

## **Strategies for professors who service the university to earn tenure and promotion**

Ruben Gentry  
Jackson State University

Dorothy Stokes  
Jackson State University

### **ABSTRACT**

Tenure and promotion are great aspirations for college professors. They are indicators of success in the professions. Universities stipulate in their official documents and numerous higher education publications specify what professors must achieve in order to earn tenure and promotion; which almost always cite effectiveness in teaching, research, and service. Many professors excel in the three areas of performance and earn the awards. A rather large number of professors render tremendous service to the university and are effective in teaching, however, they are less productive in research; this can lead to a denial of tenure and promotion and termination of employment at the institution. The question becomes, could faculty who succeed at teaching and service the university extensively prevent falling into such a predicament? An extensive review of literature and association with a number of such cases suggest that the execution of specific strategies during the early years of employment could lead to success in the tenure and promotion review. With such explicit information aspiring faculty will be positioned to more effectively reach the criteria specified for tenure and promotion. A favorable outcome is viewed as beneficial to both the professor and the university.

Keywords: academic promotion, publication, research, university service, teaching effectiveness

## INTRODUCTION

Tenure and promotion have been part of the university's culture for some time and they are likely to retain their significance as prominent accomplishments in the future (Perna, 2001). The accolades serve as mechanisms to reward faculty who perform at a high level of proficiency and at the same time, serve as mechanisms to screen out under performing faculty who are less able to carry their weight in higher education. However, the criteria and process for tenure and promotion are not perfected to a point that strong versus weak faculty can always be easily separated. Some faculty clearly deserve tenure and promotion because of their stellar record of performance; whereas some not so strong faculty perhaps earn tenure and promotion because they manipulate their performances in such a way to demonstrate minimum proficiency. On the other hand, some faculty fall miserably below the standard and do not deserve tenure and promotion; but some faculty who are denied tenure and promotion seem to have a lot to offer the university yet cannot present a creditable, balanced portfolio of performance. Particular concern is with the latter group of faculty. The proposition is that the university should not terminate potentially quality faculty; these faculty should be assisted in attaining tenure and promotion.

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this manuscript is to examine the concept of tenure and promotion and to determine if due diligence is accorded faculty who contribute tremendously in service roles to the university and teach effectively, however they are less productive in the area of publication. A number of faculty fall in this category and have struggled to earn or have been denied tenure and promotion. For this group of faculty, the challenge is to ascertain from a critical review of the literature and personal encounters if strategies may be formulated whereby these faculty may modify their work effort early in employment and become successful in earning tenure and promotion.

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature and university documents offer tremendous information on the criteria and guidelines for earning tenure and promotion. Far less is recorded on specific strategies for orchestrating performance among and within the criteria to ensure success across all areas. Some faculty need knowledge of such strategies lest they "overly" excel in some areas and come up "short" in one or more areas. To put tenure and promotion in perspective, the manuscript provides the rationale for and emphasis placed on tenure and promotion, demographics on earning them, particular problems and issues associated with the awards and general best practices as well as specific strategies for at-risk persons in earning tenure and promotion.

### **Rationale for and Emphasis Placed on Tenure and Promotion**

Tenure is an award by the university that provides professors a high degree of job security and a tremendous amount of respectability in the academy. The concept was endorsed as an organizational regulation by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1940 (Shea, 2002). Earning tenure and gaining promotion through the academic ranks are now

considered among the most honorable achievements for college and university faculty (Perna, 2001).

The first level of employment of well-prepared junior faculty at an institution of higher learning is assistant professor. Satisfactory performance generally leads to the rank of associate professor and tenure; the latter being a means for retaining one's job (Stewart, Ornstein, & Drakich, 2009). After tenure, a higher expectation is to achieve the rank of full professor, which accords the individual the highest rank in the discipline or area (McGowan, 2010). Each case of advancement basically entails satisfactory evaluation on three criteria: teaching, research, and service.

At inception, the objective of tenure was to provide faculty with job protection if they exercised academic freedom with controversial matters. But along the way it became simply viewed as job security, or essentially an assurance of sustained employment. The concept of tenure remains as a major component of the employment package between faculty and the university (Diamantes, 2002).

Conceptually, tenure and promotion mutually benefit the faculty and the university (Shea, 2002). Thus, this mutual benefit coincides with the human capital theory which proposes that human capital is accumulated via educational attainment, on-the-job training, experience, and mobility (Becker, 1975; Gilead, 2009; Perna, 2001). The theory also purports that status and rewards in academe should be based on faculty productivity (Perna, 2005), which includes performance in service to the university.

### **Demographics on Earning Tenure and Promotion**

Problems and issues have existed since the inception of tenure; even to a point of questioning its significance. One contention is that tenure is not equally granted among women who make up 41 percent of the professorate. Just one child can cause a woman to be 24 percent less probable in the sciences and 20 percent less probable in the humanities to attain tenure than men who become fathers. However, one study in Canada reported that women earned tenure at the rate of men (Perna, 2005; Stewart, Ornstein, & Drakich, 2009). The AAUP proposed that the time for tenure for new parents be extended one year but universities were slow to implement it because of concern that the additional time may lead to greater expectancy of scholarly productivity (Shea, 2002). However, despite the problems and issues, the stature of tenure remains highly regarded (Shea, 2002).

The proportion of women and the amount of time that it takes them to earn promotion do not compare favorably with that for men. For example, Canadian women do not earn promotion from associate to full professor at the rate of men. In Canada and the United States, promotion from assistant professor to associate professor has a time limit of six years and almost always comes with the concurrent awarding of tenure; this also generally comes with a pay increase (Stewart, Ornstein, & Drakich, 2009).

One study indicated that Blacks were less probable than Whites and Hispanics to possess the designation of full professor, and Blacks and Hispanics were less probable than Whites to have tenured positions. Even in view of years of attention to sex and racial/ethnic group differences in employment status, considerably smaller percentages of women than men, and Blacks and Hispanics than Whites, have earned promotion and tenure. Women faculty were found to hold lower ranks than men faculty even after factoring in such variables as educational attainment, experience, productivity, institutional characteristics, and academic discipline. Perna

(2001) noted that in some instances, different criteria were applied in promotion evaluations for women than for men.

The literature documents numerous cases of stressful or failed efforts to gain tenure and promotion; yet, there are limited orchestrated and broad-based strategies for earning them. Some studies examine relevant concerns in a particular area, such as scholarly research. However, one study collected and analyzed longitudinal data from 1984 to 1999 on faculty in Canada. It consistently showed that women were less likely to earn promotion and tenure than men (Stewart, Ornstein, & Drakich, 2009).

### **Problems and Issues in Awarding Tenure and Promotion**

Problems and issues in addition to gender and race are expressed in the awarding of tenure and promotion. According to Chait (2002), tenure generates both arguments and strong passions, yet no academic reward conveys the distinction that it does. To some, tenure embodies academic freedom for faculty and for the university it is perceived as an asset in recruiting and retaining the best faculty. To others, it is perceived as an impediment to professorial accountability and a constraint on university flexibility and finances (Chait, 2002).

The standards for tenure and promotion - teaching, research, and service - are often not clearly delineated, broadly discussed, or systematically evaluated. Also of concern is that graduate schools do not provide adequate preparation for program completers to execute the role of college professor (Price & Cotton, 2006).

Arriving at a meaningful equilibrium between teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and service can be a daunting challenge. While university assistance to faculty varies among campuses, most institutions provide only a cursory picture of the tenure process, and expectations for the professorial role are often poorly outlined (Shifflett & Patterson, 1995).

As things currently stand, promotion, tenure, and retention are greatly influenced by research and publication (and more so than ever, generation of external funding). Promotion and tenure committees will acknowledge university and community service, but for the most part, service is not a prime factor in earning tenure and promotion. Unfortunately, there is limited reinforcement to do outreach and service (Woods, 2006).

For faculty seeking tenure, the pursuit can seem overwhelmingly weighted toward research. The phrase "publish or perish" is broadly circulated both inside and outside the academy as the sure means for a successful career in higher education. Over the years various scholars have raised an issue about this intense focus on research. Such an extensive focus on research may be detrimental to teaching and service, the career of junior faculty, the mission of the institution, and the education students (Woods, 2006).

Scholarship expectations for tenure and promotion to associate professor vary more across discipline and institution than do those for teaching or service (Price & Cotton, 2006). The requirements also vary by type of institution (graduate, comprehensive, or undergraduate) and even within types of institution. The time limit is usually six years to apply for tenure and associate professor. The applicant is expected to compile and submit a portfolio of accomplishments for review in the university evaluation process and is ultimately informed of the results and recommendation by the provost or president (Mabrouk, 2007).

Faculty differ sharply on how scholarship should be assessed. Most agree that high-quality work is vital, but they disagree on how to ascertain whether quality work has been manifested. Various models, e.g., procedural and judgmental, have been advanced for

addressing the assessment issue (Matusov & Hampel, 2008). The procedural model features specific measures to reflect the significance of scholarship. When the well-defined regulations are applied, it can be determined if the faculty candidate met the established criteria. The judgment model allows the faculty committee to discuss and assess the merit of the candidate's scholarship. Fellow colleagues make the decision about the quality of the candidate's work and provide a defense of the assessment in an open forum. The judgment model is heralded as a democratic and fair approach to tenure decision making. It is posited that models are not always mutually effective. Those that employ strict regulations and guidelines tend to work well with traditional cases but work less well with unique cases. The latter tend to necessitate judgement in the decision making process (Matusov & Hampel, 2008).

In regards to the concern about expectations for earning promotion and tenure, perceptions are that some factors are overly emphasized. These factors include students' evaluation of instructor and course, peer-reviewed publications, and writing a textbook or book chapter. On the other hand, there are perceptions that documentation of good teaching is underemphasized. Together, the perceptions may be viewed as loop holes in the method of evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure (Whittiaux, Moore, Rastani, & Crump, 2010).

In the final analysis, tenure and promotion are conceptually expected to be mutually beneficial to both the faculty and the institution of higher learning (Shea, 2002). A principal concern is that some faculty perform an inordinate service load at the university but when placed in their academic portfolio it is not very beneficial in earning tenure and promotion. These faculty think that what they do is good for their students and the university and feel that they merit tenure and promotion. By a meeting of the minds of the university and faculty who advance the university; at-risk faculty may be better positioned to earn tenure and promotion.

## **BEST PRACTICES FOR EARNING TENURE AND PROMOTION**

A professor generally is one who has tenure and is considered an expert in a particular discipline or area (McGowan, 2010) at an institution of higher learning. The challenge is meeting the criteria to earn the awards of tenure and promotion. The review process that faculty undergo prior to tenure differs in length and rigor from one institution to the next but the elements reviewed often include teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and service (Shifflett & Patterson, 1995; Woods, 2006). Chait's (2002) position is that context plays such a big role that no single tenure system exists.

Some proposed improvements for the evaluation of teaching for promotion and tenure include (1) provide tenure-track faculty with all relevant written guidelines at the time of hire; (2) ensure that student rating instruments are reliable and valid; (3) offer mentoring to new faculty on within the departmental and institutional culture; and (4) encourage self-reflection and documentation of one's own teaching. A charge is posed for educational leaders in doctoral/research universities to enhance the teaching preparation for future faculty graduating from their institutions (Whittiaux, Moore, Rastani, & Crump, 2010).

Lewis (2010) recommended that the tenure and promotion system undergo reform. The author proposed a method similar to that employed by large external funding agencies, such as the National Science Foundation, to evaluate research-grant proposals. Relevant steps instituted by cooperate agencies that universities may consider are (1) have external evaluation committees and (2) have candidates to submit a statement of philosophy for tenure and promotion. Lewis'

position is that implementation of such strategies would be well received by everyone involved in the tenure and promotion process.

Fairly recent changes to Yale University's tenure process included a strengthened commitment to junior faculty members in the arts and sciences. The objective was to better compete for talent with its peer institutions. The commitment also called for mentoring junior faculty and making provisions for them to both demonstrate and be rewarded for excellent work (Millman, 2007).

Chait (2002) posited that only a few universities will institute major changes in tenure criteria without either powerful external coercion or persistent pressure from new or dismayed faculty. Needed changes proposed by Chait include availability of peers' portfolios for inspection by candidates who are up for promotion and tenure; established committees that reflect diversity; assurance that research scholarship does not outweigh quality teaching and service; value placed on collaborative research; eliminate or tailor the probationary period to candidates' circumstances; and provide tenure-track faculty with clear expectations for tenure and promotion (Woods, 2006). To enhance the climate in higher education for women and faculty of color, universities should make a commitment to provide an academically rich environment, offer multicultural learning experiences; emphasize learning in an academic environment that is inclusive, student-centered, and aware of the world it is part of; recruit and retain diverse high-quality faculty, staff, and students; and create a new slogan: "Service or Perish" (Woods, 2006).

Junior and minority faculty members need to be assured that service efforts are valued by the institution and are well regarded in the promotion and tenure evaluation. Such recognition will motivate junior faculty and provide greater incentive for all faculty to be of greater service to the academy (Woods, 2006).

Students want a good education and stimulating experiences from their attendance at the university. Scholarship is more of a faculty concern than a student concern (McGowan, 2010). Students want quality teaching, appropriate advisement and other timely services as they matriculate through the university. Professors pursue free inquiry that is rigorously evaluated by expert peers to produce new knowledge. But students and the university need more than scholars who just make "original" scholarly contributions. The university needs professors to edit journals, create and oversee curricular reforms, establish programs that take the university's expertise to wider audiences, work with external groups to impact issues such as dropout rates and environmental concerns, and serve as departmental chairs or directors of programs. The university may get more of these services from faculty if when it comes to evaluation for promotion to full professor or post-tenure review, full value were given to such outreach and service activities (McGowan, 2010).

A very practical suggestion to address the service dilemma is simply to do more in the way of recognizing and rewarding good service. Another possibility is to place significant attention on service in the faculty job description (Fogg, 2003). Other ideas include extending the tenure clock for professors who take on extensive service loads; improving academic climate females and minorities; offering females and minorities leave time for research; and giving awards or salary enhancements for faculty service. In the absence of such changes, professors may continue to ponder just how much service is sufficient (Fogg, 2003).

Table 1 (APPENDIX) captures some best practices for earning tenure and promotion as gathered from the review of literature and exploration of the university-serving faculty concept.

The practices are listed according to what both the institution and the faculty can do to facilitate success in the process.

Tenure and promotion should be taken seriously by both the institution and the faculty as each helps to ensure their attainment. Best practices for the university should begin at the time a faculty member is hired; whereby, guidelines for tenure and promotion should be distributed and discussed. Certain categories of faculty - young, women, and minority faculty – often struggle in earning tenure and promotion; the university should resolve to strengthen its commitment to these individuals (Fogg, 2003; Mabrouk, 2007; Millman, 2007; Woods, 2006).. The university should ensure that teaching, research, and service loads are equitably distributed and all evaluation instruments are valid and reliable. To accommodate diversity in ability, interest, and career orientation, the university should make an effort to accommodate and reward unique efforts and contributions that strengthen the institution; which may be in teaching, research, or service.

Table 1 also includes best practices for faculty to ensure that they earn tenure and promotion. First, there is a need for them to commit to the criteria established by the University for earning tenure and promotion; they most often include teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and service performance (Shifflett & Patterson, 1995; Woods, 2006). As faculty begin the odyssey toward tenure and promotion, it is very important that they manage, monitor, and modify their performance on a regular basis (Diamantes, 2002; Woods, 2006). Faculty should also remain intellectually proficient, engage in campus development activities, and arrange for teaching, learning, and service activities to complement each other (Knotts et al., 2004; Shifflett, 1995; Shifflett, 1995). A reasonable and beneficial goal for faculty is to aim for earning awards to validate their success in the profession (Kohler et al., 2009).

### **SPECIFIC STRATEGIES FOR FACULTY WHO SERVICE THE UNIVERSITY**

The objective in a challenging situation should be to establish policies and procedures to make matters more friendly and accomplishable. Promotion and tenure are difficult to earn, especially for faculty who are bent on high service activities and limited research productivity (identified here as at-risk faculty); however, promotion and tenure always have important long-term consequences for both the candidate and the institution. Preparing for promotion and tenure is one of the most difficult and challenging experiences a faculty may encounter. Standing suggestions for success through the tenure process are to (1) establish a research record; (2) interact with and profit from one's colleagues; and (3) maintain all accomplishments in a portfolio for the evaluation process (Diamantes, 2002).

Professors' growing service obligations make professional advancement difficult for many of them, particularly women and minority-group members (Fogg, 2003). Women and minorities often have a greater service burden because institutions want and need diversity on committees. They do a disproportionate amount on service work but service does not get much credit in academe. This may be because service is harder to quantify than teaching and research. Service may also be viewed as not requiring high-level ability or skill. If a person teaches exceptionally well or does a lot of service, he or she may be perceived as foregoing their research. Faculty must do some service but they should concentrate on teaching and especially research if their goal is to earn tenure and promotion. Universities want faculty to be good teachers, but if they are spending an inordinate amount of time on service or even teaching and too little time on research, then they are really placing themselves in a bad predicament.

Research is the icon in the academy and what faculty do short of that does not count for much in promotion and tenure decisions (Fogg, 2003).

Strategic professional service like collegial collaboration, conference involvement, and grant-review panels can potentially advance one's career. But when it comes to university assignments and committees, many supportive and cooperative faculty may be asked to do more than their fair share of the service load. Sometimes service activities may make the faculty member feel good about themselves, but service often does not contribute directly to the case for tenure and promotion (Mabrouk, 2007). Professors' growing service obligations make advancement tougher for many of them, particularly women and minority-group members (Fogg, 2003).

Selected vignettes presented some faculty's concerns and efforts in earning tenure and promotion. A vignette on an African-American female faculty member indicated need for the skill to be a master juggler of multitasks ranging from domestic and child-rearing to professional responsibilities. A typical day for this junior faculty member included requests from the department chair, demands from senior faculty, the need to serve on college and university committees, pleas for time from desperate students, opportunities for faculty development, and in-service training on the latest technologies. Everything takes time: writing, preparing for class, completing human subjects' documents, applying for grants, faculty meetings, and taking that minute with students. As a commentary, know that some faculty jealously guard every minute and work extensively on their research and publication. Other faculty are able to multitask and still focus on achieving tenure and promotion (Woods, 2006).

Another vignette depicted a situation where on Wednesdays there were no classes; they were writing days for assistant professors. The particular faculty was to complete her book before coming up for tenure the next fall. On this Wednesday the precious hours sped by as she performed service to the university: helping a graduate student with an article; listening to a lecture by a visiting job candidate; committee meetings; and in the evening, entertaining the job candidate. The only writing she did was to finish letters of recommendation for some students she advises. As a commentary, it is readily seen that multiple service commitments take time away from research and teaching. But when tenure and promotion decisions are made, it is not the number of students you advise that really counts; but it is the number of publications amassed that matters most (Fogg, 2003).

A third vignette is of an African-American female on tenure track. The faculty member is attempting to juggle the many challenges of university life with personal, professional, and community responsibilities weighing heavily on her shoulders. She has two children and an extended family; yet she managed to help develop the departmental program and has an urgency to reach out to other people of color and their communities. Enough time in the day cannot be found to complete all that is expected of her. The strategy used for the tenure process is to commit one day each week to research and writing. Someone in the department has been identified to assess the viability of her position and serve as a mentor. She chooses committees judiciously and tries to say "no" when necessary without offending anyone. A special effort is made to regularly refocus and reprioritize what she is trying to accomplish. As a commentary, it was noted that this faculty puts forth special effort to make research interests and the requirements for tenure coincide with her love for teaching, outreach, and community service (Woods, 2006).

Table 2 (APPENDIX) captures specific strategies for at-risk faculty in earning tenure and promotion as gathered from the review of literature and exploration of the university serving

faculty concept. The strategies are listed according to the areas of teaching, research, and service.

The literature has noted that women and minority faculty are often at-risk in earning tenure and promotion; some of the problem may reside with the university (see above best practices for the university), some may reside with the faculty. Here, particular emphasis is placed on what at-risk faculty may do to increase their probability of earning tenure and promotion. Across the board recommendations are that they manage time well, stay focused, and learn to multitask (Woods, 2006). In the area of teaching, it is suggested that at-risk faculty clearly conceptualize quality teaching and crystallize their skills in achieving it (Meyers, 2009). They are also encouraged to seek out a mentor, skillfully design syllabi, carefully organize materials, and employ evidenced-based teaching approaches (Berrett, 2011; Shifflett, 1995; Togeas, 2013). Of course teaching is not of quality until it is done with passion and students' minds are challenged and their lives are changed (Kohler et al., 2009; Krohn, 2014; Meyers, 2009).

Research is often the most dreaded area for at-risk faculty. Recommended strategies for them to turn this fear into success include joining fellow faculty to explore research ideas, make research coincide with their teaching and interests, and set aside a particular time to engage in research (Fogg, 2003; Kohler et al., 2009; Woods, 2006). To get published, it is important to become familiar with the contents and publication guidelines for prospective journals and to solicit critical reviews of the research from experienced colleagues (Shifflett, 1995).

Service is frequently the overload area for faculty who service the university. The objective here should be to implement efficient measures and streamline efforts in the area; yet render quality service. Recommendations in service include adequately distributing time in service, teaching, and research activities. It is important for these faculty to limit committee membership, accept strategic service assignments like collaboration and grant reviews, and manage their sense of being really needed (Fogg, 2003; Woods, 2006). A beneficial service is to hold office in professional organizations (Davis et al., 2006). It is crucial that at-risk faculty constantly evaluate how service work may become seed material to promote scholarly productivity (Shifflett, 1995).

## **SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS**

Tenure does not assure lifetime employment, but it serves as assurance that faculty will receive due process in higher education (Diamantes, 2002). Principal criteria for tenure and promotion are effective teaching, research, and service. Women and minorities are often disadvantaged in earning tenure and promotion, while being cooperative, supportive faculty who give more than their fair share in service to enhance the institution.

There is concern about expectations for earning promotion and tenure. The perceptions are that some factors are overemphasized, for example, student evaluation of instructor, and that the portfolio documenting personal assessment of teaching is underemphasized (Whittiaux, Moore, Rastani, & Crump, 2010). Faculty differ sharply in their notions of how scholarship should be evaluated. They are in support of high-quality work, but they are not in consensus about how to determine whether high quality has been realized. Various models, e.g., procedural and judgmental, have been advanced for addressing this issue (Matusov & Hampel, 2008).

There is reasonable evidence to suggest that women and minority faculty do more than a fair share of committee work and other service acts for the university; yet, these faculty

experience difficulty in obtaining tenure and promotion as reflected in the literature and selected vignettes. However, there are measures under consideration to make university-serving faculty more positioned for earning tenure and promotion, but they seem yet to be realized.

Problems and challenges do not automatically resolve themselves; they need to be addressed forthrightly. Some recommendations for ensuring that professors who service the university earn tenure and promotion are: more tenure-clock flexibility; more credit for service; faculty to refocus/realign duties, strategize - wear many hats but manage time; make teaching and service data bases for research; govern amount of service activity; and display a disposition of a winner for motivation and respect.

An implication for consideration is whether institutions of higher learning will take a closer look at faculty who serve well the university but are limited in research productivity and thereby fail to gain tenure and promotion. Such a result may not bode well with the human capital theory, indicating that the university's decision making may not reflect a conscious effort to maximize human potential (Becker, 1976). There is a need to incorporate economic modes of thinking into the operation of colleges and universities so that both the institution and the faculty benefit (Gilead, 2009).

## REFERENCES

- Becker, G.S. (1975). *Human capital – a theoretical and empirical analysis, with special Reference to education* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Becker, G.S. (1976). *The economic approach to human behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berrett, D. (2011). What spurs students to stay in college and learn? Good teaching and diversity. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 58(13), A27-A27.
- Chait, R.P. (Ed.). (2002). *The questions of tenure*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Davis, T.E., Levitt, D.H., McGlothlin, J.M., & Hill, N.R. (2006). Perceived expectations related to promotion and tenure: A national survey of CACREP program liaisons. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 46, 146-156.
- Diamantes, T. (2002). Promotion and tenure decisions using the Boyer Model. *Education*, 123(2), 322-326.
- Fogg, P. (2003). So many committees, so little time. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(17), A14-A17.
- Gilead, T. (2009). Human capital, education and the promotion of social cooperation: A philosophical critique. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 28(6), 555-567.
- Knotts, H.G., Livingston, C.D., Mercer, G.E., & Friedman, B.D. (2004). Integrating teaching, learning, and community outreach: Western Carolina's Local Government Youth Assembly. *International Social Science Review*, 79(1 & 2), 56-62.
- Kohler, N., Mohammad, S., & Mendleson, R. (2009). The 3M awards: Our best teachers, *Maclean's*, 122(5), 46-48.
- Krohn, E. (2014). Empowered learning: Bringing culture into the classroom. *Tribal College Journal*, 25(3), 36-38.
- Lewis, G. (2010). A professor proposes tenure-and-promotion reform. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 56(27), A32.
- Mabrouk, P.A. (2007). Promotion from associate to full professor. *Analytical & Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 388(5/6), 987-991.

- Matusov, E., & Hampel, R. (2008). Two approaches to tenure and promotion criteria. *Academe*, 94(1), 37-39.
- McGowan, J. (2010). An immodest proposal. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 96(4), 413-420.
- Millman, S. (2007). Yale to overhaul tenure process. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(24), A14.
- Meyers, S.A. (2009). Do your students care whether you care about them? *College Teaching*, 57(4), 205-210.
- Perna, L.W. (2001). Sex and race differences in faculty tenure and promotion. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(5), 541-567.
- Perna, L.W. (2005). Sex differences in faculty tenure and promotion: The contribution of family ties. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(3), 277-308.
- Price, J., & Cotton, S.R. (2006). Teaching, research, and service: Expectations of assistant professors. *The American Sociologist*, 37(1), 5-21.
- Shea, R.H. (2002). The new insecurity. *U.S. News & World Report*, 132(9), 40.
- Schultz, T.W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review*, 51(1), 1-17.
- Shifflett, B., & Patterson, P. (1995). Succeeding in the tenure and promotion process. *Physical Educator*, 52(3), 160-169.
- Stewart, P., Ornstein, M., & Drakich, J. (2009). Gender and promotion at Canadian universities. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 46(1), 59-85.
- Togias, J. (2013). Teaching chemistry for 51 years and not losing your edge. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 59(41), A15-A15.
- Whittiaux, M.A., Moore, J.A., Rastani, R.R., & Crump, P.M. (2010). Excellence in teaching for promotion and tenure in animal and dairy sciences at doctoral/research universities: A faculty perspective. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 93(7), 3365-3376.
- Woods, D.R. (Fall, 2006). A case for revisiting tenure requirements. *Thought & Action*, 135-142.

**APPENDIX**

Table 1  
Best Practices for Earning Tenure and Promotion

---

Institutional Practices

- Provide guidelines on tenure and promotion at the time of hiring
- Strengthen commitment to junior faculty (Millman, 2007).
- Arrange for mentors for new faculty
- Ensure that student rating tools are reliable and valid
- Reform the T/P process as necessary, e.g. consider establishing evaluation committee outside the university (Millman, 2007)
- Make a commitment to women and faculty of color through inclusive environment (Woods, 2006)
- Ensure that teaching, research, and service assignments are equitably distributed among faculty and are equitably evaluated in the T/P process (Mabrouk, 2007; Whittiaux et al., 2010; Woods, 2006)
- Ensure that the service obligation is not disproportionately distributed among cooperative, women, and minority faculty (Fogg, 2003; Mabrouk, 2007)
- Value service efforts by Junior and minority faculty (Woods, 2006)
- Reward good service; extend tenure clock for exceptional service loads; give awards, perhaps money, for faulty service (Davis et al., 2006; Fogg, 2003).

Faculty Practices

- Commit to the criteria for teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and service (Shifflett & Patterson, 1995; Woods, 2006).
  - Prepare self-reflective documentation periodically; periodically refocus/reprioritize what to accomplish (Woods, 2006)
  - Manage the T/P process: learn craft of publishing; work with/benefit from colleagues; keep materials updated (Diamantes, 2002).
  - Stay intellectual adept and interested in teaching, research, and service (Togeas, 2013)
  - Focus on incorporation of teaching, learning, and service activities (Knotts et al., 2004)
  - Take advantage of campus faculty development programs and activities (Shifflett, 1995)
  - Aspire for awards to validate effectiveness in the profession (Kohler et al., 2009)
- 

Table 2  
Strategies for At-risk Faculty in Earning Tenure and Promotion

---

Teaching

- Conceptualize quality teaching and crystallize skills to achieve it (Meyers, 2009)
- Seek services of a mentor who has mastered the art/science of teaching (Woods, 2006)

- Keep course content updated and on the cutting edge (Togeas, 2013)
- Systematically organize, explain, and review instructional material (Berrett, 2011)
- Become skillful in designing syllabi, teaching diverse students, and establishing difficulty level for the course (Shifflett, 1995)
- Earn high instructional evaluations from students and demonstrate quality academic advisement (Davis & et al., 2006)
- Know that quality instruction rests on knowledge, preparation, clarity, and concern (Meyers, 2009)
- Bring passion and respect to the environment to enhance learning (Kohler et al., 2009; Krohn, 2014)
- Concentrate on challenging students' minds and changing their lives (Kohler et al., 2009)

### Research

- Seek opportunities to join with fellow faculty to explore research ideas (Kohler et al., 2009)
- Arrange for a writing/research day – no classes (Fogg, 2003)
- Make research interests coincide with teaching and other interests (Woods, 2006)
- Become familiar with the contents and publication guidelines for journals in the discipline (Shifflett, 1995)
- Seek reviews of research from experienced colleagues before submitting it for publication (Shifflett, 1995)

### Service

- Do some service but certainly address teaching and research
- Limit number of committees, without offending others (Fogg, 2003; Woods, 2006)
- Do strategic service (collaborations, conferences grant-reviews) to advance career
- Focus on a small number but significant outreach activities (Woods, 2006).
- Gracefully turn down some service requests; manage sense of being really needed (Fogg, 2003)
- Evaluate how service activities may be used to promote scholarly productivity (Shifflett, 1995)
- Seek to hold offices in professional organizations at local, state, and national levels (Davis et al., 2006).