

Tenure Standards in Political Science Departments: Results from a Survey of Department Chairs

John M. Rothgeb, Jr., *Miami University*

Betsy Burger, *Miami University*

ABSTRACT This article presents the results from a survey of political science department chairs regarding the tenure procedures and standards at their colleges or universities. The findings reveal that only a small fraction of the colleges and universities in the United States refuse to offer tenure or are attempting to limit tenure. We also find general agreement regarding the standards for evaluating teaching and service and that research expectations vary according to the highest degree offered by a department.

This article presents the findings from a survey of political science department chairs regarding the tenure procedures and standards at their colleges or universities. As most readers know, tenure is one of the most controversial subjects in higher education. For those receiving tenure, there is a virtual guarantee of lifetime employment that can provide faculty members with considerable security as they perform their professional duties.¹ Tenure also may assist the university in its educational mission by protecting academic freedom, which many regard as the foundation for discussions and research on controversial topics and as vital to the critical thinking that is a key to the pursuit of knowledge and a healthy learning environment.²

Academic tenure systems, however, are sometimes depicted as flawed. For the colleges and universities that grant tenure there are potential financial commitments that can stretch for decades, problems relating to the loss of the flexibility needed to shift faculty in and out of programs and departments as institutional needs change, and the possibility that incompetent faculty may be shielded from dismissal.³ Among the faculty seeking tenure, the drawbacks associated with the process include the anxieties in determining what it takes to get tenure amid conflicting signals that often mean “the standards for tenure are notoriously unclear” (Anonymous and Anonymous, 1999, 95).⁴ Adding to the tensions is that those denied tenure face almost immediate dismissal from their jobs and the prospect that they may not find employment elsewhere because they are viewed as cast-offs from another institution.

While the problems associated with the pursuit of tenure affect nearly everyone in academia, some argue that women and minorities face especially daunting challenges. Two female authors discuss the “chilly climate” they faced as they navigated the tenure process at their institutions and describe their experiences as “profoundly gendered” (Anonymous and Anonymous, 1999, 91). One survey of the 376 accredited business programs in the United States finds that male and female respondents had very different perceptions of the tenure process, with women believing “that the current tenure system works to their disadvantage” (Premeaux and Mondy, 2002, 156). Perna (2005, 280–81) and Alex-Assensoh et al. (2005, 283) explain that one reason women and minorities may face greater barriers when seeking tenure is that they have more difficulty engaging in the social networking that provides clues on tenure standards and connects them to older faculty who serve as mentors.

Given the questions surrounding something as important as tenure, one would expect a large body of systematic work on the subject. A careful review of the literature, however, reveals that there have in fact been only a handful of such efforts and that most of this research has focused on procedural issues and on the general criteria employed in tenure reviews. For example, Lewis (1980) conducted a content analysis of the personnel files of the tenure candidates at a single large unidentified northeastern university to determine whether standards and practices varied across departments, and he concludes that “one is left with a very vivid impression that there are no hard and fast criteria . . . [and that] the entire process of evaluation . . . is marked by floating standards” (Lewis 1980, 93).

Another researcher approached the analysis of tenure with a cross-university research design, examining the official statements regarding tenure at 44 colleges and universities in the western United States, finding that teaching, research, and service were universally regarded as the areas for judging tenure applicants, but that beyond this “tenure and promotion statements listed only

John M. Rothgeb, Jr., is professor of political science and distinguished scholar of the graduate school at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. Professor Rothgeb is the author of numerous books and articles regarding international politics and foreign policy and about the discipline of political science.

Betsy Burger is an administrative assistant in the department of political science at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. She is the co-author of an article regarding professor training programs in political science Ph.D. programs.

general criteria without any mention of specific indicators,” and concludes that “the relative weight of the criteria remains largely unknown” (Kawar, 1983, 542). Interestingly, in their survey of 304 American colleges and universities, Park and Riggs (1993) reach a similar conclusion, noting that teaching, research, and service were the professional activities examined in tenure decisions, but that there was a pervasive lack of clarity.⁵ Yon, Burnap, and Kohut (2002, 107) and Kohut, Burnap, and Yon (2007, 21) also find in their evaluation of a dozen departments at a large southeastern university that teaching, research, and service were the keys to tenure evaluations and that research typically was the most important, with teaching second.

While the above research provides some guidance, the literature presents conflicting portraits of the relative importance of teaching, research, and service in some academic settings. As an example, Meacham (2002) writes that smaller liberal arts colleges place a premium on faculty with a strong commitment to teaching and service and that research plays a relatively minor role. Adams (2002) and Kolmerton (2005) make similar arguments. Other authors, however, present a contradictory point of view. For instance, Deardorff et al. (2001, 856) maintain that “quality research is valued” at liberal arts colleges, and Durfee (1999) makes a similar observation. In addition, in a survey of political science departments, Rothgeb, Spadafore, and Burger (2007, 761) find that liberal arts institutions have approximately the same level of interest in hiring candidates with publications as Ph.D. departments.

An overall assessment of the research literature on tenure is that it provides only superficial guidance regarding the factors colleges and universities examine when evaluating tenure cases. The literature does not give those interested in the issue much specific information and does not address such issues as the numbers, types, and quality of publications that might be expected of those seeking tenure; the precise means by which teaching is evaluated; and the role service plays as one tries to build the credentials needed to get tenure. Leaving these types of questions unanswered means that as they enter the profession, young academics continue to confront a degree of uncertainty that diverts their attention from scholarly activities and that, as was noted above, may put some at an unacceptable disadvantage. The research reported herein is designed to begin clarifying the procedures and standards used by political science departments nationwide when making tenure decisions.

THE SURVEY

We obtained the data through a mail survey conducted between February and April of 2008.⁶ The 1,242 chairs of the political science departments in the United States that offer bachelors, masters, and/or doctoral degrees received questionnaires. APSA provided the names and addresses.⁷ Postal returns due to incorrect addresses and so forth yielded a total actual population of 1,229. We received responses from 393 chairs for a response rate of 32%,⁸ and then sorted the responses according to the highest degree offered by the department. Of the responses, 64 were from Ph.D.-granting departments, 82 were from departments with masters programs, and 247 were from departments offering bachelors degrees.

The questionnaires solicited five types of information. The first group of questions focused on whether the institution in question offers tenure or is trying to limit the award of tenure, whether the chair believed tenure is essential to the protection of academic

freedom, and whether tenure has protected incompetent faculty from dismissal. In addition, we asked chairs if during the last five years their departments have denied someone tenure, have had a positive tenure recommendation reversed by higher authorities, have had a tenured faculty member dismissed for cause, or have been sued or had a grievance filed because they denied someone tenure.

The second set of questions related to the general evaluation process and overall standards. Chairs were asked whether their institutions required letters from outside evaluators, and if so, how many.⁹ Chairs also were asked whether their colleges or universities treat collegiality as an important factor in tenure decisions, whether tenure decisions are made by all tenured faculty or by a committee composed of only some of the tenured faculty, and whether their departments have agreed-to standards that guide tenure votes.¹⁰ In addition, we requested that chairs rank the relative importance of teaching, research, and service and if their institutions link decisions regarding tenure and promotion to associate professor.

In the third category of questions, pertaining to teaching standards, the questionnaire asked chairs whether a superior teaching record could compensate for a mediocre research record at their institutions. Following this, attention turned to the instruments employed to evaluate teaching. These included: (1) student evaluations of all courses taught by the candidate; (2) a teaching portfolio prepared by the candidate; (3) the syllabi of the candidate's courses; (4) peer reviews of the candidate's teaching by other faculty members, by the department chair, or by the dean or another administrator; (5) whether the candidate teaches courses that the institution or the department requires for graduation; (6) whether the candidate has created new courses; (7) whether the candidate has sponsored independent studies; and (8) whether the candidate has supervised graduate theses or dissertations.¹¹

The fourth group of questions related to various types of service that a college or university might expect from candidates for tenure. Chairs were asked to indicate whether any of the following were expected in their departments or at their institutions: (1) service on at least one department committee, (2) service on at least one college or university committee, (3) the sponsorship of at least one student club, (4) an administrative appointment (the examples offered were assistant department chair or head of student advising), (5) community service (the examples were service on the school board or as a consultant to the government, to businesses, or to the media), and (6) service to the political science profession (examples were organizing a professional meeting or being an officer in a professional organization).

The final questions were devoted to research and publications. To begin with, chairs were asked whether a superior research record could compensate for mediocre teaching at their colleges or universities. They also were asked if in their opinion single-authored research was essential in a tenure case and if they regarded publications on teaching as equal in importance to substantive publications.¹² Next were inquiries about presenting papers at professional conferences, with the questions focusing on how many papers their institutions expected candidates to present.

Following this, quantity and quality of journal articles or their equivalent was explored. Regarding quantity, chairs were requested to state whether their department expected candidates for tenure to have published at least one journal article, two or more articles,

Table 1

General Information Regarding Tenure in Responding Departments

	BA	MA	Ph.D.
Institution does not offer tenure	.06	.01	.02
Institution is seeking to limit tenure	.06	.12	.05
Tenure is a key to academic freedom	.69	.84	.83
Tenure shields incompetent faculty	.49	.63	.56
Department has denied tenure	.15	.26	.45
Higher authorities have reversed a tenure decision	.14	.17	.30
A tenured faculty member has been dismissed	.03	.07	.03
Department has been sued or had grievance filed	.03	.09	.13

one article per year, or two or more articles per year. To measure quality, chairs were asked to say whether their departments expected candidates to publish at least one article in the *American Political Science Review* (APSR), the *American Journal of Political Science* (AJPS), or the *Journal of Politics* (JOP); two or more articles in the APSR, AJPS, or JOP; at least one article in the most prestigious journals in the candidate's specific field (with prestige defined by the department's tenure decision makers); or two or more articles in the most prestigious journals in the candidate's field.¹³

Finally, chairs were asked about the books their departments expected candidates to publish. The quantity choices included one book or two or more. The quality choices focused on the type of publisher, with chairs specifying whether their departments wanted a book with a prestigious university press or with any press.¹⁴

THE RESULTS

The results are presented in a series of tables that reveal the proportion of responding chairs stating that a particular indicator applied either to their departments or to their institutions. The responses from all departments offering some type of bachelor's degree are grouped under the BA label and we used that the same approach for the varying masters and doctoral programs. Once again, the sample sizes are 247 for BA departments, 82 for MA institutions, and 64 for Ph.D. programs.¹⁵

Table 1 summarizes the results for the first group of questions. As can be seen, only a small fraction of the respondents indicated that their institutions either do not offer tenure or are making efforts to limit tenure. One also finds that the overwhelming majority of chairs in each category of department stated that tenure was a key to the protection of academic freedom at their colleges or universities. In addition, substantial proportions of the chairs stated that tenure has shielded incompetent faculty from dismissal, although BA department chairs were somewhat less likely than the chairs of graduate departments to make this observation. Beyond this, we find that Ph.D. departments are far more likely than are the other departments to have denied someone tenure and that Ph.D. programs also have tenure decisions reversed by higher authorities far more often than do other departments,

Table 2

The General Standards and Procedures Used When Evaluating Tenure

	BA	MA	Ph.D.
External evaluation letters are required	.39	.51	.84
Five or fewer letters are required	.90	.85	.48
More than five letters are required	.10	.15	.52
Collegiality is an important factor	.63	.62	.31
Decisions are made by all tenured faculty	.48	.61	.76
Decisions are made by a faculty committee	.40	.29	.17
Department standards guide tenure votes	.52	.77	.89
Research is the most important factor	.06	.21	.76
Teaching is the most important factor	.48	.24	.03
Teaching and research are equal	.20	.37	.16
Teaching, research, and service are equal	.16	.17	.03
Teaching and service are equal	.04	0	0
Tenure and associate professor promotions are linked	.53	.71	.84

although in neither case does the proportion reach 50%. Finally, we find that over the past five years very few departments have either dismissed a tenured faculty member for cause or been subjected to a grievance or lawsuit because of a tenure decision.

Table 2 includes information about some procedures and general standards used when making tenure decisions, and there are several divergences among the three categories of departments. Ph.D. departments are far more likely than the others to require letters from outside evaluators, to label research as the most important factor in tenure decisions, and to state that collegiality is not an important consideration. Clear majorities of Ph.D. and MA departments involve all tenured faculty in tenure evaluations, while BA departments are far more evenly split between participation by all tenured faculty and employing committees that include only some of the tenured faculty. In addition, much higher proportions of Ph.D. and MA departments than BA departments indicated they have departmental standards to guide tenure votes and that decisions regarding promotion to associate professor are linked to tenure decisions.

Table 3 reports the results for teaching. One finding of interest is that nearly two-thirds of the BA departments indicated that a superior teaching performance can compensate for a mediocre research record. This compares to just 38% for MA departments and only 14% for Ph.D. institutions. Beyond this, the results show that when evaluating teaching the vast majority of all three types of department used student evaluations of all the courses the candidate teaches, a teaching portfolio, a review of course syllabi, and peer reviews by another faculty member. BA and MA departments also used an evaluation of the candidate's teaching by the department chair. One interesting finding for Ph.D. programs is the emphasis placed on whether the candidate has supervised a graduate thesis or dissertation, with two-thirds of such departments saying that they expected a candidate to do so. Finally, there is less interest by any type of department in creating a new class or teaching required courses.

Table 3
The Evaluation of Teaching

	BA	MA	Ph.D.
Superior teaching compensates for mediocre research	.64	.38	.14
Instruments used to evaluate teaching:			
Student evaluations of all courses	.84	.94	.92
Teaching portfolio	.77	.83	.73
Syllabi of candidate's courses	.87	.95	.89
Peer review by another faculty member	.69	.70	.72
Peer review by department chair	.69	.51	.27
Peer review by dean or other administrator	.31	.09	.03
Candidate teaches course university requires	.18	.18	.06
Candidate teaches courses department requires	.23	.27	.13
Candidate has created a new course	.35	.33	.28
Candidate has supervised independent studies	.29	.26	.45
Candidate has supervised a thesis or a dissertation	NA	.27	.67

Table 4
The Evaluation of Service

	BA	MA	Ph.D.
Service on at least one department committee	.67	.85	.78
Service on at least one college or university committee	.77	.59	.27
Sponsorship of at least one student club	.11	.04	0
Has had an administrative appointment	.04	.01	.02
Has demonstrated strong commitment to student advising	.83	.62	.28
Has demonstrated strong community service	.36	.24	.09
Has demonstrated strong service to the profession	.15	.16	.17

Table 5
The Evaluation of Research: General Standards and Journal Quality

	BA	MA	Ph.D.
Superior research compensates for mediocre teaching	.17	.34	.55
Single-authored publications are essential	.36	.51	.72
Teaching publications and substantive publications are equal	.43	.32	.11
Conference participation:			
Candidate must present at least one paper	.17	.12	.03
Candidate must present two or more papers	.49	.68	.70
Quality of journal publications:			
Must publish at least one in <i>APSR</i> , <i>AJPS</i> , or <i>JOP</i>	.02	.02	.13
Must publish two or more in <i>APSR</i> , <i>AJPS</i> , or <i>JOP</i>	.004	0	.08
Must publish at least one in most prestigious journals in field	.08	.09	.23
Must publish two or more in most prestigious journals in field	.02	.10	.44

The results for service are in Table 4. All departments indicated that they expected tenure candidates to serve on departmental committees, although some chairs from BA institutions stated that their departments were too small for committees. In addition to department committees, clear majorities of BA and MA chairs said that candidates were asked to serve on college or university committees and to demonstrate a strong commitment to student advising. Just over one-third of the BA respondents also stated that community service was important. None of the responding departments, however, displayed much interest in such other activities as sponsoring student clubs, holding administrative appointments, or professional service.

The final results pertain to research and publications; Table 5 presents the first of these findings.¹⁶ To begin, just over one-half of the Ph.D. departments indicated that a superior research record could compensate for mediocre teaching. This compares to 17% for the BA respondents and 34% for MA institutions. Ph.D. departments also are much more likely than those offering a BA or an MA to regard single-authored research as an essential part of the record of those seeking tenure, with nearly three-fourths of the Ph.D. respondents stating that they had such expectations. A bare majority of the MA departments and just over one-third of the BA institutions said they had this requirement. Additionally, in no case did a majority say that teaching publications would be considered as equal to substantive publications, although BA departments were much more likely to regard research on teaching favorably than were Ph.D. institutions. Finally, a clear majority in all categories expected tenure candidates to present at least one paper at a professional conference and that approximately seven in 10 MA and Ph.D. departments expected that two or more papers will be presented.

Turning to publications, the most interesting results in Table 5 may be those for the quality of the journals in which candidates are expected to publish. We find that 21% of the Ph.D. departments expected at least one article in the *APSR*, *AJPS*, or *JOP*, as compared to approximately 2% for the other departments. Beyond this, 67% of the Ph.D. programs indicated that they expected candidates to publish at least one article in the most prestigious journals in their field, and 44% said they wanted two or more such articles. Among BA departments, 10% wanted at least one such article and 2% wanted two or more. For MA institutions, the figures were 19% for one article and 10% for two or more.

The data for the quantity of publications are in Tables 6–8. These tables are arranged to allow the reader to determine how the various departments combined their expectations for books and

Table 6

The Quantity of Publications for BA Departments

	NO ARTICLE REQUIREMENT	ONE ARTICLE	TWO OR MORE ARTICLES	ONE ARTICLE PER YEAR	TWO OR MORE ARTICLES PER YEAR	TOTALS
No book requirement	.28	.22	.21	.10	0	.82
One book with any press	0	.02	.02	.02	0	.06
One university press book	.004	.004	.02	.004	0	.03
Two books with any press	0	0	0	.004	0	.004
One university press book and one book with any press	0	0	.01	.01	0	.02
Two university press books	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	.29	.24	.26	.15	0	

Table 7

The Quantity of Publications for MA Departments

	NO ARTICLE REQUIREMENT	ONE ARTICLE	TWO OR MORE ARTICLES	ONE ARTICLE PER YEAR	TWO OR MORE ARTICLES PER YEAR	TOTALS
No book requirement	0	.10	.27	.28	.04	.69
One book with any press	0	.04	.02	.07	0	.13
One university press book	0	0	.01	.04	0	.05
Two books with any press	0	0	0	0	0	0
One university press book and one book with any press	0	0	.01	.01	0	.02
Two university press books	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	.14	.32	.40	.04	

Table 8

The Quantity of Publications for Ph.D. Departments

	NO ARTICLE REQUIREMENT	ONE ARTICLE	TWO OR MORE ARTICLES	ONE ARTICLE PER YEAR	TWO OR MORE ARTICLES PER YEAR	TOTALS
No book requirement	0	.03	.14	.23	.11	.52
One book with any press	0	.02	0	.06	.02	.10
One university press book	0	0	.03	.09	.05	.17
Two books with any press	0	0	0	0	0	0
One university press book and one book with any press	0	0	.03	.06	.02	.11
Two university press books	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	.05	.20	.45	.20	

journal articles or their equivalent. Beginning with Table 6, 28% of the BA departments indicated that they did not expect publications from tenure candidates. Another 22% said that one journal article or its equivalent would be an appropriate publication record. Hence, one-half of the BA institutions described one journal article or none as an acceptable standard. By way of comparison, a glance at Tables 7 and 8 reveals that 10% of the MA departments and 3% of the Ph.D. institutions were prepared to accept the one-article standard and none of the MA or Ph.D. respondents indicated that no publications would be appropriate.

Focusing on Table 8, we find that among Ph.D. departments, 85% wanted at least two articles and 65% called for at least one

article per year. Indeed, 41% of the Ph.D. respondents stated that they expected more than one article per year, either because they wanted two or more articles per year or because they required some type of book or books in addition to one article per year. Looking at books, Table 8 reveals that 38% of the Ph.D. programs expected at least one book and 11% wanted two books.

As one might imagine, Table 7 indicates that the research requirements in MA departments are located in a middle ground between those for BA and Ph.D. institutions. Of MA respondents, 76% required at least two articles and 44% said they expected at least one article per year. This compares to the figures cited above for Ph.D. programs and to the figures for BA departments where

41% wanted at least two articles and 15% wanted one article per year. We also find that 16% of the MA departments called for more than one article per year, compared to 41% for Ph.D. departments and 4% for BA institutions. Finally, 21% of the MA chairs said their departments wanted candidates to publish a book, compared to 12% for BA departments and to the 38% mentioned above for Ph.D. programs.

DISCUSSION

Several conclusions can be drawn from the results described above. The first is that tenure continues to have a relatively secure place in academia. Among the 393 responding departments, only 18 (5%) reported that their institutions did not offer tenure, while another 28 (7%) stated that their colleges or universities were trying to limit tenure. This fairly secure status for tenure apparently has both positive and negative consequences—75% of all responding chairs said tenure was important for the protection of academic freedom at their institution, while 53% stated that tenure protects incompetent faculty.

Also, the probability a candidate will be denied tenure differs from one type of department to another. Taking BA departments, where 15% reported having denied someone tenure in the past five years, as a baseline, on a proportional basis three times as many Ph.D. departments and nearly twice as many MA departments reported denying someone tenure. Compared to the proportion for BA departments, approximately twice as many Ph.D. programs indicated having had a positive tenure decision reversed by higher authorities at their colleges or universities. Still, the majority of the Ph.D. departments reported that they had not denied anyone tenure in the recent past.

Most departments have standards to guide tenure decisions; this is especially true of departments with graduate programs. Relating to those standards, Ph.D. departments overwhelmingly regard research as more important than teaching and service, while BA and MA institutions are more likely to treat teaching either as more important than research or as equally important.

Another conclusion pertains specifically to teaching: While the majority of doctoral programs indicated that research was the most important consideration in tenure decisions and that superior research can compensate for mediocre teaching, it would be inaccurate to infer that Ph.D. programs regard teaching as unimportant. Although the teaching results only relate to how teaching is evaluated, assessment techniques could say something about what a department values. If multiple procedures are employed, as was true for the way most Ph.D. programs examined teaching, where student evaluations, teaching portfolios, course syllabi, and peer reviews are all used, then one can reasonably assume that such departments regard teaching as a key factor in tenure cases. After all, there is little point in using so many indicators if one does not value what is measured.

Finally, publication standards differ substantially from one category of department to another. This is illustrated by the above discussion of the results in Tables 5–8. These differences are obvious in a profile of the general demands the categories of departments place on tenure candidates.¹⁷ For instance, the results from this survey reveal that the typical Ph.D. program expects a candidate to publish a *minimum* of five or six refereed journal articles and wants some of those articles to appear in the most prestigious journals in the candidate's area of interest. Nearly one-half of the Ph.D. respondents indicated a desire for more than five or six

articles, either because they wanted some type of book (or books), they called for up to 10 or 12 articles, or they expected both a book or books and more articles. In addition, Ph.D. departments tend to value single-authored publications and to discount research on teaching.

By comparison, the average MA department seems to require between two and five articles, and there is less pressure to place those articles in prestigious journals. Less than one-fifth of these departments stated that they expected more. Finally, in general, BA departments seem to call for no more than two or three articles, with one-half of these departments indicating that one article is sufficient as far as publishing is concerned. Only 10% of these departments stated that they expected publications in prestigious journals, and only approximately 15% said they expected more than five articles.

There is general agreement across the three types of departments regarding the appropriate means for evaluating teaching and there is little reason to believe that poor teaching performances will go unnoticed at tenure time, no matter which type of department is involved. In the area of service, Ph.D. departments seem less demanding than BA and MA institutions, calling for no more than service on departmental committees. BA and MA departments both expect candidates to engage in committee service beyond departmental boundaries and place a much heavier emphasis on faculty interactions with students on an individual basis, as indicated by the strong interest in student advising in both of these categories.

In closing, this research was designed as a first step toward demystifying one of the most important decisions scholars face over the course of their careers. While some questions may have been answered, many remain. In particular, future research might address such workload issues as how many courses candidates are expected to teach, how large those courses are, the types of student assignments given in varying courses, and the faculty-leave policies at differing types of institutions. ■

NOTES

1. Mawdsley (1999, 167) notes that in the case of *Beitzell v. Jeffrey* (1981) tenure was defined as “a long-term academic and financial commitment by a university to an individual, providing faculty with unusually secure positions tantamount to life contracts.”
2. For discussions on the relationship between tenure and academic freedom, see Dresch (1988), Pilant and Ellison (1997), Stancato (2000), and Wihl (2006).
3. For discussions of some of the problems associated with tenure, see Dresch (1988), Lenz (1997), Turner (1997), Whicker (1997), and Kelley (2000).
4. Additional discussions of what many regard as the vague nature of tenure standards can be found in Lang (2005), Harman (1991), and Montgomery (2006).
5. Park and Riggs (1993) focus their research on library science departments.
6. This research was approved by the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio.
7. The APSA list may not include some political science departments. The reader should therefore understand that the results from the survey may reflect a bias due to the omission of some departments. Information from APSA, however, has been used in many previous surveys, including those by Euchner and Jewell (1989), Dolan et al. (1997), and Fuerstman and Lavertu (2005).
8. Since the responses were anonymous, it was not possible to compare the characteristics of respondents and non-respondents.
9. Those interested in articles relating to outside letters are encouraged to consult Ripley (1985) and Schlozman (1998). When consulting the figures in the table pertaining to outside letters, it should be noted that the proportions for the number of letters are based on the number of departments requiring letters and not on the overall number of responding departments.

10. A discussion of many of the issues surrounding collegiality can be found in Mawdsley (1999).
11. Discussions of teaching evaluations and peer reviews can be found in Langbein (1994), Algozzine et al. (2004), Kelly-Woessner and Woessner (2006), Yon, Burnap, and Kohut (2002), and Kohut, Burnap, and Yon (2007).
12. The chairs were permitted to use their own definitions for "substantive publications." For discussions of the issues associated with collaborative scholarship, see Fisher et al. (1998) and Facione (2006).
13. The *APSR*, *AJPS*, and *JOP* were specified because they are often treated as the most prestigious general political science journals. See Giles, Mizell, and Patterson (1989), Garand (1990), Fisher et al. (1998, 848), Breuning and Sanders (2007, 347), and Giles and Garand (2007).
14. As was the case earlier, we told the chairs that their tenure evaluators could define the term "prestigious university press."
15. The proportions in the tables may not add up to 100% because some department chairs did not respond to some of the questions.
16. Please note that 32 departments did not respond to this section. Of the non-respondents, 18 institutions did not offer tenure. The remaining non-respondents almost uniformly indicated that they were not answering because the consideration of tenure cases in their departments involved such a complex interaction between teaching, research, and service that it was not possible to state what the expectations were regarding publications. For the reader's information, six of the non-responses from tenure granting institutions came from Ph.D. departments and eight were from MA programs. The proportions in the tables regarding research and publications are based on the total responses from each category of department (247 for BA, 82 for MA, and 64 for Ph.D.).
17. In considering the following profiles, the reader should understand that they refer to categories of departments and do not apply to specific institutions. Those interested in a particular department should consult with the authorities in that department.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Kathryn A. 2002. *What Colleges and Universities Want in New Faculty*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Alex-Assensoh, Yvette M., Terri Givens, Kathie Golden, Vincent L. Hutchings, Sherri L. Wallace, and Kenney J. Whitby. 2005. "Mentoring and African-American Political Scientists." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38 (April): 283-85.
- Algozzine, Bob, John Beattie, Marty Bray, Claudia Flowers, John Gretes, Lisa Howley, Ganesh Mohanty, and Fred Spooner. 2004. "Student Evaluation of College Teaching: A Practice in Search of Principles." *College Teaching* 52: 134-41.
- Anonymous and Anonymous. 1999. "Tenure in a Chilly Climate." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 32 (March): 91-99.
- Breuning, Marijke, and Kathryn Sanders. 2007. "Gender and Journal Authorship in Eight Prestigious Political Science Journals." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40 (April): 347-51.
- Deardorff, Michelle Donaldson, Marianne Githers, Glen Halva-Neubauer, William Hudson, Grant Reher, and Ronald Seyb. 2001. "Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Getting and Keeping a Job at a Private Liberal Arts College, but Your Graduate Advisor Didn't Tell You." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34 (December): 856-57.
- Dolan, Julie, Martha E. Kropf, Karen O'Connor, and Marni Ezra. 1997. "The Future of Our Discipline: The Status of Doctoral Students in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30 (December): 751-56.
- Dresch, Stephen P. 1988. "Tenure and Faculty Quality in Post-Growth Academe." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 21 (1): 68-71.
- Durfee, Mary. 1999. "The Small, Remote, or Odd College: Making the Most Out of Your New Teaching Position." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 32 (March): 109-12.
- Euchner, Jonathan P., and Malcolm E. Jewell. 1989. "A Survey of Teaching by Graduate Students." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 22 (March): 73-76.
- Facione, Peter A. 2006. "Collaborative Scholarship and Tenure." *Liberal Education* 92 (Summer): 38-45.
- Fisher, Bonnie S., Craig T. Cobane, Thomas M. Vandervan, and Francis T. Cullen. 1998. "How Many Authors Does it Take to Publish an Article? Trends and Patterns in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31 (December): 847-56.
- Fuerstman, Daniel, and Stephan Lavertu. 2005. "The Academic Hiring Process: A Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38 (October): 731-36.
- Garand, James C. 1990. "An Alternative Interpretation of Recent Political Science Journal Evaluations." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 23 (September): 448-51.
- Giles, Michael W., and James C. Garand. 2007. "Ranking Political Science Journals: Reputational and Citational Approaches." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40 (October): 741-51.
- Giles, Michael W., Francie Mizell, and David Patterson. 1989. "Political Scientists' Journal Evaluations Revisited." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 22 (September): 613-17.
- Harman, John D. 1991. "High Anxiety: Some Lessons for Graduate Students Entering the Profession." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 24 (September): 535-39.
- Kawar, Amal. 1983. "Criteria for Tenure and Promotion at Public Universities and Colleges in the West." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 16 (3): 541-43.
- Kelley, Michael A. 2000. "Political Science and Post-Tenure Review." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 33 (June): 233-36.
- Kelly-Woessner, April, and Matthew C. Woessner. 2006. "My Professor is a Partisan Hack: How Perceptions of a Professor's Political Views Affect Student Course Evaluations." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 39 (July): 495-501.
- Kohut, Gary F., Charles Burnap, and Maria G. Yon. 2007. "Peer Observation of Teaching: Perceptions of the Observer and the Observed." *College Teaching* 55: 19-25.
- Kolmerton, Carol. 2005. "What Small Colleges Really Want." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 29.
- Lang, James M. 2005. *Life on the Tenure Track: Lessons from the First Year*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Langbein, Laura I. 1994. "The Validity of Student Evaluations of Teaching." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 27 (September): 545-53.
- Lenz, Timothy O. 1997. "The New 'U.'" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30 (March): 11-14.
- Lewis, Lionel S. 1980. "Academic Tenure: Its Recipients and Its Effects." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 448 (March): 86-101.
- Mawdsley, Ralph D. 1999. "Collegiality as a Factor in Tenure Decisions." *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 13: 167-77.
- Meacham, Jack. 2002. "Our Doctoral Programs Are Failing our Undergraduate Students." *Liberal Education* 88 (Summer): 22-27.
- Montgomery, Beronda L. 2006. "Review of 'Life on the Tenure Track: Lessons from the First Year.'" *On the Horizon* 14: 22-24.
- Park, Betsy, and Robert Riggs. 1993. "Tenure and Promotion: A Study of Practices by Institutional Type." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 19 (May): 72-77.
- Perna, Laura W. 2005. "Sex Differences in Faculty Tenure and Promotion: The Contribution of Family Ties." *Research in Higher Education* 46 (May): 277-307.
- Pilant, Denny E., and Brian A. Ellison. 1997. "Two Perspectives on Tenure." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30 (March): 14-17.
- Premeaux, Shane R., and R. Wayne Mondy. 2002. "Tenure's Impact: Male vs. Female Viewpoints." *College Teaching* 50: 154-57.
- Ripley, Randall B. 1985. "Letters of Reference for Faculty Personnel Decisions." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 18 (4): 793-96.
- Rothgeb, John M. Jr., Annemarie Spadafora, and Betsy Burger. 2007. "Faculty Training in Political Science: Results from a Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40 (October): 759-63.
- Schlozman, Kay Lehman. 1998. "External Reviewers in Tenure and Promotion Decisions: How Does the Process Work? How Should It?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31 (September): 623-30.
- Stancato, Frank A. 2000. "Tenure, Academic Freedom, and the Teaching of Critical Thinking." *College Student Journal* 34 (September): 377-82.
- Turner, Stephen. 1997. "Tenure and the Constitution of the University." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30 (March): 17-20.
- Whicker, Marcia Lynn. 1997. "An Economic Perspective of Academic Tenure." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30 (March): 21-25.
- Wihl, Gary. 2006. "Politics, Academic Freedom, and the General Counsel's Office." *Liberal Education* 92 (Spring): 20-25.
- Yon, Maria, Charles Burnap, and Gary Kohut. 2002. "Evidence of Effective Teaching: Perceptions of Peer Reviewers." *College Teaching* 50: 104-10.