

Blessed Trinity College

Modifying Faculty Evaluation and Contracts

William T. Mallon

On March 11, 1996, Carol Roberts, academic dean and interim vice president at Blessed Trinity College,¹ gathered up several reports from her desk and made her way to a meeting with the college's Contracts and Promotion Committee. As she walked out of her office and down the hall, she reflected, "It seems that one way this institution solves problems is to not finish things. Such an approach asks, 'if no one at the gates is clamoring for a resolution, why solve the problem?'" She quickly reviewed the situation at Blessed Trinity. The board of trustees put a moratorium on tenure in 1980. After the moratorium, new faculty were hired with the understanding that they would have multiyear contracts. Despite repeated attempts to put a faculty evaluation system and multiyear contracts into place, however, neither policy had been implemented. Instead,

William T. Mallon prepared this case under the supervision of James P. Honan, lecturer on education, Harvard Graduate School of Education, as the basis for class discussion rather than to illustrate either effective or ineffective handling of an administrative situation.

This case was prepared for the Project on Faculty Appointments and funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts. © 1998 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, used in a spreadsheet, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise—without the permission of the Project on Faculty Appointments at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

all faculty hired from 1980 to 1996 had been on a series of one-year contracts.

When she was named academic dean in August 1995, Roberts' charge was to make the multiyear contracts and faculty evaluation system work. She entered the March 1996 Contracts and Promotion Committee meeting with an agenda to make progress on this issue that had stymied Blessed Trinity for over a decade.

Blessed Trinity College

Blessed Trinity College, located in a large metropolitan area, was founded in the 1950s by the Congregation of the Sisters of the Blessed Trinity (CSBT). At that time, the area was experiencing rapid population growth that coincided with increasing demand for higher education for young Catholic women. To fill a niche in that expanding market, the Sisters obtained a charter for a four-year liberal arts college for women. The institution began admitting men in 1972.

In fall 1993, Blessed Trinity expanded to a second campus in a suburban area not too far from the original campus. Through a business-education partnership with a major corporation, Blessed Trinity opened a new facility on the suburban campus in January 1995. As of fall 1996, Blessed Trinity provided liberal arts and professional undergraduate programs and graduate education programs for nearly 3,000 full- and part-time students.

Governance and Policy-Making Traditions

From its beginnings, Blessed Trinity College experienced rapid growth in enrollment, curricular offerings, and academic and administrative staff. One internal document described the college's growth during the first fifteen years as "steady, secure, and even predictable." Despite its growth, Blessed Trinity operated with little administrative infrastructure or formal policy. Long-time faculty report that the college did not have many formal rules or regulations. No fac-

ulty search committees existed; rather, the college president interviewed and appointed new faculty members.

In its first several decades, neither the faculty nor the administration of Blessed Trinity focused much attention on promotion and tenure. "In those days," said a senior faculty member, "nobody bothered with a formal process of tenure, though on paper you could have it." Furthermore, he reported, administrators discouraged faculty from applying for tenure. "There was no campus ethos to get it."

Faculty who did apply for promotion and tenure encountered a much simpler course than is typically associated with the tenure process. Describing promotion procedures, the college's 1981 accreditation self-study implied that faculty needed to provide little more than a signed application: "Promotion is not automatic. To initiate this process each fall, four copies of the Application for Faculty Promotion are completed by the eligible candidate. The original copy is retained by the candidate who gives the other three to the Department Chairman. The latter signs the forms, retains one copy, and sends his evaluation and the two remaining copies to the Academic Dean. In turn the Academic Dean recommends the candidate to the President or states his reasons for contrary action. Following review by the Faculty-Administration Committee, the President submits final recommendations to the Board of Trustees."

"There was little evidence needed in one's dossier other than a resume and student evaluations," said John Stephenson, a tenured physics professor who came to Blessed Trinity in 1979. "The real interest was in teaching evaluations and the recommendation from the department chair. Compared to other colleges with which I was familiar, I thought this tenure and promotion process was a piece of cake."

Nor did faculty play a large role in campus governance. A faculty senate established in 1970 included all full-time faculty members. Attendance at faculty senate meetings was mandatory, but enthusiasm for participation was low. One administrator commented, "Faculty back then didn't think too much about the organization and governance of higher education." But the lack of faculty involvement

in governance was not solely attributable to lack of interest. Administrators opposed faculty involvement in institutional decision making. The 1981 Accreditation Self-Study, for example, reported that: “[The college must maintain a] balance between the demands of fiscal responsibility, accountability and creative leadership on the one hand and accommodating the expectations of participatory governance on the other. A totally decentralized decision-making structure is not currently viewed as the most effective means of dealing with these new realities.”

Many faculty members accepted the administration’s powerful role in governing the institution. An economics professor explained, “It was much easier in those days to get decisions made. We would go to the president with our requests and she would say yes or no. That was it.”

The Moratorium on Tenure

From 1959 to 1966, tenure at Blessed Trinity was tied to rank; faculty members automatically received tenure after four years as full professors. Then, from the late 1960s to 1980, tenure followed a probationary period of seven years of service without regard to rank. A quota system prevented more than two-thirds of the full-time faculty from receiving tenure. College policy stipulated that, if a tenure opening was not available, tenure-eligible faculty would be offered one-year contracts in the interim.

The board of trustees began to pose questions about the college’s faculty appointment policies in the late 1970s. Its concerns centered around three issues: changes in faculty demographics, changing demographics in the religious order, and tenure’s effects on the financial well-being of the college.

Changes in Faculty Demographics

Through the 1970s and 1980s, Blessed Trinity experienced constant enrollment growth (see Table 1.1), particularly in professional degree programs such as nursing and education.

Table 1.1. Growth in Full-Time Equivalent Faculty Members and Students, Fall 1980–1983

	<i>Fall 80</i>	<i>Fall 81</i>	<i>Fall 82</i>	<i>Fall 83</i>
FTE Students	776	878	964	994
FTE Faculty	72	76	97	107

In the 1980s, 75 percent of the college’s students and faculty were in the nursing division, and eleven full-time faculty members were added to that department between 1978 and 1983. Many liberal arts departments—biology, chemistry, English, and philosophy—added full-time faculty to provide service courses to nursing students. Business administration also experienced growth: between 1978 and 1983, it added three full-time faculty to its ranks.

Shortly after being named president of Blessed Trinity in 1979, Sr. Mary Johnston realized that many departments had almost reached their tenure quota. This was particularly true of the nursing division. “Because of the strong growth in many departments, we were concerned that a large number of tenure-track faculty would reach the ‘up-or-out’ decision point and be faced with a quota,” Sr. Mary said. “If the department was tenured-in, many instructors would be forced to leave.” An internal college document described the problem and advocated eliminating tenure: “Some faculty may be adversely affected if a tenure system is continued at Blessed Trinity College. Within the traditional tenure system, if no tenure slot exists at the college or in a certain division, a faculty member is forced to leave the institution after a probationary period if a quota system exists. This action occurs whether the faculty member is qualified or not. As a result, the tenure decision, if the tenure quota is reached, is based solely on numbers, not on merit.”

Changing Demographics in the Religious Order

At one time, Blessed Trinity relied heavily on the religious sisters for faculty positions. In the early years of the college, the percentages of lay and religious faculty were equal. By 1980, however, members

of the order filled only thirteen of the forty full-time faculty positions, a trend that continued throughout the decade (see Table 1.2).

The 1981 accreditation team attributed the decline, in part, to changing demographics within the Congregation of Sisters of the Blessed Trinity: “As in the instance of other religious communities, few younger members are entering the order. The median CSBT age—order-wide—is sixty-five. This has implications for the future faculty characteristics and also for long-term financial viability.”

The financial benefit that the religious order provided to the college was considerable. The sisters’ contributed services² represented \$375,000 in annual revenue in 1980, 14 percent of the college’s revenue from all sources. Administrators and the board recognized the importance of replacing retiring sisters with other members of the religious order, but they could not keep pace with the growing need for faculty.

Moreover, religious faculty did not have tenure, affording the administration a great deal of flexibility. “Tenure was an assured position to lay faculty, but not to religious faculty,” explained Professor Stephenson. “Administrators could reassign or remove religious faculty, but they lost that flexibility with lay faculty.”

Tenure’s Effects on the Financial Well-Being of the College

The impact of tenure on the college’s financial condition also concerned the president and the board. “Everything comes back to the

Table 1.2. Changes in Religious/Lay Faculty Composition for Full-Time Faculty, Fall 1980–1989

	F’80	F’81	F’82	F’83	F’84	F’85	F’86	F’87	F’88	F’89
Full-time faculty	40	42	43	46	57	60	60	58	62	66
Full-time religious faculty	13	14	13	13	13	12	10	11	12	13

dollar,” Sr. Mary said. She explained the institution’s conundrum as follows:

A tenure system can leave an institution with a large number of high-salaried faculty in departments with low student enrollment. This situation leads to an economic burden on the institution. Additionally, predictions place the modal age of faculty at between fifty-six and sixty-five by the year 2000, with more faculty over sixty-six than under thirty-five. New laws concerning [an end to mandatory] retirement would compound this crisis.

An institution which is heavily tenured also has minimal flexibility. . . . Tenure, in fact, becomes a burden when an institution attempts to adjust its programs and curriculum to meet the educational policies of current and future students. The institution then becomes unable to reallocate resources to best achieve its mission and goals.

Because of these concerns—rapid faculty growth under the constraints of a quota system, fewer religious faculty, and fiscal considerations—the executive committee of the board of trustees suspended the tenure policy at Blessed Trinity College in 1980, grandfathering in faculty members with tenure or on a tenure-track.

Faculty Reaction

Faculty had mixed reactions to the board’s suspension of tenure. Several faculty said the announcement came out of the blue because they were not involved in the decision-making process. There was no discussion among faculty about the problem, and “we were given no alternatives,” asserted Professor of History William Morrison. “We were under duress to comply, so we voted for something that we didn’t want to vote for.”

Other faculty reported less concern about the decision. “I don’t think faculty felt it was that important when the college did away

with tenure,” said Professor Stephenson. “There wasn’t a strong faculty culture that supported an investment in academic tenure.” Another long-time member of the faculty elaborated on the faculty culture: “Colleague relationships among faculty had always been good. There was little concern about tenure because we had a sense of job security. There was a willingness to trade off tenure for another system. Plus, the lack of tenure helps with that environment of collegiality because faculty are not competitive with one another. Faculty colleagues are not willing to sit in judgment of one another. We know each other too well.”

Faculty report that there were hostile comments about the decision in private but not in public. “There was remarkable silence from the faculty,” said Professor Stephenson. “Many faculty members were accepting of the college’s power structure. They didn’t demand or expect authority or decision-making power.” Another faculty member corroborated this description: “The faculty was docile, waiting for the administration to set the tone. There was a climate of trembling passivity.”

The relationship between administration and faculty became more complicated when Sr. Mary hired Richard Stone as academic dean and vice president for academic affairs in 1981. Stone had no higher education teaching experience and was therefore viewed with suspicion by the faculty. “The faculty didn’t view the dean as one of their own,” recalled one faculty member. “He found it difficult to get respect from department or division heads or from the faculty senate.”

The Tenure and Promotion Study Group

Faculty and administrators viewed the suspension of tenure as temporary until the college could decide on a new faculty personnel policy. To that end, in November 1983, Sr. Mary informed the faculty senate of her intention to form a study group to analyze and evaluate the policies of promotion and tenure. The president appointed

Richard Stone as chair of the study group which included six faculty members. Charged with reviewing all aspects of the current tenure and promotion policy and developing a new proposal for tenure and promotion, the group was to present its findings to the president for her consideration.

The study group reported periodically to the faculty senate on its progress. In February 1985, Dean Stone informed the senate that the study group “finds the two concepts [of long-term contracts and tenure] to be very similar.” At that point, the study group had not come to any conclusions about recommending either the tenure system or long-term contracts.

The following spring—April 1986—the Tenure and Promotion Study Group presented its final report. It offered five recommendations to the president:

MEMO TO: Sister Mary Johnston, CSBT, Ph.D.
FROM: Tenure and Promotion Study Group
DATE: April 1986
SUBJECT: Study Group Recommendation—
Contract System

In response to your charge of April 9, 1984, this study group reviewed the tenure and promotion system at Blessed Trinity College. We have considered all the options of tenure systems and contract systems, applying them to Blessed Trinity in an effort to determine what we believe the most effective resolution for faculty employment status [to be]. We clarified early on in the process that all full-time teaching faculty members presently tenured and those hired in the tenure track system (those hired prior to 1980) remain in the tenure system. Then, as a result of our consideration, we recommend the following for all full-time teaching faculty hired since 1981:

1. All full-time teaching faculty members not in the tenure system be employed according to a contract system. The college contract system will award annual contracts after successful evaluation each year for seven years. After a major evaluation in the seventh year, full-time teaching faculty are eligible for continuing contracts of two to five years, depending on the results of their evaluation and upon the staff needs in their discipline.
2. The President appoint a task force to set up a system of faculty evaluation. This task force will build upon the work of this committee, the work of the Faculty Development Committee, and the academic policies and practices of the office of the Academic Dean in order to recommend a plan for faculty evaluation. This system should be comprehensive, emphasizing (a) annual evaluation of contract faculty, (b) the major evaluation in the seventh year of annual contract, (c) evaluation of continuing contract faculty, related to the years of their contract, and (d) a five year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty.
3. The seventh year evaluation for faculty on annual contracts will be implemented gradually to assure that no faculty member has fewer than three years to prepare for that evaluation. (Faculty may waive this delay and stand for the seventh year evaluation as soon as eligible.)
4. The President designate one faculty committee to review and evaluate faculty qualifications for promotion, tenure, retention of tenure, and major evaluation for seventh year contract candidates. This committee will be chaired by the Academic

Dean, as a voting member, and will have membership from each faculty division. Each faculty division will elect at least one representative from its full-time faculty. One additional member will be elected from those faculty divisions whose full-time faculty exceed 20 percent of the total full-time faculty membership.

5. Every five years the faculty contract system be reviewed and the merits of this contract system relative to the merits of a tenure system be reconsidered.

The faculty approved the recommendations that spring. At the faculty senate meeting on October 6, 1986, Dean Stone reported that “the president will consider each of these recommendations for approval or disapproval, then submit them to the board of trustees in Spring.” In Spring 1987, the board of trustees approved the study group’s recommendations with the following changes: major reviews for faculty on contracts would take place in the sixth year, not the seventh; multiple-year contracts would cover two to four years, not two to five; and a review of the faculty employment system would occur every ten years rather than every five.

Committees Continue Work on Contracts and Evaluation

In the October 1986 senate meeting, Dean Stone reported that a faculty committee on evaluation would be appointed as recommended in the study group’s report. The committee “would be very small and fast-acting. It would review, organize, and systematize all the diverse strands of evaluation which are now in effect and under discussion.” The Faculty Evaluation Committee submitted its final report to Dean Stone on June 13, 1987. It included recommendations for the process, timing, and criteria for faculty evaluation in annual reviews, the major six-year review, and post-tenure review (see Exhibit 1.1 at the end of this chapter for the proposed guidelines). The committee

recommended (1) the department or division chair conduct annual reviews of all faculty and (2) faculty on multiple-year contracts initiate the review process for the six-year major review, presenting their documentation to the Contracts and Promotion Committee. The Faculty Evaluation Committee did not further elaborate on the process other than to say, “Information will be available through the academic dean’s office.”

At a faculty senate meeting in spring 1987, Dean Stone reported that the Faculty Evaluation Committee’s work “would be finalized in 1987–88 and take effect in 1988–89.” Despite the Dean’s plan, however, the six-year major review and post-tenure review were never implemented.

The proposed Contracts and Promotion Committee was not put into place until 1989 (see the memo from Dean Stone to full-time faculty in Exhibit 1.2). On November 9, 1989, Dean Stone sent a memo to faculty with a copy of the June 1987 final report of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The memo stated that the final report “has been approved by the relevant faculty and administrative bodies.” He asked faculty, “after you have reviewed the documents, please give your reactions, questions, and suggestions verbally or preferably in writing to my office or me in person.” The memo, however, did not indicate when evaluations would be put into place or what steps the dean planned to pursue next.

The Era of “Benign Neglect”

Despite the work of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Contracts and Promotion Committee in the late 1980s and the 1990s, Blessed Trinity failed to enact a multiple-year contract system or post-tenure review, even though statements in the faculty handbook implied the system was in place.

Faculty members at Blessed Trinity offered many explanations as to why the system never materialized.

Stability and Security

The administration and faculty had been very stable. From 1981 to 1995, there was no change in the office of the president or vice president for academic affairs. Similarly, there was a perception that little turnover occurred among full-time faculty: from 1980 to 1988, only three faculty members left Blessed Trinity because they were denied tenure or did not receive contract renewal.

Given that stability, “each side was waiting for a shoe to drop,” said an economics professor. “Faculty were waiting for the administration to do something; the administration was waiting for the faculty to do something. So, little to nothing happened.”

Additionally, job security was not threatened. Blessed Trinity was growing as was demand for faculty. A senior faculty member reported, “There was no en masse resistance or engagement in the problem” from either the faculty or administration. A member of the Contracts and Promotion Committee said, “There was an era of benign neglect here for a long time. The issue just lingered.”

Faculty View: The Vice President Contributed to the Problem

Many faculty asserted that Vice President and Dean Stone derailed the progress of contracts and evaluations. Professor Stephenson, who served on the first Contracts and Promotion Committee in 1989, recalled the committee’s deliberations about the process and criteria for the six-year major review. (See Exhibit 1.3 for the faculty handbook section on six-year major review.) “Two members of the C and P committee who were nontenurable happened to be at the six-year review point,” Stephenson stated. “Both volunteered to be guinea pigs to test the process, but it never happened. It was lost in Richard Stone’s office.”

Other faculty contended that Stone never acted on a mass of paperwork, reports, and memos. “Every time the C and P committee pushed to implement the process, Stone—who was chair of the

committee—didn't call the committee together," declared Professor Stephenson. Additionally, "faculty didn't trust Stone because it was perceived that he routinely withheld information from us," maintained Professor Morrison. "There was a stagnant relationship."

The Vice President's View: A Multifaceted Problem

Stone offered a number of reasons for the lack of implementation while he was in office. First, he claimed that there was a lack of professionalism among C and P committee members. "Faculty often took the stance, 'But we know him and know his work' even if the dossier was incomplete or poorly presented. I had to make guidelines for the dossier review and insist that the committee stick to them. They didn't understand that. They didn't have a real appreciation for governance."

In addition, Stone felt a passive resistance from the faculty as a whole. Sr. Mary noted, "there was not a good relationship between the faculty and the vice president. For example, the faculty wouldn't let Stone be a part of the faculty senate. They didn't see him as one of their own."

Stone also felt a lack of administrative support. "I didn't have any one person to put in charge to make reviews and evaluations happen. I needed a point person, but there was no one in the administration to do it and the division heads weren't trained administrators." At the same time, the college expansion to its suburban location was announced, which "consumed two years of my work. Everything else fell to the side. I wasn't actively pushing for the changes because I was too busy doing other things."

The Issue Arises Again

Because of the faculty's sense of security at the college and the administration's inattention to the matter, the absence of multiyear contracts and faculty evaluation continued for nearly ten years. However, the era of benign neglect ended in 1994. In that year, two full-time

untentured nursing faculty members, each with five years of teaching experience at Blessed Trinity, were not renewed because of significant enrollment declines in the nursing division. Changes in the health care industry prompted less need for clinical nurses, and the job market became saturated. Student enrollment in the nursing division dwindled, and Blessed Trinity, for the first time in fifteen years, needed to reduce the size of its full-time faculty. Suddenly, job security at Blessed Trinity became a faculty concern, and the issue of multiyear contracts surfaced once again. "People felt that their job security was threatened, but there were no criteria in place to determine who should stay and who should go," explained Carolyn Lawrence, a junior faculty member. "Faculty feared that the process could be arbitrary."

In addition to the concern about job security, newer faculty began questioning why the six-year review and multiyear contracts hadn't been implemented. Junior faculty member Melinda Gregg said: "When I was offered the job at Blessed Trinity, I wasn't greatly concerned that the college didn't offer tenure, and any anxiety I had was alleviated by the six-year review. It was a good middle ground. I was told that multiyear contracts were in place, and the process was explained on paper in the faculty handbook. It wasn't until after I was here for a year or two that I realized the college only offered one-year contracts, and there were no six-year reviews. The security one expects in academe was just not here. Instead, there was an empty policy."

Newer faculty viewed their needs as different from those of their more experienced colleagues. "Younger faculty had different expectations about teaching, pedagogy, beliefs, and expectations of the working environment," said a junior faculty member. "Senior faculty didn't want to engage in the debate. They had a willingness to accept the administration's proposals because they thought they wouldn't get what they wanted."

Sr. Mary concurred, saying, "faculty became much more aware about their responsibilities to themselves. The quality of the faculty improved and with it the expectations of faculty entitlements."

A Change in Academic Leadership

Carol Roberts became academic dean of Blessed Trinity in August 1995. Prior to this appointment she had held several administrative positions at various colleges in addition to an active teaching career. Stone, who had been academic dean and vice president for academic affairs, remained vice president. Among other responsibilities, Roberts was assigned to work with the Contracts and Promotion Committee to get the process of six-year evaluations moving again. Later that fall, Stone announced his resignation as vice president for academic affairs, and Roberts was named interim vice president. In spring 1996, she was among a number of candidates under consideration for the permanent vice president position.

Faculty were delighted with Roberts' arrival. Various faculty called her "open," "enthusiastic," and "a straight shooter" who listened to faculty, who was interested in faculty views, and who paid attention to their opinions and ideas.

Roberts summarized the environment she found at Blessed Trinity:

There had not been a lot of thought given to governance. The faculty senate only had two committees: Faculty Welfare and Faculty Development. Other committees were collegewide, which meant they consisted of faculty and administration. Because of the seeming historical mistrust between faculty and administration, faculty didn't view the collegewide committees as representing their interests. Faculty hadn't been given license to do much at all. Faculty perceived that they had a negligible role in governance. As a result, the faculty didn't act at all like faculty are supposed to act. My challenge was to get them to become responsible, and I needed to provide the necessary academic leadership.

Many people transferred their frustration with this faculty evaluation and contracts process onto the former

vice president. I think that was counterproductive. We needed to move on. Before, people weren't ready to move on. By the time I arrived, though, I think the college was poised to move into the mainstream of higher education.

The Contracts and Promotion Committee Meeting: March 11, 1996

In the spring of 1996, Roberts had two goals with regard to promotion and contract policies. First, the committee needed to propose notification dates for nonrenewal of contracts. The faculty handbook included a notification date for first-year faculty members, but there were no dates for faculty who were beyond their first year of employment.³ Faculty felt vulnerable to potential arbitrary actions by the administration without specific language in the handbook. Second, the committee needed to decide the type, purpose, and goals of extended contracts to propose to the college community. Roberts appointed subcommittees to investigate other colleges' contract systems.

As she waited for the Contracts and Promotion Committee meeting to begin on March 11, 1996, Roberts recalled the disparate voices of the Blessed Trinity community to which she had been listening during the previous year:

A tenured economics professor:

I don't think multiyear contracts are needed. Criteria for evaluation are very vague, and it comes down to a judgment call. We don't have a consensus about what scholarship is, which makes evaluating each other impossible. It is not necessary to subject people to major reviews. My feeling is, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. The less bureaucracy, the better.

A tenured physics professor:

Some younger faculty members feel resentment toward tenured professors, as if they've been betrayed. They think we gave it all away. I've had to keep tenure to myself. It hasn't been something I've been able to rejoice about because the next person might really resent that I have it and they don't.

A junior faculty member in humanities:

With no tenure, academic freedom becomes an issue. You think in the back of your mind before you say anything. People don't want to speak up in the faculty senate. I don't know if there really is an attack on academic freedom, but it doesn't matter if it's true or not because faculty have the perception that the administration wants total control.

A junior faculty member in nursing:

A long-term contract, in my mind, is not the solution. I want tenure. A multiyear contract won't give us any resolution other than job security, but there still won't be due process. Now the administration doesn't have to give any reason for dismissal. We need due process. Tenure was given up sixteen years ago by a very different faculty. I think we need it back.

As the C and P committee members gathered around the conference table, Roberts leaned back in her chair and thought, "What should I do now? What's the best way to make progress in faculty evaluation and contract policies?"

Endnotes

1. To provide anonymity to the institution, "Blessed Trinity College" and names of individuals in this case are pseudonyms. All dates in the case have been changed.

2. “Contributed service” refers to the financial benefit the college receives from the sisters’ practice of returning their salaries to the institution.
3. The faculty handbook (revised August 1995) stipulated that “dates for notification to those whose contracts will not be renewed are determined as follows: not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, or at least three months in advance of the termination date of the current contract. An inadvertent failure to meet the deadlines shall not be construed as a renewal of a contract.”

Discussion Questions

1. What factors have prevented Blessed Trinity College from implementing its revised faculty evaluation and contract policies?
2. What are the risks and benefits of this lack of implementation for the institution? For the faculty?
3. What should Carol Roberts do regarding the faculty evaluation and contract policies? Why?

Recommended Background Readings

- Benjamin, Ernst. (February 1998). “Five Misconceptions about Tenure.” *Trusteeship*, 3(1): 16–21.
- Bess, James L. (1997). *Contract Systems, Bureaucracies, and Faculty Motivation: The Probable Effects of a No-Tenure Policy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL, March 1997.
- Byrne, J. Peter. (1997). *Academic Freedom Without Tenure?* AAHE New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry #5. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Chait, Richard, and Cathy A. Trower. (1997). *Where Tenure Does Not Reign: Colleges with Contract Systems*. AAHE Working Paper Series, Inquiry #3. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Gappa, Judith M. (1996). *Off the Tenure Track: Six Models for Full-Time Non-tenurable Appointments*. New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry #10. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Licata, Christine M. (June 1998). “Post-Tenure Review: At the Crossroads of Accountability and Opportunity.” *AAHE Bulletin*, 3–6.

Mallon, William T. (2000). "Standard Deviations: Faculty Appointment Policies at Institutions Without Tenure." In C. Trower, ed., *Policies on Faculty Appointment: Standard Practices and Unusual Arrangements*. Bolton, MA: Anker .

Miller, Richard I. (1987). *Evaluating Faculty for Promotion and Tenure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Exhibit 1.1. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation as Proposed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, June 1987

Criteria for teaching review:

Course syllabi	Organization of course(s), suitability of assigned coursework to discipline/evaluation procedures, clarity of goals, objectives, [and] grading policies.
Students	Student evaluations, handling of student conflicts or problems, availability for academic consultation with students, evidence of student competencies.
Classroom	Preparation, evidence of expertise, clarity of explanations, poise, classroom atmosphere, student response, use of varying teaching methods, use of supporting materials (such as A-V, handouts), laboratory preparation and supervision (if applicable).
Administrative	Necessary paperwork submitted promptly and efficiently, knowledge and implementation of college policy and procedure.
Other	Use of library (if appropriate), creation of special tools as supplements.

Criteria for service:

Students	Advising, counseling, moderator for club or class, student affairs, all-campus presentation, comprehensive exams, placement activities, availability for student consultation.
Faculty	Faculty senate, faculty institute, senate committees (note: events as listed in Faculty Handbook).

Exhibit 1.1. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation as Proposed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, June 1987, cont'd.

College	Ad hoc or task-related committees, academic meetings, workshops, alumni activities, recruiting/admissions activities, college events, projects for the college or academic affairs, representing college off-campus.
Community	Civic or cultural groups, parish or city-wide religious activities, volunteer service in the community, civic or community boards, local educational agencies.

Criteria for scholarship:

Professional activities	Membership, attendance at meetings, editorial boards for organization journals, committees or officers in professional organizations.
Presentations	Papers, workshops, talks, panels.
Reviews	Book reviews for publishers, published reviews.
Publications	Books, essays, journal articles, and other educational productions.
Grants	Preparing funding proposals, implementing funded projects, evaluating funded projects.
Development	Preparation of new course(s), cooperative curriculum development or review.
Study	Advanced study, fellowships and awards, workshops, conferences, independent study or coursework in a new or related discipline, professional travel.

Criteria for personal/professionalism:

- Support for the college mission
- Collegiality
- Adherence to Catholic ethical standards
- Serves as professional role model (for students)

Suggested basis for review:

Classroom visit(s); syllabi, tests, and handouts; meetings; consultations (formal and informal); student evaluations; annual report; other reports or documentation; collegial response; student response.

Exhibit 1.2. Inter-Departmental Memo: Election of Members of Contracts and Promotion Committee

DATE: February 21, 1989
TO: All Full-Time Faculty
FROM: Dean Stone

SUBJECT: Election of Members of Contracts and Promotion Committee

In accord with the report to the President on promotion and contract, April 1986, we are implementing recommendation 4.

Recommendation 4 (slightly altered):

One faculty committee be designated to review and evaluate faculty qualifications for promotion, retention of tenure, and major evaluation for the sixth-year contract candidates. This committee will be chaired by the Academic Dean, as a voting member, and will have membership from each faculty division. Each faculty division will elect at least one representative from its full-time faculty. One additional member will be elected from those faculty divisions whose full-time faculty exceeds 20% of the total full-time faculty membership.

- I. The *charge* of the Contracts and Promotion Committee is: to review and evaluate faculty qualifications for promotion, retention of tenure, and major evaluation for the sixth-year contract candidates.
- II. Liberal Arts is to *elect* two members, Business Administration is to elect one, and Nursing is to elect two.
- III. *Eligibility* to be nominated and elected as a member:

The basic requirement is full-time faculty status for at least five years at Blessed Trinity College, not counting leaves or sabbaticals. Therefore, those hired by September 198[x] who hold the rank of assistant or above are eligible. Department chairs, nursing, coordinators, and division heads are eligible for membership. Their status is full-time faculty.

For the start-up, as a one-time exception only, the division of Business Administration may elect a faculty member of three years, full-time faculty status.

Election of Members of Contracts and Promotion Committee
February 21, 1989.

Exhibit 1.2. Inter-Departmental Memo: Election of Members of Contracts and Promotion Committee, cont'd.

IV. *Terms* are normally for two years, with membership terms staggered.

V. The *start-up term* will be as follows so that the membership is staggered:

Liberal Arts and Nursing:

One member has a three-year term (then new election).

One member has a two-year term (then new election).

Business Administration:

One member for two years (then new election).

VI. *Nominations*

Liberal Arts and Nursing:

Full-time members of each division are allowed two nominations of colleagues.

Business Administration:

Full-time members nominate one colleague.

A list of eligible members will be circulated in each division.

VII. *Voting*

Liberal Arts and Nursing:

All full-time members may vote for two nominees. The two highest vote getters are elected. The one with the highest number of votes has a three-year term; the one with the next highest has a two-year term. If there is a tie, there will be a run-off vote.

Business Administration:

Full-time members vote for one member. The highest vote-getter wins for the term of two years. If there is a tie, a re-vote will be taken.

VIII. Faculty members on *leave* or *sabbatical* are not eligible to nominate or to vote or to be elected.

IX. The *next election* will be in the Spring of 1991, wherein three of the five members are replaced. After that, there is an election every year to replace the staggered-term members.

Further information will be presented at Division meetings.

Please address questions to the Academic Dean.

Exhibit 1.3. Faculty Handbook Section on Major (Six-Year) Review

4.5.1 *Promotion Review and the Major Review***4.5.2** *Purpose and Philosophy*

The standards offered here apply to promotion review as well as the major review (the latter also known as the “six-year review.”) It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to initiate the promotion process. That is to say, eligibility dates for promotion of faculty are recorded on the initial faculty member’s contract. Accordingly, the faculty member begins the process by adhering to the deadlines and procedures explained in section 4.5.2.

In considering an individual for promotion or for evaluation during the major review, each candidate will be evaluated with respect to his or her proposed rank as well as his or her record of performance in teaching, scholarship, service, and professionalism. Our purpose is to offer a framework of criteria and standards of evaluation within which judgments are made on the present achievements and future potential of the candidate. The major review will take place for all full-time faculty once every six years.

In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications within different areas of accomplishment, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier assignments and responsibilities in one area against lighter assignments and responsibilities in another. Each candidate is expected to have professional goals which are sound and productive and which can be expected to continue to develop throughout his or her teaching career. In all instances, excellent teaching abilities and intellectual attainment as well as “mission effectiveness” are crucial. Insistence upon these standards for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for the maintenance of Blessed Trinity College’s quality as an institution dedicated to the discovery, preservation, and transmission of knowledge as well as the principles of Judeo-Christian values.
