

Promotion and Tenure Issues for Two-year College Faculty of Four-Year Institutions

David A. Munn, Linda H. Houston and Royce Thornton

Introduction

Two-year colleges historically have been teaching institutions with a strong tradition of community and industry involvement [AACJC, 1984]. Many universities and four-year colleges operate satellite campuses offering two years of traditional liberal arts, business, engineering or agricultural technology and an associate degree. Faculty at these satellites (community colleges/technical colleges that are part of a larger university) face a special concern when their faculty appointments and accomplishments are evaluated by faculty and administrators at the parent institution for tenure and promotion. Will the faculty at two-year campuses be judged against their own faculty role and mission or against the broader university faculty role that emphasizes teaching upper-level courses, directing and teaching graduate students, and traditional scholarly activity and research?

Standards and expectations for promotion and tenure have been rising during the 1980's in higher education especially in the area of scholarly activity (Mooney, 1990). At our own institution, The Ohio State University, new committees of full professors were appointed at the College of Agriculture and university levels to screen and evaluate all candidates for promotion and tenure including those from the Cooperative Extension Service, the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, and The Ohio State

Munn and Houston are associate professors and Thornton is an assistant professor at The Ohio State University Agricultural Technical Institute, Wooster, Ohio 44691

University Agricultural Technical Institute (a satellite campus offering associate degrees in most aspects of agriculture). Because of rising expectations for tenure and promotion, and because these new committees of professors at the college and university levels were not totally informed of our duties and mission, our director appointed a faculty committee and charged it with rewriting our campus guidelines for promotion and tenure. We surveyed 32 member institutes of the AACJC Two-by-Four Year Council. A review of tenure and promotion issues for two-year colleges and the survey results are presented here.

Recent Surveys On Tenure And Promotion

The issues of faculty qualifications and faculty growth and development are interwoven into the matters of tenure and promotion. Many community and technical colleges hire faculty with master degrees, and such schools place a high value on business and industry experiences as an important aspect of faculty qualifications. Comprehensive and research universities normally hire as regular faculty only those with the Ph.D. or highest, appropriate academic degree. These schools value traditional academic scholarship as they search for faculty. Candidates are asked to present evidence of grantsmanship, refereed journal publications, authorship of books, and presentations at professional meetings. It is only to be expected that major differences in appropriate professional development and scholarly activity are going to occur at two-year institutions versus comprehensive and research universities. Faculty of two-year colleges or satellite campuses operated by or administratively nested within comprehensive or research universities face special concerns in the areas of hiring, tenuring, and developing faculty. How can these unique roles and missions of each campus (two-year and university) can be preserved and respected, not ground against one another?

Recent surveys published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (Mooney, 1989 and 1990) and conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for Higher Education shed valuable insight into faculties' and department chairpersons' views on tenure and promotion issues. The faculty at two-year colleges (not AACJC Two-by-Four Council members, but a broad survey of two-year college faculty) tend to see their primary role as teaching. Faculty at comprehensive and research universities see scholarly activity as their principal interest (Table 1). Faculty at two-year colleges are most likely to have professional contact with public school teachers (K-12). Comprehensive and research university faculty are the least involved with public school teachers according to the Carnegie Survey (Table 1). Since partnerships be-

Continued from previous page.

competition?

- a. one (1) [4]
 - b. two (0) [4]
 - c. three (1) [1]
 - d. one or two (4) [0]
 - e. up to five (2) [0]
 - f. set no limit (1) [2]
12. On a percentage basis, what do you think is the likelihood that your department would send students to participate in an undergraduate competition at the Southern Section ASAS annual meeting?
- a. less than 30% (0) [2]
 - b. between 30-50% (2) [2]
 - c. between 50-80% (2) [4]
 - d. greater than 80% (6) [3]

If you answered less than 30% or 30-50%, what factors do you foresee as being a deterrent to your participation?

- a. too much time involved (0) [2]
- b. too little student interest (0) [0]
- c. too little faculty interest (0) [2]
- d. all of the above (2) [0]

1 Parentheses () indicate department heads' responses.

2 Brackets [] indicate faculty responses.



Table 1. Faculty Survey of Scholarly Activities.

Scholarly Activities	-----Type of Institutions-----			
	Research	Comp	Liberal Arts	Two-Year
Major Interests:				
Primarily Research	18%	3%	2%	1%
Primarily Teaching	10%	39%	49%	77%
In Both, Leaning Toward Research	48%	20%	14%	6%
In Both, Leaning Toward Teaching	25%	38%	35%	16%
Professional Contact With K - 12 Teachers in the Past Year	37%	58%	59%	63%

Based on data in *The Chronicle of Higher Ed.*, 11-8-89, A-20.

tween higher education and the nation's public schools are often prescribed to help improve U.S. public schools, this is a noteworthy result. Two-year college faculty have a strong tradition of community involvement and service. Faculty at four-year liberal arts colleges were intermediate between two-year and comprehensive and research university faculty in their responses on most tenure and promotion issues. They express a stronger commitment to teaching than research university faculty, but a stronger commitment to traditional scholarship than two-year college faculty. A recent report by Scott Heller (1990) in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* suggests that the push for more scholarly activity by faculty at liberal arts colleges may change their culture and encourage faculty, especially younger faculty, to focus more attention on research often, but not always, at the expense of teaching.

Faculty at comprehensive and research universities felt that publishing was very important and teaching less important in achieving tenure and promotion at their institutions. Two-year faculty placed a higher expectation on effective teaching, but felt little pressure to publish. Again, four-year liberal arts faculty were intermediate (Table 2). Observations of teaching by administrators, peers, and student evaluations of teaching were most important for two-year faculty, whereas evaluations by outside scholars were important for faculty at research universities (Table 3). Again, liberal arts colleges were intermediate.

A survey of department chairpersons on items they perceived as very important in granting tenure was reported by Mooney (Feb. 7, 1990) in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Responding chairpersons affirmed the importance of quality teaching, but this was deemed most important by responding chairpersons at two-year colleges. Responding

Table 2. Faculty Survey on Tenure Issues.

Tenure Issues	-----Type of Institutions-----			
	Research	Comp	Liberal Arts	Two-Year
In my department it is difficult to achieve tenure without publishing.	94%	65%	39%	6%
The pressure to publish reduces teaching quality at my university.	52%	41%	22%	4%
Teaching effectiveness should be primary promotion consideration.	22%	41%	22%	92%

Based on data in *The Chronicle of Higher Ed.*, 11-8-89, A-20.

Table 3. Faculty Survey on Important Tenure Items.

Items Considered Very Important for Tenure	-----Type of Institutions-----			
	Research	Comp	Liberal Arts	Two-Year
Number of Publications	56%	29%	8%	2%
Research Grants Received by Scholar	41%	19%	9%	3%
Observations of Teaching by Colleagues or Administrators	4%	20%	28%	43%
Recommendations from Outside Scholars	53%	9%	16%	3%
Student Evaluations of Teaching	10%	37%	44%	29%
Service with Uni. Community	3%	17%	27%	19%
Academic Advising	1%	6%	15%	6%

Based on data in *The Chronicle of Higher Ed.*, 11-8-89, A-20.

chairpersons from research universities placed much emphasis on grantsmanship, quality of research, and number and quality of publications. At two-year institutions, chairpersons placed very little emphasis on these accomplishments (Table 4). The two-year department chairpersons valued institutional and community service and gaining a high reputation in a professional field, although the latter may mean something different than to research university faculty.

It is worth noting that the position paper "Associate Degree Preferred" by AACJC (1984) stresses the advantages of two-year college programs and various aspects of excellence or quality. But this report does not address the issues of faculty qualifications or appropriate faculty professional development and scholarly activity, how to keep a faculty member current and excited about his/her subject matter, and how to keep the course content and curriculum up to date. Surely, the issue of scholarly activity comes into play for two-year faculty and their counterparts at large comprehensive or research universities. The issues for two-year faculty are how much scholarly activity is needed and what kinds of activities are appropriate. Two-by-four faculty (two-year campus faculty administratively tied into larger universities) often feel they live and work at the confluence of two cultures. This confluence is the teaching cli-

Table 4. Factors Considered in Making Tenure Decisions, Fall 1987

Proportion of Dept. Chairmen Agreeing That Item is "Very Important" in Granting Tenure:	Public & Private Doctoral Institutions	Other Public 4-Yr. Institutions	Two-Year Institutions
Teaching Quality	68%	90%	99%
Institutional Activities or Service	15	38	41
Quality of Research	84	24	2
Quality of Publications	77	22	5
Reputation in Professional Field	56	20	22
Number of Publications	56	16	0
Community or Professional Service	10	20	20
Ability to Obtain Outside Funding	25	3	0

Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb. 7, 1990, 36 21 A15 & A19; Carolyn J. Mooney.

mate of a two-year campus and the scholarly world of the comprehensive and research universities which might be the best of both worlds or the horns of a dilemma. The survey of AACJC Two-by-Four Council member institutions provides insights into the confluence of the teaching campus and the scholarly-oriented research institutions.

Survey of AACJC Two by Four Council Institutions

Our survey was mailed to 32 member institutions of AACJC's Two-by-Four Council in the summer of 1989. A letter was addressed to the chief officer (Dean, Director, Provost, etc.) of each campus explaining that our institution was revising its guidelines for tenure and promotion. A copy of the institution's tenure and promotion policy plus a written response on tenure and promotion issues were requested. Responses were received from 16 of the 32 institutions surveyed. Nearly all respondents included a personal response from the institution's chief administrator or chief academic administrator. These cover letters were both concise and enlightening. The survey was not a carefully designed multiple choice instrument. Results are a matter of interpretation and compilation of 16 tenure and promotion policy documents tempered by the cover letters from campus leaders. The results will be presented in the text rather than a table format.

First, the area of teaching will be discussed. Very much in line with the Carnegie Foundation Surveys cited in Tables 1 and 2 earlier, good teaching is required at all institutions surveyed. Substantial efforts to document teaching success include evaluations by students, peers, and administrators. Average faculty teaching loads were 12-18 credit hours per quarter or semester. This may entail more than 12-18 hours of direct student contact since these institutions do not have graduate teaching assistants to teach laboratory and recitation sections. These teaching loads are much heavier than those required at research universities.

Service expectations to the academic institution were substantial. The expectation of "regular" faculty participation in faculty governance and other institutional service is substantial. Professional service (i.e., service to professional organizations or societies) was not universally required at all schools or for all faculty at a given school. Involvement with and service to academic professional societies tended to be expected and rewarded at those institutions with substantial, traditional scholarly activity requirements. Service to industry and the community was not universally required, but such expectations are substantial. We think such expectations are higher at two-year campuses than at research or comprehensive universities.

The area of scholarly activity is the one where expectations have been changing the most as two-year campuses become more mature academic institutions. Many of the institutions surveyed blend the components of professional development and scholarly activity. Such activity includes attending professional meetings, continuing education, and pursuit of advanced degrees besides membership in professional societies, reading books, and conducting traditional research resulting in presentations and journal articles. No

institution surveyed had scholarly activity/research expectations comparable with those at their "parent" campus. At four of the 16 responding institutions, there are no explicit requirements for traditional scholarly activity; i.e., writing and presentations at professional meetings as reflected in tenure and promotion policy documents. For eight of 16 institutions responding, at least some scholarly writing in popular and refereed journals plus presentations at professional meetings are required. We would like to offer reasons for requiring scholarly activity at all levels of higher education and then wrestle with the issues of how much and what kinds of scholarly activity is appropriate in the discussion and concluding remarks sections.

Discussion and Conclusions

Teaching is the heart of the mission and the enterprise at two-year campuses. Good teaching should always be expected and documented. As citizens of their campus, community, and industry or academic profession, faculty are going to be involved in substantial service activity. The most discussion or cause of controversy on two-year campuses is in the area of scholarly activity expectations. A colleague, Dr. Bernie Erwin (Professor of Agricultural Economics, The Ohio State University), has stated that "the mission of the faculty at Ohio State is to discover and to teach." This mission will cover Cooperative Extension, graduate education, scholarly inquiry, technical college offerings, etc. We see three reasons advanced for encouraging scholarly activity by faculty: (1) to keep abreast of new findings in their field, (2) to contribute new knowledge to their field, and (3) to challenge and stimulate faculty over a long career to avoid "burnout" or "brain death."

For faculty at major research universities, such scholarly activity includes pursuit of outside grants and funding support; research in libraries, laboratories, computer simulation, or research in outdoor environments; publication of books and monographs, publications in refereed journals; and presentations to colleagues at national/international meetings. For faculty at two-year campuses, scholarly activity may include library investigations and continuing education opportunities like computer courses or workshops; it may mean writing about teaching or the academic discipline subject matter in popular and refereed journals and presentations at national meetings. Two-year colleges are mostly "young" (post World War II) institutions with an evolving tradition of what comprises scholarly activity. The notion of teaching and the study of teaching as scholarship is in keeping with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's recommendations for a reevaluation of scholarship in this nation's colleges and universities (Leatherman, 1990).

Increasing the expectations for faculty scholarly activity will certainly require extra financial and facilities support and will require a redistribution of faculty time away from teaching and service activities. We see scholarly activity by two-year college faculty as a way of coping with change and burnout, but we close with this challenge: Will scholarly activity expectations bring the joy of discovery to two-

Blight in the Classroom

Fred C. White

Abstract

Cheating by students is a serious problem that needs to be dealt with effectively by college teachers. This paper describes how to guard against cheating, how to detect cheating, and what to do when cheating is detected. Teachers should keep thorough records, closely monitor exams, use a dynamic testing strategy, and use multiple tests. Effectively dealing with the problems of cheating are costly in terms of time and effort. Each individual teacher is encouraged to select a combination of preventative measures to reduce the risk of cheating. Each cheating incident should be referred to judiciary or administrative hearings.

You are administering another undergraduate exam. A student whom you have not seen in class for three weeks arrives wearing a sheik blouse and skirt and a baseball cap. It's cloudy outside and the cap is not color coordinated with the rest of her clothing. Is she wearing a cap to cover her eyes as she looks on a neighboring student's test? You suspect a crime in the making.

After you return the corrected exams to the class, a student approaches you with two tests in his hands. He points out that both tests have the same answers. His answers were incorrect, while his friend's answers were correct. Yes, but this student had a green test and his friend had a white test. While you are explaining that different tests may require different answers, you suspect foul play.

Soon after returning the exams, another student demands

White is a D. W. Brooks Distinguished Professor, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602.

Continued from previous page.

year college faculty and ultimately to their students, or will all the errors and terror of "publish or perish" become part of the two-year college scene? Mooney (June 27, 1990) describes a faculty increasingly divided over expectations, standards, and rewards for scholarly activity versus teaching and service. Can two-year colleges keep their central focus on teaching if they push too hard for faculty scholars and scholarly activities?

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the support provided by The Ohio State University Agricultural Technical Institute and Director Dan Garrison to encourage presentation of this work in a forum session by the same title on April 23, 1990, at the AACJC Annual Meeting in Seattle, Washington. Also, we thank Dean Charles McRoy, University of Maine-Orono, and Provost Charles Reidlinger, New Mexico State

to get his corrected exam back. Since he did not take the exam in the first place, you will have great difficulty in returning it to him. For the first time, his memory is perfect. He recalls the test and his answers in great detail. He has been planning this caper for several days, and his adrenalin is high. He has caught you off-guard, and if he can cause you to doubt your handling of the papers, he will make an easy A. He has a lot to gain and apparently nothing to lose by pursuing this course of action rather than taking the exam.

Six hours after returning the corrected exams, you are faced with an irate student. After only six hours, he has now recognized that you made an error in adding up the number of incorrect points on his exam. You found 45 points of incorrect answers, but he produces (and I mean produces) an exam with only 15 points of incorrect answers. Dum de dum dum ... dum!

Could any of this really happen? Yes, it all happened to me recently, and it can happen to you. However, there are ways to protect yourself against cheating by students. The objective of this paper is to identify practical approaches for instructors to deal with academic dishonesty. More specifically, the paper will describe how to guard against academic dishonesty, how to detect it, and how to deal with it if detected.

Academic Dishonesty Described

University regulations on academic honesty require students to do independent work. Any of the following actions violate this principle and constitute academic dishonesty¹.

University-Alamogordo, for serving as a reactor panel during the forum.

References

- The Am. Assoc. of Community and Junior Colleges. October 1984. Associate Degree Preferred. National Center for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 410, Washington, D.C. 20036.
- Heller, Scott. July 5, 1990. Stronger Push for Research on Liberal Arts Campuses Brings Fears That Their Culture is Threatened. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 36, No. 42, pp A11, A14-A15.
- Leatherman, Courtney. Dec. 5, 1990. Definition of Scholarship Must be Expanded to Include Teaching. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 37, No. 14, pp A1, A16-A17.
- Mooney, Carolyn J. Nov. 8, 1989. Carnegie Faculty Survey. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 36, No. 10, p A1, A18-A22.
- Mooney, Carolyn J. Feb. 7, 1990. Three in Four Department Heads are Found to Stress Teaching in Faculty Hiring. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 36, No. 21, p A15 & A19.
- Mooney, Carolyn J. June 27, 1990. Faculty Generation Gap Brings Campus Tensions, Debates Over Rating of Professors. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 36, No. 41, pp A1, A18-A20.

