School Leadership Review

Volume 13 | Issue 1 Article 2

2018

The Tenure Process: A Descriptive Study of Selected Texas Universities

Gary Miller
University of Texas at Tyler

Wesley D. Hickey
University of Texas at Tyler

The Tenure Process: A Descriptive Study of Selected Texas Universities

Gary Miller[i]
University of Texas at Tyler

Wesley D. Hickey
The University of Texas at Tyler

Few things in the professional life of university faculty are more important than the tenure process. Achieving tenure provides the faculty member with the confidence that his or her position with the university will be secure for life. There are exceptions; criminal behavior and elimination of the program come to mind, but tenure allows the faculty member to research controversial areas without the potential for political repercussions that could jeopardize employment. According to the American Association of University Professors:

> The principal purpose of tenure is to safeguard academic freedom, which is necessary for all who teach and conduct research in higher education. When faculty members can lose their positions because of their speech or publications research findings, they cannot properly fulfill their core responsibilities to advance and transmit knowledge. (2018)

The tenure process has three components: teaching, scholarship, and service. There are usually differences among universities as to the weighting of each area, but the old adage "publish or perish," relates to the importance of scholarship in the formula (Wiley, Wallingford, Monllor-Tormos, & Konyu-Fogel, 2016). In many cases, previous studies did not include educational administration programs when researching the perceived weight given to each area in determining tenure, most notably Boyer's (1990) exploration sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Politicians often criticize the tenure of teachers at all educational levels (Flaherty, 2017; Money, 2015). There is the shared belief among these groups that tenure provides a level of security that should not exist. The argument is that high achievement should be the final arbiter in determining whether a teacher, or professor, keeps his or her job, and termination of the educator ensues if productivity declines (Kahlenberg, 2016). This assertion resonates with many, but there are various reasons that tenure exists within higher education.

Tenure is an important step in academia that allows for protection in researching and disseminating data on politically unpopular subjects. Stergiou and Somarakis (2016) offer the following regarding their work on tenure:

> Professors and researchers are not ordinary workers but scholars, being subject to the judgment and criticisms of their peers through the peer-review process. They must be free to both pursue research for its own sake, even on unfashionable issues, and disseminate

[i] **Gary Miller** may be contacted at *gmiller@uttyler.edu.*

> (including via teaching) the knowledge produced by their research. They must also be free to speak…. (p. 1)

When academicians are able to expand conventional knowledge, even if it is uncomfortable to the public at-large, all benefit because the knowledge-base is expanded without concern for political and cultural pressures. Hearing information that of which one disagrees may be uncomfortable, but individuals grow with discomfort. Ideas that cannot be supported with evidence are ultimately eliminated, but those that have merit are given the opportunity to flourish (Hertzog, 2017).

The purpose of this study was to determine current tenure guidelines, as well as thoughts on what should be included, among deans, department chairs, and faculty in universities who have member participants in the Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration organization. This descriptive analysis looked at the perception of each group on the role of teaching, scholarship, and service, and clarified differences in expectations based upon university position.

Components of the Tenure Process

Teaching

There is little doubt that teaching plays a critical role in an assistant professor's professional life. Educational administration faculty, however, have a greater teaching demand placed on them than instructors in other disciplines because of the requirements set forth by the Texas Education Agency (TEA). Guided by the Texas Education Code, faculty must ensure the provisions found in Chapter 11 School Districts, Subchapter E, Superintendents and Principals (Texas Education Code, 2017a) and Chapter 149 Commissioner's Rules Concerning Educator Standards, Subchapter BB, Administrator Standards (Texas Education Code, 2017b) be addressed within the program.

Although heavily laden in addressing these TEA requirements, educational administration faculty must also balance other duties besides teaching. This means faculty, unlike instructors in alternative certification programs, must find time to write, research, and engage in service initiatives while ensuring that teaching is a clear priority. It is noteworthy to compare the perceptions the role that teaching assumes when comparing faculty and deans. For example, research in the field of health sciences found that 71 percent of faculty strongly agreed, or agreed, with statements that teaching effectiveness should be the most important component to getting tenured (Balogun, Sloan, & Germain, 2007). In contrast, those deans surveyed believed that teaching should be the most important criterion in tenure decisions only 54% of the time. This marked difference in perception can be an important factor when considering tenure-based decisions.

Scholarship

Although most individuals in higher education would argue that teaching is the most important role, scholarship may create the tipping point for tenure decisions. While the old adage "publish or perish" may not be completely accurate in academia, it is reasonable to assume that those who do not engage in the process of writing are unlikely to earn a favorable decision. When it comes to scholarship, the difficulty lies with the wide range of expectations and interpretations as to what counts as scholarly output.

Many talented assistant professors fail to gain tenure because of a lack of publications. The number of publications in varying types (i.e., first author, sole author, peer review) and quality (i.e., 5% acceptance rate, top tier journal, impact factor) are typically the hallmarks of scholarly productivity. Although, the process for determining the influence of any publication can still be somewhat nebulous, the number and quality of the articles is a starting point for consideration in granting faculty tenure.

Scholarly activity is important because it provides the foundation for more effective teaching and service. The process of research, writing, and publication forces the assistant professor to be more involved with the work of others and to be more informed of contemporary theories. In turn, classroom students benefit from good scholarship, often through increased student discussion.

Research has shown that students collaborating with professors have better grades and higher graduation rates. Young, Uy, and Bell (2017) at California State University, Stanislaus studied the affect teaching and scholarship had on scholarly achievement among university students participating in the university's Student Engagement in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Program. Students, under the tutelage of professors, assisted with everything from constructing institutional review board forms to determining where to submit manuscripts. These opportunities proved beneficial for everyone concerned, offering increased attention and favorable connections for the university. Scholarship, done well, positively affects other areas in the creation, discovery, advancement, and transformation of knowledge (Register & King, 2017).

Service

The concept of service entered the higher education lexicon at the start of the 20th century as resources increased for the creation of more universities. Greater access to higher education meant more students were going to be involved, and many of these individuals had practical educational needs extending beyond moral and intellectual development. Traditionalists did not approve of this increase in applied education, but it has continued as an avenue of academic practice because of its importance to connecting theory to practice (Boyer, 1990).

This need to apply information led to the expectation that faculty use their knowledge to improve initiatives within the university as well as in the public at-large. Service should interplay between the professor's other roles in teaching and research (Holland, 2016). Providing expertise to groups within one's field of study adds to the likelihood of success within these initiatives. A professor can often bring a nuanced understanding that is unavailable elsewhere in the community.

The service component analyzed in the tenure process includes committee meetings at the university and community, consulting activities, and other involvement that allows the assistant professor to assist others. There are a number of activities considered to be service oriented, and an active professional in academia is likely to have a long list. Involvement in service activities is important, but often thought to be the least considered in subsequently determining tenure.

Methodology

By definition, the term qualitative research is a naturalistic approach to studying human behavior from the informant's perspective, typically collecting empirical data through participant observation and interviews. Qualitative researchers employ techniques associated with the gathering, analysis, interpretation, and presentation of narrative information designed to emphasize descriptive explanations rather than number analyses (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). However, qualitative research does not strictly operate in the absence of numbers (Bryman, 2008), reporting data through statistical analyses also helps capture the totality of the human experience (McLeod, 2017).

For the purposes of this study, a self-identified online survey, "Tenure Practices Survey," was sent to three distinct groups within the university hierarchy including deans of accredited colleges, department chairs, and faculty, designed to derive a general conceptual theory about tenure practices within educational administration programs. Twenty-three institutions with membership in TCPEA participated in the study, including five deans, 11 department chairs, and 23 faculty. This survey asked participants clarifying questions about specific requirements within their respective programs to summarize the general practices when evaluating faculty applying for tenure.

Research Design

A qualitative approach with predetermined questions guided the investigation. In an attempt to see things from deans, department chairs, and faculty points of view, the theoretical framework for the research design was "interpretivist" (Bryman, 2008, p.16) in nature, gathering participant responses through elicitation of personal experiences and perceptions. The information collected from the investigation appeared principally in narrative form derived from survey question responses.

An inductive strategy allowed for the generation of theory based upon the findings of the research. This method offers the opportunity to draw generalizable inferences out of observations reasoning from the particular to the general (Bryman, 2008, p.11). Strauss and Corbin (1998) argued that when systematically analyzed, this process eventually results in a theory confirming the collected observations and findings. Seen as a developmental process and dependent on the collection of continuous data, researchers are better able to measure the affects of a study (Letts, Wilkins, Law, Stewart, Bosch, & Westmorland, 2007). Charmaz (2004) concluded that this methodology allows for a more interpretive research approach focusing on social and subjective ambiguities, thus resulting in a deeper understanding of the phenomenon.

Data Collection

Qualtrics, an online survey software package, facilitated the creation, sending, and analysis of the online questionnaire, "Tenure Practices Survey." Participants included post secondary academic deans, department chairs, and faculty within educational leadership programs affiliated with the Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration (TCPEA). Participants addressed an online survey in accordance with their position. This purposive sampling technique was a non-probability form of selection and therefore those agreeing to participate were not a random sample.

Upon identifying suitable candidates, recruitment emails followed explaining the scope of the study and determining level of interest. Included in the recruitment email was a hyperlink to the appropriate online survey. For those willing to participate, clicking on the hyperlink confirmed informed consent.

The purpose of the online survey was three-fold: (1) collect demographic data, (2) learn basic personal beliefs and institutional practices on awarding tenure, and (3) obtain contact information for those requesting the survey results. A fill-in-the blank formatted question provided the demographic data. For statements regarding tenure practices, respondents indicated his or her level of agreement giving a 5-point Likert scale. This closed question format ranged from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." A middle position of "neutral," indicating impartiality, was also included among the response choices. Follow-up questions requiring a written response used text boxes. Accessibility of the online survey for completion occurred over a designated two-week period.

Data Analysis

Teaching

A one-way between groups ANOVA was conducted to compare the difference among deans, department chairs, and faculty regarding the determination of the weighted value that teaching possesses when granting tenure to tenure-track faculty members. There was not a significant difference among deans, department chairs, and faculty on the weighted value of teaching at the $p<.05$ level for the condition [$F(2, 36) = 0.0533$, $p = 0.9482$]. Finding no significant difference among the groups eliminated the need for a post hoc comparison test (e.g., Tukey HSD). An assumption of a one-way ANOVA is equal variances across sample populations; Bartlett's Test for equal variances was conducted to test for non-normal distributions and found no significant differences at the $p<.05$ level among the groups [$p = 0.1358$].

Scholarship

A one-way between groups ANOVA was conducted to compare the difference among deans, department chairs, and faculty on determining the weighted value that academic scholarship has when granting tenure to tenure-track faculty members. There was not a significant difference among deans, department chairs, and faculty on the weighted value of scholarship at the $p<.05$ level for the condition [$F(2, 36) = 0.0200$, $p = 0.9802$]. Finding no significant difference among the groups eliminated the need for a post hoc comparison test (e.g., Tukey HSD). An assumption of a one-way ANOVA is equal variances across sample populations; Bartlett's Test for equal variances was conducted to test for non-normal distributions and found no significant differences at the $p<.05$ level among the groups [$p = 0.1874$].

Service

A one-way between groups ANOVA was conducted to compare the difference among deans, department chairs, and faculty on determining the weighted value that professional service has when granting tenure to tenure-track faculty members. There was not a significant difference among deans, department chairs, and faculty on the weighted value of service at the $p<.05$ level for the condition [$F(2, 36) = 0.1634$, $p = 0.8499$]. Finding no significant difference among the groups eliminated the need for a post hoc comparison test (e.g., Tukey HSD). An assumption of

a one-way ANOVA is equal variances across sample populations; Bartlett's Test for equal variances was conducted to test for non-normal distributions and found no significant differences at the $p<.05$ level among the groups [$p = 0.1574$].

Weighed Value Means of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

When comparing the weighted value means from the deans, department chairs, and faculty to the percentage each area (teaching, scholarship, and service) contributes in the tenure process (weighted values), the data found all three groups identified that teaching as the highest weighted value in determining tenure followed by scholarship and service.

Table 1.

Comparison of weighted value means among teaching, scholarship, and service on a scale of 0 to 100.

Group	Teaching: Mean	Scholarship: Mean	Service: Mean
Deans	40.40	39.02	20.40
Department Chairs	43.27	38.36	18.36
Faculty	42.61	39.57	17.83

Teaching: Ranking Criteria in Order of Importance for Tenure. This study found some differences among deans, department chairs, and faculty concerning the importance of particular criteria in evaluating teaching. Student evaluations were an important factor for each group, but deans listed professional development high, as well. Department chairs valued course evaluations from both supervisors and peers, and faculty perceived the use of data in driving course change as a top consideration. Table 2 provides a detailed look at the results.

Table 2.

By group the number of participants ranking the teaching criteria in order of importance when granting tenure on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being most important.

Deans					
Criteria	Ranking in Order of Importance				
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Student evaluations of courses	2	1	1	0	1
Peer (other faculty) evaluations of courses	1	0	1	2	1
Supervisor evaluation of courses	0	2	1	1	1
Professional development in teaching	2	0	1	1	1
Use of data to drive course changes	0	2	1	1	1
Other criteria: • Course and curriculum development					

Department Chairs					
Criteria	Ranking in Order of Importance				
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Student evaluations of courses	4	0	0	1	6
Peer (other faculty) evaluations of courses	0	6	3	2	0
Supervisor evaluation of courses	3	3	2	1	2
Professional development in teaching	2	1	3	3	2
Use of data to drive course changes	2	1	3	4	1
Other criteria: • Independent studies • Annual teaching reflections • Doing a presentation on improving pedagogy at a formal venue • Presenting at a regional or national conference on teaching	Other criteria (continued): • Co-presenting with students at a regional or national conference • Development of new courses • Use of high impact practices; innovative teaching practices				
Faculty					
Criteria	Ranking in Order of Importance				
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Student evaluations of courses	15	1	0	0	6
Peer (other faculty) evaluations of courses	1	9	3	5	4
Supervisor evaluation of courses	0	5	10	4	3
Professional development in teaching	0	3	6	9	4
Use of data to drive course changes	6	4	3	4	5
Other criteria: • In-depth self-reflection on teaching • Time spent on course revisions and design • Self-report of accomplishments	Other criteria (continued): • Course development of new materials • Complaints • Promptness of response to students with feedback				

Scholarship: Ranking Criteria in Order of Importance for Tenure. The results regarding criteria considered for scholarship indicated that each group noted that the number of manuscripts prepared and submitted to be important. Chairs valued grants as a second top criterion, and faculty indicated that they perceived several areas as an important runner-up to manuscript number. Table 3 shows the details of each group concerning scholarship considerations.

Table 3.
By group the number of participants ranking the scholarship criteria in order of importance when granting tenure on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being the most important.

Deans								
Criteria	Ranking in Order of Importance							
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
Number of Manuscripts	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Impact factor of publications or journals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1
Acceptance rate of journal	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1
First versus co-author status	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0
Multidisciplinary research endeavors	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
Student research publications	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1
Grant submissions	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0
Grant acceptance	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	0
Other criteria: • Published software programs • Video and/or television productions	Other criteria (continued): • Books and book chapters							
Department Chairs								
Criteria	Ranking in Order of Importance							
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
Number of Manuscripts	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
Impact factor of publications or journals	1	2	1	4	0	0	2	1
Acceptance rate of journal	0	1	4	0	3	2	1	0
First versus co-author status	0	0	2	3	0	4	2	0
Multidisciplinary research endeavors	2	2	0	1	3	2	0	1
Student research publications	0	3	2	1	1	0	4	1
Grant submissions	1	3	2	1	2	1	0	1
Grant acceptance	3	0	0	1	1	2	2	2
Other criteria: • Presentations at international, national, state and local conferences • Service in national organizations • State certifications beyond what is required	Other criteria (continued): • Contributing questions for state exams • Awards • Writing accreditation proposals for national accreditation							
Faculty								
Criteria	Ranking in Order of Importance							
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
Number of Manuscripts	13	3	0	0	0	1	0	5
Impact factor of publications or journals	2	6	2	4	3	3	2	0
Acceptance rate of journal	2	0	9	3	3	1	2	2
First versus co-author status	1	2	2	8	3	2	4	0
Multidisciplinary research endeavors	0	2	5	2	5	1	3	4
Student research publications	0	1	2	3	5	6	1	4

Grant submissions	2	2	2	2	2	2	9	1
Grant acceptance	2	6	0	0	1	6	1	6
Other criteria: • Single author • National and international conference presentations • Research projects	Other criteria (continued): • Quality of the actual publication • Peer reviewed presentations							

Service: Ranking Criteria in Order of Importance for Tenure. Service showed some differentiation among groups. Deans reported a hierarchy of service committees going from university to college to departmental, in that order. Chairs felt that departmental service as the most important, and faculty perceived university committees to be the top criterion. Table 4 provides a detailed look at the results for service.

Table 4. By group the number of participants ranking the service criteria in order of importance when granting tenure on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being the most important.

Deans									
Criteria	Ranking in Order of Importance								
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9
University committees	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
College committees	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
Department committees	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1
Position on committees (e.g., chair)	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0
Civic organizations	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
Volunteer work	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Paid consulting with K-12 schools	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1
Unpaid consulting with K-12 schools	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	0
Leading professional development	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
Other criteria: • Leadership in professional organizations that lead to national and international visibility									
Department Chairs									
Criteria	Ranking in Order of Importance								
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9
University committees	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	5
College committees	0	3	1	0	0	1	3	2	0
Department committees	3	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	0
Position on committees (e.g., chair)	0	0	0	3	2	1	1	3	0
Civic organizations	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	3	1
Volunteer work	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Paid consulting with K-12 schools	2	1	1	2	0	0	3	1	0
Unpaid consulting with K-12 schools	1	2	2	0	3	2	0	0	0

Leading professional development	1	1	0	1	2	4	0	1	0
Other criteria: • Service on national, regional, state, and local committees in professional organizations • Student recruiting and advising • Facilitating a university gift	Other criteria (continued): • Sponsoring a student organization • Leadership in a professional organization								

Faculty									
Criteria	Ranking in Order of Importance								
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9
University committees	12	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
College committees	0	13	2	0	0	0	1	5	0
Department committees	3	1	9	2	0	0	5	1	0
Position on committees (e.g., chair)	0	1	2	9	1	6	1	0	1
Civic organizations	0	1	0	3	7	3	0	5	2
Volunteer work	1	0	1	3	2	4	2	3	5
Paid consulting with K-12 schools	3	0	2	0	4	1	7	2	2
Unpaid consulting with K-12 schools	0	5	0	2	0	6	2	5	1
Leading professional development	2	0	3	1	7	1	3	0	4
Other criteria: • Advising doctoral students • Serving as coordinator • Officer of professional organizations	Other criteria (continued): • Officer of professional organizations								

External Reviews

When asked if their department uses external reviews for evaluating scholarship in the tenure process, the majority response for each group was no.

Table 5.

Does your department use external reviews for evaluating scholarship in the tenure process?

Group	Yes	No
Deans	1	4
Department Chairs	5	6
Faculty	9	13

Discussion and Implications

Ranking Teaching, Scholarship, and Service in Order of Importance

The most compelling result from the tenure track survey centers on the following question: Do academic deans, department chairs, and faculty within departments of educational leadership weigh differently the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service when determining tenure involving tenure-track faculty? Comparing the weighed value means of teaching, scholarship, and service among the deans, department chairs, and faculty, the researchers found that all three

groups gave teaching the highest weighted value in determining tenure followed by scholarship and service (Table 1). Further, the analysis of a one-way ANOVA showed there was no significant difference among deans, department chairs, and faculty when comparing the weighted value of teaching when granting scholarship to tenure-track faculty members.

All three groups selected scholarship behind teaching in weighted value mean in importance for granting tenure. Additionally, the one-way ANOVA for scholarship found no significant difference between deans, department chairs, and faculty. Service unanimously came in third in order of importance when determining tenure and once more, there was no significant difference among deans, department chairs, and faculty.

Ranking Criteria in Order of Importance for Tenure

Teaching. "Student evaluations of courses," "Professional development in teaching," and "Peer (other faculty) evaluations of courses" all received a vote among deans as the number one criteria in order of importance when it comes to teaching (Table 2). Only "Supervisor evaluation of courses" was not on anyone's ranking as the most important criteria when looking at the teaching component for tenure. In addition to the five criteria listed in the survey, one dean identified "Course and curriculum development" when considering tenure.

Various department chairs listed "Student evaluations of courses," "Supervisors evaluation of courses," Professional development in teaching," and "Use of data to drive course changes" as the most important criteria. "Peer (other faculty) evaluations of courses" was the only criteria that did not receive a vote ranking it as the most important. With four votes, "Student evaluations of courses" received the most of any teaching criteria. Other criteria not listed on the survey but considered by some department chairs include "Development of new courses" and "Presenting at a regional or national conference on teaching."

Faculty selected "Student evaluations of courses," "Peer (other faculty) evaluations of courses," and "Use of data to drive course changes" as the most important teaching criteria in the tenure track process. The overwhelming majority, 15 out of 22 respondents, selected "Student evaluations of courses" as the number one teaching criteria when considering tenure. Matching a department chair's survey response, one faculty member also listed course development as an important criterion for securing tenure.

Scholarship. Those criteria receiving votes as being most important among deans in granting tenure in terms of scholarship include "Number of manuscripts," Multidisciplinary research endeavors," and "Student research publications" (Table 3). Curiously, the number of manuscripts also rated as the least important by the same number of deans, two votes in each case. Other criteria listed when considering tenure include "Published software programs," "Video and/or television productions," and "Books and book chapters."

Many of the department chairs identified "Number of manuscripts," "Impact factor of publications or journals," "Multidisciplinary research endeavors," "Grant submissions," and "Grant acceptance" as most important when reviewing scholarship activities, with the number of manuscripts garnering the most votes at four, followed by grants accepted with three. As was the

case with deans, department chairs selected the number of manuscripts produced as the most important criteria. Other criteria mentioned as meaningful scholarship endeavors included "Service in national organizations," "Presentations at international, national, state, and local conferences," and "Writing accreditation proposals for national accreditation."

Faculty identified a number of criteria as most important in obtaining tenure, listing "Number of manuscripts," "Impact factor of publications or journals," "Acceptance rate of journal," "First versus co-author status," "Grant submissions," and "Grant acceptance." Thirteen out 22 faculty respondents (59 %) believe the number of manuscripts ranks highest in order of importance of evaluating scholarship for tenure. However, like the deans and department chairs, a notable number (5) thought the number of manuscripts was the least important criteria. Additional criteria cited by faculty included "National and international conference presentations, "Research projects," and "Peer reviewed presentations."

Service. Of the nine criteria listed "University committees," "Civic organizations," "Paid consulting with K-12 schools," and "Leading professional development" all earned votes as the most important (Table 4). However, two deans selected serving on university committees and participating in civic organizations as the least important criteria. Included among the criteria for service by one dean was "Leadership in professional organizations with high national and international visibility."

Department chairs recognized "University committees," "Department committees," "Volunteer work," "Paid consulting with K-12 schools," Unpaid consulting with K-12 schools," and "Leading professional development" as the most important criteria for evaluating service in granting tenure. Five department chairs identified university committee work as the least important and four chairs put volunteer work at the bottom. Added under other criteria included "Student recruiting and advising," "Sponsoring a student organization," and "Leadership in a professional organization."

Faculty also recognized a wide range of criteria as most important when evaluating service in the tenure process, "University committees," "Department committees," "Volunteer work," "Paid consulting with K-12 schools," and "Leading professional development" all ranked at the top. Twelve out of 21 faculty selected participating on university committees as the most important criteria with six other members indicating it was the least important. Other criteria identified by some faculty as important included "Advising doctoral students" and "Creating professional development workshops."

Implications

Within the tenure guidelines, there are three basic criteria that faculty must meet or exceed: teaching quality, scholarly product, and service to the university and profession. While different colleges and universities, and to some extent, different departments within those colleges and universities, have varying expectations in granting tenure, institutions must establish guidelines consistent with their own values and beliefs. Tenure candidates frequently wonder: "What are the potential barriers to success and how much is enough to ensure career promotion?"
More importantly, where does a faculty member go at his or her institution to find out how much is enough? Candidates need to know what the expectations are regarding all three components,

not just scholarship, at that moment, in his or her department and institution. Good sources of information for these issues include:

- Formal documentation outlining tenure requirements provided by the institution
- Recent tenure cases in the department
- Tenure and promotion committee heads or administrators in charge of the tenure process
- Colleagues at comparable institutions
- Department chair
- College dean
- Members of the tenure review committee

Much of the tenure evaluation process involves measurable items, including peer-reviewed articles and books published, mean score of student evaluation ratings, presentations given, and service on editorial boards and committees (Groves, 2013). Although, when it comes to assessing excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service there are clear differences among deans, chairs, and faculty. To ensure institutions conduct transparent, reliable and effective tenure reviews, guidelines containing a comprehensive and fair set of procedures must be accessible. However, Groves (2013) noted the fundamental question always comes back to, "What is the impact of the candidate's work and what is his or her trajectory?"

Taking into consideration the goals of the department, college, and institution, the evaluation of a candidate remains an inquiry process, asking: Is the candidate among the most able in his or her field? (New York University, 2018). An important lesson for tenure-track faculty of educational leadership programs to embrace is that effective teaching is vital. Regarding scholarship, the perceptions vary, but a faculty member who is consistently involved in writing is likely to emerge from the review process successfully. Querying the chair and dean on what they look for is a good idea, but a consistent agenda for scholarship will reap benefits regarding tenure.

The beginning of an academic career is an arduous time for junior faculty requiring a great deal of effort; there always seems to be one more proposal to submit, paper to write, course to prepare, or meeting to attend. The researchers investigated perspectives among those intimately involved in the process and have concluded that there are multiple ways to accomplish the tenure requirements of teaching, service, and scholarship, but it is the responsibility of the tenure-track professor to be regularly involved in all three.

References

American Association of University Professors (2018). Tenure. Retrieved from https://www.aaup.org/issues/tenure

Balogun, J., Sloan, P., & Germain, M. (2007). Core values and evaluation processes associated with academic tenure. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 104*(4), 1107-1115.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brinkmann, S. (2011). Interviewing and the production of the conversational self. In N. Dentin & M. Guardian (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and global crises* (pp. 56-75). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*. New York: Oxford Press.

Charmaz, K. (2004). Premises, principles, and practices in qualitative research: Revisiting the foundations. *Qualitative Health Research, (14)*7, 976-993.

Flaherty, C. (2017, June 26). Old criticisms, new threats [Blog post]. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/06/26/professors-are-often-political-lightning-rods-now-are-facing-new-threats-over-their

Groves, R. (2013, July 3). Some thought on the tenure process [Blog post]. The Provost's Blog, Georgetown University. Retrieved from https://blog.provost.georgetown.edu/some-thoughts-on-the-tenure-decision/

Hertzog, M. (2017). *Protections of tenure and academic freedom in the United States: Evolution and interpretation*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International.

Holland, B. (2016). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 20*(1), 63-71.

Kahlenberg, R. (2016). Tenure has a long history and, hopefully, a future. *Phi Delta Kappan, 97*(6), 16-21.

Letts, L., Wilkins, S., Law, M., Stewart, D., Bosch, J., & Westmorland, M. (2007). Guidelines for critical review form: Qualitative studies (version 2.0). In L. Letts, et al., *Qualitative review form guidelines*. Retrieved December 10, 2017, from http://www.srs-mcmaster.ca/Portals/20/pdf/ebp/qualguidelines_version2.0.pdf

McLeod, S. (2017). Qualitative vs. quantitative. Simply Psychology. Retrieved from https://www.simplypsychology.org/qualitative-quantitative.html

Money, J. (2015, April 9). Teachers push back on criticism of their profession [Blog post]. *Education Week*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/teaching_now/2015/04/teachers-push-back-on-criticism-of-their-profession.html

New York University, (2018). Promotion and tenure guidelines. *NYU Policy*. Retrieved from https://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines.html

Pérez, M. & Cannella, G. (2011). Using situational analysis for critical qualitative research purposes. In N. Denzin & M. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and global crises* (pp. 97-117). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Register, S., & King, K. (2017). Promotion and tenure: Application of scholarship of teaching and learning, and scholarship of engagement criteria to health professions education. *Health Professions Education* (2017). Retrieved http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hpe.2017.02.002

Stergiou, K., & Somarakis, S. (2016). Academic freedom and tenure: Introduction. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics, 15*(1), 1-5. Retrieved December 10, 2017, from https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00168

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Texas Education Code (2017a). Chapter 11 School Districts, Subchapter E, Superintendents and Principals. Retrieved December 10, 2017, from http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.11.htm

Texas Education Code (2017b). Chapter 149 Commissioner's Rules Concerning Educator Standards, Subchapter BB, Administrator Standards. Retrieved December 10, 2017, from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter149/ch149bb.html

Wiley, C., Wallingford, V., Monllor-Tormos, M., & Konyu-Fogel, G. (2016). Faculty promotion in business schools: What counts and what should count? *Journal of Higher Education Theory & Practice, 16*(4), 105-123.

Young, S., Uy, A., & Bell, J. (2017). Student engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity (SERSCA) program: Sharing a program model from design and development through evaluation. *Innovative Higher Education, 42*(1), 65-76.