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ABSTRACT

The study examined the perspectives of three college department heads and their work regarding assisting junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure at a Historically Black Land Grant University (HBLGU). A case study approach was utilized, employing both within case and cross case analysis. Purposeful sampling was used to select three college department heads from one institution of higher learning. Data were collected in semi-structured face-to-face interviews and analyzed using the constant comparative method. Additionally, the researcher compiled field notes and examined documents obtained through the participants and accessed on the World Wide Web. Data from each were analyzed and then across cases in which three common themes emerged: 1) Department heads must be knowledgeable of the promotion and tenure procedures to help junior faculty through the process, 2) Department heads have a keen responsibility toward junior faculty related to the promotion and tenure process, and 3) Department heads need latitude to make adjustments based on the context of the departments in which they lead.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine perspectives of the college department head regarding assisting junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure at a Historically Black Land Grant University (HBLGU). A key factor in a junior faculty member gaining promotion and tenure is the work of the college department chair that is expected to give clear guidelines and effective guidance to assist with the promotion and tenure process (Alger, 1998). The existing literature suggested that a mastery of technical skills and knowledge working with myriad personnel issues was imperative to perform effectively the wide array of duties and responsibilities associated with the position of a college department head (Freeman, 1998).

Statement of the Problem

There continues to be much discussion but ambiguity regarding the work and responsibility of the college department head to provide an effective support system for junior faculty members who seek to obtain promotion and tenure (Miller, 1987). There is no commonly agreed on role of the college department head, which leads to interpretation by university personnel and junior faculty members regarding the specific responsibilities related to the promotion and tenure process (Brown, 1999). According to Brown (1997), the ambiguity of the role of the college department head was complicated by the wide range of responsibilities, including working with junior faculty in the process of obtaining promotion and tenure while simultaneously attending to technical work such as developing departmental budgets.
Many untenured junior faculty have raised concerns about the promotion and tenure process at their respective universities (Miles, 1998). Junior faculty often contend that there remains ambiguity as it relates to the expectations of their respective department heads and other university personnel who have a direct impact on the promotion and tenure process (Berardo, 1980). Johnson (1990) suggested that the demands of the job, most associated with the management functions of administration, did not allow time for college department heads to concentrate on nurturing junior faculty members toward promotion and tenure. Cohen (1998) found that most deans put more value on the tasks essential for the efficient and daily functioning of the department rather than on the specific work associated from working with junior faculty in the promotion and tenure process.

Tenure has become a highly debated topic in higher education (Bensinow & Tierney, 1996; Miller, 1987). State policy makers, institutional leaders, the professorate, and the general public have begun to reconsider the tenure process (Baez & Centra, 1995). As a result, it is important to become aware of the arguments for and against tenure, to become familiar with the complexities involved in going through the tenure process, to understand the legal implications, and to consider alternatives to the tenure system (Miller, 1988; Rhoads & Tieney, 1993). It is perhaps more or at least equally important to understand the perspectives of the department chair related to the promotion and tenure of junior faculty.

Most full-time faculty are professors, associate professors, or assistant professors who fill tenure-track positions. Attaining tenure is a major step in traditional academic careers. If achieved, promotion and tenure usually occurs between five and seven years of teaching. Decisions related to promotion and tenure are based on evaluation of a professional’s record in
teaching, research publications, and overall service contribution to the institution and the community (Wilson, 1998). Tenure has typically been considered a form of job security at institutions of higher learning (Brown, 1999).

The road to promotion and tenure is an intensive process often deemed lengthy and difficult (Thompson, 1998). Although junior professors have invigorated disciplines by contributing a wealth of new scholarship, the number of junior professors who attain promotion and tenure continues to be alarmingly small at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) (Scott, 1981).

Before the Civil War, higher education for students of African ancestry was virtually non-existent. The few who received schooling, such as Frederick Douglas, often studied informally in hostile settings, or taught themselves entirely (Hartley, 1992). These factors contributed to the development of HBCUs, now numbering 106 in the United States. In many HBCUs, department heads have direct connection or impact on the promotion and tenure process of junior professors. There is minimal research on the responsibility of department heads within HBCUs and even less research at HBLGUs regarding the issue of promotion and tenure.

Purpose of the Study

Research shows that Black colleges and universities have been the primary educators of African Americans (Allen, 1991; Garibaldi, 1984). Roebuck and Murty (1993) noted that Black institutions produced approximately 70% of all Black college graduates up to 1991. Additionally, although HBCUs enroll less than 20% of Black undergraduates, they conferred one third of all bachelor’s degrees earned by Blacks. In Roebuck and Murty’s Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Jordan (1999) stated that HBCUs were the undergraduate home of 75% of all Black
PhDs, 75% of all Black army officers, 80% of all Black federal judges, and 85% of all Black doctors. In spite of the high rate of success, HBCUs are unacknowledged and unappreciated by much of higher education (Chenoweth, 1997).

The promotion and tenure process has been deemed to be the most important academic personnel decision made in colleges and universities (Miller, 1988). Several researchers have alluded to the fact that faculty members were frequently dissatisfied with current policies related to the promotion and tenure process (Boyer, 1990; Vroom, 1991; Wilson, 1998). Miller (1988) suggested, "the importance and sensitivity of promotion and tenure decisions may simply render it unrealistic to expect a high degree of satisfaction with any system for handling them" (p. 2). Some of the most common concerns regarding the promotion and tenure process have been reported to be outdated personnel policies and procedures and inadequate attention to the process of making decisions about applicants' files. Another issue was different perspectives of the rating systems used to assess and to evaluate junior faculty (Alger, 1998; Freeman, 1978; Lindsey, 1988; Van Fleet, 1994).

The purpose of this study was to explore the perspectives of department heads that worked with junior faculty during the promotion and tenure process at a Historically Black Land Grant University. The results of the study may contribute to a better understanding of the promotion and tenure process and as a means to provide advancement of the work of department heads at Historically Black Colleges and Universities related to the work of assisting junior faculty.
Background of the Study

The perspectives of department heads from a single Historically Black Land Grant University were examined to gain insight in the work related to assisting junior faculty during the promotion and tenure process. The different cultures and guidelines related to promotion and tenure at respective universities make the work of the department head important at a HBLGU. One of the many responsibilities of the department head includes the coordination and supervision of faculty members, which is inclusive of promotion and tenure at the university level. Research has suggested, however, that many department heads have not received formal training or leadership from school systems prior to position appointment or during their tenure as department heads (Miles, 1998).

Several researches (Hayes, 1990; Lindsey, 1988) reported that research, teaching, and service, were the major criteria used to grant promotion and tenure. Ruffins (1997) asserted that verbal or written tenure guidelines were vague, subjective, and unclear. Austin and Rice (1998) reported that tenure expectations and guidelines were conflicting, vague, ambiguous, elusive, and misleading. Overall, faculty members are typically advised by department heads to allocate 45% of their time to teaching, 45% of their time to scholarship, and 10% of their time to service (Menger & Exum, 1983).

Hacker (1997) stated, “most colleges and universities were founded on teaching and service” (p. 22). Teaching was the staple of university professors, and service helped an emerging nation. Miles (1998) and Ruffins (1997) found universities purport teaching, research, and service to be equally balanced when faculty members applied for tenure, but scholarship was assigned the most weight. Earlier, Van Fleet (1994) reported that scholarship carried more
weight. Schneider (1998b) reported that several aspects of faculty performance were considered, but most performance systems were based on scholarship, not teaching or service. Additional research found that scholarship carried considerably more weight in tenure decisions than teaching or service (Cole & Cole, 1973; Miles, 1998; Menger & Exum, 1983).

Wilson (1998) found journal articles, not books or book chapters, were the foremost measure of scholarship. Researchers have suggested that faculty members who published in refereed journals were more likely to earn tenure than faculty members who earned accolades for teaching or service (Alger, 1998; Cole & Cole, 1973; Konrad, 1991; Menger & Exum, 1983; Miles, 1998; Mooney, 1991; Ruffins, 1997; Singh, Robinson, & Green, 1993).

The context of the college and university and the expectations related to the mission have been reported to dictate what leads to promotion and tenure. For example, Schneider (1997) and Blackburn, Wenzel, and Bieber (1994) found research institutions lauded teaching and service while tenure committees and department heads evaluated faculty performance in scholarship to be the measure to evaluate faculty during the promotion and tenure process. Burgan (1998) and Alger (1998) found administrators, department heads, and deans simultaneously sent conflicting messages contending that teaching and service were important, while intensifying mandates for scholarship.

Several researchers (Hayes, 1990; Hyer, 1985; Lindsey, 1988) reported that earning tenure was contingent on research, service, and scholarship. Konrad (1991) found that faculty reward systems at colleges and universities reflected institutional history, mission, faculty interest, and departmental objectives. Schneider (1997) stated that scholarship emerged in the 17th Century, and research became the measuring instrument to assess faculty performance.
Some academic institutions purport that their mission statement emphasized teaching, not scholarship.

Tenure enhances job security and provides protection to professors who seek to publish and disseminate research and to exercise freedoms in speech and print. Before the establishment of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), faculty members were terminated or denied promotion and tenure for exercising freedoms such as those of speech. In 1900, a distinguished Stanford University economics professor, Edward A. Ross, criticized capitalism (Schneider, 1997). Wealthy railroad owners who sat on Stanford’s board, disagreed with Ross, and pressured President Leland Stanford to discharge Ross. In 1913, a Wesleyan University economics professor was fired by the university president for making a speech off campus espousing that the Sabbath should be a day to relax (De Pasquale, 1997).

These cases justified forming the AAUP in 1915. The group set the foundation that linked tenure to academic freedom in research, teaching, and elevated tenure to economic security (Savoie, 1991). In 1940, the AAUP adopted the Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The purpose of the statement was to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom. AAUP aided in the establishment of agreement on procedures to ensure that promotion and tenure were not contingent on whether or not a professor exercised freedoms (Mooney, 1991). Academic freedom was essential to these purposes and applied to both teaching and research. Academic freedom was considered fundamental for the rights of the professor in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning (Menger & Exum, 1983).
Professors that passed probationary periods and earned tenure were judged worthy by colleagues, and they held professorship until retirement. According to Wilson (1998), professors were dismissed for financial exigency, just cause, or for the “four l’s”: immorality, incompetence, insubordination, or incapacity. Before dismissal, professors received a hearing before their peers to determine their future.

The mission of the AAUP is to advance academic freedom, to define fundamental professional values and standards for higher education, and to ensure higher education’s contribution to the common good (Cole & Cole, 1973). The AAUP has helped to shape American higher education by developing the standards and procedures that maintain quality in education and academic freedom in this country’s colleges and universities (Ruffins, 1997). The Association’s procedures that ensure academic due process have remained the model for professional employment practices on campuses throughout the country (Cole & Cole, 1973).

A degree of ambiguity exists regarding college department heads and their work related to assisting junior faculty with the promotion and tenure process (Willie, 1981). Boyer (1990) noted the ambiguity in the role of the department head, and he asserted, “they walk a tightrope between the maintenance and survival needs of the school and the human and professional needs of the people with it” (p. xi). Although the work of the college department head might appear to be ambiguous, a critical area of responsibility includes assisting junior faculty through the promotion and tenure process (Clark, 1987).

Research Questions

1. How did college department heads at a HBLGU perceive supervision for junior faculty regarding the promotion and tenure process?
2. What are the key elements to an effective and efficient promotion and tenure system at a HBLGU?

3. What does the department head do to promote the key elements related to promotion and tenure?

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework that guided this study was symbolic interactionism, the term used to label a particular genre of sociological thought. The construct of symbolic interactionism positions the researcher in the place of others to understand the “what” of what and the “whom” of whom is being studied (Blumer, 1969). According to Hartley (1992), and Miles and Huberman (1994), the actions of individuals are situational, based on meanings which arise from social interaction with others, and the interpretation of the social interactions by those who are the actors. This research was conducted through face-to-face interviews with three college department heads to obtain perspectives about their work assisting junior faculty with achieving promotion and tenure at a HBLGU.

Significance of the Study

After a search of the literature regarding college department heads, it was apparent that there was minimal research on the perspectives of college department heads and their work assisting junior faculty with the promotion and tenure process at HBLGUs, and no research could be found regarding promotion and tenure at Historically Black Land Grant Universities. This research will offer insights into the experiences and perspectives of college department heads that have participated in the promotion and tenure process with junior faculty at one Historically Black Land Grant University. Understanding the dynamics of the promotion and
tenure process is an essential task for college department heads.

Minority professors have worked primarily at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Chenoweth, 1997). In 1941, a survey of predominantly white colleges and universities conducted by the Julius Rosenwald Fund found only two tenured Black faculty members—both in non-teaching laboratory positions. Before World War II, Hispanics were early invisible in academia. In 1935 on the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) legal arm, numerous suits were filed contesting the failure of graduate and professional schools to provide equal opportunity to Blacks (Alger, 1998).

According to data from the American Council on Higher Education, during the early 1960s, African-Americans represented less than one percent of faculty at predominantly white campuses, and as recently as 1979, only two percent of all faculty in higher education (Hocker, 1991). By the end of the 1970s, Hispanics represented only 1.5% of faculty at the nation’s colleges (McKnight, 1987). By 1993, faculty of color represented 12.2% of all faculty (Miles, 1998). Minorities, particularly women of color, are clustered at the bottom of the professional ladder as assistant professors and non-tenure track lecturers. Twice as many men of color hold faculty positions as do minority women (Ruffins, 1997). Faculty of color achieved their largest gains at the level of full professor.

Assumptions of the Study

Throughout the period of research, the researcher made the following assumptions:

1. The perspectives expressed by the three college department heads were their own honest opinions.

2. The perspectives shared by the college department heads were freely given
without fear of reprisal from administrators of the HBLGU in which they worked.

3. The college department heads have actively participated in assisting junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure at a HBLGU.

4. The college department heads were the best source for information about the promotion and tenure of junior faculty.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined within the context of the present study:

1. College Department Head—The primary administrator responsible for initiating the promotion and tenure process for junior faculty members.

2. Historically Black Land Grant Universities — A four (4) year institution of higher learning with a 1890 land grant mission designed primarily to educate persons of African American Ancestry.

3. Junior Faculty—Tenure-track professor at the assistant professor or associate professor levels at colleges and universities. These positions are considered prerequisites for receiving tenure.

4. Promotion—A raise in rank or status.

5. Tenure—An indefinite length of appointment granted at the faculty rank of professor or associate professor. Tenure gives faculty members a "property interest" in their jobs. The property interest of tenure means that the position or status may not be taken away by the state without due process.
Limitations of the Study

Limitations of the study included:

1. The sample consisted of three college department heads at a single Historically Black Land Grant University in Arts and Science and Education.

2. The findings were based on the perspectives of the individuals. The small number of participants impeded generalization to larger samples.

Overview of Research Procedures

A case study approach was used, and the constant comparative method of data analysis was employed to examine the perspectives of the participants, three college department heads at a HBLGU. During the course of the study, each department head was interviewed three times to gain further insight on their work with the promotion and tenure process of junior faculty. Throughout the study, the researcher kept accurate and precise documentation, collected, and analyzed the data with respect to the research questions. Fieldnotes were kept and each interview was recorded audibly. Tapes were later transcribed and the three department heads were given the opportunity to review the transcripts for accuracy, to extend ideas reported in the data, and to respond to the analysis of the data made by the researcher. Artifacts related to the promotion and tenure process were analyzed.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter 1 includes the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the background of the study, the conceptual framework of the research, the research questions, the significance of the study, the theoretical significance, assumptions, definition of terms, limitations, and an overview of the research procedures. Chapter 2 provides a review of the related literature.
including an overview of the promotion and tenure process. This chapter also includes a history of HBCUs and a broad description outlining the work of the department head with an emphasis on literature pertaining to promotion and tenure of junior faculty. Chapter 3 includes the data collection methods used for this research. The findings and analysis of data are presented in Chapter 4. Also, a cross case analysis of the findings is offered. In Chapter 5, the results of the study, implications, conclusions, and recommendations based on the findings are offered.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine the perspectives of three college department heads regarding the assistance given to junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure at a Historically Black Land Grant University (HBLGU). The guiding questions of this study were:

1. How did college department heads at a HBLGU perceive supervision and guidance for junior faculty regarding the promotion and tenure process?

2. What are the key elements to an effective and efficient promotion and tenure system at a HBLGU?

3. What does the department head do to promote the key elements related to promotion and tenure?

The status of Black faculty has been of concern to many in American higher education since the 1960s (Copeland & Murry, 1996). The consciousness provided by the Civil Rights Movement of that decade led to efforts to diversify higher education at all levels, from the student body to the faculty ranks (Garibaldi, 1984). In the subsequent decades, a steady growth in the racial and ethnic diversity of the college student population has been realized, and recent trends have illustrated unprecedented rates of growth (Ruffins, 1997). At the University of California, for example, just 70% of all undergraduates were White in 1984, and 6 years later, this proportion had dropped further to less than 60% (University of California, 1991). Nationwide, college enrollments are currently 11.0% African American, 8.7% Latino, 6.1% Asian American, 1.0% American Indian, and 73.1% White (Fogg, 2001). Similar trends of
diversification among college faculty, unfortunately, have not materialized (Kruft, 1996). In 1983, Whites still composed approximately 91% of all full-time faculties. Ten years later, the representation of White faculty had decreased by just 3% to 88% (Carter & Wilson, 1997).

Approximately 90% of all four-year colleges and universities in the United States have tenure systems, and it has been estimated that 66% of all professors nationwide were tenured (Mooney, 1991). To some, tenure was not simply a bulwark for academic freedom but a mechanism for faculty protection (DePasquale, 1997). Discharge of tenured faculty members for just cause was virtually nonexistent during the 1960s and 1970s. In the last decade, universities terminated only about 12 professors per year for just cause (Patton, 1990). Despite the low number of terminations, tenure remained a strong lifetime shield for faculty at virtually all universities. In an examination of promotion and tenure, the role of African American faculty members and department heads was seldom defined related to the promotion and tenure process. This study was therefore significant and timely.

A qualitative approach, employing case study methods, was selected for this research to gain insight and perspectives of the work of college department heads regarding the promotion and tenure process of junior faculty. This chapter presented three key areas of literature in which this study was grounded, namely, the history and evolution of HBCUs, the work of the college department head relative to the promotion and tenure process of junior faculty.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Higher education in the United States has been characterized by its pattern of limited access, particularly for persons of African American descent (McKnight, 1987). Early institutions such as Harvard and Yale were designed to help cultivate a stable upper class so that the next generation could maintain the existing social order (McKnight). As such, these
institutions tended to deny access to those who were not wealthy, male, Protestant, or White (Hocker, 1991). Prior to the end of the Civil War, these admissions restrictions had little impact on the lives of most Blacks, who were being socially, politically, and economically suffocated by the institution of slavery (Fields, 1997). It was not until the slaves were freed that the lack of available educational opportunities drew significant attention or concern. The outgrowth of this movement presented an interest in institutions of higher learning to educate Blacks.

Having been prohibited from gaining even a basic education throughout their enslavement, many freed men and women expressed a strong desire to learn. However, the animosity exhibited by their former masters made it impossible for Blacks to attend most preexisting schools at any level and this was the situation that initially fostered the need for Black colleges and universities (Vroom, 1991).

HBCUs are generally categorized as institutions of higher learning founded to educate the descendants of former slaves. Recognizing the need for institutions that would accept and educate African Americans, the American Missionary Association (AMA) developed school systems designed for freed people following the end of the Civil War (Browning & Williams, 1978). In addition to the AMA, HBCUs were also funded and established by Black churches, the Freedman’s Bureau, local communities, and private philanthropists (Brown, 1999).

_Controversial Debates_

The nation has 106 HBCUs. These institutions are clustered in 19 southern and border states (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia) plus Michigan and the District of Columbia. The early curriculum advanced at HBCUs was influenced by the debate between W.E.B. DuBois and

Symbolized through the establishment of the Tuskegee Institute, Washington was a strong advocate of vocational training. Washington argued that it was in the best interests of freed people to accept the manual labor employment roles available and succeed in these positions, proving themselves worthy of better treatment and opportunities. Washington believed that Black colleges should be established to train African Americans to fulfill these traditional roles (Konrad, 1991). DuBois, on the other hand, did not believe that Black colleges or their students should be so willing to accept segregation. Rather than provide vocational training, DuBois argued that Black institutions should work to develop an elite group known as the “Talented Tenth” that would challenge discrimination and lead Black citizens (Davis, 1998). DuBois believed that students attending HBCUs should be trained to be doctors, lawyers, teachers, and politicians as opposed to masons, blacksmiths, or farmers (McKnight, 1987).

Reflecting the influence of both Washington and DuBois, the early curriculum found at many HBCUs consisted of a combination of industrial and liberal arts courses. Many students who attended these institutions learned cooking, sewing, and farming as well as reading, writing, and mathematics (McKnight, 1987). By paying heed to Washington and DuBois, these colleges and universities were able to construct environments that supplied their students with skills that would help them to succeed in life as well as in the classroom (Konrad, 1991; Woodson, 1981).

Unlike other institutions, HBCUs were founded on and continue to be united by the distinct mission of positioning, preparing, and empowering all students to succeed in what many
perceive to be a hostile society (Woodson, 1981). Applying the notion of racial uplift, these institutions have educated students who could not only read and write but who would also be viewed as a credit to both their race and their nation (Freeman, 1978). These institutions not only promoted educational attainment and advancement, but they also served as a safehaven and cultivated hope in an otherwise racially demoralizing society (Schiele, 1995). Throughout their history, Black colleges assumed a dual role. As part of a long history of racial inequalities, state systems of higher education "created dual collegiate structures of public education, most of which operated exclusively for Caucasians in one system and African Americans in the other" (Brown & Hendrickson, p. 96). Although affected by segregation, most Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) did not have to address or concern themselves with issues of race. HBCUs, on the other hand, were always expected to meet the same curriculum standards as other institutions while also providing a predominantly Black population with a culture-specific pedagogy (Cohen, 1998). Since their inception, HBCUs have continued to promote an educational agenda that was both academically superior and culturally relevant (Singh, 1993).

Davis (1998) suggested that to understand and to appreciate the present situation of HBCUs, we must acknowledge the conditions under which they were developed. More importantly, Davis (1998) emphasized the fact that Black institutions were products of a racist and segregated society, and that these institutions were founded and developed in an environment unlike that surrounding other colleges. Similarly, Diamond and Adams (1995) believed that HBCUs emerged in a hostile environment marked by legal segregation and isolation from mainstream higher education in the United States. Historically, HBCUs “have served a population that has lived under severe legal, educational, economic, political, and social restrictions” (Roebuck & Murty, 1987, p. 3).
In spite of the fact that slavery was no longer legal, racist ideologies generally prevented Blacks from exercising the same citizenship and civil rights available to members of the dominant culture (Cohen, 1998). In 1896, the idea of dual racially divided societies became a legal reality (Johnson, 1993). Although many Blacks had been denied access to various elements of the majority society, a formal system was not formalized until the Supreme Court ruled in the case of Plessy v. Ferguson (Cohen, 1998). This court decision made segregation constitutional by ruling that it was acceptable to develop racially divided social systems that complied with the prevailing standard of "separate but equal" (Johnson). Although the court system relegated Blacks to a caste-like status within mainstream society, this system also created circumstances that allowed HBCUs and their students, alumni, and communities to flourish (Johnson, 1993). Under segregation, HBCUs helped in the development of Black fighter pilots, international diplomats, labor organizers, and most of the attorneys who later helped to make segregation laws overturned (Brown, 1999).

Legal and Federal Issues Surrounding Promotion and Tenure

A confluence of several factors usually shapes the decision to grant or to deny tenure, including not only a particular candidate’s scholarly credentials but also general budgetary, economic, staffing, and related non-academic concerns (McHugh, 1973). Like decisions about hiring, decisions about conferring tenure come with high stakes (Toma & Palm, 1999). A negative decision can derail the academic career of a faculty member, just as an ill-advised decision to grant tenure can slow or disrupt a school or department for years (Leap, 1995). In addition, tenure litigation exacts a substantial financial, social, and psychological cost for the individuals and institutions involved (Leap). Courts have typically granted institutions broad freedom from judicial scrutiny in such decisions, deferring to the asserted expertise of
administrators and faculty committees in the area (Paretsky, 1993). Nevertheless, courts will reverse negative tenure decisions when sufficient evidence exists of discrimination in making the determination, when decisions are arbitrary, or when decisions are made in bad faith (Leas, 1991; Paretsky, 1993).

**Significant Court Cases**

In *Board of Regents v. Roth* and *Perry v. Sindermann*, the U.S. Supreme Court distinguished between the rights afforded faculty members who do have tenure and those who do not, treating non-reappointment of term faculty differently from termination of tenured faculty for cause in terms of the due process rights afforded each group (Copeland & Murry, 1996; Olswang & Farlel, 1980). However, tenure may be implied by certain types of employment relationships, as in *Sindermann*, where reasonable expectations of continued employment constituted a property interest (Toma & Palm, 1999). In these tenure cases, institutions were responsible for providing adequate protection of the right to continued employment through appropriate due process (Olswang & Farlel, 1980).

When property and liberty interests are at issue, as in the case of the dismissal of a tenured faculty member, procedural due process requirements are heightened (Toma & Palm, 1999). These procedural due process protections ensure that tenured faculty are not dismissed as punishment for the exercise of unpopular pursuits protected by academic freedom (Olswang & Farlel, 1980). In the *Roth* and *Sindermann* cases, the courts ruled that procedural safeguards were required when institutional policy and practice support a claim of entitlement to a position when the dismissal has the potential to seriously damage the reputation of the faculty member and cause a stigma with an impact on future employment (Kruft, 1996). A loss of liberty can result from cases where dismissed faculty suffers a sufficient loss of reputation.
Although the notion of separate but equal was law, it was not the reality for HBCUs or the students they served (Vroon, 1991). HBCUs did not receive the same level of financial support given to other higher education institutions (Brown, 1999). The Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) acknowledged separating students solely on the basis of race was inherently unconstitutional, nonetheless, the evidence established shocking inequalities (Cohen, 1998). In assessing the ruling, Johnson (1993) proclaimed, "The decision was in response to the deplorable conditions in which African Americans were educated and forced to live—conditions which were the result of legally sanctioned segregation" (p. 1409). For the most part, the *Brown* decision focused on desegregation in primary and secondary public schools. The thrust to dismantle dual systems of higher education was not widely supported or promoted until the passage of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Brown, 1999). With the passage of Title VI, states supporting dual systems of higher education were required by law to dismantle them (Thompson, 1998).

*Federal Legal Mandates*

Even though federal law called for all systems of segregation to be eliminated, 19 states (most located in the South) continued to operate dual systems of higher education: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia (Brown, 1999). Although the federal law was well intentioned, it was difficult to enforce because "the law did not identify what was meant by discrimination based on race or national origin - it just outlawed it. The meaning of discrimination, desegregation, and compliance were not even explored in the legislative evolution of Title VI" (Brown, 1998, p. 8). Therefore, states were given autonomy to interpret and to apply the law in their own way. The

21
law did not clearly define or describe its intent, and this inevitably allowed states to uphold the segregated system in higher education (Johnson, 1993).

Despite changes in Title VI, college desegregation remains an issue of concern. Brown (1999) argued the success of collegiate desegregation was contingent on the willingness of higher education to:

(a) re-designate the missions and institutional statements of those institutions designed to deliver inferior service,

(b) redefine the financial formula whereby institutions are funded,

(c) reassess the standards of institutional admission, and

(d) reinterpret the possibility of incongruent collegiate populations. (p. 11)

The primary issue in Brown v. Board of Education was that Blacks wanted to have the opportunity to attend schools without being denied access on the basis of race (Cohen, 1998).

Despite their academic and cultural success, Historically Black Colleges and Universities have been criticized for perpetuating segregation (Thomas, 1997). HBCUs are mistakenly perceived as homogeneous entities that only serve Black students. HBCUs were created primarily for the education of Blacks; however, these institutions have always been inclusive and open to all who sought access to higher education (Johnson, 1993). In an effort to increase access, Historically Black Colleges and Universities created an open-door policy that welcomed all whom applied. Although called Black colleges, this term has become a misnomer because of the heterogeneous composition of the student body. The policy of open admissions includes the acceptance of Blacks, Asian, Caribbean, European, Latin American, and White students (Garibaldi, 1984).
It is ironic that Historically Black Colleges and Universities have been ignored when the discussion of diversity surfaces because HBCUs were perhaps the first higher education institutions to initiate an “open door policy.” Not only have Historically Black Colleges and Universities embraced people from different racial backgrounds, but these colleges and universities have also reached out to those students who have been convinced that they were not college material due to their socioeconomic status, family background, or previous academic performance (Johnson, 1993). Freeman (1998) claimed Historically Black Colleges and Universities were able to educate students successfully in spite of the predictive validity of standardized tests. The strict selection process of some colleges may have caused more harm than good because these processes have detoured a large number of potential students (Willie, 1981). Although the open-door policy at Historically Black Colleges and Universities has provided more opportunities for more students, Black colleges have acquired a negative image because of this policy. D.C. Thompson (1978) contended that Black colleges literally reversed the tradition of social-class and academic exclusiveness characteristic of higher education. Moreover, Black colleges invented the practice if not the concept of open enrollment. Flexible admissions practices and academic standards have been without precedent in higher education (Freeman, 1998). This is no doubt a fundamental reason why HBCUs have been widely criticized by leaders in higher education and largely ignored by the most prestigious honor societies (Thompson, 1978).

More than any other set of institutions, HBCUs have discarded the notion that higher education is an advantage open only to rich or to socially prestigious people. Surrounded by hostile forces, these colleges and universities have established and maintained a tradition of academic excellence (Alger, 1998). It is easy to work with students who come to college
academically strong. It is a challenge, however, to work with those students who may have low grades and test scores, and due to certain circumstances, may not be as well prepared. According to Kannerstein (1978), HBCUs are not concerned with who gets admitted but rather what happens after students are admitted.

Historically Black colleges have been pioneers in higher education (Johnson, 1993). Although created for the education of Blacks, HBCUs have been successful in making higher education more accessible for all students (Clark, 1987). Black colleges are not monolithic in that they are similar to White institutions in many ways; however, the historical traditions and the levels and types of support make HBCUs distinct (Cohen, 1998). Like many other institutions of higher learning, Black colleges reflect the diversity that is characteristic of the United States' postsecondary education system. This diversity should always be remembered when considering the past, the current conditions, and the future roles in American higher education (Garibaldi, 1984). Given the work and mission of HBCUs, it is logical to examine the work and role of department heads relative to what they do to support junior faculty in the process of promotion and tenure.

The Role of the College Department Head

In addition to American higher education giving positive consideration and attention to Black colleges, the role of department heads on the collegiate level must also be examined more closely. The department head is faced with the challenges of mentoring and providing effective guidance to junior faculty. One of the primary responsibilities of the department head is to facilitate the promotion and tenure process within the guidelines and regulations of the university. This challenge has required a commitment and expertise of college department heads to serve as mentors and role models for junior faculty (Hocker, 1991). The publication of the
Jarratt Report (1985) in some ways marked a milestone for the management of universities and the promotion and tenure process. While the report was controversial and some of its recommendations were resisted, the practices suggested had implication for department heads and their work. Mooney (1991) suggested that the Jarratt Report heightened the recognition for the college department head to manage staff while focusing on junior faculty who were working on achieving promotion and tenure.

Managing Performance

Increasingly, department heads are expected to manage the performance of their staff. Universities set high performance standards, usually through an annual planning round. Department heads are expected to reach and to exceed those targets (Cohen, 1998). Frequently, the target will be as general as raising the research performance of the department. In such circumstances, there may be some milestones (obtaining external grant income, for example), but the real assessment against the target will come with the external research assessment that may be many years away. Nevertheless, the department head will usually be aware that the performance of their department will be critically evaluated. In turn, they will be judged, at least in part, against the performance of their department. It is expected for the college department head to give clear guidelines and effective guidance to assist with the promotion and tenure process.

Previous studies have tried to define the role of the college department head (De Pasquale, 1997). The range of formal responsibilities of the department head seems remarkably similar in a number of different national settings. There appears to be more differences between academic disciplines (Tucker, 1984). Further, Vroom (1991) suggested there may be differences between department heads and staff members in terms of which functions are rated as most
important. For example, department heads rated staff selection and performance evaluation as their most important work, whereas staff members tended to place emphasis on acting as an advocate for the department, considering staff views, and developing long-range plans (Tucker, 1984). However, Middlehurst (1993) emphasized the ambiguity of the work of the department head regarding the promotion and tenure process. This ambiguity arises from the dual identity afforded to the position, one of which is manager and leader, and the other which is academic colleague. The difficulty is that regardless of role (e.g., manager as leader or academic colleague), the department head has the responsibility to provide assistance with the promotion and tenure process (Van Fleet, 1994).

Several commentators have noted how recent developments in higher education have placed greater pressure on the department head (White, 1997). For example, Kogan (1994) argued that the ambiguity and tension associated with being a department head had increased as the result of moves toward effective management. Konrad (1991) asserted, "These moves are the result of the increased demands on academics to meet the demands for evaluation and defined quality, to reorganize the delivery of the curriculum and to compete for resources" (p. 45). A similar line of argument was made earlier by Chenoweth (1997) with regard to the way in which institutions have addressed increasing financial pressures:

The roles of Chairman and Department Heads changed substantially as a result of the financial reductions. They were under constant, and at times conflicting, pressures from the administration and their own staff. They became more involved in planning and resource allocation issues than in protecting their department's interests. Their staff management role became more demanding and critical. Their own teaching, scholarship and research inevitably suffered. Some were unable to cope with the extra demands and additional stress. (p. 127)

Similar comments were made by Thomas (1997) in relation to financial evolution. Tonow (1984) noted that department heads were being pressured to move toward a collegial and
consensus style of management. Burgan (1998) extended this argument further when he stated, "potential for role conflict has greatly increased as heads find themselves simultaneously expected to act as agents of institutional management, required to deliver according to institutional objectives, and to act as first among equals in a unit where all are engaged in a collective enterprise" (p. 31). However, McKnight (1987) suggested department heads reported feeling "ill equipped" to deal with the new managerial challenges:

Many heads express concern about the power and authority at their disposal and the difficulties of managing academics. Many academics do not see themselves as belonging to a structure that has to be managed at all. The problem is in managing academics; they are highly individualistic with no strong sense of corporate identity either to the department or to the University. Heads of departments in universities have no effective managerial power and operate by inspiring or engineering consent. (p. 143)

Therefore, further insight and research should be conducted to gain perspectives regarding the work of the college department head with the promotion and tenure process. Department heads have been required to take a more general interest in the performance of all staff regarding the aspects of promotion and tenure. Many still only deal with exceptional performance, but as the department as a whole has become subject to external scrutiny, more department heads have felt pressure to be creative and proactive (Johnson, 1993). In the attempt to be creative and proactive, department heads faced numerous problems. One of the problems Kruft (1996) noted is the leverage allowed to influence performance for junior faculty who apply for promotion and tenure. Department heads can recommend that staff who perform well be granted promotion or tenure. This can be in either absolute terms or meeting the specific goals of the department. Promotion in the old universities (universities founded prior to 1890) is a particular case in point.
In all of the old universities, a university level committee made decisions on promotion. It was not simply that the department heads’ recommendation had to pass through a number of filters. The department heads’ recommendation would be one of a number of pieces of evidence examined by the central committee. One such piece of evidence was external references, given particular weight in the case of research (Willie, 1981). In such universities, promotion was not seen in terms of management interest, but as a reward for academic excellence in which research was the key factor (Clark, 1987). In some cases, a member of the staff could apply directly for promotion or tenure and would not have to rely on the department head’s nomination (Kannerstein, 1978). Promotion and tenure is handled differently in new universities, but the awarding of titles (i.e., professor) are highly sought after rewards and are equivalent in both old and new universities. They are judged primarily on the basis of academic merit, much as in the old universities (Willie, 1981).

*Training Program for New Department Heads*

Prior to the appointment as department heads, faculty members spend their tenure managing only their own careers. However, the chair must manage the task of being a manager and a leader as well as a scholar and teacher. “Some universities have recognized that in order to succeed as a department head, a faculty member needs to know what he’s getting into” (Fogg, 2001, p. 1).

Since 1992, the American Council on Education has provided annual seminars to train department heads. However, many colleges and universities have not offered a formal training program to cover the basics of becoming a department head. A 1997 study by the Tillirghast Towers Perrir consulting firm revealed that 76% of institutions surveyed offered no training in employee terminations, 65% offered no training in disability issues, and 47% offered no training
in handling sexual-harassment cases (Fogg, 2001). Several department heads feel ill-equipped due to the lack of formalized training programs to enhance skills to build knowledge about being a college department head.

**Problems Facing Department Heads**

In many cases, according to Clark (1987), one of the problems facing department heads in managing performance is that they have not been appointed because of their managerial abilities and have not been trained to any significant extent in such matters. There is a clear difference in such matters between the old and the new universities, although the differences were not as extreme as often claimed (Alger, 1998). In the old universities, department heads were appointed from within the department on a fixed term basis. In some cases this was a managerial appointment, but in others it followed some kind of consultative process (in some cases an election, but in others something less formal). The role of the department head was often viewed as one of chairing a group of colleagues rather than managing a department, especially when appointed following a consultative process.

Regardless of type of appointment, department heads continue to hold a faculty appointment and tenure in a department, and when leaving the head position, this department is where the head returns to as a faculty member. For the department head, moving into a head position often signals leaving behind time and opportunity to engage in scholarly productivity and a decrease in teaching responsibilities. In many cases, as Boyer (1990) has noted, the department head does not see the appointment as a career move that can help when applying for further promotions. Department heads are more likely to see the pursuit of their research as the key to enhancing their career prospects. Being department head will actually hinder research output, which is a critical area in the promotion process (Rafky, 1972).
One of the key variables influencing the approach taken by department heads may be on the basis of their appointment. The relationship between the dean and the department head and the decision as to whom should be given the main managerial responsibility, seemed to be strongly influenced by the method of appointment. In the new universities, appointments as department heads were commonly permanent and the option remained to return to a full-time teaching and research career. However, the criteria in the new universities looked at the appointment as department heads emphasizing a mixture of academic and managerial qualities. The separation of titles from positions (professorships to department head) enabled managerial qualities to be highlighted more than they might have been, while some looked for a mix and stipulated academic criteria as a minimum (Hughes & Tight, 1995).

*Changing Roles of College Department Heads*

The traditional picture and work of the department head started to change around a decade ago (Miles, 1998). It had been argued earlier that this change was in part a response to universities paying much more attention to management (Toma & Palm, 1999). There had been a great deal of pressure felt by universities as the result of national attempts to measure performance in teaching and research (Miles). Because the pressures placed on the university to afford all junior faculty an equal and fair chance to obtain promotion and tenure, the work of the department head has changed (Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991).

The work of the department head has changed because of a systematic consideration of the responsibilities rather than the direct consequences of other pressures (Zuckerman, 1988). In many examples, the department head only had limited ability to measure ongoing performance—such as the continuing hold of the professional model. If the department head
encountered markedly poor or good performance, they had to rely on others to implement any recommendations they might make (Lindsey, 1988).

Essentially, academic reputation is said to rest on publication with studies repeatedly demonstrating the presence of an association between departmental prestige and the corresponding level of scholarship generated by its respective faculty (Chenoweth, 1997). An examination of higher educational periodicals such as *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Change* suggested issues of student retention, post-graduation employment, and definitions of scholarship lead to discussions of departmental prestige and material rewards associated with more prominent departments (Miller, 1988). The unique contribution of scholarship to departmental prestige remains, within an institutional context, a central issue to this administrative dilemma (Clark, 1998).

Promotion and Tenure

Scholarship, research, and teaching are the three components that comprise the promotion and tenure process (Miller, 1988). The relationship between scholarship and prestige has been researched from a micro-level perspective with the individual as the unit of analysis (Vroom, 1991). Within this framework, research has established the association between departmental prestige and scholarly recognition (Wilson, 1998). Implicit within this framework was the assumption that individuals operated within a meritocratic process (Cole & Cole, 1973) that draws on their talent, professional socialization experiences, (Crane, 1967) and rewards them for recognized scholarship (Cole & Cole, 1973). Such work acknowledged the importance of structure and perceptions on individual outcomes.

While associations between scholarship, research, teaching, and prestige have been routinely noted and competing explanations developed, the question of whether such associations
exist at the departmental level has received far less attention (Van Fleet, 1994). When shifting from the individual to the departmental level, prestige is found to be an outcome of departmental characteristics (Cohen, 1998) and associated with the accumulation of departmental resources and rewards necessary to support scientific work (Zuckerman & Merton, 1971). When measured over several decades, the pattern of publication and rewards associated with a discipline may be cumulative, albeit egalitarian for some individuals. The result produces a discernible and stratified hierarchy among scientific departments that may ultimately diminish the value of scholarship. Such work acknowledges the particularism of institutional context on subsequent perceptions of academic departments.

Departmental prestige related to promotion and tenure focuses on the importance of characteristics for determining promotion and rank (i.e., professor, associate professor, or assistant professor), the second considers the work achieved by the institution and the department head (Vroom, 1991). Institutional expectations of research have increased dramatically over recent decades (Van Fleet, 1994). Levels of scholarship, once presumed to represent outstanding accomplishments, are now viewed as bare minimums in the promotion and tenure process (Zuckerman & Merton, 1971). In addition to quantity, publication of a variety of articles in top journals has also become more significant as an issue related to promotion and tenure (Cohen, 1998). Administrators apparently have largely accepted the scholarship-prestige argument that increased levels of faculty scholarship lead to greater perceptions of prestige and favorable reviews for promotion and tenure. Justification for this position derives from a cyclical rationality that implies more research leads to higher prestige and greater financial returns to the institution that, in turn, produce even greater levels of scholarship (Kovar & Overdorff, 1996; Miles, 1998; Ruffins, 1997).
Zuckerman and Merton (1971) suggested recent scholarship may not receive recognition equal to that of similar discoveries by departments located within other institutions because they do not have a record of past accomplishments and because the department is not affiliated with an eminent university. Even when faculty within a department produce distinguished scholarship that accumulates over time, the department may not be accorded a level of prestige commensurate with its accomplishments because the university, within which the department is located, is not singled out as a purveyor of knowledge (Thompson, 1998). This perspective suggests that scholarship is a significant variable when a department head evaluates a junior faculty for promotion and tenure.

Evidence showing departmental prestige to be stable over time and associated with university eminence, even after controlling for characteristics such as faculty scholarship, recognition through citations, and size, supports a closed system approach. By contrast, findings supporting an open system perspective revealed that the perceived quality of a department is primarily influenced by those attributes of merit associated with it scholarly productivity, recognition, the size of the faculty, and student collectivities are among the properties that are recognized by raters who judge departmental prestige (Chenoweth, 1997). The level of scholarly work of the junior faculty is weighed heavily on the promotion and tenure process because of the direct correlation to departmental prestige (Spencer, 1981). Although the teaching profession is not a guaranteed path to fame or riches, those in the academic world enjoy a perk that very few other professionals enjoy—tenure (Thompson, 1998). According to Alger (1998), even though many professors are beginning to question tenure, it is one benefit that most are not willing to part with. Originally designed to grant professors the academic freedom to teach and to publish controversial ideas without fear of losing their jobs, tenure has evolved into a guarantee of lifetime employment.
(Bennett, 1994). Basically, tenured faculty can only be removed if there is "just cause," termination of a program, or the university is in severe financial trouble (Mooney, 1991).

*Research, Teaching, and Service and the Promotion and Tenure of Junior Faculty*

Past research (Hayes, 1990; Hyer, 1985; Lindsey, 1988) reported earning tenure is contingent on research, service, and scholarship. Ruffins (1997) and Miles (1998) found most colleges and universities reported that teaching, scholarship, and service, were equally balanced when faculty members applied for promotion and tenure. Konrad (1991) found faculty reward systems at colleges and universities reflected institutional history, mission, faculty interest, and departmental objectives. Schneider (1997c) found research institutions laud teaching and service. Miller (1998) and Konrad (1991) stated colleges and universities use various criteria to assess faculty performance: advising students, teaching, professional development, service, and scholarship. This research suggested faculty members who published in refereed journals were more likely to earn tenure than faculty members who earned accolades for teaching or service (Alger, 1998; Cole & Cole 1973; Konrad, 1991; Menger & Exum, 1983; Miles, 1998; Mooney, 1991; Ruffins, 1997; Singh, Robinson, & Green, 1993).

Hacker (1997) reported most colleges and universities were founded on teaching and service. Teaching was the staple of university professors, and service helped an emerging nation. Boyer (1990) stated scholarship emerged in the 17th Century and became the measuring instrument to assess faculty performance. Alger (1998) found colleges and universities contend earning tenure is contingent on teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, some academic institutions purport their mission statement emphasized teaching, not scholarship. Intentionally or unintentionally, mission statements may emphasize teaching and service and de-emphasize scholarship. Regardless, scholarship is necessary to earn tenure (Menger & Exum, 1983). Not
only is scholarship required, some colleges and tenure committees neglect to define scholarship, and advise faculty members which journals carries more weight during tenure decisions.

Scholarly productivity will be measured more comprehensively than publication of both articles and books. Many of the most highly rated journals in the discipline have been used to analyze scholarly work. A long time interval which contrasts with recent inquiries of scholarly activity that examine only a small number of journals and books within a highly limited time span is represented (Boyer, 1990; Clemens, 1995).

*Functions of the Promotion and Tenure Document*

According to Lucas (2000), a comprehensive, well crafted faculty reward statement should include procedural guidelines and include the following characteristics:

- It should clearly articulate the criteria that will be used to determine the quality of a faculty member’s work, providing the candidate and faculty review committee with a clear indication of not only the review process but also the documentation that is required.

- It is the ideal vehicle for describing to others what scholarly, professional, and creative work is in your unit and discipline.

- It can play an important role in communicating to potential and new faculty members the priorities of the unit and institution. It can reduce the problems associated with new faculty expecting one thing and finding another, thus increasing the potential for long-term personal growth and productivity. (p. 96)

*System of Rewards*

Universities vary in their treatment of financial rewards. A number of universities have systems that allow performance to be monitored and financial reward to be offered (often lump sums or discretionary rewards). In practice, examples of such systems were found in both old and new universities and the most comprehensively developed scheme encountered was in an old university (Clark, 1987). In the old universities, the schemes had a history in the discretionary pay first introduced in the 1980s as a result of government policy (Schein, 1985). In the new
universities, the origins of the schemes were more varied. The schemes were sometimes less comprehensive as they only applied to deans and senior management (Jackson). Whether in old or new universities, such schemes of financial reward were not carefully codified and final responsibility for any reward did not lay with the department head (Willie, 1981). Nevertheless, the department head’s view was a key factor, partly because other evidence such as references, were not sought (Freeman, 1998).

There are a variety of rewards that are not financial, some much prized by faculty members. These rewards vary from support for conference attendance, to the provision of secretarial help, to the purchase of computing and other equipment, to the allocation of office accommodations, and to being rewarded promotion and tenure (Garibaldi, 1984). None of these non-financial rewards should be underestimated. Some department heads may use them systematically to encourage performance (Alger, 1998). However, in some departments, the allocation of these resources is not in the hands of the department heads, but is delegated to another member of the department or a committee (Carter & Wilson, 1997).

If the system of rewards available to department heads is limited and constrained, then so is the action that department heads can take in the case of poor performance (Boyer, 1990). In numerous universities, department heads had a role in both discipline and grievance. In particular, they were always the first point of contact for an aggrieved member of staff or student. Department heads would sometimes be involved in the initial stages of any disciplinary action that may have a direct impact on the promotion and tenure process (Boyer, 1990). However, while the department head was involved at the initial stages and may have been the originator of disciplinary action, a variety of patterns was recorded when formal action was taken (Brown, 1999). The concern of most department heads was not with action for which the disciplinary
procedure would be appropriate, but with poor performance which could impede promotion or tenure of junior faculty (Clark, 1987). Rather than discipline, the action a department head can take to deal with poor performance is limited. However, this action may be pivotal in the application of a staff member for promotion and tenure.

Department heads may be able to insist that a member of his or her staff assume a heavier teaching load if they are not productive in research. The new universities all work based on an annual hours formula, allowing considerable (in principle) discretion to a department head when arranging duties as they see fit (Boyer, 1990). However, a department head should be considerate of those who are applying for promotion and tenure. The old universities do not have such a formal system. A number of departments within old universities devised systems that permitted department heads to allocate workloads according to departmental needs and individual abilities. The importance of controlling the allocation of workloads should not be underestimated as a blunt instrument when it comes to taking action against under-performance, especially if the under-performance is in all areas of activity, rather than just one area (Hughes & Tight, 1995). The department head was encouraged to assess the strengths and weaknesses of staff members to make sure recommendations to strengthen the application for promotion and tenure were appropriate (Alger, 1998).

Dismissal of Tenured Faculty

“When institutions dismiss tenured faculty as a result of reduction or elimination of programs, they must clearly demonstrate that a bona fide financial exigency exists” (Toma & Palm, p. 78). One court defined financial exigency as a demonstrably bona fide and imminent financial crisis that threatens the viability of an institution or program that cannot be adequately alleviated by means other than a reduction in the employment force (Dixon, Lynch, & Swem,
1987). Only in such circumstances can an institution exercise the authority implied under academic customs and usage to close programs and to terminate faculty, including tenured faculty (Kaplan & Lee, 1995; McGee, 1993).

Chapter Summary

There is a need for research and debate focused on the factors that may be stifling efforts for increasing minorities in attaining promotion and tenure at HBCUs. These factors include: a small and decreasing pool of minorities with PhDs (Johnson, 1993); disproportionate tenure rates and rates of pre-tenure departure (Menger & Exum, 1983); the persistence of perceptions on institutional and individual levels that restrict access and impede the professional progress of Black faculty (Leap, 1995); the devaluation of the qualifications of minority PhDs not trained in the most elite, prestigious colleges (Boyer, 1990); and the lack of scholarly recognition given to research focusing on the Black populations (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997).

In 1990, Boyer drafted a report that captured and re-focused an emerging national debate on the subject of scholarship. In Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate, Boyer documented how in the last 50 years, the notion of scholarship had become narrowly conceived in terms of basic research and publication activities at the same time that the mission of American higher education continued to expand and to become more multifaceted. The work of the professorate, initially focused on the development and preparation of individuals for civic leadership, had fallen prey to the hierarchical and competitive lure of prestige defined solely by the research mission (Brown, 1999). The emphasis on undergraduate education and the service functions of the university has diminished in deference to research activities and as Clark (1987) noted, disciplinary-based relationships among faculty across institutions have become stronger at the expense of local relationships within institutions and with surrounding communities.
In a national study, Boyer (1990) empirically confirmed the dominance of research-oriented values present in academic departments across the country. Furthermore, Fairweather found faculty compensation to be strongly correlated to publication productivity and high-research/low-teaching activity across institution types and across academic ranks. Through compensation, promotion, and the presence of other cultural norms such as keeping time spent with undergraduates to a minimum, the culture of academe continues to define scholarship solely as basic research measured by publication records and acquired research grants, and more significantly, to socialize junior faculty to embrace this definition (Brown, 1999). Boyer (1990) noted the consequences of these changes in higher education were that students were frequently being shortchanged by an education shaped by a faculty who were disconnected from the campus community and poorly rewarded for excellent teaching.

Faculty, many of whom were drawn to the institutions of higher education because of their commitment to teaching and service, have found themselves torn away from those activities to concentrate on the research productivity required for promotion and tenure (Boyer, 1990; Wilson, 1998). Furthermore, Boyer (1990) reported that the nation would suffer if higher education did not forge stronger connections between the work of higher education and the challenges currently faced by our society. In light of these consequences, Boyer (1990) asserted that the most important obligation facing American higher education was to break out of a scholarship paradigm narrowly defined by basic research, and to take full advantage of the diverse talent of the professorate. Boyer (1990) concluded, “We proceed with the conviction that if the nation's higher learning institutions are to meet today's urgent academic and social mandates, their missions must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered” (p. 114).
Unlike the issues of recruitment and retention, which primarily focus on barriers and obstacles to faculty diversity, the value of Black faculty to higher education has not been subject to the same volume of research and debate. Some scholars contend that Black faculty are essential for higher education because they provide students with diverse role models, assist in providing more effective mentoring to minority students, and are supportive of minority-related, nontraditional areas of scholarship. They give minorities a greater voice in the governance of the nation's colleges and universities (Brown, 1999). Others view the full representation and participation of Black faculty in the academy as essential to creating diverse and pluralistic colleges and universities (Boyer, 1990). While contributions to mentoring, role modeling, and governance are important to note and to document, continued slow growth in the proportional representation of promoted and tenured Black faculty suggested that perspectives of college department heads should be researched to increase the success rate of junior faculty attaining promotion and tenure (Hocker, 1991).

Although research has focused on the work of the college department head and the promotion and tenure process, how department heads at a Historically Black Land Grant University perceive their work during the process has not yet been studied much in the literature. Therefore, a study that examined the work of the college department head in assisting junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure is of importance.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the present study was to examine the perspectives of the college department head regarding assisting junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure at a Historically Black Land Grant University (HBLGU). This chapter presented specific information regarding the theoretical framework of the study, an overview of symbolic interaction theory, the research questions, the rationale for the chosen research method, the design of the study, the selection of participants, the profile of the research setting, and methods of data collection and analysis, including trustworthiness of the study, and ethical considerations needed to conduct this research.

Conceptual Framework of the Study

Symbolic interaction theory was selected as the framework from which to approach this research on the perspectives of the college department head regarding assisting junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure at a HBLGU. Symbolic interactionism is the term used to label a particular genre of sociological thought that seeks to position the researcher in the place of others to better understand the “what” of what and the whom of “whom” being studied (Blumer, 1969). According to Hartley (1992) and Miles and Huberman (1994), the actions of individuals are situational, based on meanings that arise from interaction with others. The construct of symbolic interactionism allowed the researcher to get closer to understanding the meanings that the three college department heads attached to working with junior faculty members seeking promotion and tenure at a HBLGU.
Selection of the Theoretical Perspective

According to Ritzer (1988), groups and individuals can be viewed from two broad perspectives: macro level and micro level. From a macro perspective, the behavior of individuals is largely based on their relationship to large-scale social structures. Individuals are often viewed as reactive within the large-scale social structure rather than active. From a micro perspective, individuals are viewed as active participants within their environment, and that individual’s act based on their own meanings rather than on group norms. Large-scale structures such as social groups have little meaning at the micro level.

When used to study the perceptions of groups and individuals, the macro and micro models each have limitations. The macro level perspective tends to ignore personal elements, which can influence perceptions and perspectives. A micro level perspective ignores the powerful effect that the social structures have in shaping perceptions. Symbolic interaction theory provided a means to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the perspectives shared by the three college department heads.

Overview of Symbolic Interactionism Theory

Symbolic interaction theory was formulated by George Herbert Mead in the 1930s and has three underlying assumptions (Ritzer, 1988). First, symbolic interaction focuses on the interaction between the individual and his or her environment. Individuals are viewed as being both active and reactive within their environment. Second, the individual and the environment are dynamic and in constant change. The environment influences an individual’s actions and simultaneously the environment is affected by the actions of the individual. Consequently, individuals are both creators and products of their environment. Third,
individuals have the ability to interpret their environment and to derive personal meaning from their interactions within the environment.

Personal meaning within the symbolic interactionist construct is contingent on individuals labeling elements within their environment (Stryker, 1980). Labeling of the environment is a prerequisite to acting within it, and labels carry individual meanings that act as symbols that influence both individual and group actions. In a social context, individuals label others and act according to those labels. At the same time, individuals label themselves and act in relation to their meaning of their self-label (also called role identity). The process of labeling and being labeled affects either the individual or group who is labeled. In this study, the participant’s labels of themselves as department heads, tenured professors, and other role identity reference points, all affected their behavior and had a possible impact on their ability to provide an effective support system for junior faculty who sought promotion and tenure.

Although symbolic interaction theory focuses on individual meaning as the basis for human behavior, large-scale social structures can be taken into account by examining social groups. Symbolic interactionists view social groups as collections of individuals who share common meanings drawn from their environment (Ritzer, 1988). These groups, called reference groups, are collections of people or imagined groups with whom individuals closely relate. In the current study, the reference group of interest is the academic department head and the work that the department head does to support junior faculty in the promotion and tenure process. Individuals can act either jointly or singly within a reference group. Joint actions and actions common to the group through the meanings they share can create large-scale social structures (Blumer, 1969).
The perception by an individual as being part of a reference group is called role identity. When a person chooses to become a member of a group, he or she adapts to fit the expectations of the group to some degree. Learning these behaviors is based on observation of the reference group, personal reflections about the reference group, and interactions with individuals within the group. Individual group members, called significant others in symbolic interaction terminology, are influential in defining the group expectations to those wanting to be part of the reference group.

**Research Questions**

Synthesis of the related literature on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and the work of academic department heads resulted in the formulation of three research questions to guide the present study. The questions the researcher sought to answer to gain individual and collective meanings included:

1. How did college department heads at a Historically Black Land Grant University perceive the supervision and guidance they provided for junior faculty regarding the tenure and promotion process?
2. What are the key elements to an effective and efficient promotion and tenure system at a HBLGU?
3. What does the department head do to promote the key elements related to promotion and tenure?

**Rationale for a Qualitative Research Approach**

*The Qualitative Research Paradigm*

Qualitative research is concerned with understanding behavior from the subject’s own frame of reference. Qualitative research methods are an investigative process where the
researcher gradually makes sense of a social phenomenon by contrasting, comparing, cataloging, and classifying the objects of study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Qualitative data are usually collected through sustained contact with people in settings where subjects normally spend their time (Bogden & Biklen, 1992). The qualitative research paradigm has its roots in cultural anthropology and American sociology (Kirk & Miller, 1986). The intent of qualitative research is to understand a particular social situation, event, role, group, or interaction (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 1999).

Characteristics of Qualitative Research

Creswell (2003) presented the characteristics of qualitative research advanced by Rossman and Rallis (1998). These characteristics captured both traditional perspectives and the newer advocacy, participatory and self-reflective perspectives of qualitative inquiry. The characteristics of qualitative research as advocated by Creswell included eight fundamental points:

1. Qualitative research takes place in the natural setting.
2. Qualitative research uses multiple methods that are interactive and humanistic.
3. Qualitative research is emergent rather than tightly prefigured.
4. Qualitative research is fundamentally interpretative.
5. The qualitative researcher views social phenomena holistically.
6. The qualitative researcher systematically reflects on who he or she is in the inquiry and is sensitive to his or her personal biography and how it shapes the study.
7. The qualitative researcher uses complex reasoning that is multifaceted, iterative, and simultaneous.
8. The qualitative researcher adopts and uses one or more strategies of inquiry as a guide for the procedures in the qualitative study.

Considering these features of qualitative methodology and the nature of the study, it appeared that a qualitative approach was most suitable for this study of perspectives of three college department heads and the meanings they attached to working with junior faculty in attaining promotion and tenure at a Historically Black Land Grant University.

Selection of a Specific Qualitative Method

The selection of a specific research method usually occurs across five traditions of inquiry within the domain of qualitative research (Creswell, 2003). These traditions included narrative research, phenomenological research, ethnographies, case studies, and grounded theory. Considering the different focus and purpose attached to each of the traditions (e.g., narrative and ethnography focus on the investigation of events surrounding an individual or group of individuals, phenomenology aims to look at human experience in terms of their feelings and thoughts, grounded theory concentrates on the construction of theory), a case study method was considered to be the best choice for doing an in-depth analysis of the promotion and tenure phenomenon and of focusing on the complexities and particulars of the phenomenon in relation to the work of college department heads.

Design of the Study

A case study is a qualitative approach in which the researcher explores in depth a program, an event, an activity, a process, or one or more individuals. The case(s) are bounded by time and activity, and researchers collect detailed information using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period of time (Stake, 1995). The case study was considered appropriate for the study for the following reasons:
1. The purpose of the research was to provide insight into the promotion and tenure processes by examining the perspectives of academic department heads at W.E.B. DuBois University [a pseudonym].

2. Tenure and promotion processes at W.E.B. DuBois University could be defined as a "bounded" system.

3. The case selection represented some population of cases and the phenomenon being studied could be described more in depth as a case study.

4. A case study approach allowed the researcher to concentrate time and resources on the understanding of the complexity of issues revolving around promotion and tenure of junior faculty at a HBLGU.

5. A case study strategy was employed because the intended research conditions aligned with the three conditions specified as prerequisite by Yin (1989):
   
   (a) the nature of the research question,

   (b) the extent of control the researcher has over behavioral events, and

   (c) the degree of focus on contemporary events.

   Case Selection

   The decision to study any particular situation should be influenced by the nature of the research questions formulated (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995). The selection of a case is of paramount importance because of its direct impact on the researcher’s understanding of the phenomenon (Creswell, 1998; Patton, 1990; Yin, 1989). The researcher’s decision to choose W.E.B. DuBois University as the case was based on careful consideration of purposeful sampling strategies, namely the typical method as defined by Patton (1990).
Typical Case

Typical sampling cases represent “average” examples. The study was conducted at W.E.B. DuBois University, a historically Black land-grant institution. A land-grant institution was chosen because it is uniquely rooted in the service tradition. Land-grant institutions were established to provide practical educational opportunities to the public. Land-grant institutions later began offering programs to audiences external to the university campus. W.E.B. DuBois University, which enrolled about 2,500 students, was located in a southeastern state and was one of the 70 land-grant universities in the United States.

Selection of Participants

The participants in this study were three academic department heads in a state university. The researcher chose to interview those academic department heads that in some way contributed to, or were affected by the promotion and tenure process. These individuals were closest to the process and could identify issues central to the research of the present study. Based on these criteria, three academic department heads were selected to participate in this study.

First, the three selected academic department heads had considerable experience with the promotion and tenure process. They were able to speak knowledgeably about the promotion and tenure process. Second, the disciplines represented had a strong teaching, research, and service emphasis, all of which are considered in the promotion and tenure process. Third, all the participants had been involved in the promotion and tenure process themselves as well as evaluating the credentials of junior faculties. In addition, the dissertation committee chair in consultation with a W.E.B. DuBois University administrator, recommended these individuals.
Profile of the Participants

The participants for this study included three college department heads and each of them taught at W.E.B. DuBois University in the College of Arts and Science and Education (see Table 3.1). The educational experience of the college department heads ranged from 10 years to 40 years, and each participant had extended experience with the promotion and tenure process. Pseudonyms were used for the participants to maintain a high degree of confidentiality.

Dr. Nate O’Neil has been in the field of higher education for over 40 years. He has served as a coordinator in the Division of Science and Mathematics for four years prior to his appointment as department head. He has served as department head of the Biology Department at W.E.B. DuBois University for a total of 29 years.

Dr. Carol Ingals has been in higher education for over 30 years. She has several years of teaching experience and has served as head of the Honors Curriculum Program at Alcorn State University. She has served as department head of the English and Foreign Language Department at W.E.B. DuBois University for a total of 17 years.

Dr. Martin Creighton has been in higher education for approximately 10 years. He was the only participant who had a vast experienced in the corporate arena before entering higher education. He has served as department head of the Chemistry Department at W.E.B. DuBois University for a total of 10 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dr. Nate O’Neil</th>
<th>Dr. Carol Ingals</th>
<th>Dr. Martin Creighton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Higher Education</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year at ABC University</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years as Department Chair</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Supervised</strong></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>English and Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Nate O’Neil</th>
<th>Dr. Carol Ingals</th>
<th>Dr. Martin Creighton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Junior Faculty Supervised</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Profiles of Participants

The Researcher’s Role

In qualitative research, the role of the researcher as the primary data collection instrument necessitated the identification of personal values, assumptions, and bias at the outset of the study (Creswell, 2003). The researcher’s perceptions of higher education, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and the role of academic department heads have been shaped by his personal experiences as a former student at two HBCUs, and his work as Director of Student Life and Development at a HBCU.

Due to the current experience as an administrator, the researcher brought certain biases to the study. Although every effort was made to ensure objectivity, these biases may have shaped the way the researcher viewed the data collected and way the data were interpreted. To reduce bias, the researcher:

1. Recorded his beliefs about the work of the department heads related to the promotion and tenure of junior faculty. These beliefs were committed to writing before data collection began and then statements were revisited throughout data collection and analysis.

2. Conducted member checks with the participants to ensure accuracy in both the reporting and analysis of data.

3. Used the constant comparative method of data analysis in which participants reviewed data and which data were examined from multiple sources to ensure reliability and trustworthiness (Creswell, 2003). Data from fieldnotes, transcriptions
of interviews, and artifacts were used to confirm or disconfirm the researcher’s analysis of the data.

Profile of Research Setting

W.E.B. DuBois University was established in 1895. The state legislature designated the college the state’s land-grant institution for Blacks in 1949. The study was conducted on the campus of a state university. W.E.B. DuBois University [a pseudonym] is a comprehensive, residential, four-year land grant institution whose enrollment was predominantly African American, and more than 2,500 students attended W.E.B. DuBois University in 2002. Students came from approximately 130 of the state’s 169 counties, more than 30 states, and about 10 international countries. The student body is diverse, and they learned in an atmosphere that was supportive and designed to blend cultural, ethnic, racial, and gender diversity through a challenging academic program.

The University offers Bachelor’s Degrees in more than 50 majors, as well as Master’s Degrees in education, animal science, public health and counseling, and a collaborative doctorate in education in conjunction with another university. Distance learning opportunities were provided for non-traditional students, and the university offered a Weekend College characterized by small classes and personal interaction with professors. In addition to the campus offerings, courses were offered at off-campus sites. The university also offered a study-abroad program with options for academic course work, student teaching, and internship experiences in Africa.

Table 3.2 illustrates the composition of the faculty the participant department chairs supervise relative to the overall years of teaching experience and average years of experience at
W.E.B. DuBois University for the faculty in their respective departments. The table also illustrates the degrees held by the members in each of the participant’s department. Table 3.2 indicated that the average Biology faculty has nearly 19 years of teaching experience, with 11 years of experience at W.E.B. DuBois University. All of the Biology faculty has an advanced degree. The members of the English and Foreign Language Department have an average of 13 years of overall teaching experience, with an average 7 years of experience at W.E.B. DuBois University. All of the English and Foreign Languages faculty has an advanced degree. The Chemistry Department faculty has an average overall teaching experience just less than 14 years, with an average of 6 years of experience at W.E.B. DuBois University. All members of the Chemistry Department have advanced degrees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Average Years Teaching Experience of Teachers</th>
<th>Average Years at ABC University</th>
<th>Degrees Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Masters 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Foreign Languages</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Masters 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Masters 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Composition of Teachers in Participant’s Departments

Methods of Data Collection

Yin (1989) recommended six forms of data for case studies including documents, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant observations, and physical artifacts. Methods of data collection included three semi-structured interviews with the department heads and the examination of documents and artifacts germane to the promotion and tenure process at W.E.B. DuBois University. When contacting individuals to participate in the study, the
researcher gave a brief introduction and description of the research, and informed the participants how long the interview sessions were expected to last.

**Interviews**

One common form of qualitative research is the extended interview (McCracken, 1988). The open-ended nature of the extended interview allowed the participants to answer from their own frame of reference rather than from one structured by predetermined and arranged questions of the researcher (Glesne, 1999). In addition, the extended interview allowed the participants to share what experiences and factors were meaningful to him or her (McCracken, 1988).

Another common form of qualitative research is the semi-structured interview. In semi-structured interviews, researchers ask a mix of structured predetermined questions that are flexibly worded. This format allowed new ideas about the topic of promotion and tenure to emerge (Merriam, 1988). The extended interview was used in the initial interview; semi-structured interviews were used in follow-up interviews to allow the researcher to probe further the responses participants gave in previous interviews.

Interview guides were developed for use in the study (see Appendix B). Parallel questions were asked of each individual to ensure parallel perspectives were gathered. To enhance the validity of the interviews (Newman & Benz, 1998), an external expert who worked at an HBCU in another state was asked to check the questions against the objectives of the study.

Stouthamer-Lober and Bok van Kammen (1995) believed that one of the principal steps in the preparation of a study was conducting a pretest interview because it was important to know beforehand whether the proposed study and researcher would be able to deliver the information sought from the participants. A pretest interview allowed the researcher to test the interview schedule and data collection methods. Additionally, the pretest interview allowed the
researcher to gain experience before the actual interviews were conducted with participants. The researcher conducted a pretest interview with a department head from a different HBCU than where the study was conducted. The interview protocol used in this study was modified based on feedback from the pretest interviewee.

For the purpose of organizing the data for this study, the researcher used an interview guide. An initial interview was conducted to establish rapport with interviewees and acquire general information and preliminary data about each participant, their departments, and their selection as department chairs. The initial interview questions were:

1. Can you please tell me about your professional background?
2. How did you first enter education?
3. Can you tell me about how you first became an administrator?
4. What events most shaped your early career as an educational administrator?
5. What events surrounded your appointment as a college department head?
6. Can you describe in more detail the transition from your earlier position into the role of the college department head?
7. How long have you been an academic department head?

A second interview was conducted with department heads using the interview guide approach. During the second interview, each participant responded to a set of questions designed to assist with providing information that would allow the researcher to gather data designed to examine the promotion and tenure process at a Historically Black Land Grant University. Interview questions were as follows:

8. Describe the current procedures for evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure?
9. What is your perception of the institution’s promotion and tenure policies with respect to their effectiveness in facilitating the promotion and tenure process?

10. What criteria do you think should be used to evaluate (a) research, (b) teaching, and (c) service?

11. What do you think is your responsibility toward junior faculty regarding promotion and tenure processes?

A third and final interview was conducted with each participant to clarify previous data collected, document dialogue between researcher and interviewees, and further identify their roles in assisting junior faculty in the promotion and tenure process. The interview was driven by the following questions; however, each participant added additional information that aided in enhancing data and assisting in validating previous responses extrapolated in earlier interviews.

12. How many faculty are in your department?

13. What is the academic rank (i.e., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor) of each faculty member?

14. How many faculty members have been promoted within your department?

15. Please explain the post-tenure review process and what is your perception of the process?

16. Please explain the selection process for determining the Departmental Committee for the promotion and tenure process.

17. What type of policy would you recommend regarding release time to allow junior faculty the opportunity to participate in research?

18. What is the most effective means of maximizing the potential of junior faculty members?
Documentation

Policy papers and other relevant documents (promotion and tenure guidelines at W.E.B. DuBois University) identified as important by administrators and the department heads were examined. Documents such as the University strategic plan, institutional fact book, and promotion and tenure guidelines were collected and examined. According to Merriam (1988), documents are considered stable and objective sources of information and should be used as primary sources of data and as a way to triangulate data. These documents provided descriptive information, helped to verify emerging findings, assisted in advancing new categories, offered historical understanding, and helped to track data and the analysis of data leading to the reporting of findings.

Data Collection Strategies

Data were collected from August 2003 through February 2004. Each interview (three interviews with each of the three department heads) lasted approximately two hours with each participant. Interviews were audio recorded and later transcribed. The researcher took fieldnotes and collected relevant artifacts.

Data Analysis

According to Marshall and Rossman (1999), data analysis included the processes of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the mass of collected data. Schein (1985) believed that the individual, interpersonal, and emotional processes of each participant could develop into a shared view of what was being explored in a qualitative study. Parallel questions were asked of each participant and in a similar order to ensure analogous response (Nisbet & Entwistle, 1970). The interviews were semi-structured, standardized, yet formal. In addition to tape recordings, fieldnotes were taken and became part of the data.
At the completion of each interview, the researcher added codes to the transcription to identify themes and reoccurring ideas. These codes also aided in the development of subsequent probing questions to be used in the second interviews, and as themes emerged, new codes were added or modified to reflect developing trends within the data. Moreover, the codes allowed clear identification of the evolution of themes across other participant interviews and the overall process. The process also allowed the researcher to develop new categories and to modify existing categories as the data warranted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAUP</td>
<td>American Association of University Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOP</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSP</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Biology Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Chemistry Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDH</td>
<td>College Department Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English and Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Historically Black College and University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF</td>
<td>Junior Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAFT</td>
<td>Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td>Promotion and Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Codes and Meanings

Each category was aligned to coincide with the three primary research questions that focus this study. Table 3.4 portrays the research question and the accompanying categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. How did college department heads at a HBLGU perceive supervision for junior faculty regarding the promotion and tenure process? | • Elements of an effective and efficient promotion and tenure process  
• Policies and procedures for the promotion and tenure process |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. What are the key elements to an effective and efficient promotion and tenure process at a HBLGU?</td>
<td>• Supervision and guidance for junior faculty  &lt;br&gt; • Evaluation of teaching, research and service  &lt;br&gt; • Student learning outcomes and the student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What does the department head do to promote the key elements related to promotion and tenure?</td>
<td>• Recommended policies for “release time”  &lt;br&gt; • The work of the department head and the promotion and tenure of junior faculty  &lt;br&gt; • Technological advancements in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Research Questions and Accompanying Categories

After the completion of each interview, the audio recordings were scripted and reviewed for thematic significance. The data were analyzed and sorted to identify any patterns, themes, or commonalities. The data were then translated from within the general themes that were identified. An auditor of professional status was asked to read and to clarify any patterns overlooked, as well as to give advice on content. Emerging themes were classified and studied to determine similarities and differences in content. Informal observations and documents were used as additional data and reported in the findings of the study.

Reporting

Yin (1989) identified four written forms of case studies. The four forms of case studies included the single narrative for a classic single-case study, a multiple narrative for a multiple-case study, a non-traditional narrative for either a single- or multiple-case study, and a cross-case written analysis for a multiple-case study.

Yin (1989) recommended that an early selection of case study composition from these four alternatives would help to develop and to refine the design as well as to assist the researcher to conduct the research. Given that a single-case study was conducted, the single narrative was
deemed most appropriate to describe and to analyze the case of three department heads at a single HBLGU.

The reporting of this qualitative inquiry was in narrative and descriptive form, using the natural language of the participants. The accounts were derived from the interviews conducted and included narrative from artifacts and fieldnotes. Textual quotations were incorporated into the narrative chronicling the findings in Chapter 4 so that the reader could follow the analysis rendered by the researcher.

Trustworthiness of the Study

If research methods are not legitimate or truthful, the outcomes are of no value, according to Ritzer (1988). The research questions guided the methods that were chosen for this study. The methods created the design of the study. Subsequently, the aim was that the outcomes of the study were to be believable based on the design of the study. All judgments were documented with evidence (Newman & Benz, 1998). The data were made available for examination by the dissertation committee members, and afterwards, available for public examination. Pseudonyms were used to protect the confidentiality of individuals included in the study.

According to Creswell (2003), “validity does not carry the same connotations as it does in quantitative research, nor does its companion of reliability or generalizability” (p. 195). To ensure the trustworthiness of the study, the researcher included various tests of rigor that were recommended by Stake (1995), Merriam (1998), Guba and Lincoln (1998), and Creswell (2003). These tests of rigor included member checking, peer and expert review, the audit trail, prolonged engagement in the field, and triangulation? each described within the context of this study.
Member Checking

Member checking is a technique that requires consistent checking of interpretations with the participants who provided the data. Employing this technique, the researcher took the final report, descriptions, and themes back to the participants to determine whether they believed that the findings and analysis were accurate.

Peer and Expert Review

The data and its analysis were subject to the scrutiny of expert review to enhance the trustworthiness of the analysis. The expert was selected because of her expertise and experience in conducting qualitative research. The expert reviewed the interview transcription and the themes that emerged from the data and then provided feedback with respect to the accuracy and appropriateness of the themes.

Audit Trail

Information was made available for peer and expert audit. The trail included transcribed interviews, fieldnotes, coding procedures, and correspondence. An external auditor was asked to review the entire project. The role is similar to that of fiscal auditor, and it was expected that would be asked of the researcher by the auditor specific questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Prolonged Engagement

The data collection process began with collecting documents relating to promotion and tenure, followed by interviews. The researcher spent prolonged time in the field to establish a degree of trust and to assist in ensuring the credibility of the researcher and the validity of the research.
**Triangulation**

The method of triangulation involved using multiple data sources to confirm finding, to clarify meanings, and to verify repeatability of observations and the researcher’s interpretation of data. The study employed two types of triangulation (Stake, 1995). First, data were collected from more than one person. Second, more than one method of obtaining data was used.

**Ethical Considerations**

According to Kimmel (1988), researchers need to strike a balance between the scientific requirements of methodology and the human rights and values potentially threatened by the research. Merriam (1988) summarized that in a qualitative study, ethical dilemmas were likely to emerge at two points: during the collection of data and while disseminating findings. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) contended that to protect the interviewee’s anonymity, researchers used fictitious names and sometimes changed descriptive characteristics. Before the interviews, participants were given letters that assured them of their confidentiality (see Appendix A). A pseudonym was used for the selected site.

The intent and purpose of the research was explained to interviewees, and each participant was asked to sign a letter of informed consent. Participants were provided a copy of their respective interview transcript for the purpose of revision and for clarification of interview content.

To assure that the study was conducted in an ethical manner, the researcher submitted the proposal to the University of Georgia’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects for review. Approval prior to implementation of this research as required by University and federal policies governing research with human subjects was secured before data collection began.
Chapter Summary

This chapter offered a rationale for the researcher’s selection of the case study as a specific qualitative research method. The research used two complementary and mutually reinforcing research strategies, interview and documentary analysis. Personal interviews, as the primary strategy, were conducted with three department chairs to gather crucial and specific information regarding the promotion and tenure process of junior faculty at a HBLGU. Documentary data, as a secondary source of information, were collected and analyzed for the purpose of obtaining a clearer understanding of the key aspects of the promotion and tenure process at the selected HBLGU. Content analysis techniques were used to identify emerging themes from the information gathered from three interviews with each of the three department heads. Also, official university documents were collected and analyzed as secondary sources of data. Trustworthiness within the interpretivistic paradigm was ensured by using member checking, peer and expert review, prolonged engagement, and triangulation.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of three interviews conducted with three departmental heads that have worked with and assisted junior faculty during the promotion and tenure process at a Historically Black Land Grant University (HBLGU). The researcher sought to understand how these department heads influenced the promotion and tenure process of junior faculty.

Merriam (1998) defined a qualitative case study as "an intensive, holistic, description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon, or social unit" (p. 21). She added that the defining characteristic of a case was that the case was "a thing, a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries" (p. 27). Using a qualitative case study approach, the researcher sought to uncover the embedded values, attitudes, and experiences of academic department heads regarding tenure and promotion processes at W.E.B. DuBois University, a HBLGU. The following general questions guided the study:

1. How did college department heads at a Historically Black Land Grant University perceive supervision and guidance for junior faculty regarding the promotion and tenure process?

2. What are the key elements to an effective and efficient promotion and tenure system at a Historically Black Land Grant University?

3. What does the department head do to promote the key elements related to promotion and tenure?
The questions and interviews sought the detailed individual experiences of each participant within their departments at W.E.B. DuBois University (a pseudonym). The questions and interview process were also designed to help find the commonalities that existed between each participant, their stories, and experiences as department heads and their work assisting junior faculty in the promotion and tenure process. Document review and artifact examination were also used for gathering data to understand more fully the context of W.E.B. DuBois University and the promotion and tenure process. The researcher examined promotion and tenure guidelines, the faculty handbook, and visited the system’s web sites.

Data collection for this study occurred in the fall semester of 2003. Three participants were interviewed three times over a six-month period. Through reputational sampling, participants were selected because of their experience and expertise regarding the promotion and tenure process. The participants were highly recommended by the Dean of Graduate Studies at W.E.B. DuBois University.

Given the case study approach and the nature of this perspective-seeking study, symbolic interactionism served as the conceptual framework for collecting and analyzing data first as individual cases and then across the cases. Symbolic interaction demands the consideration of historical and institutional linkages to action (Blumer, 1969).

Blumer (1969) believed that symbolic interactionism was used to construct a variety of meanings from social interaction. Given the symbolic interactionism perspective, emphasis is placed on the interactions among people, the use of symbols in communication and interaction, and the reality of self as constructed by others through communication and interaction with one another. The researcher sought to learn how the three department heads constructed meaning about their work at assisting junior faculty achieve promotion and tenure.
This study was structured by a research design that provided the methods and procedures for conducting qualitative research, and the interpretative framework used to guide this study was symbolic interactionism. Symbolic interactionism is used a method of interpreting the various perspectives of individuals. According to Blumer (1969), human action was largely influenced from within an individual rather than from the outside. Symbolic interactionism takes the perspective that personal experiences provide the filter through which all that happens to and around people are interpreted. Additionally, symbolic interactionists believe that only the participant’s perception of the phenomena being examined is what matters the most (Blumer, 1969).

The perspectives of department heads at W.E.B. DuBois University and their experience with junior faculty through the promotion and tenure process were examined more fully from the ways in which they defined their responsibilities within their own interpretative framework. Blumer’s (1969) structure of symbolic interactionism rests on these three core premises:

1. People act toward things, including each other, on the basis of the meanings.
2. These meanings are derived through social interactions with others.
3. These meanings are managed and transformed through an interpretative process that people use to make sense of the objects that constitute their social worlds. (p. 2)

Since the purpose of the study was to understand the perspectives of department heads at W.E.B. DuBois University and their experiences, symbolic interactionism and its interpretative approaches provided a means to better construct meaning while analyzing the data. The data served to inform the researcher of the meanings on which department heads based their perspectives regarding their work towards junior faculty members and the promotion and tenure process.

First presented in this chapter, is the context of W.E.B. DuBois University, the research site in which the study was conducted. Next, descriptive data on the promotion and tenure
process gathered from summarizing official documents are analyzed. Then, the portraits of the three department heads developed from the interviews are provided. Finally, a cross case analysis of the interviews with the three department heads is provided.

Context of W.E.B. DuBois University

W.E.B. DuBois University is a comprehensive, residential, four-year university providing educational degrees and programs to both undergraduate and graduate students. The 1,369-acre campus makes it the second largest (in acreage) public university in the state. More than 2,500 students attend W.E.B. DuBois University. Students from W.E.B. DuBois University hail from more than 30 states and 10 international countries. The student body is diverse, and they learn in an atmosphere that is supportive and designed to blend cultural, ethnic, racial, and gender diversity in a challenging academic program. W.E.B. DuBois University offers Bachelor’s Degrees in more than 50 majors, as well as Master’s Degrees in education, animal science, and counseling, and a collaborative doctorate in education with another university.

Distance learning opportunities are provided for non-traditional students and the university offers a Weekend College characterized by small classes and personal interaction with professors. In addition to the main campus, courses are offered at off-campus sites in five nearby towns. The university also offers a study-abroad program with options for academic coursework, student teaching, and internship.

With more than 70 clubs, sororities, fraternities and social organizations on campus, students have many opportunities for leadership and personal growth outside of class. W.E.B. DuBois University is a member of its regional athletic conference and fields NCAA Division II teams in six women’s sports: basketball, tennis, cross-country, volleyball, softball and track and field, as well as men’s teams in football, basketball, cross country, track and field, and tennis.
W.E.B. DuBois University was established in 1895 and was named originally W.E.B High and Industrial School. It became W.E.B. DuBois College in 1939 and then W.E.B. DuBois University in 1996.

Mission and Goals of W.E.B. DuBois University

W.E.B. DuBois University is a public, senior, 1890 land grant institution serving the state and the nation. Founded in 1895 as an institution to serve primarily the educational needs of Black students, W.E.B. DuBois University provides instruction, research, and public and extension services, consistent with the land grant and public functions, for all segments of the population to achieve their personal, educational, and professional goals. Following the liberal arts and the land grant traditions, W.E.B. DuBois University provides diversified and challenging programs to meet educational needs resulting from societal changes. W.E.B. DuBois University provides a learning and living environment that enables its graduates and all who come under its influence to become “innovative and critical thinkers, problem-solvers, and responsible citizens” (W.E.B. DuBois University Handbook, 2003).

As an 1890 land grant institution, W.E.B. DuBois University is unique among the senior universities of the statewide university system. It shares with the other senior universities the following core characteristics:

- Commitment to excellence and responsiveness with a scope of influence defined by the needs of an area of the state, and by particularly outstanding programs or distinctive characteristics that have a magnet effect throughout the region or state;
- A commitment to a teaching/learning environment, both inside and outside the classroom that sustains instructional excellence, serves as a diverse and college-prepared student
body, promotes high levels of student achievement, offers academic assistance, and provides developmental studies programs for a limited student cohort;

- A high quality general education program supporting a variety of disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and professional academic programming at the baccalaureate level, with selected masters and educational specialist degrees, and selected associate degree programs based on area needs or inter-institutional collaboration.

- A commitment to public service, continuing education, technical assistance, and economic development activities that address the needs, improve the quality of life, and raise the educational level with the University’s scope of influence; and

- A commitment to scholarly and creative work to enhance instructional effectiveness and to encourage faculty scholarly pursuits, and a commitment to applied research in selected areas of institutional strength and area of need (W.E.B. DuBois University Handbook, 2003).

While W.E.B. DuBois University shares some of the characteristics with the other senior universities, it is a Historically Black Land–Grant University with a rich teacher education heritage and the only senior university with a statewide, land grant and public service mission. Thus, W.E.B. DuBois University is further committed to:

- The enhancement of opportunities for the intellectual, personal and professional development of the under-served segment of the population in the state and a limited cohort in the nation;

- High-quality, innovative, and technologically-advanced programs in teacher education;

- A broad-based curriculum to specialize in excellent programs in the arts and sciences and technology, and a broad general background of education in the liberal arts tradition;
• An international program designed to disseminate new knowledge and technology for improving the quality of life throughout the world;

• Full development of all components of the land grant function to include a basic and applied research program, a comprehensive public service and technical assistance program, and a full range of degree programs in the food and agricultural sciences, the mechanical arts, and related areas; and

• A general education program supporting a variety of disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and professional academic programming at the baccalaureate, and post-baccalaureate levels.

The campus life of W.E.B. DuBois University is characterized by:

• A supporting campus climate, necessary services, and leadership development opportunities, and professional academic programming at the baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate levels.

• Cultural, ethnic, racial and gender diversity in the faculty, staff and student body, supported by practices and programs that embody the ideals of an open, democratic, and global society.

• Technology to advance educational purposes, including instructional technology, student support services, and distance education; and

• Collaborative relationships with other System institutions, State agencies, local schools and technical institutes, and business and industry, sharing physical, human, information, and other resources to expand and enhance programs and services available to its citizens (see Appendix C for more detail).
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines at W.E.B. DuBois University

To gain a clearer understanding of the promotion and tenure process, the following documents were reviewed:

- Pre-tenure review, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review policies
- Promotion and tenure timetable
- Promotion and tenure guidelines
- Board of Regents Policy Manual
  - 803.07.1 Evaluation of Faculty
  - 803.07.2 Criteria for Promotion
  - 803.07.3 Tenure
  - 803.07.4 Non-tenure Track Personnel

W.E.B. DuBois University uses the typical evaluation procedures that include an annual performance review and a faculty promotion and tenure review process. The annual performance review process incorporates students' evaluations of instruction as an integral component of the determination of teaching effectiveness. The evaluative process for faculty employs a qualitative ranking of goal attainment in (a) teaching, professional development/scholarly achievement, and (c) professional service. The annual evaluation instrument consists of two parts--expected duties and meritorious performance. Merit salary adjustment determinations are based solely on the faculty member's score on the annual evaluation instrument.

Evaluation for tenure-track faculty consists of pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure services. During the third year of employment, non-tenured faculty must undergo a cumulative review of his or her potential for tenure. Either the Promotion and Tenure Committee or an
independently appointed committee conducts this review. The review is designed to complement ongoing mentoring efforts at the department level.

Promotion and tenure committees at the university have the task of judging faculty dossiers for promotion and tenure. This process begins at the department level. The individual faculty member makes a formal request to be considered for promotion and tenure to the department head. A committee of faculty members (at or above the rank of those being considered for promotion) reviews the dossiers and sends a recommendation to the department head. The department head also reviews the dossiers and sends a recommendation to the college-wide committee (Dean’s level), along with the committee’s recommendation.

The college-wide committee (composed of faculty representatives within the college who are not applying for promotion or tenure and who are credentialed to evaluate all candidates in the pool) submits a rating containing each candidate’s strengths and weaknesses to the Dean. The Dean then makes recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The process is repeated at the level of the Vice President for Academic Affairs employing an institution-wide committee with appropriate credentials. The recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is submitted to the President. Final promotion and tenure decisions are made by the President and are subject to the approval of the Board of Regents.

According to W.E.B. DuBois University’s Handbook (2000-2002), only full-time faculty members are eligible for promotion considerations that are conducted annually. Basic criteria include (a) evidence of superior teaching, (b) documented research and scholarly academic achievement, and (c) outstanding service to the profession, the institution, and the community. Criteria that are more specific are specified by rank.
Eligibility for tenure is limited to full-time faculty holding appointments in academic departments. Normally, only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are eligible for tenure. Promotion to a higher rank and appointment with tenure may be granted to faculty members with outstanding accomplishments in an appropriate combination of instruction, research, extension, and other professional activities (e.g., national recognition in their field). Such recommendations are made by the President and must be approved by the Chancellor and the Board of Regents.

A maximum of three years’ credit toward the minimum probationary period for service in tenure-track positions at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of instructor or lecturer at the same institution is required. The maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure is seven years. The maximum time that may be served in any combination of full-time instructional appointments (instructor or professorial ranks) without award of tenure is 10 years. The maximum period of time that may be served at the rank of instructor is seven years.

Traditionally, there is a hierarchical division of an institution’s three-fold mission—teaching, research, and service. According to the Board of Regents and W.E.B. DuBois University guidelines, applicants for tenure and/or promotion are expected to show outstanding achievement in two of three areas and have a good record in the third. Weights are applied in evaluation categories as follows:

- 60% - 70% for teaching
- 10% - 20% for scholarly activities
- 5% - 10% for service
The weights for teaching and scholarly activities may be interchanged based on the applicant's principal assignment for employment.

Faculty Status of W.E.B. DuBois University

W.E.B. DuBois University employs 116 faculty and Table 4.1 delineates the ranks of the full time persons whose primary responsibility is teaching. General and academic administrators with rank, research faculty, and faculty holding special chairs are excluded from Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Lecturer/Instructor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.1* Instructional Faculty by Rank

Table 4.2 presents the full-time teaching faculty, research faculty, general administrators, academic administrators, public service faculty, librarians, and counselors, who hold Board-approved academic rank, are tenured, on tenure track, in positions that are not tenure track, and whom are employed on at least an academic year contract. Part-time faculties are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Lecturer/Instructor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.2* Faculty by Rank

Table 4.3 shows full-time teaching faculty, research faculty, general administrators, academic administrators, public service faculty, librarians, and counselors who hold Board-approved academic rank, are tenured, on tenure track, or in positions that are not tenure track, and whom are employed on at least an academic year contract.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Not-Tenured/ On Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.3 Faculty by Tenure Status*

Introduction to the Participants

The three department heads who participated in this study included Dr. Nate O’Neil (Biology Department), Dr. Carol Ingals (English and Foreign Language Department), and Dr. Mark Creighton (Chemistry Department). The identities of the department heads and the institution have been disguised by the use of pseudonyms. All three participants were full professors, tenured, and brought a total of 80 years in higher education with 58 years as serving as department heads. All of the departments were part of the College of Arts and Sciences and Education at W.E.B. DuBois University.

On average, Drs. O’Neil, Ingals, and Creighton have worked with approximately 35 junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure at W.E.B. DuBois University with a self reported “100%” success rate of junior faculty who have applied for and received promotion and tenure during their stints as department head.

Case 1

*Dr. Nate O’Neil, Biology Department Head*

Dr. Nate O’Neil has been in education for over 40 years. In 1959, he received the undergraduate degree from Fort Valley State College (Georgia) with a major in Zoology. In 1959, he entered Atlanta University where he received the Master of Science Degree in Biology in 1961. Dr. O’Neil continued his academic journey, and he earned a doctorate in Zoology from Oklahoma State University. He has served as academic department head at W.E.B. DuBois
University since 1975 (29 years). He also served as a coordinator in the Division of Science and Mathematics for four years before his appointment as department head.

Dr. O’Neil began his early career in higher education while pursuing his Master of Science Degree at Atlanta University. He served as a teaching assistant with an academic department that presented “a lot of instability.” At the time, the department head was out on a medical leave, and a staff member was on leave. O’Neil worked in the department as a substitute teacher with “little to no supervision” for the first year. He commented, “I was kind of on my own with a temporary department.” Although it was a “lonely road,” this experience helped to pave his early career in higher education.

During his first year at Atlanta University, he was the laboratory assistant and laboratory instructor for the general biology laboratory at Morehouse College. During his second year at Atlanta University, O’Neil received his first experience in the classroom while teaching two classes on the graduate level. Dr. O’Neil shared that it was this “experience in the classroom that had a major impact” on his role in the various capacities, he has served leading to becoming a department head.

Due to the lack of structured supervision, Dr. O’Neil made a conscious and informative decision to return to Atlanta University. His primary reason for returning was to strengthen his background in mathematics. During this time, he began to search for a job in which he could use his expertise in the field of science.

Dr. O’Neil relayed that the Dean at Fort Valley State University requested him to serve as an instructor in the absence of a professor who was on leave for a year. During the fall of 1963, Dr. O’Neil taught many courses in the Division of Science and Mathematics. At that particular time, the division consisted of courses and majors in the fields of chemistry, biology,
and mathematics. In 1971, Dr. O’Neil took a position as an assistant professor at W.E.B. DuBois University.

Before his tenure as department head, he was appointed as a coordinator within the department in 1971. At the time, there was only the designation of divisions instead of departments. This allowed Dr. O’Neil an opportunity to move into an administrative role while continuing to serve in the classroom in a tenure track position. Dr. O’Neil eventually moved through the ranks of assistant professor to associate professor, and he is now a full professor.

In 1973, W.E.B. DuBois University decided to restructure the academic arena and established various schools and departments. Two years later in 1975, Dr. O’Neil was named department head of the Biology Department and served in that capacity for over 29 years. In 1975, he was the youngest person to serve in the capacity of a department head. Upon appointment as department head, he asserted, “the transition was very smooth because I had already been doing the job anyway. Actually, the department head really did not have any less workload. We all…worked together, and I did the majority of the paperwork.”

Table 4.4 represents the fulltime-teaching faculty within Dr. O’Neil’s department at W.E.B. DuBois University designated by specifics ranks (i.e., assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors). There is no part-time faculty in the Biology Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Full Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.4 Faculty Status by Rank in the Biology Department*
Table 4.5 represents the full time teaching faculty designated by tenure status in the
Biology Department at W.E.B. DuBois University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Not-Tenured/ On Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Faculty by Tenure Status in the Biology Department

Elements of an Effective and Efficient Promotion and Tenure Process

When asked to describe the current procedures for evaluating faculty at W.E.B. DuBois
University for promotion and tenure, Dr. O’Neil referenced the categories contained in the
Academic Affairs Handbook—superior teaching, outstanding service to the institution, and
professional growth and development. Professional growth and development at W.E.B. DuBois
University is the term used to signify research. He viewed teaching as “primary” and service as
“very important.” O’Neil stated:

Although our new instrument does not give us a whole lot of points for
advisement, I consider it important. In terms of looking at my people, I use
advisement for a fourth category in my mind. I can’t use it as a whole, but I use it
in the teaching part. It should be a fourth category with a little more weight
placed on advisement.

Dr. O’Neil believed that the institution’s promotion and tenure policies and guidelines were
“good.” However, O’Neil expressed some disdain for the effectiveness in facilitating the
promotion and tenure process. O’Neil shared, “no one looks at the portfolios/dossiers when it
goes through all the channels of command.” The process outlined in the Promotion and Tenure
Guideline Manual (see Appendix C) is “not adhered to and taken serious once it extends beyond
the departmental level.” O’Neil believed, “the department heads should have the final decision
because they have the most knowledge about the performance of their staff members.” Dr.
O’Neil further asserted, “the department head should know by the time of evaluation whether junior faculty are producing or not producing.” Dr. O’Neil indicated that there should be “clear expectations” outlined:

Let the person know what is expected and encourage the person to learn, read the handbook, to know what is expected at the top level, and the W.E.B. DuBois Handbook. I encourage them to know that and know what they are doing in order to exceed expectations.

Dr. O’Neil indicated that department heads should “take a holistic and open-minded approach” when identifying and measuring the elements of an effective and efficient promotion and tenure process.

For Dr. O’Neil, “advisement is closely related to teaching.” One of the core beliefs in the W.E.B. DuBois University Handbook is that faculty need to share in the “commitment to a teaching/learning environment, both inside and outside the classroom that sustains instructional excellence, serves as a diverse and college-prepared student body, promotes high levels of student achievement, and offers academic assistance…” Dr. O’Neil reported that contact with students is “primary in evaluating the teaching component as well as the amount of contact with students.” O’Neil further explained that teaching and the advisement of students need to be viewed “in like fashion…as complements” to each other. Dr. O’Neil related:

The quality of contact with students, whether accurate or inaccurate, and frequency and outcomes of the contact should be considered. Do your students, for example, participate in extracurricular activities? Do you keep up with what they are doing? Do you encourage them to do different things? Do you help them to get into graduate school? Do you follow up with them?

Dr. O’Neil considered “student satisfaction” as a critical aspect when evaluating the junior faculty in the teaching category. Additionally, O’Neil believed that there should be a “fourth component” in the evaluation of a junior faculty for promotion and tenure. The fourth component should include “advisement of students,” according to Dr. O’Neil.
Related to other forms of evaluating teaching, O’Neil asserted and fieldnotes indicated with a fist pounding down on his desk that “a thorough knowledge of your subject area is critical,” and this must be demonstrated through competency in the subject area that is being taught. O’Neil looks at the teaching instrument and the course outlines to gauge the “effectiveness of the overall teaching aspect.” In the lower level courses, a common outline and final examination are used to measure the content area to ensure that the students gather a basic understanding. O’Neil asserted, “I can tell from the examinations where they [students] are.” As far as observations in the classroom, O’Neil had the following thoughts:

I don’t sit in anybody’s class for a whole period, but I think it is important to observe teaching. I may come into a classroom unobtrusively for two to five minutes. I walk around the laboratory and watch activities. I have frequent contact with the teachers.

In short, Dr. O’Neil believed that teachers should have a “keen sense” in terms of the progress level of each student, and for this to be ascertained, he indicated that “punctuality” is required. O’Neil was adamant about “teachers being on time for class and well-prepared for classroom instruction.” High on his priority list was the need for “effective communication across” all disciplines. O’Neil related that he “encourages his junior faculty to prepare examinations that have an essay component in order to provide feedback as it relates to effective writing skills.”

O’Neil placed less emphasis on the research component of the promotion and tenure guidelines. Although deemed important by O’Neil, he detailed that there were “other variables that could be used to measure and to evaluate the research of junior faculty” at W.E.B. DuBois University. One of the reasons why he placed less emphasis on research was because of the “limited time afforded to junior faculty to actively write
and publish.” Dr. O’Neil shared the following thoughts related to the evaluation of research:

In terms of research, I don’t care about publishing every week. I grade more on the interaction with students. Conduct a research project where the students get involved...such as presentations related to new research developments.

Dr. O’Neil acknowledged that several of his faculty members attempt to conduct research, “particularly on weekends.” He cited that “all of them are doing some type of research, not a bunch of publications.” He asserted, “with our load [quantity of courses being taught], we can’t expect them to do much research. I can’t expect myself to.”

However, O’Neil was not afraid to categorize research in other ways to be used as “the measuring tool” in this area. Some of these categories include but were not limited to the following: (1) Preparing students for graduate school, (2) On campus programs with middle-school and high school students, (3) Proposals, (4) Grants, (5) Meetings and (6) Serving on boards and committees. O’Neil further commented, “to me, that’s research...writing, and doing what’s good for our students.”

Although O’Neil placed less emphasis on evaluating junior faculty related to research, he encouraged junior faculty to be productive. Dr. O’Neil qualified this point further by stating:

Some people haven’t had a publication in years, but they [junior faculty] are still researching and reading journals. I encourage it [traditional research] all the time. You need to write grants. I bring it to their attention when something is available and I tell them that maybe they should apply for them. Sometimes they have time; sometimes they don’t. If they don’t have the time, I’m not going to push them. They have to stand before students more than 20 hours a week some semesters.

O’Neil summarized the research component of the evaluation process by deeming it a “necessary tool” to meet the requirements of the promotion and tenure process. He
summarized, "much discretion and lenience" should be given to the area of research demands on junior faculty due to limited time to devote to this area.

Dr. O’Neil had a very limited response and point-of-view on the evaluation of service for the promotion and tenure process. He believed that service should be measured by "involvement." He contended he was "well aware and abreast" of the extracurricular activities his junior faculty are involved with on campus. Dr. O’Neil considered involvement in "student activities" as a primary measuring tool related to service to W.E.B. DuBois University. In fact, O’Neil qualified, "service to the community" should be a component in evaluating service.

Supervision and Guidance for Junior Faculty and the Promotion and Tenure Process

Dr. O’Neil considered his responsibilities paramount as it related to junior faculty and the promotion and tenure process. He takes a keen interest in the professional development and progress of all staff members. O’Neil acknowledged, "my responsibility is to see that each junior faculty works to his or her potential." It is important "that one [department head] understands that each faculty member is different and teaches in a different style." He contends it is the responsibility of the department head to create an environment that will promote and encourage successful outcomes. Put another way, O’Neil continued:

I don’t think that each has to emulate me, but it would be good if they did. I think it’s my job to see they are growing and continue to improve. In fact, it’s my responsibility to see that they have the tools and the necessary equipment to do the necessary jobs. And, in fact, it’s my job to see that they are promoted and I probably will be evaluated on how well I can get the junior faculty members promoted.

O’Neil related that resource allocation and technological support, "were critical aspects that are deemed monumental to the supervision and guidance of junior faculty," and he believed that department heads should approach resource allocation with "passion and open mindedness."
Dr. O’Neil specified different methods in order to maximize the potential of staff members. He stated, “I let them [junior faculty] become involved in as many things as possible to include departmental administration and everything from advisement to [the development of] course outlines.” Dr. O’Neil felt it was important to keep junior faculty members “busy and involved in as many things so that they have a good grasp of the department.” Keeping “busy and involved” included but was not limited to “dealing effectively with students” and “understanding administration and how administration operates on a daily basis.”

*The Work of the Department Head and the Promotion and Tenure of Junior Faculty*

Dr. O’Neil explained that the work of the department heads extends beyond the obvious items presented in the W.E.B. DuBois University Promotion and Tenure Policies. He asserted that the department head should attempt to promote and to “insist upon uniformity.” Uniformity, according to Dr. O’Neil included ensuring, “all junior faculty members feel that they are held to the same standards and treated with the utmost fairness.” O’Neil noted that there remains too much ambiguity regarding the promotion and tenure process, and he stated:

"Give some guidelines, for example. I know some departments simply have the person to fill out the application without guidance and they go with that...there is too much looseness or variations from one department to the next."

For Dr. O’Neil, a fair and just process is “mandatory to avoid any discrepancies or accusations of favorable treatment.” The process encourages “more objectivity and consistency across all barriers related to the promotion and tenure process” at W.E.B. DuBois University.

Dr. O’Neil believed that objectivity is “critical when determining the departmental committee” for the promotion and tenure process. In accordance to the Promotion and Tenure Policies at W.E.B. DuBois University, (Appendix C) it states:

"The Department Head shall appoint tenured faculty at the associate professor and/or professor ranks to serve on the departmental Committee on Promotion and"
Tenure. Balance shall be achieved according to the major programs within the department. A minimum of three individuals shall constitute the committee.

O’Neil indicated that three tenured faculty members are nominated by departmental faculty to serve on the departmental committee, and he explained further, “because of the relatively small size of the department, it is often necessary for the department head to select or appoint a departmental committee.” O’Neil was sensitive to faculty workload, and he explained, “care is taken to ensure that no individual is overworked. That is, tenured faculty members who serve one semester or one year are not asked to serve the following semester or academic year.”

Dr. O’Neil sought ways to provide “an avenue for junior faculty to maximize in the area of professional development which is inclusive of publications in referred journals.” He commonly referred to his practice of providing release time so that junior faculty have the opportunity to conduct research.” Dr. O’Neil acknowledged “this would require approval” from the Senior Administrative Level (Vice President for Academic Affairs). Dr. O’Neil explained further “external funds must be provided for release time, funds that will compensate someone to teach a course of that faculty member.” He noted there was once a time at W.E.B. DuBois University where a policy existed providing a rotation and release time amongst departments. However, “due to recent budgetary constraints, policy implementation has not been possible.” The lack of funds has prevented an opportunity for release time unless “it is a part of external funding.” As far as a policy for the Biology Department, O’Neil suggested the following:

I would like to see a policy where a faculty member can teach one class during a given semester and be permitted to do research. This would shift from faculty to faculty each semester. This would require doubling up on classes to give release time. It is not really ‘release time’; it is a reassignment or reallocation of time.
Dr. O’Neil suggested “monitoring and adjusting junior faculty schedules” would assist with meeting the needs of the overall department. O’Neil’s long-term goal was to “have a policy that would provide enough time and role delineation to give one person each semester that privilege [release time].”

*Case Summary*

An examination of Dr. O’Neil’s perspectives revealed his concern that the promotion and tenure process is not adhered to by the administrators beyond the departmental level. He suggested that the department chair should have the final evaluation of junior faculty as it relates to the promotion and tenure process. Dr. O’Neil asserted “the department head is the person who has direct contact with junior faculty on a daily or weekly basis,” and the department head is in a better position to make an assessment of junior faculty.

For Dr. O’Neil, the department heads should provide clear and precise expectations about the promotion and tenure process to the junior faculty members. In addition, the department head should remain “open-minded” when applying the provisions of the promotion and tenure guideline. Dr. O’Neil values the work faculty do with students, and he “takes advisement of students as a tool” when evaluating junior faculty members in the area of teaching. He contends “student satisfaction” is paramount when evaluating junior faculty.

Dr. O’Neil believes that department heads should remain “realistic” and take into account the junior faculty schedule. For example, he does not place a lot of emphasis on research because of the rigorous schedule of courses a junior faculty is required to teach. He forwards there should be a policy allowing junior faculty an opportunity to conduct research; however, he proclaimed there should be opportunities for release time fairly and objectively applied to all junior faculty to ensure that each staff member has an opportunity to conduct research. Dr.
O’Neil ranks “fairness and uniformity” very high in the evaluation procedures and providing opportunities for the junior faculty.

Case 2

Dr. Carol Ingals, English and Foreign Language Department Head

Dr. Carol Ingals has been in education for over 30 years. She received the undergraduate degree, a Bachelor of Science Degree, in English from the University of Mississippi. Ingals earned the doctorate in English from Bowling Green State University (Ohio). She has served as department chairperson at W.E.B. DuBois University since 1987 (16 years).

Dr. Ingals had no intention or desire of entering administration in higher education. On completion of her Master of Science Degree, she served as an instructor at Alcorn State in the English Department. From 1974 to 1978, she pursued the Doctor of Philosophy degree (PhD). After completing the PhD, she returned to Alcorn State University, and after teaching there from 1979 to 1981, she became head of the Honors Curriculum Program. In 1981, she was asked to serve as chairperson of the English and Foreign Language Department that was inclusive of the Mass Communication majors. Ingals served as Chairperson at Alcorn State for five years before she assumed the position of head of the English and Foreign Language Department at W.E.B. DuBois University. She has been employed in this position since 1987.

Dr. Ingals has served W.E.B. DuBois University in several capacities during her tenure. She has spearheaded several committees on both the departmental and university-wide levels, and Ingals serves as the chair of the Board of Regents Committee on English and Foreign Languages.

Table 4.6 represents those full-time teaching faculty within the Department of English and Foreign Languages at W.E.B. DuBois University designated by specifics ranks (i.e., assistant
professors, associate professors, and full professors). There are no part-time faculty in the Department of English and Foreign Languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Full Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.6 Faculty Status by Rank*

Table 4.7 represents those full-time teaching faculty designated by tenure status within the Department of English and Foreign Languages at W.E.B. DuBois University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Not-Tenured/ On Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.7 Faculty by Tenure Status*

*Elements of an Effective and Efficient Promotion and Tenure Process*

When asked about an effective promotion and tenure process, Dr. Ingals initially made reference to the Promotion and Tenure Polices (see Appendix C). She made mention that the decisions are outlined at the institutional level which begins during the fall semester of each fiscal year. Promotions in rank are based on merit and are not automatic. The promotion applications are considered and recommendations made at the department level are forwarded to the school level. The Dean of the School forwards the recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who submits recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the Board of Regents. She further added the procedures “cover a five-year period, more or less, of faculty accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service.” Dr. Ingals believes that the department head plays an instrumental role with the procedures as outlined in the Promotion and Tenure Policies. She made the following assertion:
The department head can assist by coaching and I think all along the way assuring that individuals keep track of their evaluations, sample items, outlines, and quizzes, etc.

Dr. Ingals believed “inventory controls” were very relevant and pertinent to assure junior faculty remains focused during the entire process. All pertinent and relevant documents must be “organized in a structured manner for presentation.” Dr. Ingals stated, “the presentation of materials sends a favorable message” to committee members before they make an assessment of the portfolio/dossier.

Dr. Ingals expressed a concern about “technological advancements” to meet the needs of a changing and advancing society. She takes into account the diverse needs and nature of “student learning outcomes in the overall objectives and guidelines.” Ingals elaborated:

Effective use of technology, of course, is one of them [included portfolio item]. We also want to look at cultural diversity, critical thinking and other outcomes that are part of the general education core as well as the major core. So, these items should be put together in the order prescribed by the guidelines for promotion and tenure.

Dr. Ingals believes in a “cutting edge” mentality to sustain a “competitive edge in today’s society.”

Due to the large department that Dr. Ingals serves in the chair capacity, she makes an interesting point and observation related to the large number of submissions for promotion and tenure. She contends that the formation of “sub-committees” is helpful when dealing with numerous applications for promotion and tenure. Elaborating further on her perspective, Ingals stated:

As department head, I also must formulate a committee to look at materials that are submitted. If the number of submissions is large, I will form sub-committees with at least three persons. I convene and charge the committee; we go through procedures… what they should look at and so forth.
In addition to assigning the committees, she believed that it was her responsibility “to monitor the process to make sure that the guidelines are followed.” Ingals seeks to contact the appropriate person or persons if a problem in which additional clarification and interpretation of guidelines is needed. According to Dr. Ingals, she sees the department head as the person to “provide departmental resources by way of duplicating material and notebooks.” She “tries to do everything to make the process easier” because she understands the “process can be intimidating and stressful.”

Dr. Ingals believed the department head should be “compassionate and empathetic” to the many demands placed on the junior faculty during the promotion and tenure process. Although the junior faculty may apply for promotion and tenure, “you must keep in mind that the candidate still has to carry on with other duties such as teaching and the numerous committee [departmental and university wide] assignments.” She notes that the candidate’s application must be accompanied by a letter of support from the department head. Ingals also indicated “the department head must always be prepared in the event of an appeal by a candidate” who does not receive a favorable vote for promotion and tenure.

Although the promotion and tenure evaluation is standardized and accompanied with specific guidelines, Dr. Ingals believed there should be alternative means to evaluate junior faculty. She related, there “should be some way to avoid duplication and/or replication of items required to complete the tedious process of promotion and tenure.” Ingals made the following comment related to condensing the process and using other alternative instruments to simplify the promotion and tenure process:

If there were a better way of actually using the annual evaluations, it would save a lot of time and energy. I find some of the process repetitive; I think it may be
shortened. If there were some way to use the annual evaluation as a plug-in, it would certainly help.

It is Dr. Ingals’ belief that the annual evaluations serve as a “measuring stick” for junior faculty. In addition, she believed evaluations needed to be performed on a “frequent basis” to show more “continuity and commitment to the profession.”

Additionally, Dr. Ingals made mention of the “pre-tenure, tenure, and post tenure process” that seems to elevate frustration for candidates. She asserted that many feel that junior faculty share the sentiment that they were “over evaluated.” Therefore, it was her opinion that “an interview is added to the process.” Ingals added:

It could be at the school level or the institutional level. I think it would really help the individual to see first hand and do follow-ups. If there is something not clear in the application process, that person can provide clarification in the interview.

Although the process is deemed lengthy and frustrating to many, she believed that an interview could “clear the air” and “relieve a lot of the frustration for the junior faculty and those who evaluate the candidates.”

Dr. Ingals remains very adamant about details pertaining to key elements of the evaluation process. During her experience and tenure as a department head, she noted that “scholarship” (referred to as professional development at W.E.B. DuBois University) presented the “greatest challenge to junior faculty” in her department.

Dr. Ingals made several observations related to professional development. She shared, “recent graduates are more likely to deal with research better than those who have been in the department for 10 or 15 years.” She believed this to be true because recent graduates were still in the “scholarship mode” as recent graduates, and they tend to devote “the needed efforts to this area.” She further noted the following differences between junior and senior faculty:
And, so it’s not very difficult for them to slip right easily into that and turn out an article or two and do presentations and all. Others, who have been here 10 or 15 years, find it a bit more challenging to get the time to do it.

There continues to be a distinct delineation regarding recent graduates and “the seasoned professional” as it relates to publications. Although this distinction existed “all junior faculty will be measured by the same measuring tool,” according to Ingals. Ingals continued to stress the need to publish in “refereed journals” because they are “based upon scrutiny from an editorial board to judge the quality of the paper/manuscript.” Publication in refereed journals is certainly an indication of “high quality work,” Ingals stressed.

Ingals was open to using other variables to measure professional development. In her summation, securing outside resources for the department and university is considered as “a critically important” means of advancing the promotion and tenure dossiers of junior faculty. Moreover, Ingals was resolute in pointing out that the vast and drastic budgetary constraints continue to make it “necessary to seek outside monies in order to remain competitive and afloat” at W.E.B. DuBois University. Ingals indicated there should also be “a reward system for junior faculty” that secured external grants and sponsorships. Her contention was supported by this insight:

Grant writing is another area to be looked at very carefully. If only we can find a way to reward our faculty who do pursue grants. That hasn’t happened. I would like to see it [happen].

Concerning service, Dr. Ingals encourages junior faculty “to render service which helps with their [junior faculty] evaluations.” She points to the fact “that it looks good on resumes.” Ingals makes every attempt to find opportunities, on and off campus, for the faculty members to become “good citizens for humanity.” She asserts:
It is the department head’s responsibility to know the strengths and weaknesses of junior faculty in order to make recommendations for them to serve on respective committees (ad hoc, departmental, institutional and community based). Of course, this all require the department head to be actively engaged in community service to provide avenues for others [junior faculty].

Ingals was very critical of community service and said, “we [staff members] should serve as models for the students we serve to exemplify that they owe something to the community.” Dr. Ingals believed service was a “very subjective area that includes improving our public education system.” Faculty are encouraged to go to “public schools, support agencies, or even extended day programs,” and the quality of public service according to Ingals should be measured accordingly:

Quality, I believe is how much can we move or how much can we improve [our communities] by giving our expertise in an area. This includes and is not limited to working at the local Boys and Girls Club or perhaps working at an adult literacy center. These are places that you can see a real impact in terms of improving the quality of life in the community that goes beyond the campus.

Dr. Ingals sets high standards in the area of teaching which carries the most weight (70%) for the promotion and tenure process at W.E.B. DuBois University. She asserted, “peer reviews” serve as an instrument for “gauging a faculty member’s effectiveness.” She is also cognizant of the fact that peer reviews “may present a degree of apprehension.” Many would prefer the department head being the sole evaluator of their performance.

Ingals believes that creativity with committees serve as an instrument to increase “efficiency and effectiveness.” She explained her point-of-view further:

One thing we do in this department, especially as it relates to core courses, we have a Freshman English Committee. We also have a Curriculum Committee that looks at sophomore level courses and beyond.
In addition, “we look at course outlines and instructions.” This practice is accompanied by “common essay examinations and assessment of certain courses.” Based on feedback and objectivity, “an outcome assessment” is performed to provide the necessary “corrective actions” for junior faculty who need assistance. Ingals believed that these were necessary measures to “ensure quality teaching.”

Other means of assisting junior faculty with their teaching is to provide “a means for junior faculty to attend certain meetings on the state, regional, and national levels.” Attending these types of meetings, according to Ingals, provides an opportunity to “collaborate and share ideas” with fellow colleagues from across the country.

*Supervision and Guidance for Junior Faculty and the Promotion and Tenure Process*

Dr. Ingals shared several perspectives related to department heads and their responsibility to junior faculty and the promotion and tenure process. Ingals considered it her responsibility to serve as “a mentor and support person.” Serving as a mentor involves establishing a positive rapport to establish a “great degree of trust.” She also contends that it is her responsibility to “initiate and orient the individuals [junior faculty] upon arrival to the department.” Orientation involves providing adequate space for necessary and relevant documents. Ingals added:

> We are in the process of setting up a file in our office so that when the faculty member runs out of space he (she) has a space to place his or her work [dossiers] when they need to find it. When they are ready to submit, they will have little difficulty submitting items.

In addition, the department chair “should involve them [junior faculty] in activities and opportunities that will help them to get to the point of being ready for pre-tenure.”
The Work of the Department Head and the Promotion and Tenure of Junior Faculty

According to Dr. Ingals, it is important to provide equal opportunities on the Departmental Committee for all faculty to “feel a balance” with the overall promotion and tenure process. She emphasized that the eligibility criteria and stated that there was somewhat of a “rotational duty roster to assure an equity distribution among tenured faculty.”

As far as enhancing the potential of junior faculty members, Dr. Ingals stated the following:

Well, I believe the unit head looks at the skills, the expertise, and experiences of that junior faculty member. I look for certain kind of skills and look for opportunities to get that person started early on. I think it is a matter of mentoring and giving the individual some directions.

Dr. Ingals takes a more objective approach using the business concept of SWOT (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats). She sees the need to do a “thorough assessment” to ascertain the area that junior faculty can be the most effective.

Dr. Ingals also contends that the promotion and tenure process is too lengthy, and department heads should attempt to provide “recommendations to deal with this matter.” She has her own perspective on the means to eradicate the “long and cumbersome” process. She indicated:

The process could be simplified even more. I think we do too much paperwork. If only we could get this thing down to a single page. We do annual evaluations anyway. Right now, the pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure processes seem to be more of a chore or task that is dreaded. For the junior faculty member, it’s like a root canal.

The trend in higher education seems to be a “paperless society.” The need to become more technological advanced may serve to “use other means to get the same end result with less chaos.”
Dr. Ingals asserts “release time” should be granted to encourage and afford junior faculty the opportunity to “publish in refereed journals.” She favors re-implementation of a release time policy on a “rotational basis among faculty each semester.” She attributes the lack of policy implementation to “budget constraints.”

Case Summary

An examination of Dr. Ingals’ perspectives suggests that the department head should “coach” the junior faculty through the promotion and tenure process. Coaching includes but should not be limited to inventory controls and assuring that the department is remaining abreast with the new technological advancements. Dr. Ingals also places a great deal of emphasis on student learning outcomes and contends that this is paramount when evaluating junior faculty through the promotion and tenure process. However, Dr. Ingals believes that the department head should serve as a “mentor and a support person.” This would constitute providing release time on a rotational basis to assist junior faculty in their professional development efforts.

Although Ingals’ perspectives were positive, she contends that department heads should remain “empathetic to the many demands” placed on junior faculty. She also expressed the need “to simplify the overall process” and to use the annual evaluations as a tool of measurement. This would allow for a greater degree of continuity over a sustained period. She contends that the current process makes many junior faculty feel overwhelmed and “over evaluated.”

Dr. Ingals believes the department heads should use a SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threat) approach while working with junior faculty. She
indicated that this "comprehensive approach" would allow for "constant, constructive, and realistic feedback" to the junior faculty.

Case 3

_Dr. Martin Creighton, Chemistry Department Head_

Dr. Creighton has been in education for 10 years. He received the undergraduate degree, Bachelor of Science Degree, in chemistry, from Eastern Michigan University. Dr. Creighton earned his doctorate in physical organic chemistry from Wayne State University. Before entering the field of education, he worked with Dupont and retired from Johnson and Johnson. Dr. Creighton became the Chemistry Department Head at W.E.B. DuBois University in 1995.

After attending Wayne State University, Dr. Creighton held a teaching assistantship followed by a research assistantship. The teaching assistantship lasted for a period of four years, and the research assistantship lasted for one year. During the teaching assistantship, he taught undergraduate chemistry courses to approximately 300 students in a lecture session. His other responsibilities required supervising the lab for three hours a day and conducting "help sessions." This was designed for students who required additional instruction related to homework assignments.

After graduating with a PhD from Wayne State University, Dr. Creighton joined Corporate America where he worked for DuPont in Wilmington, Delaware. After working at DuPont for almost four years, Dr. Creighton took a job with Johnson & Johnson. He eventually took an early retirement package that was offered to employees 55 and over.

Upon his retirement from Johnson & Johnson, Dr. Creighton had an interest in "educating the young minds of America." While on vacation, he learned of a position announcement for the Head of the Chemistry Department at W.E.B. DuBois University. Dr.
Creighton attributed his selection to "his teaching experience and managerial experience." He recalls the position being synonymous with working as a group leader in a leading industry. Dr. Creighton expressed the need to understand the system while having a high degree of responsibility for budgets and personnel. Dr. Creighton has served as the Chemistry Department Head since September 1995.

Table 4.8 represents those full-time teaching faculty within the Chemistry Department at W.E.B. DuBois University designated by specific ranks (i.e., assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors). There are no part-time faculty in the Chemistry Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Full Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.8 Faculty Status by Rank*

Table 4.9 represents those full-time teaching faculty within the Chemistry Department at W.E.B. DuBois University designated by tenure status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Not-Tenured/ On Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.9 Faculty by Tenure Status*

*Elements of an Effective and Efficient Promotion and Tenure Process*

All faculty members in the Chemistry Department have a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and several years of experience. Dr. Creighton shared that the educational background and expertise of his junior faculty members makes his role as department chair "less strenuous." Each year, he deems it necessary to meet with all faculty
members and assess "what I believe are their strengths and weaknesses." Dr. Creighton further explained, "he informs them [junior faculty] of the rules and what things are required and expected within the department."

Dr. Creighton stressed that his philosophy is "not to rule with an iron fist." He places great value on department meetings that he has regularly with his staff to discuss any "issues of pertinence" that have a direct or indirect effect on the department as a whole. However, Dr. Creighton stressed the following regarding the need to meet with individuals on a personal basis:

I don't wait until departmental meetings to tell a person something. I will go down and speak with the person and let him or her know immediately how I feel about something and what is necessary. I manage on a one-on-one basis more so than group management.

It is evident that Dr. Creighton values departmental meetings along with one-on-one sessions with the faculty. Dr. Creighton indicated that both [department and individual meetings] were "necessary to effectively meet the needs of the department as a whole and individually."

Dr. Creighton had some interesting thoughts regarding the student evaluations of faculty members. His contention was that the student evaluations "were too heavily weighed." He gave the following explanation:

I do understand that student evaluation is necessary but it should be between the professor and the department chair or someone such that student evaluations will tell how you can improve and not used as a vendetta against the faculty member by the student.

Although he acknowledges the need for student evaluations, Dr. Creighton was concerned that student evaluations were, for the most part, "counter-productive." Dr.
Creighton believed that student evaluations should be “used to serve as a means of gaining insight for areas of needed improvement instead of retaliation purposes.”

Dr. Creighton shared that many of his professors were at a disadvantage “because of the mere difficulty of the subject matter they teach.” He has identified “a positive correlation between ‘hard professors’ and ‘low ratings.’ Dr. Creighton shared the following assessment of this situation like this:

And students have the tendency to know that if you are a hard professor, they will give you a low rating because they don’t want to study. I think that’s the one thing I will consider to throw out.

Creighton asserted, “student learning outcomes should not be considered when students evaluate their professors.” On a personal note, Dr. Creighton shared he received low ratings from students because “I am considered a difficult teacher who holds my students to higher standards.” Additionally, he asserted that he “would have administrators come in and sit in on the lectures of junior faculty.”

With regard to the evaluation of junior faculty for promotion and tenure, Dr. Creighton spoke about the disadvantage junior faculty were at when it came to research. He shared, “it is very difficult to conduct because of the enormous workload—12 hours plus of teaching.” Creighton encouraged “original work” but understood “many of the professors here [W.E.B. DuBois University] do not have the time because they teach up to 12 hours of credit.” Dr. Creighton explained further:

Twelve hours plus of teaching is equivalent to more than 12 hours of contact. That probably ends up to more than 16 to 20 contact hours. We are not given credit for the three-hour lab that is attached to the course. We are given partial credit because a four-hour course requires a three hour elective and a three hour lab. So, we have at least six contact hours for a four-hour course.
Creighton asserts that these factors [direct contact hours] are not taken into consideration for certain courses in the Science curriculum. Additionally, he qualified, "lab preparation is more extensive than classroom preparation." Although the time constraints are evident, Dr. Creighton tries to encourage his junior faculty to "perform quality research in journals frequently read by their peers."

As far as teaching, Creighton indicated junior faculty should "follow a certain pattern." This requires presenting materials to students in a very "clear manner" that requires "higher standards for the students." He believes that his department requires higher standards than any other department that would require junior faculty to "hold high standards." Dr. Creighton acknowledged, "many of our students have not been adequately prepared in the sciences and mathematics at the high school level;" therefore, "the passing rate for students is not as great as it may be at other universities." Dr. Creighton elaborated:

The success rate is not as great [in chemistry courses] as it might be in other courses. If 60%-65% of the students get through the first time, then that's a good success rate, compared to other colleges and universities. But that still is not enough for the administration. They would like to see all students passing.

Dr. Creighton spoke about the challenge for junior faculty to "raise the bar" when students seem to be "ill-equipped or ill-prepared." Compounding the time factor even more, Dr. Creighton explained there was a need for junior faculty to hold office hours... to provide advanced tutoring beyond the instruction in the classroom."

Working with students goes beyond the "nuts and bolts" of teaching. Dr. Creighton believed the "upper level or advanced courses" serve as an excellent "tool" to measure the progress of a student, to gauge the work junior faculty do to encourage
students to develop good study habits, and to avoid last minute preparation that leads to
“poor performances.” Dr. Creighton explained this point of view further:

Junior faculty should be able to see in the advanced courses that this student has
learned. Too often our students wait until the last minute and cram for an
examination. Therefore, the next semester, they do not have a good
understanding of information. A quality teacher will encourage students to start
studying daily or at least every other day so they will not have to cram.

Dr. Creighton acknowledged it was the responsibility of “junior faculty to make sure that
students are keeping up, and they are not waiting until the last minute” with their studies.
Creighton contends, “information learned at the last minute” has the tendency to be lost
in a week. Dr. Creighton places emphasis on measuring “quality teaching” by the
performance of students in the higher level or advanced courses. Additionally, the
measure of performance is critical when certain governing bodies review the overall
content of a particular area or discipline. There are numerous accrediting organizations
that will “cite a department for deficiencies related to student learning outcomes and
other performance instruments,” and Creighton stressed, “all faculty, including junior
faculty, must pitch in” to ensure the department “looks good.”

Dr. Creighton placed an equal emphasis on the service component of the promotion and
tenure process. He claims “service consists of serving the community.” This can be obtained by
serving on various committees and doing “extracurricular things for the university.” However,
Dr. Creighton considers “servicing the community” with just as much importance as serving the
university. He contends:

In terms of service, I think one should work. Also, servicing the community and
helping others are important. For a long time, I did tutorial service through the
church and found many of the students were not getting the basics or didn’t have
the basics in mathematics and science. So, therefore, I had to adjust the
curriculum somewhat.
Creighton has found that service, on the campus and off the campus, can provide some rather “rewarding experiences.” Dr. Creighton’s philosophy is, “it is our obligation to leave our communities in a better position than we found them.”

Supervision and Guidance for Junior Faculty and the Promotion and Tenure Process

Dr. Creighton indicated that his responsibility to junior faculty was to “encourage and help them, and suggest to them things to do.” He advises junior faculty “to go to the committee, write proposals, and apply for a summer program of enrichment.” Dr. Creighton looks for, “a willingness to do it or work toward it, whether you get it done or not.” Moreover, Dr. Creighton shared:

My programs operate by themselves, folks just do it. I don’t believe in micro management. I help them to do whatever they want to do. My responsibility is to push them to do, show them what is expected of them, and provide opportunities for them.

Dr. Creighton’s style of management appears to work for the small department in which he is the department chair, and believes that the department head serves as a “motivator” for junior faculty to “go beyond the call of duty.”

According to Dr. Creighton, the department head should serve as a “mentor” for junior faculty, and encourage “faculty” to seek a mentor. Creighton believed that mentors for junior faculty should “not [be] affiliated with the department.” He shared that every junior faculty member should have at least “two mentors that will allow opportunities for junior faculty to get another perspective on issues that are relevant and pertinent to the profession.” Dr. Creighton shared:

A mentor serves to help junior faculty members gain an understanding of proper protocol. He is also instrumental in assisting the junior faculty in meeting their needs and goals. Too many junior faculty do not understand the ropes or have a clue to the organization and key players within the department and university as a whole.
Dr. Creighton believes that mentoring is the “cornerstone” for the “success or failure of a junior faculty member.” Those who have good mentors tend to excel and move up the corporate ladder. However, Dr. Creighton warned, “mediocre mentors tend to produce ‘average’ or ‘sub-average’ results from those [junior faculty members] they mentor.”

*The Work of the Department Head and the Promotion and Tenure of Junior Faculty*

Dr. Creighton has several perspectives related to the work of the department head to promote junior faculty during the promotion and tenure process. As with Dr. O’Neil and Dr. Ingals, Creighton believed the promotion and tenure process has to become more “realistic” in terms of available research opportunities for junior faculty. He proposed the following:

I would like to see a policy where a faculty member can teach one class during a given semester and be permitted to do research. Also, this would shift or rotate from faculty to faculty each semester. We would have to double up on classes in order to give release time. In reality, it is not release time, it is reassignment time. When someone says release time, they [faculty] think they don’t have to do anything.

It appears that “release time” would afford junior faculty the opportunity to excel with the professional development component needed to be prepared to “go up” for promotion and tenure according to Creighton.

Creighton sees it as his responsibility to encourage “administrators to come in and sit in on the lectures of junior faculty because “this would reduce the ambiguity that may arise if a junior faculty is rated unfairly by their department head.” Dr. Creighton shared:

I go in and sit in on the faculty members lectures periodically or peep my head in a couple of minutes to get the gist of how they are performing. This is done impromptu and I have indicated to them [junior faculty] that I have the liberty to come into the class and just observe at any time.

Creighton explained it is “necessary to make periodical visits instead of scheduled visits” because junior faculty will put forth “their best foot” and have a “prepared text” if visits are scheduled with prior notification. Dr. Creighton believed, “impromptu visits tend to keep them
[junior faculty] abreast of the syllabus and well prepared on a daily basis.” Dr. Creighton shared that he “stands outside the door without them knowing and listens and comes in just to see what’s going on.” Dr. Creighton suggested that practice gives him an opportunity “to make notes and make suggestions of different or alternative methods for presenting course materials.” Creighton remained adamant, “recommendations or corrective action should take place in a one-on-one setting.”

Case Summary

Dr. Creighton, as a department head, believes that an annual meeting with junior faculty members is necessary to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses. He maintains that meeting with junior faculty in this manner, provides the opportunity to express his “requirements and expectations.” Moreover, this practice can assist in avoiding any unexpected outcomes when it comes to evaluations for promotion and tenure. He qualified that he meets with junior faculty if there are “critical issues” that needs to be address immediately. In summary, Dr. Creighton believes that both departmental and individual meetings are necessary to meet the needs of the overall department and the needs of junior faculty members.

Creighton asserted that student evaluations do not serve the purpose in which they were designed. As a matter of fact, Dr. Creighton suggested that the student evaluations may be “counter productive” because “tougher teachers” tend to receive unfavorable reviews, whereas the “easier teachers” tend to receive more favorable reviews. The student evaluations, Creighton stated, “do not fit the purpose with which they were designed.”

Dr. Creighton has high expectations for his junior faculty and he expects for junior faculty to set high standards for their students. Dr. Creighton uses this as a measure to evaluate
junior faculty in the teaching area suggesting that it is the responsibility of junior faculty to assure that the learning objectives are met and extended.

Dr. Creighton believes that there is an obligation for department heads to serve as a "motivator" encouraging superior performance. He recommends that the mentoring process serve as a viable tool for junior faculty. Dr. Creighton also suggests junior faculty members to seek a mentor not affiliated with the department to gain alternative perspectives and "outlooks on issues that pertain to the department." From his viewpoint, mentoring is the "cornerstone" that determines the destiny of many junior faculty members.

Cross-Case Analysis

The following is an integrated account of interviews with the three department heads. The cross case analysis is critically important because "qualitative data analysis is primarily an inductive process of organizing the data into categories and identifying patterns (relationships) among the categories" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, p. 461). Bogden and Biklen (1982) further elaborated that cross case analysis is "the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and other materials that you accumulate to increase your own understanding of them and enable you to present what you have discovered to others" (p. 145). The patterns that emerged were extrapolated from the data collected with the study participants.

Findings across the participants emerged in three broad areas. The broad areas included:

1. Elements of an effective and efficient promotion and tenure process.

2. Supervision and guidance for junior faculty and the promotion and tenure process.

3. The work of the department head and the promotion and tenure of junior faculty.
Regarding the elements of an effective and efficient promotion and tenure process, the participants had much to say. Table 4.10 highlights the major findings of what was meant by the elements of an effective and efficient promotion and tenure process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Head</th>
<th>Process Factors Related to Efficient and Effective Promotion and Tenure Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nate O’Neil</td>
<td>• Superior teaching, outstanding service, and professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commitment to a teaching and learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thorough knowledge of subject area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Punctuality and preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective communication across disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Service to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality of course instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discretion and lenience to the research component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Carol Ingals</td>
<td>• Inventory controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintaining a competitive edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commitment to teaching, scholarship, and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formation of sub-committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adequate departmental resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technological advancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compassion and empathy to junior faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid duplication and replication of items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outcome assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attendance at local, state and national conferences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department Head | Process Factors Related to Efficient and Effective Promotion and Tenure Process
---|---
Dr. Martin Creighton | • Effective meetings  
• Elimination of student evaluations  
• Student learning outcomes  
• Original work  
• Lab preparation  
• Raising the expectations of students  
• Critical review of advanced courses  
• Quality teaching, research, and service

**Table 4.10** Elements of Effective and Efficient Promotion and Tenure Process

The participants of the study held a wide range of responses related to the promotion and tenure process. All participants acknowledged that one of the key elements in accordance to the Promotion and Tenure Policies was exceptional performance in the three critical areas to include teaching, professional development, and service. Student satisfaction and student learning outcomes were two critical areas that department heads considered when evaluating junior faculty. This was recommended through means of reviewing course contents, holding students accountable by raising expectations, proper preparation for classroom instruction, discussing clear expectations and maintaining open and effective lines of communication with junior faculty.

Regarding supervision and guidance for junior faculty and the promotion and tenure process, the participants had similar point-of-views. Table 4.11 highlights the major findings of what the participants perceived as means of providing supervision and guidance to junior faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Factors Related to Supervision and Guidance of Junior Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dr. Nate O’Neil | • Work to his or her potential  
• Understanding of different teaching styles |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Factors Related to Supervision and Guidance of Junior Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martin Creighton</td>
<td>• Resource allocation and technological support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relating effectively with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote and encourage successful outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain growth and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Source of encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Motivator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outside mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding of protocol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.11  Supervision and Guidance for Junior Faculty*

The supervision and guidance that department heads provided to junior faculty was deemed critical to their success. Mentoring and providing a support base was viewed as instrumental in assisting junior faculty with attaining promotion and tenure. Mentoring included but was not limited to: 1) preparing for pre-tenure, 2) providing encouragement, 3) orienting members to the department, and 4) assuring the proper resources and technological support are provided. One participant suggested junior faculty seek a person outside of the department to serve as a mentor. Another professor suggested the department heads establish trusting relationship for mentoring to be effective. Moreover, all participants believed it was their responsibility to perform the necessary duties for the well being and professional growth of the junior faculty.

The participants had some suggestions regarding the work of the department head and the promotion and tenure of junior faculty. Table 4.12 highlights the major findings of what department heads considered important in their work assisting junior faculty through the promotion and tenure process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Work of Department Heads Regarding Promotion and Tenure of Junior Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nate O’Neil</td>
<td>• Extends beyond the promotion and tenure policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insist on uniformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure fair and just process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoidance of discrepancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Objectivity regarding departmental committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sensitivity to faculty workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide means to improve in professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide release time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor and adjust faculty schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Role delineation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Carol Ingals</td>
<td>• Develop a balance amongst numerous responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide equal opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rotational basis for release time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equitable distribution of duties and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SWOT analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thorough assessment of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommendations to shorten and simplify the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technological advancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy for release time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martin Creighton</td>
<td>• Policy for release time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More realistic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impromptu visits to classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Immediate feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend alternative methods of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Corrective action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.12* The Work of the Department Head and the Promotion and Tenure Process

The findings suggest that the work of the department head towards junior faculty requires a degree of understanding and creativity to assist them [junior faculty] through the promotion and tenure process. Due to budgetary and time constraints to all junior faculty, all three of the participants suggested that there should be some form of a release policy on a rotational basis to
promote professional development (research productivity). Although the promotion and tenure policy is clearly outlined, the participants believed that there was a need to take a more realistic and open-minded approach. The findings suggested that there needs to remain a degree of uniformity and objectivity within the respective departments’ assigned task to evaluate junior faculty members. A fair and just system to avoid any preferential treatment is vital and necessary when performing annual evaluations and providing corrective action to junior faculty members.

Themes

From these broad categories, the researcher examined data from each case, and analyzed further which yielded three common themes that emerged from the data in a cross case fashion.

1. Department head must be knowledgeable of the promotion and tenure process to help junior faculty through the process.

2. Department heads have a keen responsibility toward junior faculty related to the promotion and tenure process.

3. Department heads need latitude to make adjustments based on the context of the departments in which they lead.

Theme 1: Department heads must be knowledgeable of the promotion and tenure process to help junior faculty through the process

At Historically Black Land Grant Universities such as W.E.B. DuBois University, promotion and tenure guidelines usually contain general rules and standards by which to judge faculty performance in teaching, research, and service. Based on their understanding of these rules, the promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty dossiers for promotion and tenure.

Some faculty members believe that teaching should be more highly regarded than it is presently in the faculty reward system (Diamond & Adam, 1995). The participants in this study
valued teaching more highly than research and outreach, and they cited the traditional activities contained in the literature for evaluating teaching, research, and search. The criteria for evaluating teaching cited by interviewees parallel those suggested by Centra, Froh, Gray, and Lambert (1987). These criteria were (a) good organization of subject matter and course, (b) effective communication, (c) knowledge of and enthusiasm for subject matter and teaching, (d) positive attitudes toward students, (e) fairness in examinations and grading, (f) flexibility in approaches to teaching, and (g) appropriate student learning outcomes.

Current Procedures for Evaluating Junior Faculty for Promotion and Tenure

Dr. O’Neil frequently referenced the Promotion and Tenure Policies at W.E.B. DuBois University to indicate most emphasis is placed on teaching when evaluating junior faculty. He acknowledges research but suggests, “a whole lot of weight should not be placed on this area.” Service should be judged on “the importance to the university, surrounding community, and to former graduates that need help.” According to Dr. O’Neil, advisement should be considered “a fourth criterion” in the promotion and tenure process. He looked at the advisement of students as a sub-category of teaching since the Promotion and Tenure Policies do not allow for a separate category.

Dr. Ingals expressed the viewpoint that scholarship and professional development presents a greater challenge to junior faculty than teaching. She contends that “recent graduates” tend to be more productive in this area. Dr. Ingals suggests that the new hires are “still in the scholarship mode and continue to publish articles in well known journals.” Additionally, Dr. Ingals added that the department head should be creative and take into account other areas that should be considered in one of the three broad categories (teaching, service, and research). For
example, she suggested that grant writing should be considered when evaluating faculty in the area of professional development (research at W.E.B. DuBois University).

Dr. Creighton believed the evaluation of the three categories for promotion and tenure should allow a junior faculty and the department head to identify the various strengths and weaknesses of junior faculty. He does not “rule with an iron fist” but insists that meeting regularly with staff members keeps everyone “on top of things.” He tends to manage better on a one-on-one basis versus a group management.

Measuring Professional Development (Research) Performance

Measuring research performance has traditionally been done by counting the number of articles published in prestigious journals, books authored, and conference presentations (Bukalski, 1993). According to Creswell (1986), review committees have evaluated faculty scholarship based on their “gut reactions.” Detecting quality in education is often arbitrary, subjective, and controversial especially during the promotion and tenure process.

Dr. O’Neil asserted there are numerous means to evaluate and measure research of junior faculty. He does not place evaluating and measuring productivity high on his priority list due to the limited time constraints placed on junior faculty. Although, he suggested there could be numerous means to evaluate junior faculty regarding research or professional development, Dr. O’Neil contends that other means include and are not limited to proposals and grants that “reap large sums of money to assist with the operations of the department.” Dr. O’Neil further comments, “I put research under things that prepare students for graduate school such as programs on campus that focus on examinations to Medical and Dental schools.”

In regard to research, Dr. Ingals believed, “the scholarship and development area is probably the most challenging.” She has the same perspective as Dr. O’Neil related to time
constraints. She also believes that writing grants is a viable aspect to look at when assessing professional development. Dr. O’Neil recommended there should be some degree of award to junior faculty that obtains grant money for the department and the university. Dr. Ingals suggested that junior faculty should receive valuable credit for any work they have “edited” since it may not be realistic to actually publish an article or write a book.

Dr. Creighton agreed with the other two department heads indicating that research is “very difficulty to conduct because of the enormous workloads—12 hours plus of teaching.” He asserted, “You should do original research, but I don’t believe many of the professors here have the time. It is required, but I don’t know where they are going to get the time.” Dr. Creighton maintained the hours of teaching are “not equivalent to the total number of contact hours which takes into account laboratory preparation and tutorial services on an as needs basis.”

Measuring Service Performance

According to Bukalski (1993), service is often seen as a cruel trap and, for non-tenured faculty, should be virtually avoided because promotion and tenure committees will often disregard service accomplishments. However, at W.E.B. DuBois University, service accomplishments are highly recognized and valued. This may be attributed, perhaps, to the land grant tradition and the institution’s unique mission.

Dr. O’Neil contends that measuring service should look at the “overall involvement” of junior faculty. This includes and is not limited to serving on committees and working with various student activities. When these services are identified, Dr. O’Neil suggested that the services are rated on a scale from 1–10. Dr. O’Neil contends that junior faculty should not be penalized if funds and time constraints prevent them from providing service to the university and local community.
Dr. Ingals attempts to provide opportunities for her junior faculty to get involved with service opportunities. Along with Dr. O’Neil, Dr. Ingals contends service should be “evaluated based upon serving on committees.” Dr. Ingals believed junior faculty need a model “in which they should follow when they are actively involved with servicing our communities.” Although O’Neil believes measuring service is very subjective, junior faculty should set aside the necessary time to make “invaluable contributions.”

Dr. Creighton suggested that service consists of “serving the university” which is inclusive of being on certain committees and doing extra-curricular activities for the university. He also believes junior faculty should make “a vigilant effort to service the community through tutorial services and just lending a helping hand to someone in need.” Through his tutorial service at the local church he attends, Creighton has learned that many of these students were not getting the basic and fundamental aspects of mathematics and science. Therefore, he was able to develop an “action plan” to combat the shortcomings, and he has provided “open invitations” to junior faculty in his department.

Theme 2: *Department heads have a keen responsibility toward junior faculty related to the promotion and tenure process*

Based on the perspectives of the participants, perceived responsibilities of department heads toward junior faculty and the promotion and tenure process can be grouped into three categories: (a) communication, (b) professional development, and (c) mentoring and support.

**Mentoring and Supporting Junior Faculty**

Dr. O’Neil desires to have his junior faculty members work to his or her potential. He acknowledged this requires him to be “accepting [of the] differences and teaching styles in order to remain objective” to each junior faculty. As a department head, Dr. O’Neil believes it is his
“responsibility” to see that junior faculty are “growing and continuing to improve.” Growth and
development includes “maintaining the proper and necessary tools” needed to be successful
through “the promotion and tenure process and in the classroom.” He suggests that he should be
evaluated based upon the number of junior faculty members he promotes and mentors through
the promotion and tenure process.

Dr. Ingals believed her responsibility to junior faculty in the promotion and tenure
process was to serve as a” mentor and support person,” initiate and orient the individual when he
or she first joins the department,” and “to involve them in activities and opportunities” that will
help them to get to the point of being ready for the pre-tenure review. Dr. Ingals stated:

We are in the process of setting up a file in our office so that when the faculty
member runs out of space he (she) has a space to place his or her work when they
need to find it. When they are ready to submit, they will have little difficulty
finding and submitting items.

Dr. Creighton indicated that his responsibility to junior faculty was to “encourage and
help them and to suggest to them things to do.” He strives to “advise them (junior faculty) to go
to the committee, write the proposal, and apply to a summer program.” There should be a
“willingness to do it or work toward it, whether you get it done or not.” Creighton further
asserted:

My programs operate by themselves, folks just do it. I don’t believe in micro
management. I help them to do whatever they want to do. My responsibility is to
push them to do, show them what is expected of them, and provide opportunities
for them.
Penner (2001) explored the concept and practice of mentoring in higher education. He
described senior and junior faculty relationships. These relationships can be one-to-one or even
a team identified to work with one new faculty member. Mentoring settings may also be a group
of departmental faculty meeting together for the express purposes of networking and professional
development. Drs. Ingals and Creighton viewed mentoring as the most effective means for
enhancing the potential of junior faculty members. Dr. O’Neil viewed involvement in as many things as possible in the department (e.g., advisement, development of instructional materials). He stated:

In so many words, just keep them busy, involved in many things so they know about the department, handling students, and the university administration and how the administration operates. This involvement speeds up the adaptation process and reduces the likelihood of frustration and failure.

When asked why this was not occurring at W.E.B. DuBois University, interviewees cited paperwork requirements for the promotion and tenure process, lack of time, teaching loads, and large classes, along with publication and service expectations.

Theme 3: Department heads need latitude to make adjustments based on the context of the departments in which they lead

Based on the perspectives of the participants, the work of the department heads extends past the Promotion and Tenure Policies. Due to budgetary and time constraints, the department head is faced with the challenge of becoming creative and intuitive to meet the overall needs of the department and the junior faculty.

Recommendations for a Release Time Policy

When asked about policy recommendations regarding release time for research, Dr. O’Neil favored load reduction for one faculty member, on a rotational basis, each semester. Dr. Creighton expressed similar sentiments; he stated:

I would like to see a policy where a faculty member can teach one class during a given semester and be permitted to do research. And this would shift from faculty to faculty each semester. And we would really have to double up on classes to give release time. It is not really ‘release’ time; it is a reassignment or reallocation of time.

Dr. O’Neil would like to see external funds allocated during the release time to compensate those individuals that teach the course loads. He acknowledged there was a policy
of that nature providing a rotation of faculty members. However, that policy has been restricted due to budgetary constraints and cutbacks.

Dr. Ingals had a similar point-of-view as her other two colleagues regarding a release time policy for junior faculty. She suggested that the department heads should have a "compassionate and understanding heart" regarding the excessive course load junior faculty are required to teach every semester. Additionally, Dr. Ingals tried to be protective regarding the various committees in which junior faculty are asked to serve. She contends, "these factors must be considered and amendments should be made to provide opportunities for junior faculty to publish articles in referred journals" instead of placing an inordinate amount of service obligations on junior faculty.

Promotion and Tenure Policies at W.E.B. DuBois University

All three department heads had their personal perspectives regarding the promotion and tenure policy at W.E.B. DuBois University. Although written guidelines for the promotion and tenure process are published, department heads feel that there are areas of needed improvement with the promotion and tenure policy. Dr. O'Neil acknowledges that teaching constitutes the largest component amongst the three critical areas of the promotion and tenure process. However, Dr. O'Neil contends that there needs to be an additional criteria or a fourth category that constitutes the promotion and tenure evaluation process.

Dr. O'Neil suggests that an "adviseemnt category would add a more comprehensive approach to the overall process." O'Neil suggested to junior faculty to "take adviseemnt very serious because it makes a difference in the success rate of students." The factors that he contends are relevant to adviseemnt include but are not limited to the following: (1) quality of contact with students, (2) frequency of contact with students, and (3) student learning outcomes
of students. O’Neil further asserts that junior faculty members should encourage students to participate in extracurricular activities and to pursue graduate school to enhance students’ skills and knowledge to “become productive citizens in today’s work society.” O’Neil believes “student satisfaction” is a critical aspect “when he evaluates junior faculty in the area of teaching.” After all, O’Neil contends, “we are in the business to serve our student body and make sure that our students become successful.”

Dr. Ingals attempts to follow the Promotion and Tenure Policies, but she contends the process is “too tedious” and it “needs to refrain from duplication and/or replication.” Dr. Ingals believed that junior faculty members are being “over evaluated.” However, like Dr. O’Neil, she also believed that there should be alternative means to evaluate junior faculty. Ingals suggested, “annual evaluations could be used to supplement the promotion and tenure process.” She contends that the annual evaluations would simplify the process and save a lot of time and energy for the department head and the junior faculty member. Additionally, Dr. Ingals asserted that an “interview would be beneficial to the process.” In her opinion, the “interview would serves as an avenue for gaining further insight for the junior faculty applying for promotion and tenure.”

Dr. Creighton uses departmental meetings and one-on-one meetings to provide insight and guidance on the promotion and tenure process for junior faculty. Unlike his other two colleagues, Dr. Creighton had a recommendation to remove a sub-category from one of the three primary areas. He has much disdain about the “student evaluations that fall under the teaching component.” In his opinion, student evaluations should be removed as a part of the teaching area. Dr. Creighton tends to believe that the student evaluations are “counter-productive and serves as a mechanism for students to retaliate against their professors.” He noted that those in
the “hierarchy of the process need to gain better insight of the junior faculty in order to make a fair and just evaluation that is representative of the work of the junior faculty.”

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the data collected from participants’ interviews. The constant-comparative method was used to further delineate themes and categories from the data. Two classification systems described by McMillian and Schumacher (2001)—interview questions and themes or categories—were used to analyze and to organize the data.

A cross case analysis of the data was performed to further delineate the findings. Upon the analysis of the data, broad categories emerged in the data that assisted the researcher in organizing the data and providing guidance for further analysis. Based on the broad categories, the data were refined until individual perspectives were delineated and clarified. These refined perspectives were used to provide common themes that were analyzed to answer the primary research questions established as the framework of this study. The themes included: 1) Department heads must be knowledgeable of the promotion and tenure process to help junior faculty through the process, 2) Department heads have a keen responsibility toward junior faculty related to the promotion and tenure process, and 3) Department heads need latitude to make adjustments based on the context of the departments they lead.

Chapter 5 presents further discussion, implications, and recommendations.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the perspectives of department heads who worked with junior faculty during the promotion and tenure process at a Historically Black Land-Grant University (HBLGU). Specific research questions addressed were:

1. How did college department heads at a HBLGU perceive supervision for junior faculty regarding the promotion and tenure process?
2. What are the key elements to an effective and efficient promotion and tenure system at a HBLGU?
3. What does the department head do to promote the key elements related to promotion and tenure?

This chapter presents a summary of the study and the major findings. This chapter concludes by presenting the implications and recommendations for further research.

Discussion

The purpose of this section is to discuss the major findings in the larger context of the literature reported in Chapter 2. The reader is reminded that this was a case study, and the findings are situated in the context of one university and within the departments in which the participants worked. Thus, generalizability is not appropriate, and to wit, the reader is cautioned not to make broad assumptions to be applied across populations other than those studied—three department heads in one Historically Black Land-Grant
University. The themes that emerged are discussed in relation to the findings and the literature in Chapter 2.

Theme 1: Department heads must be knowledgeable of the promotion and tenure process to help junior faculty through the process.

Theme 2: Department heads have a keen responsibility toward junior faculty related to the promotion and tenure process.

Theme 3: Department heads need latitude to make adjustments based on the context of the departments in which they lead.

Theme 1: Department heads must be knowledgeable of the promotion and tenure process to help junior faculty through the process

According to Miles (1998), many untenured junior faculty have consistently raised concerns about the promotion and tenure process at their respective institutions. Promotion and tenure guidelines at W.E.B. DuBois University, contain general rules and standards by which to judge junior faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. All three of the participants in this study reported that for department heads to assist junior faculty through the promotion and tenure process, a fundamental working knowledge and mastery of managerial skill were prerequisites. All of the participants of this study referenced the promotion and tenure policy to provide guidance of junior faculty through the process.

While all interviewees acknowledged the importance and value of the promotion and tenure process, their perceptions regarding supervision and guidance for junior faculty were mixed. Mentoring was consistently mentioned by all participants as a viable mechanism to
facilitate the promotion and tenure process. One interviewee believed that making the
application, guidelines, and procedures available to junior faculty was sufficient.

All three of the participants agreed that the department head must possess and understand
the basic knowledge related to the promotion and tenure process to assist junior faculty through
the promotion and tenure process. There were several commonalities related to the degree of
importance with the promotion and tenure process at W.E.B. DuBois University. The
participants held several points-of-view related to the three primary areas (i.e., teaching,
professional development, and service) that are evaluated when a junior faculty member applies
for promotion and tenure at W.E.B. DuBois University.

There were some basic and critical areas that the department heads deemed to be
important in relation to junior faculty qualities in the promotion and tenure process. The range of
the different responses were (a) good communication, (b) knowledge of and enthusiasm for
subject matter and teaching, (c) positive attitudes toward students, (d) fairness in examinations
and grading, (e) flexibility in approaches to teaching, and (f) appropriate student learning
outcomes. According to Cohen (1998), department heads need to possess a variety of skills that
are transferable to many areas or specialties. All of the above qualities had an impact with the
department heads when they performed the evaluation of junior faculty.

“Clear and effective guidelines for promotion and tenure,” according to Dr. Creighton is
necessary for department heads to provide the necessary assistance to junior faculty. One
department head suggested that departmental meeting should be used to ensure that all junior
faculty members have a “keen understanding for the promotion and tenure process.” However, if
individual attention is warranted, Dr. Creighton suggested, “meeting individually on a regular
basis to meet the needs of each junior faculty” could assist a junior faculty member.
It is the responsibility of the department head to assure that there is “a commonly accepted standard for teaching, research, and service,” according to Dr. Ingals. This will decrease the degree of “ambiguity and uncertainty” when the junior faculty makes application for promotion and tenure. This is necessary because each department head in this study considered “sub-categories” under one of the three primary categories when evaluating junior faculty for promotion and tenure. For example, Dr. O’Neil considers “student advisement as a sub-category for teaching,” and two of the department heads place emphasis on “securing external funds as a sub-category for professional development.” These external funds included and were not limited to “grants and proposals.” One of the elements that emerged was “an institutional commitment to reward various forms of scholarship.”

In accordance to the guidelines for the promotion and tenure application (Appendix D), examples of accomplishments in teaching included, “innovative teaching, critical thinking, higher order thinking, technology infusion, and multiculturalism.” When evaluating the teaching component, the department heads had mixed perspectives regarding the critical areas that needed to be assessed. However, all department heads indicated that a thorough knowledge of the subject area is “probably the most profound factor” when evaluating junior faculty in the area of teaching.

The teaching standard of the promotion and tenure process at W.E.B. DuBois University has 9 indicators which carries a maximum of 10 points for each category. The 9 indicators in the area of teaching include: 1) quality of the course syllabi, 2) strong evidence that students are learning, 3) effective use of technology, 4) evidence of teaching activities beyond the immediate classroom, 5) infusion of multicultural/global dimensions in the classroom, 6) evidence that the office hours are maintained and the instructor attends classes as scheduled, 7) consistently high
student evaluations are achieved, 8) quality of course materials, and 9) quality final examinations and assignments. Since W.E.B. DuBois University has a primary focus of teaching, it carries the most weight with 70% toward promotion and tenure.

According to Ruffins (1997), junior faculty members primary focus should be to provide the highest degree of instructional learning to the students they teach. Dr. O’Neil believed that “student satisfaction” based on student evaluations should always be considered when department heads evaluate teaching of junior faculty.” On the contrary, Dr. Creighton believed that student evaluations are not needed because “student evaluations serve as a means of retaliation in some instances.” He asserts this belief particularly when “students evaluate those hard instructors” who set the “highest standard for their students.” This comment is supported by the assumption that the “success rate in the science based courses is extremely low in comparison to other courses,” made by Dr. Creighton.

Freeman (1988) suggested that a mastery of technical skills and a broad base understanding of the subject area are essential to disseminate knowledge in an effective manner. Dr. Ingals indicated, “a thorough knowledge of the subject area is critical and a high degree of competency needs to be exhibited.” In higher education, there has been a growing trend for institutions to maintain a high degree of accountability and an increased focus on student learning outcomes (Alger, 1988). Therefore, course outlines and the examinations administered to students should be carefully evaluated to assess “student learning outcomes.” Accountability and student learning outcomes are considered a viable “measuring stick” when the area of teaching is evaluated according to Drs. Ingals and Creighton.

One department head asserted that “peer reviews” are a viable tool that should be used when evaluating junior faculty for promotion and tenure. Peer reviews serve as a means to assist
the department head who is responsible for managing and providing supervision for a large number of junior faculty. According to Dr. Ingals, peer reviews are viewed as an additional means to “gauge the effectiveness and efficiency of a staff member.” Dr. Ingals also suggests, “formulating sub-committees” to assist with the evaluation of junior faculty when a large number of them apply for promotion and tenure. It is important for the department head to be able to delegate responsibilities and to be creative to “relieve the pressures of the leader during hectic periods of time,” according to Dr. O’Neil.

Department heads assert that junior faculty should attend meetings on the state, regional, and national levels to enhance their teaching skills and techniques. Two of the department heads contend it is equally the responsibility of the junior faculty to “seek opportunities to improve their teaching skills.” Supporting the argument, Dr. Creighton suggested, “some of the junior faculty should shadow some of the more seasoned staff members in the classroom to gain further insight of different teaching styles.” Shadowing would provide opportunities for junior faculty members to improve on their teaching skills and allow for continued growth in this critical area of the promotion and tenure process.

According to Lucas (2000), many institutions of higher education have incorporated in their mission statement and goals a statement that pertains particularly to academic excellence and teaching. “Accommodating” and “compassionate,” in the words of Dr. Ingals, are some words used to signify the type of attitude department heads should have toward evaluating junior faculty in the area of teaching. Course scheduling based on the needs of the department is critical to avoid any staff members from becoming “burned out.” In several of the science based courses (i.e., biology, chemistry, and physics), many of the junior faculty are required to teach a laboratory class equivalent to three direct contact hours that is attached to the course. Dr.
Creighton asserted, "preparation for the laboratory is more time consuming and requires more preparation than teaching a regular course." Additionally, Dr. Creighton stated, "the department head must be cognizant and understanding of the tutorial sessions and office hours that are required of all junior faculty in the Biology and Chemistry departments."

When evaluating junior faculty in the area of teaching, "student progress is another key to consider." One of the participants suggested that the best means to evaluate the progress of students is through the performance in the higher level or advanced level courses. The more advanced courses serve as an "accurate measuring gauge" as it relates to student progress and student learning outcomes. Department heads must be reminded that accrediting organizations have the "authority to restrict or terminate a program based upon student learning outcomes," according to Dr. Creighton.

According to the Promotion and Tenure Policies at W.E.B. DuBois University (see Appendix C), the research and professional development standard has eight different areas in which the department head evaluates junior faculty. This area consists of the following eight standards to include: 1) published a book, 2) edited a book, 3) received a patent, 4) published refereed journal articles, 5) presented papers at national or regional professional meetings, 6) completed a formal program of study with an earned degree, 7) evidenced successful grantmanship, and 8) designed innovative techniques/tools that were used to advance research and/or teaching. The research and professional development constitutes 20% of the overall evaluation of promotion and tenure.

Alger (1998) found that the primary administrators involved in the promotion and tenure process sent conflicting messages contending that teaching and service were important, while intensifying mandates for scholarship. Although the three participants understood the value of
research, their stories revealed different points-of-view. The main concern stemmed from the conflicting of “too many demands of a junior faculty that impinges on the ability and time to perform the desired research,” according to Dr. O’Neil. Dr. Creighton contends, “junior faculty are at a disadvantage when it comes to research.” Therefore, the department heads deemed it important to look at “alternative means” of evaluating junior faculty in this area of the promotion and tenure.

Based on the findings of this study, the area of professional development (synonymous with research at W.E.B. DuBois University) presents the greatest challenge to junior faculty in all three of the departments. Therefore, the department heads believed there should be a “degree of discretion and leniency” to conduct a fair and just evaluation in this area of the evaluation. According to Dr. Ingals, the recent graduates tend to produce research at greater rates than the senior faculty members with more experience. However, Dr. O’Neil asserted, “research is a necessary tool, but I do not place much emphasis on it because of the limited time to devote to this [junior faculty have] area.” According to Dr. Ingals, “quality research is improving our communities...where you can see a real impact.”

Given the budgetary constraints in higher education, several departments and areas are seeking to find alternative funding to support their efforts. McHugh (1973) suggested that a confluence of several factors such as budgetary, economic, staffing, and non-academic concerns have a direct and indirect impact on the promotion and tenure process. All of the participants agreed that research could be categorized by the ability of the junior faculty to seek “outside resources particularly related to grants and proposals.” Two of the department heads believed that there should be a “reward system that will grant them [junior faculty] an incentive to seek
monies to support the efforts of the departments.” All of the department heads asserted that there should be an allotment of money to send junior faculty to grant writing courses.

Hughes and Tight (1995) suggested that there should be some degree of university commitment that links university teaching and research. For example, Dr. O’Neil reported junior faculty can receive a favorable response in the area of research by conducting on campus programs for the middle and high school students. One department head encourages “serving on boards and attending meetings” a critical component that has a direct link to research. Although the area presents the greatest obstacles and challenges, the department heads attempt to create opportunities and to remain “open-minded” when evaluating junior faculty in the area of research or professional development.

Service, the third criteria in the promotion and tenure process, constitutes 10% of the overall evaluation. The area of service looks at a total of seven categories that carry a weight of four points per category. The service standards of the promotion and tenure application looks at the following indicators: 1) served actively on institutional, college, and/or departmental committees, 2) evidenced successful student recruitment and retention efforts, 3) advised students in conjunction with the Academic Success Center, 4) demonstrated community service, 5) provided service to professional organizations, and 6) provided service to colleagues.

Mays (1978) reported that most colleges and universities were founded on the premise of teaching and service. All three department heads deemed that service was a high priority on their list when evaluating junior faculty. This area is considered to have the highest degree of subjectivity that looks at improving the institution [W.E.B. DuBois University] and the local community.
Dr. O’Neil looks at involvement in “extra-curricular” activities on campus to include “student activities.” Junior faculty serve as role models to students by being visible on and off the campus “to improve the well being of others.” On and off campus service involvements are equally valued and those who have an attitude of “servitude are considered good citizens in today’s society,” according to Dr. Ingals.

One department head asserted that citizenship constitutes, “leaving your environment in a better place than you received it.” Faculty are encouraged to go to the public schools, support agencies, extended day programs (e.g., Boys & Girls Club) and community based centers and to provide service to those organizations. All department heads agreed that the end goal of service is to improve the “quality of life” for the individuals served by W.E.B. DuBois University.

**Theme 2: Department heads have a keen responsibility to junior faculty related to the promotion and tenure process.**

All three department heads deemed that the responsibility to junior faculty involves “mentoring,” “motivating,” and “serving as a support person.” In their opinion, there is a correlation with the quality of mentoring to junior faculty and the success rate of junior faculty. Dr. Creighton contends, “junior faculty should seek a mentor who is not affiliated with the department.” Although he attempts to mentor his junior faculty, there is a need to gain other perspectives to expand the horizon and to increase the learning curve.

According to Boyer (1990), a mentor is deemed an individual that maximizes the potential of staff members. Motivating and serving as a support person may be viewed as a prerequisite to maximizing the potential of junior faculty members. According to Dr. Ingals, “a degree of trust” must be established in order for mentoring to have any value. The development
of good rapport and positive life-long relationships is deemed a form of mentoring junior faculty successfully.

Dr. Creighton does not practice a style of “micro-management;” however, he encourages junior faculty to “go beyond the call of duty.” He further asserted it is the responsibility of department heads “to push junior faculty so that there is a desire to become their very best.” The responsibility of the department head also extends to the point of assuring junior faculty are meeting goals established by the department head. Additionally, department heads should have inventory control measures in place to provide the necessary resource allocation and technological support to junior faculty. Therefore, it is important to understand the needs and desires of junior faculty to be of assistance to them.

All department heads involved in the study believed that one of their mentoring or supervisory goals is to “improve student learning.” Dr. Ingals detailed, “I want all of my junior faculty to be excellent teachers so that they can provide our students at W.E.B. DuBois University the best education possible.” Dr. Creighton believed, “it is my responsibility to help a junior faculty improve to make them better in the classroom and laboratory.” Dr. O’Neil asserted, “the support system needs to be present in order to advance the skills and knowledge base of our students.”

Theme 3: Department heads need latitude to make adjustments based on the context of the departments in which they lead.

The three department heads held different perspectives related to the promotion and tenure process at W.E.B. DuBois University; however, all three of the participants referenced the promotion and tenure manual regarding the specific guidelines. To one department head, the promotion and tenure process was deemed synonymous to a “root canal.” Another department
head asserted that the institution’s promotion and tenure guidelines were “good;” however, he was not confidant of the “effectiveness in facilitating the promotion and tenure process” evenly across all departments at W.E.B. DuBois University.

According to Chenoweth (1997), junior faculty views of the promotion and tenure process are deemed “lengthy and repetitive.” The research from this study revealed that the promotion and tenure policy at W.E.B. DuBois University is in need of “much improvement and revisions.” Dr. O’Neil professes, “the guidelines are not adhered to or taken serious beyond the departmental level.” He further believed the department head should have the “final decision making powers” because “he is the most familiar person” regarding the work of junior faculty. Dr. O’Neil was convinced that the dossiers are seldomly reviewed “beyond the departmental level.”

Dr. Ingals admits that the process can be “rather intimidating and stressful.” She attempts to make adjustments and accommodations to ensure that the process is a favorable experience to junior faculty. Although not mentioned in the promotion and tenure guidelines, Dr. Ingals takes the liberty to “appoint sub-committees” when a large number of her junior faculty members apply for promotion and tenure. The study further suggests that the department head should be “understanding of the junior faculty course load when they apply for promotion and tenure,” according to Dr. Creighton.

Although the literature reviewed for the present study did not expound heavily on specific constraints to the department head or junior faculty, a case could be made that time constraints have had a tremendous hindrance on the advancement of research related to the promotion and tenure process. This study suggests that time and resources are limited and there
should be amendments made to deal with this shortfall. Therefore, all three of the department heads believed that a policy related to “release time” was needed for junior faculty.

Historically, there was a “release time” policy at W.E.B. DuBois University that provided for release time of departments on a rotational basis. However, due to budgetary constraints, this policy has been eliminated and has not been reinstated because of ongoing concerns related to the budget situation at W.E. B University.

Clark (1987) suggested lack of time paves the way for conflicts and impinges on progress on those matters deemed a priority. One recommendation for a “release time” policy suggests that a faculty member to be permitted to teach only one class a semester and devote the rest of the time to conducting research. In order for this policy to occur, the department head would be responsible for providing a schedule that would “rotate from one staff member to another.” However, Dr. O’Neil thinks that the term for this action should be considered “reassignment time” to imply that the junior faculty is continuing to be productive.

In regard to a release policy, another department head suggested that junior faculty should be relieved of all teaching assignments to be permitted to conduct research. The recommendation would also provide a funding source to compensate a part-time teacher who would teach the junior faculty course load. Dr. Ingals supports a policy of this nature, suggesting “this policy would allow a junior faculty to focus on professional development and scholarship.”

Implications

The implications of the research on the perspectives of the college department head regarding the promotion and tenure process include suggestions for further research. Additionally, implications for higher education and department heads will be discussed in relation to the findings of this study.
Implications for Higher Education

The present study examined elements of an effective and efficient promotion and tenure system relative to institutional policies. Based on the research and the findings, the following key elements emerged that are relevant and related to the promotion and tenure process at an institution of higher learning:

- Encourage senior administrators to attend classroom instruction
- Seek outside mentors to gain different perspectives
- Effective communication across all disciplines
- Commitment to student learning outcomes
- Create an environment to encourage successful outcomes
- Insist upon uniformity while maintaining a fair and just process
- An institutional commitment to reward various forms of scholarship
- Link between academic scholarship and the practical needs of the community
- A promotion and tenure system that does not perpetuate the hierarchical division of the institution’s three-fold mission (e.g., weighting of the categories)
- Standards (i.e., quality) or criteria for judging teaching, research, and service
- Procedures and structures (i.e., promotion and tenure committees) for evaluating teaching, research, and service productivity

The American Council on Education has provided seminars to academic heads for the past decade. Perhaps, a training session for department heads may assist with the numerous responsibilities that they are faced with including assisting junior faculty members with the promotion and tenure process. A training seminar or session of this nature could serve to ease the overall process for department heads.
Implications for Department Heads

Department heads need to demonstrate an appreciation for the diverse talents junior faculty members bring to the institution. Department heads tend to operate with a broader definition of scholarship. Department heads provide resource support and capacity building opportunities. The department heads must ensure that the promotion and tenure policies and procedures are clearly understood and expectations communicated to the junior faculty member. The department head should provide opportunity for professional development and scholarly research through release time from teaching assignments. These findings support the conclusions of a number of researchers who cite the importance of the department heads and senior faculty in the development of junior faculty.

Implications for Further Research

By design, this study was limited to three department heads at one institution of higher learning. Given the lack of research on this subject matter, it is recommended that future studies on assisting junior faculty with attaining promotion and tenure in Historically Black Universities be conducted using a more comprehensive approach. Based on the findings of this study, perhaps several different institutions should be surveyed. The present study was limited to three department heads at one Historically Black Land-Grant University.

Concluding Thoughts

The purpose of this study was to examine the perspectives of the college department head regarding assisting junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure at a Historically Black Land Grant University (HBLGU). Through a case study design, the researcher presented the perspectives of the department heads and described the promotion and tenure process related to
junior faculty in the context of one HBLGU. Since department head perspective-seeking studies are limited, it is hoped that this study would bridge a gap in knowledge essential to educational research and the work of the college department head.

The findings of this study indicate that the department head is involved with junior faculty assisting them through the promotion and tenure process. However, much more research needs to be conducted related to the promotion and tenure process, and support systems for junior faculty. If department heads are to meet the challenge of continuous improvement, the department head must have a keen sense of the promotion and tenure process, support from senior level administration, and a more comprehensive understanding of the numerous dynamics surrounding the support needed from junior faculty members.
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APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I agree to participate in the research study entitled, Perspectives of the college department head regarding assisting junior faculty in achieving promotion and tenure at a Historically Black College and University, which is being conducted by Terrance D. Smith from the Department of Education Leadership at the University of Georgia, and whose phone number is (478) 555-1234, under the direction of Dr. Sally J. Zepeda, Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy at the University of Georgia, whose phone number is (706)-542-0408. I understand that this participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty and have the results of the participation, to the extent that it can be identified as mine, returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The reason for the research is to answer the following questions: (a) How did college department heads at a HBCU perceive supervision for junior faculty regarding the promotion and tenure process? (B) What are the key elements to an effective and efficient promotion and tenure system at a HBCU and what does the department head do to promote the key elements related to the promotion and tenure of junior faculty?

I understand that there are no direct benefits associated with my participation in this study.

I understand that my part in this study will include participation in three interviews lasting approximately 120 minutes per interview. I also understand as a subject of a participant observation study that the interviews will be of a mutually agreeable length, time, and place, and that I may be asked to provide documents such as memos and/or agendas. Questions for the interview will relate to my experiences as an administrator and instructor at an institution of higher learning. I understand that the interviews will be audio taped.

No discomforts or stresses are foreseen. No risks are foreseen.

Any information the researcher obtains about me as a participant in this study, including my identity, will be held confidential. My identity will be coded with a pseudonym. All data will be kept in a secured, limited access location. My identity will not be revealed in any publication of the results of this research. All transcripts, audiotapes, and other artifact will be kept for five years. The results of this participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior consent unless otherwise required by law.

The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at (478) 555-1234 or (478) 555-5678 or email, smith@aol.com
I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Please sign both copies of this form. Keep one and return the other to the investigator (researcher).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Researcher</th>
<th>Signature of Researcher</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(478) 555-1234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:smith@aol.com">smith@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Participant (please print)</th>
<th>Signature of Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Additional** questions or problems **regarding** your rights as a **research participant** should be **addressed** to Chris A. Joseph, PhD, Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, **612A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center**, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone **(706) 542-3199**; E-mail address IRB@uga.edu.
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

(Interview 1)

1. Can you please tell me about your professional background?
   a. How did you first enter education?
   b. Can you please tell me about how you first became an administrator?
   c. What events most shaped your early career as an educational administrator?
   d. What events surrounded your appointment as a college department head?
   e. Can you describe in more detail the transition from your earlier position into the role of college department head?

2. How long have you been an academic department head?

   (Interview 2)

3. Describe the current procedures for evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure.

4. What is your perception of the institution’s promotion and tenure policies and procedures with respect to their effectiveness in facilitating the promotion and tenure evaluation process?

5. What criteria do you think should be used to evaluate research? Teaching? Service?

6. What should be included in faculty dossiers to indicate quality research? Teaching? Service?

7. What do you think is your responsibility toward junior faculty regarding tenure and promotion processes?
8. How many faculty members are in your department?

9. What is the academic rank (e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor) of each faculty member?

10. How many faculty members have been promoted within your department?

11. Please explain the post-tenure review process and what is your perception of the process?

12. Please explain the selection process for determining the Departmental Committee for the promotion and tenure process.

13. What type of policy would you recommend regarding release time to allow junior faculty the opportunity to participate in research?

14. What is the most effective means of maximizing the potential of junior faculty members?
APPENDIX C

PROMOTION AND TENURE

Promotion Criteria

Only full-time faculty are eligible for promotion considerations which are conducted annually. The Vice President for Academic Affairs distributes the timetable for promotion each year during the Fall semester. Faculty are advised of their performance expectations for the various academic ranks in the Faculty Handbook, at annual evaluation times, and during the pre-tenure assessment. A written recommendation is forwarded by the head of the department setting forth the reasons for promotion the faculty member.

Criteria for Promotion: In all professional ranks, the basic criteria are:
- evidence of superior teaching,
- documented research and scholarly academic achievement, and
- professional growth and development
- outstanding service to the profession, institution, and the community.

More Specific Criteria by Academic Rank:
- **Instructor:** Master’s Degree. Exceptions may be made for (a) persons of special learning and ability, (b) promising individuals who are progressing toward the master’s degree, and (c) the appointment is for a temporary or emergency situation.
- **Assistant Professor:** Qualifications of the previous rank, a master’s degree in an appropriate field, and at least one year of successful work in appropriate graduate studies beyond the master’s degree, or special competencies in lieu of this requirement. Evidence of successful teaching and an emerging record of scholarly achievements in the profession.
- **Associate Professor:** Qualifications of the previous rank and an earned doctorate degree in an appropriate field, or special competencies in lieu of this requirement. Evidence of successful teaching and a successful record of recent scholarly publications in refereed publications, extensive grantsmanship, and achievements in the discipline.
- **Professor:** Qualifications of the previous rank, plus achievement as an outstanding teacher, scholar with at least three recent publications and grants, and/or comparable creative or research activity sustained over time; a record of significant contributions as a member of faculty committees and in the community. A record of noteworthy participation in professional organizations.

At the institutional review level, noteworthy achievement is expected according to the maximum weights by categories of 70%, 20%, and 10%, respectively, for teaching, professional growth and scholarly achievements, and service. An average 85% or better rating is the minimum requirement for a positive recommendation for promotion or tenure, given that other criteria for academic credentials appropriate to the rank have been met.
The faculty member’s length of service with an institution shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be promoted. Neither the possession of a doctorate nor longevity of service is a guarantee of promotion.

Tenure Criteria

The institutional policy for tenure provides general statements, which describe the minimum standards for the award of tenure. Institutional responsibility for employment of a tenured individual is to the extent of continued employment on a 100 percent workload basis for two out of every three consecutive academic semesters until retirement, dismissal for cause, or release because of financial exigency or program modification as determined by the Board.

Tenure resides at the institutional level. Normally, only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who are normally employed full-time (as defined by Regents’ Policies) by an institution are eligible for tenure. Faculty members with adjunct appointments shall not acquire tenure. The award of tenure is limited to the above academic ranks and shall not be construed to include honorific appointments. The term “full-time” is used in these tenure regulations to denote service on a 100 percent workload basis for at least two out of three consecutive academic semesters.

Probationary Credit Toward Tenure

A maximum of three years’ credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service in tenure track positions at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of instructor or lecturer at the same institution. Such credit for prior service shall be defined in writing by the President and approved by the Board of Regents at the time of the initial appointment at the rank of assistant professor or higher. Upon completion of the required total probationary period of at least five years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher, the recommendation for tenure may be forwarded by the President to the Chancellor on behalf of the faculty. The five-year period must be continuous except that a maximum of two years’ interruption because of a leave of absence or of part-time service may be permitted, provided, however, that no probationary credit for the period of an interruption shall be allowed.

Tenure Upon Appointment

Outstanding scholars having national recognition in their fields may be recommended by the President for tenure upon appointment. Such recommendations must be approved by the Chancellor and the Board of Regents. Additional information regarding the conditions of the award of tenure upon appointment is available in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Length of Service Without Tenure

The maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure shall be seven years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for an eighty
year may be proffered if an institutional recommendation for tenure is not approved by the Board of Regents. The maximum time that may be served in any combination of full-time instructional appointments (instructor of professional ranks) without the award of tenure shall be 10 years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for an 11th year may be proffered if an institutional recommendation for tenure is not approved by the Board of Regents. The maximum period of time that may be served at the rank of full-time instructor shall be seven years.

Loss of Tenure

Tenure or probationary credit toward tenure is lost upon resignation from an institution, or written resignation from a tenured position in order to take a non-tenured position, or written resignation from a position for which probationary credit toward tenure is given in order to take a position for which no probationary credit is given. In the event such an individual is again employed as a candidate for tenure, probationary credit for the prior service may be awarded in the same manner as for service at another institution. The rights guaranteed by tenure status may also be lost in the event a person does not successfully complete his/her plan of development following a post-tenure review.

Upon approval of the award of tenure to an individual by the Board of Regents, that individual shall be notified in writing by the President of his/her institution, with a copy of the notification forwarded to the Chancellor.

PROMOTION AND TENURE EVALUATIONS

Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process

The promotion process is initiated by the individual faculty member who makes a formal request to the Department Head at the appropriate time according to the promotion review timetable distributed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Department Head is required to form a departmental review committee composed of faculty representatives at or above the rank of those being considered for promotion. If such a committee cannot be formed from within the department, the Department Chair may invite qualified faculty from related disciplines to serve on the promotion review committee. However, the number of faculty external to the department should not exceed the number of departmental faculty members chosen to serve from within the unit.

Should neither of these conditions be met, the Department Chair may send the faculty member’s promotion portfolio outside the campus for an external review by an expert in the discipline or choose to have the individual portfolio reviewed at the college level. This first level review is intended to provide an independent assessment by the faculty member’s peers.

The faculty member must submit documented evidence of having met the criteria necessary to be considered for promotion. The Department Head may initiate the promotion process for an individual. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to inform each faculty member of his/her eligibility to apply (or must apply, in case of tenure) for promotion and/or tenure. The Department Head is required to complete an independent assessment of the candidate and
forward all recommendations received at the departmental level to the Dean of the College, who sends all requests for promotion (and/or tenure) to the Dean.

This process is repeated at the Dean's level. The College wide committee is composed of faculty representatives within the College who are not applying for promotion or tenure and who are credentialed to evaluate appropriately all candidates in the pool. This committee submits its rating containing the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate to the Dean. The Dean then makes recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. At each level, if a candidate is declined, the supervisor is required to inform the candidate in writing in sufficient time so as to allow the candidate to appeal to the next level supervisor if so desired.

This process is repeated at the level of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. An institution wide committee is appointed with appropriate credentials. Care is exercised to ensure that an individual does not participate in evaluating a candidate more than once across these various levels of review. The recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is submitted to the President. Final promotions and tenure decisions are made by the President, subject to the approval of the Board of Regents.

**Guidelines for the Committee Evaluation of Candidates**

The committee's evaluation shall include all factors it considers pertinent. Recommendations shall be based on definite statements accompanied by supporting evidence, including statements describing wherein and in what manner the faculty member meets expected performance.

A systematic procedure for the evaluation of the faculty member shall be distributed by the VPAA and publicized. This procedure will outline the objective criteria upon which evaluations are to be based. Faculty members have the right to discuss their status with the Department Head or Dean at any time.

**Criteria for Appointing Promotion and Tenure Committees**

**University Level:** The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint tenured faculty at the associate professor and/or professor ranks to serve on the Institutional Committee on Promotion and Tenure. There shall be representatives from each College and balance shall be achieved according to gender, race/ethnicity, etc. Any faculty member who is a candidate for review shall be ineligible to serve on a Promotion and Tenure Committee at any level. A Departmental Chairperson cannot render a review of a given candidate at more than one level of review. That is, a Departmental Chair who evaluates a member of his/her department for promotion or tenure consideration cannot subsequently serve on the College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee or the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**College Level:** The Dean of the College shall appoint tenured faculty at the associate professor and/or professor ranks to serve on the College Level Committee on Promotion and Tenure. There shall be representatives from each College and balance shall be achieved according to the units within the College. A minimum of four individuals shall be appointed.
**Departmental Level:** The Department Head shall appoint tenured faculty at the associate professor and/or professor ranks to serve on the Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Balance shall be achieved according to the major programs within the Department. A minimum of three individuals shall constitute the committee.

In the event that there are insufficient members of qualified individuals to constitute a committee, the College Level Committee shall serve in lieu of the Departmental Committee or an external review may be conducted. Additionally, faculty from related disciplines may be invited to participate provided they constitute less than a majority of those voting.

**The Promotion and Tenure Time Table**

The following timetable for promotion and tenure shall be followed. The process shall be initiated by letter from the faculty member to the Department Head on or before September 1st, or the last workday of August nearest thereto, whenever the first day of September falls on a non-workday with the following deadline observed.

1. Promotion and/or tenure applications with all supporting documentation shall be filed with the Dean of the College within 25 calendar days following the initiation of the process. These materials shall be received the College’s committee within three workdays following the deadline.

2. College promotion/tenure committee reports shall be received by Deans within 15 workdays following receipt of the application materials by the committee.

3. Deans shall submit their reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and notify applicants of the status of their application within three workdays following receipt of the report of the College committee. Appeals of the Deans’ decisions shall be received within five days following the said notification.

4. Final recommendation at the institutional level shall be filed with the President of the University within 65 calendar days following receipt of the Deans’ reports. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall inform each applicant of the status of his/her application within two workdays following the filing of his/her (Vice President for Academic Affairs’) report with the President. Appeals of the recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be filed with the President within five days from the date of the said notification. Any subsequent changes made by the University System’s office regarding the promotion and tenure calendar shall supersede these printed deadlines.

**Promotion and Tenure Appeals**

An Appeals Committee should be appointed by the President to review individual appeals. The Appeals committee will make its recommendations to the President, who will inform the appellant of his/her decision. (An Appeals Committee is distinct from a Grievance Hearing Committee and is appointed to hear appeals for promotion and tenure only.)
NOTE: The faculty member should be officially notified, in writing, when the application for promotion or tenure has been approved or rejected by the Board of Regents.

PRE-TENURE REVIEW POLICY (ABRIDGED)

Cumulative Review and Development of Faculty for Tenure: During the third year of employment, each faculty member in a tenure-track position must undergo a cumulative review of his/her potential for tenure. The review identifies areas where the faculty member may not need assistance in ensuring his/her continuous intellectual and professional development. A mid-course review is also conducted for faculty who are hired with prior credit toward tenure. Failure to complete the pre-tenure review as required renders a faculty member unlikely for the subsequent award of tenure.

The initial performance review will be conducted by either the promotion and tenure committee or an independently appointed committee. The committee will receive comments from the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The final recommendations will be forwarded to the President. The review is designed to complement ongoing mentoring efforts at the department level. The cumulative review is different from the annual review in that it encompasses a longer termed perspective on the faculty member's accomplishments. It allows opportunity for redirection and change in work orientation in preparation for subsequent tenure considerations (See Appendix F for the current guidelines.).

Required: Faculty members considered for pro-tenure review are required to submit a curriculum vita, copies of publications, scholarly works and evidence of effective teaching and advisement. Faculty members are also required to demonstrate services and contributions made to his/her profession and to the community. Two peer reviews of the faculty member’s teaching and student evaluations of instruction and grades awarded are required with submission package.

As stated earlier, the pre-tenure review will begin at the departmental level, with either the promotion and tenure committee or an independently appointed committee conducting the review. At least three tenured faculty members are required to constitute a pre-tenure review committee, whether at the departmental or institutional level. Reviews are conducted at the College and Institutional levels. A written report of the results of the cumulative review is provided to each respective faculty member under review. Operational guidelines for the pre-tenure review are specified by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY (ABRIDGED)

The post-tenure evaluation is retrospective and prospective and is in no way intended to infringe upon the accepted standards of academic freedom. The post-tenure evaluation requires each tenured faculty member to be reviewed every five years in an effort to ascertain that a balance has been achieved and maintained across the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Special attention is given in the evaluation process to recognizing outstanding teaching and research. The primary goals of the post-tenure evaluation are faculty development and recognition of professional achievements and contributions.
Guidelines for the post-tenure review are included in Appendix G. Aspects of the review process require faculty who are to be reviewed to present a portfolio containing at a minimum the following:

- current curriculum vitae
- self-evaluation narrative of accomplishments according to institutional goals in teaching, scholarly contributions and service;
- copies of annual performance evaluations for the previous five-year period
- projected goals for the next five years
- copies of student evaluations of instruction for all classes evaluated
- evidence of teaching effectiveness such as peer reviews, student letters, programs of students’ works, etc.
- documentation of scholarly achievements such as publications, grants, professional papers presented
- documentation of services to the community

The post-tenure review is conducted first at the departmental and College levels. Subsequently, an institution-wide committee will evaluate the faculty under review. Faculty shall be rated as Superior, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. On the basis of the post-tenure review, the departmental chairperson shall be responsible, in consultation with the faculty member, for determining whether the person should be rewarded for outstanding performance and/or be scheduled for faculty development activities that would promote the best interests of the faculty member and the institution. Any faculty member who fails to achieve the goals of the development plan within the specified three-year period will be terminated. Nothing in the post-tenure review procedures reverses the Regents’ policy on dismissal for cause or its due process requirements. Dismissal for cause under the post-tenure review is expected to be rare; however, it is justified in certain instances as described in the Regents’ policy on dismissal.

**The Right to Appeal: The System and the University encourage the resolution of concerns related to recommendations for tenure, promotion, pre-, and post-tenure at the lowest possible level. Therefore, the faculty member should begin his/her appeal process within the published time frame with his/her supervisor before proceeding to the Dean of the College as the next level supervisor. If there is not a resolve at either of these levels, then the appeal should be submitted successively to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, then to the President.**

**EARLY DISMISSAL OF FACULTY**

**Prior to the End of Contract**

A tenured faculty member, or a non-tenured faculty member, before the end of his/her contract term, may be dismissed for any of the following reasons provided that the University has complied with procedural and due process requirements:

- conviction or admission of guilt of a felony or of a crime involving moral turpitude during the period of employment—or prior thereto, if the conviction or admission of guilt was willfully concealed,
• professional incompetency, neglect of duty, or default of academic integrity in teaching, in research, or in scholarship,
• unlawful manufacture, distribution, sale, use or possession of marijuana, a controlled substance, or other illegal or dangerous drugs as defined by Georgia laws; teaching or working under the influence of alcohol which interferes with the faculty member’s performance of duty or his/her responsibilities to institution or to his/her profession,
• physical or mental incompetency as determined by law or by a medical board of three or more licensed physicians and reviewed by a committee of the faculty,
• false swearing with respect to official documents filed with the institution,
• disruption of any teaching, research, administrative, disciplinary, public service, or other authorized activity, or
• such other grounds for dismissal as may be specified in the Statutes of the institution,
• failure to comply with expectations for submitting pre-tenure of post-tenure documents after a reasonable period of time beyond the published schedule,
• failure to meet the requirements of the Professional Development Plan according to the time frame which has been provided subsequent to Post-tenure Review.

As part of its statutes, the University may supplement Regents’ policies governing causes for dismissal and procedures for dismissal. In the imposition of sanctions, the burden of proof lies with the institution.

Preliminary Dismissal Procedures

The dismissal of a tenured faculty member or a nontenured faculty member during his/her second or later contract term should be preceded by:

• discussion between the faculty member and appropriate administrative officers looking toward a mutual settlement.
• informal inquiry by an appropriate faculty committee which may, upon failing to effect an adjustment, advise the President whether dismissal proceedings should be undertaken; its advisory opinion shall not be binding upon the President.
• a letter to the faculty member forewarning that she/he is about to be terminated for cause and informing her/him that a statement of charges will be forwarded to her/him upon request. The faculty member may also request a formal hearing on the charges before a faculty committee. Failure to request charges or a hearing within a reasonable time shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing.
• a statement of charges, if requested by the faculty member, framed with reasonable particularity by the President or his/her designated representative. Along with the charges, the faculty member shall be advised of the names of the witnesses to be used against him/her, together with the nature of their expected testimony.

Provision for a Hearing Committee

A dismissal, as defined above, shall be preceded by statement of charges or causes (grounds for dismissal) if so requested; including a statement that the faculty member concerned shall have the right to be heard by a Faculty Hearing Committee.
The Hearing Committee shall consist of not less than three, or more than five, impartial faculty members appointed by the Executive Committee (or its equivalent) of the highest legislative body of the faculty, from among the members of the entire faculty (as defined by the Policy Manual of the Board) of the institution.

Members of the Hearing Committee may serve concurrently on other committees of the faculty. The Hearing Committee will meet as a body when it is called into session by the Chair of the body which selected them either at his/her discretion or upon the request of the President or the faculty member who is subject to dismissal.

When the Hearing Committee is called into session, it shall elect a chair from among its membership. A member should remove himself/herself from the case, either at the request of a party or on his/her own initiative, if he/she deems himself/herself disqualified for bias or interest.

Each party shall have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause, provided however, that all challenges whether with or without cause shall be made in writing and filed with the Chair of the Hearing Committee at least five days in advance of the date set for the hearing. The Chair shall have the authority to decide whether a member of the Committee is disqualified for cause. If the Chairperson determines that a member is so disqualified or if a Committee member removes himself/herself from a case, the replacement shall be made in the same manner as the original Committee was selected. If the Chair is thus removed, the Committee shall elect a new Chair after Committee replacements have been appointed. A minimum of three members is required for any action to be taken.

**Dismissal Procedures**

In all instances where a hearing is requested, the following hearing procedures shall apply:

1. Service of notice of the hearing with specific reasons or charges against the faculty member together with the names of the members of the Hearing Committee shall be made in writing at least 20 days prior to the hearing. The faculty member may waive a hearing or she/he may respond to the charges in writing at least five days in advance of the date set for the hearing. If a faculty member waives a hearing, but denies the charges or asserts that the charges do not support a finding of adequate cause, the Hearing Committee shall evaluate all available evidence and rest its recommendation upon the evidence in the record.
2. The Hearing Committee, in consultation with the President and the faculty member, may exercise its judgment as to whether the hearing should be public or private.
3. During the proceedings, the faculty member and the administration shall be permitted to have an academic advisor and/or counsel of his/her choice. The Hearing Committee will be permitted to have advisory counsel.
4. At the request of either party or the Chair of the Hearing Committee, a representative of a responsible education association shall be permitted to attend as an observer.
5. A tape recording or transcript of the proceedings shall be kept and made available to the faculty member and the administration in the event an appeal is filed.
6. An oath or affirmation shall be administered to all witnesses by any person authorized by law to administer oaths in the State of Georgia.
7. The Hearing Committee may grant adjournments to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made.

8. The faculty member and the administration shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence.

9. The faculty member and the administration will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Where the witness cannot or will not appear but the Committee determines that the interests of justice require the admission of his/her statement, the Committee will identify the witness, disclose his/her statement and if possible, provide for interrogatories.

10. The Hearing Committee will not be bound by strict rules of legal evidence and may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues involved. Every possible effort will be made to obtain the most reliable evidence available. All questions relating to admissibility of evidence or other legal matters shall be decided by the Chair or presiding officer.

11. The findings of fact and the decision of the Hearing Committee will be based solely on the hearing record.

12. Except for such simple announcements as may be required covering the time of the hearing and similar matters, public statements and publicity about the case by either the faculty member of administrative officers should be avoided until the proceedings have been completed, including consideration by the Board of Regents in the event an appeal is filed. The President and the faculty member will be notified in writing of the decision and recommendation, if any, of the Hearing Committee.

13. If the Committee concludes that adequate cause for dismissal has not been established by the evidence in the record, it will so report to the President. If the President does not approve the report, she/he should date her/his reasons in writing to the Committee for response before rendering her/his final decision. If the Committee concludes than an academic penalty less than dismissal would be more appropriate than dismissal, it may so recommend with supporting reasons. The President may or may not follow the recommendations of the Committee.

14. After complying with the foregoing procedures, the President shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying him/her of his/her retention or removal for cause. Such letter shall be delivered to addressee only, with receipt to show to whom and when delivered and the address where delivered. The letter shall clearly state any charges which the President has found sustained and shall notify such person that he/she may appeal to the Board of Regents for review. The appeal shall be submitted in writing to the Executive Secretary of the Board within 20 days following the decision of the President. It shall state the decision complained of and the redress desired. The Board or a committee of the Board shall investigate the matter thoroughly and render its decision thereon within 60 days from the date of the receipt of the appeal or from the date of any hearing which may be held thereon.

15. Upon dismissal by the President, the faculty member shall be suspended from employment without pay from the date of the final decision of the President. Should the faculty member be reinstated by action of the Board of Regents, he/she shall be compensated from the date of the suspension.
APPENDIX D

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE APPLICATIONS

Deans and Unit Directors announce to their faculties that completed Promotion and Tenure applications are to be accepted by the Department Heads until Wednesday, October 2, 2002. The identified candidates are to submit documents to the Department Head or Unit Director.

Each candidate must prepare and submit three copies of his/her portfolio with one copy clearly labeled on the outside as Official Copy. A three-ring notebook is preferred. The applicant's official copy is reserved for use by the evaluating supervisors and must contain all of the recommendation forms.

The inside pockets may be used to hold related documentation, such as diskettes or copies of certificates, cards, etc. Do not include entire copies of publications in the notebook pockets. At most, include the cover of the publication, the page that includes the name of the publisher and the date of publication, the Table of Contents, and the first page of your publication may be included. If additional documentation is required, it will be requested by the Chair of the appropriate review committee.

The portfolio must be neat and well-organized to the following sections:

Section I.  Forms (to be completed by the Applicant, Department Head, Deans, VPAA)
Section II. Documentation

I. Letter of Application (for Tenure, Promotion, Pre- or Post-Tenure Review) - This is a narrative that states why your application should be approved. It is a sell yourself narrative that summarizes:

A. Your goals and accomplishments as a faculty member.
B. The unique or valuable contributions you have made/are making as a member of the Fort Valley State University community.
C. Accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarly Work, Service/Outreach and Professional Development. Include specific examples of accomplishments such as, in the area of Teaching, innovative teaching critical thinking, higher order thinking, technology infusion, and multiculturalism.
D. Future/long-range goals as they relate to the goals of the Department and/or University.

II. Current Curriculum Vitae (to include a list of courses taught, funded research, publications by category: books, chapters in books, edited volumes, refereed journal articles, articles in popular publications, etc., selected professional presentations, professional, university, community service, honors and awards. The curriculum vitae should not exceed ten pages.
III. Samples of Course Syllabi (for a maximum of three courses taught over the past five years)

IV. Samples of Student Evaluations (select at least five from among the different courses taught and/or courses taught of the past five years)
P&T FORM 1
Regents’ Summary Information for Applicants for Promotion and Tenure
Year __________

Applicant’s Name

Department

I. Please apply the following weights to the indicated categories as my credentials are being reviewed.

   ______  Teaching (70%)

   ______  Scholarly Activity, Research, Creative Activities, and Professional Development (20%)

   ______  Service (10%)

   100%  Total

II. My principal assignment is ________________________.

    Select one of the three categories above.
P&T FORM 2
PROMOTION AND TENURE APPLICATION
(To Be Completed by the Applicant)
Year: __________

Check, as appropriate:
_____ Promotion
_____ Tenure

Applicant’s Name
Race          Gender          College

FVSU Employment History:
Employment Date
Date of Last Promotion
Other Positions Held/Dates

If applying for tenure, was probationary credit awarded at time of employment?

If yes, provide a copy of the letter from the President granting probationary credit.

Educational Preparation:

Degree          Date          Institution          Discipline
P&T FORM 3
PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW EVALUATION
Year: ____________

____ Promotion

____ Tenure

Applicant's Name
Department
College

Directions: Indicate the number of points awarded accorded to each indicator. The maximum number of points for a given indicator and the maximum to be allocated overall in the categories are indicated. Only accomplishments since the last promotion and/or tenure application are to be considered.

Teaching Standard (70 point maximum)

Maximum of 10 points per indicator

____ Quality of course syllabi
____ Strong evidence that students are learning (graded papers, exam results, standardized tests, etc.)
____ Effective use of technology
____ Evidence of teaching activities beyond the immediate classroom - e.g., field trips, consultants
____ Infusion of multicultural/global dimensions in the classroom
____ Evidence that office hours are maintained and the instructor attends classes as scheduled
____ Consistently high student evaluations are achieved
____ Quality of course materials
____ Quality of exams and assignments
____ Other

________________________

____ Other

The Research/Professional Development Standard
(20 point maximum/Teaching appointment)

____ Published a book (20 point maximum per book)
____ Edited a book (10 point maximum per book)
____ Received a patent (10 point maximum)
____ Published refereed journal articles (5 point maximum per article)
____ Presented papers at national or regional professional meetings (5 point maximum per presentation)
Compared to a formal program of study with an earned degree (10 point maximum)
Evidence successful grantsmanship (funded proposals) (15 point maximum)
Designed innovative techniques/tools that were used to advance research and/or teaching (10 point maximum)
Other

The Service Standard (10 point maximum)

Maximum of 4 points per category
Served actively on institutional college, and/or departmental committees
Evidenced successful student recruitment and retention efforts
Advised students in conjunction with the Academic Success Center
Demonstrated community service
Provided service to professional organizations
Provided service to colleagues
Other

Other
P&T FORM 4
Supervisor’s Promotion and Tenure Checklist

____ Promotion

____ Tenure

Applicant: ____________________________  Department: ____________________________

Date Submitted: ______________________  College: ____________________________

1. Department Head’s Letter of Recommendation

2. Department Head’s Review

3. Departmental Committee’s Review

4. College Committee’s Review

5. Dean’s Review

6. Dean’s Letter of Recommendation

7. SACS Credential Form

Forwarded to Vice President for Academic Affairs:

__________________________  ____________________________
Signature                     Date

Forwarded to President:

__________________________  ____________________________
Signature                     Date
P&T FORM 5
PROMOTION/TENURE APPLICATION
(To Be Completed by the Department Head)
Year: __________

Applicant’s Name
Department/College

Teaching
Strengths:

Challenges:

Scholarly Work/Professional Development
Strengths:

Challenges:

Service
Strengths:

Challenges:

Recommendation: _____ Yes  _____ No
Signed  Date
Department Head  Printed/Signature
P&T FORM 6
PROMOTION/TENURE APPLICATION
(To Be Completed by the Departmental Committee)
Year: ___________

Applicant’s Name
Department/College

Teaching
Strengths:

Challenges:

Scholarly Work/Professional Development
Strengths:

Challenges:

Service
Strengths:

Challenges:

Recommendation: _____ Yes    _____ No

Signed
Date

Chair, Departmental Committee
Printed/Signature

Committee Members (Continue on back page):
Names:    Signatures:
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P&T FORM 7
PROMOTION/TENURE APPLICATION
(To Be Completed by the College Level Committee)
Year: 

Applicant’s Name
Department/College

Teaching
Strengths:

Challenges:

Scholarly Work/Professional Development
Strengths:

Challenges:

Service
Strengths:

Challenges:

Recommendation: _____ Yes _____ No

Signed

Date

Chair, Departmental Committee
Printed/Signature

Committee Members (Continue on back page):
Names: ____________________________

Signatures: ________________________
P&T FORM 8
PROMOTION/TENURE APPLICATION
(To Be Completed by the Dean)
Year: __________

Applicant's Name
Department/College

Teaching
Strengths:

Challenges:

Scholarly Work/Professional Development
Strengths:

Challenges:

Service
Strengths:

Challenges:

Recommendation: _____ Yes _____ No

Signed: ___________________________________ Date:

Dean Printed/Signature

Committee Members (Continue on back page):
Names: Signatures:

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
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P&T FORM 9
PROMOTION/TENURE APPLICATION
(To Be Completed by the Institutional Committee)
Year: __________

Applicant’s Name
Department/College

Teaching
Strengths:

Challenges:

Scholarly Work/Professional Development
Strengths:

Challenges:

Service
Strengths:

Challenges:

Recommendation: _____ Yes _____ No
Signed: ________________________________ Date
Chair, Institutional Committee Printed/Signature

Committee Members (Continue on back page):
Names: Signatures:
P&T FORM 10
PROMOTION/TENURE APPLICATION
(To Be Completed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs)
Year: ____________

Applicant’s Name
Department/College

Teaching
Strengths:

Challenges:

Scholarly Work/Professional Development
Strengths:

Challenges:

Service
Strengths:

Challenges:

Recommendation: _____ Yes _____ No

Signed: ________________________________ Date: __________________

Vice President for Academic Affairs Printed/Signature

Committee Members (Continue on back page):
Names: ____________________________ Signatures: ______________________