

TENURE PRACTICES IN CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION: POLICIES OF  
MEMBER INSTITUTIONS IN THE COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN  
COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES

Norman Scott Harris, B.B.A., Th.M.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2005

APPROVED:

D. Barry Lumsden, Major Professor  
Michael Lawson, Committee Member  
Ron Newsom, Committee Member  
Michael Altekruise, Chair of the Department of  
Counseling, Development, and Higher  
Education  
M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of  
Education  
Sandra L. Terrell, Dean of the Robert B.  
Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Harris, Norman Scott, *Tenure Practices in Christian Higher Education: Policies of Member Institutions in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities*. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), August, 2005, 215 pp., 53 tables, references, 60 titles.

This study identified tenure policies and practices among Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCCU) member schools. A survey of CCCCU member schools was conducted; 65 usable questionnaires were received. A response rate of 69% was achieved. Schools also provided portions of their faculty handbooks addressing tenure.

The purpose of the study was to determine (a) what CCCCU schools grant tenure, (b) why they grant tenure, (c) specific tenure policies and practices, (d) what CCCCU schools do not grant tenure, (e) why they do not grant tenure, (f) retention policies used in place of tenure, and (g) how CCCCU schools' tenure policies compare with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) guidelines.

The data suggests that (a) the majority of CCCCU schools (68%) grant tenure, (b) these schools represent nearly all religious affiliations within the CCCCU, and (c) they are large in relation to CCCCU schools that do not grant tenure. The predominant reasons given for granting tenure are protection of academic freedom, mutual commitment by institution and faculty, and recruiting / retaining quality faculty. The schools grant tenure based on teaching, scholarship, service, and the integration of faith and learning. Tenure success rates seem high.

Thirty-two percent of the CCCCU colleges and universities do not grant tenure. These schools are small in relation to CCCCU schools that grant tenure. They represent nearly all religious affiliations within the CCCCU. The predominant reason given for not

granting tenure is tradition / institutional values. The majority of these schools use a graduated contract system while some use an eventual continuous contract system.

The CCCU member schools' tenure policies are largely consistent with AAUP guidelines.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
Chapters	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Background of the Study	
History of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities	
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Research Questions	
Significance of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Basic Assumptions	
Limitations	
Delimitations	
Theoretical and Philosophical Framework	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	15
Historical Overview of Tenure	
Alternatives to Tenure	
Arguments For and Against Tenure	
Requirements to Achieve Tenure	
Post-Tenure Review	
Tenure in American Christian Higher Education	
III. METHODOLOGY .....	27
Introduction	
Research Questions	
Research Design and Data Collection	
Population of the Study	
Data Analysis Procedures	
IV. RESULTS OF DATA COLLECTION AND FINDINGS .....	33

- Introduction
- Schools Granting Tenure
- Reasons for Granting Tenure
- Tenure Policies and Practices
- Schools Not Granting Tenure
- Reasons for Not Granting Tenure
- Policies in Place of Tenure
- Comparison to the AAUP's Standards

- V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 95
  - Introduction
  - Summary of Findings
  - Discussion of the Findings
  - Conclusions
  - Recommendations

Appendices

- A. MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF THE COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ..... 154
- B. AAUP 1940 STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE ..... X
- C. TENURE POLICIES AND PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE ..... X
- D. STUDY CONTACT DOCUMENTS ..... X
- E. SUMMARIES OF INDIVIDUAL FACULTY HANDBOOK TENURE POLICIES ..... X

- REFERENCES.....211

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Denominational Affiliation of Sample Schools .....	34
2. Size of Sample Schools.....	35
3. Number of Faculty Members at Sample Schools.....	36
4. Schools Granting Tenure.....	36
5. Size of Schools Granting Tenure.....	37
6. Sample Schools Classified by Denominational Affiliation and Tenure Policy ...	38
7. Reasons for Granting Tenure .....	40
8. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Teaching Skill .....	41
9. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Research / Publishing Skills .....	42
10. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Mentoring Skills .....	43
11. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Service Abilities .....	44
12. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Grant Writing Abilities / Success .....	45
13. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Biblical Literacy.....	46
14. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Christian Faith Commitment .....	46
15. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Ministry / Field of Service Experience .....	47
16. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Terminal Degree Held.	48
17. Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Expertise in Chosen Field of Study .....	49
18. Statement of Faith Required for Faculty at Schools Granting Tenure .....	49
19. Written Tenure Policy Addresses Academic Freedom .....	50
20. Tenure Review Practices Protect Academic Freedom .....	50

21.	Probationary Period as Part of Tenure Process .....	51
22.	Maximum Length of Probationary Period in Tenure Process .....	52
23.	Maximum Number of Years of Prior Experience Accepted for Probationary Period .....	53
24.	Percentage of Faculty at Participating Schools Who Went Through Tenure and Were Granted Tenure During the Years 2001 – 2004 .....	54
25.	Percentage of Current Faculty with Tenure .....	54
26.	Eligibility for Tenure by Faculty Rank .....	55
27.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Number of Publications .....	56
28.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Reputations of Presses / Journals	57
29.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Student Evaluations.....	58
30.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Observation of Teaching .....	58
31.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Recommendations – Outside Scholars .....	59
32.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Research and/or Other Grants Received .....	59
33.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Recommendations from Faculty within Institution .....	60
34.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Service within Institution .....	61
35.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Service within the Surrounding Community or Local Church .....	61
36.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Papers Delivered at Professional Meetings and/or Other Schools .....	62
37.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Published Reviews of the Scholar’s Books .....	62
38.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Academic Advisement .....	63
39.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Collegiality .....	64
40.	Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Other .....	64
41.	Schools That Limit Percentage of Faculty Who May Possess Tenure .....	65

42.	Written Reasons Given for Tenure Denial or Contract Non-Renewal as Distinguished between Tenure-Granting and Non-Tenure Granting Schools ...	66
43.	Appeals Process in Place for Tenure Denial or Contract Non-Renewal as Distinguished between Tenure-Granting and Non-Tenure Granting Schools ...	67
44.	Number of Faculty Denied Tenure between Fall of 2001 to Spring 2004 .....	68
45.	Tenure Granting Schools Conducting Post-Tenure Reviews .....	68
46.	Number of Years between Post-Tenure Reviews.....	69
47.	Tenure Policy Items Addressed in CCCU Member Institutions' Faculty Handbooks .....	70
48.	Number of Schools Granting Tenure and Not Granting Tenure .....	82
49.	Schools Not Granting Tenure by Size .....	82
50.	Schools Classified by Denominational Affiliation and Contract Only or Tenure Granting Policy .....	84
51.	Reasons for Using Contract System Rather than Tenure.....	86
52.	Initial Contract Offered by Schools Using Term Appointments Only.....	87
53.	Term Appointment Systems as Reported in Faculty Handbooks.....	89

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### *Background of the Study*

Faith and freedom are the two dynamics in Christian higher education that may cause great tension for many. Institutions are desirous to maintain their commitments to the faith they espouse. They, therefore, set appropriate boundaries within which faculty members are expected operate. Faculty members at any given institution are desirous of freedom to pursue their academic interests. This perceived “freedom” often comes in the form of tenure. As Barry Callen (1985, p. 64) writes, “Can the presence of such a tension constitute a genuine educational community in which faculty academic freedom has meaning, or is it merely an invitation to an intolerable intellectual schizophrenia?”

In Christian higher education then, the idea of tenure is often at the crossroads of this paradox. This study sought to discover why and how a group of Christian colleges and universities utilize tenure. How will tenured faculty members affect schools’ statements of faith? If schools don’t have tenure, can they attract top faculty members? This is the backdrop for the following study. The question of tenure and its implications for academic freedom in the Christian college or university are handled differently by different schools. Some Christian schools opt for granting tenure. Others do not. The reasons vary for each school. This study attempted to learn why.

Christian higher education has a unique dual responsibility. These responsibilities coalesce through the integration of faith and learning. Kenneth Gangel (1978, p. 100) defined the concept of integrating faith and learning as "...the teaching of all subjects as a part of the total truth of God thereby enabling the student to see the unity of natural and special revelation".

Within his definition, the concept of learning includes the teaching of all subjects. Christian higher education institutions are in the same business of education as are secular or state universities although, as noted earlier, this goal operates within the theological beliefs of each institution. They seek to gather and impart knowledge in all given subjects of study so as to serve the community/world around them and prepare students for future endeavors.

The faith portion of the integration equation for Christian higher education institutions comes as the awareness of God being the source of all truth, whether it be by natural revelation—what is seen around us—or by special revelation—God revealing truth through holy scripture, which is the Bible for the Christian, and through His Son, Jesus Christ. Thus both faith—what is believed about God—and learning—the subjects studied in the classroom—are brought together in a way that illustrates how they both relate in any given discipline. Beyond this mere academic experience, some schools may actively seek to develop spiritual maturity in students as well.

A recent conference for religiously affiliated institutions addressed this tension between faith and learning. As reported by Snyder (2003), the complexities of maintaining balance between spiritual integrity and academic honesty are not easily nor

may ever be completely resolved. He gave specific examples of sexual and scientific issues which give rise to controversy for religiously affiliated institutions to name a few.

Therefore, a major responsibility of Christian higher education institutions is that of holding to their understanding of special revelation from God as given in the Bible. With this being said, it must be stated that each Christian higher education institution will most likely employ this responsibility to varying degrees from campus to campus. Some campuses might emphasize the inspiration of scripture in all classes, while another campus might state this in its doctrinal statement but not emphasize it in the class.

The Christian faith is based on the teachings of the Bible and the life, death, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. For an institution to claim it is “Christian” there must, by definition, be a connection with Christ, the Bible, and the intersection of all subject matters taught in the classrooms. These Christian colleges will therefore seek to integrate their biblical worldview with the various disciplines of instruction. This integration of faith and learning distinguishes Christian colleges from state or secular private colleges which may not put an emphasis on faith within the context of their instruction. Kenneth Gangel (1983, p. xviii) explains it this way:

Higher education that is Christian involves more than having a doctrinal commitment—more than maintaining good relations with churches. It is more than requiring students to be Christians or hiring a Christian faculty. It is more than having a Bible department in the curriculum, more than requiring students to be engaged in Christian service. Christian education is all these plus another very important ingredient—*the integration of the*

*Scriptures into every academic pursuit thereby developing a truly biblical world and life view.* It is this single concept that really distinguishes Christian education from other approaches to education.

Another responsibility is that of pursuing truth and educating students within the context of the surrounding culture. This responsibility comes with the potential trappings of that particular culture. Academe's predominant cultural practice of academic tenure in American higher education is one of these cultural influences that must be addressed by Christian colleges and universities. Should a school grant tenure, or should it avoid tenure? Depending upon a school's view of tenure, it could be seen as a potential help or threat to the goals of the school.

Tenure in higher education already has battle lines drawn with well-entrenched arguments both for and against the notion of tenure. When the specific arena of Christian higher education is thrown into the mix, the question of tenure is raised to a new level. The reason is that Christian colleges and universities are often, by definition, confessional schools—that is they hold to a particular set of beliefs within the Christian tradition (Monsma, 2001; Theissen, 2001). Since they hold to a particular set of beliefs, they normally expect their faculty to embrace and work within the parameters of those beliefs. One of the perceived benefits of tenure is that of academic freedom where one can teach and do research freely without concern for reprisal due to the controversial nature of the teaching or research being done (AAUP, 1984, Huer, 1991). Therefore, one might wonder how tenure works in an overtly Christian academic setting where certain beliefs are espoused by the institution.

### *History of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities*

The colleges formed during the colonial periods began with strong ties to particular denominations within Christianity (Burtchaell, 1998 & Tewksbury, 1965). Yet as time continued, there was an erosion of the Christian influence in these schools in particular and in higher education in general. Some overarching reasons for this shift were: (1) the undermining of the hegemony of Protestantism by the pluralism resulting from the influx of various immigrant groups, (2) the German model of higher education became more desirable, (3) a broader curriculum base was called for, (4) elite schools with a Christian distinctive removed these coverings from their identities, and (5) Christian educators did not present a viable worldview that integrated faith and learning (Patterson, 2001 & Tewksbury, 1965).

Some have laid the responsibility first at the feet of the faculty of these institutions. Burtchaell (1998, pp 828, 829) argues, "...the faculty was the first constituency to lose interest in their colleges being Lutheran or Catholic or Congregational". He continues his point by explaining that faculty members became more detached from the overarching principles of the school in order to be more and more focused in the disciplines in which they taught. Faculty members were no longer grounded in a clerical background. On the contrary they were very much laity.

The response to these shifts in the academic culture of the day was steady and eventually well established. In the 1880s the Bible College movement sprang forth to provide a place of learning that was founded in the scriptures. Some schools founded before the Civil War resisted "secularization". An example of this is Wheaton College in Illinois. Alan Wolfe (2000, p. 56) illustrates how Wheaton is maintaining its Christian

moorings while at the same time pursuing academic excellence when he writes  
Wheaton believes:

...that God has revealed Himself and His truth in the created order, in the Scriptures, and supremely in Jesus Christ; and that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are verbally inspired by God and inerrant in the original writing, so that they are fully trustworthy and of supreme and final authority in all they say.

His writing goes on to argue against the notion that a school holding firmly to traditional Christian beliefs cannot be academically rigorous when he writes:

Wheaton's rejection rate last year was higher than the University of Chicago's. Its class of 2003 includes sixty-one National Merit Scholars. The average SAT score of last year's entering class was 1,310, putting Wheaton in the same range as Oberlin College and the University of Virginia. (Wolfe, 2000, p. 58)

After World War II, evangelical leaders called for Christian Schools to set aside their differences and work together to engage the culture rather than be isolated from it. Schools reasserted their roots. They realized the rich Christian history that was theirs in education. In 1955 the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges was formed. This resulted in many Christian schools achieving accreditation and it helped establish a pattern of different schools working together for the common good of them all (Patterson, 2001).

The 1970 Tempe Conference of Christian college presidents put forth the idea of a consortium of Christian colleges that would work to make Christian colleges stronger

and more effective. The *Christian College Consortium* was incorporated in March of 1971 with 10 members. Membership in the consortium grew some, but remained small. The members of the consortium believed they could be more effective if they could remain small (Patterson, 2001). This very decision to keep other institutions out helped lead to the establishment of a sister organization, which we now know as the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities.

Even though the Consortium experienced some successes, there was need for more. Potential governmental regulations and the lack of lobbying power by a 13 member Consortium revealed the necessity of an organization that could have lobbying power in Washington for Christian college interests. Gordon Werkema, the first president of the Consortium, proposed to the board in 1975 the need for a new organization. The result was the Christian College Coalition (Now, CCCU). It was to be an advocacy group for Christian Colleges in America. The organizational meeting of the new Coalition was held on September 21 and 22 in Washington, D.C. There were 26 Christian college presidents in attendance. This number included the 13 members of the Consortium (Patterson, 2001)

In 1981 the Consortium and Coalition separated, and the Coalition continued to expand in members and influence. This expansion included many publishing endeavors and programs for student, faculty and administrative development. In the years that followed, the Coalition had two name changes. The first change was to the Coalition for Christian Colleges & Universities. This was in recognition that many of the member institutions had attained university status since joining. The second change was to the present name of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. This move was

designed to distinguish the organization from other Christian coalitions active across the nation and in the Capitol (Patterson, 2001).

The Council for Christian Colleges & Universities today has a membership of 105 institutions (see Appendix A). The CCCU fosters an ecumenical spirit “that unites a diverse group of schools in the pursuit of a common cause” (Patterson, 2001, p. 96), namely the cause of Christ and the Christian academic intellectual engagement in the society as a whole. Its stated mission is “to advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education and to help our institutions transform lives by faithfully relating scholarship and service to biblical truth” (CCCU, 2003).

Since both scholarship and confessional fidelity—holding true to one’s set of beliefs within the Christian tradition—are of value to the schools that are a part of the CCCU, this study sought to understand how these schools approach the subject of tenure in their dealings with faculty members. Specifically the study will look at the tenure policies and practices of these member institutions.

### *Statement of the Problem*

This study was designed to ascertain the tenure policies and practices of member institutions in the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (hereafter referred to as CCCU).

### *Purposes of the Study*

The purposes of the study were to:

1. Identify how many and what kind of CCCU schools grant tenure.
2. Determine why these CCCU schools grant tenure.

3. Summarize what the tenure policies and practices are at these CCCU member institutions.

4. Identify how many and what kind of CCCU schools do not grant tenure.

5. Determine why these CCCU schools do not grant tenure.

6. Summarize the retention policies utilized in place of tenure at these CCCU member institutions.

7. Determine how CCCU schools' tenure policies compare with the AAUP's 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

### *Research Questions*

To achieve the purposes listed above the following research questions were implemented:

1. How many and what kind of CCCU member schools grant tenure?

2. Why do these CCCU schools grant tenure?

3. What are the tenure policies and practices of these CCCU schools?

4. How many and what kind of CCCU member schools do not grant tenure?

5. Why do these CCCU schools not grant tenure?

6. What faculty retention policies are utilized in place of tenure at these CCCU schools?

7. How do the CCCU schools' policies compare to the AAUP's 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure (See Appendix B)?

### *Significance of the Study*

While many books, multiple studies, and many reports have addressed the subject of tenure, few studies have focused on Christian higher education. No tenure studies to date have been directed solely toward the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU) member institutions in regards to tenure. This study has thus broken new ground in the understanding of how tenure relates to Christian Higher Education.

Schools often operate without in-depth knowledge of the workings of other institutions. Schools may have to experience problems and find solutions on their own. As Cathy Trower (2002, p. 32) writes:

Typically, individual institutions lacked reliable and comprehensive information about policies and practices elsewhere. Often, anecdotes and impressions substituted for analysis. Among the unanswered questions were these: What is normative? What is unconventional? What changes would be outside of the mainstream? Who else does...? and Would any other respectable institution...?

The results of this study may be beneficial in four ways in that they: (1) provide individual CCCU institutions information about the tenure policies and practices at other CCCU institutions, (2) may assist administrators and faculty at CCCU schools in developing tenure policies and practices that work best for their institutions, (3) provide information about tenure to would-be professors considering positions at CCCU institutions, and (4) provide information to academia at large regarding how the issue of tenure is handled in the context of schools in Christian higher education.

### *Definition of Terms*

1. Academic Freedom: the right, identified with the purposes of academic institutions, whereby members of the academic community are protected in the privilege to receive, discover, convey to others, and, as generally described in the 1940 Statement of Principles, to act upon knowledge and ideas. Academic freedom should be distinguished from the personal freedoms guaranteed by the constitution, through which it is sometimes reinforced in litigation (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, p. 256).
2. Academic Tenure: an arrangement under which faculty appointments in an institution of higher education are continued until retirement for age or physical disability, subject to dismissal for *adequate cause* or unavoidable termination on account of financial exigency or change of institutional program (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, p. 256).
3. Adequate Cause: a basis on which a faculty member, either with *academic tenure* or during a *term appointment*, may be dismissed. The term refers especially to demonstrated incompetence or dishonesty in teaching or research, to substantial and manifest neglect of duty, and to personal conduct which substantially impairs the individual's fulfillment of his institutional responsibilities. (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, p. 256).
4. Confessional School (OR CHRISTIAN COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY): an institution that (1) is God-centered and loyal to the Christian revelation [as it understands it], particularly as focused on Jesus Christ and His gospel; (2) commits itself to the formation and maintenance of a Christian worldview; (3) is marked by humility of mind

and communal care that fosters integrity and candor; (4) is beholden to the church, the world, and God; (5) grapples with issues of Christianity and culture; and (6) seeks to balance academic freedom and confessional fidelity. (Carson, 1997)

5. Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU): an association of Christian Colleges and Universities that have united to promote and further the cause of Christian Higher Education.
6. Probationary Period: a period of professional service during which a faculty member on term appointment does not hold *tenure* and is observed by his colleagues for the purpose of evaluating his professional qualifications. At the end of this period, the faculty member either receives *academic tenure* or is not reappointed (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, p. 257).
7. Retention Policies: codified institutional practices that are utilized to maintain faculty members' continued commitment to and employment at given colleges or universities.
8. Term Appointment: an appointment for a fixed period, usually from one to five years, as contrasted to an appointment with academic tenure. Term appointments may be renewable or nonrenewable (Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, p. 256).

### *Basic Assumptions*

The following assumptions applied to this study:

1. Tenure systems will be present in some schools within Christian higher education while it will be absent from others.
2. The decision to have or not have tenure at a Christian college or university will be influenced by the degree to which the institution holds to a clear mission statement,

along with the attending religious beliefs, tenets and doctrines which are central to the identity and mission of the institution, while at the same time seeking to promote academic freedom within framework of boundaries of the institutions' mission and identity.

3. The codified data from the provided handbooks and the answers given on the questionnaire are the actual tenure practices put in place on a day to day basis.

### *Limitations*

The following limitations applied to this study:

1. The survey response rate of the instrument by the Chief Academic Officers (CAO) from CCCU member schools affected results. The researcher was unable to control when or if surveys were completed by CAOs of the schools being studied.

2. The study was subject to the typical survey research limitations such as honesty, halo effect (the respondents' tendency to answer the way they believe the researcher wants them to respond), and non-response bias.

### *Delimitations*

This study provided the following delimitations:

1. The population of the study consisted of CCCU member institutions. Affiliate schools were not approached in this study.

2. Only the Chief Academic Officers (CAO) at CCCU member schools were asked to respond to the questionnaires. Other faculty and administrative staff members were not approached.

3. Published resources (i.e. faculty handbooks) about tenure policies by CCCU member institutions were the only other information gathering sources utilized apart from the survey instrument. These documents were the only sources of data to account for any possible halo effect originating from the CAOs participating in the study.

### *Theoretical and Philosophical Framework*

The study was based on the understanding that there are strong points on both sides of the argument when it comes to tenure. Further, tenure becomes more complicated once it is implemented in the arena of Christian higher education. The reason is that these schools can often require that their professors hold certain beliefs. These doctrinal boundaries of faith can complicate the practice of granting tenure. Schools with strong confessional moorings expect their faculty (and sometimes students) to hold to these beliefs. Professors must carefully consider how much they can question norms or beliefs in the spirit of academic pursuit of the truth.

Therefore, some schools have opted to grant tenure on their campuses, while others have chosen to use other faculty retention systems, usually in the form of a term appointment (contract system). These schools have made choices regarding tenure in light of protecting their confessional beliefs and pursuing the mission of their respective schools.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### *Historical Overview of Tenure*

The American higher education and its practice of tenure follow in the line of the early higher education systems of Oxford and Cambridge in England. The English system had ecclesiastical and magisterial alliances that provided oversight for institutional practices. Masters and tutors prepared young men for theological and other professions in society. Although not defined as tenure as we know it, these academic positions in England retained a sense of “privilege” according to the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education (1973, pp. 110, 111):

With some exceptions, the Oxbridge colleges did not explicitly limit fellowships to a fixed term of years. From the complaints of academic critics that beneficed clergymen were retaining fellowships rather than yielding them to the young and poor, it may be inferred that, assuming good behavior (that is, the continuing tolerance of peers), and no doctrinal misadventure or royal disfavor, these holdings were tenable for life.

This may be an argument from silence, yet it could be argued that the principle of academic tenure as privilege is not a novel idea even though some critics portray tenure as a relatively recent phenomenon in American higher education (Anderson 1996). It

can be shown, as follows, that it has been present in some form or fashion from the beginning of higher education in America.

Tenure began to transition into the idea of “time” as schools grew in America. Higher Education in America started with the founding of Harvard in 1636. It too had ecclesiastical and magisterial ties to England (Commission, 1973; Patterson, 2001). Yet it gave allowances to tutors by making them a part of the corporation. The tutors (or teachers) held a position of prominence within the institution itself. Eventually Harvard and other schools began to implement charters and policies that allowed for teachers to be appointed “indefinitely” after probationary periods (Commission, 1973). Different institutions applied these policies uniquely. Some granted this status to all faculty members, while others established a second track of what we would call non-tenure track or term contract position. Yet all faculty members, within the terms of their employment, retained their position as long as they fulfilled their duties appropriately (Commission, 1973).

Tenure evolved into “judiciality” (Commission, 1973) after the formation of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). This group of professors was called into being by eight professors from Johns Hopkins University in 1913 (Huer, 1991; Commission, 1973). According to founding members, the AAUP was needed to confront and cajole “the university hierarchy of powerful trustees and presidents for professorial autonomy” (Huer, 1991, p. 7). These professors wanted to establish standardized tenure policies and procedures that would be to the benefit of faculty rather than administrative powers in the university (Commission, 1973).

In 1915 the AAUP put forth a document outlining its ideas for tenure. It was entitled, *The General Report on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure*. Ten years later, the AAUP joined with the Association of American Colleges (which represents college presidents) to produce their *Conference Statement*. This document moved the two groups forward to greater cooperation. Finally in 1940, the AAUP and the AAC published their *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* (Huer, 1991; Commission, 1973). Its intention was to inform the public regarding academic freedom and tenure and to establish agreed upon policies that ensured these practices were carried out on campuses around the country (AAUP, 1984). It has since become the standard by which tenure policies are judged.

Academic tenure has shown many faces over the last 50 years. During the 60s college campuses grew at an unprecedented rate. The need for faculty paralleled this growth. Tenure became an expectation of professors. Schools liberally granted tenure to secure the necessary faculty to teach courses. Some have argued that this practice led to many “under-qualified” individuals being given tenure (Huer, 1991). As unrest on the college campuses erupted in the late 60s and mid-70s, many professors became activists and cloaked themselves in academic freedom. Critics called for the reconsideration of tenure at this time (Chait, 2002; Huer, 1991).

As academia moved through the 1980s and 1990s and into the present, there has been a relative calm on the college campuses across the nation. This calm is also said to rest on the faculty. Some argued there has been great economic security, but not much risk taking or teaching being done by university faculty (Anderson, 1996; Chait, 2002, Huer, 1991; Sykes, 1988).

Today, tenured professors may assume job security unless adequate cause in one or more of five major areas dictates the termination of employment. These five major areas are as follows: (a) financial exigency, where the survival of the institution necessitates drastic reductions in programming and/or faculty & staff (This cause must be bona fide.); (b) discontinuance of a program which is not based on financial restrictions but reflects a shift in the educational mission of a school (Reasonable efforts must be made by the institution to reassign the tenured faculty in some other department position); (c) neglect of duty as a professional in the institution; (d) incompetence which impedes the faculty member's ability to accomplish assigned duties; and (e) moral turpitude, for instance, sexual harassment (Euben, 2002; Kennedy, 1997; Van Alstyne, 1997). Throughout a termination, due process should be given to the faculty member by the institution (AAUP, 1984b). The AAUP put forth a statement on dismissal procedures (1958) that summarizes the context in which the due process should occur. They wrote:

In the effective college, a dismissal proceeding involving a faculty member on tenure, or one occurring during the term of an appointment, will be a rare exception, caused by individual human weakness and not by an unhealthy setting. When it does come, however, the college should be prepared for it, so that both institutional integrity and individual human rights may be preserved during the process of resolving the trouble. The faculty must be willing to recommend the dismissal of a colleague when necessary. By the same token, presidents and governing boards must be willing to give full weight to a faculty judgment favorable to a colleague.

## *Alternatives to Tenure*

While tenure is the dominant model in higher education, some institutions are resorting to other avenues for faculty retention in place of tenure. Policies used in place of tenure to retain full-time faculty are usually implemented through term appointments. Quite often both tenure and non-tenure tracks are in place side by side (Chait & Trower, 1997). One other alternative to tenure also falls under the contract system, yet it is for part-time or adjunct faculty. Colleges and universities have been utilizing this employment practice to greater extents in the recent years, and the trend seems to be here to stay (Baldwin & Chronister, 1997; Carroll, 2000; Finkin, 2000; Magner, 1999).

Contract systems are built upon the concept of providing faculty with short-term job security while providing flexibility for the institution to make necessary faculty adjustments (Mallon, 2001). Other incentives for this route are increases in salaries, added funding for development, and scheduled development leaves (Kinkel, 2003). Schools give faculty members anywhere from a one to multiple-year contracts that ensure their employment. As the end of these contract periods approach, the institutions evaluate whether the faculty member in question is deserving of continued service. In some cases, reviews of faculty members are performed on an annual basis. This process may be a part of a rolling contract system. Often, contract renewal is presumptive after several years of quality service unless a reason for termination is clearly present (Mallon, 2001).

One such institution that implemented a contract system is Florida Gulf Coast University. This system does not come without its complaints though. Some protested that the environment is unhealthy and that the faculty must rely on the goodwill of the

administration to not terminate their employment. The question of job security was said to be at the forefront of faculty members' minds (Wilson, 2000) because any academic freedom that faculty experience on a campus with contract systems is there only by the pleasure of the administration (AAUP 2000; Commission, 1973; Mallon 2001).

As stated above, there are perceived pros and cons with contract systems just like the arguments raised for and against tenure (below). A study conducted by Baldwin and Chronister (1997) showed that 52% of those non-tenure-track faculty members surveyed were satisfied with their salaries and that a majority was satisfied with the authority they possessed to decide the courses and content they taught. On the other side though, 53% were dissatisfied with the prospects of career advancement. There seems to be contentment with the at-the-time current status they held, but the long-term outlook was unclear.

### *Arguments For and Against Tenure*

The argument surrounding academic tenure is not an open and shut case whether one is for or against it. Even though many remain committed to the concept, there are those who believe it is a practice that has run its course (Anderson, 1996; Chait, 2002).

The major arguments calling for the continuance of tenure are:

- tenure is not seen as an end in and of itself, rather it is a means to an end – namely academic freedom – because term contracts don't guarantee academic freedom (AAUP, 1989; Anderson, 1996; Mallon, 2001);

- tenure promotes job security, which in turn helps attract talented professors in an occupation that is often low on the pay scales in comparison to other occupations (Carroll, 2000; Mallon, 2001);
- tenure allows the faculty to have more power in campus governance (Mallon, 2001);
- tenure promotes quality, productivity and stability for the school due to its rigorous process, whereas on the contrary contracts lower the quality of faculty on a campus (Carroll, 2000; Finkin, 2000; Mallon, 2001);
- tenure is seen as a symbol of “normality and legitimacy” in mainstream academia (Mallon, 2001).

The major arguments that criticize the granting of tenure are:

- academic freedom must be ensured for all, therefore tenure is not necessary for the few—what is necessary though is academic due process for all (Chait, 2002);
- tenure creates a burdensome financial weight for institutions who are not as free to expand or create new departments or enlist younger faculty, whereas contracts or term appointments maintain flexibility for the institution (Chait, 2002; Mallon, 2001);
- tenure probationary requirements often promote research and publishing requirements over good teaching, which can be to the detriment of the tenure-track faculty member (Anderson, 1996; Boyer, 1990; Burgan, 2003; Chait, 2002; Sykes, 1984);
- tenure reduces accountability and promotes mediocrity resulting in “deadwood” professors who don’t contribute any substance to the program in question, yet

contracts provide motivation for faculty to excel continually (Anderson, 1996; Chait, 2002; Kennedy, 1997; Lewis, 1997; Mallon, 2001; Sykes, 1984); and

- once tenure is granted, the school is committed to the professor, but the professor is not committed to the school (Chait, 2002; Lawson, 2003).

### *Requirements to Achieve Tenure*

When faculty members are hired into tenure-track positions they enter into a probationary period of usually no more than seven years. During this time they attempt to demonstrate to their colleagues they are worthy of being granted tenure. Written criteria for the granting of tenure should be provided for the new faculty member. These tenure track faculty members should seek and receive guidance and feedback from senior faculty regarding professional endeavors that work towards the stated criteria. These criteria must be communicated clearly and implemented consistently with each faculty member during the probationary period. If a tenure-track faculty member is not performing as expected, they should be told with clear instructions on how to improve before they enter the tenure review meeting (AAUP, 1984b; ACE, 2000; Franke, 2001; Sorcinelli, 2000; Van Alstyne, 1997).

The three over-arching areas used to evaluate professors in tenure decisions are teaching, research and service (Kennedy, 1997; Seldin, 1999). First, professors are expected to be proficient and knowledgeable in their discipline, yet they should also be able to impart their knowledge through sound teaching to their students. Second, higher education is by definition built upon scholarship and learning. Some schools define this scholarship as staying abreast of current developments in a given field. Others require original research and publishing / presentations to fulfill the tenure requirements. Third,

service to the institution and the surrounding community is expected of the professor. These requirements for attaining tenure vary from campus to campus though, but whatever the requirements are, they should be applied consistently on each respective campus. For instance, major research universities might reduce or eliminate the teaching responsibility of professors engaged in large research projects. Liberal arts colleges, on the other hand, might reduce the research requirement placed on faculty in order to give them ample time to prepare for increased teaching responsibilities. Some colleges may not have any research requirements at all. Therefore, each school determines its own criteria for granting tenure (AAUP, 1989; Boyer, 1990; Frank, 2001; Kennedy, 1997; Van Alstyne, 1997).

### *Post-Tenure Review*

The practice of post-tenure reviews is one more source of contention in academia. The reason for this according to Judith Fry (2000, p. 149) is “a lack of agreement concerning the primary purpose of post-tenure review, whether it is faculty development, to make personnel decisions, or a combination of the two”.

Some argue that post-tenure review is needed to hold tenured faculty accountable after being granted tenure. It's a way to get rid of deadwood professors (Euben, 2002; Platter, 2001). Others counter though that this headhunting mentality hinders academic freedom and the collegial atmosphere of a campus in general. Professors will not want to address controversial issues if they could be let go because of some personality or ideology conflicts with administrators (AAUP, 1999; Grodsky, 2000). An excerpt from the AAUP (1999, p.1) illustrates this point. Their Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure writes:

The Association believes that periodic formal institutional evaluation of each post-probationary faculty member would bring scant benefit, would incur unacceptable costs, not only in money and time but also in dampening of creativity and of collegial relationships, and would threaten academic freedom.

Others see it as an opportunity to help faculty become the best they can be (When is Post-Tenure, 2001). Post-tenure review is seen as a way to reinvigorate the profession. It helps avoid accepting mediocrity in a profession that deserves continued excellence within the academic community of a given institution and the academy at large (Plater, 2001). All parties involved have voiced their desires to maintain and develop excellence in the profession. The question that has not been resolved as of yet is “Is post-tenure review beneficial or not?”

#### *Tenure in American Christian Higher Education*

While tenure is present and is the desired brass ring for many in secular colleges and universities in the United States, it is not a necessarily a given in Christian higher education. Some Christian schools do offer tenure tracks for faculty. These most often are liberal arts colleges and seminaries (CCCU, 2003d; Dallas Theological Seminary, 2003; Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003). On the other hand, many if not most Bible colleges do not use tenure as a reward system for faculty members (Kelly, 2003).

Academic freedom issues related to the school’s doctrinal statement are often at the heart of the tenure debate. Tenure and academic freedom are seen as concepts that go hand in hand (Habecker 1991). Tenure, as stated above, was devised to protect academic freedom. Quite often Christian schools receive harsh rebuke from academe

for their apparent limitations placed on academic freedom. Some require that faculty adhere to/sign the school's statement of faith (Dallas Theological Seminary, 2003; Monsma, 2001; Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003 & Thiessen, 2001). If they provide tenure, it is within the confines of the doctrinal statement of the school. Given these parameters in which a tenured faculty member must operate at a Christian college or university, a sixth condition providing adequate cause for termination would be "confessional unorthodoxy", namely holding beliefs that are outside of the accepted traditional Christian beliefs of the particular school in question (Maguire, 2002; Monsma 2001). Yet, if schools utilize contracts, it may be to maintain accountability for faculty who might step outside of the doctrinal boundaries. Therefore, these faculty members find themselves operating within confines as well.

Whether a school grants tenure or gives contracts, academic freedom is never operational within a vacuum. It has boundaries set by the institution. For Christian colleges and universities that boundary is usually the school's doctrinal statement and/or educational philosophies & mission statement. Wolterstorff (2001) even argued that if the government (or any other body) denied these religiously affiliated schools the ability to limit academic freedom, they would themselves be guilty of the highest form of denial of academic freedom. These institutionally imposed restrictions are similar to those at secular universities where boundaries are placed around their faculty members as well. For instance, faculty members at secular institutions are limited from religious proselytizing or the introduction of material into their teaching that has no connection with their subject matter. Therefore, one can argue that whether professors are at a

secular institution or a Christian institution academic freedom is limited to some extent (Diekema, 2000; Dovre, 2000 & Thiessen, 2001).

In summary, the question of tenure and its implications for academic freedom in the Christian college or university are handled differently by different schools. Some Christian schools opt for granting tenure. Others do not. The reasons vary for each school. This study worked to discover why and how member institutions in the CCCU utilize tenure.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### *Introduction*

The purposes of the study were to:

1. Identify how many and what kind of CCCU schools grant tenure.
2. Determine why these CCCU schools grant tenure.
3. Summarize what the tenure policies and practices are at these CCCU member institutions.
4. Identify how many and what kind of CCCU schools do not grant tenure.
5. Determine why these CCCU schools do not grant tenure.
6. Summarize the retention policies utilized in place of tenure at these CCCU member institutions.
7. Determine how CCCU schools' tenure policies compare with the AAUP's 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

To fulfill the purposes of this study, the researcher collected data from the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) at member institutions of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU) with a survey entitled *Tenure Policies & Practices Questionnaire* (See Appendix C) and from portions of faculty handbooks that contain pertinent information to tenure and/or contracts. This chapter contains sections on (a) research

questions, (b) research design and data collection, (c) instrumentation, (d) population, and (e) data analysis procedures.

### *Research Questions*

To achieve the purposes listed above the following research questions were implemented:

1. How many and what kind of CCCU member schools grant tenure?
2. Why do these CCCU schools grant tenure?
3. What are the tenure policies and practices of these CCCU schools?
4. How many and what kind of CCCU member schools do not grant tenure?
5. Why do these CCCU schools not grant tenure?
6. What faculty retention policies are utilized in place of tenure at these CCCU schools?
7. How do the CCCU schools' policies compare to the AAUP's 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure?

### *Research Design and Data Collection*

A membership list of CCCU institutions was acquired via the Internet (CCCU 2003b). As of April 2004 there were 103 United States member institutions and 2 Canadian member institutions of the CCCU (See Appendix A). Institution address and Chief Academic Officer (CAO) information were entered into an Excel spreadsheet for ease of data tracking.

Demographic data were collected from each participating institution. These data included institution size, denominational affiliation, etc.

The basic research design was adapted from a study done by Webb (2003) on presidential leadership. A pilot study was conducted with CAOs from 11 randomly selected CCCU schools before the full study was implemented. All of the remaining CCCU institution CAOs, or their equivalents (N=94), were then contacted to petition their involvement in the study (See Appendix D). This contact consisted of a study packet with a written request encouraging each CAO to participate. This initial contact included instructions on completing and returning the questionnaire as well as a request for the portion of the institution's faculty handbook that dealt with the school's tenure and/or contract system. Each packet included separate self-addressed, stamped return envelopes for the questionnaire and the faculty handbook information. A separate self-addressed, stamped coded "Notification Card" was included so as to facilitate anonymity. Participants were assured of anonymity throughout the study.

After three weeks, a reminder card was sent to non-responders with instructions to complete the questionnaire in the study packet previously received. After another three weeks another complete packet was mailed to the remaining non-responders. This packet also included a cover letter requesting that the questionnaire be completed and returned and that the portion of the faculty handbook relating to tenure or contracts be returned. This process sought to achieve at least a 65% response rate.

#### Instrumentation

The Tenure Policies and Practices Questionnaire (TPPQ) was used in this study. This instrument was a compilation from three sources. The first source was an instrument used by the Commission on Academic Tenure (1973), the second, a portion

of Ernest Boyer's questionnaire used in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), and third, questions developed uniquely for this study.

This questionnaire had 18 questions containing 68 descriptive items. The questions were designed to identify the schools' priorities when hiring faculty, if and why they utilize tenure as an employment system for faculty, and lastly why they have opted for another system if they do not use tenure as an employment system for faculty. It was divided into four sections which were as follows:

1. Section One: Hiring Priorities. This section identified the priorities institutions have when hiring faculty members. This section sought to identify trends associated with the subsequent policies identified in following sections of the questionnaire.
2. Section Two: Tenure Policies. This section identified tenure policies and reasoning behind these policies for individual institutions. Priorities used in the granting of tenure were studied. The practices of these policies were also identified.
3. Section Three: Alternative Retention Systems: This third section identified alternative retention systems for faculty utilized in place of tenure and the reasoning behind these alternative systems.
4. Section Four: Institutional Demographics. The final section provided demographic information related to the schools that completed the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was administered via regular mail. The cover letter referenced the joint efforts between the Institute for Christian Higher Education at the University of North Texas and the Research office at the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. This joint effort made by the University and the Council is believed to have given greater credibility to the study in the eyes of the respondents.

### *Population of the Study*

The Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU, 2003) represents 105 colleges or universities that describe themselves as “religiously affiliated” (CCCU 2003b).

The CCCU requires that its member institutions have the following characteristics: (a) be North American schools with comprehensive undergraduate curriculum and full accreditation; (b) have a Christ-centered mission; (c) have only persons who profess faith in Jesus Christ as full-time faculty members; (d) be cooperative in their approach to other Christian colleges; and (e) have institutional integrity both financially and ethically (CCCU, 2003c).

After the initial pilot study with 11 schools, this study surveyed the remaining sample of the CCCU membership (N=94). The CCCU member institutions were identified for the study through the CCCU website (CCCU, 2003b).

### *Data Analysis Procedures*

Since this study was designed to identify and describe the tenure policies and practices at CCCU member institutions, non-parametric statistics as well as qualitative description of analysis were utilized after collection of the data.

Once received, quantifiable data were converted into usable SPSS formats. Data were studied and reported using frequency tables, cross-tabulations, Chi Square analyses, and percentages. During the Chi Square portion of the study, the analyses assumed the hypothesis of no difference or equal distribution across all categories analyzed. This assumption of no difference was employed to establish a baseline with

which to analyze the data. Any other point of reference based upon unfounded estimations would have illustrated bias towards the potential data. Demographic data were analyzed and communicated in frequency counts and percentage distributions as well. Qualitative data from faculty handbooks and questions allowing for expanded answers have been organized and analyzed in a manner which highlights trends as well as identifies interesting “outliners”.

The quantitative data helped explain how many CCCU institutions utilize tenure. Both the quantitative and qualitative data illustrated how schools put tenure into practice. The qualitative data helped explain these policies regarding tenure. The end result provided a clearer picture of which schools grant tenure, why they grant tenure, and how they implement their tenure policies and practices. As a by-product this study also identified which schools do not grant tenure, why they do not, and what faculty retention policies they have in place of tenure.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF DATA COLLECTION AND FINDINGS

#### *Introduction*

After an initial pilot study of 11 of the 105 member schools in the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities, questionnaires and requests for tenure-related policy statements were sent to the Chief Academic Officers at the remaining 94 CCCU schools. Of the 94 questionnaires sent, 65 were returned for a return rate of 69%. These Chief Academic Officers were informed that the researcher would maintain their institutions' anonymity and that the results would be analyzed in the aggregate. Results include demographic and quantitative analyses taken from the questionnaire as well as qualitative analyses derived from portions of participating schools' faculty handbooks dealing with faculty tenure and/or contract policies.

#### *Denominational affiliations.*

The sample schools were from various Christian traditions and affiliations. The researcher grouped some schools for ease of study. Of the 65 surveyed schools, 1.5% (n = 1) was from the Assemblies of God denomination; 24.6% (n = 16) were from one form or another of the Baptist tradition (Baptist, American Baptist or Southern Baptist); 4.6% (n = 3) were from the Christian Church / Church of Christ affiliation; 4.6% (n = 3) were from the Christian Missionary Alliance Church; 3.1% (n = 2) were from the

Christian Reformed tradition; 6.2% (n = 4) were from the Church of God denomination; 3.1% (n = 2) were Free Methodist; 1.5% (n = 1) was from the Friends / Quakers tradition; 1.5% (n = 1) was Grace Brethren; 9.2% (n = 6) were Independent (also Evangelical or Reformed); 3.1% (n = 2) were Interdenominational; 4.6% (n = 3) were from the Mennonite tradition; 6.2% (n = 4) were from the Nazarene denomination; 11% (n = 7) were Non-denominational; 7.7% (n = 5) were from the Presbyterian tradition (PCA or PC USA); 1.5% (n = 1) was from the Reformed Church of America; 1.5% (n = 1) was from the United Brethren tradition; 4.6% (n = 3) was from the Wesleyan tradition; and one school (1.5%) did not respond to the question. See Table 1 below.

Table 1  
Denominational Affiliation of Sample Schools

<b>Denominational Affiliation</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Assemblies of God	1	1.5
Baptist (Baptist, American, Southern)	16	24.6%
Christian Church / Church of Christ	2	3.1%
Christian Missionary Alliance	3	4.6%
Christian Reformed	2	3.1%
Church of God	4	6.2%
Free Methodist	2	3.1%
Friends / Quakers	1	1.5%
Grace Brethren	1	1.5%
Independent (Also Evangelical or Reformed)	6	9.2%
Interdenominational	2	3.1%
Mennonite	3	4.6%
Nazarene	4	6.2%
Non-Denominational	7	11%
Presbyterian (PCA or PC USA)	5	7.7%
Reformed Church of America	1	1.5%
United Brethren	1	1.5%
Wesleyan	3	4.6%
Unanswered	1	1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>N = 65</b>	<b>100%</b>

*School size.*

Of the 65 responding schools in the study, 20% (n = 13) enrolled between 1 and 999 students; 35.4% (n = 23) enrolled between 1,000 and 1,999 students; 27.7% (n = 18) had between 2,000 and 2,999 students; 12.3% (n = 8) reported having between 3,000 and 3,999 students; 3.1% (n = 2) enrolled between 4,000 and 4,999 students; and 1.5% (n = 1) enrolled between 5,000 and 5,999 students. See Table 2 below.

Table 2  
Size of Sample Schools

<b>School Size</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1 – 999	13	20%
1,000 – 1,999	23	35.4%
2,000 – 2,999	18	27.7%
3,000 – 3,999	8	12.3%
4,000 – 4,999	2	3.1%
5,000 – 5,999	1	1.5%
Total	N = 65	100%

\* Mean = 1929 students

*Number of faculty members.*

Of the 65 responding schools in the study, the minimum number of full-time faculty was six (6); the maximum number of full-time faculty was 307. The mean number of full-time faculty was 94. One school (1.6%) did not reply to this question. One school reported not having any part-time faculty (n=0). The maximum number of reported part-time faculty was 207. The mean number of part-time faculty was 67. Two schools (3.1%) did not reply to this question. See Table 3 below.

Table 3  
Number of Faculty Members at Sample Schools

<b>Number of Faculty</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Full-Time N = 63*	6	307	94
Part-Time N = 63*	0	207	67

\* Two schools did not reply to this question.

### *Schools Granting Tenure*

The majority of CCCU schools responding to the survey indicated that they grant tenure at their institutions. Of the 65 schools that responded to the questionnaire, over two-thirds, 68% (n = 44) responded that they do grant tenure. See Table 4 below.

Table 4  
Schools Granting Tenure

<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	44	68%
No	21	32%
Total	N = 65	100%

Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 13.6% (n = 6) enrolled between 1 and 999 students; 27.3% (n = 12) had between 1,000 and 1,999 students enrolled; 34.1% (n = 15) enrolled between 2,000 and 2,999 students; 18.2% (n = 8) had student enrollments between 3,000 and 3,999; 4.5% (n = 2) enrolled between 4,000 and 4,999 students; and 2.3% (n = 1) had student enrollments between 5,000 and 5,999. The mean size of tenure granting schools was an enrollment of 2274 students. See Table 5 below.

Table 5  
Size of Schools Granting Tenure

School Size	Number	Percentage
1 – 999	6	13.6%
1,000 – 1,999	12	27.3%
2,000 – 2,999	15	34.1%
3,000 – 3,999	8	18.2%
4,000 – 4,999	2	4.5%
5,000 – 5,999	1	2.3%
Total	N = 44	100%

\* Mean = 2274

The granting of tenure varied within denominations / traditions. Of the 65 CCCU schools responding to the study, the one school within the Assemblies of God tradition reported it does grant tenure. Of the 16 schools within the Baptist tradition, 13 reported they grant tenure; three indicated they do not. Of the three Christian Church / Church of Christ schools in the study, one stated it grants tenure, one does not. Of the three Christian Missionary Alliance schools, two grant tenure; one does not. Within the Christian Reformed schools, one indicated it grants tenure and one reported it does not.

Of the four Church of God schools in the study, two grant tenure; two do not. Within the Methodist tradition, the two CCCU schools which responded indicated that they do grant tenure. The one school within the Friends / Quakers tradition grants tenure. The one school within the Grace Brethren tradition does not grant tenure.

Six schools which participated in the survey identified their institutions as Independent (some Evangelical, some Reformed). Five of these schools grant tenure; one does not. Of the two participating Interdenominational schools, one grants tenure; one reported it does not. Two participating Mennonite schools grant tenure; one does not. Two of the Nazarene affiliated schools grant tenure; two do not.

Within the non-denominational tradition, four grant tenure; three do not. Five schools within the Presbyterian tradition participated in the survey. Three of these

schools grant tenure; two do not. The one school that is a part of the Reformed Church of America does not grant tenure. The one school within the United Brethren tradition does not grant tenure. Lastly, two of the three schools within the Wesleyan tradition grant tenure; one does not. The denominational breakdown of schools that grant and do not grant tenure appear in Table 6 below.

Table 6  
Sample Schools Classified by Denominational Affiliation and Tenure Policy

<b>Denominational Affiliation</b>	<b>Grant Tenure (Percentage granting tenure)</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure (Percentage not granting tenure)</b>
Assemblies of God	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 0 (0%)
Baptist (Baptist, American, Southern)	n = 13 (20%)	3 (4.6%)
Christian Church / Church of Christ	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Christian Missionary Alliance	n = 2 (3.1%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Christian Reformed	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Church of God	n = 2 (3.1%)	n = 2 (3.1%)
Free Methodist	n = 2 (3.1%)	n = 0 (0%)
Friends / Quakers	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 0 (0%)
Grace Brethren	n = 0 (0%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Independent (Also Evangelical or Reformed)	n = 5 (7.6%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Interdenominational	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Mennonite	n = 2 (3.1%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Nazarene	n = 2 (3.1%)	n = 2 (3.1%)
Non-Denominational	n = 4 (6.1%)	n = 3 (4.6%)
Presbyterian (PCA or PC USA)	n = 3 (4.6%)	n = 2 (3.1%)
Reformed Church of America	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 0 (0%)
United Brethren	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 0 (0%)
Wesleyan	n = 2 (3.1%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
	N = 44	N = 21

### *Reasons for Granting Tenure*

The 44 schools that grant tenure do so for various reasons. The reader should be reminded that the CAOs were trying to reflect their respective schools' values. Other faculty members and administrators may in fact value/view particular items differently. Some CAOs cited more than one reason for granting tenure. When explaining why their institutions grant tenure, the respondents from the schools provided a total of 70 categorical reasons. These responses were grouped into 15 separate categories (See Table 4.5). There were some similarities between certain categories of reasons for granting tenure, but delineations were made to represent the differences in the responses given.

Of 70 reasons for awarding tenure on the 44 campuses, 22.9% (n = 16) of the responses cited the protection of academic freedom; 14.3% (n = 10) mentioned commitment by the institution to the faculty and/or mutual commitment by the institution and faculty member as a reason; 12.9% (n = 9) responded that tenure allows them to retain quality faculty members more easily; 11.4% (n = 8) reported that tenure assists them in recruiting quality faculty members; 10% (n = 7) indicated that tenure provides recognition and affirmation for faculty members who perform well; 5.7% (n = 4) stated that tenure provides job security for faculty; 5.7% (n = 4) explained that tenure protects faculty from arbitrary dismissal and provides for due process; 4.3% (n = 3) explained that they have tenure because of tradition; 2.9% (n = 2) indicated they have tenure because tenure is a dominant practice in higher education in our country; 2.9% (n = 2) stated that tenure allows for shared governance; 1.4% (n = 1) reported they added tenure in light of applying for accreditation; 1.4% (n = 1) stated tenure assists in

acculturation and socialization of the faculty; 1.4% (n = 1) indicated that tenure assists in quality learning; 1.4% (n = 1) cited continuity of their programs as a reason for tenure; and 1.4% (n = 1) identified tenure as building faculty morale. See Table 7 below.

Table 7  
Reasons for Granting Tenure

<b>Reasons for Granting Tenure</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Academic Freedom	16	22.9%
Commitment by Institution / Mutual Commitment by Institution and Faculty	10	14.3%
Retaining Quality Faculty, Helps with	9	12.9%
Recruiting Quality Faculty, Helps with	8	11.4%
Recognition & Affirmation	7	10%
Job Security	4	5.7%
Protects Faculty / Due Process	4	5.7%
Tradition	3	4.3%
Higher Education Practice in General	2	2.9%
Shared Governance	2	2.9%
Applying for Accreditation, Part of	1	1.4%
Acculturation & Socialization	1	1.4%
Assists in Quality Learning	1	1.4%
Continuity of Programs	1	1.4%
Faculty Morale	1	1.4%
Total	N = 70*	100%

\* Some schools cited more than one reason for why they grant tenure.

*Tenure Policies and Practices*

*Important factors when hiring faculty.*

All the CAOs that participated in the study were asked to rank the importance of different factors when hiring faculty members. These factors were taken from Boyer’s study in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990). The scale for each factor was from 1 – 4 where 1 = “Extremely Unimportant”, 2 = “Somewhat Unimportant”, 3 = “Somewhat Important”, and 4 = “Extremely Important”. The responses of schools that grant tenure were compared to schools that do not grant tenure on each factor.

The first factor considered by respondents was “Teaching Skill”. Schools that grant tenure value this factor equally with schools that do not grant tenure. Of the 65 schools that participated in this survey, 100% (n = 65) reported that teaching skills are extremely important when hiring a faculty member. See Table 8 below.

Table 8  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Teaching Skill

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	0	0
Somewhat Unimportant	0	0
Somewhat Important	0	0
Extremely Important	44 100%	21 100%
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

When considering the factor of “Research / Publishing Skills”, schools that grant tenure are more likely to value this factor than schools that do not. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 0% (n = 0) indicated this factor is extremely unimportant; 13.6% (n = 6) stated that this factor is somewhat unimportant; 79.6% (n = 35) reported that this

factor is somewhat important; and 6.8% (n = 3) indicated that this factor is extremely important. Of the 21 schools that do not grant tenure, 4.8% (n = 1) stated that this factor is extremely unimportant; 38.1% (n = 8) reported that research and publishing skills are somewhat unimportant; 57.1% (n = 12) reported that this factor is somewhat important; and 0% (n = 0) indicated that this factor is extremely important. See Table 9 below.

Table 9  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Research / Publishing Skills

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	0	1 4.8%
Somewhat Unimportant	6 13.6%	8 38.1%
Somewhat Important	35 79.6%	12 57.1%
Extremely Important	3 6.8%	0
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

When asked to consider the factor of “Mentoring Skills”, schools that grant tenure are less likely to value this factor than schools that do not grant tenure. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 4.5% (n = 2) indicated that this factor is extremely unimportant; 20.5% (n = 9) stated that this factor is somewhat unimportant; 43.2% (n = 19) indicated that this factor is somewhat important; and 31.8% (n = 14) reported that this factor is extremely important. Of the 21 schools that do not grant tenure, 0% (n = 0) reported that mentoring skills are extremely unimportant; 9.5% (n = 2) indicated that this factor is somewhat unimportant; 42.9% (n = 9) stated that this factor is somewhat important; and 47.6% indicated that this factor is extremely important. See Table 10 below.

Table 10  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Mentoring Skills

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	2 4.5%	0
Somewhat Unimportant	9 20.5%	2 9.5%
Somewhat Important	19 43.2%	9 42.9%
Extremely Important	14 31.8%	10 47.6%
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

Respondents were asked to consider the factor of “Service Abilities” when hiring new faculty members. Schools that grant tenure are more likely to value this factor, but the difference is only slight. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 2.3% (n = 1) reported this factor is extremely unimportant; 9.1% (n = 4) answered that this factor is somewhat unimportant; 79.5% (n = 35) reported that service abilities are somewhat important; and 9.1% (n = 4) indicated that this factor is extremely important. Of the 21 schools that do not grant tenure, 0% (n = 0) listed this factor as extremely unimportant; 19% (n = 4) reported this factor is somewhat unimportant; 71.5% (n = 15) reported this factor is somewhat important; and 9.5% (n = 2) stated that service abilities are extremely important. See Table 11 below.

Table 11  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Service Abilities

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	1 2.3%	0
Somewhat Unimportant	4 9.1%	4 19.0%
Somewhat Important	35 79.5%	15 71.5%
Extremely Important	4 9.1%	2 9.5%
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

When considering the factor of “Grant Writing Ability / Success”, neither the schools that grant tenure nor the schools that do not grant tenure valued this factor very highly. Although a higher percentage of tenure granting schools see this factor as somewhat important, skill in grant writing is not highly sought after in the hiring process.

Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 18.2% (n = 8) reported that this factor is extremely unimportant; 70.5% (n = 31) indicated that this factor is somewhat unimportant when hiring; and 11.4% (n = 5) indicated grant writing is somewhat important. No tenure granting sample schools view this factor as extremely important. Of the 21 schools that do not grant tenure, 38.1% (n = 8) stated that this factor is extremely unimportant; 57.1% (n = 12) reported this factor as somewhat unimportant; and 4.8% (n = 1) indicated that grant writing is somewhat important. None of the participating non-tenure schools viewed this factor as extremely important. See Table 12 below.

Table 12  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members:  
Grant Writing Abilities / Success

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	8 18.2%	8 38.1%
Somewhat Unimportant	31 70.4%	12 57.1%
Somewhat Important	5 11.4%	1 4.8%
Extremely Important	0	0
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

Biblical literacy was the next factor respondents were to consider. Even though both school groupings ranked this factor highly, schools granting tenure value this factor less than schools that do not grant tenure. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 2.3% (n = 1) answered that this factor is extremely unimportant; 13.6% (n = 6) indicated that biblical literacy is somewhat unimportant; 59.1% (n = 26) indicated that this factor is somewhat important; and 25% (n = 11) stated that this factor is extremely important. Of the 21 schools that do not grant tenure, 0% indicated that this factor is extremely unimportant; 5% (n = 1) indicated that biblical literacy is somewhat unimportant; 60% (n = 12) answered that this factor is somewhat important; and 35% (n = 7) stated that biblical literacy is extremely important. See Table 13 below.

Table 13  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Biblical Literacy

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	1 2.3%	0
Somewhat Unimportant	6 13.6%	1 5%
Somewhat Important	26 59.1%	12 60%
Extremely Important	11 25%	7 35%
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

When it comes to “Christian Faith Commitment” both tenure-granting and non-tenure-granting schools rated factor highly. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, none viewed this factor as either extremely unimportant or somewhat unimportant; 2.3% (n = 1) indicated this factor is somewhat important; and 97.7% (n = 43) replied that Christian faith commitment is extremely important. Of the 21 non-tenure-granting schools, 100% (n = 21) declared that this factor is extremely important. See Table 14.

Table 14  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members:  
 Christian Faith Commitment

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	0	0
Somewhat Unimportant	0	0
Somewhat Important	1 2.3%	0
Extremely Important	43 97.7%	21 100%
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

Respondents were asked to consider the role that “Ministry / Field of Study Experience” plays when considering hiring a faculty member. Even though both groups place a great deal of value on this factor, schools that grant tenure do not value this factor as highly as do non-tenure granting schools. Of the 44 tenure-granting schools, 0% identified this factor as extremely unimportant; 21.4% (n = 9) stated that this factor is somewhat unimportant; 59.5% (n = 25) indicated that this factor is somewhat important to them; and 19% (n = 8) reported that this factor is extremely important. Of the 21 schools that do not grant tenure, 0% indicated this factor is extremely unimportant; 14.3% (n = 3) responded that this factor is somewhat unimportant; 71.4% (n = 15) reported that this factor is somewhat important; and 14.3% (n = 3) indicated that this factor is extremely important to them. See Table 15 below.

Table 15  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Ministry / Field of Service Experience

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	0	0
Somewhat Unimportant	9 21.4%	3 14.3%
Somewhat Important	25 59.5%	15 71.4%
Extremely Important	8 19%	3 14.3%
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

The next factor to be considered by respondents was “Terminal Degree Held”. Schools that grant tenure more highly value this factor than do schools that do not grant tenure. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 0% indicated that this factor is extremely unimportant; 2.3% (n = 1) indicated that a terminal degree held is somewhat

unimportant; 15.9% (n = 7) stated that this factor is somewhat important; and 81.8% (n = 36) answered that holding a terminal degree is extremely important. Of the 21 schools that do not grant tenure, none viewed this factor as either extremely unimportant or somewhat unimportant; 38.1% (n = 8) stated that this factor is somewhat important; and 61.9% (n = 13) answered that they view this factor as extremely important. See Table 16 below.

Table 16  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Terminal Degree Held

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	0	0
Somewhat Unimportant	1 2.3%	0
Somewhat Important	7 15.9%	8 38.1%
Extremely Important	36 81.8%	13 61.9%
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

Lastly, respondents were asked to consider the factor of “Expertise in Chosen Field of Study”. The differences between tenure-granting schools and those that do not were negligible. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 0% viewed this factor as extremely unimportant; 2.3% (n = 1) answered that this factor is somewhat unimportant; 11.4% (n = 5) indicated that expertise is somewhat important; and 86.4% (n = 38) believed that this factor is extremely important. Of the 21 schools that do not grant tenure, none of the respondents viewed this factor as either extremely unimportant or somewhat unimportant; 14.3% (n = 3) indicated that expertise on one’s chosen field of study is

somewhat important; and 85.7% (n = 18) responded that this factor is extremely important to them. See Table 17 below.

Table 17  
Importance of Factors When Hiring Faculty Members: Expertise in Chosen Field of Study

<b>Importance of Factor</b>	<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Do Not Grant Tenure</b>
Extremely Unimportant	0	0
Somewhat Unimportant	1 2.3%	0
Somewhat Important	5 11.4%	3 14.3%
Extremely Important	38 86.3%	18 85.7%
Total	N = 44 100%	N = 21 100%

Of the 44 schools that grant tenure to their faculty, 50% (n = 22) require that their faculty members sign their respective school's statement of faith; 31.8% (n = 14) do not require their faculty members to sign a statement of faith. A little over 18% (n = 8) reported that the issue of signing a statement of faith was not applicable. See Table 18 below.

Table 18  
Statement of Faith Required for Faculty at Schools Granting Tenure

<b>Statement of Faith Requirements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Faculty Must Sign Statement of Faith	22	50%
Faculty Not Required to Sign Statement of Faith	14	31.8%
Signing Statement of Faith Not Applicable	8	18.2%
Total	N = 44	100%

*Tenure policies and academic freedom.*

Of the 44 schools which indicated that they grant tenure, 77.3% (n = 34) stated that their written tenure policies address academic freedom; 20.5% (n = 9) indicated that their written tenure policies do not address academic freedom. One school, 2.2%, did not respond to this question. See Table 19 below.

Table 19  
Written Tenure Policy Addresses Academic Freedom

<b>Written Tenure Policy Addresses Academic Freedom</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	34	77.3%
No	9	20.5%
Missing	1	2.2%
Total	N = 44	100%

When asked if the tenure review practices at their respective institutions protect academic freedom, 84.1% (n = 37) reported they do; 9.1% (n = 4) indicated that their tenure review practices do not protect academic freedom; and 4.5% (n = 2) did not know if their tenure review practices protect academic freedom. One respondent, 2.3%, did not answer this question. See Table 20 below.

Table 20  
Tenure Review Practices Protect Academic Freedom

<b>Tenure Review Practices Protect Academic Freedom</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	37	84.1%
No	4	9.1%
Don't Know	2	4.5%
Missing	1	2.3%
Total	N = 44	100%

*Tenure policies and probationary period.*

Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 86.3% (n = 38) have some form of probationary period as part of the tenure granting process; 11.4% (n = 5) indicated not having a probationary period during the tenure process. One respondent, 2.3%, did not respond to this question. See Table 21 below.

Table 21  
Probationary Period as Part of Tenure Process

<b>Probationary Period Part of Tenure Process</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	38	86.3%
No	5	11.4%
Missing	1	2.3%
Total	N = 44	100%

The probationary period varied from institution to institution. Thirty-six of the 38 schools responded to the question regarding the length of probation on their campuses. Of these schools, 8.3% (n = 3) indicated their probationary period is three years; 2.8% (n = 1) reported their probationary period is four years; 2.8% (n = 1) indicated their maximum number of years for probation is five years; 36.1% (n = 13) reported their maximum probationary period is six years; another 36.1% (n = 13) noted a maximum probationary period of seven years; 5.6% (n = 2) indicated their maximum probationary period for tenure is seven years; and 5.6% (n = 2) reported their maximum probationary period is 9 years. The mean of the probationary periods is 6.14 years with a standard deviation of 1.74. One school (2.9%) indicated they have an indefinite probationary period. Two schools (5.6%) did not respond to this question. See Table 22 below.

Table 22  
Maximum Length of Probationary Period in Tenure Process

<b>Maximum Length of Probationary Period in Tenure Process</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
3 Years	3	8.3%
4 Years	1	2.8%
5 Years	1	2.8%
6 Years	13	36.1%
7 Years	13	36.1%
8 Years	2	5.6%
9 Years	2	5.6%
Total	N = 35*	100%

The mean is 6.14 years; the standard deviation is 1.74 years.  
 \* One school reported having an indefinite probationary period.  
 Two schools did not respond to question.

Some schools accept prior experience at previous institutions as counting toward the tenure probationary period on their campuses. Thirty-three of the 44 schools granting tenure answered the question regarding the acceptance of prior experience as part of the probationary period for tenure. Of these schools, 18.2% (n = 6) reported they do not accept any prior service toward the probationary period; 21.2% (n = 7) indicated they accept up to 2 years prior service towards probation; 42.4% (n = 14) indicated they accept up to three years of prior service toward the probation requirement; 6.1% (n = 2) reported they accept four years prior service toward probation; 6.1% (n = 2) indicated they accept up to six years prior service for probation; and 6.1% (n = 2) noted they accept seven years prior service for probation requirements. The mean of accepted years is 2.73 years with a standard deviation of 1.86. See Table 23 below.

Table 23  
Maximum Number of Years of Prior Experience Accepted for Probationary Period

<b>Maximum Length of Probationary Period in Tenure Process</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
0 Years	6	18.2%
2 Years	7	21.2%
3 Years	14	42.4%
4 Years	2	6.1%
6 Years	2	6.1%
7 Years	2	6.1%
Total	N = 33*	100%

\* Only 33 schools responded to this question.  
 The mean prior service accepted is 2.73 years; the standard deviation is 1.86.

*Tenure policies and the granting of tenure.*

Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 84.1% (n = 37) reported the percentage of faculty members who have been through tenure review and have received tenure from the fall of 2001 through the spring of 2004. Of these 37 schools, 2.7% (n = 1) reported that only 50 to 59% going through tenure review received tenure; 5.4% (n = 2) stated that 70 to 79% of eligible faculty members received tenure; 16.2% (n = 6) reported that between 80 to 89% who went through tenure review were granted tenure; 32.4% (n = 12) indicated that 90 – 99% of the faculty members requesting a tenure review received tenure; and 43.2% (n = 16) stated that 100% of the faculty members who went through the tenure review process were granted tenure. Of the faculty members who have gone up for tenure in these 37 schools from 2001 – 2004, a mean of .922 were granted tenure status with a standard deviation of .105. See Table 24 below.

Table 24  
Percentage of Faculty at Participating Schools Who Went Through  
 Tenure and Were Granted Tenure During the Years 2001 – 2004

<b>Tenure Granting Range</b>	<b>Number Receiving Tenure</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
50 – 59%	1	2.7%
70 – 79%	2	5.4%
80 – 89%	6	16.2%
90 – 99%	12	32.4%
100%	16	43.3%
Total	N = 37*	100%

Mean = .92 with a Standard Deviation of .11

\* Seven (7) tenure-granting schools did not respond to this question.

The schools granting tenure were asked what percentage of their current faculty members has tenure. Forty-One (93.2%) of the 44 schools with tenure responded. The maximum number reported is 80% with the minimum number being reported as 8%. The mean percentage of tenured faculty members is .47 with a standard deviation of .18. Three institutions, 6.8% did not respond to this question. See Table 25 below.

Table 25  
Percentage of Current Faculty with Tenure

	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
<b>Percentage Receiving Tenure</b>	.80	.08	.47	.18
N = 41 Schools reporting	–	–	–	–

If schools distinguish faculty positions based on rank, namely Full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Adjunct, etc., they were asked to identify the ranks in which tenure may be held. Of the 43 schools that answered this question 100% (n = 43) stated that tenure may be held at the rank of full Professor. One hundred percent (n = 43) of the schools indicated that tenure may be held at the rank of

Associate Professor. Of the 43 schools responding to this question, 51% (n = 22) reported that tenure may be held at the Assistant Professor position. Forty-nine percent (n = 21) indicated that those with the rank of Assistant Professor may not hold tenure.

For all the schools answering this question, 100% (n = 43) indicated that the rank of Instructor is not eligible for tenure. All schools responded similarly to the rank of Adjunct Professor. One hundred percent (n = 43) stated that this position is not eligible for tenure. One school that grants tenure did not respond to this question. See Table 26.

Table 26  
Eligibility for Tenure by Faculty Rank

	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Associate Professor</b>	<b>Assistant Professor</b>	<b>Instructor</b>	<b>Adjunct Professor</b>
<b>Eligible for tenure</b>	n = 43 (100%)	n = 43 (100%)	n = 22 (51%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 0 (0%)
<b>Not eligible for tenure</b>	n = 0 (0%)	n = 0 (0%)	n = 21 (49%)	n = 43 (100%)	n = 43 (100%)
<b>N = 43* Schools Reporting</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

\* One school did not respond.

*Important factors when granting tenure.*

If schools indicated that they grant tenure, they were then asked to identify from a given list the standards or criteria they use to grant tenure. Each potential variable for granting tenure was measured on a 1 to 4 Likert scale where 1 = “Extremely Unimportant”, 2 = “Somewhat Unimportant”, 3 = “Somewhat Important”, and 4 = “Extremely Important”.

These data were analyzed under the assumption of the null hypothesis that there would be no difference between the values given to each criterion utilized for evaluating tenure eligibility. For instance, it was assumed that the relative value for the variable “Number of Publications” would be equally distributed across the option of categories of

“Extremely Unimportant”, “Somewhat Unimportant”, “Somewhat Important”, and “Extremely Important”. This assumption of no difference is justified in that a starting point must be established for study. The argument could be made that certain categories would be skewed in one direction or the next given the sample being studied. Yet any base assumption which does not start at the null would taint the study’s attempted objectivity and bias the results. Therefore, with 44 schools considering a given variable, the assumed or expected distribution was 11 for each possible option. This same assumption was employed for each criterion considered for tenure eligibility.

When considering tenure for candidates, the number of publications by a candidate is valued differently. The number of participants ( $n = 1$ ) who believe this is extremely unimportant is less than the expected number of 11. The number of respondents who believed it is somewhat unimportant ( $n = 14$ ) was more than the expected number. The number viewing it as somewhat important ( $n = 28$ ) was much greater than the expected number of 11, and those who value this as extremely important ( $n = 1$ ) was far less than expected. The calculated chi-square value 45.27 is statistically significant. See Table 27 below.

Table 27  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Number of Publications

<b>Factor Rating</b>	<b>Observed N</b>	<b>Expected N</b>	<b>Residual</b>
Extremely Unimportant	1	11.0	-10.0
Somewhat Unimportant	14	11.0	3.0
Somewhat Important	28	11.0	17.0
Extremely Important	1	11.0	-10.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 45.27  
df = 3

When asked about the reputations of the presses or journals publishing the books or articles of the tenure candidates, the number of respondents ( $n = 4$ ) who

considered this variable as extremely unimportant was much lower than the expected number of 11. The number who viewed this variable as somewhat important (n = 23) was much higher than the expected number. A slightly greater number of respondents (n = 14) than the expected 11 valued this variable as somewhat important. Only a few (n = 3) perceived it as extremely important – far below the expected number of 11. The chi-square value 24.28 is statistically significant. See Table 28 below.

Table 28  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Reputations of Presses / Journals

<b>Factor Rating</b>	<b>Observed N</b>	<b>Expected N</b>	<b>Residual</b>
Extremely Unimportant	4	11.0	-7.0
Somewhat Unimportant	23	11.0	12.0
Somewhat Important	14	11.0	3.0
Extremely Important	3	11.0	-8.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 24.28  
df = 3

Student evaluations were also considered as a criterion for tenure. The expected number for each category was 11. None of the respondents (n = 0) believed that student evaluations are either extremely unimportant or somewhat unimportant. Therefore, both of these categories fell below the expected number of 11. Those viewing student evaluations as somewhat important (n = 10) approximated the expected number. Those who valued student evaluations as extremely important (n = 34) more than tripled the expected number of 11. The chi-square value 70.18 is statistically significant. See Table 29 below.

Table 29  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Student Evaluations

Factor Rating	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Extremely Unimportant	0	11.0	-11.0
Somewhat Unimportant	0	11.0	-11.0
Somewhat Important	10	11.0	-1.0
Extremely Important	34	11.0	23.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 70.18  
df = 3

Respondents considered the category of observation of teaching by colleagues and/or administrators. The number of respondents who rated this category as extremely unimportant (n = 1) was far below the expected number of 11. The number of those who viewed it as somewhat important (n = 1) was far below the expected number as well. The group of respondents who viewed this category as somewhat important (n = 18) was greater than the expected number of 11. Many respondents (n = 24) valued this category as extremely important. This number more than doubled the expected number of 11. The chi-square value (38.00) is statistically significant. See Table 30 below.

Table 30  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Observation of Teaching

Factor Rating	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Extremely Unimportant	1	11.0	-10.0
Somewhat Unimportant	1	11.0	-10.0
Somewhat Important	18	11.0	7.0
Extremely Important	24	11.0	13.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 38.00  
df = 3

When asked to consider recommendations from outside scholars (those outside the given institution) when deciding on tenure for a candidate, the number of respondents who viewed this variable as extremely unimportant (n = 15) was above the expected number of 11. Those respondents who counted this input as somewhat unimportant (n = 22) doubled the expected number of 11. The number of respondents

who believed this variable is somewhat important (n = 4) fell far short of the expected number. The number of respondents who believed outside recommendations are extremely important (n = 3) was even farther below the expected number of 11. The chi-square value (22.73) is statistically significant. See Table 31 below.

Table 31  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Recommendations – Outside Scholars

Factor Rating	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Extremely Unimportant	15	11.0	4.0
Somewhat Unimportant	22	11.0	11.00
Somewhat Important	4	11.0	-7.0
Extremely Important	3	11.0	-8.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 22.73  
df = 3

When asked to consider research and/or grants received, the number of respondents (n = 7) who believed this is extremely unimportant was a little lower than the expected number of 11. The number who believed this variable is somewhat unimportant (n = 18) was above the expected number of 11. Those who thought this is somewhat important (n = 18) totaled more than the expected number. The respondents who thought this variable is extremely important (n = 1) was far below the expected number of 11. The chi-square value (19.46) is statistically significant. See table 32.

Table 32  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Research and/or Other Grants Received

Factor Rating	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Extremely Unimportant	7	11.0	-4.0
Somewhat Unimportant	18	11.0	7.00
Somewhat Important	18	11.0	7.0
Extremely Important	1	11.0	-10.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 19.46  
df = 3

Respondents were asked to consider faculty recommendations from within their own institutions. There were no respondents ( $n = 0$ ) who viewed this input as extremely unimportant. The number of respondents who viewed this variable as somewhat unimportant ( $n = 4$ ) was far below the expected value of 11. The number of respondents who viewed faculty members' input as somewhat important ( $n = 21$ ) nearly doubled the expected number of 11. The number of respondents who viewed this input as extremely important ( $n = 19$ ) was greater than the expected number of 11. The chi-square value (30.36) is statistically significant. See Table 33 below.

Table 33  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Recommendations from Faculty within Institution

Factor Rating	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Extremely Unimportant	0	11.0	-11.0
Somewhat Unimportant	4	11.0	-7.00
Somewhat Important	21	11.0	10.0
Extremely Important	19	11.0	8.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 30.36  
df = 3

When considering service within the institution, the majority of respondents valued this variable. The respondents who stated that this variable is extremely unimportant ( $n = 0$ ) was below the expected number of 11; the number of respondents who believed this variable is somewhat unimportant ( $n = 4$ ) was below the expected number of 11 as well. Respondents who viewed this category as somewhat important ( $n = 22$ ) doubled the expected number of 11. The respondents who saw this category as extremely important ( $n = 22$ ) also doubled the expected number. The chi-square value (44.00) is statistically significant. See Table 34 below.

Table 34  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Service within Institution

<b>Factor Rating</b>	<b>Observed N</b>	<b>Expected N</b>	<b>Residual</b>
Extremely Unimportant	0	11.0	-11.0
Somewhat Unimportant	0	11.0	-11.00
Somewhat Important	22	11.0	11.0
Extremely Important	22	11.0	11.0
Total	44	44.0	

Chi-Square = 44.00  
df = 3

Service outside of the given institution was a criterion to be considered when granting tenure. No respondents (n = 0) viewed this variable as extremely unimportant. This was far below the expected number of 11. Only one respondent (n = 1) reported this as somewhat unimportant – again, far below the expected 11. The number of respondents who counted this variable as somewhat important (n = 30) far surpassed the expected number of 11. Respondents who viewed this category as extremely important (n = 13) approximated the expected number. The chi-square value (53.27) is statistically significant. See Table 35 below.

Table 35  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Service within the Surrounding Community or Local Church

<b>Factor Rating</b>	<b>Observed N</b>	<b>Expected N</b>	<b>Residual</b>
Extremely Unimportant	0	11.0	-11.0
Somewhat Unimportant	1	11.0	-10.00
Somewhat Important	30	11.0	19.0
Extremely Important	13	11.0	2.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 53.273  
df = 3

When asked how much the presentation of papers at professional meetings and/or other schools counts towards tenure, none of the respondents (n = 0) reported that it is extremely unimportant. This number was below the expected number of 11. The number of respondents who viewed it as somewhat unimportant (n = 7) fell slightly

below the expected number of 11. Those respondents who viewed this category as somewhat important (n = 32) nearly tripled the expected number. The number who viewed it as extremely important (n = 5) fell below the expected number of 11. The chi-square value (55.82) is statistically significant. See Table 36 below.

Table 36  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Papers Delivered at Professional Meetings and/or Other Schools

Factor Rating	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Extremely Unimportant	0	11.0	-11.0
Somewhat Unimportant	7	11.0	-4.00
Somewhat Important	32	11.0	21.0
Extremely Important	5	11.0	-6.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 55.818  
df = 3

Respondents were asked about published reviews of tenure candidates' published work. The number of respondents who viewed this category as extremely unimportant (n = 3) fell far below the expected number of 11. Those respondents who saw this as somewhat unimportant (n = 27) far exceeded the expected number. The number of respondents who viewed this category as somewhat important (n = 13) approximated the expected number of 11, and one respondent (n = 1) viewed this category as extremely important. This last response was far below the expected number of 11. The chi-square value (33.55) is statistically significant. See Table 37 below.

Table 37  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Published Reviews of the Scholar's Books

Factor Rating	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Extremely Unimportant	3	11.0	-8.0
Somewhat Unimportant	27	11.0	16.00
Somewhat Important	13	11.0	2.0
Extremely Important	1	11.0	-10.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 38.545  
df = 3

When asked to consider academic advisement for tenure, only one respondent (n = 1) indicated that this is extremely unimportant. This was below the expected number of 11. Respondents who saw this as somewhat unimportant (n = 10) nearly equaled the expected number of 11. Respondents who viewed this category as somewhat important (n = 25) far exceeded the expected number of 11. The number of respondents who perceived this category as extremely important (n = 7) was less than the expected number of 11. The chi-square value (29.09) is statistically significant. See Table 38 below.

Table 38  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Academic Advisement

Factor Rating	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Extremely Unimportant	1	10.8	-9.8
Somewhat Unimportant	10	10.8	-.8
Somewhat Important	25	10.8	14.3
Extremely Important	7	10.8	-3.8
Total	43	44	

Chi-Square = 29.093  
df = 3

Respondents were asked to report how important collegiality is when considering tenure. No respondents (n = 0) reported this variable as extremely unimportant. This number was less than the expected 11. The number of respondents who saw this variable as somewhat unimportant (n = 3) was well below the expected number of 11. The number of respondents who viewed this as somewhat important (n = 19) was well above the expected number. Those respondents who indicated that it is extremely important (n = 22) doubled the expected number of 11. The chi-square value (33.64) is statistically significant. See Table 39 below.

Table 39  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Collegiality

Factor Rating	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Extremely Unimportant	0	11.0	-11.0
Somewhat Unimportant	3	11.0	-8.0
Somewhat Important	19	11.0	8
Extremely Important	22	11.0	11.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 33.64  
df = 3

Of the 44 respondents from schools with tenure, 25% (n = 11) identified an “other” variable for granting tenure in addition to those cited above. While data that follow will show that faculty handbooks identify the integration of faith and learning as a key component to be considered when granting tenure, only six (6) respondents listed the integration of faith and learning in teaching as an extremely important component of granting tenure on the questionnaire. Only two (2) respondents listed mission compatibility as extremely important. Only two (2) respondents cited evidence of Christian commitment as extremely important. Finally, only one (1) respondent identified evidence of effective student learning outcomes as extremely important. See Table 40.

Table 40  
Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure: Other

<b>“Other” Factors Influencing the Granting of Tenure</b>	<b>Number</b>
Integration of Faith and Learning	n = 6
Fit with Mission	n = 2
Evidence of Christian Commitment	n = 2
Evidence of Effective Student Outcomes	n = 1
Total Responding to Question	N = 11

The schools that grant tenure were asked if they limit the percentage of faculty who may possess tenure at any given time. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, the number of schools that limit the percentage of faculty members who may hold tenure at

any given time (n = 6) was far below the expected number of 22. In contrast to this, the number of schools who do not limit the percentage of faculty who may possess tenure (n = 38) was significantly above the expected number of 22. See Table 41 below.

Table 41  
Schools That Limit Percentage of Faculty Who May Possess Tenure

Limit Percentage of Faculty Who Possess Tenure	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Yes	6	22.0	-16.0
No	38	22.0	16.0
Total	44	44	

Chi-Square = 22.27  
df = 1

The Chief Academic Officers were asked about giving formal written reasons to faculty members whose contracts are not renewed or who are denied tenure. Within the 44 schools that grant tenure, 63.6% (n = 28) reported that they always provide formal written reasons for faculty members whose contracts are not renewed or who are denied tenure; 27.3% (n = 12) indicated they sometimes provide formal written reasons for these negative personnel decisions; and 9.1% (n = 4) responded that they never provide formal written reasons for personnel being denied tenure or not having a contract renewed.

The above statistics differed from the schools that use term appointments or contracts only. Of the 21 schools that only use contracts, 42.9% (n = 9) indicated that they always provide formal written reasons for not renewing a faculty member's contract; 28.6% (n = 6) reported that they sometimes provide written documentation for contract non-renewal decisions; and 28.6% (n = 6) indicated they never provide written reasons for contract non-renewal decisions. See Table 42 below.

Table 42  
Written Reasons Given for Tenure Denial or Contract Non-Renewal as Distinguished between Tenure-Granting and Non-Tenure Granting Schools

			Written Reasons Why for Negative Decisions			Total
			always	never	sometim es	
Grant Tenure	no	Count	9	6	6	21
		% within GRNTTEN	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	100.0%
		% within WRTREWY	24.3%	60.0%	33.3%	32.3%
		% of Total	13.8%	9.2%	9.2%	32.3%
	yes	Count	28	4	12	44
		% within GRNTTEN	63.6%	9.1%	27.3%	100.0%
		% within WRTREWY	75.7%	40.0%	66.7%	67.7%
		% of Total	43.1%	6.2%	18.5%	67.7%
Total		Count	37	10	18	65
		% within GRNTTEN	56.9%	15.4%	27.7%	100.0%
		% within WRTREWY	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	56.9%	15.4%	27.7%	100.0%

A question about the appeals process on each campus was the follow-up question to that of formal written reasons for non-renewal of contracts and tenure denial. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 95.5% (n = 42) indicated that they provide a means for faculty members denied tenure to appeal the decision; 4.5% (n =2) reported that they do not have a means for appealing these decisions.

These data were somewhat similar to contract only schools, yet there were differences. Of the 21 schools that only utilize contracts, 81% (n = 17) reported they do have an appeals process; 14.3% (n = 3) reported that they do not. There was one school that only uses contracts that did not respond to this question. See Table 43 below.

Table 43

Appeals Process in Place for Tenure Denial or Contract Non-Renewal as Distinguished between Tenure-Granting and Non-Tenure Granting Schools

			Appeal Process in Place on Campus			Total
			no	yes		
Grant Tenure	no	Count	3	17	1	21
		% within GRNTTEN	14.3%	81.0%	4.8%	100.0%
		% within APPEAL	60.0%	28.8%	100.0%	32.3%
		% of Total	4.6%	26.2%	1.5%	32.3%
	yes	Count	2	42	0	44
		% within GRNTTEN	4.5%	95.5%	.0%	100.0%
		% within APPEAL	40.0%	71.2%	.0%	67.7%
		% of Total	3.1%	64.6%	.0%	67.7%
Total		Count	5	59	1	65
		% within GRNTTEN	7.7%	90.8%	1.5%	100.0%
		% within APPEAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	7.7%	90.8%	1.5%	100.0%

The Chief Academic Officers were asked about the number of tenure denials at each of their respective schools between fall 2001 and fall 2004. Of the 44 schools that grant tenure, 62.8% (n = 27) reported that they have had no tenure denials between fall 2001 and fall 2004; 18.6% (n = 8) indicated that there was one (1) tenure denial during the previous 3 years; 4.7% (n = 2) indicated denying tenure to two faculty members during the same period; 7.0% (n = 3) say that they had denied tenure to three faculty members between fall 2001 and fall 2004; 2.3% (n = 1) responded that they denied tenure to four faculty members; and 4.7% (n = 2) indicated they denied tenure to five individuals. See Table 44 below.

Table 44  
Number of Faculty Denied Tenure between Fall of 2001 to Spring 2004

Faculty Denied Tenure Between Fall 2001 and Spring 2004	Frequency	Percentage
0	27	62.8%
1	8	18.6%
2	2	4.7%
3	3	7.0%
4	1	2.3%
5	2	4.7%
Total	N = 43	100%

Mean = .81; Standard Deviation = 1.38

Respondents from schools that grant tenure were asked if their institutions conduct post-tenure reviews. Of the 44 schools granting tenure 64% (n = 28) indicated that they do conduct post-tenure reviews. The remaining 36% (n = 16) reported that they do not. See Table 45 below.

Table 45  
Tenure Granting Schools Conducting Post-Tenure Reviews

<b>Conduct Post-Tenure Reviews</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	28	64%
No	16	36%
Total	N = 44	100%

The schools that do conduct post-tenure reviews were asked to indicate how often they are conducted. Of the 28 schools that conduct post-tenure reviews, 3.6% (n = 1) reported that the number of years between post-tenure reviews is one year; 7.1% (n = 2) conducted post-tenure reviews every two years; 10.7% (n = 3) conducted post-tenure reviews every three years; 7.1% (n = 2) practiced post-tenure reviews every four years; 42.9% (n = 12) indicated they have post-tenure reviews every five years; 21.4%

(n = 6) reported having post-tenure reviews every six years; and 7.1% (n = 2) indicated they have post-tenure reviews every seven years. The mean number of years between post-tenure reviews was 4.7 years with a standard deviation of 1.49. See Table 46 below.

Table 46  
Number of Years between Post-Tenure Reviews

<b>Number of Years Between Post-Tenure Reviews</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Year	1	3.6%
2 Years	2	7.1%
3 Years	3	10.7%
4 Years	2	7.1%
5 Years	12	42.9%
6 Years	6	21.4%
7 Years	2	7.1%
Total	N = 28	100%

Mean = 4.7 Years; Standard Deviation = 1.49

*Findings in faculty handbooks provided by institutions.*

Many of the institutions participating in this tenure study supplied copies of the parts of their faculty handbooks dealing with tenure and/or contracts – depending on the practices at their respective schools. Thirty-eight of the 44 schools that utilize tenure supplied parts of their faculty handbooks dealing with tenure (See Appendix E). While the information retrieved from the provided portions of handbooks were very helpful, there were gaps in the desired information. For instance the section dealing with tenure might or might not address the requirement of a faculty member possessing a terminal degree. Another example is “reasons for termination” of a tenured faculty member.

Therefore data are missing from a complete picture of the tenure policies of the sample school. A summary of findings from respective faculty handbooks is below in Table 47.

Table 47  
Tenure Policy Items Addressed in CCCU Member Institutions' Faculty Handbooks<sup>1</sup>

School Label	Eligibility:	Terminal Degree Required	Usual Length of Probation	Maximum Prior Svc. Accepted	Criteria: Teaching	Criteria: Scholarship	Criteria: Service	Criteria: Integration Faith/Learn
E1	FT Faculty	No	6 Years	3 years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*
E2	FT Faculty	Yes	5 Years	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E3	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	6 Years	3 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	?
E4	Assoc. – Prof.	No	7 Years	3 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	?
E5	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	5 Years	2 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	?
E6	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	6 Years	?	Yes	Yes	No	No
E7	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	6 Years		Yes	Yes	Yes	No
E8	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	7 Years	2 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E9	Assoc. – Prof.	Yes	6 Years	None	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*
E10	Asst. – Prof. & Librarians	Yes	6 Years	2 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E11	Asst. – Prof.	?	7 Years	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E12	Assoc. – Prof.	Yes	6 Years	None	Yes	No	Yes	No
E13	Asst. – Prof.	No	?	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E14	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	4 Years	2 Years	Yes	Yes	No	No
E15	Assoc. – Prof.	Yes	7 Years	3 Years	Yes*	No	Yes	Yes*
E16	Asst. – Prof.	No	7 Years	2 Years	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes*
E17	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	7 Years	?	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	No
E18	Assoc. – Prof.	No	6 Years	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
E19	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	5 years	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E20	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	7 Years	1 Year	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes
E21	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	7 Years	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
E22	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	6 Years	None	?	?	?	?
E23	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	6 Years	None	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E24**	Asst – Prof.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
E25	Assoc. – Prof.	Yes	6 Years	2 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E26	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	7 Years	4 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E27	Asst. – Prof.	?	7 Years	3 Years	Yes	?	?	?
E28	Asst. – Prof. & Librarians	Yes	7 Years	3 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E29	3/4 service	Yes	5 Years	None	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*
E30	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	6 Years	None	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*
E31	Asst. – Prof.	?	6 Years	Up to 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E32	Assoc. – Prof.	?	6 Years	?	Yes	?	Yes	Yes
E33	Asst. – Prof.	?	6 Years	3 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*
E34	Asst. – Prof.	?	6 Years	3 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*
E35	Assoc. – Prof.	?	7 Years	3 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E36	Asst- Prof.	Yes	5 Years	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E37	Asst. – Prof.	?	7 Years	3 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
E38	Asst. – Prof.	Yes	7 Years	5 Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

1. Summary of information found in faculty handbook portions provided by institutions (See Appendix E)  
 \* Denotes greater significance given to category by the particular school  
 \*\* School "E24" no longer grants tenure, but still retains faculty members with tenure.

Table 47  
 Tenure Policy Items Addressed in CCCU Member Institutions' Faculty Handbooks  
 (Continued)

School Label	Faith or Academics First <sup>2</sup>	Procedure Initiated By:	Final Decision Made By:	Terminal Contract if Denied	May Reapply at Later Date	Academic Freedom Addressed <sup>3</sup>	Post-Ten. Review / Cycle	Termination Clearly Defined
E1	Faith	Administration	Board	?	?	Yes	No	Yes
E2	Faith	Candidate	Board	No	Yes	No	Yes / 5 yrs.	No
E3	Academics	Candidate	Board	?	?	Yes	No	Yes
E4	Academics	Administration	Board	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
E5	Academics	Candidate	Board	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	No
E6	Academics	Administration	Board	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
E7	Academics	Administration	Board	Yes	No	No	Yes / 5 yrs.	Yes
E8	Academics	Administration	President	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	No
E9	Faith	Administration	Board	No	No	Yes	Yes / 5 yrs.	Yes
E10	Academics	Administration	Board	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes / 6 yrs.	Yes
E11	Faith	Administration	Board	Yes	N/A	No	Yes / 7 yrs.	Yes
E12	Academics	Administration	Board	No	No	No	No	No
E13	Academics	Candidate	Board	No	?	No	Yes / 5 yrs.	No
E14	Academics	Administration	Board	No	?	No	No	Yes
E15	Faith	Administration	Board	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes
E16	Faith	Candidate	Board	Yes	N/A	No	No	No
E17	Academics	Candidate	Board	No	?	No	Yes / 5 yrs.	No
E18	Academics	Administration	Board	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
E19	Academics	Administration	Board	No	?	No	Yes / 5 yrs.	No
E20	Faith	Administration	Board	No	?	Yes	No	Yes
E21	Academics	Administration	Board	No	No	No	No	Yes
E22	?	Candidate	President	Yes	N/A	No	No	No
E23	Academics	Candidate	President	No	Yes	No	No	No
E24	Faith	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	?	Yes
E25	Faith	Administration	Board	By 8 <sup>th</sup> Year	By 8 <sup>th</sup> Year	Yes	No	Yes
E26	Faith	Administration	Board	Yes & No	Some Yes	Yes	No	Yes
E27	?	Administration	President	No	?	No	No	Yes
E28	Faith	Administration	President	Yes & No	No	Yes	Yes / ?	?
E29	Faith	Administration	Board	No	No	No	?	?
E30	Faith	Candidate	Board	Yes & No	No	No	No	Yes
E31	?	Administration	Board	No	No	No	No	No
E32	Academics	Administration	Board	No	No	No	No	Yes
E33	Faith	Administration	Board	No	No	No	Yes / 5 yrs.	No
E34	Faith	Administration	Board	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes
E35	Faith	Administration	Board	?	?	No	No	Yes
E36	Academics	Administration	Board	Yes	N/A	No	Yes / 1 yr.	Yes
E37	Faith	Candidate	Board	Yes	N/A	No	No	No
E38	Faith	Administration	Board	No	?	No	No	Yes

2. Inference of priority placed on academics and faith demonstration based on order in tenure criteria listings.  
 3. Academic Freedom addressed in context of tenure policy.

Tenure is often referred to as a covenantal relationship or mutual commitment to and/or agreement between the faculty member and the given institution. Each of the handbook portions was written in various formats and with differing levels of detail pertaining to tenure. Some were written in prose delineated by subject headings. Others were detailed to the point of subheadings or multiple subheadings with multiple lists communicating explanations and expectations.

Of interest is the relative consistency of the categories covered in the respective handbooks as related to tenure policies and practices. Categories listed in written policies included: rationale for tenure, definition of tenure, limits on tenure, academic freedom, eligibility, criteria, process for attaining tenure, denial of tenure, supporting evidence required for tenure, and removal of tenured faculty.

Another point of interest is the order in which the criteria for tenure were listed. Although all schools in the study were Christian in name and/or affiliation, the majority of schools listed their academic criteria before their Christian faith requirements of the faculty member in question. The requirements that addressed the faculty member's demonstration of a personal faith as a Christian were primarily listed towards the end of their criteria lists.

The schools that offer tenure had created different paths to the goal of tenure. Some schools have initial appointments to faculty in tenure-track positions. Other schools' initial appointments to all faculty members are year-by-year contract appointments. Faculty members desiring tenure may apply for tenure upon completion of the respective schools' written eligibility requirements. Schools viewed tenure in

terms of being a privilege and not to be expected. One exception was a school that stated that faculty may “reasonably expect” to receive tenure if criteria are met.

Probationary periods differ in length and intensity. Some schools with tenure-track appointments have intermediate year reviews where potential tenured faculty can demonstrate and discuss their tenureability (the candidate’s likelihood of meeting the criteria for tenure). These intermediate reviews are designed to help faculty members move toward their goals of tenure. They also help the respective schools see if a given faculty member is tenureable.

Upon completion of the probationary period schools handle their final decisions regarding tenure in similar ways. All but one school places the final decision with the board of trustees after the administrative hierarchy makes its recommendations. The schools do have various evaluation processes though. Some schools have a committee handling promotion and tenure. This is the originating committee for tenure recommendations. Other schools place the initial responsibility of tenure recommendations with the department chair. In all cases, if tenure is granted, tenure status begins in the year following the tenure review.

Schools differ in how they handle faculty members who are denied tenure. Some schools only offer these faculty members a one-year terminal contract. Other schools, though, allow the faculty member in question the option to continue with the institution on a year-by-year contractual basis. Some of these schools even allow these faculty members to reapply for tenure at a later date either on their own initiative or by the recommendation of the president.

Schools repeatedly put forth the view of tenure being a covenant relationship between the institution and the faculty member. Tenure is granted to an individual based on a demonstration of past excellence and future promise at the institution. The expectation is continually communicated that the faculty member will be committed to the goals and mission of the institution in question.

*Rationale and theological context for tenure.*

Many of the schools that provided faculty handbooks recognize tenure as a common practice in higher education. One school includes in its policy statement:

The granting of tenure to faculty members by American institutions of higher learning has been justified, customarily, by appealing to the interest of three parties: the individual faculty member, the profession that he or she represents, and the institution that he or she serves.

For the faculty member, tenure provides assurance that he or she meets the standards of the profession and of the employing institution and that he or she will be protected from arbitrary harassment in the performance of his or her duties.

For the profession...tenure signifies official recognition of the unique challenges and responsibilities that attend the advancing and disseminating of learning. The performance of these tasks...cannot be adequately performed when the scholar is required, under threat of economic or political sanctions, to conform to standards extrinsic to the profession.

For the employing institution, tenure provides both an opportunity to assert publicly its commitment to the ideal and norms of higher education and an incentive to excellence on the part of its faculty...

In sum, tenure systems in American higher education have been used to promote academic freedom for faculty members and academic quality for the institutions they serve (Table E8).

Some of the schools intentionally address how tenure fits in the context of Christian Higher Education. One school (Table E8) in particular clearly articulates the seemingly common beliefs of the schools in the study that grant tenure. Below is a portion of this school's handbook which addresses the theological context of tenure.

The handbook reads:

Academic tenure at [college name] is defined as a covenant between two parties with mutual responsibilities. The faculty member pledges to adhere to the commitment of the college; [college name] pledges to maintain quality liberal arts education, within the Christian perspective, as stated in its educational goals.

As a Christian college, [college name] recognizes that all decisions regarding personnel must be made with love and justice. When a professor is successful, it is the happy duty of the members of the college family to offer commendation and recognition. When a professor is in need of advice and aid, it is the responsibility of other members of the college family to offer those in the spirit of compassionate concern; every effort shall be made to help a professor improve and overcome any deficiency. By the same token, the demands of love and justice call for the college to make available to its students the best education

possible and to deal honestly and forthrightly with a professor in assessment of individual performance, for the professor's own sake as well as for others.

Tenure is consistent with Christian ideals of justice and fair play. Tenure has the goal of replacing a climate of competitive struggle with a model of faculty as a community of co-laborers. The idea of a covenant community serving under God is basic to [college name's] self-concept.

Tenure is a shield, which allows scholars to work for the true, right and good without being subject to unreasoned prejudice or to undue pressures from various sectors of society. The scholar deserves freedom in particular to teach, research, and publish. There is need to examine and appraise the validity of accepted values, established theories and traditional practices. This is consistent with such goals as the search for truth and the cultivation of critical advancement of the cause of Christ.

Freedom is always based upon certain presuppositions with a given framework of faith. Christian freedom is always in Christ and in his covenant people. To reject these is to destroy freedom. The Christian finds freedom within a committed community. Thus freedom implies a reciprocal responsibility. Every faculty member and every institution of learning is accountable to some authority. [College name] and its faculty are accountability to Christ and His church, as manifested in the [School Denomination affiliation] and the board of trustees.

*Academic freedom as addressed in faculty handbooks.*

The issue of academic freedom is repeatedly addressed and allowed for by the different schools. One college's handbook (Table E26) states, "Every faculty member,

whether tenured or untenured, shall be entitled to the right of academic freedom in the performance of his or her duties”.

The academic freedom, as provided for through tenure at these representative schools, is not just intended for faculty who possess tenure. It seems to extend to all faculty members on campus. Another handbook illustrates this concept. It reads, “Every teacher is entitled to academic freedom as defined above. It extends to the discussion of the discipline in the classroom, to research, writings, and other public utterances in the field of professional competence”. (Table E4)

One school communicates the idea that academic freedom also extends even to the students on campus (Table E10). All parties involved in the academic exercises on campus must be allowed the freedom to pursue knowledge freely and unencumbered by possible sanctions from the powers that be. One school (Table E3) directly mentions in its handbook that it has “adopted the academic freedom portion of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure...” This school goes on to include the AAUP Statement in its handbook so as to clearly explain the reasoning behind its adoption of tenure and how academic freedom applies to all on the campus – faculty and students alike.

There are limits to academic freedom though. The above mentioned school that expresses the extension of academic freedom to all faculty members also identifies some of the concurrent limitations when it writes,

It [academic freedom] does not extend to the expression in the classroom of opinions on controversial and partisan issues that have no relationship to the discipline or teaching subject. The classroom may not serve the teacher as a

platform for causes unrelated to his or her profession as a teacher of a discipline.  
(Table E3)

Some schools intentionally place further limits on academic freedom in relation to statements of faith. Professors are expected to work in harmony with the mission and purpose of the school. An application of that principle is that professors are expected to teach in line with stated beliefs. While a school's beliefs can be discussed in the classroom, they are not expected to be taught against. One school writes,

A faculty member at [name of college] is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing the academic subject, but should be careful not to introduce controversial matter which has no relation to the subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution will be stated in writing at the time of appointment. (Table E16)

Academic freedom – in some form or fashion is present within the schools participating in the study. The amount and extent of that freedom varies though in relation to the expectation of adherence to stated beliefs of the respective institutions.

*Tenure eligibility as addressed in faculty handbooks.*

All schools providing handbook information set parameters for the granting of tenure. Schools grant tenure for full-time teaching positions (or in the case of one institution, teaching equivalent positions) only. Tenure is also normally limited to one department unless an exception is applied for (Table E14). Administrative positions are not tenureable at all the schools providing handbook information. Schools providing handbook information allow tenure status to those faculty members with the rank of

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Full Professor only. Some schools limit tenure status to only the ranks of Associate and Full Professor (Tables E4, E12, and E18). In some cases, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor was linked to granting tenure. (Table E7)

The terminal degree in the particular discipline of the faculty is the usual standard. The completion of the probationary period is required for attaining tenure at each respective institution. Some schools allow for prior service at another institution and/or service in a tenured position to count towards the probationary time requirement. One school also states that tenure will only be granted in a “position in which continuing funding is expected” (Table E5).

Faculty members applying for tenure are expected to demonstrate support of the mission of the school (Tables E7, and E15). A demonstration of maturing understanding of the integration of faith and learning is listed as an eligibility factor (Tables E14, and E15). Quite often a paper which addresses the candidate’s discipline in relation to the Christian faith and/or the school’s particular set of doctrinal beliefs is required. Some schools list the eligibility factor of exhibiting professional and spiritual competence, growth, and development as well. (Table E16)

*Tenure criteria addressed in faculty handbooks.*

Schools are similar in their criteria for tenure in that they include teaching, scholarship, and service. Commitment to the mission of the school and/or having a demonstrative faith in Christ in some form or fashion also is a predominant requirement. Yet each school varies in how it measures these fundamental criteria for the granting of tenure.

The schools' policies do all overlap in their expectations of excellence in teaching. Teaching ability is the dominant factor used in evaluating a faculty member's work toward the goal of attaining tenure. Service to the institution and community are consistently listed. Service within a local church is often listed.

Scholarship is widely defined by the schools. The definitions vary from being familiar and current with the literature in the field to contributing to the field of study through research, presentations, papers or other creative work. A few schools expect their faculty to be about the business of research and publishing in some manner. Some schools' handbooks fail to directly mention the work of research and publishing at all.

Only a few schools place components specifically relating to faith in Jesus Christ and/or Christian commitment at the top of their criteria. More often than not, schools seem to mirror the traditional Teaching, Scholarship, Service order with Christian commitment being placed at the end of the list of criteria.

#### *Termination of tenure as addressed in faculty handbooks*

The schools in question are very similar in their reasons for terminating tenured faculty. Major reasons listed for termination are: financial exigency, changes in programs, insubordination, neglect or inability to perform duty, incompetence, and moral turpitude. Other areas listed by schools that warrant termination vary from departing from school beliefs and/or standards of conduct (e.g. alcohol policies) to certain circumstances such as divorce and criminal prosecution.

In the case of termination based on financial exigency or change in programs some schools' handbooks state how the school will attempt to reposition the terminated faculty member elsewhere in the college or assist in securing employment at another

institution. When terminated under these conditions, the faculty member in question is given the assurance that the terminated position will not be offered to another faculty member for two – three years unless first offered to the terminated faculty member.

*Summaries of individual faculty handbook tenure policies.*

In Appendix E the reader will find the summaries of individual tenure policies found in the faculty handbooks provided by the CCCU institutions participating in the study. Not all schools participating in the study supplied portions of their respective handbooks that deal with tenure. Schools did not all address the same subject matter in their respective policy manuals.

The information given in Appendix E is designed to communicate the unique characteristics of each institution and to highlight the similarities and/or differences of the institutions. Each school's anonymity has been maintained so as to keep the focus on the policy components being illustrated.

Attention has been given to eligibility requirements, probationary period activities, criteria for granting tenure as described in the given handbook, needed materials for tenure evaluation if listed in handbooks, process of evaluation, denial of tenure, grounds for termination, and any other unique activities of interest at the respective institutions. See Appendix E for details.

*Schools Not Granting Tenure*

*Non-tenure granting institutions.*

As stated above, the Chief Academic Officers at participating CCCU schools were asked if their respective institutions grant tenure. Thirty-two percent of the

respondents, (n = 21), state that their schools do not grant tenure. Sixty-eight percent, (n = 44), of the responding schools indicated they do grant tenure. See Table 48 below.

Table 48  
Number of Schools Granting Tenure and Not Granting Tenure

<b>Grant Tenure</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No	21	32%
Yes	44	68%
Total	N = 65	100%

Of the 21 schools that do not grant tenure 33.3% (n = 7) enrolled between 1 and 999 students; 52.4% (n = 11) had between 1,000 and 1,999 students enrolled; and 14.3% (n = 3) enrolled between 2,000 and 2,999 students. There were no schools which do not grant tenure having student enrollments between 3,000 and 5,999. The mean school size was 1205 students. See Table 49 below.

Table 49  
Schools Not Granting Tenure by Size

<b>School Size</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1 – 999	7	33.3%
1,000 – 1,999	11	52.4%
2,000 – 2,999	3	14.3%
3,000 – 3,999	0	0%
4,000 – 4,999	0	0%
5,000 – 5,999	0	0%
Total	N = 21	100%

\* Mean = 1205

The responding schools were classified by denominational affiliation and tenure granting policy. The use of contracts rather than tenure varied between denominations / traditions. Of the 65 CCCU schools responding to the study, the one school (n = 1) within the Assemblies of God tradition reports it does grant tenure rather than using contracts only. Of the 16 schools within the Baptist tradition, three (n = 3) indicated they

only use contracts; 13 (n = 13) state they grant tenure. Of the two Christian Church / Church of Christ schools in the study, one (n = 1) reported it uses only contracts; one (n = 1) responded it grants tenure. Of the Christian Missionary Alliance tradition, one (n = 1) uses contracts only; two (n = 2) grant tenure. Within the Christian Reformed schools, one (n = 1) indicated it only utilizes contracts, and one (n = 1) reported it grants tenure.

Of the four Church of God institutions in the study, two (n = 2) only use contracts; two (n = 2) grant tenure. Within the Methodist tradition, the two (n = 2) CCCU schools which responded reported they do grant tenure rather than using contracts only. The one (n = 1) school within the Friends / Quakers tradition grants tenure rather than relying solely on contracts. The one (n = 1) school within the Grace Brethren tradition only uses contracts.

Six of the participating schools identified their institutions as Independent (some Evangelical, some Reformed). One (n = 1) of these schools provides only contracts; five (n = 5) of grant tenure. Of the two participating Interdenominational schools, one (n = 1) utilizes a contract system only; one (n = 1) grants tenure. One (n = 1) of the participating Mennonite schools prefers contracts only; two (n = 2) grant tenure. Two (n = 2) of the Nazarene affiliated schools use contracts only; two (n = 2) grant tenure.

Within the non-denominational tradition, three (n = 3) only use contracts; four (n = 4) grant tenure. Five schools within the Presbyterian tradition participated in the survey. Two (n = 2) reported using contracts only, and three (n = 3) of these schools grant tenure. The one (n = 1) school that is a part of the Reformed Church of America has a contract system only. The one (n = 1) school within the United Brethren tradition only uses contracts. And lastly, one (n = 1) of the three schools within the Wesleyan

tradition prefers the use of contracts only; two (n = 2) grant tenure. The results of this breakdown of schools may be seen in Table 50 below.

Table 50  
Schools Classified by Denominational Affiliation and Contract Only or  
Tenure Granting Policy

<b>Denominational Affiliation</b>	<b>Contracts Only (Percentage of Total Schools)</b>	<b>Grant Tenure (Percentage Total Schools)</b>
Assemblies of God	n = 0 (0%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Baptist (Baptist, American, Southern)	n = 3 (4.6%)	n = 13 (20%)
Christian Church / Church of Christ	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Christian Missionary Alliance	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 2 (3.1%)
Christian Reformed	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Church of God	n = 2 (3.1%)	n = 2 (3.1%)
Free Methodist	n = 0 (0%)	n = 2 (3.1%)
Friends / Quakers	n = 0 (0%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Grace Brethren	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 0 (0%)
Independent (Also Evangelical or Reformed)	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 5 (7.6%)
Interdenominational	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Mennonite	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 2 (3.1%)
Nazarene	n = 2 (3.1%)	n = 2 (3.1%)
Non-Denominational	n = 3 (4.6%)	n = 4 (6.1%)
Presbyterian (PCA or PC USA)	n = 2 (3.1%)	n = 3 (4.6%)
Reformed Church of America	n = 0 (0%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
United Brethren	n = 0 (0%)	n = 1 (1.5%)
Wesleyan	n = 1 (1.5%)	n = 2 (3.1%)
N = 65	N = 21	N = 44

## *Reasons for Not Granting Tenure*

### *Reasons for term appointments.*

The 21 schools which do not grant tenure do so for various reasons. These institutions have chosen some form of a contract system for faculty members. Some schools gave more than one reason for using contract systems rather than tenure. When explaining why their institutions use contracts, the respondents from the schools provided a total of 27 reasons. These responses were grouped into 13 separate categories. There were some similarities between certain categories, but delineations were made to represent the differences in the responses given.

Of the 28 reasons for using contracts on the 21 campuses reporting they do not use a tenure system, 28.5% (n = 8) cited tradition and/or institutional values; 10.7% (n = 3) indicated tenure creates problems and is overly complicated; 10.7% (n = 3) explained that tenured faculty members have little incentive to continue to develop or stay current in their professions; 10.7% (n = 3) reported that tenure provides no advantage or is unnecessary; 7.2% (n = 2) indicated that faculty should be judged on current performance; 7.2% (n = 2) cited fiscal reasons; 3.6% (n = 1) of the responses cited better flexibility; 3.6% (n = 1) reported that contracts extend protection simultaneously to faculty members and the institution; 3.6% (n = 1) reported they have seen abuses of tenure on other campuses; 3.6% (n = 1) mentioned that contracts have never been an issue with faculty. Another 3.6% (n = 1) cited a reluctance to embrace a tenure system; 3.6% (n = 1) indicated that tenure is outdated; and 3.6% (n = 1) reported they transitioned to rolling three-year contracts. Three schools which utilize contracts only rather than tenure did not respond to this question. See Table 51 below.

Table 51  
Reasons for Using Contract System Rather than Tenure

<b>Reasons for Using Contract System</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Tradition / Institutional Values	8	28.6%
Tenure Creates Problems / Is Overly Complicated	3	10.7%
Tenured Faculty Have Little Incentive to Stay Current in Their Profession	3	10.7%
Tenure Provides No Advantage / Is Unnecessary	3	10.7%
Faculty Members Should Be Judged on Current Performance	2	7.1%
Fiscal Reasons	2	7.1%
Better Flexibility	1	3.6%
Contracts Extend Protection Simultaneously to Faculty Members and Institutions	1	3.6%
Have Seen Abuses of Tenure Elsewhere	1	3.6%
Contracts Have Never Been Issue with Faculty	1	3.6%
Reluctance to Embrace Tenure System	1	3.6%
Tenure is Outdated	1	3.6%
Transition to Three-Year Rolling Contracts	1	3.6%
Total	N = 28*	100%

\* Some schools gave more than one reason for using contracts.

### *Policies in Place of Tenure*

#### *Term appointment systems.*

Nearly 1/3 of the responding schools do not grant tenure, but provide various forms of term appointments in place of tenure. These term appointment systems differ in duration and in structure. Some schools only offer one year term appointments

regardless of years of service or rank. Other schools provide longer contracts based on years of service or rank.

Of the 21 schools that responded to the survey indicating they utilize term appointments—contracts only, 95.2% (n = 20) reported that the initial contract faculty members receive is a one-year contract; 4.8% (n = 1) indicated the initial contract offered is a two-year contract. See Table 52 below.

Table 52  
Initial Contract Offered by Schools Using Term Appointments Only

<b>Number of Years in Initial Term Appointment</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1 Year	20	95.2%
2 Years	1	4.8%
Total	N = 21	100%

Schools that participated in this study were asked to supply portions of their faculty handbook that deal with term appointments or tenure. Of the 21 schools that offer term appointments only, 17 supplied portions of their faculty handbooks dealing with term appointments. These handbooks reveal variations in the application of term appointments.

The various structures of term appointments are grouped into three different categories. The first is labeled a One-Year Contract Only System. The second is a Gradation Contract System. The third group is labeled an Eventual Continuous Contract System.

Of the 18 schools that provided portions of their faculty handbook regarding term appointments, 22% (n = 4) reported they have a One-Year Contract Only System. These schools offer annual contracts to faculty members regardless of years of service

or faculty rank. The one exception to the annual contracts is one school that offers a three-year contract to department chairs.

The percentage of term appointment only schools supplying handbook information that have a Gradation Contract System is 61%, (n = 11). These schools have an initial contract of one or two years. Subsequent contracts are anywhere from two to five years. One school has a mixture of various contracts that could be given to faculty members. Annual renewable contracts are given in years one through six. Extended contracts are then given anywhere from two to five years. This school also has a probationary contract of three years and a one-year terminal contract. Most schools in this category provide longer contracts for faculty members who have been with the schools the longest.

The last group of schools utilizes an Eventual Continuous Contract System. Of the 18 schools supplying handbooks, 17% (n = 3) can be grouped into this category. These schools have an initial contract of one year. Multiple years are offered thereafter. One school provided detail by stating that Assistant Professors receive three-year contracts and Associate Professors receive five-year contracts. Full Professors are the faculty members who receive the continuous contract status. This school provides for annual reviews of faculty members with continuous contract status, but these reviews are for salary determination purposes only. Another school reports that five-year contracts are the norm before Senior Faculty (continuous contract) status is conferred. Again, Full Professors are the faculty members who receive the continuous contract status. This is a contract that provides for continuous employment unless termination of the contract is mutually agreed upon by both the school and faculty member or if

adequate cause makes termination of the faculty member a necessity. The school with “Senior Faculty Status” indicates that all faculty members must apply for Senior Faculty Status by their sixth year. If they are not granted Senior Faculty Status they are given a one-year terminal contract. Once faculty members reach the age of 65, annual contracts are issued by the institutions. See Table 53.

Table 53  
Term Appointment Systems as Reported in Faculty Handbooks

<b>Contract System</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One-Year Only Contract System	4	22%
Gradation Contract System <sup>1</sup>	11	61%
Eventual Continuous Contract System <sup>2</sup>	3	17%
Total	N = 18 <sup>3</sup>	100%

1. Initial Contract 1 or 2 years; Subsequent contracts 2 – 5 years based on longevity

2. Initial Contract 1 year; Multiple years thereafter; Continuous Contracts given to Full Professors only

3. Three Contract-Only schools did not provide Faculty Handbook information.

### *Comparison to the AAUP's Standards*

*AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure (See Appendix B).*

The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure was prepared by the American Association of University Professors. Its purpose “is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities” (AAUP 1984).

The portion of the 1940 Statement addressing Academic Freedom discusses three areas. The three major tenets (AAUP 1940) provide that:

1. Teachers are to have “full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the performance of their other duties...”;

2. Teachers are to have “freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject” as long as the subject matter is relevant to the class. “Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of appointment”;
3. College and university teachers are representatives of their profession and institution and therefore should exercise restraint and wisdom when speaking in public since their remarks will reflect upon their respective institutions and profession as a whole.

The portion of the 1940 Statement addressing Tenure discusses the following matters:

1. Definition of tenure;
2. Terms and conditions of appointment
3. Length of probationary period;
4. Academic freedom during probationary period;
5. Due process during termination of tenure faculty members;
6. Termination due to financial exigency.

*CCCU schools and academic freedom.*

As shown above in Tables 17 and 18, many of the schools address academic freedom in their written policies and protect academic freedom during their tenure review practices. These policies and practices are predominantly operating within the doctrinal beliefs of the respective schools. Some schools have adopted portions if not all of the 1940 AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. One school (Table E3) writes in its Faculty Handbook, “The University has adopted the academic freedom

portion of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure”. School F (Table E6) also references the 1940 Statement when it writes, “In its policy for tenure, the institution subscribes to the policies and procedures developed by the American Association of University Professors, as interpreted by the Board of Trustees and incorporated into the stipulations of this Handbook...”. One final example is School P (Table E16) which adopts and nearly quotes the entire portion on academic freedom as put forth by the AAUP in 1940.

Again, it must be stated though, that this practice of academic freedom on any given school campus within the CCCU is usually operating within the context of a given school’s theological grid. Part of the American Association of University Professors’ definition of academic freedom in its 1940 Statement is “full freedom in research and in the publication of the results.” This “full freedom” is not necessarily present on campuses within the CCCU. For instance, one school (Table E28) writes about academic freedom, “Tenure is a means of protecting academic freedom which, in the [name of school] context, is understood to have limitations by virtue of one basic belief system undergirding the institution”.

The confines of a school’s doctrinal beliefs are clearly set in place by another school (School E34) when it writes,

A faculty member is free to examine and discuss with students different points of view relative to the subject matter involved, but in the teaching role a faculty member may not advocate a position contrary to the University’s doctrinal statement or standards of conduct which are annually affirmed. Controversial

matters not pertaining [to] the academic discipline of a given faculty member are not appropriate material to introduce in the classroom.

Lastly, one school illustrates the influence of doctrinal parameters when it proclaims its independence from any “outside” dictates from professional agencies. School E32 writes as a disclaimer,

Although many of the policies and procedures specified in this document are similar to those recommended by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and other organizations, [name of school] declares that its policies are independent of those of any other agency and that it cannot be bound by interpretations of its policies suggested or endorsed by such an agency. This principle extends to professional organizations, or subunits of organizations in which the College may hold professional membership, which have endorsed policies and procedures of AAUP or other agencies. The College does not recognize as binding any policies, procedures, or interpretations other than those explicitly stated in its own documents.

Other schools echo this sentiment of academic freedom within the confines of the school’s doctrinal statement. The researcher has identified that the participating CCCU schools value the concept of academic freedom and are friendly towards the 1940 Statement. In contrast to this though, these same schools set parameters around that freedom. Beliefs contrary to those of the school may be discussed, but they can not be professed.

*CCCU schools and tenure.*

The CCCU schools in this study that grant tenure are very similar to the AAUP definition and application of tenure. Tenure as defined by both the AAUP and the CCCU schools means a reasonable expectancy of continued employment until retirement barring any unforeseen financial crises, program redirections/reductions, or adequate causes for termination. Tenure is not to be presumed by the faculty member, but it can be achieved if the given faculty member demonstrates a present / future benefit to the institution's mission and meets the stipulated requirements.

The terms and conditions of appointments are clearly spelled out in most of the faculty handbook portions provided to the researcher. While complete handbooks were not requested / provided for the study, the researcher sees evidence of clear expectations for faculty members during the probationary period and after the granting of tenure.

The length of probationary periods are usually under the seven year limit as espoused by the AAUP 1940 Statement, yet not all of the CCCU schools follow the suggestion that the seven year maximum probationary period include prior service at another institution. Also, schools that do allow for prior service do not cap their probation period years based solely on the number of years of prior experience a faculty member brings to their institution. This goes against the suggestion of the AAUP that the seven year probation period can be fulfilled at other schools prior to a faculty member arriving at a given campus and that those years should automatically count towards the probation period at the current campus.

The CCCU schools provide for academic freedom—as they define it—during the probation period. Therefore they line up with the 1940 statement in this regard.

Due process is afforded faculty who are being considered for the denial of tenure or who have their tenure status terminated due to any given reasons as stated in the school's faculty handbook. The schools' handbooks repeatedly reference the grievance process in place on the respective campus.

The handbook portions provided to the researcher do not specifically address financial exigency being demonstrable, but financial exigency is addressed in the handbooks. The researcher infers from the context of the tenure policies in general that the financial exigency must be demonstrably bona fide.

CHAPTER V  
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS  
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*Introduction*

This chapter presents a summary of the findings of the study, discusses the implications of these findings regarding Christian higher education tenure policies and practices in Christian colleges and universities, draws conclusions derived from the findings, and offers recommendations for future research. The reader should again be mindful that the CAOs were trying to reflect their respective schools' values. Other faculty members and administrators may in fact value/view particular items differently.

*Summary of Findings*

*Number and kind of CCCU member schools granting tenure.*

The total number of sampled colleges and universities offering tenure was 44 (68%). Sixty percent of these CCCU schools were large in relation to other CCCU schools; that is they enroll between 2,000 and 6,000 students. From the standpoint of denominations, schools offering tenure represented a wide variety of denominations. They include Assemblies of God, Baptist, Christian Church / Church of Christ, Christian Missionary Alliance, Christian Reformed; Church of God, Free Methodist, Friends / Quakers, Independent (Evangelical or Reformed), Interdenominational, Mennonite,

Nazarene, Non-Denominational, Presbyterian (PCA & PC USA), Reformed Church of America, United Brethren, and Wesleyan.

*Why CCCU schools grant tenure.*

The reasons given for schools offering tenure were categorized into 15 different groupings. Schools usually gave multiple reasons for granting tenure. The reasons for granting tenure were academic freedom, accreditation requirements, acculturation and socialization, assistance in quality learning, commitment by institution / mutual commitment by institution and faculty, continuity of programs, faculty morale, higher education practice in general, job security, protection of faculty / due process, recognition & affirmation, recruitment of quality faculty, retaining quality faculty, shared governance, and tradition.

Of these 15 different groupings, the predominant reasons given for granting tenure were academic freedom, commitment by institution / mutual commitment by institution and faculty, recognition & affirmation, recruitment of quality faculty, and the retaining of quality faculty.

*Tenure policies and practices of CCCU schools.*

The policies and practices of tenure-granting schools were studied from hiring to firing. When hiring a new faculty member, teaching, Christian faith commitment, possession of a terminal degree, and expertise in the given field were listed as extremely important. Publishing, service, Biblical literacy and experience were identified as only somewhat important. Grant writing ability was viewed as somewhat unimportant.

The majority of faculty handbooks addressed academic freedom, and the majority of schools stated that tenure review practices protect academic freedom.

Nearly 90% of the tenure-granting schools in the sample stated they have a probationary period with an average duration of six to seven years. Schools accepted on average 2.73 years of prior service toward probation requirements. On average, 92% of the faculty going through tenure review from fall 2001 to spring 2004 received tenure. Sixteen schools reported granting tenure to 100% of the faculty going up for tenure during the same time period. Half of the schools granting tenure stated they do so for faculty at the rank of Assistant to Professor. The other half of the tenure-granting schools responded they only grant tenure to faculty members with the professional rank of Associate or Professor.

When considering the granting of tenure, the sample schools cited student evaluations, teaching observations by colleagues, recommendations from within the school's faculty, service on campus, and collegiality as the major factors considered. The factors that listed as only somewhat important are publication and paper presentations, recommendations from scholars on other campuses, grants, service off of campus, and academic advising.

The majority of schools stated they do not limit the percentage of faculty possessing tenure. The majority responded they provide written reasons for not granting tenure, and they provide an appeals process for faculty denied tenure. A majority of tenure-granting schools reported they practice post-tenure reviews on average every 5 years of a faculty member's tenure appointment.

The schools' samples of written tenure policies revealed tenure-granting criteria primarily in one of four categories: teaching, scholarship, service, and Christian faith commitment. The majority of schools listed the criteria relating to the demonstration of a Christian faith commitment towards the end of the criteria list.

Academic freedom for faculty members was addressed in faculty handbooks. It usually fell within the confines of the schools' given doctrinal statements.

Schools reported that faculty members with tenure may be dismissed for the following reasons: financial exigency, changes in programs, insubordination, neglect or inability to perform duties, incompetence, moral turpitude, and departure from a school's beliefs.

#### *Number and kind of CCCU member schools not granting tenure.*

The total number of sampled colleges and universities not offering tenure was 21 (32%). Nearly eighty-six percent of these schools were small in relation to other CCCU schools; that is they enrolled under 2,000 students. From the standpoint of denominations, schools not offering tenure represented a wide variety of denominations. They included Baptist, Christian Church / Church of Christ, Christian Missionary Alliance, Christian Reformed; Church of God, Independent (Evangelical or Reformed), Grace Brethren, Interdenominational, Mennonite, Nazarene, Non-Denominational, Presbyterian (PCA & PC USA), and Wesleyan.

#### *Why CCCU schools do not grant tenure.*

The reasons given for schools not offering tenure were categorized into 13 different groupings. Schools usually gave multiple reasons for not granting tenure. The

reasons for not granting tenure were better flexibility, protection for faculty members and institutions alike, judging faculty members on current performance, fiscal reasons, abuses in tenure elsewhere, contracts never being an issue, reluctance to embrace tenure system, tenure creates problems / is overly complicated, tenured faculty have little incentive to stay current in profession, tenure outdated, tenure provides no advantages / is unnecessary, tradition / institutional values, and use of rolling contracts.

Of these 13 different groupings, the predominant reason given for not granting tenure was tradition / institutional values.

*Faculty retention policies in place of tenure at CCCU schools.*

Schools that do not grant tenure reported having term appointments (contracts) for their faculty members. The initial contract offered to faculty members is a one-year contract at all but one of the 21 schools that have term appointments only.

The schools with term appointments only were grouped into one of three categories. The first is an Annual Contract System where schools offer annual contracts to faculty members regardless of years of service or faculty rank. The second is a Gradation Contract System where subsequent contracts are anywhere from two to five years usually based on the longevity of service to the institution. The third grouping is an Eventual Continuous Contract System. This is a contract that provides for continuous employment unless termination of the contract is mutually agreed upon by both the school and faculty member or if adequate cause makes termination of the faculty member a necessity. The continuous contract is usually reserved for the rank of professor. The majority of schools reported using the Gradation Contract System.

*CCCU schools' policies in comparison to the AAUP's 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.*

Academic freedom policies and practices on CCCU campuses were largely consistent with the AAUP's 1940 Statement. Academic freedom parameters were usually within the context of a given school's theological grid. Tenure policies and practices were clearly defined, and due process are provided.

*Discussion of the Findings*

The following discussion is outlined along the lines of the seven research questions of the study: 1) How many and what schools offer tenure, 2) Why schools offer tenure, 3) Policies and practices of schools offering tenure, 4) How many and what schools do not offer tenure, 5) Why schools do not offer tenure, 6) Other faculty retention systems, and 7) Tenure policies in comparison to the AAUP 1940 Statement.

*Number and kind of CCCU schools offering tenure.*

The attraction of membership in the CCCU is built upon the desire to further the interests of Christian higher education as a whole and simultaneously the interests of the respective schools. As evidenced by the numerous denominations that belong to the CCCU, the Council has seemingly built a reputation of success and purpose that has attracted schools from various denominations. The schools that comprise the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities hail from a diverse Christian spectrum. Eighteen various denominational groupings (as determined by the researcher) and some further diversification within these grouping illustrate this point.

This diversification of Christian perspective provides a backdrop for the findings of the study. Any trends within the group suggest that the tenure practices might be more widely accepted and not just a practice of a small sub-group within the whole. Tenure, as has been shown is not just a practice of a few denominations. Its use is wide-spread.

The majority of member CCCU schools participating in the study (68%) offer tenure. Seventeen of the 18 represented denominational groupings have at least one school that offers tenure on their campuses. Therefore, tenure was not necessarily seen as a possible threat to schools' missions via wayward faculty members who potentially stray from the schools' beliefs. Tenure was also not a commodity owned by a few denominations. All sampled denominations, save one, have at least one representative school utilizing tenure. Schools are able to incorporate this long-term commitment to a faculty member within their efforts to maintain their doctrinal beliefs and purpose. These schools may accept tenure as a common practice within higher education as a whole. Therefore, it perhaps makes sense to some schools to offer tenure on their campuses as well.

Of the CCCU schools within the study that implement tenure, the majority (69%) enroll over 2000 students. This may be explained by the financial support base upon which larger schools operate compared to smaller schools. With other schools offering the incentive of tenure, schools must factor in the level of financial remuneration they can provide faculty members. Smaller schools might not have the financial resources to make long-term commitments to tenured faculty members. In comparison larger schools

can commit to faculty members with tenure and possibly still have room for flexibility in their programs.

*Reasons CCCU schools grant tenure.*

The schools granting tenure provided numerous reasons for granting tenure – 15 groupings in all. The major reason given for granting tenure is the protection of academic freedom. This is consistent with the arguments for tenure in the literature review. Tenure is seen as a means to an end, not an end in itself. The fact that academic freedom was listed as the number one reason probably reflects the desire of faculty members on Christian campuses to have the freedom to pursue their discipline without arbitrary reprisal due to controversy. Schools most likely also want to maintain a reputation of open-minded academic inquiry and not across-the-board indoctrination.

Academic freedom on Christian campuses does not provide a *carte blanche* approach though to teaching and writing by faculty members at CCCU institutions. The schools' written tenure policies illustrate that tenure and academic freedom principles usually operate within the confines of the doctrinal beliefs of the schools. For instance, faculty members with tenure at CCCU schools are most likely not able to teach against the deity of Jesus Christ since this is a cardinal tenet of the Christian faith. This would probably be grounds for dismissal, albeit by due process, for faculty members.

The next most common reason for granting tenure is mutual commitment. The idea of covenantal relationships dovetails well with Christianity. Christians are described by the Apostle Paul in the Bible as a body of believers (1 Corinthians 12; Ephesians 4). Therefore, the covenantal relationships of schools to faculty members and faculty members to schools fit this mutual commitment mindset of Christianity well. The

question remains to be seen as to how well this mutual commitment is practiced once tenure is granted. Do faculty members with tenure remain free to discuss controversial ideas without reprisal? Do faculty members stay with institutions once they are granted tenure, or do they view their appointments as resume builders for a “bigger and better” school? Mutual commitment is nice so long as both parties remain mutually committed.

Recruiting and retaining quality faculty members are the next most frequently cited reasons for granting tenure. These reasons seem to imply that the Christian higher education market is competitive. Perhaps these smaller Christian schools also feel the competition with state or other secular private schools that most likely have deeper pockets and larger endowments with which to attract prospective faculty. Therefore, the benefit of tenure status attracts faculty members who are willing to settle for possibly lower salaries for the possibility of tenured status. Retaining faculty as a reason accompanies the idea of mutual commitment. Most likely schools foster an environment of mutual commitment in order to lead faculty members to remain committed to the given school once they have been granted tenure.

The atmosphere of mutual commitment and retention is further developed by the next major reason for granting tenure. Schools mentioned they grant tenure to recognize and affirm faculty members. For the schools that grant tenure, tenure recognizes and affirms faculty members for work done as few other means can. Even long-term contracts, at face value, do not provide the potential longevity that tenure does. All individuals want to be affirmed and recognized for work done well. This is no different for faculty members at CCCU institutions.

One factor that was mentioned by only one institution is continuity of programs. While this is a by-product of the retention of faculty, it was not clearly identified as an overarching reason for tenure. This was surprising seeing that the development of quality educational programs at a school is most likely a major contributor to attracting students. The researcher wonders if the schools that offer tenure are operating with the potential larger benefit of program continuity in mind. The focus may be on getting the prized faculty members rather than developing the prized academic program. Schools may begin to build a solid program with a talented faculty pool. But if these same talented faculty members begin to leave, the program does not continue in the same fashion. New faculty member must be brought in and be trained. The program by definition does not continue as such. One might argue, though, that faculty continuity and program continuity are one in the same since the faculty members are the ones that make a program strong or weak, continuous or fragmented. The CAOs may have chosen to mention faculty recruitment and retention while maintaining the larger picture of program continuity in doing so.

*Tenure policies and practices of CCCU schools.*

The tenure policies and practices do not begin after faculty members are granted tenure. They begin during the hiring process. This study began its look at factors considered important when hiring potential faculty members. The comparison was made between how schools that grant tenure and those that do not value selected factors.

*Hiring considerations.*

The first factor respondents were asked to consider as a variable when hiring faculty members was that of teaching ability. All tenure-granting and non-tenure-granting schools participating in this study value this factor as extremely important when hiring faculty. This stands to reason since faculty members are hired to teach students. Schools begin to differ though on the next selected factor.

Schools that grant tenure value research/publishing skills more than those who do not. Eighty-six percent of tenure-granting schools value this as somewhat important or extremely important in comparison to only 57% of non-tenure-granting schools. Since research and publishing/presenting papers, etc. are usually part of the criteria for being granted tenure, schools granting tenure appropriately value this factor during the hiring process. Schools most likely desire some entering track record of writing and publishing success so as to demonstrate the potential for future benefit to the school.

Tenure-granting schools seem to value mentoring skills less than do those schools that do not grant tenure. While high, only 75% of tenure-granting schools rank mentoring skills as important as compared to 90% of non-tenure-granting schools. This most likely reflects tenure-granting schools' realization that to be involved with research and publishing, faculty members must reduce involvement in other areas. Since schools might reduce out-of-class responsibilities before teaching loads, the mentoring of students is most likely one area that is viewed as less important. This area is also cut before service within committees on campus since the logistical machine of the institution can continue to run.

Service abilities are seen almost equally in importance between tenure-granting schools and non-tenure-granting schools. This is most likely due to the environment of

Christian higher education. Christians are supposed to follow the example of Jesus Christ in service to others. Therefore, it is no surprise that there is not much variation between schools. Again, there are committees to be filled and administrative responsibilities that need to be delegated whether an institution grants tenure or not.

Grant writing ability is not viewed highly by either tenure-granting schools or non-tenure-granting schools. Only 11% of schools that grant tenure say this factor is important when hiring faculty members; 5% of non-tenure-granting schools ranked grant writing abilities as important. This seems to identify a need for Christian higher education institutions to address. As assumed above, financial resources may be limited at smaller schools (the predominant make-up of CCCU schools). If this is in fact the case, schools may not have the internal resources to help fund research required of tenure track faculty. Therefore, research possibilities are limited and the end result is that Christian faculty in Christian higher education institutions are not engaged to a great extent in the discussions in academe and in publishing new research. Papers presented or articles published may only rehash past subjects or present personal anecdotes. Schools would do well to reconsider this skill when hiring and or training faculty. The payoffs could be great – not just monetarily but also in reputation of the school.

Biblical literacy was the next factor schools were asked to consider when hiring faculty members. Both tenure-granting schools and non-tenure-granting schools value this competence as important. Ninety-five percent of non-tenure-granting schools as compared to 85% of tenure-granting schools participating in this study said this is important when hiring potential faculty members. This raises the question: Why is this

not near 100% in tenure-granting schools as well? All of these schools are Christian in belief. As discussed below, the integration of faith and learning is of vital significance to these schools. Yet faculty members will not be able to integrate knowledge of the Bible if they do not possess that knowledge. While it cannot be conclusively shown in this study, perhaps schools may be threatened with the possibility of valuing academic credentials above a biblical foundation under-girding those academic credentials. On the other hand, it may reveal a realization by tenure-granting schools that the potential Christian faculty members they are courting come to them with a deep knowledge in their chosen field, but a shallow biblical literacy. Why look for something that is not there to begin with? Perhaps schools believe it will be too difficult to recruit highly qualified professors in given fields of study if they set their standards too high in the area of biblical literacy. If faculty members are short on their biblical literacy, schools will do well to bring them up to speed once on campus so that faith integration can occur in class.

Both tenure-granting schools and non-tenure-granting schools within the CCCU mirror one another in highly valuing the areas of Christian faith commitment, terminal degree requirements, and ministry/field expertise. This shows that both categories of schools want Christian faculty with terminal degrees and adequate experience/expertise. This speaks highly of their desire to maintain their Christian beliefs and provide quality faculty for their students. Necessitating a vital Christian commitment helps maintain their Christian perspective in the disciplines studied. Requiring a terminal degree provides the highest standard possible for faculty. This communicates to accrediting agencies and parents of potential students that the faculty members hired are qualified. Expertise and experience in the field of study allow faculty

members to go beyond theoretical head knowledge acquired from a book to a practical working knowledge to address questions raised by students. Students benefit more readily from instructors who have experienced what is being discussed rather than just regurgitating facts taken from a book.

*Probationary policies and practices.*

Respondents were asked if faculty members must sign the given school's statement of faith. Fifty percent of the schools that grant tenure require their faculty members to sign their respective statements of faith. The other 50% either do not require this of their faculty or signing a statement of faith is not applicable. This finding is surprising. It is assumed that since all schools confess a certain belief they would want to insure that their faculty members subscribe to those beliefs. While faculty members might be able to sign and explain discrepancies with "minor" tenets of the doctrinal statement, agreement with major distinctive beliefs of the school seems necessary. Perhaps schools that don't require the signing of a doctrinal statement ascertain congruence of beliefs during the interview process or annual discussions. Obviously, any instruction in the classroom that runs counter to the school's beliefs would be easily identified. Therefore, schools that don't require faculty members to sign may look more at practice in the classroom rather than principle as seen in a signature.

Seventy-seven percent of the schools that grant tenure address academic freedom in their written tenure policies. Eighty-four percent of schools indicated that their tenure review policies protect academic freedom. These policies and practices are helpful in defining the parameters in which faculty operate. As opposed to subjectively viewing a controversial subject matter raised by instructors, schools give guidance to

faculty when they address given subjects. Faculty members are usually instructed not to teach against the given school's stated beliefs even though the beliefs may be discussed. This provides a balance between allowing for quality scholarship while at the same time maintaining doctrinal parameters objectively.

Eighty-six percent of the schools that grant tenure indicated that they do have probationary periods. The average length of probationary period was between six to seven years with up to 3 years of prior experience accepted towards the probationary requirements. This practice mimics state college and university standards. During this probationary period, colleagues of tenure-track faculty members are assessing their tenurability. A few of the schools provided clear requirements and processes for attaining tenure. The schools that defined the process and provided clear and intentional guidance along the way seem most capable of developing faculty members who can contribute long-term to the institution. The schools that only give superficial guidance and direction might not take full advantage of the probationary period in light of how it contributes to the granting of tenure. The assumption seems to be that if schools have a list of criteria, the new faculty members will meet the requirements. Clear instructions on how to attain tenure and measuring standards are missing with some schools. CCCU schools that grant tenure will do well to review their written tenure policies to see if they clearly spell out what is expected and how the school will contribute in the process. If mentoring and review systems are not put in place in writing, these practices might only be accomplished on a hit or miss basis.

*Tenure review.*

Tenure-granting schools were asked about the number of faculty members who were granted tenure between fall 2001 and spring 2004. The results seem high in light of state and secular private schools averaging approximately a 65% success rate in the granting of tenure (Lumsden, 2005). The CCCU schools' CAOs indicated that on average 92% of the faculty members going up for tenure were granted tenure. Sixteen schools reported that 100% of eligible faculty members were granted tenure. Twelve schools reported that between 90 – 99% were granted tenure during this same time period. In comparison to these statistics is the report on faculty members who were denied tenure during the same time period. Of the schools that grant tenure, 63% indicated that no faculty members were denied tenure; and 19% reported that only 1 faculty member at a given school was denied tenure during the period between fall 2001 and spring 2004.

When considering the high success rates of faculty members pursuing tenure in tenure reviews, several explanations for this success surface. The first option is that the tenure bar at some CCCU schools that grant tenure may be too low. It is too easy to attain tenure. Therefore, almost everyone makes it. The CCCU schools ought to revisit their evaluation standards if they have questions as to the standards they have set. A second option is that untenurable faculty members are weeded out during the probationary period. Therefore, only the faculty members who are likely to receive tenure make it to a tenure review. A third option is that tenure is something to be expected after a given number of years. Tenure is provided, but it is provided for everyone. This option begs the question, "Why grant tenure?" If it is given based on longevity rather than professional abilities, the title does not carry the same weight as

on a campus where faculty members truly earn the distinction. A fourth explanation is that 86% of schools that grant tenure do not limit the number of faculty members who may possess tenure. This explanation contributes to the first and third options above. Tenure is something that someone may expect because it is easy as compared to other schools and/or everyone who is here long enough makes it. One final option is that the Christian scholars on these CCCU campuses are performing so well that there is no reason to deny tenure to tenure candidates.

The explanation for the high success rate probably includes some combination of all the above. On some campuses, the bar may be too low. Schools that find themselves in this situation need to be careful though that they do not raise the standard too high too quickly so as to dismantle their present faculty in order to acquire an unknown faculty not even in place yet. Current faculty members may not be able to meet certain standards.

On other campuses, faculty members who are not tenurable are identified during the probationary process. The researcher assumes these schools are utilizing the probationary period for what it was intended – to prepare and take a close look at potential tenured faculty members. On other campuses, tenure is merely the name of the faculty retention system, yet it does not necessarily equate with tenure on other campuses. It's like two individuals who both say, "I have a car". The difference is one drives a Lexus while the other drives a Kia. They're both nice to have, but there are obvious differences. Lastly, there is the possibility that on some campuses the mentoring and equipping is to the level that true Christian scholars are developed. Candidates like this make the granting of tenure an easy decision for the review board.

An environmental factor that may contribute to the high success rate is that the schools in question are all Christian. Christians are instructed to build up one another. In Ephesians 4, Paul instructs that Christ has given spiritual gifts to the body of Christ (Christians) for the building up of the body for works of service. The application of this truth should be carried out on the college campus as well as in the local church congregation. Perhaps these CCCU schools are about the business of developing the faculty members who come to them. Now to be sure, not every faculty member is going to meet the standards of a given university. These should be asked to leave and find some other school or endeavor that better suits their abilities. The principle remains though that Christians and Christian institutions should be about the business of equipping other believers to serve as best they can. Yet, if faculty members do not meet the standards of the institutions, schools must be willing to let these faculty members go and secure others who will so as to seek the best return possible for the tuition money paid by parents for their children's education. The probationary period should be a two way street metaphorically.

*Tenure-granting variables.*

Respondents were asked to rank different variables used to consider the granting of tenure. All of the Chi square results calculated with these variables are significant in that the variation is seen as not due to chance. They can be attributed most likely to institutional factors at the participating institutions. The variables that are valued the highest might be considered evaluations from "inside" the given institution. Namely these include student evaluation and collegial observation of teaching ability,

recommendations from fellow colleagues, service within the institution, academic advisement, and collegiality.

The factors that judge a candidate's work from "outside" the institution are not valued as highly. These include number and review of publications, outside scholar evaluations, and grant proposals accepted. The only exceptions from "outside" were service in the community and the reception of papers to be delivered.

The number of publications was the first factor respondents were asked to consider. Sixty-four percent of the respondents ranked this factor as somewhat important. Only two percent indicated it is extremely important. Only 32% of schools responded that the reputation of the presses or journals is important. This second finding possibly hurts the reputation of the Christian scholar's abilities. Are faculty members writing for an in-house publication or are they writing for outside peer-reviewed journals? Are they contributing in a manner that people outside the walls of their schools know about the work they are pursuing? Tenure recognition is fine and well, but part of the process should include confirmation of work from respected authorities outside of the given institutions. This may provide more solid objectivity.

One such outlet for the dissemination of information outside of the institution is that of presenting papers. Eighty-four percent of the respondents indicated that this is an important factor when considering the granting of tenure. The standards for presenting papers are perhaps not as high as getting papers published in peer reviewed journals. This assumption is based on the limited number of publications in given fields when compared to the more numerous seminar opportunities at educational conferences. Whether this is the case or not, faculty members are able to meet

research requirements quite often in this manner as dictated by their respective schools. The presentation of papers can be a viable means of disseminating information, but that information ought to be research information. The papers ought to contribute to the body of knowledge already amassed in academe.

Teaching ability is the primary measuring stick by which faculty are judged when considering the granting of tenure. Respondents view student evaluations and observation of teaching as important by 100% and 96%, respectively. This far surpasses the weight given to research and publication. A possible reason for why teaching is weighted so heavily is that faculty members at these CCCU schools might carry greater teaching loads than do their colleagues at larger state institutions or well-endowed private colleges. Therefore, they are accurately being evaluated according to what they are asked to do. If they do not have a great deal of time to do scholarship (research and publishing), they can't be unfairly evaluated along these lines. Another possible explanation for teaching's high marks in Christian higher education is that teaching is more readily seen as ministry to people as opposed to research/publishing or even service on campus for that case. Quite often professors on Christian campuses are there because they want to interact with students. Scholarship and service activities do not as quickly afford them the outlets to students. Therefore, they are not as highly valued.

Outside scholar evaluations of the given candidate's work is not highly weighted. A total of 84% indicated that this variable is unimportant. This is probably due to the fact that confessional schools do not want to lean upon "outsiders" to determine if they have a candidate who deserves tenure. Colleagues inside the walls of the institution are the

primary judges of a candidate's tenurability since they know what they are looking for in a future tenured colleague. This coincides with downplaying the reputation of journals or presses that is determined by the academe as a whole.

Service within the institution and within the surrounding community was ranked as important by 100% and 98% of the respondents, respectively. This again reflects a Christian perspective that believers ought to be about the business of serving. One concern that might be raised is the amount of service that can be expected of tenure candidates. Are they being evaluated on quantity of service or quality of service? A candidate's time could be easily consumed between committee responsibilities on campus and community responsibilities off of campus to the point that teaching and research efforts suffer. Schools ought to carefully advise candidates on how they allocate their time in the arena of service.

Academic advisement was ranked as important by 73% of the respondents in the study. This reflects an attitude of one-on-one mentoring. Faculty members should be expected to direct students in their studies, not just impart information in the classroom. This variable, in the consideration of a tenure decision, calls upon the faculty member's ability to know students and guide them accordingly. Faculty members who struggle in this area should be coached in academic advisement. Schools ought to pursue faculty members who relate well to people, both students and colleagues alike.

Collegiality was the last given factor to be considered. Ninety-three percent of respondents indicated this is an important factor when granting tenure. This is no surprise. CCCU schools, like any other school, should attempt to build a faculty team who works well together. Faculty members who are not team players or who are divisive

can damage a school's reputation or run off quality faculty members. Faculty members might not fit in at one institution, but work well in another institution's environment. Schools must, therefore, consider if new faculty members fit. Schools must also constantly evaluate how well current faculty members are doing in their efforts to establish and maintain an environment of collegiality. New tenure candidates might be a great addition to a school, yet there might be tenured faculty members who are not extending a welcoming hand to new candidates. The reason might be that they are threatened by new candidates, or they are just set in their ways and do not want to allow for change potentially inherent in new candidates.

The major "write-in" variable to be considered was the integration of faith and learning. Six schools listed this variable in the "Other" category. This also coincided with findings in the provided written tenure policies. The integration of faith and learning is what allows faculty members to make connections between the subject matter discussed in class and the Christian faith. This is what makes a Christian school's education Christian. An education is not Christian just because a professor prays at the beginning of class or because students take a Bible class. An education is Christian when professors help develop a Christian worldview in the minds of students by helping them approach the given subject matter through the grid of biblical teachings.

Some schools have policies in place that intentionally develop this skill of integrating faith and the subject matters presented. The schools that do this well give new tenure candidates direction along the way. They require continual feedback through such vehicles as integration papers. They work to build a Christian world-view

in faculty members. If schools do not instill this principle in their faculty members, these same faculty members will be less likely to expect the same of their students.

The biblical literacy finding above contributes to the integration of faith and learning. Faculty members will not be able to impart what they do not possess. Therefore, schools should be about the business of providing integration training. They should also test and provide feedback to ascertain how biblically literate faculty members are.

*Tenure criteria in faculty handbooks.*

Upon reviewing the portions of the faculty handbooks addressing tenure, similar criteria were identified. The major criteria categories listed are teaching, scholarship, service, integration of faith and learning, and Christian commitment. These subjects have been addressed above, but special notice is given here.

Teaching is repeatedly noted as the primary variable considered when making tenure decisions. These CCCU institutions are in existence to provide a quality Christian education. They rightly value teaching since this should be the primary enterprise of the professoriate. It is presumed by the researcher that these schools want professors who not only can teach subject matter well, but who can also understand and teach in line with the stated school beliefs. It would be useless for a school to attempt to maintain a denominational perspective on knowledge and not seek to have professors who can teach that perspective well. As Burtchaell noted (1998), schools drifted from their original Christian moorings as more and more faculty and staff differed from the schools' denominational beliefs.

The second major criteria area for the granting of tenure is scholarship. Institutions broadly define scholarship. It is not just limited to research and publication in peered reviewed journals for instance. This latitude is probably to allow faculty members to exercise their abilities without trying to fit every faculty member into the same mold. Some schools do provide more clear direction though in what constitutes a scholarly activity. Outlets for scholarly work include publication in journals or the publication of books, paper presentations at scholarly associations, and even creative artistic endeavors. Some schools have also included leadership in academic and scholarly societies in this category.

Service is listed repeatedly. Service includes both on-campus committee responsibilities and other administrative needs. It also involves participation in local church and community activities. Some schools go so far as to require involvement in the particular denomination with which the schools are associated, but most schools leave the particulars of church affiliation up to the professors in question. This open-ended position is probably due to the acknowledgement that many professors come from different denominational backgrounds. The schools most likely prefer to have professors who have been a part of their denominational tradition all their lives. But the fact remains that the most qualified candidates, academically speaking, may be from other denominations. Therefore, broad application of church involvement is applicable.

Fourthly, many schools require that their tenure candidates articulate in a paper their understanding of integrating their faith with the disciplines they teach. Some schools are vague in how this paper is to be constructed. Others walk candidates through the entire process of developing their integration philosophy. Mentors and

training sessions are provided to give the candidates guidance along the way. These processes are probably put into place to both ensure the candidate aligns with the given school's philosophy, but they are also most likely designed to help the candidate develop a solid philosophy based on study and thought.

The last major criterion is that of a Christian faith commitment. The schools that articulate this criterion have probably learned a lesson from the past. Schools that have drifted from their original Christian moorings have done so to a great part because of the faculty members they have employed (Burtchaell, 1998). Certain schools in the past seem to have valued academic credentials over commitment. Therefore, they eventually drifted because the professors no longer held to the same understanding of the schools' denominational beliefs or even Christianity in some cases. The CCCU schools that hold evidence of Christian commitment as a criterion are doing well to maintain their schools' belief system. The schools that do not intentionally value this may be in trouble of eventually moving away from their current values and beliefs.

#### *Academics and faith.*

One particular observation that may correlate to the previous point stood out in the context of this study. When the criteria for tenure were listed, a trend began to surface for many schools. It was surprising to see the order of the criteria for tenure at some schools. Seventeen, nearly half, of the schools that provided written portions of their tenure policies listed academic requirements before Christian faith criteria. A few more were inconclusive on whether academics were listed before or after Christian faith commitment. Eighteen of the schools placed Christian faith criteria before academic or professional criteria. This point might seem meaningless until the point is raised that

sometimes, lists are given in order of importance (See Table 7). Therefore, ordering may matter. It must also be stated that the researcher might not have taken note of this possible nuance if it were not for the 18 schools that did clearly identify Christian faith commitment criteria at the first of their tenure criteria lists.

In response to this point of discussion, Ron Mahurin (2005) wrote,

While the case can be made that “ordering is important,” much more sophisticated content analysis of the handbooks would need to be done, along with in-depth interviews with members of Faculty Senates or other bodies which review faculty for tenure. Only then could one begin to develop a more meaningful and nuanced understanding of the relative importance of faith commitment in determining faculty members’ fit within the institution.

Dr. Mahurin’s point is well-taken. The researcher acknowledges that no definitive conclusions can be drawn from an introductory study such as this. It is assumed by the researcher that the intent of all CCCU schools is to further the aims of Christian higher education, in this instance, through tenured faculty members possessing strong Christian commitments, otherwise they would not maintain membership with the CCCU. The point of the dynamic tension between faith and academics is only raised by the researcher for discussion.

Perhaps this ordering of tenure criteria is due to the fact that professors will only be hired to begin with if they have a vital Christian testimony as judged by the school. Therefore, the point is of minor concern when discussing tenure. Therefore, schools may be highlighting the professional requirements for gaining tenure only. Another possible explanation for this ordering in the tenure criteria section is that this Christian

testimony priority is addressed elsewhere in the faculty handbook. The researcher was not privy to all portions of the schools' faculty handbooks. Again, it is not necessary to address these concerns as directly when discussing tenure criteria if they have been discussed elsewhere.

If these explanations are not the case, a question might be raised as to whether schools might unintentionally value academics over faith. This is the point being raised for discussion by the researcher. While this possible charge is most likely not the case given the CCCU member schools' commitment to Christian higher education, these schools must pay close attention to how criteria lists and the like may be viewed. Professors most likely pay attention to what gets the most emphasis when it comes to qualifying for tenure. If they are judged most highly on teaching or scholarly activities, it may be assumed they will pursue these with the most effort. The researcher believes the schools would do well to review their tenure criteria ordering if for no other reason than on-going self examination as institutions committed to furthering Christian higher education. Since they are Christian academic institutions, placing the criteria that distinguish them from secular or state institutions in prominent positions might help highlight and promote that distinction. Prioritizing their Christian emphases may also help avoid institutional drift in years to come as described by Burtchaell (1998).

*Model tenure-granting policy.*

Many varieties of tenure policies are within the CCCU membership. That is to be expected since there are a variety of schools and belief and value systems in place. Another reason for this is that schools are at different stages in their history and in their

tenure policy development. As schools take more time to develop their tenure policies, they will be more (or less as needed) specific in the expectations of tenure candidates.

As the written policies were being evaluated, a possible model written tenure policy template began to emerge. First, schools need to clearly identify who is eligible for tenure and when. Most schools did well in this area in written format.

The next topic needing to be addressed is that of probation. Schools need to clearly spell out how long the probationary period is and what expectations the candidate may have of the school during this period. Some schools provide clearly articulated guidance for candidates during the probationary period. Other schools seem to leave this guidance to chance. Perhaps these latter schools do provide input along the way, but a school would seem to benefit greatly from an intentional system designed to provide a well-trained tenure candidate. This intentional mentoring also keeps currently tenured professors' mentoring skills honed as they work with motivated tenure candidates.

The schools that seemed to have an advanced probationary period were those that provide regular feedback along the way with intermediate year reviews and mentor-type feedback. These intermediate reviews (usually in the 2<sup>nd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> years) seem to provide the formal structure needed to help the candidate have a successful tenure review. If a school does not give guidance along the way during probation it is potentially setting itself up for a poor tenure review situation. If schools deny tenure because criteria are not met, the schools can possibly be charged with not assisting the candidate to fulfill expectations. If schools grant tenure in an inconsistent way or for duration of probationary period, they could be charged with having the bar for tenure set

too low. Therefore, schools will be wise to intentionally use the probationary period to mold tenure candidates into the type of professors desired.

The criteria section should reflect the values of the school. Items listed towards the top of the lists should be of the greatest importance per the researcher. It is presumed that a school that maintains Christian distinctions will prioritize Christian faith demonstration as a tenure criterion. While it is not possible to make a general rule of application for all institutions, the author puts forth one school with the following criteria listings as a possible model policy as an illustration of points discussed (author's wording):

- Demonstration of satisfactory development as a maturing Christian teacher and scholar
- Master of the discipline / art of presentation
- Confirmation and respect of colleagues
- Modification of courses based on evaluations by students, peers, and development in the discipline
- Continual contact with literature in the field
- Participation in appropriate professional organizations
- Contribution to scholarship in discipline through publications, lectures, and/or creative activities
- Ability to articulate beliefs in discipline
- Acceptable levels of participating in community service
- Anticipated continuance of educational program

The ordering of this list seems to communicate the following values:

- Developing Christian faith as a teacher first and then a scholar is paramount.
- Teaching is not just information dumping, but knowing what to teach and how to best teach.
- Collegiality is a necessity for this school.
- Adaptability instead of rigidity is necessary as a teacher. Input must be taken from those below, beside and above the professor.
- A teacher must know what is going on in the field.
- The professor must participate in the discussion in the field. (Again, these priorities show teaching first then scholarship second.)
- Integration of faith now must be demonstrated. (This perhaps could be moved up the list following the mastery of discipline component.)

- Service within the community is needed, but not as important as items listed above.
- Lastly, this school communicates the stipulation that the program is a worthwhile long-term venture.

As stated above, nearly half of the schools list academic or professional criteria such as teaching or terminal degree before listing Christian faith testimony criteria. The listings of criteria should clearly distinguish the CCCU schools from state and secular private schools.

The procedure for evaluating candidates and granting of tenure should be clearly articulated as well. Some schools do this well. Procedures are clearly spelled out at each level. Needed documentation and information dissemination requirements are provided. Recommendation and decision processes are spelled out. Appeal procedures are explained. Dates and deadlines are given as well. The schools that do not provide clear explanation in the tenure-granting procedure fail to give the candidate all of the necessary information for preparing for tenure review. Some schools on the other hand might be too detailed in the written policies. This is a rare exception. It would be better to err though on the side of providing too much information than on the side of not enough information.

If post-tenure reviews are utilized, these procedures should be explained next. Items needed are rationale for post-tenure review, the frequency of reviews, evaluation criteria, disciplinary or corrective procedures to be taken, and dismissal requirements.

Lastly, the schools' tenure policies explain termination or dismissal of tenured faculty members. This information is a must in any tenure policy. Tenure candidates must understand what a school constitutes as an adequate cause for dismissal. Most

schools listed the generally accepted reasons such as financial exigency, incompetence, professional misconduct / moral turpitude, changes in programs, etc. A category that is unique to confessional schools though is the departure from stated school beliefs. While most schools probably maintain this category within the range of the deity of Christ and belief in the Bible as God's word, some schools also included such reasons as certain personal situations as divorce and specifics such as plagiarism.

Schools must clearly indicate to candidates the areas that must not be taught against and the beliefs that are expected to be held. About half of the schools do not identify moving away from stated school beliefs as grounds for termination. This may be due to the school listing belief expectations or the practice of requiring faculty members to sign the doctrinal statement elsewhere in the faculty handbook, but this information was not provided to the researcher. Some schools used the phrase "adequate cause". This, perhaps, is the umbrella under which shifts in beliefs by professors is addressed. Regardless of the avenue, all professors must be clearly directed in at least general parameters as to what the school will not allow teaching-wise in relation to school beliefs. One possible solution as proposed by Mahurin (2005) is to ask professors if they can sign in good conscience the school's statement of faith as well as subscribing to the school's educational philosophy. This protects the schools and candidates alike.

#### *Tenure decisions.*

The final tenure decision approval is entrusted to the board of trustees in all but five of the schools. In five of the schools, the president makes the final decision regarding the granting of tenure. The reason for the five exceptions is probably due to school governance and denominational tendencies. Some denominations value a single

leader. Others utilize boards for leadership. Information was not available to the researcher as to what denominations these five schools were.

One concern may be raised regarding schools that allow presidents to make the final decision regarding tenure without trustee approval. This is that the boards of trustees will most likely maintain their values over the spans of different presidents' administrations. This gives continuity to a school's direction. Various presidents, on the other hand, will have varying value systems and temperaments. This could lead to fluctuations in the application of tenure decisions. While different presidents will always have different value systems, it seems beneficial to allow the trustees to determine the make-up of the tenured faculty members since they will most likely be in place as well for a longer period of time than typical presidents.

*Denial of tenure.*

As stated above, a vast majority of the schools do not limit the percentage of faculty members who may possess tenure. A Chi-square analysis showed that this did not fit expected results according to chance. A possible explanation as to why the majority of schools don't limit tenure is that they want to maintain a community of colleagues who are not distinguished by titles such as "tenured faculty". There are certain expectations placed on all faculty members. It doesn't matter if one is tenured or not. If faculty members demonstrate they are valuable members of the team, schools probably want to keep them. Tenure is a commodity they can produce to entice these faculty members to stay.

When it comes to denying tenure and appealing decisions, it was helpful to compare tenure-granting schools with statistics from schools that don't grant tenure. It

was interesting to see that schools that grant tenure answered they are more likely to “always” or “sometimes” give written reasons as to why tenure was denied than were non-tenure-granting schools giving written reasons when not renewing a faculty member’s contract. Tenure-granting schools were also more likely to have an appeals process in place than were schools that do not grant tenure.

The explanation for this tendency to have policies in place that “benefit” faculty members may be due to the consideration of due process in tenure systems. One of the AAUP 1940 Statement main points is that due process must be followed in negative tenure related decisions. Providing written reasons for tenure denials helps facilitate this environment. Faculty members then have explanations for denials and can evaluate whether or not the decisions (from their points of view) was just. If deemed unjust, this information provides guidance for the appeals process. Written reasons also stop appeals that could be avoided if decisions are clearly explained and backed-up in writing.

Another possible reason is a desire for openness and a realization that those that make the denial decisions are accountable for the decision. Adequate reasons must be in place rather than arbitrary rationale such as the clothes someone wears. Written explanations and set appeals processes again help a school avoid the accusations of being unjust.

Some of the schools have an interesting twist on denial of tenure. While most schools that deny tenure will offer the faculty member in question a one-year terminal contract, the denial of tenure does not necessarily lead to an end of employment at some institutions. Some institutions will allow the tenure candidate to apply for tenure

again at a later date. Others will allow for the faculty member to stay employed on a year-by-year contractual basis if approved by the president. This is both encouraging and questionable. It is encouraging in that these CCCU member schools are apparently exhibiting an accepting spirit by not creating an “up or out” environment. Faculty members can hope for and pursue tenure, but tenure is not an all or nothing prize needed to keep their jobs.

The practice is questionable for a couple of reasons. The first is that if the faculty member is not qualified to be granted tenure and stay on for the long-haul, why would a school offer the faculty member a continued position? The granting of tenure is a vote of confidence. The denial on the other hand seems to be the opposite. The second reason this is questionable is that the candidate in question did have on average six years to demonstrate to colleagues that tenure is deserved. If this is not possible in six years, what is the reasoning to expect it can be done in additional years?

This continued employment after denial of tenure might demonstrate for some that CCCU schools are not able to hold their faculty members to high standards or are non-committal in direction of faculty employment. If tenure is granted to communicate the message that a school wants a faculty member to stay for the long-haul, then denial of tenure communicates that there is either a question about the qualifications for tenure or that those qualities are not there at all. A school might be sending mixed messages to faculty members if on one hand it says no to tenure, but then on the other hand asks a faculty member to remain because the faculty member is “useful” to the school in a given subject. A possible rebuttal to immediately dismissing a faculty member not

granted tenure is that a replacement may not easily be available. Schools, therefore, may maintain a faculty member until a more suitable faculty member is recruited.

Schools would possibly be better off to make the break during the probationary period or at the tenure review. This allows them to pursue new candidates, and it allows the faculty member in question to pursue employment elsewhere where long-term possibilities are more likely.

#### *Post-tenure reviews.*

The majority of schools conduct some form of post-tenure reviews. This is encouraging to see. It seems to provide a sense of desire for continued growth. It is also a means of ensuring that faculty members are maintaining alignment with school mission and beliefs. The average occurrence of post-tenure reviews mirrors that in secular and state schools. A five year average seems to be a fair cycle of evaluation should a school choose to use post-tenure reviews. Even if a school does not use post-tenure reviews, they should have regular evaluations for all faculty members. Individuals need to receive feedback from trusted colleagues regarding professional and personal performance. As stated in the literature though, post-tenure reviews should always be done in the context of encouraging faculty members to get better. They should not be a thing to be feared. Faculty members who are not performing adequately should be made aware of possible short-comings along the way by supervisors or colleagues. In this way, adjustments can be made before post-tenure reviews arrive. Continual growth should be the goal of every faculty member.

#### *Rationale and theological context for tenure.*

With the majority of schools responding to the survey granting tenure, the concept of tenure seems to be well embraced by the schools in the CCCU body. As seen in chapter four, one school's policy manual spelled out the benefits of tenure as seen by that particular school. Tenure, according to the given school, benefits the faculty member, the profession and the employing institution.

The schools repeatedly addressed the benefit of academic freedom for the faculty members at their institution. Tenure, for them, helps promote and sustain the idea of academic freedom. The schools have done well to identify the need for academic freedom to apply to everyone on campus – from the tenured faculty member to the tenure candidate to the entering freshman.

One might wonder though how schools that hold to a set of beliefs about God, the Bible and Jesus Christ practically allow for the free exercise of thought without continually bumping into the doctrinal statements on campus. Is it true academic freedom or only a pseudo-freedom? Perhaps the schools have all clearly laid out the doctrinal boundaries or pillars of the faith that cannot be moved and then instructed the faculty to run freely elsewhere. This would be analogous to God placing the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil in the middle of the Garden of Eden. That tree was something for Adam and Eve to avoid because God told them that the day they eat of it they would die. They had freedom throughout the rest of the Garden, but that tree was off limits. Tenured faculty on CCCU member campuses most likely have to avoid certain topics if they are likely to take a stance contrary to the school's position on a given subject. This is true because in the day they partake of the forbidden fruit they will "die professionally" in the school's eyes. This again is consistent with what has been

discussed above that faculty members have academic freedom within the confines of the doctrinal statements of the school.

As discussed in the literature before, CCCU schools seem to be no different from state institutions that set boundaries for their faculty members. For instance, faculty members at state schools and CCCU schools both have the freedom to discuss topics so long as they contribute to the subject matter of the course at hand. Yet there are limits to academic freedom for faculty members on both secular campuses and CCCU campuses. According to Diekema (2000), one of the greatest threats to academic freedom at a state institution is religious intolerance—one belief system claiming superiority over another. Religious dogmatism, claims of ultimate truth, is the greatest threat on a Christian campus. A state school might not care what you believe religiously as long as you don't proselytize students with your beliefs. A Christian school most likely will require a belief in Jesus Christ by its faculty members and will not allow professors to promote teachings that degrade Jesus Christ. State schools value political correctness and objectivity (Diekema, 2000). They, therefore, will limit teachings that set one worldview above another. Christian schools seek to promote Christian beliefs above other worldviews (Patterson, 2001). They most likely will not allow faculty members to equate the teachings of Jesus Christ with those of Mohamed. Therefore, it can be safely stated that CCCU schools and state schools both have academic freedom, but they also have some limits placed on that academic freedom. The only difference is where the limits are placed. According to Diekema (2000), those limits will be determined by the worldview guiding the formulation of the curricula on the given campus.

The tenured faculty member on the campus of a CCCU member school is operating within a set belief system. One school clearly states in its handbook that limitations on academic freedom will be stated in writing at the time of appointment. Schools that don't clearly state parameters are not exercising care for their faculty members. Not knowing where the boundaries are is dangerous for faculty members and schools alike. The potential for lawsuits and the loss of quality tenured faculty members due to miscommunication and lack of specificity on the school's part are always present.

It is interesting to read the language used by many of the schools when discussing tenure. Tenure is seen by many schools as a covenant and a mutual commitment. Tenure is seen by one school as being in line with justice and fair play. Schools that offer tenure seem to be desirous of providing philosophical as well as economical security. They also, as stated above, want to provide latitude of freedom academically. This freedom and security are provided best within the context of a committed community.

This seems to be the theological context of tenure for these CCCU schools. Tenure, and all that comes with it, fits well with Christianity according to this mindset. According to the writings of Paul in 1 Corinthians and Ephesians, the Church is the body of Christ. The members of the body are said to be mutually connected and thereby committed to one another. Christians are also said to have freedom in Christ, yet at the same time Christians are under His leadership and are accountable to one another. Therefore, there is freedom, but there are boundaries for the Christian. For the Christian faculty member at a CCCU member institution there is freedom in tenure, but there are also boundaries and accountability.

Another interesting point brought up by one school is that just because a school is a Christian school that does not mean that love and justice rule out denying tenure to certain faculty members. Schools that grant tenure are said to be happy to do so for the successful candidate. They have the responsibility to the faculty member to encourage and train along the way in areas of deficiencies. They also have the responsibility to the students to provide the best education possible. This may mean not renewing a probationary contract or denying tenure to some faculty members who do not have the Christian faith, skills, or character qualities necessary to represent and teach for the school. The schools, therefore, should be applauded for recognizing the apparent responsibility of granting tenure. Tenure denials are not practiced in a cut-throat fashion. On the other hand, tenure is granted to almost all who apply for it at the given CCCU schools. This practice might be questioned in light of the value of the tenure status given. If the majority of individuals receive tenure, why offer it at all? To combat this way of thinking, faculty members who are not fulfilling the requirements of receiving tenure, even after training and guidance, need to be released so as to provide room for other potential faculty members.

*Number and kind of CCCU schools not offering tenure.*

In contrast to the number of member CCCU schools that participated in this study, which grant tenure, the number of schools that do not grant tenure is half the size. Of the 65 schools which participated in the study, 21 schools do not grant tenure. This high number was surprising. The researcher assumed that tenure would be more prevalent in the CCCU member schools due to the prevalence of tenure in higher education in general.

Thirteen out of the 18 representative denominations participating in the study offered some form of term contracts only to their faculty members. Therefore, it is fair to say that the dislike for tenure is not isolated to a few denominational groupings. The subject of tenure is not a mute one on these campuses. This is probably self-evident since respondents at schools that don't practice tenure took the time to respond to a study on tenure. Tenure has made many inroads into various denominations, but it also has many more opponents to be won over if it is to have a greater following on CCCU campuses.

Again, in contrast to tenure-granting schools, those schools that do not grant tenure are more likely to be smaller in size than their CCCU counterparts that do grant tenure. Nearly 86% of the schools not granting tenure enroll fewer than 2,000 students. The remainder of schools that do not grant tenure fell below 3,000 students in number. Perhaps this again is due to lack of resources in relation to committing long-term to faculty members. Smaller schools may need to be more flexible when it comes to financial matters. Having many tenured professors may make it harder for a school to adjust to unforeseen financial obstacles. The researcher is making the assumption regarding salary rates for tenured professors that these salaries are higher than non-tenured professors.

There are two more possible reasons that many of these smaller schools do not offer tenure. The first is that these schools are seen as stepping stone schools or starter schools to many professors. These faculty members may not be willing to make commitments to the schools in question due to the size. These professors may see greener fields on larger campuses where the pay is higher and the options are greater.

If schools see professors continually moving on anyway they may question the rational of providing tenure to begin with since tenure really does not bind faculty members to continued service to the given institutions.

Another possible reason for tenure not being offered on these smaller schools is that the communities that have been established are such that professors don't sense the necessity to pursue the title of tenured professor elsewhere. They enjoy these smaller communities. They are not looking to move on to larger campuses. Therefore, they are willing to work within the systems in place on the campuses where they work. Schools ascertain these commitments on the parts of the faculty members and choose not to add the incentive of tenure to keep faculty members employed. These faculty members already want to be on these campuses so there is not a pressing need to add the incentive of tenure.

*Reasons CCCU schools do not grant tenure.*

The schools that do not grant tenure provided multiple reasons for their selection of term-appointments only for faculty members. The reasons provided by the Chief Academic Officers of each institution were grouped into 13 distinct categories. This too was similar to the tenure-granting schools. There are multiple explanations for contract only systems, and not just a one.

While there was one reason cited more frequently than the rest, it was not very conclusive in its parameters. Eight schools (28%) out of the 21 non-tenure-granting schools identified Tradition or Institutional Values as a reason for not granting tenure. There was no further explanation for this answer, so one can only speculate as to what lies behind this selection. Most likely these schools started with only term-appointments,

and the shift to tenure is not a reasonable one since it would demand too much change. Institutions may often find change hard to embrace. Schools with confessional beliefs may find it doubly hard since they are attempting to stay true to their original beliefs and teachings. Term-appointments may provide schools with a sense of control over the confessional orthodoxy among their faculty members. The comment, “We’ve always done it this way” applies to school beliefs, teaching styles, class scheduling, etc., as well as the granting or not granting of tenure.

The second reason for not granting tenure resonates with the first reason given. Three of the 21 schools (10.7%) indicated that tenure provides no advantage or is unnecessary. Again the current system of using only term-appointments suits the institutions well enough to negate adopting a tenure policy. The no advantage / unnecessary idea may apply to faculty members or institutions or both groups. For faculty members, it may be argued that schools are providing continual employment and opportunity through contractual agreements. As long as faculty members perform their given tasks well and operate within the parameters set by the schools, they should safely assume they will be asked to continue.

On the institutions’ side, the no advantage and unnecessary clause could relate to competition with other institutions for qualified faculty members, or it could apply to the inner workings of the institutions. These schools most likely believe they are attracting qualified faculty members and are retaining them sufficiently. The pros of tenure do not outweigh the cons of tenure or the current term-appointment only systems in place.

Tenure, when seen in this light, might be viewed by these institutions as an above and beyond program when compared to term-appointment only systems. The wording “unnecessary” possibly communicates that tenure involves more work than the viable options already in place. A question might be asked as to whether term-appointments are simpler systems and less involved than tenure systems. This is not to communicate that term-appointment systems are inadequate. On the contrary, term-appointments by definition to these schools are adequate because tenure is deemed unnecessary.

The opposite view of tenure can also be taken in light of the no advantage / unnecessary sentiment regarding tenure. It could be argued that tenure systems do not fully measure up to term-appointment systems and are therefore unnecessary. The schools using contracts only already have systems in place that recruits and retains faculty members with contract only systems. Schools that embrace this mindset probably view the schools’ amenities such as pay, faculty responsibility, location, atmosphere, purpose, etc. as enough to warrant faculty members staying the course on their particular campuses.

Two other more common reasons were given that are of particular interest to the researcher. The first is that some schools see tenure as creating problems or being overly complicated. The second reason is the belief that tenured faculty members have no incentive to remain current in their fields once tenured.

The notion that tenure creates problems or is overly complicated possibly has some merit for schools if they are use to certain outlooks on how Christian higher education ought to operate. Adding requirements associated with granting tenure may

just be too much for these schools. For instance schools have to make pseudo long-term commitments to faculty members if they place faculty members on tenure tracks. Also schools may not wish to place themselves or the faculty members in an all or nothing evaluation position as created in tenure review evaluations. In these situations, there are target dates that are set somewhere in the future for both the schools and the tenure candidates. Tension and pressure to perform possibly can build as the inevitable days approach. This is possibly what complicates matters for schools.

In comparison to the tenure review evaluations, term-appointment contracts have built into them the continual evaluation processes. As contract terms draw near to an end for faculty members, the schools also evaluate these faculty members. Therefore, it could be argued that evaluation deadlines are in place whether schools use tenure or not.

When schools mention that tenure can create problems or be complicated they may be considering the long-term commitment schools make to faculty members with tenure. The schools may not sense having the flexibility (another reason for not using tenure that was mentioned) to adjust faculty assignments and school direction with tenured faculty members.

More possible complications for schools granting tenure are the perceptions by faculty members that some faculty members are more valuable than others. If schools limit the percentage of faculty members able to receive tenure, or if they do not grant tenure opportunities to every faculty member, then those who are not afforded the opportunity for tenure may sense they are not valued as much by these institutions. Faculty members may wonder if they are second class citizens. While it must be

acknowledged that not all people are created equal (we all have different gifts and abilities), people still want equal treatment. Schools most likely want to have fair systems in place. The schools that mentioned that tenure creates problems and makes things difficult most likely believe that term-appointments are the most fair and equitable system for a school to utilize. Term-appointments don't create as many problems for these schools.

One final reason of note given by schools for not using tenure is that tenured faculty members have little incentive to stay current in their professions. This charge may have merit in some cases. Once faculty members are granted tenure they might be tempted to coast or relax energy expended in job responsibilities. Human nature as it is may produce any sort of faculty member at a given school. Therefore, it is possible that schools might find themselves with tenured faculty members not staying current in their given fields.

This would most likely be the case if there are character and work ethic issues in place within the individuals in question. Schools would most likely be able to identify these tendencies in individuals before granting tenure if they are keeping watchful eyes upon the tenure candidates during the probationary years.

The researcher speculates that if individuals have demonstrated the ability to achieve tenured status, they most likely will continue to perform and grow at similar professional levels. Schools who have concerns about lack of incentive might implement post-tenure review practices to measure continued growth in faculty members. They might create incentive programs which reward original research and/or

writing presentations on current trends in the fields of study. These incentives are relevant to term-appointment faculty members as well.

Schools also must be willing to remove tenured faculty members who are not demonstrating continued growth in their fields of study. There most likely will be colleagues within the same department that are aware of current trends in their fields. If continued shortcomings are clearly evident in faculty members, schools should invoke their right to remove faculty members who are professionally incompetent through lack of growth. Standards established and maintained through post-tenure reviews would assist in objectifying and administering these judgment calls on faculty members' professional growth.

Ultimately schools need to look for and hire faculty members who demonstrate an inner drive to excel in their professions. Schools should also work to strengthen the intrinsic motivation within their faculty members so that faculty members desire to stay current not only for job security but to provide the students sitting before them with the best possible education they can provide.

The researcher then views this last argument against tenure as a weak argument since it can be theoretically addressed and corrected very easily.

#### Retention Policies Used in Place of Tenure

The schools that do not offer tenure utilize systems that can be categorized into one of three variations of term-appointments. The first is an Annual Contract System. The second is a multiple year Gradation Contract System. The third is a Continuous Contract System. All, but one of these schools sampled in the study, begin their employment with a one-year contract.

There were only four schools in the sampled schools that offer an annual contract only. These schools most likely desire great flexibility as well as control in the hiring and retaining of faculty members. This system allows schools to easily remove faculty members who are not performing up to par or who begin to show signs of not fitting the school mission. This system requires schools to make continual evaluations of current faculty members regarding employment. This can be taxing on administrators unless the evaluation rubrics are easily employed.

Questions might be raised concerning the depth of evaluations that can possibly be exercised in these evaluation systems each year. Are faculty members retained as long as they don't rock the boat? Do these systems allow faculty members time to pursue and produce creative or publishable endeavors? Lastly, do these systems put undue pressure on faculty members to please administrators to the point they don't truly experience the benefits of academic freedom? Irrespective of the answers, faculty members who work in these environments might possibly demonstrate a stronger commitment to their institutions than do faculty members at schools with longer appointments or tenure. While the system may work, schools that use this system have their own problems and difficulties with which to deal.

The Gradation Contract System is the most popular among the sampled schools. Sixty-one percent of the participating schools utilize this system in place of tenure. As faculty members continue on with schools they receive longer renewable contracts. Longer contracts are usually five years at the most. Since some of the schools offer these extended contracts on a rolling contract basis, they are in essence very similar to tenure. A rolling contract allows for faculty members to have a sense of security

economically and professionally as long as they are following the institutions' given guidelines. Rolling contracts also allow the institutions the benefit of long-term commitments to faculty members while at the same time providing an out if faculty members do not fit the long-term directions of the schools.

Another possible benefit of long-term or rolling contracts is that faculty members have ample time to address any inadequacies in job performances whereas faculty members who operate under annual contract systems might not have time to address any perceived inadequacies. Faculty members with long-term or rolling contracts also are not as susceptible to arbitrary bias from colleagues or administrators.

The last category of term-appointments is a combination of the above two systems and what the researcher believes, in reality, is another form of tenure. Continuous Contracts Systems begin most likely with one year contracts which adjust to multiple-year contracts up to a point where faculty members have the opportunity to receive continuous employment contracts. These continuous contracts are very similar to tenure status. Faculty members possessing continuous contracts are secure in their employment as long as they abide by the guidelines set out by the schools.

In the researcher's opinion, this system of faculty retention might as well be called a tenure system since it functions very similar to one. One school that uses this system requires all of its faculty members to apply for Senior Faculty Status in the sixth year of employment. If they do not receive this status they are given one-year terminal contracts. This is the same practice of many of the tenure-granting schools. This system is not bad since it does allow for time periods where faculty members can prove to colleagues that Senior Faculty status or continuous contracts is deserved. It provides

long-term commitment provisions for the institutions and the faculty members. It possibly is just mislabeled.

Long-term and rolling contracts might possibly be the best system for a school if they choose term-appointments. As stated above they provide institutions with continuity of programs more easily than annual contract systems, yet they provide schools flexibility in hiring faculty members. They possibly allow schools the freedom to do more forward thinking in regards to faculty activities and administrative endeavors. Faculty members do not have to work on a year-to-year basis. They are able to pursue long-term goals with a sense of professional security. Schools also do not have to focus so much on year-to-year evaluations of faculty members and hiring needs. They can make plans for the future more readily since they know relatively well the faculty members who will be in place over the coming years. There are not the potential worries that faculty members with annual contracts will leave to be a part of schools that offer long-term contracts to deserving faculty members. Therefore, both institutions and faculty members are provided for and protected.

*Comparison to the AAUP's 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom.*

CCCU member schools must walk a fine line when it comes to academic freedom. If they disallow academic freedom, they stifle learning and expression of ideas. If they give free reign to academic freedom, they chance losing their distinctive beliefs as Christian schools to radical ideas on campus. Therefore, schools must find the balance of academic freedom and confessional orthodoxy.

As seen in chapter four, CCCU member schools are friendly towards the AAUP's 1940 Statement. They desire to protect academic freedom. This is commendable and to

be expected. Institutions of higher learning need to provide an atmosphere of inquiry where professors are free to pursue truth and understanding – even in areas that might be controversial. If CCCU schools decided not to provide an atmosphere of academic freedom yet wanted to instruct students within the beliefs of their given denominations, they might possibly start to mirror the churches within their denominations. They might transition from being institutions of learning to institutions of indoctrination—a term not meant to be derogatory.

Therefore, schools within the CCCU sample group attempt to protect their core beliefs by establishing boundaries within which professors must practice their academic freedom. Professors have academic freedom within the confines of their doctrinal statements. Schools that clearly set out these boundaries at the time of employment fit the guidelines established by the 1940 Statement which allows religious schools to identify limitations of academic freedom based on doctrinal beliefs. The researcher thus found the CCCU schools to compare favorably with the AAUP 1940 Statement in relation to academic freedom.

*Comparison to the AAUP's 1940 Statement on Tenure.*

The CCCU schools in this study are largely consistent with the AAUP's guidelines as set forth in their 1940 Statement in regards to tenure. Even though one school maintained its autonomy by professing its independence from outside organizations, it still recognized its usage of many of the AAUP's principles. Other schools might likewise espouse their gratitude of but independence from the AAUP and other similar organizations.

These CCCU schools did not seek to reinvent the wheel with tenure in many ways. The only difference to speak of is their extension of probationary periods at times. This is probably due to a more gracious and collegial atmosphere on Christian campuses than on schools that do not identify themselves with a Christian heritage. The schools are smaller size than most state schools. Therefore, the smaller communities may allow for more flexibility in probationary period guidelines. Since extensions must be applied for, it is assumed they are the exception rather than the rule.

On the other hand, the practice of granting tenure seems to be very liberal on the CCCU sample schools. The researcher was amazed at the number of schools granting tenure to 90% - 100% of tenure candidates. The practice of allowing some candidates to reapply if declined also seems to be different. These may be the only problematic issues for CCCU schools regarding tenure. Tenure is nice to have, but if it is devalued by the process with which it is granted, one might question its usage. Tenure-granting schools will do well to reevaluate their tenure programs if they grant tenure too leniently.

On the whole, the AAUP should not find any practice on these tenure-granting campuses as threatening to tenure or academe in general. They, in fact, should find it encouraging to see tenure as broadly represented within the CCCU member schools. CCCU schools should also not feel threatened by AAUP guidelines for tenure. The AAUP has allowed for religious beliefs at schools. Therefore, schools are able to protect confessional orthodoxy as needed.

### *Conclusions*

Because the principle researcher does not want to extrapolate beyond the data, the following conclusions are tentative.

1. Sixty-eight percent of the colleges and universities within the membership of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities offer tenure. Sixty percent of these schools are large in relation to other CCCU schools; that is they enroll between 2,000 and 6,000 students. From the standpoint of denominations, schools offering tenure represent a wide variety of denominations. They include Assemblies of God, Baptist, Christian Church / Church of Christ, Christian Missionary Alliance, Christian Reformed; Church of God, Free Methodist, Friends / Quakers, Independent (Evangelical or Reformed), Interdenominational, Mennonite, Nazarene, Non-Denominational, Presbyterian (PCA & PC USA), Reformed Church of America, United Brethren, and Wesleyan.

2. The reasons for CCCU schools offering tenure can be categorized into 15 different groupings. Schools usually have multiple reasons for granting tenure. The reasons for granting tenure are academic freedom, accreditation requirements, acculturation and socialization, assistance in quality learning, commitment by institution / mutual commitment by institution and faculty, continuity of programs, faculty morale, higher education practice in general, job security, protection of faculty / due process, recognition & affirmation, recruitment of quality faculty, retaining quality faculty, shared governance, and tradition.

Of these 15 different groupings, the predominant reasons given for granting tenure are academic freedom, commitment by institution / mutual commitment by institution and faculty, recognition & affirmation, recruitment of quality faculty, and the retaining of quality faculty.

3. The tenure policies and practices of tenure-granting schools within the CCCU stretch from the hiring to firing of faculty members. When hiring new faculty members, teaching, Christian faith commitment, possession of a terminal degrees, and expertise in given fields are extremely important. Publishing, service, Biblical literacy and experience are only somewhat important. Grant writing ability is viewed as somewhat unimportant.

The majority of faculty handbooks address academic freedom, and the majority of CCCU schools' tenure review practices protect academic freedom.

Nearly 90% of the tenure-granting schools within the CCCU have a probationary period with an average duration of six to seven years. Schools accept on average 2.73 years of prior service toward probation requirements. On average, 92% of the faculty members going through tenure reviews receive tenure. Sixteen schools, on average, grant tenure to 100% of the faculty members going up for tenure. Half of the schools granting tenure do so for faculty at the rank of Assistant to Professor. The other half of the tenure-granting schools only grants tenure to faculty members with the professional rank of Associate or Professor.

When considering the granting of tenure, student evaluations, teaching observations by colleagues, recommendations from within the school's faculty, service on campus, and collegiality are the major factors considered at CCCU schools. The factors that are only somewhat important are publication and paper presentations, recommendations from scholars on other campuses, grants, service off of campus, and academic advising.

The majority of schools do not limit the percentage of faculty possessing tenure. The majority of CCCU schools provide written reasons for not granting tenure, and they provide an appeals process for faculty denied tenure. A majority of tenure-granting schools practice post-tenure reviews on average every 5 years of a faculty member's tenure appointment.

The schools' samples of written tenure policies reveal tenure-granting criteria primarily in one of four categories: teaching, scholarship, service, and Christian faith commitment. Nearly half of the schools list the criteria relating to the demonstration of a Christian faith commitment towards the end of the criteria list.

Academic freedom for faculty members is addressed in faculty handbooks. It usually falls within the confines of the school's given doctrinal statement.

Faculty with tenure may be dismissed for the following reasons: financial exigency, changes in programs, insubordination, neglect or inability to perform duties, incompetence, moral turpitude, and departure from a school's beliefs..

4. Thirty-two percent of the CCCU colleges and universities do not offer tenure. Nearly eighty-six percent of these schools are small in relation to other CCCU schools; that is they enroll under 2,000 students. From the standpoint of denominations, schools not offering tenure represent a wide variety of denominations. They include Baptist, Christian Church / Church of Christ, Christian Missionary Alliance, Christian Reformed; Church of God, Independent (Evangelical or Reformed), Grace Brethren, Interdenominational, Mennonite, Nazarene, Non-Denominational, Presbyterian (PCA & PC USA), and Wesleyan.

5. The reasons given for schools not offering tenure can be categorized into 13 different groupings. Schools usually have multiple reasons for not granting tenure. The reasons for not granting tenure are better flexibility, protection for faculty members and institutions alike, judging faculty members on current performance, fiscal reasons, abuses in tenure elsewhere, contracts never being an issue, reluctance to embrace tenure system, tenure creates problems / is overly complicated, tenured faculty have little incentive to stay current in profession, tenure outdated, tenure provides no advantages / is unnecessary, tradition / institutional values, and use of rolling contracts.

Of these 13 different groupings, the predominant reason given for not granting tenure is tradition / institutional values.

6. Schools that do not grant tenure have term appointments (contracts) for their faculty members. The initial contract offered to faculty members is a one-year contract at all but one of the 21 schools that have term appointments only.

After the initial contract is over schools with term appointments have systems that can be grouped into one of three categories. The first is an Annual Contract System where schools offer annual contracts to faculty members regardless of years of service or faculty rank. The second is a Gradation Contract System where subsequent contracts are anywhere from two to five years usually based on the longevity of service to the institution. The third grouping is an Eventual Continuous Contract System. This is a contract that provides for continuous employment unless termination of the contract is mutually agreed upon by both the school and faculty member or if adequate cause makes termination of the faculty member a necessity. The continuous contract is usually

reserved for the rank of professor. The majority of schools use the Gradation Contract System.

7. Academic freedom policies and practices on CCCU campuses are largely consistent with the AAUP's 1940 Statement. Academic freedom parameters are usually within the context of a given school's theological grid. Tenure policies and practices are clearly defined, and due process is provided.

### *Recommendations*

The discussion regarding tenure policies and practices within Christian higher education will continue to advance in the future. For the discussion to be well-informed, further research is needed in this area. Listed below, in random order, are the recommendations of the principle investigator of this research:

1. This study centered on tenure-granting schools within the membership of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. Further research regarding tenure should be conducted among other groups of Christian institutions of higher education such as Bible colleges or seminaries. The results of these studies could then be compared with the results of this study. Those results may then also be compared to secular higher education institutions' policies and practices.

2. Research should be conducted by the CCCU on the attrition rates of faculty members with tenure at tenure granting schools and the attrition rates of faculty members at schools that do not grant tenure. The purpose of this study, among possible others, could be to see if tenure assists in program continuity and faculty member longevity.

3. A study should be conducted on the scholarship/publication practices of CCCU faculty members. Are CCCU faculty members publishing in refereed journals and contributing to their fields of study? Are they engaged with other scholars inside and outside of Christian higher education in the current discussions of academe, or are they just staying current of other faculty members' works? While quantity of publications cannot take the place of quality work, this proposed research is based on the assumption that professors ought to be about the business of contributing back to their fields of study. It is also based on the observation that teaching and on-campus requirements seem to be the predominant variables in granting tenure in this current study.

4. A study should be conducted on how faculty members at CCCU schools are currently integrating faith and learning. How are they trained to do so? What processes do schools put in place to ensure the development of such thinking? How do professors combine faith with various disciplines? What evaluation processes do schools implement to ensure this practice in classrooms? How well are students able to make connections between faith and learning? These questions will shine light on how well CCCU faculty members are implementing this goal on campuses.

5. Since CCCU tenure-granting schools have such a high success rate of faculty members being granted tenure in tenure reviews, a study should be conducted on the probationary period terminations of CCCU faculty. This study would seek to learn how frequently and why schools are not renewing the contracts of tenure candidates during the tenure probationary period.

6. A similar study to the preceding suggestion is a study on the termination of tenured faculty members at CCCU schools. How many tenured professors have been terminated in the schools' histories? Under what circumstances were they terminated? This study, while sensitive in nature, would be helpful in determining how stringently schools enforce termination criteria. It would also help future faculty members in achieving tenure and thereby facilitate faculty retention at all CCCU schools.

7. Another possible study could be built along the same lines of the preceding two. This study would seek to learn what Christian schools do in probationary periods to ensure success in the granting of tenure. The aim of the study might be to create a tenure review process that ensures success in the review.

8. A study should be conducted on the biblical literacy of CCCU faculty members. This study would identify how well faculty members are prepared biblically to integrate faith and learning. Professors are expected to be well-educated in their given disciplines. This preparation provides the resources from which professors teach students the subject matters in classes. The biblical literacy is the first variable in the equation of integrating faith and learning. If faculty members have deficiencies in biblical literacy areas, schools will be able to address these inadequacies through workshops and training requirements. Professors cannot impart what they do not possess. They must be biblically literate to integrate faith and learning.

9. A study should be conducted on whether or not potential faculty members are looking for tenured positions when inquiring about or interviewing for positions. This study would identify expectations of potential faculty members. This study would compliment the study on faculty member attrition above.

10. A study should be conducted on the make-up of tenured faculty members on CCCU campuses. Items to research would include gender, ethnicity, geographic background, educational background, denominational affiliation. This study would identify potential imbalances in diversity on CCCU campuses.

11. A study could be conducted to determine if there is indeed a correlation between the size of all Christian schools and the use or non-use of tenure.

12. A study should be conducted to determine if CCCU schools have leniency problems when it comes to granting tenure. Industry and sector guidelines based on types and sizes of schools should be identified and then applied to CCCU schools' tenure granting policies to evaluate the relative strength or weakness of the schools' respective tenure programs.

This concludes the study on tenure policies and practices of CCCU member institutions. Tenure is granted by various schools within the CCCU membership for various reasons. While tenure is not practiced on every CCCU campus, it is practiced on the majority of campuses. Therefore, it may be assumed that the granting of tenure will have continued longevity within the CCCU body of institutions.

APPENDIX A

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

OF

THE COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN COLLEGES & UNIVERISTIES

Member Institutions of  
The Council for Christian Colleges & Universities  
(April, 2004)

1.	Abilene Christian University	Abilene, TX
2.	Anderson University	Anderson, IN
3.	Asbury College	Wilmore, KY
4.	Azusa Pacific University	Azusa, CA
5.	Belhaven College	Jackson, MS
6.	Bethel College (IN)	Mishawaka, IN
7.	Bethel College (MN)	Saint Paul, MN
8.	Biola University	La Mirada, CA
9.	Bluffton College	Bluffton, OH
10.	Bryan College	Dayton, TN
11.	California Baptist University	Riverside, Ca
12.	Calvin College	Grand Rapids, MI
13.	Campbellsville University	Campbellsville, KY
14.	Carson-Newman College	Jefferson City, TN
15.	Cedarville University	Cedarville, OH
16.	College of the Ozarks	Point Lookout, MO
17.	Colorado Christian University	Lakewood, CO
18.	Cornerstone University	Grand Rapids, MI
19.	Covenant College	Lookout Mountain, GA
20.	Crichton College	Memphis, TN
21.	Crown College	St. Bonifacius, MN
22.	Dallas Baptist University	Dallas, TX
23.	Dordt College	Sioux Center, IA
24.	East Texas Baptist University	Marshall, TX
25.	Eastern Mennonite University	Harrisonburg, VA
26.	Eastern Nazarene College	Quincy, MA
27.	Eastern University	St. Davids, PA
28.	Erskine College	Due West, SC
29.	Evangel University	Springfield, MO
30.	Fresno Pacific University	Fresno, CA
31.	Geneva College	Beaver Falls, PA
32.	George Fox University	Newberg, OR
33.	Gordon College	Wenham, MA
34.	Goshen College	Goshen, IN
35.	Grace College & Seminary	Winona Lake, IN
36.	Greenville College	Greenville, IL
37.	Hardin-Simmons University	Abilene, TX
38.	Hope International University	Fullerton, CA
39.	Houghton College	Houghton, NY
40.	Houston Baptist University	Houston, TX
41.	Howard Payne University	Brownwood, TX
42.	Huntington College	Huntington, IN

43.	Indiana Wesleyan University	Marion, IN
44.	John Brown University	Siloam Springs, AR
45.	Judson College (AL)	Marion, AL
46.	Judson College (IL)	Elgin, IL
47.	Kentucky Christian College	Grayson, KY
48.	King College	Bristol, TN
49.	King's University College, The	Edmonton, AB
50.	Lee University	Cleveland, TN
51.	LeTourneau University	Longview, TX
52.	Lipscomb University	Nashville, TN
53.	Louisiana College	Pineville, LA
54.	Malone College	Canton, OH
55.	Master's College & University, The	Santa Clarita, CA
56.	Messiah College	Grantham, PA
57.	MidAmerica Nazarene University	Olathe, KS
58.	Milligan College	Milligan College, TN
59.	Mississippi College	Clinton, MS
60.	Montreat College	Montreat, NC
61.	Mount Vernon Nazarene University	Mount Vernon, OH
62.	North Greenville College	Tigerville, SC
63.	North Park University	Chicago, IL
64.	Northwest Christian College	Eugene, OR
65.	Northwest College	Kirkland, WA
66.	Northwest Nazarene University	Nampa, ID
67.	Northwestern College (IA)	Orange City, IA
68.	Northwestern College (MN)	Saint Paul, MN
69.	Nyack College	Nyack, NY
70.	Oklahoma Baptist University	Shawnee, OK
71.	Oklahoma Christian University	Oklahoma City, OK
72.	Oklahoma Wesleyan University	Bartlesville, OK
73.	Olivet Nazarene University	Bourbonnais, IL
74.	Oral Roberts University	Tulsa, OK
75.	Palm Beach Atlantic University	West Palm Beach, FL
76.	Point Loma Nazarene University	San Diego, CA
77.	Redeemer University College	Ancaster, ON
78.	Roberts Wesleyan College	Rochester, NY
79.	Seattle Pacific University	Seattle, WA
80.	Simpson College	Redding, CA
81.	Southeastern College	Lakeland, FL
82.	Southern Nazarene University	Bethany, OK
83.	Southern Wesleyan University	Central, SC
84.	Southwest Baptist University	Bolivar, MO
85.	Spring Arbor University	Spring Arbor, MI
86.	Sterling College	Sterling, KS
87.	Tabor College	Hillsboro, KS
88.	Taylor University	Upland, IN

89.	Trevecca Nazarene University	Nashville, TN
90.	Trinity Christian College	Palos Heights, IL
91.	Trinity International University	Deerfield, IL
92.	Trinity Western University	Langley, BC
93.	Union University	Jackson, TN
94.	University of Sioux Falls	Sioux Falls, SD
95.	Vanguard University	Costa Mesa, CA
96.	Warner Pacific College	Portland, OR
97.	Warner Southern College	Lake Wales, FL
98.	Wayland Baptist University	Plainview, TX
99.	Waynesburg College	Waynesburg, PA
100.	Western Baptist College	Salem, OR
101.	Westmont College	Santa Barbara, CA
102.	Wheaton College	Wheaton, IL
103.	Whitworth College	Spokane, WA
104.	William Tidal College	Farmington Hills, MI
105.	Williams Baptist College	Walnut Ridge, AR

APPENDIX B  
AAUP 1940 STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES  
ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

## 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

### Academic Freedom

- a. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
- b. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.
- c. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

## Academic Tenure

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

1. The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.
2. Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.
3. During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.
4. Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges and should have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon the case. The teacher should be permitted to be accompanied by an advisor of his or her own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from the teacher's own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.

5. Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.

### 1940 Interpretations

At the conference of representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges on November 7–8, 1940, the following interpretations of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* were agreed upon:

1. That its operation should not be retroactive.
2. That all tenure claims of teachers appointed prior to the endorsement should be determined in accordance with the principles set forth in the 1925 *Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.
3. If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph 4 of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges, the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

APPENDIX C  
TENURE POLICIES AND PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE

## TENURE POLICIES AND PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the questions below.

1. Please circle a number from the scale below, which corresponds to how important *each* of these factors is *to your institution* when *hiring a faculty member*.

Extremely Unimportant 1	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Somewhat Important 3	Extremely Important 4
----------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

Teaching skills .....	1	2	3	4	1
Research / Publishing skills .....	1	2	3	4	2
Mentoring skills .....	1	2	3	4	3
Service abilities .....	1	2	3	4	4
Grant writing ability / success .....	1	2	3	4	5
Biblical Literacy .....	1	2	3	4	6
Christian Faith Commitment .....	1	2	3	4	7
Ministry / Field of study experience .....	1	2	3	4	8
Terminal degree held .....	1	2	3	4	9
Expertise in chosen field of study .....	1	2	3	4	10

2. Faculty must sign the school's statement of faith.     Yes     No     N/A    11

3. What percentage of faculty at your institution is considered full-time?     percent.    12

4. A full-time faculty member may be granted tenure at this institution:  
 Yes,     No **[If "no," skip to question 13.]**    13

a. If **YES**, briefly explain *WHY* your institution uses a *TENURE* system for faculty.    14

---



---



---

5. My institution's written tenure *policy* addresses academic freedom?     Yes     No     Don't Know    15

6. The tenure review *practices* at my institution protect academic freedom?     Yes     No     Don't Know    16

7. This institution has a probationary period for tenure.     Yes     No **[If "no," skip to question 8.]**    17

a. Maximum length of probationary period:     years    18

b. Maximum years of prior serve accepted as part of the probationary period:  
 Years     No prior service accepted    19-20

c. During the last 5 years, what percentage of those faculty members going up for tenure before your tenure review board were granted tenure?     percent    21

8 In what ranks may tenure be held? [Check as many as apply.]  
 Professor  Associate  Assistant  Instructor  Other :    22-29

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

If your faculty is unranked, check here: .    30

9. Please circle the number from the scale to show how important *each* of these factors is *to your institution* when you are *granting tenure* and record it in the space to the right of *each* item.

	Extremely Unimportant 1	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Somewhat Important 3	Extremely Important 4	
Number of publications .....	1	2	3	4	31
Reputations of presses or journals publishing the books or articles	1	2	3	4	32
Student evaluations of courses taught .....	1	2	3	4	33
Observation of teaching by colleagues and/or administrators .....	1	2	3	4	34
Recommendations from outside scholars .....	1	2	3	4	35
Research and/or other grants received .....	1	2	3	4	36
Recommendations from other faculty within your institution .....	1	2	3	4	37
Service within your institution's college or university community ...	1	2	3	4	38
Service within the surrounding community or local church.....	1	2	3	4	39
Papers delivered at professional meetings and/or other schools .....	1	2	3	4	40
Published reviews of the scholar's books .....	1	2	3	4	41
Academic advisement .....	1	2	3	4	42
Collegiality .....	1	2	3	4	43
Other (Please identify)_____	1	2	3	4	44

10. Approximately what percentage of current full-time faculty possesses tenure? \_\_\_ percent 45

11. Does your institution limit the percent of tenured faculty? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Don't Know 46

12. Does your institution conduct post-tenure reviews? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No 47  
 If yes, how often? Every \_\_\_\_\_ years, Other: \_\_\_\_\_ 48

13. Is the tenure system currently under review for change on your campus? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Don't Know 49  
 If yes, what change and why? \_\_\_\_\_ 50

14. FOR THOSE INSTITUTIONS WITH ONLY TERM APPOINTMENT (CONTRACT) SYSTEMS  
**[Other institutions skip to question 15.]**

a. Briefly explain *WHY* your institution uses a *CONTRACT* system rather than a tenure system. 51  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

b. What has been the typical length of contracts?  
 First contract: \_\_\_\_\_ years 52  
 Succeeding contracts: \_\_\_\_\_ years 53

c. What percentage of faculty whose contracts expired in 2003 was renewed? \_\_\_ percent 54

d. Is your institution considering a tenure system? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Don't Know 55  
 If yes, why \_\_\_\_\_ 56

**[Continue to 15]**

15. Does your institution give formal written reasons to the faculty member concerned for non-renewal of contracts (probationary or recurring term appointments) or for denial of tenure?

Always\_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes\_\_\_\_\_ Never\_\_\_\_\_

57

16. Does your institution have procedures under which a faculty member whose contract was not renewed or who was denied tenure may appeal? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No

58

a. If yes, number receiving non-renewal of contract since Fall 2001 \_\_\_ times \_\_\_ N/A

59

b. If yes, number appealing non-renewal of contract since Fall 2001 \_\_\_ times \_\_\_ N/A

60

c. Number receiving denial of tenure since Fall 2001 \_\_\_ times \_\_\_ N/A

61

d. Number appealing denial of tenure since Fall 2001 \_\_\_ times \_\_\_ N/A

62

17. Is there a recognized faculty bargaining agent on your campus? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Don't Know

63

18. Please describe your institution:

Year founded \_\_\_\_\_

64

Number of students \_\_\_\_\_

65

Number of full-time faculty \_\_\_\_\_

66

Number of part-time faculty \_\_\_\_\_

67

Denominational affiliation \_\_\_\_\_ (i.e. Baptist, Nazarene, Independent)

68

*Thank you for taking the time to complete our questionnaire.*

## APPENDIX D

### STUDY CONTACT DOCUMENTS

- Initial Mail Contact
- Reminder Card
- Follow-up Mail Contact
- Survey Instructions
- Notification Card for Respondents)

UNT Letterhead

Initial mail contact from Scott Harris

Dear (Name of CAO):

We at the University of North Texas, with the assistance of Dr. Ron Mahurin from the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities, have undertaken a national survey of the member institutions of CCCU. The purpose of our study, which has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of North Texas (940-565-3940), is to ascertain the tenure policies and practices at CCCU member institutions.

We are using the *Tenure Policies and Practices Questionnaire*, which will help quantify *and* qualify CCCU institutions' use (or non-use) of tenure. We are approaching the Chief Academic Officer at each CCCU member institution. We ask that you complete the questionnaire included with this letter and then return it in the envelope marked "Questionnaire". We assure you that **all participants will remain anonymous**. The information we receive will be analyzed in the aggregate and not on an individual institution basis.

Will you also please send us one (1) copy of the portion of your faculty handbook pertaining to your faculty tenure (or contract) system to assist us in our study? You may return it in the separate envelope marked "Faculty Handbook Information" provided in this packet. These data will provide written details of policies, which will contribute to our study. As with the questionnaire, **all institutions will remain anonymous**.

It will be helpful if you will please spend approximately 10 - 15 minutes to respond to the questionnaire even if your institution does not grant tenure. *Participation is voluntary, but your participation in this study is important*. We believe this study will better help Christian colleges and universities understand how tenure relates to the aims of Christian schools in higher education.

Upon the completion of the research, we will gladly provide you a copy of our findings. You may request an executive summary of our findings when you return the notification card included in this packet. At all times throughout this study, you and your institution will remain anonymous. Again, your cooperation with this study is very much appreciated. Should you have any questions, you may email them to sharris@unt.edu. Please take a few minutes at this time to complete the survey and provide the requested faculty handbook information.

Collegial Regards,

D. Barry Lumsden  
Professor of Higher Education  
Director of Institute of Christian Higher Education  
University of North Texas  
940-565-4074

N. Scott Harris  
Research Assistant  
University of North Texas  
972-422-7939

Reminder card sent after first mailing

## **Tenure Policies & Practices Questionnaire Reminder Card**

This is a reminder asking for your participation in our national study on the tenure policies & practices of CCCU member institutions. You should have received a copy of our questionnaire. Please take a few minutes to complete and return the questionnaire and to provide a copy of the portion of your faculty handbook dealing with tenure and/or faculty contracts. We also ask that you return the previously provided *Notification Card*. Thank you for your cooperation in this study. If you have already returned your questionnaire, please disregard this card.

Sincerely,  
Dr. D. Barry Lumsden  
and  
Scott Harris  
Institute of Christian Higher Education  
University of North Texas

Dr. D. Barry Lumsden  
College of Education  
University of North Texas  
P.O. Box 311337  
Denton, TS 76203-1337

Dr. [Name of CAO]  
CCCU Member School  
Address  
City, State, Zip

UNT Letterhead

Follow-up mail contact from Scott Harris including paper survey

Dear (Name of CAO):

We at the University of North Texas, with the assistance of Dr. Ron Mahurin from the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities, have undertaken a national survey of the member institutions of CCCU. The purpose of our study, which has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of North Texas (940-565-3940), is to ascertain the tenure policies and practices at CCCU member institutions.

Recently you received a letter and study packet your participation in our study. This is a follow-up to that request. We are using the *Tenure Policies and Practices Questionnaire*, which will help quantify and qualify CCCU institutions' use (or non-use) of tenure. We are approaching the Chief Academic Officer at each CCCU member institution. We ask that you complete the questionnaire included with this letter and then return it in the envelope marked "Questionnaire". We assure you that **all participants will remain anonymous**. The information we receive will be analyzed in the aggregate and not on an individual institution basis.

Will you also please send us one (1) copy of the portion of your faculty handbook pertaining to your faculty tenure (or contract) system to assist us in our study? You may return it in the separate envelope marked "Faculty Handbook Information" provided in this packet. These data will provide written details of policies, which will contribute to our study. As with the questionnaire, **all institutions will remain anonymous**.

It will be helpful if you will please spend approximately 10 - 15 minutes to respond to the questionnaire even if your institution does not grant tenure. *Participation in this study is voluntary, but your participation in this study is important.* We believe this study will better help Christian colleges and universities understand how tenure relates to the aims of Christian schools in higher education.

Upon the completion of the research, we will gladly provide you a copy of our findings. You may request an executive summary of our findings when you return the notification card included in this packet. At all times throughout this study, you and your institution will remain anonymous. Again, your cooperation with this study is very much appreciated. Should you have any questions, you may email them to sharris@unt.edu. Please take a few minutes at this time to complete the survey and provide the requested faculty handbook information. If you have already responded to our questionnaire, you may disregard this second request.

Collegial Regards,

D. Barry Lumsden  
Professor of Higher Education  
Director of Institute of Christian Higher Education  
University of North Texas  
940-565-4074

N. Scott Harris  
Research Assistant  
University of North Texas  
972-422-7939

## Tenure Policies & Practices Questionnaire

### Instructions:

- \* Please answer all of the following 18 questions to the best of your ability.
- \* Upon completion of the questionnaire, enclose the questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope labeled “questionnaire”.
- \* Also upon completion of the questionnaire, please return the enclosed self-addressed stamped “Notification Card” **SEPARATELY** from the questionnaire. On this card you may request an executive summary of our study. This summary will be sent to you upon completion of the study.
- \* In conjunction with the questionnaire, please return a copy of the portion of your faculty handbook that addresses the tenure and/or contract systems on your campus. You may use the self-addressed stamped envelope in your packet labeled “faculty handbook information”.

Notification card used upon completion of questionnaire

## **Tenure Policies & Practices Questionnaire Notification Card**

Please return this card **SEPARATELY** from the *Tenure Policies & Practices Questionnaire* upon completion of the questionnaire. This will notify us that you have completed and returned the questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study.

Sincerely,  
Dr. D. Barry Lumsden  
and  
Scott Harris  
Institute of Christian Higher Education  
University of North Texas  
\_\_\_\_\_Request Executive Summary  
Code:\_\_\_\_\_

Dr. D. Barry Lumsden  
College of Education  
University of North Texas  
P.O. Box 311337  
Denton, TX 76203-1337

Dr. D. Barry Lumsden  
College of Education  
University of North Texas  
P.O. Box 311337  
Denton, TX 76203-1337

APPENDIX E  
SUMMARIES OF INDIVIDUAL  
FACULTY HANDBOOK TENURE POLICIES

Table E1  
School A Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial Appointment: Year-to-year contract

- Eligibility:
- Pre-tenure conference 4<sup>th</sup> year with Academic Dean & Department or Division Chair
  - Six years of satisfactory service
  - Up to 3 years prior service at another institution may be considered
  - Full-time faculty status

- Criteria
- Satisfactory performance in classroom & demonstrates integration of faith & learning
    - o Factors considered in classroom
      - Knowledge of field
      - Lecture & discussion skills
      - Conscientious & creative preparation
      - Competent evaluation of student performance
    - o Faith and Learning Factors
      - Paper relating Christian beliefs & principles of academic discipline
      - Statement detailing practical out-workings of integration in a classroom
  - Professional growth reflecting progress toward a terminal degree, new course development, or integration of disciplines
  - Other considerations
    - o Service to the college & community
    - o Organization and advisement
    - o Student counseling
    - o Academic advising
    - o Church and community involvement

- Tenure Committee:
- Academic Dean
  - Three tenured faculty elected by the faculty
  - Two tenured faculty selected by Academic Dean

- Tenure Review Material
- Resume / Vitae
  - Self-evaluation
  - Evidence of Spiritual Modeling
  - Syllabi
  - Student evaluations
  - Material describing responsibilities & involvement at the institution
  - Letters from colleagues
  - Paper on Integration of Faith and Learning

Termination of Tenured Appointments

- Failure to adhere to doctrinal statement
- Violation of moral principles upheld at the college
- Inability to fulfill terms & conditions of appointment due to medical reasons
- Demonstrated professional incompetence
- Lack of sympathy to the aims & objectives of the college
- Financial exigency
- Discontinuance of or significant changes in the program

Academic Freedom within confessional standard parameters of the school

---

Table E2  
School B Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial Appointment: One-Year contract

- Criteria:
- Manifest Christian lifestyle in personal conduct and relationships
  - Supports the institutional mission of the College
  - Performs all responsibilities of his/her ministry as outlined in Faculty Handbook
  - Performs all responsibilities of his/her ministry as outlined in Faculty Handbook
    - o Teaching
    - o Academic Advising
    - o Three-years of course evaluations above average of other full-time faculty
    - o Strong academic rigor as described through syllabi, grading patterns and evaluations
  - Actively supports ministry of an evangelical church. Church denomination encouraged
  - Minimum of five years of full-time teaching at College (Three years as Professor)
  - Earned doctorate and three years continued learning through contributions to field
  - Tenured to programs and not to the college
  - Five-year post-tenure reviews (Possible remediation)

Faculty members able to apply at their discretion, but they must have met all requirements at time of application.

- Process:
- Application made by faculty member
  - VP of Academic Affairs reviews application & makes recommendations to President
  - President reviews application / recommendation makes recommendation to Board
-

Table E3  
School C Tenure Policy Summary

---

- Eligibility:
- Tenure-Track
  - Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor
  - Full-time appointment

Criteria:

- Recognition of outstanding teaching
- Exemplary service in areas of administrative assignments, scholarship, interpersonal relationships
- Continual professional advancement
- Scholarship
- Active involvement in local church
- Active involvement in the community
- Six years of service at [school name] (Three years if three years previous service)
- Based on individual merit – "...no departmental, college, or university quotas or limits"
- May be granted if 10 years experience at approved school with initial appointment of professor

Procedures:

- Candidate contributes supporting materials to folder maintained by dean which give evidence to meeting criteria listed above.
- Department chair with department input provides recommendation to Dean
- Tenured faculty in applicant's department vote (secret ballot) whether or not to endorse applicant's tenure request
- Dean gives recommendation along with Department Chair's recommendation and faculty vote to Promotions and Tenure Committee
- Promotions and Tenure Committee reviews application and applicant's file if necessary then gives recommendation to Provost
- Provost gives recommendation to President
- President gives recommendation to Board of Trustees who makes final decision.

Reduction in Force Procedures

- Reassignment
- Early Retirement
- Retraining Opportunities (At College or other approved institution)
- Reasons for termination:
  - o Professional incompetence
  - o Continued neglect of academic duties
  - o Serious personal or professional misconduct
  - o Deliberate and serious violation of the rights and freedoms of others on campus
  - o Conviction for crime direction related to the faculty member's fitness to perform duties
  - o Falsification of credentials or experience
  - o Failure to observe the ethical or professional canons of a faculty member's discipline
  - o Failure to follow guidelines in handbook
  - o Any other just or legal cause

Academic Freedom: [Name of college] has adopted the academic freedom portion of the AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom.

---

Table E4  
School D Tenure Policy Summary

---

- Eligibility: position
- Teaching & Research Appointments
  - Administrators who hold regular faculty status when appointed to administrative position
  - Associate or Professor Rank
  - Terminal or advanced degree
  - Endorsement of [school's name] educational philosophy
  - 7<sup>th</sup> year of full-time teaching

- Criteria:- Mastery of Discipline
- Confidence and respect of students
  - Modifications of courses in light of student evaluations and developments in discipline
  - Continuing contact with literature in the field
  - Competence as student counselor
  - Member of institutional committees
  - Participation in appropriate professional organizations
  - "Where possible, contributions to knowledge in the discipline through lectures, publications and the like..."

Procedures for Granting Tenure

- Notification of tenure eligibility given to candidate (Committee forms)
- Provost provides data to committee (Evaluation data / instruments)
- Committee sends recommendation to Provost (if majority of committee agrees)
- Provost sends recommendation to President
- President
  - reconvenes committee if recommendations are negative or conflicting
  - makes recommendation to Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees

Trustees

- AA Committee of the Board of Trustees interviews candidate
- Action taken by AA Committee of the Board
- Confirmed by Board if approved

Failure to Achieve Tenure

- Opportunity for continued two-year terms
- Possible reconsideration for tenure at later date

Loss of Tenure

- Elimination of programs
  - Financial exigency
    - Due Process:
      - Last-to-tenure first to be removed
      - Repositioning or reassignment if possible
  - Willfully working against constitution of the college
  - Incompetence
  - Deliberately disregarding expectations
  - Insubordinations
  - Other good & just causes
-

Table E5  
School E Tenure Policy Summary

---

- Purpose:
- Create atmosphere favorable to academic freedom
  - Provide faculty member with reasonable expectation of security (Attract/Retain quality faculty)
  - Promote institutional stability
- Eligibility:
- Assistant, Associate or Professor rank
  - Employed ½ time or more in teaching
  - Completed probationary period (5 years) full-time service
  - Position that continuing funding (tuition, fees, and designated endowment) is expected
  - Tenured faculty from another school completing 1 – 2 years probation
- Criteria:
- Faculty performance
    - o Teaching excellence
    - o Evidence of concern for students (advising & student development)
    - o Academic & personal integrity
  - Appropriate degree
  - Professional development & growth
  - Academic & professional recognition
  - Involvement in and contribution to the University and community
  - Christian commitment

Procedure for Granting Tenure:

- Faculty member applies for tenure
  - Application and supporting materials provided to Academic Unit Promotion & Tenure Committee
  - Academic Unit Promotion & Tenure Committee makes recommendation to Dean or Division / Department Chair
  - Dean or Division/ Department Chair provides recommendation to the University Promotion & Tenure Committee
  - Recommendation made to the Vice President for Academic Affairs
  - Recommendation made to the President
  - Recommendation made by President to the Board of Trustees
-

Table E6  
School F Tenure Policy Summary

---

- Eligibility:
- Tenure Track
  - Positive Tenurability Review in 4<sup>th</sup> year
  - Positive Tenure Review in 6<sup>th</sup> year
  - Terminal degree
  - Assistant, Associate, or Professor rank

- Criteria:
- Superior teaching and educational abilities
  - Evidence of an ongoing professional study, scholarly production and self-improvement
  - Collegiality even in the midst of dissent
  - Breadth of knowledge that allows candidate to respond appropriately to changes in school
  - Academic advisement of students
  - Compatibility with mission of the College

Materials provided in portfolio

- Self-evaluation report
- Recent scholarship examples
- Evidence of student advising
- Evidence of service
- Recommendations from five colleagues
- Student evaluations
- Classroom observation notes
- Interview

Denied Tenure or Promotion

- Must wait until following year to reapply for appointment
  - If candidate denied in two successive years, candidate must wait two years before reapplying.
-

Table E7  
School G Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial Appointment: One-year contract (Succeeding appointments – two-year contracts)

Eligibility:

- Support of Mission
- Fulfill requirements for respective ranks
- Teaching, Scholarship & Creative Work and Service to College & Community
  - o Different faculty members will reflect different proportions of each
  - o Teaching is primary consideration
    - Teaching: 50%
    - Scholarship & Creativity: 15%
    - Service: 15%
    - Discretionary: 20% to be added to one of the above areas by candidate
- At the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> two-year contract, faculty member develops a five-year plan for development

Criteria: (Each area has both competency and merit levels of consideration.)

- Teaching:
- Scholarship & Creative Work
- Service

Procedure for Granting Tenure

- Initiated by Academic Dean who sends letter to faculty member
- Dean forms evaluation team (Academic Dean, Dept. Chair, Appointed peer reviewer)
- Faculty member provides personal evaluation & statement and supporting materials
- Evaluation team members provide written evaluation to Dean
- Faculty member can view evaluation and provide a written response
- Evaluation team meets with faculty member / Sends recommendation to Promotion & Tenure Committee
- Promotion & Tenure Committee sends recommendation to President
- President makes final recommendation to Board of Trustees

Materials provided to Evaluation Team

- Personal Statement / Self-evaluation and Supporting materials
- Department Chair's written evaluation
- Peers' written evaluations
- Department responses
- Candidate's written responses

Termination Grounds:

- Grave misconduct
- Failure to perform duties
- Failure to maintain competent level in all three areas of evaluation
- Financial exigency

If candidate not granted tenure in 6<sup>th</sup> year then given one year terminal contract

Post-Tenure Review: Every five years

Candidate may opt not to be considered for tenure during 7<sup>th</sup> year.

Health and Athletic Department members eligible under certain circumstances

---

Table E8  
School H Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Complete seven year probationary period (Decision end of 6<sup>th</sup> year)
- Teaching positions only
- Professional rank of Assistant, Associate, or Professor only
- Positive review during Two- and Four-year reviews prior to tenure evaluation
  - o Possible responses are:
    - Approval of continuance without reservation
    - Approval of continuance with stated qualifications
    - Disapproval of continuance for stated reasons

Probationary Period:

- Seven Years
- If “no” or disapproval during Two- or Four-year reviews, one-year terminal contract given
- Faculty going from Part-time to full-time may receive one year for two years served towards the seven year probation requirement.
- Time exceptions sometimes made in unique circumstances
- Leaves of absence don't count towards tenure probationary period requirement

Criteria:

- “...proven trustworthiness as a maturing Christian scholar / teacher...”
- Appropriate terminal degree
  - o Exceptions made for
    - Exceptional demonstration of competence in past positions
    - Special requirements of faculty position
    - Scarcity of prospective faculty member in given discipline
    - Special circumstances delaying terminal degree (extension of tenure evaluation allowed)
- Demonstrate effectiveness as a teacher
  - o Mastery of discipline / continuing professional development
  - o Mastery of teaching using appropriate methodologies
  - o Mastery in relating to students
  - o Appropriate expectations for student achievement
- Demonstrate effectiveness as a scholar
  - o Participation in appropriate professional organizations
  - o Continuing familiarity with literature in the field
  - o Making contributions to the field through a variety of means (publishing, papers, etc.)
- Endorse and promote the aims of Christian liberal arts education
  - o Commitment to the educational objectives of the college
  - o Demonstrate the integrations of faith and learning with and outside the classroom
- Express an active Christian Commitment
  - o Membership and active participation in an area Christian church
  - o Ability to relate to students and colleagues in a Christ-like manner
- Demonstrate effective service to the college
  - o Participate in recruitment and advising of students
  - o Participate in departmental and committee governance process
- Professional rank of Assistant, Associate, or Professor

Tenure Denied:

- If tenure is denied, a one-year terminal contract is given.
-

Table E9  
School I Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial Appointment: tenure track position

- Eligibility:
- Associate or Professor rank
  - Terminal degree in field of study
  - Complete appropriate years of service
  - Outstanding proficiency in teaching, scholarship, and service
  - Commitment to long-term success of university

Criteria:

- Teaching
  - o Engaged learning / academic excellence in classroom
  - o Relevance of Christian faith to subject shown
  - o Respect & appreciation of others
  - o Clear & accurate communication
  - o Keep up-to-date in field of study
  - o Enthusiasm
  - o Self-awareness & adaptable
  - o Student awareness & adaptable to their needs
  - o Mentoring relationships
  - o Demonstrated effectiveness
- Scholarship
  - o Breadth
  - o Individualized with clear and sustained pattern of action
  - o Validation by peers
- Service
  - o Variegated and Intentional
  - o Documented and Sustained

Portfolio Requirements:

- Vita
- Three essays addressing:
  - o Commitment to mission and objectives of the university
  - o Achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service
  - o Current understanding of the integration of faith & learning
- Previous growth plans and evaluations of progress
- Plans of continued growth over the next two years
- Evidence of excellence in teaching
- Evidence of outstanding scholarship
- Description and examples of service
- Student evaluations

Termination (Reasons for)

- Voluntary resignation
  - Retirement
  - Discontinuance of a major program
  - Financial exigency
  - For cause including, but not limited to, a significant decline in performance, failure to meet expectations in the Professional Improvement Plan, immoral behavior, or conviction of a felony
  - Behavior or beliefs that fail to conform to the current Statement of Faith & Community Responsibility
-

Table E10  
School J Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Full-time
- Assistant, Associate, or Professor rank
- Tenure-Track – Full-time instruction & research in at least 50% of prescribed load
- Librarians also eligible

Probationary Period:

- Six years (Tenure review by end of 5<sup>th</sup> year)
- If tenure denied, a one-year terminal contract given
- Maximum of two years credit allowed for prior service
- Pre-tenure review in 3<sup>rd</sup> year to determine “tenurability”
  - o Determine progress towards criteria
  - o Correct any misdirection
  - o Release faculty member if deemed non-tenurable by tenure review

Criteria: (Portfolio given to Faculty Rank & Tenure Committee)

- Effectiveness as a Teacher
  - o Appropriate terminal degree
  - o Continuing professional development
  - o Mastery in subject matter in way that enhances student learning
  - o Master in relating to students
  - o Appropriate expectations for student achievement
- Effectiveness as a Scholar
  - o Participation in appropriate professional organizations
  - o Demonstration of continuing familiarity with literature in the field
  - o Contributions to the field through presentations, publications, exhibits, performances, etc.
- Endorsement and promotion of the aims of Christian Higher Education
  - o Demonstration of commitment to educational goals of the college
  - o Demonstration of the integration of faith & learning within and outside of classroom
- Expression of an active Christian commitment
  - o Membership and participation in an area Christian church
  - o Relates to students & colleagues in a Christ-like manner
- Demonstration of effective service to college
  - o Collegial participation in department & committee governance
  - o Participation in recruiting and advising students
- Collegiality and the respect & confidence of colleagues

Retaining Tenure:

- Maintain loyalty to College and its Christian stance
- Maintain good character
- Maintain professional competence
- Maintain effectiveness and diligence in the performance of duties
- Cooperate with regular evaluations procedures

Academic Freedom seen as a necessity for all, not just tenured professors

---

Table E11  
School K Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Tenure-track position
- Seven-year probationary period
- At least Assistant Professor rank
- After three years if tenure possessed at prior institution
- After four years if having completed three years in tenure track at prior institution
- Positive Third year Pre-Tenure Evaluation
  - o If no problems or if areas needing progress are address, tenure reasonably to be expected.  
If serious problems exist, then a one-year terminal contract is given.

Terminal one-year contract given if tenure denied

Criteria:

- Teaching & daily Christian living integrity
- Service to college, church, and community
- Professional development within discipline

Procedure for evaluation:

- Annual evaluation by Division Chair
- Peer evaluation submitted to VP of Academic Affairs
- Self-evaluation given to Division Chair
- Division chair reviews self-evaluation and submits own recommendation to VP of Academic Affairs
- Faculty Council reviews previous evaluations and makes recommendation to VPAA
- VP for Academic Affairs completes recommendation and sends it to President
- President makes recommendation to the Board of Trustees

Four Levels of Evaluation

Level I	Division Chair	* Most valuable
Level II	Peer Evaluation	* Optional but desired
Level III	Self-Evaluation	* Optional but desired
	Graduating seniors' evaluations	
Level IV	Three-year summary of student evaluations	

Non-Reappointment during probationary period (Reasons for)

- Cancellation or redirection of program
  - Declining enrollment
  - Financial exigency
  - Over-staffing
  - Lack of excellence in teaching
  - Inadequate service to college
  - Incongruence with educational goals of the College
-

Table E12  
School L Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Six years probation
- Seven years full-time service at College
- Up to four years of previous experience may be counted
- Associate or Professor rank only

If tenure denied, the candidate may receive an invitation by the President to remain on for a term with approval by the board. Candidate may reapply after one year.

Criteria:

- Teaching
  - o Prepares for instruction effectively
  - o Uses teaching strategies and skills appropriate to the subject, objectives, and learner
  - o Uses appropriate means of evaluation to improve instruction
  - o Manages classroom activities and procedures effectively
  - o Demonstrates effective instructor-student rapport
  - o Integrates faith and learning in the instructional process
- Advising / counseling / interaction with students
  - o Serves students as an effective academic advisor
  - o Helps students with career/personal counseling
  - o Interacts effectively with students
- Professional growth
  - o Holds appropriate graduate degree(s) and/or takes graduate work relating to teaching assignment
  - o Participates in professional development activities
  - o Uses ideas from professional books/journals/organizations/conferences to enhance classroom instruction
  - o Tries new methods/approaches in the classroom and evaluates their success
- Service
  - o Participates effectively in committee assignments, department activities, and when appropriate, student class or club sponsorships
  - o Attends regularly faculty meetings/chapel/revival services
  - o Participates in university social and cultural activities
  - o Participates in community activities and service
  - o Performs administrative duties effectively (if assigned such responsibilities)
- Loyalty to the university mission/purpose
  - o Committed to higher education in a Christian context
  - o Seeks to exemplify basic Christian virtues
  - o Committed to the doctrinal and ethical stance of [school's denomination]
  - o Exemplifies devotion to a church through regular church attendance and participation

Procedure for Granting Tenure

- Initiated by faculty member who keeps own file on five criteria listed above
    - o Faculty evaluation data on teaching & advising
    - o Professional growth plans
    - o Annual faculty reports
  - Must be recommended for tenure by Division Chair and/or School Dean
  - Prepare and present Faith and Learning paper which is critiqued by given department
  - Tenure & Promotion Committee reviews materials, interviews candidate, and makes recommendation to Vice-President for Academic Affairs
  - VPAA makes recommendation to President
  - President makes recommendation to Board of Trustees
-

Table E13  
School M Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial Appointment: Contract

Eligibility:

- Teaching faculty only

Portfolio Requirements

- Vitae
- Demonstration of competence and skills as a teacher
- Evidence of keeping active professionally
- One's projected goals as a professional
- One's involvement in the institution and community
- One's understanding of the relationship between academic discipline and the Christian faith (Essay)

Termination:

- Adequate Cause
- Financial Exigency
- Retirement
  - o Annual or part-time contracts may be negotiated upon mutual agreement between institution and faculty member after retirement.

Tenured faculty may keep tenure if asked to serve in administrative position unless agreeing in writing to the contrary.

Post-Tenure reviews every five years for:

- Continuing effectiveness
- Continuing professional development
- Assistance in goal setting

Evaluation Process

- Materials provided by candidate
- Division Chair to provide evaluation of above portfolio material and interviews senior students in major

\* Statement in handbook –

“As the college continues to improve, ever-higher standards to be met are applied.”

---

Table E14  
School N Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial Appointment: Annual Contract

Eligibility:

- Earned doctorate / terminal degree
- In one department / school unless responsibilities lie across more than one department/school
- Assistant, Associate, or Professor rank
- Teaching positions only
- Recommendation by colleagues
- Demonstration of excellence in teaching
- Scholarship & professional achievement and service
- Personal integrity
- Strong spiritual commitment
- Four years of full-time service at [college]
- Two years if Associate or Professor at [college] and tenured at prior institution

Procedure

- If interested in being considered for tenure, faculty members must complete a pre-tenure review during each of the years prior to the application for tenure.
- Department Chair responsible for initiating pre-tenure review
- Applicant submits application for tenure with supporting documents to the Faculty Committee for Promotion and Tenure
  - o Other supporting materials utilized
    - Personal development goals
    - Student evaluations
    - Annual report by the faculty
    - Comments added by Department Chair
- Committee sends recommendation to VP for Academic Affairs
- VPAA sends recommendation to President
- President sends recommendation to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees
- AA Committee of the Board makes recommendation to the Board who makes final decision
- Tenure begins the following year

Relinquishing Tenure

- Retirement or resignation from institution
- Acceptance of new position within another school / department at the institution. Tenure may be awarded immediately in new position

Withdrawal of Tenure

- Incompetence or neglect of contractual responsibilities
- Physical or mental disability that prevents regular execution of contractual duties
  - o Subject to federal & state laws pertaining to disabilities
- Marked enrollment decline, discontinuance or reduction in program
- Gross insubordination
- Financial exigency
  - o If removed, effort made to employ in another position in institution
    - Same rank, salary and tenure not guaranteed
    - Position will not be filled within three years without first offering position to terminated faculty member

Table E15  
School O Tenure Policy Summary

---

Probationary Period / Eligibility

- Seven years typical but exceptions made, may be up to nine years
- Scholarly leave of absence may count as if years of prior service
- Full-time Teacher (high academic & teaching competence)
- Associate or Professor rank, but promotion to Associate Professor may be linked to tenure

AAUP Friendly

- Approximately 5% of full-time faculty will be non-tenure

Procedure for Tenure

- Thorough review of teacher's performance at end of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year to inform regarding progress towards tenure
- Candidate applies
- Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) reviews information submitted by candidate
- FPC makes recommendation to Chief Academic Officer (CAO)
- CAO makes recommendation to President (if negative, candidate may appeal before President)
- President makes recommendation to the Board
- If tenure denied, one year terminal contract issued

Criteria:

- Length of service:
  - o Six years as full-time
  - o Up to three years prior service counted
- Rank:
  - o Associate or Professor
  - o Promotion to Associate may be linked with tenure application
- Professional Qualifications
  - o High academic and teaching competence
  - o Commitment to model professional and spiritual growth
- Faith and Learning Requirement
  - o Faith and Learning paper required
  - o Paper written in conjunction with Faith & Learning Coordinator/other Faith & Learning Mentors
  - o Paper is reviewed seeking consensus by readers
  - o Decision reported to Dean who makes recommendation to Chief Academic Officer
  - o Faith & Learning workshop provided to assist in preparation of the paper
- Institutional Commitment
  - o Evidence of general agreement with goals of Christian Higher Education and mission, philosophy and practice of the College

Termination of Tenure:

- Voluntary resignation
  - Failure to accept and model the Statement of Faith and/or the Community Covenant
  - Failure to conform to employee policies
  - Moral delinquency
  - Demonstrable incompetence, neglect of contractual obligations, unproductive classroom performance, or unacceptable professional performance
  - Physical or Mental disability which prevents regular execution of duties
  - Discontinuance or reduction of a program or department
    - o 12 month notice
    - o Make reasonable effort to reassign or if unable, assist in securing other employment
    - o Agree not to fill position with a replacement without first offering position to terminated faculty member
-

Table E16  
School P Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Full-time rank of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor
- Exhibits professional and spiritual competence, growth, and development
- Seven years probationary period as Assistant or Associate Professor, five years as Professor

If tenure denied, one year terminal contract issued

Criteria:

- Professional competence:
    - o *Actively integrates Christian perspective into one's professional field*
    - o Steadily attain graduate credit
    - o Participate in research efforts within one's discipline
    - o Attempt to become knowledgeable in a discipline other than one's own
    - o Participate in a multi-disciplinary course offering
    - o Travel in such a way as to become acquainted with cultures other than one's own
    - o Make ongoing efforts to explore the historical and philosophical roots of one's discipline
    - o Overtly encourage students and colleagues to join in developing a Christian world view
  - \* For Tenure: Italicized item and one additional item
    - Teaching performance:
      - o *Receive positive evaluation by the division head or supervisor.*
      - o *Present evidence of ongoing efforts to encourage students to develop a Christian perspective on the subject matter taught*
      - o *Show evidence of thorough class or task preparation.*
      - o *Show evidence of influencing students toward positive spiritual and intellectual growth*
  - \* For Tenure: Italicized items
    - Scholarly productivity:
      - o *Maintain membership in, and attend meetings of, one or more professional organizations*
      - o Publication of one of the following: a book or musical composition; an article in a scholarly journal, book, or reference work; a book review in a scholarly journal
      - o Edit or serve on the editorial board of a scholarly journal
      - o Present a paper at a scholarly or professional meeting
      - o Hold office or committee membership in a professional organization
      - o Present a recital or lecture or exhibit works of art
      - o Supervise a meaningful student research project
      - o Show evidence for other pertinent performance in this category
  - \* For tenure: Italicized item and one additional item
    - Cooperation in implementing university policies:
      - o *Accept leadership responsibility for divisional or committee activities*
      - o Serve effectively on assigned committees
      - o Draft successful grant proposals
      - o Sponsor campus programs, activities, or student organization
      - o Recruit students as part of the programs of the admissions office
      - o Speak to alumni or church groups in the PR/development efforts of the institution
      - o Show evidence or other pertinent performance in this category
  - \* For tenure: Italicized item and one additional item
    - Participation in community life:
      - o *Maintain membership and active participation in a local church congregation*
      - o *Actively encourage spiritual growth and development of students and colleagues*
      - o Hold membership in a civic organization
      - o Participate in conducting a charity drive
      - o *Accept speaking or performing engagements in the community*
      - o *Make other cultural contributions to the community*
      - o Participate in recreation programs
  - \* For tenure: Italicized item and one additional item
-

Table E17  
School Q Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Full-time position
- Tenure-track
- Terminal degree in field of study
- Considered during 7<sup>th</sup> year of probationary period
- Must meet criteria during probationary period
- “Good” evaluation standards in all four Carnegie standards of scholarship (Boyer, 1990)
  - o Discovery
  - o Teaching
  - o Integration
  - o Application

Criteria:

- Teaching performance
  - o Mandatory Indicators:
    - Self-assessment
    - List of courses taught, course syllabi, and materials
    - Statistical summaries of student evaluation data
  - o Additional Indicators (Optional)
    - Any other evidence of teaching related activities may be included
  - o Must meet criteria rating
    - “Unacceptable” Less than 85% 4 or 5 ratings
    - “Good” 85-90% 4 or 5 ratings
    - “Excellent” 90% or more 4 or 5 ratings
- Scholarly & creative activities
  - o Self-assessment
  - o Publications
  - o Pragmatic scholarship – grants, consultations, policy analysis
  - o Presentations
  - o Professional licenses, credentials...
  - o Editing professional journals
  - o Must meet criteria ratings
    - “Unacceptable” No scholarly/creative activity or activity with sufficient depth
    - “Acceptable” Modest degree of scholarly and creative activity
    - “Good” More in depth or extensive scholarly activity
    - “Excellent” Exemplary performance in depth and/or breadth of activity
- Service
  - o Self-assessment is mandatory
  - o Evidence of on- and off-campus activity
- Ethical consideration
  - o Participates actively and constructively in the affairs of the University
  - o Demonstrates commitment to the Christian character and identity of [college name]
  - o Demonstrates compliance with the guidelines on ethical behavior outline in Handbook

Consideration will be given to the length of time served when evaluating quantity and quality of indicators.

Post-Tenure Reviews

- Purpose is professional development
- Every five years if receiving a favorable post-tenure review

Table E18  
School R Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial Appointment: Contract

Eligibility:

- Six years of satisfactory service
- Rank of at least Associate Professor

Application Procedures

- Applicant applies to Academic Dean
  - o Record of professional growth and a plan for future growth
  - o Record of involvement in the life of [college name]
  - o Statement of agreement with purpose of [college name]
  - o Statement indicating membership in and active participation in a local Christian church
  - o Letters of evaluation from: 1) Candidates department, and 2) Division Chair
    - Candidate's strengths and weaknesses
    - Teaching skills
    - Professional growth
    - Service
    - Involvement in the life of the college
- Academic Dean and President review application and make recommendation to the Board

"Denial of tenure does not imply termination of employment, nor that the faculty member could not make an application at a future date."

General Provisions

- No more than 75% in a department shall be tenured
- Tenure expires for the faculty member at the end of the academic year he/she attains age of 65
- Faculty member may then serve on a year-to-year basis without tenure
- Tenure relinquished by resignation or move to part-time
- Tenure can be carried to appointment of administrative position

Dismissal

- Moral malfeasance or gross misconduct
  - Incompetence or neglect of responsibilities
  - Necessity of retrenchment by the institution
    - o One year advanced notice given
-

Table E19  
School S Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial appointment: Annual contract

Eligibility:

- Terminal degree in field of study
- Five years successful service at college upon which switching to tenure-track appointment
- Full-time teaching status only

Delay in tenure review for

- An unpaid voluntary leave of absence of one semester or longer
- An illness of the faculty member or faculty member's family
- The birth of a child or the adoption of a child under the age of six

Tenure granted for five-year periods after which review by the appropriate committee is initiated.

Criteria

- Appropriate terminal degree
- Effectiveness in teaching and/or effectiveness in non-formal classroom teaching
- Professional competence and growth, evidence in graduate and post-graduate studies, research, writing, performances, shows, artist productions, skills, etc.
- Effectiveness in maintaining working relationships with colleagues in the on-going academic disciplines, collegiate programs, spiritual ministries of the college
- Effectiveness in relationships with students as an advisor and counselor
- Commitment to the development of a Christian world-view and to the search for biblical perspectives applicable to one's areas of teaching and scholarship
- Cooperation with and support of the spiritual life and program of the college, such as regular chapel participation, fellowship and service in a local church, and consistency with witness and life according to the spiritual ethos of the college

Criteria Rubrics

- Teaching – Areas of assessment include:
    - o Content expertise
    - o Instructional strategies
    - o Course design
    - o Course management
    - o Student contact
    - o Student learning outcomes
  - Scholarship – Examples of scholarly productivity:
    - o Publication – articles, books, columns, compositions, films, patents granted and computer programs published
    - o Grants funded
    - o Work in progress
    - o Editorial activity
    - o Presentations
    - o Participation in learned and professional societies
    - o Professional practice
    - o Performance
    - o Applied research
  - Service
    - o Institutional service
    - o External service in local church or community
  - Faith-Living-Learning integration
    - o Demonstration of consistency of life and witness in accordance with Scripture
-

Table E20  
School T Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial appointment: Annual contract

Eligibility:

- Terminal degree
- Seven year normal probationary period
- Performance at a level appropriate to faculty member's current rank
- Successful third year review

Criteria:

- Excellence in past performance and future promise
- Demonstrable integration of faith and learning
- Articulate understanding of liberal arts education
- Embrace mission of college
- Demonstrate commitment to service and leadership
- Performing at a level appropriate for rank
- Present tenure paper – Integration paper addressing faith and learning

Evaluation means and materials

- Updated vita
- Self-evaluations
- Course evaluations by students
- Classroom teaching evaluations by colleagues
- Letters of reference
- Current syllabi
- Copies of professional work
- Reviewers from outside the college consider scholarship
- Division Chair report from students (Seven upper-level students interviewed)

Limitations on Tenure

- Tenure granted within the limits of the Statement of Faith
- Faculty members not required to accept tenure

Termination

- Violation of the limitations stated in this Handbook
- Professional incompetence
- Engaging in any practice demonstrably detrimental to the goals and purposes of the institution
- Financial exigency
- Failure to adhere to the Statement of Faith
- Failure to comply with the contract
- Negligence of the performance of faculty responsibilities
- Program change
  - o Provide 12 month advance notice
  - o Make reasonable effort to place faculty member in another position or aid in securing other employment elsewhere
  - o Agree not to fill the position with a replacement with three years, without first offering it to the terminated person

Table E21  
School U Tenure Policy Summary

---

Limits on tenure: 50% of particular school's regular full-time faculty

Tenure status & benefits

- Tenured faculty annually offered a three-year contract
- A one-level advancement on the full-time salary scale
- Parking privileges in executive parking lot (when available)

Eligibility

- Any regular full-time teacher
- Assistant, Associate or Professor rank
- Appropriate terminal degree
  - o Assistant: Seven years at Assistant rank at [name of institution]
  - o Associate: Five years at Associate rank at [name of institution]
  - o Professor: Three years at Professor rank at [name of institution]
- Must be conferred by Board of Regents

Procedures

- VP for Academic Affairs provides list of faculty eligible to apply for tenure
- Faculty members submit letter of intent to apply along with evidence of achievement
  - o Application
  - o Vita
  - o Supporting documents (journal articles, books, other works...)
  - o Personal development plan
  - o Most recent results of Student Opinion Survey
- Application proceeds up hierarchy to Board of Regents

Termination

- Resignation
  - Financial exigency
  - Failing to sign contract
  - Failure to maintain high degree of competence
  - Failure to perform reasonable faculty duties
  - Intransigent actions or expressions in opposition to or inconsistent with the purposes of [school]
  - Moral turpitude or commission of state or federal felony
  - Failure to conform to and comply with administrative policies of the University
-

Table E22  
School V Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Assistant, Associate, Professor ranks
- Full-time teacher and or service director related to academic program
- Terminal degree in teaching field (exceptions made)
- Tenure-track faculty must apply at end of probationary period
- Probationary period determined at time of initial appointment
  - o May be extended by mutual agreement
- Applies to Rank and Tenure Committee
  - o In 6<sup>th</sup> year for initial appointment as Instructor
  - o In 5<sup>th</sup> year for initial appointment as Assistant
  - o In 4<sup>th</sup> year for initial appointment as Associate
  - o In 3<sup>rd</sup> year for initial appointment as Professor

Evaluation materials

- Provided by applicant \* Details of requirements not provided to researcher

If tenure denied, then one-year terminal contract given.

President makes final decision in consultation with Executive Committee of Board of Trustees

If removed during first two years of probation, no appeal available.

---

Table E23  
School W Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Full-time
- Terminal degree
- Assistant, Associate, or Professor rank
- Five years service at [name of college], including 3 years of full-time teaching
- Tenure review in 6<sup>th</sup> year
- Personal witness of vital Christian faith & evidence of a lifestyle consistent with college expectations
- Ratings of at least commendable in required criteria and "Satisfactory" in one optional area

Review

- Candidates initiate review
- President makes final decision

Rating System

- Exceptional
- Commendable
- Satisfactory
- Needing Improvement
- Deficient

Faculty Criteria

- Required areas of evaluation
    - o Teaching
    - o Professional Growth
  - Optional areas of evaluation (Applicant chooses one best relating to personal skills)
    - o Scholarship
    - o Governance
    - o Service
-

Table E24  
School X Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Full-time teachers
- Assistant, Associate, or Professor rank

The school has transitioned to multi-year contract system. No new tenure appointments apparent.

Termination:

- Three month notice for violation of University Drug & Alcohol Policy
- Change in educational programs
- Breach of Contract
- Failure to perform duties in professional and competent manner
- Insubordination
- Mental or physical disability
- Financial exigency
- Moral turpitude (immediate)

Normal retirement at age of 65, but no mandatory retirement in place

---

Table E25  
School Y Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial Appointment: Contract

Eligibility:

- After 6 years of full-time service (2 years prior service may count towards requirement.)
- Associate or Professor rank
- Evaluation for promotion to Associate can accompany tenure decision

Tenure by 8<sup>th</sup> year or a one-year terminal contract issued

Evaluation:

- Supports mission of the College
- Honors Community Life Expectations
- Commitment of the integration of faith & learning
- Commitment to moral and spiritual development of students
- Cooperates with colleagues

Criteria:

- Teaching
- Professional development
- Institutional service

Evidence considered:

- Student evaluations
- Peer evaluations
- Department evaluations
- Administrative evaluations
- Candidate's personal statement
  - o Self-Assessment
  - o Faith & Learning portfolio

Tenure review performed by Personnel Committee.

Recommendations made up hierarchy with Board making final decision.

Academic Freedom protected within doctrinal parameters.

---

Table E26  
School Z Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility / Process:

- Appropriate terminal degree
- Seven years at [name of college] with rank of instructor or above
- Exceptions may be made for experience as professors from other colleges
- Process initiated by Provost
- Evaluations start with Chair of the given department

Dossier Requirements

- Chair evaluation of candidate
- Summary of department recommendations
- Statement whether a majority of tenure colleagues support reappointment with tenure
- Confidential evaluation by colleagues in department
- Written evaluation of at least 3 alumni who have majored in the department
- Evaluation of scholarship by external referees when applicable
- Self-evaluation by candidate
  - o Curriculum vitae
  - o Profession development plan
  - o Advising & community service
- Other materials as deemed necessary
- Statement on integration of faith and learning
- Statement on compliance with requirement of signing Form of Subscription, Church membership, and Christian schooling for faculty member's children
- Copies of publications

Denial of tenure (Options)

- Termination of service
  - Renewal of two-year appointment (possible reconsideration for tenure at future date when initiated by Dean or Provost)
-

Table E27  
School AA Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- After seven years of tenure track service
- Full-time
- Up to 3 years of prior service accepted
- Time spent of special leaves of absence will not be counted

Process:

- In third year & sixth year Dean or Director of appropriate college will notify faculty member in writing of the status of decision process
- Decision made by President consultation with the Committee on Educational Policies & Personnel of the Board of Trustees

Causes for Termination

- Gross neglect of duty or unprofessional conduct
- Immorality
- Demonstration of financial exigency
- Necessary elimination or reduction of a school or department
- Open, vocal, and sustained contempt for the Christian Faith or the customs generally held by college community
- Retirement for disability
- Professional incompetence

Appeals process in place for termination

---

Table E28  
School AB Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility

- Teaching Faculty
- Librarians
- Holds terminal degree

Probation

- Seven years
- Up to three years prior service accepted
- Employment terminated if not qualified for tenure
  - o Circumstances may warrant an extension of contract but not on tenure track
- Faculty member responsible to maintain record
  - o Statements from Department Chair and Dean required

Criteria:

- Adhere to the Life Together Covenant
- Teaching effectiveness highest priority
- Interdisciplinary integration
- Faith and learning integration
- Scholarship
- Service
- Support spiritual dimension of university
- Student evaluations

Evaluators for Criteria for Tenure evaluation

- Department Chair
- Students
- Associate Dean
- Self

President makes final decision regarding tenure

Detailed year-by-year guidance processes explained

---

Table E29  
School AC Tenure Policy Summary

---

Tenure-track appointment when  $\frac{3}{4}$  time or higher:

- Criteria given for determination of appointment to tenure-track
- Multi-year contract available when tenure-track not available

Limits on Tenure-track:

- 70% of Full-time academic year faculty positions in the budget

Eligibility:

- $\frac{3}{4}$  Teaching responsibility
- Terminal Degree
- May apply during 5<sup>th</sup> year of full-time or  $\frac{3}{4}$  time on tenure-track
- Leaves of absence not counted
- Non-tenure track may apply for tenure-track

Criteria:

- Teaching, scholarly activity, and other contributions to the goals of the university
- Spiritual and personal nurturing of students
- Active commitment to the processes of the integration of faith and learning
- Growth and development in one's own spiritual life
- Terminal degree or equivalent

Procedure:

- Board makes final decision
  - Complete a Doctrinal Response Form
  - Submit documentation demonstrating understanding of the integration of faith and learning
  - Doctrinal response form evaluated by reviewer with written response
    - o Interviews set up to discuss discrepancies
  - Recommendations made by different administrative levels
-

Table E30  
School AD Tenure Policy Summary

---

Tenure is defined as a “tenure-track contract – This period is not to exceed one academic year and automatically terminates upon the expiration of that year. Tenure gives faculty members the contractual right to be re-employed for succeeding years until the faculty member (1) resigns, (2) retires, (3) is discharged for cause, (4) is terminated pursuant to a reduction in workforce, or (5) becomes disabled or dies.

Eligibility:

- All teaching faculty members at Assistant level or above

Probation

- Up to six years, but may be extended one year
- Tenure-track faculty members must apply at end of probationary period
- Denial of tenure ends status as tenure-track faculty member / may result in a one year terminal contract.

Criteria:

- Five years of successful teaching at the Assistant Professor level or higher at school
- Up to two years of previous experience may be applied
- If beginning in middle of year, credit is given for full year
- Evidence of Christian character and commitment as shown by:
  - o The impact of Jesus Christ and the fruit of the Holy Spirit in personal life
  - o Participation and support of church activities
- Professional competency and student relationship as evidenced by ability to mentor students

Procedure:

- Initiated by faculty member or Area Chair
- Dossier provided (Promotion request may accompany tenure review process)
  - o Formal letter requesting tenure
  - o Current curriculum vitae
  - o Statement of academic and professional direction with research, professional development plans, and teaching strengths in light of the College mission (Teaching is primary, but evidence of scholarship necessary as well.)
  - o Portfolio of teaching
  - o Copies of any publications or other evidence of professional activities
  - o Statement about college citizenship (committee work, advising, chapel involvement, and church involvement)

Reasons for Termination

- Discontinuance of a teaching field in particular or in whole because of financial necessity
  - Deterioration of faculty member’s intellectual or physical capacity to teach
  - Academic incompetence
  - Change in the faculty member’s teaching or action contrary to the stated objectives of the college
  - Immoral behavior
-

Table E31  
School AE Tenure Policy Summary

---

Tenure is defined as a “mutual agreement between the college and faculty member”.

Eligibility:

- Full-time tenure-track (Administration not eligible unless teacher previously)
- Assistant or higher

Probation

- Up to six years, but at least one year even if tenured at previous institution
- Some prior service allowed
- Some time in non-tenure-track may be accepted
- Sabbatical leave time / paid leave may count
- Review meetings in the first, third, and fifth years of probationary period

Procedure:

- Initiated by faculty member in sixth year
- Dossier provided by faculty member
  - o Formal letter requesting tenure
  - o Vita
  - o Supporting materials
  - o Board makes the final decision
  - o A negative decision may be appealed (Detailed grievance process given)

Reasons for Termination

- Financial exigency
  - Discontinuance of education program
  - Immoral conduct
  - Criminal conduct
  - Violation of college's alcohol & drug policies
  - Breach of contract
  - Failure to perform duties in a collegial, professional & competent manner.
-

Table E32  
School AF Tenure Policy Summary

---

Initial Appointment: Serve on an at-will basis

Tenure provides:

- the faculty member a limited degree of additional security
- the teacher greater confidence to present views concerning College policy and practice to the administration
- the faculty member a sense of the administration and Board's backing based on evidence of a commitment to the College
- the College the confidence that tenured faculty members will provide early notice if intending not to return the following year
- the faculty added status and a feeling of professional acceptance by peers

Eligibility:

- Full-time teacher or combination teaching / administration (i.e. also department chair)
- Associate or Professor
- Permanent position
- Confirmation by Academic VP, President, and Chair of academic division

Probation

- Six years service at college

Criteria

- Effective teaching
- Compatible with the spirit and life of the College
- Institutional usefulness
- Keeping current in academic discipline
- Commitment to the purpose of the College
- Length of service

Reasons for Termination

- Failure to sign and return annual renewal contract and doctrinal statement
  - Retirement
  - Gross or unresolved negligence, incompatibility, or incompetence in performance of instruction and academic responsibilities
  - Immorality; gross insubordination or brooding of non-compliance with standards of conduct of College
  - Divorce whether the plaintiff or defendant when certain conditions not met
  - Defection from position of the College in Statement of Beliefs
  - Extraordinary circumstances such as a national emergency or financial exigency
  - Change in curriculum for cause
  - Prolonged disability
-

Table E33  
School AG Tenure Policy Summary

---

Tenure is defined as a “five-year rolling contract, which would begin to wind down only by the decision of the President... due to the failure of a faculty member to continue to meet the professional standards expected of a faculty member at [name of college]”.

Eligibility:

- After six years of successful teaching (three to five in exceptional cases, may be extended to eight)
- Assistant or higher
- All full-time teaching faculty members

Probation

- Six years, but may be three to five years in exceptional case (may be extended to eight)
- Leave of absence may not count
- Review meetings in the first, third, and fifth years of probationary period

Criteria

- Demonstration of satisfactory development as a maturing Christian teacher and scholar
- Mastery of the discipline / art of presentation
- Confirmation and respect of colleagues
- Modification of courses based on evaluations by students, peers, and development in discipline
- Continual contact with literature in the field
- Participation in appropriate professional organizations
- Contribution to scholarship in discipline through publications, lectures, and/or creative activities
- Ability to articulate beliefs in discipline
- Acceptable levels of participating in community service
- Anticipated continuance of educational program

Procedure:

- Initiated by President
- Evaluation based on
  - o Paper on integration of denominational beliefs and discipline which is presented to division for revision and colloquium discussion
  - o Materials (curriculum vitae, activity list, self-evaluation, etc)
  - o Interview with Board of Governors or its Exec.
- Promotion to Professor status normally accompanies review if not already attained
- Development of a personal development plan after receiving tenure
- If tenure denied, President may recommend an additional limited-term appointment

Post-Tenure Reviews

- Informal annual review
    - o Formal review the following year if previous review unsatisfactory
  - Satisfactory review leads to five-year rolling contract
  - If unsatisfactory formal review, contract goes to four years / subsequent reviews must be satisfactory for five-year contract to be renewed.
  - If after three years of unsatisfactory review, full formal evaluation takes place to see if continued employment is warranted in final year
-

Table E34  
School AH Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Full-time tenure-track teaching faculty position
- Part-time teaching faculty when at least ½ of time is spent in teaching responsibilities

Probation

- Six years service at college
- Pre-tenure review in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years

Criteria

- Spiritual interest
- Teaching effectiveness
- Effective Christian relationships in the University family
- Professional proficiency
- Academic development
- Ability to academically advise students

Procedure:

- Written department recommendations
- Integration Statement Paper on:
  - o the candidate's Christian world-view and correlation between scripture and discipline
  - o the candidate's role in and commitment to Christian Higher Education
  - o the relationship between faith and practice
- Evidence of integration in course syllabi, lectures and assignments as well as comments from students, peers, and Department Chair
- May refuse tenure and thereby stay on a year-by-year contract system in a non-tenure status while maintaining the same protection and privilege of a pre-tenure faculty member
- All faculty must go through tenure process
- Denial of tenure leads to a one-year terminal contract

Reasons for Termination

- Resignation
  - Retirement
  - Retrenchment
  - Cause:
    - o Incompetence
    - o Dishonesty
      - Plagiarism
      - Falsification of academic credentials
      - Misappropriation of funds
    - o Failure to perform duties
    - o Breach of contract
    - o Professional misconduct
    - o Departure in conduct or belief from doctrinal or conduct positions of the University
-

Table E35  
School AI Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Full-time Associate or Professor
- Faculty members only

Probation

- Seven years
- Up to 3 years prior experience allowed

Criteria

- Commitment to Christ and Christian Higher Education
- Teaching Excellence
  - o Command of subject
  - o Ability to organize course materials and communicate them well
  - o Demonstrable concern for students
  - o Successful integration of discipline with other disciplines in College and with faith
- Scholarly and professional pursuits
  - o Keep abreast of developments in field
  - o Scholarship of discovery, integration, and/or application
  - o Publication, presentations, creativity
- Time Utilization
  - o 50-60% Classroom instruction
  - o 20% Professional responsibilities (Advising, committee work, professional organizations)
  - o 20-30% Research, community involvement, and/or continuing education

Procedure:

- Self and department evaluations
- School Dean evaluation
- Student evaluation summaries
- Peer evaluation
- Other:
  - o After satisfying probationary period, may opt for four-year continued growth contract

Reasons for Termination

- Adequate cause
  - Financial exigency
  - Extraordinary circumstances such as changes in school programs
-

Table E36  
School AJ Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Five years service in probationary period
- Earned doctorate

Probation

- Five years service at college

Criteria

- Time
- Teaching performance to standard appropriate for rank
- Professional and scholarly activity
  - o Sustained success at setting and meeting agreed upon goals
  - o Evidence of scholarly research or creative activity (not necessarily publishing)
  - o Scholarly interaction
  - o Continued intellectual vitality
  - o Subject progressing towards integration at scholarly level of discipline and biblical world-view and life-view
- Institutional, Church, and community service
- Attitude and commitment to Christian leadership
  - o Assurance of sustained supportive attitude & actions towards the University's Statement of Faith, Community Standards and Mission, and towards the University Community

Procedure:

- Promotion & Tenure Committee makes recommendation to Academic VP who then reports to President who then makes recommendation to the Board who decides
- Candidate provides evaluation material
  - o Curriculum vitae
  - o Self-evaluation based on criteria standards
  - o Letter of recommendation from applicable Department Chair
  - o Sample course syllabi
  - o Student opinionnaires over past five years
  - o Other relevant data
- If tenure denied, one-year terminal contract given
- Probation extension possible in some cases

Post-Tenure Reviews

- Annual to set personal development goals
- If two consecutive unsatisfactory and/or incomplete annual professional interviews, faculty member must appear before committee to explain results
- Possible termination of employment after a one-year terminal contract given

Reasons for Termination

- Lack of quality performance
  - Lack of a ministry attitude
  - Lack continuing compatibility with the University's confessional stance
  - Changes in programs
  - Financial exigencies
-

Table E37  
School AK Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Full-time teaching faculty position
- Assistant rank or higher

Probation

- Assistant Professor – five to seven years
  - o Must attain tenure by 7<sup>th</sup> year or no further contract will be offered
- Associate Professor – three to five years
  - o Must attain tenure by 5<sup>th</sup> year or no further contract will be offered
- Full Professor – two to four years
  - o Must attain tenure by 4<sup>th</sup> year or no further contract will be offered

Criteria

- Spiritual interest
- Teaching effectiveness
- Effective Christian relationships in the University family
- Professional proficiency
- Academic development
- Ability to academically advise students

Procedure:

- Tenure review initiated by candidate
    - o Letter of intent given to Promotion and Tenure Committee who makes recommendation to VPAA who makes recommendation to President who makes recommendation to Board
    - o Evaluation data presented to committee by candidate
  - Board makes decision
    - o If denied, no further contract offered
    - o When applicable a schedule / method or procedure and conditions re reapplication for tenure may be given by President.
-

Table E38  
School AL Tenure Policy Summary

---

Eligibility:

- Tenure-track teaching faculty position only, no administrative tenure (Administrative personnel may hold tenure from an academic department, but may not hold tenure in regard to the administrative position.)
- Assistant rank or higher
- Terminal degree held

Probation

- Seven years for first-time hires
  - o Initial appointment is for one year (Evaluation towards end of first year)
  - o Second appointment if successful in first is for two years (Evaluation towards end of third year with regard to goals set in first year)
  - o Third appointment if successful in second is for three years
  - o Upon unsatisfactory results during initial and second appointment, a one-year terminal contract will be given to faculty member
- At least a two-year probationary period for experienced faculty coming from another institution
- Tenure may be immediately conferred for faculty members who were granted tenure at previous institution.
- One-year extension possible

Criteria

- Exhibit long-term benefit to the university based on present and long-term needs of the University
- Demonstrable Christian faith and action
- Support of the educational and spiritual mission of the University
- Terminal degree

Reasons for Termination

- Adequate cause
  - Discontinuance of program
  - Financial exigency
  - Medical disability which preclude the fulfillment of the faculty member's responsibilities
-

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of University Professors (1984). Academic freedom and tenure: 1940 Statement of Principles and interpretive comments. In *Policy documents & reports*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- American Association of University Professors. (1984b). 1958 Statement on procedural standards in faculty dismissal proceedings. In *Policy documents & reports*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- American Association of University Professors. (1984c). 1982 Recommended institutional regulations on academic freedom and tenure. In *Policy documents & reports*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- American Association of University Professors. (1989). *Statement on procedural standards in the renewal or nonrenewal of faculty appointments*. Retrieved January 29, 2004 at [www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbrenew.htm](http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbrenew.htm)
- American Association of University Professors. (1999) *Post-tenure review: An AAUP response*. Retrieved February 6, 2004 at [www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/rbpostn.htm](http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/rbpostn.htm)
- American Association of University Professors. (2000). *Incentives to forgo tenure*. Retrieved on January 29, 2004 at [www.aaup.org/Issues/tenure/comaten.htm](http://www.aaup.org/Issues/tenure/comaten.htm)
- American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors & United Educators Insurance. (2000). *Good practice in tenure evaluation*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson, Martin (1996). *Impostors in the Temple: A blueprint for improving higher education in America*. Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press.
- Baldwin, Roger G. & Chronister, Jay L. (1997). *Colleges, universities are increasingly using non-tenure-track faculty, nationwide study shows*. Retrieved on February 6, 2004 at [www.virginia.edu/topnews/textonlyarchive/March\\_1997/tenure.txt](http://www.virginia.edu/topnews/textonlyarchive/March_1997/tenure.txt)
- Bennett, John B. (1998). *Collegial professionalism: The academy, individualism, and the common good*. Phoenix, Arizona: The Onyx Press.
- Boyer, Ernest L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Burgan, Mary A. (2003). Academic freedom without tenure: New pathways. *Academe* 89(5), 104, 105.

- Burtchaell, James Tunstead (1998). *The dying of the light: The disengagement of colleges and universities from their Christian churches*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Carroll, Linda (2000). *Tenure & academic excellence*. Retrieved January 29, 2004 at [www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2000/00mj/MJ00Carr.htm](http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2000/00mj/MJ00Carr.htm)
- Carson, D.A. (1997). Can there be a Christian university? *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*, 1, 26-33.
- Chait, Richard P. (2002). Why tenure? Why now? In R. P. Chait (Ed.), *The questions of tenure*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Chait, Richard P. & Trower, Cathy A. (1997). Where tenure does not reign: Colleges with contract systems. American Association for Higher Education. Retrieved February 6, 2004 at [www.aahe.org/members\\_only/NP\\_excerpt.htm](http://www.aahe.org/members_only/NP_excerpt.htm)
- Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education. (1973). *Faculty tenure: A report and recommendations by the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. (a). *Mission and organization*. Retrieved December 3, 2003 at [www.cccu.org/about/about.asp](http://www.cccu.org/about/about.asp)
- Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. (b). *Members*. Retrieved December 3, 2003 at [www.cccu.org/about/members.asp](http://www.cccu.org/about/members.asp)
- Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. (c). *Criteria & application for membership*. Retrieved December 3, 2003 at [www.cccu.org/about/about.asp?contentID=5&ChildContentID=7](http://www.cccu.org/about/about.asp?contentID=5&ChildContentID=7)
- Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. (d). *Search career results*. Retrieved December 9, 2003 at [www.cccu.org/search/career\\_result.asp?q=tenure](http://www.cccu.org/search/career_result.asp?q=tenure)
- Dallas Theological Seminary (2003). *Faculty handbook*. Dallas: Author.
- De George, Richard T. (1997). *Academic freedom and tenure: Ethical issues*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Diekema, Anthony J. (2000). *Academic freedom & Christian scholarship*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Dovre, Paul J., (Ed.). (2000). *The future of religious colleges: Proceeding of the Harvard Conference on the Future of Religious Colleges, October 6-7, 2000*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Euben, Donna R. (2002). *Tenure: Current perspectives and challenges*. Retrieved at [www.aaup.org/Legal/info%20outlines/legtenur.htm](http://www.aaup.org/Legal/info%20outlines/legtenur.htm)

- Finkin, Matthew W. (2000). *The campaign against tenure*. Retrieved January 29, 2004 at [www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2000/00mj/MJ00Fink.htm](http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2000/00mj/MJ00Fink.htm)
- Franke, Ann (2001). *Making defensible tenure decisions*. Retrieved January 29, 2004 at [www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2001/01nd/01ndfra.htm](http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2001/01nd/01ndfra.htm)
- Fry, Judith E. (2000). *Post-tenure review: A study of policies and practices at colleges and universities in the United States*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Gangel, Kenneth O. (1978). Integrating faith and learning: Principles and process. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April-June, 99-108.
- Gangel, Kenneth O. (Ed.) (1983). *Toward a harmony of faith and learning: Essays on Bible college curriculum*. Farmington Hills, Michigan: William Tyndale College Press.
- Grodsky, Dawn (2000). Post-tenure evaluations criticized at UMSL. *St. Louis Journalism Review* 30(228), 7-8.
- Habecker, Eugene B. (1991). Academic freedom in the context of mission. *Christian Scholars Review*, 21(2). 175-181.
- Holden, Karen C. & Hansen W. Lee, (Eds.). (1989). The end of mandatory retirement: Effects on higher education. *New directions for higher education*, no. 65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Huer, Jon (1991). *Tenure for Socrates: A study in the betrayal of the American professor*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Kennedy, Donald (1997). *Academic duty*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Kinkel, Doreen (2003). Alternatives to tenure: Three successful case studies. American Association for Higher Education. Retrieved February 6, 2004 at [www.aahe.org/LTCreports/concurrent/cs71.htm](http://www.aahe.org/LTCreports/concurrent/cs71.htm)
- Lewis, Michael (1997). *Poisoning the ivy: The seven deadly sins and other vices of higher education in America*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Magner, Denise K. (1999). Report urges post-tenure reviews for professors and more pay for part-timers. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 45(20), A10.
- Maguire, Daniel C. (2002). *Academic freedom and the Vatican's Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. Retrieved January 31, 2004 at [www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2002/02mj/02mjmag.htm](http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2002/02mj/02mjmag.htm)

- Mallon, William T. (2001). *Tenure on trial: Case studies of change in faculty employment policies*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Monsma, Jr., George N. (2001) *Faith and faculty autonomy at Calvin College*. Retrieved January 31, 2004 at [www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2001/01jf/JF01MONS.htm](http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2001/01jf/JF01MONS.htm)
- New American standard Bible*. Anaheim, California. Foundation Publications, Inc.
- Patterson, James A. (2001). *Shining lights: A history of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Platter, William M. (2001). A profession at risk: Using post-tenure review to save tenure and create an intentional future for academic community. *Change* 33(4), 53-57.
- Seldin, Peter (1999). *Changing practices in evaluating teaching*. Bolton, Massachusetts: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Sorcinelli, Mary Deane (2000). Principles of good practice: Supporting early-career faculty. *American Association for Higher Education*. Retrieved February 6, 2004 at [www.aahe.org/FFRR/principles/brochure2.htm](http://www.aahe.org/FFRR/principles/brochure2.htm)
- Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (2003). *Faculty handbook*. Ft. Worth: Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Snyder, Martin D. *Academic freedom and religion*. Retrieved January 29, 2004 at <http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2003/03mj/03mjSOTP.HTM>
- Sykes, Charles J. (1988). *ProfScam: Professors and the demise of higher education*. Washington, D.C.: Regency Gateway.
- Tewksbury, Donald G. (1965). *The founding of American colleges and universities before the Civil War: With particular reference to the religious influences bearing upon the college movement*. New York: Archon Books.
- Thiessen, Elmer John (2001). *In defence of religious schools and colleges*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Trower, Cathy A. (2002). What is current policy? In R. P. Chait (Ed.), *The questions of tenure*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Van Alstyne, William (1997). Tenure: A summary, explanation and "defense." In P. G. Altbach (Ed.). *The academic profession: The professoriate in crisis*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Webb, Kerry S. (2003). *Presidents' leadership behaviors associated with followers' job satisfaction, motivation toward extra effort, and presidential effectiveness at evangelical colleges and universities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton.

When is post-tenure review not post-tenure review? (2001, August 17). *Chronicle of Higher Education* 47(49), A8.

Wilson, Robin (May 12, 2000). A new campus without tenure considers what it's missing. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 46(36), A18.

Wolfe, Alan (2000). The opening of the evangelical mind. *The Atlantic Monthly* (October, 2000): 55-76.

Wolterstorff, Nicholas (2001). *Ivory tower or holy mountain? Faith and academic freedom*. Retrieved January 31, 2004 at [www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2001/01jf/jf01wolt.htm](http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2001/01jf/jf01wolt.htm)