UNIVERSITY FILM AND VIDEO ASSOCIATION

MONOGRAPH NO. 7
MILLENNIUM EDITION

GUIDE TO FACULTY ADVANCEMENT: ANNUAL EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

PETER J. BUKALSKI
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY EDWARDSVILLE

With additional text suggested and drafted by
Suzanne Regan and Richard B. Jewell

Introduction by

WILLIAM O. HUIE, JR.
1998-2000 President, UFVA
TEXAS A & M UNIVERSITY, CORPUS CHRISTI

Original manuscript (Fall 1993) reviewed by:

Suzanne Regan, California State University, Los Angeles
Charles M. Berg, University of Kansas
Lilly A. Boruszkowski, Southern Illinois University Carbondale
J. Stephen Hank, The University of New Orleans
Richard B. Jewell, University of Southern California

ISBN # 0-9704557-0-4

 Edited by outstanding teachers/filmmakers, the UFVA Monograph series is an intermittent publication focusing on specific issues of film/video production/study in the university setting. Available from the *Journal of Film and Video* office are: UFVA Monograph No. 2, *Glossary of Film Terms*, John Mercer (1986; $6.50); No. 5, *College Course Files*, ed. Patricia Erens (1986; $9.00); and No. 6, *Guide for Nontenured Faculty Members*, Peter J. Bukalski (1993; $15.00). Contact: *Journal of Film and Video*, Department of Communication Studies, California State University at Los Angeles, 5151 State University Drive, Los Angeles 90032.

Guide to Faculty Advancement

University Film and Video Association **Monograph No. 7**

Contents **Page**

Introduction *by William O. Huie, Jr.* 5

The Variety of Colleges and Universities in the United States 7

Differing Expectations 7
Some Standard Ways of Looking at Institutions: Admissions Guides 9
Standardized Information: Carnegie Classifications 10
Changes in Expectations Since 1970 11
The Nature of Academic Decision Making 14
Official College and University Policies on Promotion and Tenure 17
How to Find Out the "Real" Expectations of Your Institution 17
The "Match" between Faculty Interests and Institutional Expectations 21

Teaching 23

Student Evaluations of Teaching 23
Forms for Student Evaluation 24
Administering Student Evaluations 25
Commenting on Student Evaluations 26
Maintenance of Student Evaluations 26
Peer Evaluations 26
Teaching Portfolios 28
Other Evidence of Teaching Excellence 29
The Importance of "The File" 30

Research/Creative Activity 31

Research 31
Books 31
Articles 33
Conference Presentations 34
What is an Acceptable Balance? 35
Creative Activity (Film/Video/Media Production) 35
Film/Video Festivals 35
Conference Showings 36
UFVA Awards of Merit 36
Electronic Exhibition 37
Showings at Museums, Media Art Centers, Colleges, and Universities 37
Selection for Distribution 37
Grant Applications 37
The *Journal of Film and Video*'s Annual CD-ROM Edition 38
Other Types of Dissemination and Evaluation 38

Special Problems 38
Length *versus* Difficulty 38
Collaborative Works 38
Professional Experience 38
Scriptwriting 39
Multimedia Shows and Other Experimental Work 39
The "Scholarship of Teaching" 39
Using Time Wisely 40

Service 41

Institutional Service 41
Local or Community Service 43
Regional Service 43
National Service 44
International Service 44
Service as a "Cruel Trap" for Young Faculty 45

The Fourth Factor in Personnel Decisions: Collegiality 45

Personality Conflicts 46
Disciplinary Orientation 47
"Filling In" the Teaching Load 47
Ideological Conflict 48
Social Incompatibility 48
Dealing with Collegiality Problems 49

The Special Problems of Women and Members of Minority Groups 50

Women in the Professorate 50
Faculty of Color 51
Gays, Lesbians, and Other Groups 52
Dealing with the Problems of Special Status 52

Additional Thoughts 54

The Relationship of Annual Evaluation and the Promotion/Tenure Process 54
The Continuing Importance of Tenure 55
Post-tenure Reviews 57
The Proactive Stance and Its Limitations 59
Mentoring 60
The Special Rights of Private Institutions 61
The Abuse of Outside Evaluators 61
Litigation 61
The Post-tenure Blues 63
Moving On, Of Necessity 63

Appendix A: Carnegie Foundation Classification Codes 64

INTRODUCTION

This Monograph offers an updated and expanded version of the 1993 UFVA Monograph entitled *Guide for Nontenured Faculty Members: Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, also authored by Peter Bukalski with help from several collaborators. The popularity of the earlier edition suggested that it filled an important need in the academic community. Many faculty new to the field benefited from its advice. Experienced, tenured faculty reported finding it useful as well. In this new edition, Professor Bukalski offers a number of new sections, including material of special interest to women and minority faculty, as well as expanded attention to the concerns of tenured faculty.

In the first section, "The Variety of Colleges and Universities in the United States," Bukalski stresses the fundamental need for faculty to understand the unique situation they face at their own institutions. He includes a new section on admission standards and their relationship to the teaching environment. He also considers the impact of changes in higher education in the 1990s which continue to affect the review process, such as changes in student attitudes and behavior. There is also a new section on decision-making in a multi-disciplinary environment, where film/video/new media faculty may find themselves being reviewed by colleagues from different disciplines.

The section on teaching offers an expanded treatment of teaching portfolios and some new thoughts on evidence of teaching excellence.

The third section, "Research/Creative Activity," discusses and applies the broadened concepts of scholarship introduced by Ernest Boyer in his influential book, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* (1990). Boyer proposed a useful taxonomy of scholarship, which is being adopted to varying extents at different institutions, and Bukalski considers the taxonomy in relation to film/video/new media faculty. Also important are new avenues for peer review, especially for creative work. Bukalski mentions the UFVA Awards of Merit and the annual CD-ROM issue of the *Journal of Film and Video* as two measures of quality in film/video/new media production.

One factor often present in the review process but less often articulated in institutional policy is that of collegiality. Whether stated or not as a criterion, collegiality should not be overlooked as an element in faculty advancement, and Bukalski offers some new thoughts on this important topic.

In a significant new section, "The Special Problems of Women and Members of Minority Groups," Bukalski addresses various realities of academic life which affect advancement for these faculty. He notes that we would like "to assume that prejudice does not exist in academe," but the reality is that difficulties arise for women, faculty of color, gays and lesbians, and others even before the review process begins. One of the most perceptive and valuable parts of this new section addresses the "problems of special status" by offering ten specific points of advice for managing one's academic life so as to avoid problems in career advancement.

Issues of importance to tenured faculty are discussed in a new section on the increasingly widespread practice of post-tenure review. Bukalski addresses such topics as revocation of tenure, expectations for research/creative activity, collegiality, and preparation for post tenure review. To those faculty responsible for evaluating candidates for advancement,

either as administrators or committee members, Bukalski also offers helpful advice on the use of outside evaluators.

A great strength of this monograph is its even-handed, objective treatment of a process which all faculty know has lasting consequences for academic careers. Wisely avoiding an "us-versus-them" approach, Professor Bukalski—with many years' experience as a faculty member and as a dean—has provided advice not only for faculty who face the review process in the early and middle stages of their careers, but also for those who now face post-tenure review, as well as for those who serve as reviewers for their colleagues. This monograph can therefore assist faculty (and administrators) on both sides of the review process. It reminds us all that our goal in the decisions we make about evaluating and rewarding each other should be to foster an educational environment where faculty are stimulated to excellence. Together with their colleagues and students, we hope to create true communities of learning where work is rewarded and where all may benefit..

William O. Huie, Jr.
1998-2000 President, UFVA
Texas A & M University, Corpus Christi

THE VARIETY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Differing Expectations

The work of faculty is traditionally divided into three broad areas: teaching, research/ creative activity, and service. The processes of annual evaluation, promotion, and tenure all involve an examination of faculty accomplishments in each of these three areas. Although the division of activities into three broad areas is generally accepted across the country, the relative weight given each area varies tremendously from institution to institution.

The differences among institutions are truly remarkable, although seldom noted by individuals in the field of film and video. Following are three examples of institutional differences, and of how they are reflected in the promotion and tenure process.

- There is a private liberal arts college in which it is possible for a faculty member to be tenured and promoted without engaging in any research or creative work. At this institution, a good teaching record and completion of modest committee assignments within the college are considered sufficient for tenure or promotion. Faculty members are also expected to "keep up" with their fields through reading, but no systematic attempt is made by the college to assess this self-development. As part of the promotion and tenure process, each candidate's teaching is rigorously evaluated, as is the candidate's status as a "role model" for students. In this particular institution, several professors have been promoted to prestigious endowed chairs without ever having published any research or having engaged in any creative activity. This liberal arts college emphasizes the quality of the education it provides students. The college does not believe that faculty research is necessarily essential to providing that education.

- A medium-size private university is located fairly close to the liberal arts college discussed above. The expectations of this university are quite different from those of the college. All faculty members are expected to be heavily involved in research. When an individual is considered for promotion or tenure, the only publications acceptable for consideration are articles that have been published in the leading periodicals in each field, and books published by the most discriminating publishers. In a celebrated case, tenure was denied a professor who had published two books since joining the faculty. The administration issued a statement that although the two books were valuable, they were not sufficiently "on the cutting edge" of the field, and were not sufficiently theoretical to merit tenure for the author.

As a part of the promotion and tenure process, this university includes an evaluation of teaching, but it is not a particularly rigorous one. Productive researchers frequently are "given the benefit of the doubt," and are assumed to be adequate teachers, sometimes despite the existence of little proof to support that assumption. A dean at this school wrote, "[We] continue to recruit *stellar researchers* who *also care about teaching*" [emphasis added]. This statement clearly shows that the institution's first priority is research; good teaching seems to be a secondary interest.

This university does not use the phrase "research/creative activity." Instead, it always uses the word "research," because any work that faculty members complete but do not publish is unacceptable proof of productivity. Therefore, this university has a music department that consists entirely of composers and music historians, representatives of the two subfields most likely to pro-

duce publishable work. This music department struggles to maintain a minimal program in music performance, because it can hire no faculty with a major interest in this area. The theater program is similarly handicapped. Although a few professors of film studies have been hired at this institution, none have ever been tenured, and thus the film program is in jeopardy.

• Many institutions fall somewhere between the two extreme examples discussed above. One is a regional state university that requires faculty to be engaged in research/creative activity, but is relatively liberal about both the quantity required and the form and content of faculty work. At this institution a film professor was both tenured and promoted to associate professor on the basis of two published articles, which were relatively brief, and which dealt with practical problems associated with the teaching of his field. The professor's case for promotion and tenure was undoubtedly helped by his having extraordinarily high teaching evaluations, and by the fact that his classes drew high enrollments. He was, in fact, a "hit" with students. At a later date, this same individual was promoted to full professor on the basis of his publishing a book that was a collection of film criticism that he had written for a local newspaper.

What can we learn from these examples?

It seems obvious that professors wishing to be promoted and tenured would be wise to behave quite differently at the three institutions described above. In the case of the private liberal arts college, it would be sensible for new professors to devote themselves fully to their teaching. Although professors at this college might want to engage in research/creative activity, they would have to realize that it would not be likely to improve their chances for promotion and tenure at that institution. Rather, they should pursue with vigor anything that would enhance their reputations as teachers. Any college committee assignments should be handled with care, since this college values such work.

Professors recently hired by the private university (described in the second example) would be wise to devote themselves fully to research—and not just any research. The research should be publishable in the leading periodicals in their fields and be related to the most current concerns of their fields. Quantity of research would be extremely important in any promotion or tenure decision, and thus a new faculty member should begin research projects immediately. Faculty at this institution would have to realize that time devoted to nonpublishable work would not advance their careers, and that time devoted to improving teaching would largely be wasted (for purposes of promotion or tenure) once an acceptable level of teaching had been achieved. Students frequently describe faculty teaching at such institutions as selfish—students think courses are taught in a way that requires a minimum of time on the faculty member's part. This posture is realistic, considering the pressure to publish that is exerted on faculty in such institutions.

It is interesting to note how the same faculty member might fare at other institutions. The faculty member described in the third example, at the regional state university, would probably be quite acceptable at the private liberal arts college, given his popularity as a teacher, although the writing he completed would probably not help advance his case for promotion and tenure. The publications he completed would not even be considered acceptable at the private university described in the second example—given the small number of publications and their practical or applied content. It is conceivable that a faculty member who could be granted tenure at the university in the second example would not be tenured at either the liberal arts college or the regional state university, if it were perceived that the time he devoted to

research forced him to do only a mediocre job of teaching.

In these examples, the key variable is not the size of the institution but the importance that the school attaches to each of the three areas of faculty activity—teaching, research/ creative activity, and service—and the manner in which quality of effort is assessed.

There are some who say that colleges and universities with modest research expectations such as those described above no longer exist, and that the extremely high standards of research universities are now the national standard. This is not true, although it is easy to get that impression from newspaper accounts and hearsay. Controversial cases at elite research universities are often featured in media accounts. While these cases attract the academic community's attention and arouse paranoia, great numbers of faculty are quietly tenured and promoted across the country at institutions with more modest standards. It is true, however, that more and more schools aspire to follow the research university model.

Some Standard Ways of Looking at Institutions: Admissions Guides

If there is a considerable variety of institutions within American higher education, how does one begin to understand what a particular school is like? There are a couple of standard ways in which institutions are classified, and these classifications can provide valuable information. It is wise for all faculty, but particularly newly hired faculty, to consult some sources for information on their school.

A number of publications, including *Peterson's Guide to 4 Year Colleges*, and *Barron's Profiles of American Colleges*, rate institutions according to their admission standards. *Peterson's* rates institutional admission standards in five categories: most difficult, very difficult, moderately difficult, minimally difficult, and noncompetitive. For purposes of this discussion, it is possible to simplify this division by separating institutions into just three categories: highly competitive, somewhat competitive, and noncompetitive.

Highly competitive institutions are schools that have high or very high admission standards, and that have no difficulty attracting what they consider to be an ideal size student population. Included in this category are some of the best known elite private schools, as well as some flagship state universities.

The somewhat competitive category includes institutions that reject as few as ten or fifteen percent of applicants, as well as schools that are more selective. Included in this category are lesser known liberal arts colleges, and many regional state universities. Most of these institutions would not be able to raise their admission standards and still meet their enrollment goals. Enrollment, of course, provides income, which is crucial to every institution's survival. Probably every college and university in the somewhat competitive category would like to have higher standards, but the competition for highly qualified high school graduates does not permit this. Some of the schools in this category struggle to meet their minimum enrollment goals.

Noncompetitive institutions include those that have open admission by design (including most community colleges), as well as those schools that are so hampered by location or other factors that they accept every applicant in order to keep operating.

A generation ago, few students used or cared about sources such as *Peterson's Guides*. Today many students research the schools they are applying to, and want to attend the most highly rated school to which they can be admitted. Ratings appearing in publica-

tions such as *U.S. News and World Report* have become widely influential. Coupled with this is the wide availability of financial aid. There are, of course, reference books and on-line services that one can use to search for scholarships and grants, but it is also common knowledge that if a student is willing to take on considerable debt, loans are available to cover the cost of attending just about any college or university in America. Under these circumstances, it is said that elite institutions "cherry-pick" students from around the country, robbing other universities of the best talent available, preventing many somewhat competitive institutions from raising admission standards.

How does this situation affect the faculty member? Since most faculty teach at least some undergraduate courses, admission standards are likely to have an impact on a faculty member's ability to teach effectively. Admission standards give some indication of the quality of students a faculty member is likely to encounter in the classroom. Faculty at elite institutions may have an easier job teaching because their classes are likely to be populated by well prepared and highly motivated students. A faculty member at such a school can be confident that classes will be relatively homogeneous in terms of student ability levels. This may result in a faculty member's needing to spend less time on teaching, and having greater time for research/creative activities.

An institution's low admission standards often means that it has large numbers of poorly prepared and poorly motivated students, along with some who are more able to cope with college-level work. A faculty member at such a school may feel the need to spend inordinate amounts of time and energy teaching particular courses because of the inferior ability and motivation level of students enrolled in these courses. Further, a professor very likely will face classes where students have a wide range of ability levels. Handling a course that has such a broad range of students may be difficult. This problem is likely to be even more difficult for faculty at noncompetitive institutions.

A more subtle factor related to admission standards is the departmental/college/institutional notion of what is expected in courses, and the relationship of these expectations to grading. There are institutions that have only somewhat selective admission standards, but offer very tough courses. Students must either live up to expectations or flunk out of school. Any new faculty member in such an institution would be expected to have similar standards. On the other hand, at some institutions there exists the assumption that all or most students will get passing grades. There are many famous examples, of course, of academic programs in which everyone—or almost everyone—gets straight A's for doing little or nothing. In nonelite institutions, there is pressure, often very subtle, to give grades that will help the school maintain its enrollment. Even in schools that are doing well in enrollment overall, there may be programs in need of additional students. While teaching an underenrolled course in a program that is in danger of being eliminated for lack of sufficient student demand, a faculty member almost certainly will feel some pressure to give grades that will retain current students.

Institutional admission standards, then, are not an unimportant factor in each faculty member's ability to meet teaching expectations.

Standardized Information: Carnegie Classifications

If admission guides can provide information relevant to the faculty's teaching, Carnegie classifications are good indicators of research expectations. The Carnegie classifications, which date back as far as 1970, are shown in detail in Appendix A. Basically, all institu-

tions are divided into the categories of research universities, doctoral universities, master's (comprehensive) universities and colleges, baccalaureate colleges, and associate of arts colleges. The divisions are based on the number and type of degrees granted, research funds received, and admission requirements.

In many ways, the Carnegie classifications mirror the conventional value structure of higher education. Research universities are usually considered the most prestigious, institutions offering doctoral degrees are usually considered more prestigious than those offering only master's, and so on. It is a common ambition among institutions to want to move up one Carnegie category. Some individuals are preoccupied with securing professorships at prestigious institutions (and conventional prestige is often related to Carnegie categories). However, as will be pointed out elsewhere in this monograph, a school's prestige does not necessarily ensure contentment for its faculty.

Carnegie categories are very good indicators of the amount and quality of research required of faculty. At the top of the pile, research universities generally have the highest expectations in both quality and quantity of the research completed by faculty who are coming up for promotion and tenure. Also, in general, research universities have the narrowest definitions of what constitutes acceptable research. Some research universities devalue applied or interpretive work, or will not accept creative activity as a substitute for research. This can have a significant impact on faculty in film, video, and the other arts.

In general, as one moves down through the Carnegie classifications, the amount of required research decreases, the definition of acceptable work becomes more inclusive, and the required evaluation of completed work is less rigorous. There are exceptions, of course; thus, one needs to move beyond standardized sources in order to determine each institution's precise standards.

Changes in Expectations Since 1970

There seems little doubt that the expectations of faculty coming up for promotion and tenure have changed enormously since 1970. It is, therefore, unwise to look at the résumés of older faculty in a department in order to try to determine one's own chances for promotion or tenure. In the late 1950s and throughout most of the 1960s, there was a shortage of new faculty in many fields. Colleges and universities went to great lengths to hold onto faculty who were perceived as being even modestly productive. Thus, there are faculty who were promoted during the 1960s from instructor to full professor in only four years—a promotion for each year of service. These promotions (and associated tenuring) were based largely on the potential for accomplishment within the field; often there were few, if any, actual accomplishments. In 1968 a newsletter from a department in a prestigious institution, one that would now be described as "a major research university," quoted the chairperson as boasting that although tenure and promotion through the rank of associate professor were based on potential, promotion to full professor still required accomplishments. Now, of course, substantial publication is expected in this same department, even for contract renewal at the assistant professor level.

At another institution, the granting of tenure was a relatively simple process throughout the 1960s. Individuals eligible for tenure simply checked a box on a form that stated, "I do/do not want to be considered for tenure." Tenure was seldom denied, and massive dossiers like those now routinely put together for tenure decisions were unheard of.

After 1968 some faculty placement services began reporting that for the first time in

memory there were more job applicants than there were positions available. By 1970 this situation became much worse, and schools that had once had great difficulty finding individuals suitably qualified for available positions now had their choice of some of the best graduates of important universities. This situation led to a very different climate within which promotion and tenure decisions were made. Many schools came to believe that any faculty member could be replaced by "someone better."

It would be wrong, however, to suggest that market forces comprised the only explanation for why schools increased their expectations of faculty. The growth of student influence on college and university affairs certainly played a major role. In the late 1960s, students began to demand good teaching; in an earlier period, student complaints were seldom listened to seriously, but by 1970 student opinion was often sought.

Also by 1970, the boom years of higher education were coming to an end, and it at last became apparent that college enrollments would not continue expanding at an exponential rate. As long as higher education was expanding, it was always possible to push a tenured but ineffective faculty member into some corner where, it was supposed, he or she could do little harm. When it became apparent that all faculty had to pull their own weight, the stakes were raised in the promotion and tenure process.

Demands for accountability also had an influence as universities found themselves defending the productivity of their faculties to boards of trustees or state legislatures. The idea that a grant of tenure was, in effect, a commitment to a million dollars or more in expenditures began to be widely discussed.

After 1980 or so, it was apparent that institutions of higher education had overbuilt in the 1960s. Many institutions had excess enrollment capacity, and could accommodate a larger number of students with only minimal additional expenditures. The budgetary possibilities of this situation were obvious. This reality set off a great competition between institutions for potential students at a time when the number of high school graduates was declining. Colleges and universities struggled to "manage" enrollment, that is, to find as many potential recruits within the shrinking pool as possible. Remedial programs were begun at many institutions in an attempt to bring students with inadequate preparation up to college standards, even though the success rate of such programs was not high. Retention programs were widely established. While administrators often insisted that these programs existed only to ease students' transition from high school to college, and provide additional help for those who needed it, many faculty suspected that retention programs really sought to keep students who were extremely unlikely to be capable of finishing college in school as long as possible. In this environment, students realized that they were much sought after, and began thinking of themselves as "consumers" who could demand whatever they wanted from the institutions in which they were enrolled. It became true that virtually any student who disliked a particular institution could be happily accepted by another—a markedly different situation from that which existed in the 1960s.

Institutions began positioning themselves to survive the wave of student consumerism, and this effort had an effect on the role of the faculty member, and on the promotion and tenure process. Institutions such as the liberal arts college described earlier believed that their future lay in providing excellent teaching in small classes, and in providing for a close, mentoring relationship between the student and professor; the promotion and tenure process within such colleges tried to reinforce these values. The regional state university described above was impressed by

the professor whose classes drew large enrollments, probably because enrollment was important in justifying university budgets to a sometimes hostile legislature. The private university decided that its survival necessitated transforming itself into a major research university, in the belief that a good reputation (based on research) would attract a sufficiently large student body; this school began requiring extraordinary research records of faculty members coming up for promotion or tenure. It is interesting that although all three institutions have adopted markedly different coping strategies, they were all successful at increasing both enrollment and financial stability in the 1980s.

In the 1990s, the yearly number of high school graduates was projected to increase, and thus it was thought that recruitment pressures and associated effects on higher education would lessen. This did not always prove true. The number of college applications did not go up as rapidly as had been predicted. Preparation for college continued to be often inadequate, and in many regions, K-12 education was considered to be of lower quality in the '90s than it had been in the '80s. Student consumerism continued, and in fact, intensified. It was frequently observed that students felt that they were "entitled" to a degree; indeed, some students spoke of "their" degree (as yet unearned), as if it were simply waiting to be claimed. Students were frequently strident in their demands that colleges change grades, waive requirements, and remove what they considered to be obstacles to their finishing degrees. Some institutions acquiesced to such demands. For instance, some schools changed failing grades to course withdrawals when students threatened to transfer to another school. This kind of activity was shameful, and clearly undermined the credibility of higher education.

Faculty were in the front lines of dealing with the changing nature of the student population. Many in somewhat selective or non-selective institutions found that teaching became more difficult, and that it required more time. Some professors who had been active for twenty years or more believed that students in the '90s would not have been able to cope with courses at the difficulty level at which similar courses had been offered decades earlier. The late '90s saw an additional problem—lack of classroom civility. Students often behaved badly in class, shouting offensive comments at professors, and creating distractions. Undergraduate students at somewhat competitive institutions often did not believe that their instructors were well qualified. While students generally acknowledged that faculty had graduate degrees—the value of which was often suspect in students' minds—they frequently refused to believe that faculty had other accomplishments on their record, or might even be well known in their field. In addition, more students than in the past did not feel the need to attend class regularly, leading to the establishment of elaborate attendance policies that the faculty had to administer.

It was often observed that the long-existing gap widened during the '90s between elite institutions and all the rest of American higher education. Elite institutions, with their highly qualified students, could offer a supreme education that had the potential to transform students into truly cultivated people. The rest of higher education had to do the best it could with the student body and resources available. In a few cases, the "education" provided was a fraud. Many graduated from college, some even with master's degrees, who were virtually illiterate.

Also, the number of full-time tenure-eligible and tenured faculty declined in many institutions, as schools converted positions to non-tenure-line or part-time positions. These changes put a strain on the remaining faculty, who had to assume increased responsibilities in areas such as administration, advisement, and committee work.

Through all of this change and upheaval, expectations of faculty increased. More emphasis was placed on teaching effectiveness, despite the intense problems that many professors had to deal with in the classroom. And while teaching began to require more and more time in many schools, expectations of faculty productivity in research and creative activity continued to increase. Research expectations in some universities were so high that a few faculty felt pressure to "pad" their résumés, sometimes in easily detectable ways. While such falsification was not publicized often, newspapers did carry many stories of scientific misconduct in government sponsored research.

The changes in institutional expectations in the past several decades have resulted in an odd situation at colleges today; in many departments there are full professors, tenured and promoted years ago, whose résumés would not even get them hired today. These professors are not necessarily sympathetic to the newly hired faculty member's plight, and many senior faculty consider it their duty to enforce current tenure and promotion standards, regardless of their own personal lack of accomplishment.

The Nature of Academic Decision Making

Most universities have a hierarchically oriented set of loci where promotion and tenure decisions are considered. Understanding the decision-making process depends in part upon having not only a comprehension of the review process as it flows through the various levels of the institution, but also a comprehension of the possible prejudices of the individuals responsible for making decisions at various levels.

Consideration for promotion and tenure usually begins at the department level. In larger departments, it is not unusual for the consideration of candidates to begin in a departmental personnel committee or some similar committee. A few institutions even appoint a separate committee for each faculty member under consideration. Most institutions require that all tenured faculty participate in promotion and tenure decisions at the department level, once recommendations have been forwarded from the initial review committee. Of course, in smaller departments, it is not unusual to skip the initial committee review and to begin consideration of candidates at the all-department level. Institutional regulations often require the department chairperson to review dossiers separately from the rest of the department, and to write a separate recommendation to be appended to the other material.

Some film/video programs are located in their own departments; others are part of either a department of television-radio, or a communication department that contains disciplines such as speech communication. Some programs are in departmental units containing theater, photography, or the visual arts. The departmental structure will almost inevitably impact promotion and tenure decisions. Often in units that are not free-standing film/video departments, the individuals serving on departmental committees, those eligible to vote on promotion or tenure, and the chair will come from disciplines other than film/video. To some extent, individual faculty members reflect the mindsets of the disciplines in which they were trained. Research and publication in the arts is sometimes deemed suspect by committees made up of individuals trained in other fields. "Creative activity" in lieu of publication is accepted in some departments and on some campuses, but viewed with skepticism elsewhere. Many communication faculty members understand scholarly research well but not creative activity, and they are also uncomfortable with the idea of "art," a term that is likely to be used in film/video dossiers. Some faculty have difficulty understanding what art is, and may view it as some standardless, self-indulgent form of

noncommunicative effort. Many faculty in television are oriented toward social science-based media research, and may look askance at the interests of film/video faculty. Others will see only work validated by being shown on public or commercial television as a worthwhile creative accomplishment. It must be recognized that the concerns of the disciplines of television and film/video, considered broadly, are quite different even though they are often housed in the same department. Faculty in multi-disciplinary departments must be educated to understand differences between fields, if they are to make objective decisions.

Dossiers considered at the department level next move to the school or college level. Often there is an all-college review committee consisting of professors from each of the departments in the college. At other institutions there is no requirement that all departments be represented. In some cases, the all-college committee is elected; in others, it is appointed; and in still others, it consists of the chairs of the departments. This committee reviews dossiers and appends recommendations. Usually, the dean of the college conducts a separate review and appends his or her recommendation. In the case of larger colleges, the dean's staff may play a role in the review of dossiers. In the case of small liberal arts colleges, the review may actually begin at the dean's level.

Film/video programs are often located in a college of communications, a school of fine arts, or a college of arts and sciences. Faculty must find out the composition of the school/college-level review committee, as well as the disciplines represented by committee members. In a college of communications, film/video faculty are likely to encounter attitudes about art not unlike those described for communications departments. In schools of fine arts, committees will almost certainly include faculty trained in the visual arts and music. For visual artists, recognition at juried exhibitions is very important. The dearth of similar recognition available in film/video may be a problem, as well as the small number of works typically completed by the film/video artist as opposed to faculty in departments of art. Music performance professors frequently value recognition of faculty as soloists, and peer reviews of performances. In the preparation of a dossier, these prejudices must be considered by the faculty member seeking promotion or tenure. In a school of fine arts, at least, there is likely to be little problem with the definition and value of "art" such as is sometimes encountered in colleges of communication.

Colleges of arts and sciences are typically very large and include many dissimilar disciplines. In colleges in which the review committee does not include a representative from each department, it is often true that faculty from the sciences or social sciences will predominate. Science faculty typically find creative activity very difficult to understand or to evaluate. In addition, they are accustomed to seeing dossiers in which faculty list many publications for each year of service, often as coauthors. These faculty are likely to question the productivity of film/video faculty who produce only a small number of works. Humanities faculty, who also often work long periods of time on a single work, often have a greater understanding and appreciation for the work of creative artists. Hopefully, humanities faculty are also present on arts and sciences college-level committees.

Next, dossiers move to the all-institution level. In many institutions there is an all-university committee that reviews all candidates and makes recommendations to the provost or chief academic officer. The composition and means of appointment of all-university committees vary tremendously from institution to institution. Some committees are appointed by faculty senates, some are appointed by provosts or presidents, and some are elected. In a few instances, the

deans of the various schools serve as the all-university committee. Some appointment procedures require that a representative from each of the university's schools be on the committee, while others do not. Some all-institution committees are quite large, but the opposite can also be true. There are even cases in which the membership of all-university committees is secret. It is important to know the composition of the review committee at the all-institution level, if possible, because one might encounter the same disciplinary prejudices discussed above for other levels of review.

Ordinarily, the provost or chief academic officer also conducts an independent review of the dossiers, and writes an additional recommendation. As in the case of the dean's review, reviews at the provost's level can be highly influenced by staff assistants.

Typically, the final decision rests with the president of the institution. In many institutions, the president does not have time to review dossiers carefully, and relies on the recommendations passed on from the various earlier reviews. In some institutions, however, the president plays an active part in the decision-making process.

Generally speaking, when one looks beyond the department level, administrators who have been in office for a number of years have shed their disciplinary prejudices, have developed a broad understanding of various fields, and are likely to make an unbiased judgment in promotion and tenure cases. This is often not true, however, for inexperienced administrators. Further, it must be understood that some administrators feel obligated to support the recommendations of review committees or advisory groups, even if they disagree with them.

In many institutions, all personnel actions must be approved by the board of trustees. In 99 cases out of 100, the board automatically approves administrative recommendations. There have been cases, however, in which trustees have intervened in academic decision making. In the 1960s there were cases in which politically active faculty were denied promotion or tenure, despite favorable administrative recommendations. There also have been cases in which trustees have used private information given to them by students or friends to challenge administrative recommendations.

The many levels of review complicate an understanding of the decision making process. Faculty members often see their fate as resting entirely in the hands of their department. Although the department is the main territory for most academics, and the place where primary allegiances are formed, faculty members must remember the other levels at which dossiers are reviewed. The composition of the review committees at the various levels is extremely important, as discussed above. The skill of the departmental committee and chair as advocates, both in their written evaluation and through any face-to-face contacts that may occur with higher levels of review, may affect candidates favorably or unfavorably.

The reputation of a department on campus—its history with the administration—will be a factor in the decision making process. Departments in the arts are often—but not always—seen by academics from the sciences or social sciences as lacking intellectual rigor and credibility.

It is absolutely essential that each probationary faculty member take a proactive stance by understanding the promotion and tenure process, and preparing to be reviewed. The remainder of this publication is devoted to helping faculty meet the challenges of the promotion and tenure process.[1]

---

[1]Some material on academic decision making was drafted by Suzanne Regan.

Official College and University Policies on Promotion and Tenure

Most colleges and universities have guidelines for promotion and tenure that attempt to spell out the achievements expected of faculty. The length and complexity of these guidelines vary enormously. Some are relatively brief general statements, while others are long and detailed. Almost universally, they do not reflect the realities of current promotion and tenure decision making.

There are a number of reasons this would be so. In the simplest cases, written policies have not been revised to reflect the current, more stringent decision making process. In a large number of cases, the struggle for power between the faculty and administration, which has typified higher education in past decades, is reflected in promotion and tenure policies. In some cases administrators have succeeded in imposing very general policy statements, in the belief that such statements give institutions maximum flexibility. Similar brief and very general policies have also emerged from cooperative faculty-administration efforts to draft statements. In this latter situation, the process of negotiation has revealed a need to account for so many exceptions and variations that only a very general policy statement has seemed acceptable to the negotiators.

The sustained faculty-administration conflict that has characterized some institutions in recent years has resulted in some strange and essentially meaningless official policy statements. In one institution, the promotion and tenure process operated under a "temporary" policy for fifteen years. In this university, the suspicion and hostility between the faculty and administration were so great that no policy proposed by one group could be accepted by the other; this impasse extended even to "clarifications" of the "temporary" policy.

In another institution, promotion and tenure are decided on the basis of unwritten policies that have resulted from faculty grievances. The balance of power is such that the administration almost never overturns the findings of faculty grievance panels. The results of past grievances over promotion and tenure decisions have acquired the status of case law, and new decisions are based on the results of past grievances even when these decisions appear to conflict with official written policy.

The inadequacy of written policies is a source of considerable frustration for newly hired faculty, most of whom would like to have a clear-cut statement that says, in effect, "If you do these things, you will be tenured and promoted." New faculty members are particularly enamored of very explicit numerical criteria being specified, such as "seven articles (or equivalent) are required for tenure." With the possible exception of some unionized institutions, such specific criteria are not common.

The lesson to be learned is this: don't ever assume that written institutional policies actually reflect the reality of the promotion and tenure process. Although all faculty members should begin by reading institutional policies, they should not end their search for information there.

How to Find Out the "Real" Expectations of Your Institution

Since you cannot depend on written policies reflecting the reality of the promotion and tenure process, you should become "tuned in" to the process in your own institution. The following steps represent several that can be taken.

- Talk to tenured older faculty members in your department in order to elicit an interpretation of existing policies and current institutional conditions. This step will not provide you with all the information you need; but, if

nothing else, it will provide an opportunity to get to know the viewpoints of your colleagues. Don't be surprised if you obtain a lot of contradictory information. Some faculty, particularly senior members, are remarkably uninformed about what is going on in their own institutions. Some faculty may never have participated in promotion and tenure decision making, partly because institutions vary considerably in the extent to which senior faculty are required to participate in this process. Some faculty may be embarrassed about their own accomplishments vis-à-vis current expectations, and thus may paint a more optimistic picture than is justified; some faculty may want to impress you with how much they have accomplished, and/or the difficulties they had in getting promotion and tenure; and some may have special axes to grind.

- Talk with your department's representative on the all-college or all-university promotion and tenure committee (if such a representative exists). In some cases, the departmental representative will have served for a number of years on the committee. This individual is likely to have up-to-date information about current requirements, and can give advice on all manner of details. If an all-college committee exists, but your department has no representative, this should be brought to the attention of your colleagues. It is politically dangerous to be unrepresented at levels at which it is possible to have representation. It may also be useful to talk with the current chairperson of the all-college committee. This individual will have important, recent experiences with the promotion and tenure process, and might be willing to be helpful.[2]

- Talk with your department chairperson; an experienced and perceptive one can provide a great deal of information. A chairperson who has been in office for a number of years has almost certainly been involved in the promotion and tenure process, and should have up-to-date information that can supplement your understanding of written policies. You are likely to get less information, however, from a chair who has only recently taken office, or from one who is at odds with current institutional standards. Generally, your visit with your chairperson will provide you with some of the best and most detailed information you will ever get.

- Talk with your dean. There are several reasons the information he or she provides might be different from that provided by your chair. A dean is more likely to be able to suggest comparisons between different disciplines, information that might be very valuable to you. A dean might comment on the quality or limitations of promotion and tenure dossiers he or she has been receiving from your department, which could give you a clue as to how adequate your department's procedures are, at least from the dean's viewpoint. Extra effort may be required on your part if your department has a reputation for producing mediocre promotion and tenure dossiers. If this seems to be the case, find out which departments produce the best dossiers. If your dean is willing to be candid, it is possible that you will receive some very valuable information. Deans in many institutions, however, perceive themselves (or are perceived) as "enforcers," or worry that anything they say will be quoted in a later court trial. Thus, it is equally possible that your dean will (1) not want to be candid; (2) describe higher standards than actually are in force; or (3) be overly cautious in talking with any faculty he or she does not know well.

- Examine and analyze the dossiers of recent promotion and tenure candidates. This is the best way of finding out what accomplishments are really required by your institution.

[2]This paragraph was suggested by Suzanne Regan and Richard B. Jewell.

Promotion and tenure dossiers are standardized to some extent in virtually every institution. The forms for dossiers are frequently included in policy statements or personnel manuals. These dossiers typically include several sections that ask for parts of your résumé to be restated on a number of standard forms. To these, a number of descriptive texts are added, either as summary statements or in response to a number of questions posed. Then statements are added that are written by departmental personnel committees, the chairperson, the dean, and evaluators from outside the institution, along with student and peer evaluations of teaching, reviews, recommendations, and so on. It is not unusual for dossiers of fifty or more pages to be submitted, sometimes supplemented by voluminous supporting materials. Dossiers have become so large, in fact, that many institutions are now limiting their size. This restriction challenges faculty and departments to evaluate carefully the importance of the various items that could be included.

At most institutions, parts of the dossier are confidential, particularly statements by outside evaluators. Candidates may be reluctant to allow you to see the written statements of chairs and deans, as well as some of the other information included in a dossier. The basic information, however—the restatements of résumé information and the descriptive texts—is not confidential or controversial, and you should be able to obtain these portions of recently forwarded dossiers. It is these portions that will describe the actual accomplishments of the candidates for promotion and tenure—and this is precisely what you want to know.

Ideally, you should examine the dossiers of at least one successful and one unsuccessful candidate from your department. If you can't get your hands on an unsuccessful candidate's dossier, you probably can learn all you need to know from a successful one. If dossiers from your own department are unavailable, those from a related department can be useful. If you find that your department is known for producing inadequate dossiers, be sure to try to obtain a successful one from another department, if only to contrast it with those of your department.

Some schools have begun to make model dossiers available to all who are interested; this practice is not, however, widespread. It may be possible to obtain dossiers from a chairperson or dean, if you assure such administrators that you are interested only in the factual portions of the dossiers. More likely, however, you will have to obtain dossiers from the candidates themselves. Successful candidates for promotion and tenure are likely to be proud of their accomplishment and, therefore, willing to provide their dossiers to you. It may be more difficult to obtain the dossier of an unsuccessful candidate, but you may still be able to find out what was lacking in it.

Once you have a dossier to examine, what do you look for? Compare the accomplishments described in each section of the dossier with the expectations described in written policy statements, and verbally described by your colleagues and administrators. Careful comparisons can reveal the real expectations of your institution. Some examples:

- Let's say that the dossier you are examining is for a filmmaker who was tenured after six years at your institution, and after completing three short films. A conclusion in this case might be that three short films of a quality similar to those described in the dossier comprise sufficient creative activity to merit tenure, provided that expectations have not risen since he was tenured.

- Now let's assume that you are examining the dossier of a filmmaker who was tenured with only one finished film. The text describing the candidate's work is just a bit defen-

sive about the single film listed, suggesting that the superlative reviews the film has received in some way compensate for the candidate's finishing only a single film during the probationary period. One conclusion might be that since the dossier "flew," or was approved, a single, well reviewed film is sufficient creative activity to merit tenure. Another conclusion might focus on the defensive sounding text, which would suggest that this case was a close call, with the text attempting to compensate for a perceived weakness in the dossier, namely the completion of only one film. A possible conclusion would be that one film may be sufficient for the granting of tenure, but that it would be very close to being insufficient. It would be wise for future candidates to present the department with a more productive record.

- The teaching section of a typical dossier is likely to describe the various ways the department has of evaluating teaching. This description may or may not seem close to what you have heard or read about this process. Let's say that the particular dossier you are examining notes that the candidate's student evaluations of teaching are lower than those of others in the department. The text goes on to describe that the candidate teaches difficult, unpopular required introductory courses, and that faculty peer evaluations of his or her teaching indicate that the courses are well constructed and adequately prepare students for advanced courses in the field. One might reach one or more of the following conclusions: (1) The department prefers that candidates for tenure have student evaluations of teaching that are better than average (however that is determined), but is willing to forward candidates with lower averages if there is compensatory evidence of good teaching (in this case, good faculty peer evaluations). (2) The department realizes that some courses may be unpopular with students, resulting in lower student ratings. (Not all departments may make this sort of judgment.) (3) In this department, peer evaluations of teaching not only are conducted but are, in some cases, used as evidence to compensate for lower than desirable student evaluations.

- A dossier's section on service might contain a long list of committee assignments at the candidate's institution, service as a departmental adviser, some work with statewide committees, and service on a committee of a national association. It would be interesting to see how the candidate's service is described in the text. If the text said that the candidate had met the minimum standard of institutional service, it would be clear that this particular department (or university) expected a great deal of institutional service from candidates for tenure. If the text rambled on and on about the service to a national organization, with hardly a mention of institutional service, one would conclude that institutional service was not rated very highly; at this particular school, it might behoove new faculty to become involved in national service in a big way.

- Pay attention to the "look" of the dossier. Committee members often have to read dozens of dossiers in a year, and tend to react more positively to those that are easy to follow and have a professional appearance. This means, among other things, that everything is clearly organized, that the contents of the entire package are well written, that nothing is missing, and so forth. The quality of the dossier reflects on the unit that prepared it, as well as on the candidate. An excellent dossier suggests that both the department and the candidate are first-rate; a sloppy dossier sends the opposite message.

The examples above suggest some general ideas about how to analyze a dossier. A great deal more can be learned from a very close analysis, and from asking faculty colleagues and administrators what they thought of the particular dossier you are examining. *Always*

be wary of the possibility that expectations are rising at your institution, as they are at many schools, thus rendering observations of older dossiers somewhat out of date.

The "Match" between Faculty Interests and Institutional Expectations

Many believe that there is an institution in this country exactly suited to each faculty member. The problem is that the "ideal" job is seldom available when one is looking for employment. This situation is especially true when the job market for professors is depressed, which has often been the case in the last few decades.

It is important to realize that if your examination of the expectations of your current institution results in the conclusion that you are ill suited to your particular college or university, perhaps it would be wise to consider a move before coming up for promotion or tenure. Such a move should not be looked upon as "giving up," but rather as a relocation to an institution where one's own inclinations and interests are compatible with institutional expectations. Some examples follow.

- There is a faculty member who was an excellent teacher, but was not very ambitious about doing research and publishing. When he finished his Ph.D., he stated that he wanted to find a job at a major, "big-name" university. He wanted such a job, he said, because of the prestige associated with such schools, and because he imagined that these schools paid higher salaries than less well known institutions. After a great many job interviews, including a few at "big-name" schools, he had his choice of a number of jobs. All were at schools he considered "lesser" institutions. He was surprised, however, that the job he picked offered a much higher salary than was advertised by several "big-name" schools.

The professor prospered in his new university home. His teaching evaluations were terrific, he completed a few publications at a leisurely pace, he was tenured and promoted, and his salary climbed steadily upward. He became, in fact, a superstar at his institution just by following his own interests. This particular school, it turned out, wanted faculty who were terrific teachers, and who completed a modicum of research. The "match" of faculty inclinations and institutional expectations was perfect.

The professor never forgot his desire to be at a big-name institution, however. He applied for jobs elsewhere, and one day he received a call informing him that he had been selected for a position at a major, prestigious university. Before resigning from his current job, the professor traveled to the new institution to be given an orientation. During the orientation, he discovered a number of conditions that were not to his liking: (1) he would be expected to publish at least two articles a year if he wished to retain his job; (2) he would be required to teach some courses he was not particularly interested in; (3) although his new institution would match his rank (associate professor), it would not give him tenure, even though he had it at his own school; and (4) he was offered less money than he was already making. The professor realized that he disliked the research requirement of his new institution, and that he would probably not be considered a superstar there, as he was at his current school. He realized that the expectations of this particular big-name school were not a good match with his own professional and personal inclinations and interests—and he happily returned to his old university.

- The next example is from outside our field—the story of a professor of history. This person graduated from one of the most prestigious history departments in the country, and was quite research-oriented. He chose a job at a private liberal arts college that did not expect its faculty to be involved in

research, probably because it was rather like the school he had attended as an undergraduate. Initially, he prospered at his chosen college, and he was quickly tenured and promoted to associate professor. He typically published two articles a year, a fact of minor interest to the administration of his college. Students considered the professor's courses unusually difficult, but this was not a problem in the eyes of the administration at the beginning of the professor's career.

This faculty member began to have difficulties ten to fifteen years after he was hired. The college began to have enrollment problems, and faculty members whose classes were smaller than average began to be considered detrimental to the institution. The history professor was one of those individuals. In addition, the administration began to consider him something of a gadfly. He did not deliberately set out to make trouble, but his analytical mind drove him to point out problems with administrative proposals that might otherwise have easily passed by the faculty. Increasingly, the administration came to believe that he was not an asset to the college. He was described as "not the sort of faculty we should have"—that is, not the sort of faculty *we think* will help the college survive difficult times. He was denied raises year after year. His colleagues urged him to move to a school where his continuing research record would be valued, and where having high expectations of students would be rewarded. He did not move on, and eventually retired at the rank of associate professor. Before his retirement, many of his colleagues in the history department, who were much younger and had no research records, were promoted to full professor.

Some additional examples follow.

- A faculty member who was denied tenure at two institutions was tenured by a third, where he remained a productive faculty member for the remainder of his career.

- A faculty member whose creative work was labeled "not sufficiently mainstream" and "too diffuse" at one institution became a faculty star at another school, where her work was described as "refreshingly interdisciplinary."

- A professor whose poor teaching evaluations in introductory undergraduate courses led to his dismissal at one institution became a valued faculty member in a graduate-only department.

The above examples suggest how important the match is between an institution's expectations and a faculty member's abilities and interests. You might want to make sure that you are a good match with your institution before committing to remain at that institution and participating in the promotion and tenure process.

In recent decades, a number of publications have described poor teaching in American higher education. These publications and public pressures have resulted in an increased emphasis on the quality of teaching in many institutions. Even many predominantly research oriented institutions are becoming sensitive to this issue. Thus, the evaluation of teaching is likely to be of increasing importance on college campuses in the years to come, and increasingly important in promotion and tenure decisions.

The purpose of this section is not to talk about teaching per se—for there are many books one may consult on this subject. Rather, this section is intended to show you how to *document* your teaching activities and how to *improve the ratings* of your teaching within the framework of the evaluation process your institution already has in place.

Student Evaluations of Teaching

Student evaluations of teaching are an accepted part of academic life at almost all institutions in the United States. The acceptance of this process does not mean that debate does not continue about the usefulness of such evaluations. An incredible amount of research has been devoted to student evaluations in the past thirty years, and the results of this research have been both reassuring and disturbing. For instance, some studies have shown that students rate the instructors of courses in which they are receiving high grades more positively than instructors of courses in which they are receiving lower grades. Other studies have shown that students downgrade the instructors of courses they were forced to take by institutional requirements. Still other studies have shown that it is difficult for students to differentiate the "feeling that they are learning" from actual learning. A generation ago the famous "Dr. Fox" experiment demonstrated that even faculty members can be taken in by a "teacher" with slick presentational skills. (In the Dr. Fox experiment, faculty members were invited to a lecture by a "Dr. Fox," who was introduced through an elaborate résumé as a scientific expert. In reality, Dr. Fox was an actor who proceeded to deliver a one-hour lecture consisting entirely of intellectual-sounding gibberish. All but two of the attendees rated the lecture very highly in their evaluations, and Dr. Fox was described by some as an extraordinary intellectual.) More recently, there has been considerable discussion of the possibility that student evaluations are more a judgment of the students' degree of "comfort" with a course than the degree to which they are receiving quality instruction or learning at a level appropriate for institutional, state, and national norms.

Despite the negative points described above, many experts continue to believe that student evaluations are a valid method of obtaining information about the teaching of faculty. Experts point out that students are in a better position than anyone else to judge such matters as whether the faculty member meets class regularly, spends sufficient time explaining course organization, is able to explain difficult concepts effectively to students with different backgrounds, and so forth.

In reality, it hardly matters what the experts or faculty debates say about student evaluations of teaching—they are here to stay. Most colleges and universities have institutionalized the use of student evaluations, if only because it is a convenient way of seeming to be responsive to student comments. In most institutions, student evaluations of teaching are taken seriously. This is, after all, an age of student consumerism, and any student unhappy at one school can easily be admitted by another. So there is no point in debating the

validity of student evaluations; they are a fact of life.

Forms for Student Evaluations

Student evaluations have been around long enough for many institutions (or subunits thereof) to have certain standard evaluation forms. Faculty members must determine which form they are required to use and under what conditions the form is used. Some universities have very elaborate forms that are analyzed by computer and from which a wealth of data is generated—comparisons across disciplines, across age groups, with historical data, and so on. Other institutions have forms that are required by particular colleges or departments. These may vary from sophisticated instruments designed by evaluation experts to a short list of general, open-ended questions. In a few, rare instances, you may be allowed to use any form you desire; if this is the case, ask to examine the forms used by your colleagues before designing one yourself.

Once you have the required form in hand, it is quite easy to see what qualities the form seeks to judge. Typically, forms ask questions about such matters as course organization, fairness of examinations, and the faculty member's ability to make the content of the course clear. The questions asked on the form may have an impact on the design of your courses. For instance, there was a faculty member who did not give grades until the end of the course, not wishing students to work solely for grades; however, the evaluation form required by his institution discriminated against faculty who "did not keep students informed of their grade progress." He was forced to decide whether his grading philosophy was more important to him than receiving the highest possible evaluations.

It is important to understand how the evaluations are analyzed. Is it by computer? What does such an analysis look like? Are departmental/college/university averages calculated? Are comparisons made? On what basis? Some departments, for instance, develop a numerical rating for the teaching of each faculty member, based on an analysis of evaluation forms. If averages are calculated, a candidate for promotion or tenure would prefer to be on the positive side of the average, rather than on the negative side.

Likewise, it may be difficult to evaluate a numerical score on a particular question without having a standard of comparison. If departments analyze scores on each question individually, it might show that a seemingly low number is a very high mark on that item.

Despite the length of some evaluation forms, analysis often focuses on only a few questions. For example, many forms ask for an "overall" evaluation of the teaching of the faculty member on some scale, and subsequent analysis emphasizes this single question. One university asks students to rate the difficulty of the course from their perspective, from easy to very difficult. Administrators at this particular institution look for "average" responses based on the theory that "easy" responses indicate a lazy faculty member and "very difficult" responses indicate a situation that might have a potentially negative impact on enrollment. Of course, another administration might have a totally different view of the response to this question. Another institution asks students to respond, on an agree-disagree scale, to the statement "This teacher represents what I think a university faculty member should be." This question has become the most important one analyzed. It is entirely appropriate for newly hired faculty members to ask colleagues and administrators how they analyze student evaluations and if there are indeed "key" questions on the form.

With the evaluation form before you and a knowledge of how the form is analyzed, it should be relatively easy to figure out ways

to improve your ratings on student evaluations. For instance, if you are rated low for canceling class too often, it is easy to see how to improve your rating on this question. It may be less easy to determine how to improve your rating on other questions. For instance, what if you are rated low on course organization? What is being complained about? Written student comments, if they are included on the form, may help; otherwise, it may be necessary to discuss the evaluation with the class. Some students (such as those who work and commute to class) may want the syllabus to describe the course, day by day, including all exams and papers. In contrast, other students may better tolerate a looser course organization. If your examinations are considered poorly written or ambiguous, it should be possible to have one of your colleagues look at them and give advice. By watching your ratings change, question by question and term by term, it should be possible to spot ways to improve your teaching and your ratings. And this is exactly what you should be doing to establish a pattern of concern about teaching and a pattern of growth—in advance of being considered for promotion and tenure.

Administering Student Evaluations

Some institutions require that student evaluations be administered by a departmental secretary or another individual not enrolled in the course. Other schools allow faculty to administer their own evaluations. Early on, determine the required frequency of student evaluations. Some colleges require that all courses be evaluated. Others require that probationary faculty evaluate one course each term, and tenured faculty one course each year. If it is not required that you have each of your courses evaluated, choose the course in which you think you will receive the best ratings.

The timing of student evaluations and the conditions under which they are administered can have a major impact on the results. One faculty member always had students fill out the evaluation *after* the final exam. This particular faculty member consistently gave a final exam that was somewhat easier than students expected; he felt that this situation resulted in more positive evaluations. Some faculty have found that after a difficult final, students sometimes demonstrate their immediate frustration by giving the instructor an unfavorable review. Another faculty member who tended to receive a lot of positive comments on his student evaluations found that requiring student evaluations to be completed during the time pressures of the final exam period greatly reduced the number of written comments, a situation that in his case harmed the faculty member.

There are stories of events in which, immediately before distributing the form, faculty members have pleaded with students for a good evaluation, citing their need for tenure, promotion, or even a merit salary increase. Most observers think this is unethical. It is not out of line, however, for a faculty member to "prep" students prior to an evaluation by reminding them of some of the goals of the course. In one case, the faculty member always schedules a very dramatic and impassioned review of the course immediately before the evaluation. In this review, the faculty member reads a very impressive statement that reminds students of the goals of the course and the ways they were accomplished, in a high-toned style accompanied by film excerpts, slides, and music. The presentation is a quite impressive multimedia presentation that frequently receives sustained applause, and probably has an impact on the student evaluations, which is its purpose. Another faculty member had always received low evaluations for course organization, ratings he felt he did not deserve. He felt that his not having stressed the very tight organization of the course after the first week was the problem, so he attempted to improve his ratings by reminding students about the

organization immediately before administering the evaluation. Another faculty member was distressed that ten percent of his students consistently said he did not attend the course regularly, even though he had never missed class. He found a subtle way to remind students, immediately before handing out the evaluation, that he *never* missed class.

Preparing students for evaluations only serves to remind them of the virtues of the course before the completion of the evaluation. Such prepping does not change the facts of the faculty member's teaching, but it might produce a better—or more accurate — written evaluation.

Commenting on Student Evaluations

It is well known that a particular course, by chance, can be populated by troublesome and poorly motivated students. It is most unfortunate if that particular course is the one designated for evaluation. To mollify the damage that can be done by a poor set of evaluations in such an instance, some institutions allow faculty to add cover memos to batches of student evaluations—in effect, evaluating the evaluations. These memos can point out comments which are clearly incorrect or exaggerated, and can describe the problems the instructor encountered teaching the class. In institutions in which such cover memos are not a part of the evaluation system, an effort should be made to institute them, if possible.

Maintenance of Student Evaluations of Teaching

Ordinarily, departments maintain files of student evaluations. It behooves you to be certain that these records are adequately maintained for a sufficient period of time. Most tenure cases require at least six years of records, and promotion cases can require records to be maintained over an even longer period. In one notorious case, a particularly inefficient department chairperson *could not find* the student evaluations for two candidates for tenure, and in all probability had thrown them away. Try to be certain that your records will be there when you need them.

Peer Evaluations

Faculty peers are much better prepared to answer certain questions about teaching than students are. For instance, students are not well prepared to judge whether a course adequately represents the discipline, prepares students for more advanced courses, or is at an appropriate level of difficulty. Faculty are far better prepared to answer these questions; hence, many institutions have developed systems of peer evaluations of teaching.

Peer evaluations by departmental colleagues are now required at most institutions. It is all faculty members' job to find out what peer evaluations consist of on their campus. If peer evaluations are not required, or if they are unheard of, a proactive stance would suggest that you ask for them to be instituted —if only to provide further documentation of quality teaching in your record.

Peer evaluations are often completed by a committee or team of faculty and usually result in a written evaluation or memo for the record. Evaluation teams frequently focus on written materials, but class visitations can be equally important.

Typically, a peer evaluation team is likely to want to examine *all* the written materials for *all* your courses. This includes syllabi, descriptions of assignments, and handouts. While designing your courses and writing these materials, it is wise to consider that other faculty members might be evaluating these documents at some point. Syllabi loaded with cute remarks and silly jokes might go over well with students but not with faculty peers. Faculty are much more likely to be impressed with well thought out, well written, neat, and detailed documents.

It is not unusual for inexperienced faculty to design syllabi that are not very cohesive and that are overly loaded with the faculty member's favorite topics, some of which might have only a tangential relationship to the intended content of the course. It is important to examine previous syllabi for the courses you currently teach, particularly those designed by senior faculty, to get a sense of what the department expects a particular course to cover. It is especially important that courses that are part of a sequence adequately prepare students to be successful in advanced courses. In writing course syllabi, you also should consider what topics are covered in similar courses in other universities, and to what depth they are explored in those courses. Above all, course syllabi and materials should not be idiosyncratic.

It is wise to consider the prejudices (if any) of the peer evaluation committee. Some of the members of this committee may have taught your courses at some point in their careers and thus may have certain expectations of your course materials. In one case, a senior faculty member would always become critical when film theory courses did not include a topic labeled "film aesthetics." It was a little difficult to determine what he meant by film aesthetics, but eventually it was discovered that he meant the relationship of film to pre-20th-century aesthetic philosophy. A little relabeling of existing course content was all that was required to deal effectively with this problem.

Peer evaluators usually look at examinations and at samples of papers produced in courses. Evaluators often have very different ideas about what constitutes a good exam. It is wise to attach cover memos to copies of examinations, explaining what you are seeking to judge in each exam; this sometimes helps make an examination more comprehensible to peer evaluators. For the same reasons, it is wise to attach a copy of the assignment to any sample paper given out for review.

Peer reviewers sometimes require a statement of teaching philosophy from the faculty member being examined. Be certain that your statement is well thought out and not in conflict with departmental goals.

Peer reviewers sometimes examine grade distributions. If this is true at your institution, try to determine the prevailing attitude toward grades. Is a bell-shaped curve expected? Grading in the arts, including film and video, is often done quite differently from grading in other disciplines.

Some peer review procedures require reviewers to interview current or former students. If you are asked for a list of potential interviewees, put your best foot forward. If the selection is to be random, there is little you can do to influence the outcome of the interviews.

Some teaching in the arts, including film/video production, involves one-on-one contact with students. This can include lengthy sessions in editing rooms and mixing facilities. The hope is that faculty peers will understand the importance of such contact and the significant amounts of faculty time consumed by such activities. Interviews with current or former students may be the only way to document the quality of one-on-one contacts.

Universities frequently require that peer review committees conduct classroom visitations. Ideally, you will be given a choice of days for the visit. If this is the case, put your put your best work in view and choose a class session that you feel is particularly good —perhaps a really great lecture or a workshop session that fully covers some ground, results in an enthusiastic student response, or demonstrates student learning. If you are not given a choice, you simply must live with the committee's choice of time and date. The worse situation is when a committee arrives unannounced, only to find that the faculty

member is returning examinations that day or showing a film the entire period.

Many institutions conduct relatively short and uncomplicated peer reviews of each faculty member's activities each year. It is quite usual for a faculty member to have at least two *major* peer reviews before coming up for tenure or promotion. The first of these is often called the "midterm review," e.g., a review midway in the process toward a tenure decision or a promotion consideration. At all stages, those being evaluated should try to *comprehend* the comments made by the peer evaluators. The comments should be helpful to you. Alternatively, the comments will provide you with information about how to make your work more acceptable to your colleagues. This does not necessarily mean "selling out." The use of different terms or a simple restatement of requirements will often greatly increase the acceptability of a faculty member's courses to a peer review committee.

Teaching Portfolios

In some institutions, "teaching portfolios" are common or at least an option available to the faculty member. On a simple level, a portfolio can contain syllabi, teacher-composed class materials, sample examinations, samples of student work, and similar materials—just the sort of material useful to peer or other review committees. In some institutions, however, teaching portfolios have become enormous assemblages of a wide variety of material. The American Association of Higher Education's publication, *Teaching Portfolios,* lists forty-nine different types of materials that could conceivably be included in a portfolio. These include items such as "documented reports of [student] satisfaction with out-of-class contacts," "comments from parents of students," "reports from employers of students," documentation of use of "general [university] support services," descriptions of "steps taken to emphasize the interrelatedness and relevance of different kinds of learning," etc.[3] Much of this material could be very difficult and extremely time consuming to obtain. It is assumed, of course, that no one individual would submit material in all forty-nine categories. In fact, advocates of teaching portfolios stress that portfolios should be individualized.

While a teaching portfolio is certainly valuable in that it can provide *detailed* evidence of careful teaching—evidence of the type not often available to review committees in the past—the very size and diversity of portfolios makes their evaluation difficult. Committee members often feel overwhelmed in attempting to separate the more significant from the less significant items in the mass of highly disparate material present in many portfolios.

A much greater problem is the very individuality of teaching portfolios, a point which advocates of such portfolios stress. Review committees frequently want to make *comparisons between individuals.* Such comparisons are difficult or impossible when each individual presents different sets of materials for evaluation. There is also the suspicion that the contents of a teaching portfolio are chosen to emphasize the candidate's good qualities while obscuring potentially important deficiencies. It is especially difficult to determine the importance of a particular portfolio item if a review committee has never seen such an item before and has no way of verifying its contents. It is for these reasons that teaching portfolios are viewed with skepticism by many review committees and are not seen as important evidence on some campuses.

If your campus permits or requires teaching portfolios, try to determine the credibility and usefulness of portfolios in the minds of

[3]Russell Edgerton, Patricia Hutchings, and Kathleen Quinlan. *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing Scholarship in Teaching* (Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education, 1991), p. 8.

reviewers. Then attempt to negotiate the contents of your portfolio so that it represents your work as favorably as possible.

Other Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Following is a series of items that many institutions accept as evidence of accomplishment in teaching.

- **Elaborate course materials:** In some institutions, faculty write elaborate laboratory or self-instruction manuals. Sometimes these materials are given out for free by departments, while at other times they are sold at cost by college bookstores. Most institutions recognize that the writing of such materials represents a commitment to teaching, since they are often tedious to write and there is usually no financial reward for the writers. If you become involved in such a project, make certain that what you write is of good quality. Use your colleagues as reviewers, consultants, or collaborators. Sometimes these course materials can become part of a course or teaching portfolio, discussed above.

- **Educational experiments:** Considering the training that many faculty members have in the design and execution of experiments, it is remarkable that one hears about so few experiments being conducted to document teaching methods. A description of an interesting example follows.

A graduate student in speech wished to test the notion that the best way to develop students' public speaking skills was to have them give as many speeches as possible during a course. An experiment was set up in which one section followed the traditional format, with students giving a number of speeches during the term. In the experimental section, students gave only two speeches, one at the beginning and one at the end of the course. The time in the experimental section was filled with topics such as speech outlining, composition, rhetorical analysis, and examination of model speeches. The first and last speeches of both sections were videotaped, randomly mixed, and evaluated using a standard scale, by a group of judges unassociated with the experiment.[4]

The results were astonishing. The students who had little actual public speaking experience in the course improved as much as did those who had a great deal of experience. While any review committee would want to see such a startling study replicated on a larger scale, the case demonstrates what persuasive evidence experimental studies can generate.

- **Textbooks:** Institutions in the United States are remarkably different in the way they view the writing of textbooks. Some schools insist that textbooks be considered as evidence of teaching excellence; others consider textbooks to be research; and still others analyze each textbook to determine if it contains enough original material or a unique synthesis of existing material to qualify as research/creative activity. More will be said on this matter in the section on research/creative activity.

- **Evidence of student involvement in the discipline:** Recently, the term "service learning" has entered the common vocabulary of higher education. Succinctly, service learning means involving students in the actual work of a discipline, even in the early stages of collegiate study. For example, some biology professors have devised ways of involving beginning students in the design and execution of biological experiments that have the potential to contribute to the field. In film/video, it has not been uncommon for students to work with clients to produce media works with immediate, practical applications, even if the results of such efforts have not always been satisfactory.

---

[4]Rollin Gene Eakins. "A Comparative Study of the Effectiveness of Teaching the Service Course in Speech as a Content and a Performance Course." Diss. The Ohio State U, 1966.

"Service learning" is frequently employed in fields such as social work and nursing, even if this term is not the one used to describe such efforts. *If your school places a particular value on service learning,* it would be wise to talk with other professors who have become involved in such efforts to determine the possibility of your own involvement.

• **Articles about teaching methods:** Some periodicals publish articles about the teaching of film or video. As in the case of textbooks, some institutions consider such writings under the category of teaching, others as research/creative activity.

• **Conference presentations about teaching methods:** Film and video associations, including UFVA, include presentations and panels about teaching methods and educational philosophies at their national conferences. These are often viewed by institutions as being similar to, but lesser than, articles on these subjects. Before preparing a conference presentation, it is wise to scout out each association one might want to make a presentation to by attending a national conference or examining conference programs for the past several years. Associations are sometimes more sophisticated than one might expect, sometimes less. Association interests also change from time to time.

• **"Love notes" from students:** Sometimes students write to a faculty member after completing a course, to complement her or his teaching. These notes should be retained for use as documentation in annual evaluations, and in promotion and tenure dossiers. Much more frequently, students give faculty members verbal compliments on their teaching. It is not unusual for faculty to ask students to put their comments in writing. Students should write to the departmental chairperson and send a copy to the faculty member. Of course, most students will not bother to write, but some will understand the importance of the request. At the time a faculty member comes up for promotion or tenure, it is quite common to solicit letters evaluating the candidate's teaching from selected students who have graduated. This is one good reason to maintain class rosters for a considerable period of time.

• **Statements from other faculty:** If you regularly team-teach a course and/or give guest lectures in the classes of other faculty, you should plan on requesting a formal evaluation of this teaching at some point, perhaps not every year but certainly before being considered for promotion or tenure.

The Importance of "The File"

Given the quantity of evidence and material that must be accumulated during the years before a faculty member comes up for tenure and promotion, it is essential for each faculty member to establish a means of assembling evidence and materials. Each individual should establish a file and routinely and regularly deposit in it any and all documentation that might be valuable in the promotion and tenure process. It is virtually impossible to assemble all this documentation after a number of years have passed. If information is filed and organized yearly, it can also be used to document annual evaluations.

The importance of establishing and maintaining a file cannot be overemphasized.

At many institutions the decision to grant tenure or promotion is made on the basis of the accomplishments listed in the research/creative activity section of the dossier. The section on teaching is read carefully and, provided that the candidate's teaching appears to be satisfactory, those in a position to make decisions quickly move on to the text on research/creative activity. The institutional attitude toward service is often ambivalent; most institutions are unsure of how to evaluate service or of how much should be required. Thus, the section on research/creative activity frequently becomes the "make or break" portion of the dossier.

This section will not discuss research or creativity per se; rather, it will discuss ways to maximize efforts and to accumulate the documentation that will be required in future dossiers.

"Research/creative activity" is an awkward phrase at best and there have been attempts in recent years to use the word "scholarship" to encompass the variety of activities performed by faculty. In the minds of most faculty, however, "scholarship" continues to be most often associated with traditional research and thus it has not become a universally adopted term.

Scholarship is, however, the term used in an influential work which has had an impact on higher education, Ernest L. Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered.*[5] Boyer argues for a broader conception of scholarship and of institutional missions than has often been true in higher education. This *Monograph* certainly is in agreement with these positions. All too often universities have copied the missions and standards of research universities at the top of the Carnegie classifications, ignoring other interesting, challenging, and important missions available to them. More directly related to this section of the *Monograph,* however, is Boyer's taxonomy of scholarship (or research/creative activity).

Boyer discusses the "scholarship of discovery" (which comes closest to what academics traditionally call "research," e.g., investigation which advances knowledge); the "scholarship of integration" (which makes connections between existing knowledge); the "scholarship of application" (which applies knowledge to the understanding and solution of important problems); and the "scholarship of teaching" (which investigates how students learn in a particular discipline). Boyer's taxonomy of scholarship is useful and will be applied in the material that follows.

The UFVA statement entitled "The Evaluation of Faculty in Creative Specialties for Promotion and Tenure" (available at the UFVA website: www.ufva.org) explains that all research and creative work must be *disseminated* and *evaluated* to be acceptable evidence of accomplishment. This section will attempt to explain how these two functions apply to a variety of types of work.

Research

Conventional research is typically disseminated by means of books, articles, and conference presentations. The means by which these works are evaluated are discussed below.

Books: The writing of books is a traditionally valued activity in higher education. Institutions differ, however, in the kinds of books they find acceptable. The first section of this publication contained an example of a

[5]Ernest L. Boyer. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

school that denied tenure to a professor who had completed two books—because the administration did not find the books to be sufficiently on the cutting edge of his discipline. Using Boyer's taxonomy, it could be observed that this particular institution decided that only "scholarship of discovery" was acceptable for tenure; therefore, the professor's work did not qualify. This position is not atypical of that of major research universities. On the opposite extreme would be the institution that would find virtually any book acceptable, simply because it was published.

Before beginning any book-writing project, it is a good idea to inquire about your own institution's attitude toward book publication vis-à-vis promotion and tenure. Are the only acceptable books those considered to be "on the cutting edge," that is, in the manner of Boyer's scholarship of discovery? Some institutions value only books with a highly theoretical slant, while others value any book published by a legitimate publisher.

Textbooks represent a special case. Some schools consider them to be evidence of good teaching, not research. Other schools, taking a different view of "research," view as an acceptable form of research the process of the compilation of materials from diverse sources in order to create a text. Boyer might call this the scholarship of integration. Still other schools take a middle view; they consider portions of a text that repeat the accepted principles of a field to be evidence of good teaching, and portions that provide original material, or a new synthesis or interpretation of existing material, to be evidence of integrative scholarship.

Once it is established that a particular book is acceptable to an institution, the evidence of the evaluation of that book can take many forms. The prestige of the publisher is one indication of quality. For example, a book published by Oxford University Press will frequently be considered of good quality, while a book published by an unknown publisher might be examined more closely.

Publishers generate printed reviews by providing review copies to periodicals likely to print reviews. These reviews should go into your documentation file as soon as you receive them. Publishers usually will provide the comments of prepublication reviewers to the author, and these should also be filed.

It is not uncommon to see reviews especially commissioned for a promotion and tenure dossier and written by faculty members. These reviews often are included when there seems to be an insufficient number of printed reviews, or when a book is published just prior to the submission of the author's dossier. Generally, reviews by one's colleagues are given less weight than reviews by academics at other institutions, although a candidate or a candidate's department may be asked to document the reputation of a reviewer from another institution. It is obviously to the candidate's advantage to have reviews from the best possible sources.

Books take a great deal of time to write, and it is not unusual for a book to be accepted for publication but not yet printed at the time the writer is scheduled to be reviewed for tenure. In such situations, most institutions will accept a letter from the publisher (along with prepublication reviews), because tenure decisions can rarely be delayed. When an individual is being considered for promotion and is claiming a soon-to-be-published book, however, it is not unusual to delay consideration of the promotion until the book appears and has been reviewed. This is especially true in cases of promotion to full professor. The rationale for treating tenure and promotion cases differently generally seems to be that delaying a promotion decision does not hurt the individual being considered, but allows time for more supporting documentation to be gathered.

Articles: Printed reviews of articles are relatively rare and frequently take the form of a letter to the editor or a relatively short text appearing in a special "response" section of a periodical. The quality of articles is more often established by the prestige of the publication in which they appear. When assembling promotion and tenure dossiers, departments are frequently asked to comment on the quality of periodicals in their field. Some schools restrict the articles that can count toward promotion and tenure to those published in a very few periodicals within the field. Most schools prefer publications in blind-refereed journals—which routinely submit all manuscripts to expert reviewers before publication. The "best" periodicals have high rejection rates. Articles often focus on integrative or applicative scholarship. Many articles can be seen as the application of particular knowledge or a theoretical position to a selected work or body of work.

Some institutions will accept nonrefereed publications, especially in fields in which there are very few refereed periodicals. In addition, some institutions will accept newspaper articles and other so-called popular writing, provided such writing is also accompanied by an evaluation or review prepared by the department or by an academic expert at another institution. Boyer probably would see popular writing as the application of the knowledge of the field to problems of or interests of the everyday public. Many observers of higher education feel that too many academics write work comprehensible only to other academics and thus are totally unable to communicate their field to the general public, or to use their knowledge in any practical way. There is an interest in some quarters in seeing this change. Acceptance of popular writing by universities may be one step in this direction.

The status of invited publications deserves special mention. Some institutions believe that when a faculty member is invited to write an article, such an invitation is a recognition that he or she is an expert on the subject. Other schools consider invited articles to be more suspect, believing that they may represent one friend doing a favor for another by extending such an invitation.

Before submitting an article for publication, you should determine what periodicals are acceptable to your institution. Since the reputations of periodicals are constantly changing, and review procedures prior to publication are likely to change as often as the editors, an institution's position on this subject may be even more ambiguous than its position on other promotion and tenure matters. Administrators may be reluctant to name acceptable periodicals, given that their ideas on this subject may change before a particular candidate comes up for tenure or promotion consideration. Look at the dossiers of other candidates (as suggested in the first section) in order to obtain some idea about where your department and institution stand on this matter.

Before beginning the writing of an article—indeed, even before beginning the research—you should select several target periodicals. Examining the last several years of a periodical will give you a good sense of the interests and direction of the publication, as well as the length of its articles. There is no point in submitting a monograph-length manuscript to a periodical that has no record of publishing longer manuscripts; nor is there any point in submitting an article interviewing a filmmaker (which might be very attractive to a number of journals) to a periodical such as *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, which clearly publishes very different manuscripts.

Documenting the quality of articles—other than by means of the periodical's reputation or subsequent letters to the editor—requires some effort. The editor of a periodical can often be called upon to write an evaluation of

the published article. In some cases, editors will provide the written comments of prepublication reviewers. These evaluations should be requested immediately after publication (so the article will be fresh in the editor's mind), and then added to the documentation file.

It is now quite customary for articles to be further evaluated by other professors. These evaluations may be completed by peers at one's own institution or experts at other institutions, or both, depending upon your institution's custom. Normally, however, these evaluations are requested and completed at the time of the midterm review and immediately prior to the assembly of a promotion or tenure dossier. The evaluations typically cover all of the articles listed as accomplishments up to that time.

When printed works are cross-disciplinary or interdisciplinary in nature, it is crucial that appropriate reviewers be identified by the candidate and the department.

Some prestigious periodicals are fully two years behind in publishing accepted articles. Most institutions will accept a letter from a periodical editor as proof that an article will be published. Reviews of the accepted article can be based on the prepublication manuscript.

Conference Presentations: A conference presentation is another way research results can be presented to the professorate for evaluation. Some institutions devalue conference presentations as little more than previews of publications. Other institutions are quite pleased with the institutional visibility that a conference presentation can provide and believe that the exposure to criticism that a presentation provides a professor is a valuable professional activity in and of itself. Although some schools will not accept conference presentations, and most schools would prefer publications, giving a conference presentation is often viewed as an indication that a professor is actively involved in her or his discipline.

Of course, the selection processes for conference presentations vary considerably. It is well known that some associations program every topic submitted, in order to give faculty "credits" for their résumés. The opposite extreme would be an association that programs only papers selected in a competitive process. Most associations fall somewhere between these two extremes; they use different selection processes for different portions of their programs. It is not unusual to see at the same conference a competitive paper session and a program hastily thrown together by a few friends.

If you appear on a conference program, be sure to place the letter inviting you to present your paper or accepting your paper in your documentation file, along with anything you can obtain that describes the selection process used by the organization or conference planners.

Providing evaluations of conference presentations is a more difficult process, and not one that should be postponed and done at the last minute. The chair of the session in which you appear should be willing to provide a written evaluation of your presentation. Written evaluations by audience members who are academics at other institutions might be acceptable to your university. In some cases, if your presentation is completely written, you may be able to get someone who did not view the presentation to evaluate the text. Given that conference presentations are quickly forgotten, it is imperative to make arrangements (which are acceptable to your school) for evaluations to be written at the time of the presentation. It is just about impossible to obtain an evaluation of an old presentation when you come up for tenure six years later!

What is an Acceptable Balance?

The proper balance between books, articles, conference presentations, and other forms of research productivity is very difficult to assess. One school uses a formula in which one book equals seven articles. Few institutions are this precise about equivalents. Whether or not a listing of research accomplishments is sufficient for promotion or tenure is a subjective matter.

Frank Tomasulo, a long-time UFVA member, tells an amusing, classic story about the required number of publications. In response to the question, "How many publications are required for tenure?" an administrator's answer always seems to be "n+1," with the "n" of the equation equalling the number of publications the faculty member then has in print. In other words, the faculty member is always one publication short. The same answer could be given to the question, "How many films are required for tenure?"

Just as one cannot be too thin or too rich, according to popular wisdom, it is generally true that one cannot have too many research accomplishments listed in a dossier. Many observers believe that in nine cases out of ten, *quantity counts.* This is especially true when dealing with administrators outside our field, who often make final promotion or tenure decisions. Newly hired faculty should not devote too much effort to too few projects. There is a danger in devoting all of your time to a very important book, which will constitute just about all of your research effort. What if the book is not well reviewed? There may not be enough other accomplishments on your record to justify your being promoted or tenured, even though you may be the most brilliant professor who ever emerged from graduate school.

Creative Activity (Film/Video/Media Production)

Film/video production and other creative activities pose challenges if they are to be accepted as evidence of productivity. Depending upon the project, they could be explained as belonging to any portion of Boyer's taxonomy. An anthropological film might be considered an example of the scholarship of discovery, an historical documentary might be considered an example of the scholarship of integration, and the production of an educational film might be considered an example of the scholarship of application.

Using the model derived from research, productions will have to be *disseminated* (shown) and *evaluated* (reviewed) if they are to be acceptable to most institutions. Fortunately, these challenges have been mitigated by the now common procedure of making even very long and expensive productions available for distribution on low cost videotape cassettes.

Listed below are a number of ways film and videotape productions can be disseminated, including a listing of ways to assemble evaluations of the work.

Film/Video Festivals: The number of film festivals is truly amazing, as anyone who has read any of the published guides to such festivals will attest. Festivals can be of local, regional, national, or international importance. They make up an important means for film and video works to be disseminated and evaluated. Most festivals are at least somewhat selective in the works they exhibit. To be selected for exhibition at a festival is a mark of some degree of distinction—but some festivals clearly are more selective than others. A great deal depends on the reputation of the festival in determining the degree of distinction that a festival showing demonstrates. From the standpoint of a faculty member coming up for tenure or promotion, it is

important to try to get one's work shown at the most prestigious festivals. Since festivals are often genre-specific, however, it is fruitless to try to submit a narrative film to an anthropological film festival.

Although showing at a festival provides dissemination of a media work, evaluation is another matter. Simply being selected for showing is one measure of quality, but the selectivity and prestige of the festival will often have to be explained in the promotion or tenure dossier. Some festivals result in reviews appearing in newspapers or other publications; these reviews should be collected and filed very carefully, even if newspaper reviews do not carry much weight with academic authorities. It is possible to request reviews from the festival judges or administration, although these individuals are usually not "tuned in" to the needs of the academic world, may be reluctant to write reviews at all, or might produce generalized statements that are not very useful in the promotion and tenure process. Institutions of higher education are particularly fond of evaluations produced by outstanding academics at other institutions. It may be possible to arrange for such an evaluation even if the reviewer is not present at the festival. The review could be completed after viewing a videotape copy of the presentation. Some institutions will insist that the department rather than the faculty member arrange for such a review.

The internet has greatly facilitated all faculty members' ability to find appropriate festivals for their work. The internet also allows faculty members to work at home, and not to be at the mercy of local library facilities. Festival websites often contain a great deal of information, application blanks, etc. It is important to try a variety of search engines to locate as many festivals as possible, since results often vary from search engine to search engine. There is one thing that cannot be learned about festivals through the internet—the reputation of the festivals, particularly among academics. Thus, is it is important also to consult one's colleagues. In addition to local colleagues, be certain to use contacts through UFVA and other professional groups in order to learn as much as possible. Don't delay starting this process. Learning about festivals is likely to take more time than you expect.

Conference Showings: Many professional and faculty associations, such as UFVA, have regular screenings at their national conferences. Such associations include not only those in film/video, but also those in various traditional subject areas. In many ways, association screenings operate like festival showings. To find out about opportunities to exhibit one's work at conferences, consult as many colleagues as possible; a lot of follow-up effort will be required. Association selection procedures vary tremendously. It is important to find out as much as possible about the selection procedures—not only to aid in the placement of your work, but also to use as evidence in future promotion and tenure dossiers.

As a part of the UFVA showings, the film/video maker is provided with a written critique prepared by an academic from another institution. Obtaining such an evaluation from other associations is sometimes more difficult, but you should request one at the time your work is accepted for showing.

UFVA Awards of Merit: Each year at its annual conference, UFVA allows individuals showing works for the written and oral feedback the Association regularly provides to simultaneously enter a competition that designates a limited number of works for "Awards of Merit." The number of awards given each year is small, and there is no fixed number of them; this matter is decided by the juries. Because of the limited number of Awards of Merit given, recipients (and their institutions) should consider an award to be an important recognition.

Electronic Exhibition: Each year a small number of films and videotapes made by professors are shown on public or commercial television or on one of the many available nonbroadcast channels. Clearly, there is a big difference between a tape being shown on a local cable system and its being selected in a competitive process for inclusion in a PBS anthology series. While this is an unlikely means of dissemination for most faculty work, it should be pursued wherever an opportunity exists. Evaluation of broadcast work can follow the patterns described for festivals and conference showings.

Showings at Museums, Media Arts Centers, Colleges, and Universities: Many museums, media arts centers, colleges, and universities have regular showings of media works. In addition, these institutions are more likely to be interested in work faculty members produce than some festival and television outlets are. Suffice it to say, faculty media makers should take any and all opportunities to have their work shown.

It is generally believed that faculty members receive invitations for such showings based on their reputations. Many faculty, however, have generated showings through self-publicity. These individuals have typically produced and mailed illustrated brochures about their work, often accompanied by a letter of introduction and sometimes followed up by further mailings or phone calls. In any such efforts, it is important to emphasize the strengths of one's work. One filmmaker was able to generate showings by demonstrating that her work was relevant to several different departments in the same school—film, women's studies, and political science.

Promotion and tenure dossiers often have to compare the value of film showings with something that is more familiar to faculty in other disciplines, namely publications. Some schools count each important showing of a creative work as a separate "publication," while others see the production itself as a single publication, regardless of the number of screening opportunities realized. Regardless of how an institution "counts" a film showing, the faculty member should use such showings to generate evaluations for her or his file.

Obtaining evaluations from showings at museums and schools requires further effort. Some media series or institutions have such reputations that to be selected for showing is in itself an indication of quality. For instance, being selected for a showing at the Museum of Modern Art would be an honor recognized by just about every university. For other showings, it may be necessary to demonstrate the selectivity of the host institution's film/video series, however difficult that may be. It would be good to obtain an evaluative statement or a memo for your file from those at the host institution who have selected your work for showing. If audience discussion followed a screening of your work, with or without your being present, the comments made might be transcribed for your file or reported in memo form. The evaluation most likely to be respected by an academic institution is, as in most cases, one written by a faculty expert from another institution.

Selection for Distribution: It is generally very difficult for faculty members to have their work accepted by a company or cooperative for distribution. The mere fact of having been selected by a distribution company may be an indication of quality work, provided that the company is selective. If your work is selected for distribution, be certain to find out what percentage of submitted work is accepted. It is also a good idea to get a list of institutions to which the distribution company has rented your work (if this is possible); many schools are impressed by such lists.

Grant Applications: Most institutions encourage faculty to apply for grants to support their media productions. Such grants are highly competitive. All schools like to see

any grants received listed in promotion and tenure dossiers. Given the highly competitive nature of media grants, the UFVA urges that institutions give credit for grants applied for as well as for grants received; but, clearly, not all institutions will concur with the UFVA position.

The *Journal of Film and Video*'s Annual CD-ROM Edition: Each year there is a special CD-ROM edition of UFVA's *Journal of Film and Video,* which includes both reviews of member-produced work and illustrative clips from those works. Given the limited number of works reviewed each year in this publication, inclusion in the CD-ROM should certainly be considered a prestigious accomplishment.

Other Types of Dissemination and Evaluation: It is not uncommon for a film/video maker to be asked to make a personal appearance at a postviewing discussion in connection with a screening. Some (but not all) schools consider this to be the equivalent of presenting a paper at a conference. In all cases of personal appearances, it is important to generate a transcript or memo that records or condenses the audience's questions and comments as well as your responses.

Reviews of faculty media work sometimes appear in print, and opportunities for such reviews should be sought. Newspapers sometimes review faculty works shown on television or at local universities, but newspaper reviews may be considered suspect by academic institutions. Printed reviews of interest to libraries and media centers appear in media library publications, and academic journals sometimes include reviews of films of interest to their readers. Obviously, you should pursue any possibility for a printed review. Often a review can be generated simply by finding an appropriate publication and providing a videotape review copy. Finding appropriate outlets may be difficult—but colleges and universities are wonderful places, full of people who know about resources and who are willing to help.

Special Problems

Length *versus* Difficulty: It is important that evaluators be able to determine the probable difficulty and originality of particular projects. The length of a finished work might be significant but usually is not indicative of the effort required to complete it. A short experimental video piece or a multimedia production might require even more time and effort to create than a relatively straightforward hour-long documentary. Candidates for promotion and tenure may need to assist their departments in selecting evaluators who are able to be insightful about the issue of length *versus* difficulty.

Collaborative Works: A great deal of work in film and video is collaborative. If you are not solely responsible for the creative work you are involved in, it is wise to sit down with your chairperson and discuss how your department will determine what credit you will receive for collaborative works. This is a very complex problem and if difficulties develop in dealing with collaborative work, the UFVA recommends that experts in the field be consulted.

Professional Experience: Another difficult problem is the question of whether or not working free-lance in commercial film and video constitutes creative activity. Some schools completely exclude such work, while others encourage it. Many schools are uncertain about how to interpret professional work. It is important to examine any staff position a faculty member is given on a professional production. Some positions entail a high degree of responsibility, while others do not. Before listing a great many professional credits in your dossier, be certain to determine your institution's attitude toward such work.

Scriptwriting: Some schools consider scripts not to be worthwhile works in and of themselves. These schools often express the viewpoint that the script is only the "outline" for a production and cannot be evaluated unless the script is produced. This viewpoint places faculty interested in feature-length scriptwriting in a most difficult position, because it is extremely unlikely that a faculty member's script, no matter how good, will ever be considered for professional production. (Very few faculty members have sold feature scripts for production, and most faculty who did had to leave their academic careers to continue to meet professional writing demands.) It is extremely unrealistic for institutions to believe that academic scriptwriting must somehow be validated by professional production. It is important that professors who write scripts determine their institution's view of this issue early on.

Providing an evaluation for scripts written by faculty is a special problem. Unproduced scripts are almost never published, and few means of dissemination and evaluation exist. Scriptwriting competitions exist, but many are limited to students or have other restrictions. Some institutions might agree that the optioning of a script is a recognition of its quality. Peer reviews of a script produced by a scriptwriting professor are relatively easy to arrange and are usually the best option. Scripts can be mailed to one or more screenwriting professors at other universities who have agreed to provide peer evaluations. Contacts made through a professional association, such as the UFVA, are important in identifying appropriate evaluators.

At each annual UFVA conference, scripts written by members are read and critiqued. The form of the readings varies from year to year—some conferences include sessions dedicated to readings of individual scenes as well as of complete works. Official respondents are required to provide authors with detailed, written responses. Faculty members should be certain that these evaluations are deposited in files for promotion and tenure.

Multimedia Shows and Other Experimental Work: Works that do not fall into well established patterns, such as multimedia shows and some experimental work, present special problems, since many exhibitions and reviews are closed to such work. If you are interested in such work and your department agrees that this work is acceptable to your institution, it is wise to determine in advance what means of dissemination and evaluation will be acceptable.

The "Scholarship of Teaching"

The last category in Boyer's taxonomy is the "scholarship of teaching." Those who promote the concept of the scholarship of teaching stress that studying how students learn in a particular discipline ought to be a valued faculty activity at all schools and that individual campuses should encourage faculty to study the teaching of their discipline. Certainly this seems a worthwhile idea.

Problems arise, however, when discussion moves to how the scholarship of teaching is to be rewarded and thus how it fits into institutional promotion and tenure requirements. While it is not often stated, one of the reasons for requiring faculty research is to encourage faculty to continue to learn within their discipline. However, many faculty believe that the study of teaching methods is only a marginal subject in their discipline, if that. Within institutions which accept and encourage the idea of the scholarship of teaching, there is the question about how much credit for such scholarship should be granted toward promotion or tenure. Often committees believe that "scholarship of teaching" projects, in and of themselves, should not be considered sufficient for the granting of promotion or tenure.

At the beginning of this section of this

Monograph, it was stressed that for work to be accepted as research/creative activity, it had to be *disseminated* and *evaluated*. It is in this realm that the scholarship of teaching is most problematical. In theory, the scholarship of teaching could be disseminated and evaluated on a national level as other forms of scholarship are, but the mechanisms which would make this possible do not exist on the same scale or with the same standards as those developed for the other types of scholarship described by Boyer.

Thus, most well regarded institutions do not accept Boyer's notion of the scholarship of teaching, while others accept it but with reservations and restrictions placed on the acceptability of such scholarship as a substitute for research in the promotion and tenure process. This situation is unlikely to change in the near future.

Using Time Wisely

Media production is invariably very time-consuming. In addition, the effort required for the dissemination and evaluation of creative work can take a great deal of faculty time. Thus, faculty members in creative specializations sometimes have to make choices between various creative options.

Many experienced faculty advise choosing creative projects that have the best chances for completion in the shortest possible time. It may be exciting to consider making a feature-length project that will take several years to complete, but this can be a risky option for newly hired faculty members. What if financial difficulties prevent the completion of the project? The faculty member could end up having spent several years of effort with nothing to show for it. Some time ago, a graduate student was the cinematographer for a long thesis production. He insisted the film be shot in 35mm and as a result of the financial burdens of this decision, as well as other reasons, the film was never completed. Those who saw the rough footage said that the cinematography was brilliant; however, unfortunately—since the film was never completed—it was never available to be shown by the cinematographer as a demonstration of his skills.

In general, it is far better for a young faculty member to make a number of shorter projects than to risk everything on a single longer project. Older faculty and tenured faculty have more options available to them. Most administrators outside our field do not understand the time required for creative production and prefer to make decisions that can be justified on the basis of long, ongoing records of accomplishment. The phrase "sustained record of research/creative activity" is frequently used. Decision making committees do not want to see a résumé which contains a flurry of activity in the year before tenure but little else. Remember, in dealing with administrators who make promotion and tenure decisions, *quantity counts.*

Although quantity counts, it is essential when assembling dossiers that important accomplishments not be mixed up with too many unimportant ones. Listing every accomplishment, no matter how trivial, can actually make a dossier seem less impressive. Always emphasize your major accomplishments.

SERVICE

Service is a strange category, because there is no widespread agreement about what constitutes service and no agreement about how important service ought to be in promotion and tenure decisions, except at community colleges which are clearly service-oriented. A few institutions have attempted to state clear criteria regarding service, but at most colleges and universities it continues to be a very ambiguous category.

At many institutions, only a token effort in service is *required* of candidates for promotion and tenure. At the same time, service accomplishments are sometimes used as substitutes for accomplishments in other categories. For instance, older faculty members in administrative positions will often have a long list of service accomplishments, and this record is sometimes viewed as a substitute for having taught little for years. It is dangerous, however, for young faculty to believe that service can be used as a substitute for adequate research/creative activity. This is discussed under "Service as a Cruel Trap for Young Faculty," below.

Service is extremely important in certain institutions, or parts of institutions. Two examples are described below.

- One small liberal arts college has taken the view for several decades that faculty participation in the committee structure is essential to the way the college operates. At this school, a significant record of institutional service is clearly a requirement for promotion and tenure.

- One department that has high service requirements is part of an institution that is ambivalent about service. In this particular department, the faculty have the attitude that all service activities are mindless drudgery, which takes them away from the work they would really like to be involved in. The department as a whole recognizes that committees must be staffed, and that other service functions (at least within the institution) must be performed. Thus, the department is adamant in requiring all faculty members to be "good citizens" and perform their share of service functions at the institutional level. Individuals who are "slackers" are denied promotion, tenure, and annual salary increases.

The examples above suggest that it is essential for you to determine your institution's attitude toward service.

Institutional Service

Possibilities for institutional service include student advising and membership on committees, including departmental, school or college, and all-institution committees.

The approach to advising varies tremendously from institution to institution. In many schools, everyone does some advising, while in others, a few faculty (or even one) do all the advising. Advising requires that the faculty member be well informed about degree requirements and extremely careful in recordkeeping. The biggest student complaint about advisers is that their adviser is not available. (Translate this to mean "my adviser is not available at the time I want to meet.") The biggest faculty complaint about advisers is that students are put into courses for which they do not have the prerequisites and/or are unprepared. In recent times, students seem to have adopted the attitude that advising means more than academic advising; they expect psychological counseling and other advice that faculty often are ill equipped to provide.

If you are assigned duties as an adviser, be certain to determine what your department expects of you in this role. It would be valu-

able to talk with other faculty, particularly those who are considered to be good advisers. Keep in mind that advising can be a bottomless pit: some students will take as much time as you allow them. For the newly hired faculty member who must establish a record of accomplishment in other areas, being willing to meet at length with students can be a disaster. To avoid having advising take too much time, prepare sheets outlining requirements on which students can plan their own college programs, term by term. If students arrive unaware of requirements and expect you to do all the work (a situation that happens all too often these days), give the students copies of the college catalog and any worksheets you have created, and ask them to return only after they fully understand all requirements *and* have prepared course schedules for you to examine.

Committee work is relatively free of pitfalls. Most committees deal with work that must be done but is noncontroversial and not difficult. The work can be mindless and thankless. Make certain that you attend meetings and participate in committee discussions. Also be certain that the committee accomplishes its tasks within the prescribed time frame. One senior faculty member was always eager to accept committee assignments, in order to add them to his résumé, but was very lackadaisical about such responsibilities. When he attended only one of nine meetings of a committee outside his department, believing no doubt that no one would be the wiser, the chairperson of the committee became angry and published attendance records. The faculty member's home department was supremely embarrassed. This same individual also agreed to be a member of an important committee that was discussing possibilities for an administrative reorganization of his school; again, he did not attend meetings regularly—and ended up signing a final report without ever reading it. The report proved quite controversial. Eventually, he had to acknowledge that he had never read it, and needless to say, his standing in his department and college was jeopardized by this behavior.

Young faculty members are generally not assigned to committees involved in controversial or exceedingly difficult tasks. Only senior faculty are usually assigned to difficult committees, such as those designated to draft a new mission statement for the institution or to revise degree requirements.

Sometimes young faculty members can inadvertently get in over their heads. In one unfortunate example, a faculty member was assigned to an all-university committee on general education, which had a tradition of being inactive, passing minor revisions of courses that were proposed by departments, and certainly never engaging in any major discussions. He was befriended by an older colleague from another college who had a vested interest in seeing that the current general education program be significantly changed. The two faculty members then began to insist that the committee discuss the philosophy of general education and examine programs at other institutions. The faculty members became so enamored of some of the ideas discussed that they began to propose a drastic revision of the university's existing program. The committee became hopelessly divided into those wanting to continue the existing program and those favoring the radical revision. With the committee deadlocked, both notions were taken to the whole faculty for discussion and a vote; a majority of the faculty were dead set against the radical revision because it would change the courses they taught. The faculty member and his colleague were forced to defend the proposal against an increasingly hostile audience. Following discussion, the proposal for radical revision was defeated. The young faculty member felt that there was so much hostility toward him personally that he resigned rather than go through the tenure process the following year. His fear was probably exaggerated.

Most committees have some "scut" work, including the taking of minutes, processing of paperwork, and writing of reports. Faculty members can greatly endear themselves to fellow committee members by volunteering to take on these tasks. If you volunteer, be certain you are willing to put in the effort necessary to do the work in a timely manner. If you are disorganized or not very good at administrative tasks, don't volunteer. Be especially cautious about written reports, which can often be much more difficult to write than you might imagine, and which may require many revisions to deal with differing opinions within the committee. Ask yourself if you really are a good writer and if you are willing (and able) to devote the time the task requires. Well done committee work frequently passes unacknowledged, but poor committee work can jeopardize a career.

These days it is quite common for faculty members to request a committee chairperson to write a memo for their file describing their contribution to the committee. This is especially true when the faculty members have taken responsibility for the written work or paper flow of the committee. Such memos should be requested at the end of each academic year, before the chair has had time to forget each faculty member's contribution, and before the membership of the committee has changed. In many institutions, such memos are so routine that they count for little in the promotion and tenure process. Nonetheless, the documentation should be available in the file; trivial memos can always be eliminated when a dossier is assembled.

Local or Community Service

Local service can include such activities as making speeches before civic or educational groups, conducting workshops in local schools, and serving on community boards, such as school boards, arts councils, or boards regulating cable television.

Many institutions devalue local service as something that anyone can do, and therefore not an important activity for faculty. There are exceptions to this view, however. Community colleges often focus on their relationship with groups and individuals in their service areas. Small schools that are greatly concerned about their relationship with their communities want their faculty to contribute to community groups in some way. A case in point is that of a young theater professor at a liberal arts college that had had a checkered relationship with the small town in which it was located. At the request of a local literary club, the professor prepared a lecture and some dramatic readings, focusing on new developments in the contemporary theater. The club was delighted, and the local newspaper ran a very favorable article about the event. In later years, the president of the school would frequently cite this article as proof of the positive influence the school had had on the community.

If your institution values local service, it is not usually difficult to become involved. Many boards are desperate for members, and in many cases one needs only to volunteer to be on them.

Some schools have urged or required that students enrolled in specific courses be engaged in community service, sometimes by helping established social agencies, sometimes by creating services that had not existed earlier. If your institution is community service oriented, find out as much as possible about this institutional interest and determine if you and your classes can participate.

Regional Service

Regional service can include service on statewide education committees and arts councils, as well as involvement in regional organizations, such as the Central States Speech Association, which includes film/video among its many interests.

Again, the value placed on regional service varies widely. Many prestigious institutions devalue all service below the national level. State-supported schools are the most likely to value activities at the state level.

In general, there is probably more competition for positions on statewide committees and boards than there is on local committees and boards. It is possible, however, to obtain statewide assignments. Regional academic associations, like all academic associations, are generally desperate for help. In most cases, about all that needs to be done is to volunteer for committee service.

Regional service, like institutional and local service, can be time consuming. It requires time spent away from campus to attend meetings and time spent on writing and paper-flow assignments, not unlike that required by campus committees. Be certain you are willing to put in the time necessary, which often means taking time away from your personal life, and remember that your institution may not be able or willing to support these activities with travel funds.

Newly hired faculty members who have a limited number of years of service before coming up for promotion or tenure should not become involved in regional service unless it is valued at their institutions.

National Service

National service can include service on federal committees, councils, and advisory panels, as well as work with national faculty associations such as the UFVA. Realistically, few younger faculty will have an opportunity to serve on federal panels, since these assignments are greatly sought after by and typically go to senior faculty. Work with national associations, however, is easily within the realm of possibility.

Most institutions place some value on national service, even while realizing that few people will be so involved. A few institutions are against national service by faculty, believing that such service takes time away from departmental concerns.

It is relatively easy to become involved in committee work with many national associations; usually, all one needs to do is ask for an assignment. Contrary to popular belief, many associations find it difficult to find members willing to serve on committees and to work on national conferences. Committee work, if well done, can lead to committee chairs and officerships within an association.

The same caution should be raised about national committee assignments that was raised about other committee assignments. National committee assignments can be very time-consuming, and no individual should accept an appointment without having sufficient commitment. Often the assignments that demand the most time (and that require a high level of administrative skill) are the easiest ones to get. It can be difficult to complete national committee assignments when faced with the day-to-day demands of your teaching and research/creative activity schedule. Also keep in mind that your institution may not support you by providing travel money, secretarial help, long-distance telephone service, or reimbursement for expenditures.

International Service

Most associations that use the word "international" in their titles but have their offices in the United States are really national associations with a modicum of international membership. In our field, the major international organization, CILECT (International Center for Schools of Film and Television), is not an organization of individuals but of schools and organizations. The few truly international assignments available are likely to go to senior faculty. It is possible for others to

become involved in some international activities, but typically only if one is able either to pay all expenses personally or to secure a grant for international travel.

Service as a "Cruel Trap " for Young Faculty

Ideally, nontenured faculty at four-year colleges and universities should be given minimal service assignments so they can concentrate on their development as teachers and scholars/creative artists, because promotion and tenure committees at many institutions will not pay much attention to service accomplishments. Unfortunately, some established faculty members, to avoid service assignments themselves, give major assignments to young, nontenured faculty; this may be especially true for women and members of minority groups, who are sometimes given extra assignments on major committees because of the constituent groups they represent. Nontenured faculty should be extremely careful about the time they devote to service assignments, knowing that *in no way will service, however distinguished, ever compensate for insufficient research/creative activity.*[6]

[6]This paragraph and the term "cruel trap" were suggested by Richard B. Jewell.

THE FOURTH FACTOR IN PERSONNEL DECISIONS: COLLEGIALITY

The ideology of higher education suggests that promotion and tenure decisions are based *entirely* on the merits of the candidate. Some institutions certainly live up to this ideal, tenuring individuals with radically different ideas about their discipline. This can result in departments being perpetually involved in internecine warfare, as individuals battle for control of the decision making process of their department.

Most departments and most faculty members, however, prefer not to work perpetually in a war zone. They want to be able to pursue their own interests without interference; in other words, they want peace and harmony in their departments. Despite what many people in higher education believe, most faculty are not very comfortable co-existing with academic gadflies who are constantly questioning the status quo.

This means that when deciding on matters of tenure and promotion, most faculty *do* consider the extent to which a candidate is able to work in a collegial manner within the department. Senior faculty will often not admit that collegiality is a factor that is considered, because, in many cases, institutional regulations do not permit it as a criterion. Many institutions prefer to cling to the ideology that merit is the sole criterion used in promotion and tenure decisions.

This situation is changing, however. More and more institutions are including collegiality in their promotion and tenure criteria, and this inclusion is no longer considered radical as it might have been interpreted in past decades. This change is supported by recent Federal court decisions. The Federal courts have always given higher education institutions great latitude in making personnel decisions, even when these decisions appeared to come close to abrogating Constitutional rights. Recent court decisions have affirmed the right of institutions to dismiss individuals who act in a disruptive manner by distracting colleagues in some way from their normal work. While recent decisions have focused

on disruptiveness, it is also clear that institutions have the virtually absolute right to determine teaching assignments and to reassign individuals, even if this right is seldom exercised.

Some observers believe that collegiality is a factor in virtually every tenure or promotion decision, even if institutional regulations do not permit such consideration. At schools that lack collegiality clauses in their promotion and tenure regulations, the explanation for the denial is usually stated as being related to standards of teaching, research/creative activity, or service. Many faculty may not even realize that the notion of collegiality entered their own heads when they voted on a particular case.

Personality Conflicts

Following are a number of cases in which collegiality was a factor in the decisions made.

- Many years ago, a young professor of theater history left a major research university under difficult circumstances. He had been hired from one of the country's top graduate schools, largely because he had excellent potential to become one of the top professors of theater history in the United States. This individual was rather abrasive, however, and had a tendency to shoot from the hip. At a departmental faculty meeting scheduled to discuss the possibilities for the upcoming season of play productions, he proposed an obscure play. One of the senior theater faculty, who was very much respected by both students and faculty, admitted that he did not know the play and asked for a description. The young historian responded by saying, "I would be embarrassed if I were a full professor of theater and didn't know that play." There was quite a chill in the room after that remark. Later that month, the contracts of all the other probationary faculty in the department were renewed, but the contract for the young historian was held "for further study." The young faculty member saw the handwriting on the wall and resigned from the university rather than risk being fired.

- A tenured faculty member devoted an entire one semester-long graduate seminar to a negative critique of a departmental colleague's work, spending a full week of the course on each of the articles his colleague had published. No action was taken by the institution; in fact, there is no evidence that anyone other than the students were aware of what was being done in this course. However, given the understandings gained from recent court decisions, the faculty member's behavior could be considered disruptive and distracting. One might also wonder if there were not better topics to which to devote a graduate seminar.

- A young faculty member was hired by a major film department that up until then had consisted mostly of older faculty. He examined the syllabi for courses the other faculty were teaching. He immediately began talking to students, condemning the courses taught by the other faculty as out-of-date and irrelevant to the discipline. This was clearly inappropriate, since it could be interpreted as the prohibited disruptive behavior described in recent court cases. One older faculty member befriended the young man, and suggested that if he really believed the older faculty needed to change, he should work with them rather than just criticize them. The young faculty member refused, feeling this was not a role he wished to assume. Not much later, the department fired the young man in order to avoid a battle over tenure in the future.

This last case is particularly instructive because it illustrates the generation gap that often exists between younger and older professors. Younger professors frequently are devoted to disciplinary methods and interests that are different from those of senior faculty. It is not unusual for young faculty to feel that their interests are superior to those of the

older faculty. And it is true that some older faculty are not up-to-date or aware of what is "going on" in the field. The vast majority, however, are dedicated to their field, only to aspects and methods that are different, at least to some extent, from those to which younger faculty are dedicated.

Most faculty of any age believe in what they are doing and try to do a good job as faculty members. They want to be able to continue the activities and interests they value; they want to feel good about what they are doing; and they want to feel that they are valued. What most older faculty don't want is a young gadfly telling them constantly that their teaching is passé and that their research/ creative activity is irrelevant.

Disciplinary Orientation

• Some years ago a young film studies professor was hired by a department that had a special interest in documentary film. The young professor was grateful for the job, but the department's professed orientation to documentary film made him uncomfortable, since he was interested mostly in narrative film. Shortly after being hired, the young professor tested the waters by proposing an additional course in narrative film. Many of the senior faculty opposed the course, and the vehemence of their opposition indicated that they were completely devoted to maintaining the department's documentary orientation. The young faculty member backed off, bided his time, and eventually was tenured and promoted. Then, as a more accepted and presumably permanent member of the faculty, he again proposed additional courses in narrative film. This time he met no opposition: not only had the proposer become an accepted member of the "team," but opinion had shifted to a point where many faculty realized that maintaining the department's overwhelming emphasis on documentary orientation was probably unwise.

It is not unusual for a department to want to maintain particular strengths through personnel decisions. Nor is it unusual for a faculty member to be hired despite obvious interests that are not fully compatible with the department doing the hiring. It is difficult for a newly hired individual to act on those interests, however, without potentially jeopardizing her or his chances for tenure and promotion.

"Filling In" the Teaching Load

Many departments are not able to replace faculty members who retire or leave. This stretches faculty resources to the limit when departments try to offer their entire curriculum in a timely way.

Years ago, job ads were often very general, simply specifying the general subfield in which applicants were sought. Today it is not unusual for an institution to advertise for someone to fill a position requiring a specific teaching load. Sometimes the specified courses are ridiculously diverse; nonetheless, the department placing the advertisement needs to have all the courses taught and sees no other way to effect this.

• A university advertised for a professor of film studies. The ad specified that a majority of the teaching load would consist of introductory courses in history and theory for majors, and a general education course for nonmajors, and that there would be some possibility of teaching advanced courses.

The individual hired for this position was grateful to have a job, and probably did not carefully consider the specific content of the ad. Within six months after being hired, he made it clear that he was very uncomfortable teaching the introductory courses for majors, and said further that it would be "psychologically traumatic" for him to teach the course for nonmajors, which he had not yet been assigned. The young man asked to teach a graduate seminar, then being taught by

another faculty member, and requested that the balance of his load consist of only advanced courses. His request was denied because if the department agreed, it would be unable to staff the courses the young professor wanted to give up. Two concessions were made, however: the young professor was not assigned the course for nonmajors, and he was allowed to teach at least one advanced course each semester. These concessions were made, as is often the case in higher education, even though the courts have established that institutions have the legal right to make teaching assignments. The professor was much disliked by students in the introductory courses, and enrollment began to decline. When the young professor was considered for tenure, the other faculty openly discussed his lack of versatility and his unwillingness to be flexible about his teaching load. The department needed someone who could teach whatever the department required, but the young professor was successful only in advanced courses. There was open resentment of the fact that he had never taught the course for nonmajors, which everyone else had taught at one time or another. The conclusion of the discussion was that the young professor was not a collegial member of the department. The explanation for denial of tenure, however, mentioned only the inadequacies in the quality of his teaching, since the institution involved did not include collegiality among the criteria for tenure.

Ideological Conflict

Even to suggest that ideological conflict exists within American higher education is enough to make many academics angry. Many professors do not want to admit that ideology plays any role in personnel matters.

• This example, fortunately, is not from our field but from an English department. A brilliant young woman was hired by a rather traditional English department to teach feminist criticism and women's studies. Although the department wanted these subjects taught, its faculty expected them to be taught in a detached, academic manner. They did not expect the young faculty member to act like a feminist, to be politically involved, and most of all, to point out constantly the ways the department and its faculty discriminated against women. Despite her brilliant teaching and research record, the young woman was denied tenure. The official reason for denial of tenure was that her completed research could not be shown to be sufficiently rigorous—a good example of how a "legitimate" explanation, one with a policy basis, can be used to cover up a decision actually based on a collegiality problem.

Great apprehension exists in many institutions about social and political activism on the part of university faculty. This is often the result of fear of bad publicity, which can jeopardize the future of institutions in an era of student consumerism, strict public oversight, and steady state or strained budgets. It is acceptable (at most institutions) to teach about Marxism, but actually to be a Marxist and to act on those beliefs frightens most administrators and some faculty. In the case above, the department and university were uneasy about the young professor's political activities. Of greater importance in the English faculty's vote, however, were the candidate's assertions about paternalistic behavior on the part of the department.

Social Incompatibility

Generally, university faculty are fairly tolerant of differences in social background. The following example, however, is one in which social differences had an impact on a tenure decision.

• A well respected music department was dominated by faculty who were very proper, indeed almost aristocratic in their behavior. Somehow, this department hired a young woman whose background and demeanor

were quite different from that of the other faculty. She was casual in manner, dressed most of the time in jeans and plaid blouses, and regularly brought two big hunting dogs to the office with her. Some described her as a Southern "good old girl." Eventually, she was denied tenure, even though she (1) had received the very highest evaluations from the chairperson every year before coming up for tenure; (2) had been promoted from instructor to assistant professor; and (3) had received glowing notices from experts in her specialty who were not associated with the university.

This was a most interesting case. Despite the spirited defense of a few faculty and the testimony of experts, an overwhelming majority of the faculty voted against tenure for this young woman. Those who voted against tenure were certain that the level of musicianship of the candidate was insufficient to merit tenure, and most faculty probably believed this rationalization. Some faculty in other departments, however, concluded that the music faculty had persuaded themselves that anyone with the candidate's social background and demeanor could not possibly have the "proper artistic sensitivity" to perform music at a high level.

Dealing with Collegiality Problems

Obviously, one of the best ways for an individual to deal with collegiality problems is to move to an institution which seems more compatible. If one senses great collegiality problems with one's institution, one's life certainly can be difficult, and one's situation may not improve in the future. Pretending to be something one is not is a good way to acquire an ulcer, if not some more serious health problem. How much better it is to be at an institution where one can be appreciated for what one is. And, as mentioned earlier, moving to a different institution does not necessarily mean accepting poorer working conditions or a lower salary.

Most, if not all, collegiality problems can be dealt with without changing institutions, provided that the faculty member is flexible and willing to be diplomatic. The following advice should be considered:

1. *Wait until you are an accepted member of the department before suggesting major changes in policy or curriculum.* You may not have to wait until you are tenured. Some faculty quickly find a "niche" and become virtually essential to a department's operation. In one case, a faculty member was reassigned to a department other than the one that had hired him. At first he was resented by his new department. But he took over a number of courses that no one else wanted to teach and made a great success of them, attracting considerable new enrollment. Within two years he was able to get curricular proposals approved that earlier would have been ignored or voted down.

2. *Keep in mind that any major changes in curriculum or policy that you propose will be far more acceptable if they do not impinge on the territory of other faculty members.* Most faculty jealously guard the courses they teach. They do not want other faculty eliminating these courses or telling them how they should be taught. If you propose changes, try to design them so that other faculty will not be affected.

3. *Accept that your department may need you to teach a course or courses that you do not enjoy teaching.* This is simply part of the job of being a responsible faculty member of any age or level of experience. Try to find ways to make your courses more enjoyable and satisfying for you, but not by modifying courses beyond the point your colleagues would find acceptable. Also, accept the fact that most colleges reward senior faculty by allowing them to teach more advanced courses and graduate seminars. Don't expect that an exception will be made in your case because of your brilliance—and if this

should happen, consider yourself extremely fortunate.

4. *Work with your colleagues.* There may be more to them than you imagine. If you think they really are out-of-date, try to educate them by passing along books and articles that you think might interest them. But be very low-key about doing this.

5. *Always be diplomatic.* This is the most important piece of advice. In the first example in this section, the theater history professor could have responded to the senior faculty member without insulting him. Disagreements need not degenerate into accusations and name-calling. Don't denigrate your colleagues' work.

Older faculty frequently comment that individuals emerge from graduate school with "chips on their shoulders" and "know-it-all attitudes." This is sometimes accepted as the usual result of long years of graduate study. As mentioned above, older faculty do not want to be told that they are irrelevant. Young faculty should try to assume that older faculty are dedicated to their field and have something to offer, even if it is not immediately apparent.

Remember, above all, that most older faculty want to continue to do what they do best without feeling guilty, old fashioned, or out of date. You are likely to be part of the "old guard" someday, at which point you might have similar feelings. Disagreements between younger and older faculty need not degenerate into major conflicts.

6. *Be careful with whom you talk about your views of colleagues and the problems of your department.* Never, never talk with students about these topics.

THE SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF WOMEN AND MEMBERS OF MINORITY GROUPS

The problems of women and members of minority groups do not begin with the promotion and tenure process; rather, they begin at the moment of hiring.

It would be reassuring to assume that prejudice does not exist in academe; in fact, many faculty subscribe to an ideology that presumes that the academic world has a higher moral and ethical code than the rest of the world. The reality is that women and members of minority groups often have difficult experiences in advance of the trials of the promotion and tenure process.

Women in the Professorate

Women today are disproportionally represented in the lower ranks and among non-tenure track faculty. If teaching full-time, they frequently make less than their male colleagues at the same rank. There are disciplines in which it is still rare to see a woman faculty member, although some disciplines, such as foreign languages, the arts, and education, have better hiring records.

In this era of disruptive student behavior in the classroom, women are much more likely to have their authority challenged by students than white, male professors. There have been numerous instances in which women professors have had their credentials questioned by hostile students in front of a class and have had to defend their right to teach a particular course. Such challenges have been particularly vehement in disciplines that have few women faculty—engi-

neering, for example. Some international students, because of the nature of the cultures from which they come, are practically, if not totally, unwilling to accept a woman as an authority figure in the classroom.

Women have also been the victims of less overt disruptive behavior. In one case, a female faculty member, as the most recent hire in the department, was assigned to teach a very large introductory course held in a huge lecture hall. The professor was the victim of interruptions and loud, derogatory student comments to the point that she became ill and went on disability leave. Eventually, she resigned her position rather than return to teaching under such difficult conditions.

Many women professors are also disappointed in the behavior of their male faculty colleagues. Sometimes males have assumed that the sole woman member of a committee will automatically serve as secretary for the group. It is also sometimes assumed by male faculty members that women have less need for summer employment, and that women are automatically more interested in community activities. More insidiously, women have sometimes found that they are regularly interrupted at meetings, that their opinions are ignored, that sexual metaphors or commentary are inserted into conversations with them, and that they are viewed as immature individuals who need to be managed. In some units, all women professors are thought to be looking for husbands or lovers.

It has been reported that more than half the women faculty in film/video have been the victims of sexual harassment. Although much of the harassment is reported to have taken place during the victim's graduate education, some of it happens to faculty members. For example, one woman is reported to have been denied a place on a conference panel as a result of refusing sex to the panel chair, and another woman is reported to have been denied tenure after ending an affair with a married department chairperson. Even without actual harassment, many women find tenure a difficult process; it is, after all, the last hurdle in joining what still is, at many institutions, an old boys' club.

Faculty of Color

Professors of color at predominantly white institutions frequently experience feelings of isolation and devaluation. Feelings of isolation are often the result of being the only professor of color in a department, or one of a small percentage of all faculty on a large campus. Many report experiencing a chilly atmosphere in their departments, despite a superficial cordiality. Many are made to feel that they are outsiders in their own schools.

The devaluation of professors of color is sometimes the result of suspicions about their credentials or the way they were hired. Minority faculty may have to fight the perception that they were hired as a result of affirmative action procedures or administrative action, rather than on their own merits. This perception is strongest in cases in which the minority faculty member does not have the same terminal degree as others in the department, or when the terminal degree is from a school not familiar to majority faculty. Minority faculty frequently feel that they have to work harder and must have higher levels of achievement than their white colleagues in order to be accepted and, ultimately, promoted and tenured.

Many faculty of color believe that their research and creative work is more likely to be questioned and criticized than that of white faculty. Indeed, there are examples in which work by minority faculty has been devalued or totally discounted. Faculty of color resent having their ethnicity stressed whenever they are mentioned or their work is described, as if ethnicity were their most important characteristic. Most of all, they resent being treated as tokens whose pres-

ence gives credence to the actions of groups of which they are a part.

As is the case with women faculty, minority faculty are likely to be questioned by students about their credentials. Studies in some institutions suggest that students are exceptionally critical of minority faculty in student evaluations of teaching.

Gays, Lesbians, and Other Groups

Historically, most colleges and universities have been tolerant about sexual preferences, but that tolerance often extends only as long as the university can avoid bad publicity or notoriety. University presidents and boards of trustees are often very concerned about faculty making the "proper" impression in the small towns in which so many schools are located. Promotion and tenure committees can become very nervous and can feel a great deal of external pressure when dealing with the candidacy of a faculty member who has revealed a homosexual preference in a public forum, or whose activities have been generating negative publicity for the institution. The presence of gay and lesbian faculty on promotion and tenure committees and in the administration does not necessarily mitigate these circumstances.

On many campuses in this country, a portion of the student population is homophobic. These students often use student evaluations and other means to ridicule openly homosexual professors. Professors must be aware of this possibility and attempt to explore how promotion and tenure committees will react to such evaluations.

Disabled faculty must overcome physical barriers as well as prejudice. While trying to prove that they are worthy of promotion and tenure by virtue of their superior performance, they must often deal with the fact that their campuses are full of physical barriers that make their work difficult. Complaining may be counterproductive. Despite Federal law, some institutions resent criticism of efforts to make their campuses barrier-free.

Some campuses are far more open and sensitive to the needs of women, minorities, handicapped, and gay and lesbian faculty members than others are. It is wise to consider this early in one's career, before making a commitment to a particular institution.

Dealing with the Problems of Special Status

The circumstances in which women, minorities, gays, and others work can pose special career advancement difficulties. The following advice should be considered:

1. *Manage your time very carefully.* Women and minority faculty, even more than other faculty, need to be extraordinarily careful about devoting time to activities that will not benefit them in the promotion and tenure process. Women and minority faculty are asked to serve on search and other administrative committees far more frequently than white male faculty. One African American woman professor complained that she was asked to serve on so many committees that it would have been impossible for any single individual to serve on them all. As mentioned in the section on service, excessive committee assignments can severely cut into time needed for other important activities that count much more toward promotion and tenure.

Women and minority faculty are also frequently asked to help create women's or ethnic studies curricula, to advise an inordinate number of students, to help devise retention mechanisms for students, to speak to community groups, and in general, to function as role models for the constitutencies they are thought to represent. All of these activities will count little toward promotion and tenure at most institutions, and such burdens are not shared by white male faculty, who can be viewed as competitors in the promotion and

tenure process. It is important to limit the amount of time devoted to such service activities.

2. *Consider your teaching load carefully.* It is unfortunate but true that many departments do not value courses with titles like "women in film" or "African Americans in film." Some faculty believe that these courses are marginal to the discipline. However, a greater concern of departments as a whole is providing enough enrollment space in required or core curriculum courses. Be certain that you teach courses that your department has difficulty staffing, in order to avoid any resentment about time devoted to special courses that are of particular interest to you.

3. *Establish your authority in the classroom.* Since difficulties in the classroom can have a negative impact on promotion and tenure considerations, faculty should be certain that students respect their authority. Some faculty have distributed their résumés at the start of their courses, in order to establish their credibility. This might seem excessive, and there are certainly more subtle ways to establish one's authority. Some faculty have attached to syllabi copies of newspaper articles about themselves; some have put their publications on the reading lists for their courses or have shown their media works in class; and others have talked seemingly casually in the first few days of class about successful students they have trained or their own accomplishments. As was noted earlier, however, there is a tendency for today's students not to believe that professors in nonelite institutions have achieved anything noteworthy or worthwhile during their careers. Some women professors feel that it is necessary to dress in severe, tailored suits in order to effect the image that some of today's students think proper.

4. *Don't expect a nurturing atmosphere in your department.* These days, many professors of all ages find the atmosphere in their institutions to be highly competitive and often cold. Don't expect it to be different. If you find a supportive atmosphere, consider yourself lucky.

5. *Find a good mentor.* A good mentor is useful to all newly hired faculty but is particularly important to women and members of minority groups. One African American woman full professor recalls the advice she received from her mentor twenty years ago: "Publish, publish, publish, and don't expect to be tenured or promoted for your teaching or service." This turned out to be good advice in this case. Mentors are discussed further in the "Additional Thoughts" section of this *Monograph.*

6. *Find out what your institution accepts as research/creative activity.* As was stressed earlier in this *Monograph,* it is important for every professor to determine what is acceptable research/creative activity. Some institutions will not accept publications in women's or ethnic studies journals even if they are film- or media-related; or if they do accept such articles, faculty committees might believe that research about women's and minority issues is unimportant, and therefore, a publication resulting from such research is not the equivalent of more traditional publications.

The problem of acceptability is not dissimilar to the one faced by an earlier generation of professors who found that research on film was not acceptable in traditional disciplines. In one case, a professor very famous for his film publications continued to publish journal articles about an arcane American history subject in order to convince his colleagues that he was a legitimate scholar.

It is important to discover what constitutes acceptable research/creative activity early on, if only to be able to discern what attitudes one is up against.

7. *Be wary of split appointments.* In recent decades, it has not been unusual for women and members of minority groups to serve in split appointments, with their time divided between two or more departments. Split appointments have historically been very difficult to deal with, since the "home" department almost invariably knows little about what a faculty member is doing in the secondary department. Often the home department feels that it wants more of the faculty member's time. Individuals with split appointments are almost certain to have fewer accomplishments in their key discipline than a person without such an appointments and this will certainly be problematic in the promotion and tenure process. Because of such difficulties, split appointments should be reserved for well established faculty.

8. *Know the territory.* This *Monograph* has stressed the importance of understanding one's institution, and its regulations, attitudes, and politics. Knowing the territory is even more important for women and members of minority groups. Make sure you understand institutional politics before speaking out. Don't get involved in issues until you really understand the territory.

9. *Have your department discuss the problems of women and minority students and faculty.* This suggestion can be tricky in that having such a discussion can do more harm than good if the department is defensive or not yet ready to have an open discussion on this topic. Nonetheless, in many cases bringing issues out into the open in a nonthreatening way can be a positive step.

10. *Having a sense of humor helps.* One now senior minority faculty was asked how she dealt with difficult moments in her career. Her response was that her sense of humor carried her through many bad experiences.[7]

---

[7]Portions of this section were originally drafted by Suzanne Regan.

ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS

The Relationship between Annual Evaluation and the Promotion and Tenure Process

In most institutions with a formalized annual evaluation process, this process usually mirrors that described above for promotion and tenure, but it is, of course, considerably simplified. Often, each faculty member completes a form listing accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. It is common for these forms to be similar to those used for promotion and tenure, but, of course, they cover only one year. In some schools it is required that supporting materials (teaching materials, completed research, evaluation letters, and so on) be appended; in others, this is optional.

Annual evaluation forms, if any, are usually reviewed by a departmental committee, the chairperson, and the dean. At some point a recommendation regarding a merit salary raise is produced by one or more of the reviewers, and it is usually appended.

The annual evaluation can have, but does not necessarily have, an important relationship to the promotion and tenure process. If the forms used for annual evaluations are well designed and complete, and if the faculty member completes them with great care, and

if the faculty member makes a point of assembling all manner of supporting material, whether required or not, the preparation of a promotion or tenure dossier several years later can be remarkably simplified. All the information and supporting material required for a dossier could be obtained with ease from the annual evaluations. The possibility of omitting something from a dossier because of faulty memory or faulty records would be greatly reduced. For this process to work, however, it is essential that annual evaluation forms include all the data required in promotion and tenure dossiers. A little time spent comparing the information required on the two forms will prove to be time well spent.

Most faculty members would like to believe that if they receive superior annual evaluations for the required number of years, their promotion or tenure is guaranteed. This is often not the case. A study of recent cases suggests at least two reasons why this might be so.

First, in many institutions, the annual evaluation process has an emphasis that is slightly different from promotion or tenure review. Annual evaluation often emphasizes teaching and service accomplishments. The most logical explanation for this is that work done on research/creative projects frequently extends over several years and it is extremely difficult to judge works in progress. At many institutions, however, the promotion and tenure process emphasizes research/creative accomplishments. Thus, it is not completely illogical that one could have excellent annual evaluations and be denied promotion or tenure.

Second, the decision makers in the annual evaluation process are often different from those involved in promotion and tenure decisions. In some institutions, the chairperson's decision in an annual evaluation is final, subject only to a grievance. In other institutions, the college dean reviews the chairperson's decisions. Seldom, however, are annual evaluations subsequently reviewed by central faculty committees, provosts, and institutional presidents. But these individuals are involved in making promotion and tenure decisions and, in fact, many dossiers are rejected at these upper levels of an institution's administration. Also, lower-level decision-making bodies (departmental committees and the like) are less likely to be generous in a promotion and tenure case, knowing that their work will be reviewed carefully at higher levels.

To conclude, the young faculty member should use the annual evaluation process as a convenient way of gathering together information and supporting materials that will certainly be useful later. Remember, however, that annual ratings should never be looked upon as a guarantee of promotion or tenure.

The Continuing Importance of Tenure

The most commonly cited document on tenure, the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) "1940 Statement on Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure," states, "tenure is a means to certain ends—specifically, (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability."[8]

Considering the first end—academic freedom —some faculty active today think that there is less need for tenure than there was in the 1950s, when loyalty oaths were required on some campuses, or in the1960s, when many

[8]American Association of University Professors, "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure," as reprinted in *Faculty Tenure* (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973).

individuals were threatened with dismissal for participating in social protests. In contract to this view, there have been many instances in recent years in which institutions and their faculty have not supported the rights of individuals to hold unpopular views. For instance, university invitations to speakers discussing the controversial book, *The Bell Curve*, and to members of racial supremacist groups, have been withdrawn as a result of faculty action. Institutions have sought to write and to enforce so-called "hate speech" codes; these have universally been shown to be unconstitutional. If these things can happen in academe, it is easy to imagine circumstances in which a professor, without the protection of tenure, might run afoul of popular beliefs and be threatened with dismissal. Despite the supposed dedication of the academic world to free speech, it is clear that many in the academy draw the line when it comes to speech not considered to be "politically correct."

The AAUP's second reason for tenure, "economic security," is particularly relevant today. Most students prefer faculty members who are closer to their own age. In addition, administrators are aware that a senior faculty member can be replaced by a younger one at less cost. Many administrators faced with institutional crises have tried to take advantage of those with tenure. Some examples follow.

- A new chairperson was hired by a large department in a community college, just at the moment of a financial crisis. The chairperson was told that he would have to notify all six untenured faculty in his department that they would not be retained, and also that he would have to figure out how his program could be handled by the remaining faculty. The chairperson was reluctant to lose one of the six untenured faculty because he perceived that this particular faculty member played a crucial role in the department. In order to keep this young faculty member, the chairperson dismissed an older faculty member with tenure. The individual chosen for dismissal was someone who was less popular with students and did not approve of the direction the chairperson was leading the department. In the chairperson's view, this dismissal was appropriate, since he felt it was crucial to the future of the department. Amazingly, the chairperson's superiors initially did nothing to stop this personnel action, despite the fact that the dismissal violated the institution's tenure policy. The failure of the superior officers of the college to act is not unusual in higher education; it illustrates an old axiom that administrators support other administrators. Once other faculty in the community college became aware of what was happening, a protest began, and the tenured faculty member, who had devoted twenty years of his life to the school, was reinstated. Without tenure, this faculty member would have been jobless at an age at which it would have been very difficult for him to find another professorship.

- A group of full-time faculty was hired to create a department at a newly established branch campus. After ten years the campus had grown considerably, and the department was thriving. At this point, a new chairperson was hired, an individual with great ambitions for the department. The new chairperson discovered that none of the faculty hired ten years earlier had been officially tenured, despite the fact that the institution routinely awarded tenure after a sixth-year review. Believing he had an opportunity, the chairperson informed all of the original faculty that their contracts would not be renewed. He believed that these faculty were insufficiently specialized, and had credentials not distinguished enough for the kind of department he was trying to establish. There was a protest, of course, and the institution was forced to acknowledge that the faculty hired ten years before had de facto tenure. With tenure policies published in the faculty handbook, the fact that there had been no formal

grant of tenure to the individuals involved could be viewed only as an administrative error. Other faculty at this college observed these events and realized how little loyalty had been initially shown toward a group of faculty who had successfully established a department and had developed it into a flourishing one. Tenure—in this case de facto tenure—was the only thing that kept these faculty from being casually discarded.

Post-tenure Reviews

A generation ago, it was considered shocking even to discuss the topic of post-tenure reviews, much less institute them. Today, post-tenure reviews are a fact of life at many institutions, and are in the process of being established at others.

Usually the justification for the institution of post-tenure reviews is the possibility of providing guidance to older, tenured faculty for the improvement of their performance. Certainly it is true that there are some faculty who have abused the security of employment provided through tenure by teaching indifferently and making few contributions to their institutions. Despite the often-stated goal of improving performance, it is clear that many college administrators want to use post-tenure reviews to revoke tenure. Some administrators are quite open about this goal; others are less so.

The revocation of tenure as a result of post-tenure review is a concept fraught with serious problems. It is very easy to imagine circumstances in which a department might feel considerable pressure to proceed with a revocation of tenure under dubious circumstances. As has been discussed elsewhere in this *Monograph*, many colleges and universities have a static or declining number of regular, full-time faculty members, even in fields in which there is rising student enrollment. This makes it very difficult for a department to offer courses in new areas within the discipline; these areas have traditionally been taught by faculty right out of graduate school. There are also cases in which there is a single film or media person in a department devoted to another discipline—theater or television, for example. It is easy to see how such a faculty position might be considered unnecessary to the department's primary orientation, particularly in difficult economic times. Added to this are the widely known facts that students frequently prefer younger faculty (a situation that often yields all-important higher enrollments), and that senior faculty earn considerably more than junior faculty, sometimes twice as much. Thus, from at least one point of view, being able to replace a tenured faculty member is very attractive—there is the possibility of hiring a young faculty member who will be likely to attract a greater number of students, teach a new area of specialization, and, at the same time, reduce salary costs.

Under such circumstances, an administrator or group of faculty might come to believe that revoking the tenure of a colleague is the best way to obtain an open position to meet unfulfilled needs. But what would be the basis for such a revocation? Personnel decisions are inherently a matter of judgment. The mindset of a post-tenure review committee might be very different from that of a committee awarding tenure or promotion. The same material presented to two different committees might yield dissimilar decisions. For instance, let us consider the area of teaching. Most sets of student evaluations contain both positive and negative comments. By emphasizing one set of comments over another, it is possible to reach different conclusions. A post-tenure review committee might also decide that a faculty member is not teaching the "right" material. Perhaps the faculty member has not embraced all of the latest developments in the field. Does this mean that the faculty member is not keeping up with the field, or that he just doesn't see the value of new approaches? Perhaps the

faculty member faces a committee of "true believers" in a particular methodology. Is it not possible that such a committee might interpret a faculty member's teaching to be out of touch with the mainstream of the discipline?

In the area of research/creative activity, a major question currently being debated is the level of continuing achievement that should be expected of senior faculty. Should a faculty member keep up the same research pace as was the case in the years that preceded tenure? Looking at the record of the American professorate in recent decades, this has not often been the case. However, at least one major university has banned senior faculty from evaluating other faculty if they are not at least as productive as those being evaluated. A post-tenure review committee could easily conclude that a particular faculty member has not been sufficiently productive since achieving tenure, even if that faculty member's record is superior to that of other senior members of the department. Alternatively, a committee could have the expectation that greater ongoing productivity should be expected of senior faculty than of junior faculty.

There is also the issue of collegiality. Many senior faculty remark that they "have seen it all before" and are not enthusiastic about curricular and other proposals made by other faculty. Tenured faculty are frequently freer in their criticisms of their departments and institutions. Is it possible or likely that such faculty could be labeled as "negative" and conclude that they are no longer making a positive contribution to their departments and institutions?

All of the above suggests that post-tenure review can be a very slippery slope that provides circumstances in which normal changes over the length of a faculty member's career can be looked upon negatively. There are examples above in which departments, administrators, or institutions, under pressure to achieve goals, have successfully convinced themselves that particular faculty members were unworthy, and that the revocation of their tenure was the best solution to pressing problems.

Given the existence of post-tenure review, how can an individual prepare for such a review? The obvious answer is to compile the same sort of documentation as that required for tenure or promotion, and to continue the compilation for a whole career. The compilation of documentation should not be difficult at those institutions that conduct annual evaluations requiring that supporting evidence be submitted.

How can an individual avoid a revocation of tenure? Obviously, remaining an active and productive faculty member is essential. However, this will not prevent a negative evaluation that is based less on merit than on ideology or other considerations. An important proactive action is for each tenured faculty member to perform some crucial function in the department or institution, preferably some function that others do not want to perform. Some examples follow.

- An older faculty member in a department with a large graduate program was disliked by many of his colleagues, who considered him pedantic and old-fashioned. However, all departmental faculty were grateful that their colleague willingly taught an introduction to graduate study, which was required of all master's degree candidates. This course had a very large enrollment, and had students with diverse interests, which made it difficult to teach. Since no other faculty member wanted to teach the course—indeed, all wanted to avoid the course as much as possible —the teacher of the course played a very crucial role in the department.

- An undergraduate department had a tradition of having a single faculty member

advise all departmental majors. The faculty member who performed this function was not a productive researcher and in addition was much disliked by the other professors in the department. In some circumstances he might have been identified as an individual whose tenure would be considered for revocation. However, no other faculty member was willing to handle advisement, nor were the faculty as a whole willing to share the responsibility. Thus, the department realized that the faculty adviser played a crucial role in the department.

It should be recognized that a task which is crucial to a department's operations in one period of time, may not be crucial at a later date. The degree to which a task or role is considered crucial may be a function of how pressing other concerns are at a particular moment.

The most important thing faculty can do about post-tenure reviews is to participate in the writing of institutional regulations and procedures for such reviews. Without faculty participation, it is possible that a process could be developed that could easily be misused. The AAUP has a policy statement that contains guidelines for the creation of review procedures (see www.aaup.org). The AAUP also recommends that the revocation of tenure be a separate process from that of post-tenure reviews.

The Proactive Stance and Its Limitations

In various places, this guide has suggested the importance of taking a proactive stance when dealing with promotion or tenure. The description of such a stance has focused on the faculty member's role in the accumulation of data to be used in dossiers. It is possible that at some institutions a proactive stance would go further. A faculty member could, for instance, try to have annual evaluations include a written statement about progress toward promotion and tenure. Many institutions now have a three-year review of probationary faculty that is designed to give recently hired faculty an assessment of their progress toward tenure or promotion. If there is no such review, a non-tenured faculty member might press for one. In institutions that appoint a separate promotion and tenure committee for each individual, a faculty member might request that the committee be appointed within a year of hiring so as to provide the faculty member with maximum guidance. The probationary faculty member might even press for some exact and specific written standards for promotion and tenure, if such specific standards do not exist.

Some individuals and professional associations suggest that faculty should press very hard—indeed demand—the actions discussed above. Undoubtedly, at some schools such demands might be considered appropriate faculty behavior. There are a great many institutions, however, at which it is simply not acceptable to make demands of administrators. At some institutions, a discussion of promotion or tenure procedures is not considered appropriate until a faculty member is in the fifth or sixth year of service. In these institutions a faculty member who requests that a promotion and tenure committee be appointed early might be looked upon as someone who was attempting to manipulate the review process unfairly.

As has been noted earlier in this guide, there are some very good reasons why chairpersons and deans may not want to provide written statements of progress toward promotion or tenure. They may be fearful that their judgments will not be supported at higher levels of the administration; they may be aware that standards are fluid in their institutions; or they may have been cautioned that written statements can be used subsequently in faculty grievances or court cases. Many administrators have been given specific legal advice that suggests they put as little in writing about personnel actions as possible. A

faculty member who demands written statements when they are not the norm has a good chance of attracting a lot of negative attention from administrators, and may end up being labeled a "troublemaker" or "problem child." In other words, making demands may negatively affect a faculty member's chances for promotion or tenure.

Institutional tradition determines how proactive a faculty member can be in asking for the actions outlined above. The search for information, which was outlined in the first section of this publication, should provide guidelines. It is usually okay to ask for something; demanding often crosses the line into unacceptable behavior. Also, asking too often for too much can attract negative attention.

There is another way a faculty member can be proactive, in addition to gathering documentation. The faculty member can offer to help assemble and organize the promotion or tenure dossier. Many department chairs and/or committee chairs are overburdened and will respond positively to such an offer. By helping with the assembly of the dossier, a faculty member can make certain that accomplishments are displayed prominently, and that important information is not buried in a mass of trivia. For instance, student evaluations of teaching often generate masses of information. Significant supportive written comments (such as, "This is the best class I have ever had," or "This is the best instructor I have ever had at this university," or "Now I understand why this program has such a high reputation") should be placed prominently in the teaching section of the dossier, instead of being buried among a great many other comments that may never be read.

Helping to assemble a dossier may be particularly important in departments where dossiers have been found to be lacking. Some department chairs may even welcome outlines or drafts of some texts—for instance, summaries of student comments. Obviously, the candidate cannot help with all of the material that eventually will go into the dossier. But simply organizing the summaries and supporting materials can greatly help make a dossier readable and persuasive.[9]

Mentoring

The importance of faculty mentors in the development of students, especially graduate students, has long been recognized. More recently, it has been observed that experienced faculty can be extremely important mentors for younger faculty and newly hired faculty who are negotiating the increasingly difficult process of promotion and tenure. The importance of mentors has been particularly emphasized in the cases of women, minorities, and the disabled, who may face more difficulties than white males.

The use of mentors has become so bureaucratized in many institutions that mentors are automatically assigned to newly hired faculty. This is a problematic process in that the mentors assigned may not have the knowledge or interest to be really helpful. There have been cases in which mentors have been assigned who have only one year of institutional experience. The ideal mentor should be politically savvy, have considerable experience at the institution, and be truly interested in helping newly hired faculty. Assignment of mentors by a bureaucracy will seldom provide such ideal mentors; thus, each faculty member will probably end up having to find an appropriate individual to substitute for the one assigned.

Unfortunately, it is not always possible for new faculty to find a mentor. Because of the potential of being accused of harassment, or more simply, of not knowing how to relate to

---

[9]The need for this section and the use of the term "proactive" in other parts of this document were suggested by Richard B. Jewell.

young women, minority, or disabled colleagues, white male faculty may feel ill equipped to help these faculty. Women and minority faculty expecting automatic support from other such faculty can be disappointed. Many senior women and minority faculty members have struggled very hard to get to their present positions, are war-weary, and don't have the energy needed to help younger colleagues. Others may, for various reasons, simply be unwilling to help.

At the same time, a newly hired faculty member of any rank should not expect automatic hostility from those of a different sex or ethnicity. The American work ethic is alive and well on college campuses, and often the best champion is the person in the next office who knows that a colleague is indeed carrying an important share of the load and that losing that faculty member would not be to the department's advantage.

When appropriate local mentors are not readily available, faculty members have been mentored by individuals at other institutions. Such mentors are useful for discussions of broad career issues; but outside mentors cannot help a faculty member understand the regulations and politics of a particular institution.

Having the wrong mentor can be costly, particularly if the relationship continues for a long period of time. Strong champions have strong enemies. Political power shifts frequently on college campuses. Being on the wrong side as political fortunes turn can become very costly to the newly hired faculty member. An example follows.

- A department chairperson hired two individuals against the wishes of the faculty of the department. The faculty and chairperson were at odds and in this polarized atmosphere, the chairperson encouraged the new hires not to work with the other faculty, and even to remain as removed from them as possible. The chairperson assured the new hires that "he would protect them," even in promotion and tenure considerations. The chairperson was removed from office, and eventually the new faculty were denied tenure in an almost unanimous vote. In this case, the chairperson did an enormous disservice to the individuals he hired by advising them to distance themselves from established faculty. But, likewise, if they were at all reasonable in their approach to human relationships, the newly hired faculty should have realized that the chairperson's advice was inappropriate.[10]

The Special Rights of Private Institutions

Most of the discussions in this *Monograph* have assumed that faculty members are serving at a public institution or at a college or university that, in spite of its legal status as a private school, follows the practices of public institutions. Despite the fact that many private institutions function in a way that is indistinguishable from the way public universities function, private institutions do have the legal right to impose restrictions that would not be possible at public ones. For instance, religiously affiliated universities can require that professors not contradict official church doctrine. Private institutions can also limit the freedom of speech of professors and even legislate their personal lives. Provided that restrictions on behavior are made clear in official documents and are not applied capriciously, the Federal courts usually refuse to intervene in the affairs of private schools. Obviously, it is important to know a private school's regulations before accepting a position.

The Abuse of Outside Evaluators

In the past several decades, the use of outside evaluators has become common practice in the promotion and tenure process at most

[10]Portions of this section were originally drafted by Suzanne Regan.

schools. This has led to a number of seemingly abusive practices that are worth discussing.

Some universities have regulations requiring that a selection of publications and/or creative works be sent to prominent individuals in the field without notifying prospective evaluators in advance. This results in some very awkward situations, because evaluators are often unfamiliar with the candidate's whole record as well as the place the materials sent have in that record. Evaluators may not have enough time to complete the required review within the institution's time limit; if no review is completed, a faculty member's career can be put in jeopardy.

Other universities ask evaluators to forward their own résumés along with evaluation letters. The implication of this practice is clear —after the evaluation is completed and sent, someone at the receiving institution will determine if the evaluator was qualified to write a review in the first place. This procedure asks evaluators to put in a lot of time preparing a letter that may never be used.

Still other institutions have administrations which distrust outside evaluations entirely. While evaluations may be solicited by these institutions, it is certain that they will be ignored.

All of these practices abuse outside evaluators and make individuals less willing to serve in this capacity, potentially jeopardizing the whole practice. Faculty at institutions with procedures such as those described above should work toward improvement of their systems. Whenever possible, outside evaluators should know the faculty member being evaluated, and should consent in advance to write a review.

Litigation

Many faculty who have been denied tenure or promotion feel that litigation is the best response to their situations. Newspaper accounts of faculty being awarded large judgments frequently attract a lot of attention. It is not often noticed that, upon appeal, many of these cases are reversed, or the monetary award is significantly reduced.

There are many reasons why litigation is not usually a good option. Universities have deep pockets and can use their large legal staffs to gain postponements (which are routinely granted) and to keep a suit from going to trial for years. In contrast, faculty bringing suits are likely to find legal costs to be overwhelming within a very short period of time.

When suits do go to trial, faculty seldom prevail. The courts have given institutions of higher education great latitude in the handling of personnel and have consistently refused to become involved in second-guessing the judgments that schools have made.

The courts have intervened when institutional procedures have not been followed or when Constitutional rights seem to be in jeopardy. Sending cases back for reconsideration through normal institutional procedures is not a good development for most faculty, because this frequently results in the same decisions being made. In cases of alleged violation of Constitutional rights, the faculty complainant's legal representation carries an enormous burden of proof; these cases are seldom successful. Indeed, the courts' interpretation of the right of free speech is far narrower than most faculty would imagine.

Some institutions offer cash settlements to avoid the costs of going to trial. The faculty member involved is likely to be tempted by such an offer, if only to get out from under continuing legal expenses. However, these settlements are usually quite small, and often

cover little more than already-incurred legal expenditures.

Finally, each faculty member needs to ask if it is desirable to be reinstated. Functioning in a department or school in which one has been rejected for tenure is difficult at best. Relocating would usually seem a better option. Promotion is another matter. It is not at all unusual for promotions to be denied one year and then granted the following year, or later. A negative promotion decision should not affect one's relationship with colleagues.

The Post-tenure Blues

The process of being reviewed for tenure has become so arduous at many institutions in recent years that there are now reports that many recently tenured faculty feel exhausted, stressed out, unproductive, and unable to decide what direction to follow. This is probably a normal reaction to living through a long period of time during which so much effort has been directed toward a single goal. It is also a reaction to the conclusion of a period of time during which one has had to live one's life in a picture window amid constant worry about living up to others' expectations. It is not unusual to hear reports that the recently tenured feel that they have lost touch with family and friends. Many regret that they have neglected creative interests that they perceived would not have an immediate benefit to their careers. Given all of these factors, it is not unusual for recently tenured faculty to be uncertain about what interests they want to pursue, particularly since they have not had the luxury of such freedom for a long time.

If you get the post-tenure blues, please be reassured that this is a fairly common reaction to the rigors of the tenure process. Getting tenure does not mean that you have instantly become dead wood, or that you have become a kneejerk, reactionary member of an establishment designed to protect the incompetent. Give yourself some time to sort out your life and your interests. Life after tenure can be the best part of one's career.

Moving On, Of Necessity

Of course, you must face the possibility that you may not be tenured. This would mean being forced to move on to another school, whether you want to move or not. If this happens, remember that some now famous (and tenured) academics failed to achieve tenure at an earlier time in their careers.

Moving on can be a positive step. As was discussed earlier, you may find yourself at an institution that more closely matches your own interests.

Finally, not achieving tenure does not carry the stigma it once did. Despite changes in the academic scene, it is still widely believed that those who are denied tenure have little chance of being hired by another institution. Although this may have been the case twenty years ago, there is now much greater understanding of the role a proper "match" plays in the tenure process. Many faculty are now grateful that they were not granted tenure at a particular institution—because they are now working with individuals with whom they are compatible, under congenial and enjoyable circumstances.

Appendix A
CARNEGIE FOUNDATION CLASSIFICATION CODES*

The following is an edited and abridged text of the 1994 version of the institutional classification system created by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Earlier forms of this classification system date back to 1970, and the system has been revised in minor ways over time. Institutions are grouped according to the level of degrees offered, the comprehensiveness of their mission, and the amount of funded research.

RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES I

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

RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES II

These institutions have the same characteristics as Research Universities I but receive between $15.5 and $40 million in federal support, and award at least 50 Ph.D. degrees each year.

DOCTORAL UNIVERSITIES I

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

DOCTORAL UNIVERSITIES II

These institutions are committed to offering the same range of degrees as Doctoral Universities I, but they award 10 doctoral degrees in three or more disciplines, or 20 doctoral degrees in one or more disciplines.

MASTER'S (COMPREHENSIVE) UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES I

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

MASTER'S (COMPREHENSIVE) UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES II

These institutions are similar to Master's I institutions. They award 20 or more master's degrees annually in one or more disciplines.

BACCALAUREATE (LIBERAL ARTS) COLLEGES I

These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award 40 percent or more of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields and are restrictive in admissions.

BACCALAUREATE COLLEGES II

These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award less than 40 percent of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields, and are less restrictive in admissions.

TWO-YEAR COMMUNITY, JUNIOR, AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

These institutions offer certificate or degree programs through the Associate of Arts level and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees.

---

*As reprinted in Mary Pat Rodenhouse, ed. *2000 Higher Education Directory.* Falls Church, VA: Higher Education Publications, Inc. 2000.