

Accounting Faculty Opinions on Post-Tenure Review

Rafik Z. Elias

Cameron University

Abstract

Tenure has been cherished in academia for a long time. However, factors such as decreasing budgets and increasing demands for faculty accountability have resulted in many colleges/universities implementing post-tenure review policies. This paper examines accounting faculty opinions on post-tenure review. A national survey was conducted to determine opinions on possible consequences of post-tenure review as well as support for several policies currently in place in many colleges/universities and the likelihood of implementing these policies in the respondents' institutions. Possible advantages of post-tenure review such as improved performance and possible disadvantages such as loss of academic freedom were not substantiated in this study. Results revealed significant differences in opinion on post-tenure reviews based on many factors such as rank, tenure status, experience and size of the institution.

Introduction

The tenure system has existed in American universities for the greater part of the twentieth century. During this period, it survived many calls from politicians, trustees, students and the general public for its abolition. However, in the last decade, increasing demands from many constituents of higher education prompted institutions to reconsider the concept of tenure. Institutions are increasingly requiring tenured faculty to undergo performance evaluations, commonly known as "post-tenure review" (Johnson and Kelly 1998).

The purpose of this paper is to examine opinions on post-tenure review from both the positive and the negative sides. Specifically, several advantages and disadvantages of post-tenure review are investigated from faculty perspective. In addition, faculty support for five review policies, currently in place in many institutions, is investigated.

Post-tenure review has been likened to the "elephant-in-the-room syndrome" in psychotherapy where the patient ignores a central reality in his/her personal situation (Applbaum 1997; Livingston 1992). Currently, at least 28 states have mandated some kind of post-tenure review in all their public institutions (Morreale and Licata 1997). Many private institutions have also mandated such review. Andrews and Licata (1991) reported that 70 percent of surveyed institutions have some form of post-tenure review. However, many faculty and administrators are ignoring calls for tenure reform (Applbaum 1997). This is evident in the lack of research on post-tenure review, especially empirical research. Existing research provides anecdotal evidence of possible consequences of post-tenure review through faculty interviews in several institutions.

This exploratory study fills a void in the research on post-tenure reviews by presenting accounting faculty opinions on review policies and their consequences. The findings reveal that

The author thanks the Editor, Associate Editor, two anonymous reviewers and workshop participants at Cameron University for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

accounting faculty differ significantly in their opinions on the consequences of post-tenure review as well as differing support for such review. These differences are functions of many factors including rank and experience, tenure status, type of school (private vs. public and AACSB-accredited vs. non-AACSB accredited) and size of school.

The Institution of Tenure

The tenure system in higher education started at the turn of the twentieth century as a result of concerns over faculty academic freedom (Whitehead et al. 1998). Finkin (1983) notes that tenure exists for at least two reasons: protection of academic freedom and provision of economic security. Applbaum (1997) explains academic freedom as encompassing the freedom to take chances academically, to experiment with new instructional techniques and to explore new, controversial areas of research. Economic security means the ability to fail in these endeavors without the fear of termination (Applbaum 1997).

Even though tenure has been around for a long time, non-academics have difficulty understanding its merit and faculty and administrators have difficulty explaining it. Politicians, students, and the general public frequently perceive tenured professors as performing their duties in a leisurely manner (Whitehead et al. 1998). Henry (1980) called this phenomenon "the tenured-professor syndrome" where a faculty member shows a lack of interest in teaching, research and service. However, recent empirical research does not support this perception. Antony and Raveling (1998) tested differences in faculty productivity in about 1,000 institutions and found no significant differences in productivity between tenured and non-tenured faculty. However, they noted that tenured faculty teach less but engage in more service and administrative duties than non-tenured faculty.

Morreale and Licata (1997) posit five reasons why tenure is under more attack at this point in history: (1) the economic squeeze that is affecting business, government and higher education; (2) the demand for accountability and pressure from state legislatures; (3) misunderstanding about the nature of faculty work; (4) the privilege of economic security; and (5) increasing inflexibility and rising cost of higher education's work force. Due to increasing pressure from state legislatures and taxpayers, institutions realized they had to walk a fine line between the "status quo" and totally abolishing tenure. Post-tenure review became a viable response.

Pros and Cons of Post-Tenure Review

A discussion on the appropriateness of post-tenure review usually involves both optimism and apprehension. Proponents of this policy suggest that it can result in improved performance, more accountability, improved collegiality and, eventually, better personnel decisions. Those in favor of post-tenure review argue that faculty will be motivated to improve their performance in many areas such as scholarship and teaching due to the clarification of performance expectations on a more regular basis (Chait and Ford 1982; Perry 1983). Those who support post-tenure review argue that current informal performance evaluations are too subjective and inadequate to be of real value (Morreale and Licata 1997). Proponents argue that faculty gain significant performance feedback from their colleagues which results in improved collegiality (Chait and Ford 1982; Bennet and Chater 1984). Furthermore, post-tenure reviews are expected to result in a fairer and more efficient allocation of resources such as increases in salary and other benefits if the reviews are tied to a reward system (Bennet and Chater 1984).

Opponents of post-tenure review believe that such policies would have adverse consequences. Their first concern is the loss of academic freedom (AAUP 1983; Perry 1983). They argue that senior (usually tenured) faculty take more chances in teaching and research compared to junior faculty and that post-tenure review would lead the former to a "status quo" in teaching and research. Opponents also argue that post-tenure review would create a hostile environment between faculty and administrators and would result in suspicion and mistrust (Stern 1983). Opponents also believe that post-tenure review is too costly in terms of resources and too time consuming for both faculty and administrators and that the benefits are not worth the extra cost or effort (AAUP 1983; Bennet and Chater 1984). Finally, critics argue that post-tenure review would result in the eventual disappearance of tenure (AAUP 1983).

Johnson (1993) interviewed faculty at two institutions: a small private liberal-arts college and a comprehensive publicly-funded university. Results from interviews indicated that faculty did not believe post-tenure review would have an effect on their performance. The claim that faculty benefited from performance feedback from colleagues was supported in the small college but not in the large university. Faculty did not, however, believe that improved personnel decisions would result from post-tenure review since they did not believe the review would be tied to a reward structure. They also believed that post-tenure review would be too costly and time-consuming. On the other hand, the fear of loss of academic freedom was not reported by the interviewed faculty, neither was fear of tenure erosion.

Post-Tenure Review Options

Morreale and Licata (1997) surveyed AACSB-accredited institutions and provided a summary of five post-tenure review policies currently used in these institutions. The current study presents these five options to accounting faculty and solicits their opinions on support for such policies in their institutions and the likelihood of their implementation.

The first option (annual reviews) involves a system of annual evaluation of tenured faculty to determine salary increases, research support and other benefits. Under this option, a beginning-of-year plan is discussed and end-of-year performance evaluation is conducted. Policies may be implemented for dismissal due to incompetence if performance is unsatisfactory.

The second option (summative: triggered/consequential) involves only *selected* tenured faculty who exhibited sub-standard performance in another review (e.g. annual review). Unsatisfactory performance, according to a developed three-year plan, could lead to dismissal proceedings (Morreale and Licata 1997). The third option (summative: periodic/consequential) involves evaluating *all* tenured faculty on a regular basis. Those faculty with unsatisfactory performance, according to a developed three-year plan, could face dismissal for cause hearings (Morreale and Licata 1997).

The fourth option (formative: individual and department needs) involves developing a five-year improvement plan for all tenured faculty focusing on individual and department needs. The fifth option (formative: individual needs) also develops a five-year improvement plan but focuses only on the tenured faculty needs. Under the fourth and fifth options, deliberations are confidential and can not be used in termination proceedings (Morreale and Licata 1997).

Research Method

A questionnaire was developed to solicit accounting faculty opinions on the consequences of post-tenure review and their support for and opinion on the likelihood of implementation of the five options. The sample consisted of 740 accounting faculty in all size and type institutions throughout the United States. The database was obtained from Hasselback's Directory of Accounting Faculty (1998). The randomly selected faculty were mailed a copy of the questionnaire and a return envelope for the responses. One envelope was returned as undeliverable. A total of 225 responses were received yielding a 30.4% response rate. After disregarding unusable responses due to missing information, the final sample consisted of 216 faculty members representing a usable response rate of 29.2%. An analysis of the postmarks indicated that a national sample had been achieved. The response rate for this study compares favorably with other studies using accounting faculty (e.g. Borkowski and Gaffney 1995). To measure non-response bias, a comparison between early and late respondents was conducted and revealed no significant differences in opinions on post-tenure review or support for such policies between early and late respondents.

The questionnaire consisted of two major sections. First, faculty were asked about their agreement or disagreement with possible consequences of post-tenure review on their campus. The respondents recorded their opinions on a seven-point Likert scale. The following possible outcomes of a post-tenure review policy, as developed by Chait and Ford (1982) and Johnson (1993), were used: (1) it will improve my performance; (2) it will make me more aware and alert of my actions; (3) it will enhance collegial relationships by receiving performance feedback from my colleagues; (4) it will result in improved personnel decisions; (5) it will result in loss of academic freedom; (6) it will require excessive cost in time and energy and (7) it will eventually result in tenure erosion.

The second portion of the questionnaire included a description of the five post-tenure review options, as described in Morreale and Licata (1997). One set of questions asked faculty to indicate their support for implementing each of these policies in their institution. Another set of questions asked the respondents to indicate the likelihood that each of these policies would be implemented on their campus in the foreseeable future. Each set of questions was answered on a seven-point scale.

In addition to responding to several questions on post-tenure review, respondents were asked questions about gender, degree held, accounting certification, academic rank, administrative duties, experience at the present institution, tenure-status, type of institution (private vs. public), accreditation status (AACSB vs. non-AACSB), highest degree offered and size of institution. Answers to these questions were used to classify respondents into groups and were used to determine differences in opinions on post-tenure review. Descriptive statistics are provided in [Table 1](#).

Nonparametric statistics were used because the data collected was not interval in nature. In cases where the classification had two categories, such as gender, the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (equivalent to the Mann-Whitney U-test) was used. However, in cases where the classification variable had more than two categories, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used (Conover 1980). The purpose of these tests is to determine whether respondents were from different populations regarding their responses to each of the questions about post-tenure reviews.

Research Results

The mean responses to the questions regarding the consequences of post-tenure review policies, support for these policies, and likelihood of their implementation are presented in [Table 2](#). The standard deviations generally suggest that accounting faculty have very different opinions regarding post-tenure review policies.

Regarding the consequences of post-tenure review, there were significant differences on every characteristic except administrator status and institution size. The mean responses of faculty opinions on consequences of post-tenure review are presented in [Table 3](#).

Male faculty were less likely to predict enhanced collegiality but more likely to predict tenure erosion compared to female faculty. Faculty without a doctoral degree were less likely to predict loss of academic freedom compared to faculty who hold a doctoral degree. Non-certified faculty indicated that post-tenure review policies were less likely to make them more aware of their actions. Non-certified faculty were also less likely to believe in improved personnel decisions but more likely to predict loss of academic freedom compared to certified faculty. Professors were the least likely to predict enhanced collegiality followed by associate professors, assistant professors and instructors. Professors were the most likely to predict excessive cost, followed by assistant professors, associate professors, with no significant difference between the latter two groups, and instructors. Professors were also the most likely to predict tenure erosion followed by assistant professors, associate professors, and instructors.

Faculty with 20 years or more of experience were the least likely to predict improved personnel decisions, followed by faculty with less experience. There was no significant difference between faculty with five years or less of experience and faculty with 6-10 years of experience. Faculty with 6-10 years of experience were the least likely to predict excessive cost in time and energy followed by faculty with 5 years or less of experience, faculty with 11-15 years and faculty with 16-20 years of experience, with no significant difference between the latter two groups, and faculty with 20 years or more of experience.

Faculty not on tenure-track were the most likely to predict improved performance and enhanced collegiality followed by faculty on tenure-track and tenured faculty. Faculty not on tenure-track were also the least likely to predict tenure erosion compared to tenured faculty and those on tenure-track, with no significant difference between the latter two groups. Faculty at private institutions were less likely to predict improved performance compared to faculty at public institutions. Faculty at AACSB-accredited institutions were less likely to predict enhanced collegiality compared to faculty at non AACSB-accredited institutions. Faculty at institutions offering doctoral programs were the most likely to predict improved performance followed by faculty at institutions offering masters and bachelor programs. Faculty at institutions offering bachelor programs were the least likely to be more aware of their actions followed by faculty at doctoral and master-granting institutions, with no significant difference between the latter two groups.

Regarding faculty support for the five options, there were significant differences based on certification, academic rank, years of experience, tenure-status, and size of institution. Mean responses of faculty support for post-tenure review options are presented in [Table 4](#).

Accounting faculty in general had slight support for the five review options currently in place in many institutions. Certified faculty were less likely to support option 5 compared to non-certified faculty. Professors were the least likely to support option 1, followed by associate professors, assistant professors and instructors. Faculty with 20 years or more of experience were the least likely to support option 2, followed by faculty with 11-15 years, faculty with 16-20 years, faculty with five years or less, with no significant difference between the latter two groups, and faculty with 6-10 years of experience. Faculty with 20 years or more of experience were also the least likely to support option 3, followed by faculty with 11-15 years, faculty with 16-20 years, faculty with five years or less, and faculty with 6-10 years of experience, with no significant difference between the latter two groups.

Tenured faculty were the least likely to support options 1 and 2, followed by faculty on tenure-track and faculty not on tenure-track. Faculty at institutions with less than 4,000 students were the most likely to support option 5, followed by faculty at institutions with 12,000-16,000 students, faculty at institutions with more than 16,000 students, with no significant difference between the latter two groups, faculty at institutions with 4,000-8,000 students, and faculty at institutions with 8,000-12,000 students.

Mean responses on likelihood of implementation of the five options are presented in **Table 5**. There were significant differences based on degree held, certification, tenure status, accreditation status, and institution size.

Generally, accounting faculty were less likely to predict the implementation of any post-tenure review option on their campus. Faculty without a doctoral degree were less likely to predict implementation of option 3 compared to faculty with a doctoral degree. Non-certified faculty were less likely to predict implementation of option 5 compared to certified faculty. Faculty on tenure-track were the least likely to predict implementation of option 1, followed by faculty not on-tenure track, with no significant difference between them, and tenured faculty. Faculty not on tenure-track were the least likely to predict implementation of option 3, followed by faculty on tenure-track, and tenured faculty. Faculty at non AACSB-accredited institutions were less likely to predict implementation of options 1 and 2 compared to faculty at AACSB-accredited institutions. Faculty at institutions with 4,000-8,000 students were significantly less likely to predict implementation of option 2 compared to faculty at all other institutions.

Discussion and Future Research

The findings of this study provide several important guidelines for administrators in implementing a post-tenure review policy. The worst fears of post-tenure review and the best scenarios were not substantiated in this study. Accounting faculty generally did not believe that improved performance would result from post-tenure review or that post-tenure review would result in loss of academic freedom.

Tenured faculty were less likely to believe that a post-tenure review policy would improve their performance compared to non-tenured faculty. This result is surprising since post-tenure review is designed to demand accountability of tenured faculty. However, results indicate that post-tenure review is viewed as more likely to improve the performance of faculty at Doctoral-granting institutions followed by faculty at Masters-granting institutions.

Tenured faculty were less likely to support the first and second options (i.e. post-tenure legalism) compared to non-tenured faculty. The American Association of

University Professors (AAUP) and the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) have generally opposed post-tenure legalism since it shifts the burden of proof from the professor to the institution and have generally supported post-tenure development (Edwards 1997). However, the AAUP noted that evaluation criteria should be developed, and the review process conducted, by the faculty.

The results of this study indicated that accounting faculty generally did not believe it was likely a post-tenure review policy would be implemented on their campus. These results contradict actual data that indicates more than half of the state university systems and many private institutions currently have post-tenure review policies in place (Morreale and Licata 1997).

Future research should investigate the reason accounting faculty do not believe post-tenure reviews would improve their performance. Possible reasons include that accounting faculty believe they are performing at a high level already and would not benefit from post-tenure reviews. Another explanation would be that faculty do not believe that post-tenure reviews would have any consequences (i.e. post-tenure legalism). A distinction should be made between high-performers and low-performers based on teaching, scholarship and service. The research should examine differences of perception of performance improvements between these two groups.

This study's results should be interpreted in light of the following limitations. Even though the response rate was adequate for the purpose of this study, there is always the possibility that non-respondents may have different characteristics than respondents that may affect the results. In addition, the survey used prior research to ask faculty about their opinions on seven possible consequences of post-tenure review policies. It is possible that such policies would have many other important consequences not addressed in this study.

References

- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). 1983. On Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty. *Academe* 69: 1a-14a.
- Andrews, H. A. and C. M. Licata. 1991. Administrative Perceptions of Existing Evaluation Systems. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 5: 69-76.
- Antony, J. S. and J. Raveling. 1998. A Comparative Analysis of Tenure and Faculty Productivity: Moving Beyond Traditional Approaches. *Proceedings of the Association for the Study of Higher Education ED 427598*.
- Appelbaum, R. L. 1997. "The Elephant in the Room": Post-Tenure Review. *JACA* 1: 1-9.
- Bennett, J. and S. Chater. 1984. Evaluating the Performance of Tenured Faculty Members. *Educational Record* 65: 38-41.
- Borkowski, S. C. and M. A. Gaffney. 1995. A Code of Ethics for Accounting Faculty: Some Empirical Evidence. *Accounting Educators' Journal* 7(2): 1-15.
- Chait, R. and A. Ford. 1982. *Beyond Traditional Tenure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conover, W. J. 1980. *Practical Nonparametric Statistics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Edwards, R. 1997. Can Post-tenure Review Help us Save the Tenure System? *Academe* 83: 26-31.
- Finkin, M. W. 1983. On Institutional Academic Freedom. *Texas Law Review* 61: 817-857.
- Goodman, M. J. 1990. The Review of Tenured Faculty. *Journal of Higher Education* 61: 408-424.
- Hasselback, J. 1998. *Accounting Faculty Directory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Henry, J. B. 1980. The Tenured Professor Syndrome. *Journal of Medical Education* 55: 449-451.
- Johnson, G. E. R. 1993. Post-Tenure Review: Practical Considerations. *Journal of Higher Education Management* 8: 19-29.
- Johnson, C. and M. Kelley. 1998. Productivity and Competence: Post-tenure Review in American Universities. *Issues in Accounting Education* 13: 747-759.
- Livingston, W. S. 1992. Looming Demands on Higher Education. *Issues in Accounting Education* 7: 80-86.
- Morreale, J. C. and C. M. Licata. 1997. *Post-Tenure Review: A Guide Book for Academic Administrators of Colleges and Schools of Business*. St. Louis: AACSB.
- Perry, S. 1983. Formal Reviews for Tenured Professors: Useful Spur or Orwellian Mistake? *Chronicle of Higher Education* 27: 25-27.
- Stern, C. 1983. Remarks. *Academe* 69: 12a-13a.
- Whitehead, R., D. Grider, J. Pritchard and P. A. Spikes. 1998. Post-Tenure Review: Reasonable or Superfluous. *Issues in Accounting Education* 13: 213-221.

Table 1: Demographics (N=216)

	<u>Count</u>	<u>Percent (%)</u>
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	147	68.05%
Female	69	31.94%
<u>Degree held</u>		
Doctorate	161	74.53%
NO	55	25.46%
<u>Certification</u>		
CPA or other	187	86.57%
NO	29	13.42%
<u>Academic Rank</u>		
Instructor	13	6.01%
Assistant	59	27.31%
Associate	72	33.33%
Professor	72	33.33%
<u>Administration</u>		
Administrator	48	22.22%
NO	168	77.77%
<u>Experience</u>		
5 years or less	58	26.85%
6-10 years	48	22.22%
11-15 years	38	17.59%
16-20 years	27	12.50%
more than 20 years	45	20.83%
<u>Tenure status</u>		
Tenured	142	65.74%
On tenure-track	50	23.14%
Not on tenure-track	24	11.11%
<u>Type</u>		
Private	72	33.33%
Public	144	66.66%
<u>Accreditation</u>		
AACSB-accredited	149	68.98%
non-AACSB accredited	67	31.01%
<u>Highest degree offered</u>		
Doctorate	55	25.46%
Masters	135	62.50%
Bachelor	26	12.03%
<u>Size</u>		
Less than 4,000 students	47	21.75%
4,000-8,000 students	39	18.05%
8,000-12,000 students	47	21.75%
12,000-16,000 students	29	13.42%
more than 16,000 students	54	25.00%

Table 2: Mean Responses for all Faculty (N=216)

	<u>Means</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>
Consequences of review (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree)		
Improve performance	4.01	1.77
More alert about actions	4.38	1.84
Enhance collegiality	3.26	1.65
Improve personnel decisions	4.23	1.81
Loss of academic freedom	3.40	1.84
Excessive cost in time and energy	4.14	1.65
Tenure erosion	4.31	1.82
Support for review options (1=strongly oppose; 7=strongly support)		
Option 1: Annual review	4.17	2.10
Option 2: Summative: Triggered/consequential	4.23	1.96
Option 3: Summative: Periodic/Consequential	4.48	1.81
Option 4: Formative: Focus on individual & department needs	4.58	1.76
Option 5: Formative: Focuses on individual needs	4.55	1.73
Likelihood of implementation (1=highly unlikely; 7=highly likely)		
Option 1: Annual review	3.77	2.15
Option 2: Summative: Triggered/consequential	2.92	1.76
Option 3: Summative: Periodic/Consequential	3.62	1.91
Option 4: Formative: Focus on individual & department needs	3.18	1.65
Option 5: Formative: Focus on individual needs	3.06	1.58

Table 3: Consequences of Post-Tenure Review

Characteristic	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Male	3.96	4.34	3.14*	4.17	3.51	4.22	4.49**
Female	4.11	4.46	3.55*	4.34	3.17	3.97	3.91**
Doctorate	4.05	4.46	3.16	4.14	3.50*	4.16	4.34
NO	3.89	4.14	3.56	4.49	3.09*	4.09	4.20
Certification	4.02	4.48**	3.32	4.32**	3.25***	4.10	4.28
NO	3.93	3.72**	2.89	3.62**	4.34***	4.41	4.48
Instructor	4.46	4.53	4.23*	5.23	2.46	3.15**	2.46***
Assistant	4.16	4.33	3.49*	4.40	3.35	4.08**	4.49***
Associate	3.80	4.31	3.16*	4.06	3.51	4.01**	4.23***
Professor	4.01	4.45	3.00*	4.06	3.50	4.50**	4.56***
Administrator	4.10	4.39	3.10	4.39	3.39	4.20	4.10
NO	3.98	4.38	3.30	4.18	3.40	4.12	4.36
5 or <	4.20	4.39	3.55	4.60*	3.53	3.94***	4.53
6-10 years	4.31	4.81	3.35	4.54*	3.00	3.56***	3.81
11-15 years	3.71	4.28	3.21	4.07*	3.44	4.42***	4.15
16-20 years	4.11	4.40	3.11	3.88*	3.51	4.48***	4.25
20 or >	3.60	3.97	2.93	3.75*	3.55	4.57***	4.71
Tenured	3.83*	4.30	3.06**	4.05	3.47	4.28	4.42**
Tenure-track	4.32*	4.42	3.54**	4.48	3.40	4.02	4.46**
NO	4.45*	4.70	3.87**	4.75	2.95	3.58	3.33**
Private	3.70**	4.31	3.15	4.04	3.61	4.30	4.43
Public	4.16**	4.41	3.31	4.32	3.29	4.06	4.25
AACSB	4.02	4.51	3.14*	4.18	3.42	4.18	4.37
Non-AACSB	4.00	4.08	3.52*	4.34	3.34	4.04	4.16
Doctorate	4.32**	4.45**	3.47	4.60	3.65	4.23	4.10
Masters	4.04**	4.50**	3.21	4.12	3.46	4.02	4.36
Bachelor	3.19**	3.61**	3.07	4.00	3.28	4.57	4.46
< 4000students	3.78	4.12	3.42	4.17	3.57	4.21	4.23
4000-8000	4.17	4.48	3.23	4.23	3.15	4.20	4.17
8000-12000	3.97	4.46	3.21	4.36	3.36	3.82	4.40
12000-16000	3.93	4.58	3.34	4.66	3.48	4.17	4.31
> 16000	4.16	4.35	3.14	4.25	3.42	4.29	4.38

*significant at .10 **significant at .05 ***significant at .01

Q1: Improve performance

Q2: More alert about actions

Q3: Enhance collegiality

Q4: Improve personnel decisions

Q5: Loss of academic freedom

Q6: Excessive cost in time and energy

Q7: Tenure erosion

Table 4: Support for Five Post-Tenure Review Policies

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Male	4.30	4.15	4.50	4.61	4.57
Female	4.10	4.40	4.43	4.52	4.52
Doctorate	4.12	4.14	4.51	4.67	4.60
NO	4.30	4.50	4.38	4.55	4.54
Certification	4.24	4.28	4.50	4.96	4.48*
NO	3.72	3.96	4.31	4.52	5.03*
Instructor	5.31*	4.61	4.69	4.69	4.46
Assistant	4.39*	4.52	4.69	4.83	4.84
Associate	4.05*	4.33	4.44	4.50	4.70
Professor	3.90*	3.83	4.30	4.44	4.18
Administrator	4.18	4.22	4.75	4.41	4.27
NO	4.16	4.23	4.40	4.63	4.63
5 or <	4.46	4.46***	4.82***	4.82	4.56
6-10 years	4.27	4.66***	4.93***	4.37	4.35
11-15 years	3.78	4.26***	4.18***	4.65	4.73
16-20 years	4.55	4.40***	4.44***	4.59	4.51
20 or >	3.77	3.35***	3.82***	4.42	4.62
Tenured	3.97**	4.03*	4.38	4.50	4.47
Tenure-track	4.32**	4.58*	4.70	4.94	4.88
NO	5.04**	4.70*	4.58	4.33	4.33
Private	3.97	4.19	4.57	4.38	4.59
Public	4.27	4.25	4.29	4.68	4.53
AACSB	4.31	4.15	4.46	4.46	4.53
Non-AACSB	3.85	4.41	4.52	4.85	4.59
Doctorate	4.23	3.92	4.49	4.49	4.50
Masters	4.20	4.37	4.49	4.53	4.58
Bachelor	3.88	4.15	4.38	5.03	4.50
< 4000students	4.08	4.76	4.55	4.80	4.95*
4000-8000	3.97	3.97	4.29	4.84	4.48*
8000-12000	4.38	4.36	4.29	4.27	4.04*
12000-16000	4.58	4.31	4.41	4.58	4.68*
> 16000	3.98	3.81	4.55	4.46	4.62*

*significant at .10 **significant at .05 ***significant at .01

*Option 1: Annual review**Option 2: Summative:
Triggered/consequential
Option 3: Summative:
Periodic/Consequential**Option 4: Formative: Focuses on
individual and department needs
Option 5: Formative: Focuses on
individual needs*

Table 5: Likely Implementation of Post-Tenure Review Policies

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Male	3.80	3.04	3.65	3.08	3.00
Female	3.69	2.68	3.53	3.40	3.18
Doctorate	3.89	2.98	3.85**	3.27	3.11
NO	3.41	2.74	3.08**	2.90	2.92
Certification	3.77	3.03	3.58	3.12	3.51*
NO	3.75	2.90	3.82	3.55	2.99*
Instructor	3.38	2.84	3.23	3.00	2.69
Assistant	3.31	2.77	3.32	3.13	3.11
Associate	3.95	3.18	3.79	3.31	3.25
Professor	4.02	2.80	3.76	3.12	2.90
Administrator	3.79	2.60	4.02	3.33	3.04
NO	3.76	3.01	3.50	3.14	3.07
5 or <	3.38	2.81	3.46	3.20	3.12
6-10 years	3.58	3.02	3.83	3.10	3.10
11-15 years	4.05	2.84	3.47	3.02	3.05
16-20 years	4.25	2.37	3.74	2.70	2.48
20 or >	3.93	3.37	3.64	3.66	3.31
Tenured	4.04**	3.01	3.83*	3.23	3.07
Tenure-track	3.22**	2.70	3.24*	3.12	3.06
NO	3.30**	2.87	3.12*	3.04	3.00
Private	3.81	2.84	3.69	3.41	3.29
Public	3.74	2.96	3.47	3.06	2.95
AACSB	4.12**	3.11**	3.71	3.22	3.00
Non-AACSB	3.00**	2.50**	3.41	3.10	3.19
Doctorate	4.09	2.85	3.67	3.36	3.20
Masters	3.64	3.01	3.65	3.19	3.01
Bachelor	3.76	2.61	3.34	2.76	3.03
< 4000students	3.38	2.89*	3.48	3.19	3.27
4000-8000	3.38	2.25*	3.82	3.05	2.84
8000-12000	4.00	3.27*	3.68	3.23	3.02
12000-16000	3.96	2.89*	3.13	3.10	2.86
> 16000	4.09	3.14*	3.79	3.27	3.18

*significant at .10 **significant at .05 ***significant at .01

Option 1: Annual review

Option 2: Summative: Triggered consequential

Option 3: Summative: Periodic Consequential

Option 4: Formative: Focus on individual and department needs

Option 5: Formative: Focus on individual needs