

### Comprehensive Mid-Probationary Review

The comprehensive mid-probationary review is a summative, developmental review of a candidate's progress toward meeting the institution's written criteria for achieving promotion and tenure. Comprehensive mid-probationary reviews serve as a written early warning system for probationary faculty regarding their current level of productivity and progress toward tenure.

Comprehensive mid-probationary reviews assess the current status and future professional potential of tenure-eligible faculty members. Reviews must objectively assess candidates' strengths and weaknesses and contributions to departmental and institutional objectives.

Because of their greater depth and the additional peer review involved, comprehensive mid-probationary reviews provide greater accountability than annual reviews. Mid-probationary reviews are more than the sum of annual reviews, so they may replace the annual review in the year(s) they are performed.

At all institutions that award tenure, faculty members must receive a mid-probationary written evaluation from the department and the next highest administrative level indicating whether the current level of performance merits continuation on tenure track. Assessment of satisfactory achievement/progress made and suggestions for further development, even
if completed in the time specified, should not constitute a guarantee of tenure.

Comprehensive mid-probationary reviews result in one of several outcomes:

**Overall Satisfactory Performance**
A faculty member performing satisfactorily will continue on tenure track. Suggestions for improved performance or correction of any identified deficits will be made so the candidate can better understand the expectations for meeting tenure criteria. This in no way guarantees a positive tenure recommendation, even if the candidate addresses such concerns. It does indicate that the department and the next highest level would likely support the candidate for tenure even if the candidate addresses concerns and continues to perform and develop at the current level.

**Candidate Needs Improvement In One or More Areas**
The current pattern of achievement puts the candidate at risk of not achieving tenure. Nonetheless, the candidate has the potential to improve sufficiently to achieve tenure and should receive an additional probationary contract. The candidate, working with the department chair and the next highest level, must develop a plan of action to remedy noted deficiencies. Every institution should develop a system to monitor the development of faculty in this category.

**Removal from Tenure Track**
Candidates whose performance is substantially deficient and are found unlikely to receive tenure must not receive an additional probationary appointment after the comprehensive mid-probationary review. In most cases this will lead to a terminal contract.

**Policy Recommendation**

40. Faculty at all institutions that award tenure must receive written mid-probationary performance evaluations indicating their progress toward tenure no later than the mid-point of their probationary period.

**Promotion and Tenure Reviews**

Tenure is considered one of the most important decisions made by an institution, representing a major commitment and investment of resources for both the faculty member and the institution. The award of tenure is not solely a reward for services performed during the probationary years but is an expression of confidence that the faculty member will continue to be a valued colleague, effective instructor, and active scholar, artist, or leader in the profession. Consequently, it defines the intellectual character of the institution.

Through tenure, the institution confirms its commitment to academic freedom, honors its obligation to provide a sufficient degree of economic security, and supports the continuous professional development of the faculty member. For their part, faculty members accept the obligation to serve the institution through the pursuit of teaching excellence, scholarly contributions, and service to the professional community.

As with tenure, criteria for promotion in academic rank should reinforce the Institution's mission and values and should be clearly expressed in writing. Promotion is not automatic but recognizes merit and ability. Although promotion to associate professor traditionally is concurrent with the award of tenure, one decision does not necessarily presuppose the other. Institutions should take particular care to define separate standards for promotion and tenure in ways that make it clear when those standards are made distinct and where they overlap or presuppose the other. Tenure and promotion decisions are on the basis of the recommendations of peers in the academic discipline, expert reviewers, and appropriate administrators.

**Policy Recommendation**

41. Criteria and expectations for tenure, as well as criteria for promotion in academic rank, must be compatible with the mission of the institution, developed in consultation with faculty, and approved at the institutional level. Although complex legal issues arise when an institution asserts the right to deny tenure based on constraints such as fiscal or programmatic concerns, the value of communicating these potential constraints to candidates for faculty positions makes candor preferable to silence.
Post-tenure Review

Post-tenure review has become a major focus of attention for higher education policy makers in the last five years. Licata (1998) reports that post-tenure review is being considered or implemented in more than 30 states. The need for such ongoing evaluation of tenured faculty has been a source of contention since 1982 when the National Commission of Higher Education recommended that tenured faculty be reviewed periodically. AAUP's most recent statement (12/9/98) continues to raise concerns about the need for, cost of, and outcomes of post-tenure review.

Such review typically is a systematic and comprehensive process, is separate from the annual review, is aimed specifically at assessing performance and/or encouraging faculty growth and development. The process may be initiated for all tenured faculty or for certain tenured faculty as the result of some trigger event. Faculty may also volunteer for such a review for personal or professional reasons.

Despite the tensions surrounding post-tenure review, pressure for increased accountability and the need to reclaim public trust in higher education have kept it at the forefront of discussion both within and outside the academy. The public perception of an aging, less productive professoriate as an outcome of the elimination of mandatory retirement has strengthened demands for post-tenure review.

Two purposes underlie post-tenure review policy development:

- Formative reviews are developmental in nature. The institution's role is principally to provide support and appropriate resources to help advance a faculty member's growth and to promote institutional and departmental missions and goals.

- Summative reviews identify a faculty member's performance level against a standard. When performance is above the norm, rewards may follow; when performance is below an acceptable level, outcomes may include a professional development plan or sanctions.

Few "pure" examples of these two approaches exist. Many of the post-tenure review systems in place, or under development at this time, reflect some combination of these purposes. This can lead to complex situations as stakeholders attempt to negotiate compromises in policy and procedures to represent their different purposes. The task is challenging and it remains to be seen whether any of the various approaches being developed and implemented can serve all of these purposes equally well.

Licata and Morreale (1996, pp. 10–15) identify five options for the design of post-tenure review systems:

Post-tenure Reviews Based on Annual Reviews

Rigorous annual reviews, where already in place, can serve as the primary component of a post-tenure review system. The range of annual review practices is considerable, however, and can involve anything from a one-page summary of achievements to an extensive portfolio of performance data. Given this variability, it is understandable that some policy makers and university administrators alike may have little faith in the annual review as a vehicle for providing feedback about long-term career development. Innovative approaches to annual reviews include the practice of conducting the review annually but each time considering data from a period longer than one year. For example, in Arizona, annual reviews now are based on documented performance information from the previous 36 months.

Summative (Periodic/Consequential)

Periodic comprehensive reviews of all faculty members are conducted by a peer committee, administrators, or both, according to a prescribed cycle, usually about five years in duration. Outcomes may involve rewards for outstanding performance and required professional development plans when performance is deemed unsatisfactory. If progress remains unsatisfactory after a given time, substantial administrative sanctions may be imposed.

Summative (Triggered/Consequential)

This form of summative review differs from the periodic/consequential in that only selected faculty members are reviewed; these are identified by unsatisfactory performance detailed in an earlier review (or series of reviews). Consequences usually are defined in advance.

Formative (Departmental)

This type of review focuses on the establishment of a professional development plan for each faculty member. The plan is developed with the department head
or dean and emphasizes the academic needs of the university as well as the career interests of the faculty member.

**Formative (Individual)**

Individual formative reviews are periodic and are directed toward the long-term development of faculty. As a result of this review, a development plan is formulated in conjunction with peers, and institutional support is made available. There are no consequences for failure to meet one’s development plan, and materials collected cannot be used in dismissal-for-cause proceedings.

Faculty development should be a significant aspect of post-tenure review. We support Licata’s and Morreale’s recommendation that post-tenure review systematically and comprehensively assess performance, include significant peer involvement, assist individual faculty in establishing long-term professional goals within the context of institutional mission and priorities, and make it easier to remove chronic non-performers.

Academic administrators at institutions with post-tenure review generally are positive about the process. In those systems and institutions where post-tenure review coexists with collective bargaining, such review has been sustained through successive rounds of negotiations.

Evidence of the relationship between post-tenure review and administrative sanctions is less compelling; this includes dismissal for cause, though a pattern of increased use of early retirement options seems to be emerging.

**Tensions**

Some perceive external stakeholders’ role in promoting post-tenure review as an infringement on institutional autonomy. Many faculty are concerned that administrators will use post-tenure review to summarily, arbitrarily, and capriciously dismiss “unwelcome” faculty. Others are concerned that administrators do not use the personnel evaluations and sanctions already available. Historically, tenure was created to protect academic freedom, not to guarantee continuing employment for chronically poorly performing faculty. Consequently, post-tenure review systems must uphold the protection of academic freedom and reflect established minimum performance standards below which continued employment cannot be assured. Likewise, post-tenure review systems must incorporate faculty development to maximize institutions’ substantial investment in tenured faculty by sustaining and revitalizing performance.

Many are concerned about the time and resources that must be devoted to post-tenure review. Mandated post-tenure review can be unnecessarily time consuming given that the vast majority of well-performing faculty do not need such intensive review. Finding the appropriate balance between sensitivity to disciplinary differences and adherence to campus-wide standards is another primary concern.

Post-tenure review also can have unintended consequences. For example, if the period of review is short, faculty may be inclined to produce short-term scholarly work rather than pursue extended efforts that may not provide formal outcomes for several years. Similarly, the ongoing scrutiny of short-term teaching performance may be a disincentive to the development of innovative teaching practices—particularly those involving high-tech delivery. For many faculty, ongoing scrutiny of performance may prove counterproductive to innovation.

Whatever post-tenure review may achieve, it is not a “quick fix” to the problems facing higher education. Nor is an appropriate strategy for addressing the difficult issues of resource reallocation and restructuring. Specifically, a faculty member who is performing satisfactorily in a program area for which demand is low should not be judged as performing unsatisfactorily in order to address the demand problem.

**Policy Recommendations**

42. Every institution that grants tenure must require post-tenure review.

43. The purpose of post-tenure review is to support career-long faculty development and to provide quality assurance. Where possible, post-tenure review systems should involve rewards for high performance and consequences for chronic poor performance; the most intensive review efforts should focus on identifying chronic poor performers. Institutions should give consideration to both periodic post-tenure review systems mandated for all and systems where a series of poor performance on annual reviews triggers a post-tenure review.
Review of Part-time and Contract Faculty

The number of part-time and contract (or non-tenure track) faculty has grown significantly in colleges and universities of all sizes. Many different stakeholders have voiced concerns about potential effects on the quality of education. Part-time faculty should be fully integrated into the campus environment. They provide institutions with the flexibility to respond programmatically to clearly defined community and student needs. However, part-time and contract faculty at many institutions are less likely to receive regular evaluations, serve on committees, participate in faculty governance, attend professional conferences, engage in research, and have opportunities to interact with colleagues.

Many of the concerns pertaining to part-time faculty could be addressed if institutions were to implement regular evaluations that would assess in-class teaching and other responsibilities such as course preparation, student advisement, and service. Individual evaluations ideally would have both formative and summative components and would stress continuous professional improvement.

Program evaluations, using criteria established by the institution, state oversight departments, commissions, and accrediting agencies should assess the role of part-time faculty members in advancing program goals.

At the invitation of the American Historical Association, eight disciplinary associations met in the fall of 1997 to assess the excessive use of part-time faculty. Those associations concluded that higher education should develop new forms of compensation and recognition to address inequities associated with current use of part-time faculty, or rethink training and contractual arrangements for those who are assigned to courses typically taught by part-time faculty.

**Policy Recommendation**

44. Colleges and universities must have in place policy statements which establish periodic formal evaluations for part-time and contract faculty. These statements must be based on established, published criteria developed in consultation with those faculty and based on the institution’s expectations and the faculty’s level of involvement apart from individual teaching responsibilities. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 26, 27, 38 and 46.)

Accreditation processes best serve higher education when accreditors relate faculty achievements to those of their peers and provide substantive comments regarding professional development opportunities.

Accrediting agencies are urged to partner with higher education to develop standards that will enable institutions to proactively address the challenges posed by distance learning, increasing demands for accountability, vastly increased access, and commercial competition. Merely meeting standards will not enable the nation’s education system to meet the needs and challenges of people in the 21st century.

**Policy Recommendation**

45. Institutions must make strategic decisions about which accreditations they wish to pursue and must select only those agencies which recognize and support individual institutional missions and higher education’s mandate to respond to the changing world of learning and work.

Accreditation Reviews

Faculty performance is scrutinized in the context of regional and professional accreditation reviews based on standards designed primarily by the sponsoring agency. Unfortunately, these standards may conflict with the mission and goals of the campus under review. Ideally, colleges and universities should seek only those specialized accreditations that are consistent with institutional and departmental missions and that emphasize quality improvement.

Cohort Studies and Data Sharing

Some institutions have developed strategies for informing their governing boards about the nature of higher education and its unique values. Faculty personnel management is one area which has been given particular attention. Legitimate confusion regarding tenure in public schools versus tenure in higher education can be corrected through presentation of institutional cohort studies that track over six or seven
years the employment status of all the full-time faculty hired in a given year. On campuses where such studies have been conducted, cohort studies demonstrate that not everyone hired into a tenured position receives tenure, and that there is significant attrition in the pre-tenure period. The result is opportunities to redefine positions according to updated institutional needs.

As more institutions develop different employment arrangements and strategies more areas deserving closer attention will appear. The working years of the tenured workforce were "uncapped" in 1994 when the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) was applied to higher education. Little analysis of the potential impact of this has been done, and further analysis is necessary. "Term tenure," which would limit tenure to a specified number of years, or creative retirement incentives may need to be explored. Studies could provide data to ensure that institutional effectiveness is well served and that no discriminatory impacts are created. They also could be instructive in planning future hiring, faculty evaluation, and institutional orientation efforts.

In addition to conducting institutional studies, colleges and universities need to gather and share more information about their personnel policies, practices, and procedures. The recently established listserv on post-tenure review (posttenure@osfmail.lsc.rit.edu) sponsored by the American Association of Higher Education's (AAHE) New Pathways II Project is an example of how the Internet can be used effectively to inform and help practitioners and policy makers. The Project on Faculty Appointments, led by Richard Chait, A. Ann Trower, James Honan, and Holly Madsen, will further aid this effort by establishing an information clearinghouse on faculty appointment policies around the country.

**Policy Recommendations**

46. Institutions should gather and use information about each year's cohort of instructional personnel, tracking new hires through tenure, renewal of contract, rehiring, etc., and monitoring how women and minorities fare in employment decisions. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 26, 27, 38 and 44.)

47. Institutions should monitor patterns of faculty retirement over the next several years in order to determine whether institutional responses to the effects of "uncapping" the retirement age of the tenured workforce are needed.

48. A national study of the effects of early retirement incentive programs should be undertaken by higher education research associations such as the Association for Institutional Researchers (AIR) and/or the American Educational Research Association.

49. Institutions should conduct studies of past offerings of retirement options/incentives to determine whether they have been institutionally advantageous.
Policy Recommendations

1. Tenure should be maintained, but institutions must be vigilant to ensure its integrity in concept and practice, through rigorous evaluation and innovation when appropriate. Except in institutional environments where the mission or program dictates otherwise, a substantial proportion of the faculty should be tenure eligible.

2. Institutions should implement deliberate efforts to enhance both faculty and public understanding of the obligations on faculty that are entailed by the tenure system.

3. The probationary period, during which tenure-eligible faculty are rigorously evaluated consistent with institutional mission expectations, should be retained. Any practice of granting tenure principally on the basis of length of service should be eliminated.

4. Institutions should explore the utility of variations in the probationary period, appropriate to variations in discipline and/or assignment. Similarly, institutions should continue the practice of "stopping the tenure clock" for reasonable cause; other adjustments, when appropriate, should be considered.

5. Institutions should establish locus of tenure upon hiring of tenure-track faculty and should consider varying the locus of tenure for faculty, appropriate to differences in discipline/assignment and institutional need. When variances occur, reasons should be explicit.

6. Institutions of higher education should have clear, written policy statements and procedures regarding the employment of nontenure track faculty; such policies should detail recruitment, selection, and appointment processes, including minimum academic qualifications.

7. Reappointment of nontenure track faculty should be based upon evaluation governed by established procedures.

8. Part-time faculty should be compensated equitably relative to the institution's full-time faculty. The concept of equity includes consideration of market and disciplinary differences as well as salary structure across the institution. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 9, 13, 26, 27, 38, 44 and 46.)

9. Institutions should provide benefits, support services and opportunities for career advancement and collegial participation for nontenure track faculty whenever feasible. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 13, 26, 27, 38, 44 and 46.)

10. Institutions should develop flexible arrangements in determining distribution of faculty effort. Such arrangements would accommodate both changing institutional needs and individual faculty members' changing professional interests.

11. Institutions should determine the appropriate "mix" of faculty positions and categories of employment based on mission and educational benefits as well as financial resources. The mix could vary across units within a single institution.

12. Accrediting agencies should reexamine the validity/necessity of constraints on institutions regarding faculty "mix."

13. Formal faculty recruitment plans, both for full-time and for part-time positions, should be developed at appropriate levels (e.g., institutions or academic units). (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 26, 27, 38, 44 and 46.)

14. Institutions should improve and enhance the professionalism of their search processes.

15. Institutions should develop, implement, and monitor hiring procedures designed to enhance faculty diversity.

16. Orientation and development of new faculty should prepare them to better fulfill the roles of teaching, scholarship, and service. This should be a major institutional commitment supported by institutional financing.

17. Annual retirement planning programs should be integrated into professional development.

18. Policies should permit layoff and retrenchment in response to mission or program alterations.
19. Policies should permit institutions to consider measures of performance as well as seniority in determining which faculty will be affected by layoff/retracement.

20. When an institution determines that layoff/retracement is necessary, it should assist affected faculty members in identifying alternative employment possibilities.

21. Institutions should have policies and procedures on separation for cause that respect the rights of all parties and provide for timely disposition.

22. Institutions should constantly improve and update faculty development opportunities, taking into consideration the changing needs of the institution, the changing nature of both the student body and the faculty, and the changing nature of knowledge. They should devote resources sufficient to support appropriate development for faculty at all stages of their careers.

23. Benefits of faculty development and valued outcomes should be aggressively communicated. The institution’s mission and goals should be emphasized in these communications.

24. Institutions should commit financial resources to educate and train faculty in service/outreach.

25. Institutions of all kinds should increase the value of high-quality teaching in tenure and promotion decisions.

26. Because of its potential to adversely affect students and institutions, the extensive use of part-time faculty should be carefully re-examined as part of a larger re-examination of appropriate faculty mix. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 27, 38, 44 and 46.)

27. The American model of promotion through the faculty ranks has had a beneficial impact on the professional development of faculty in all categories of higher education. It is imperative that this model be retained and that both part-time and non-tenure track faculty have opportunities for similar advancement and reward. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 28, 38, 44 and 46.)

28. The higher education community should clearly communicate to all constituencies the importance of teaching in promotion and tenure decisions at institutions of all kinds.

29. Higher education communities should carefully review awards and incentives to ensure that they are closely linked to institutional initiatives and that they reflect changing expectations.

30. Institutions should develop and implement strategies to more effectively communicate to the public the benefits of sabbaticals to students, institutional mission, and the community.

31. Institutions need to continue to strengthen the sabbatical process. While many institutions are demanding greater accountability, all institutions should have policies that require a rigorous application process, means of monitoring progress, and appropriate dissemination of the results.

32. Institutions should consider allowing greater flexibility in the traditional sabbatical program, to include faculty improvement leaves.

Institutions should provide faculty professional development opportunities that include four broad areas of support:

33. Education opportunities (technology use and teaching, learning, and evaluation issues and methods; curriculum design processes).

34. Access to people, materials, and equipment during the entire curriculum design, development, delivery, and evaluation process.

35. Funding for release time (including sabbaticals), technology purchases and upgrades, and materials.

36. Guidance and assistance in documenting and evaluating the impact of curriculum change and technology enhancements.
37. Colleges and universities must review all faculty evaluation processes, take steps to eliminate redundancy, and ensure that all reviews are consequential. In devising effective and efficient review systems that best meet their needs, institutions must aim for the best possible reviews at the lowest possible cost.

38. All postsecondary institutions must have an effective annual performance evaluation system. As their mix of full-time, part-time, adjunct, and other employment arrangements is developed, it is critical that institutions integrate effective annual performance evaluation into faculty roles and reward systems—both for its stand alone value and as a foundation for all other types of performance review. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 26, 27, 44 and 46.)

39. Reviews for determination of merit pay must be directly linked to institutional goals and mission. A strategic variety of rewards for merit should be considered, and particular attention should be paid to both individual and collective achievements.

40. Faculty at all institutions that award tenure must receive written mid-probationary performance evaluations indicating their progress toward tenure no later than the midpoint of their probationary period.

41. Criteria and expectations for tenure, as well as criteria for promotion in academic rank, must be compatible with the mission of the institution, developed in consultation with faculty, and approved at the institutional level. Although complex legal issues arise when an institution asserts the right to deny tenure based on constraints such as fiscal or programmatic concerns, the value of communicating these potential constraints to candidates for faculty positions makes candor preferable to silence.

42. Every institution that grants tenure must require post-tenure review.

43. The purpose of post-tenure review is to support career-long faculty development and to provide quality assurance. Where possible, post-tenure review systems should involve rewards for high performance and consequences for chronic poor performance; the most intensive review efforts should focus on identifying chronic poor performers. Institutions should give consideration to both periodic post-tenure review systems mandated for all and systems where a series of poor performance on annual reviews triggers a post-tenure review.

44. Colleges and universities must have in place policy statements which establish periodic formal evaluations for part-time and contract faculty. These statements must be based on established, published criteria developed in consultation with those faculty and based on the institution's expectations and the faculty's level of involvement apart from individual teaching responsibilities. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 26, 27, 38 and 46.)

45. Institutions must make strategic decisions about which accreditations they wish to pursue and must select only those agencies which recognize and support individual institutional missions and higher education's mandate to respond to the changing world of learning and work.

46. Institutions should gather and use information about each year's cohort of instructional personnel, tracking new hires through tenure, renewal of contract, rehiring, etc., and monitoring how women and minorities fare in employment decisions. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 26, 27, 38 and 44.)

47. Institutions should monitor patterns of faculty retirement over the next several years in order to determine whether institutional responses to the effects of "uncapping" the retirement age of the tenured workforce are needed.

48. A national study of the effects of early retirement incentive programs should be undertaken by higher education research associations such as the Association for Institutional Researchers (AIR) and/or the American Educational Research Association.

49. Institutions should conduct studies of past offerings of retirement options/incentives to determine whether they have been institutionally advantageous.
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