

2013

Stopping the tenture clock : university support on scorn?

Margaret Singer Ruebsamen

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [Human Resources Management Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ruebsamen, Margaret Singer, "Stopping the tenture clock : university support on scorn?" (2013). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 1212.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/1212

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

STOPPING THE TENURE CLOCK: UNIVERSITY SUPPORT OR SCORN?

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The School of Human Resource Education
and Workforce Development

by

Margaret “Mimi” Singer Ruebsamen
B.S., Louisiana State University, 1999
M.S., Louisiana State University, 2003
August 2013

©Copyright 2013
Margaret “Mimi” Singer Ruebsamen
All rights reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project could not have been realized without the support of several key individuals. I would like to first acknowledge the faculty on the Louisiana State University Council on Women, Dr. Katrice Albert, Dr. Pamela Monroe, and Dr. Rita Culross, who urged me to conduct research on Stopping the Tenure Clock. Each of these women is brilliant and I was fortunate to be surrounded by such accomplished academicians.

I was privileged to have had an outstanding doctoral committee. I cannot fully express my enormous gratitude to my committee chair, Dr. Michael F. Burnett. His continuous commitment to his students, even while serving in two administrative roles, is incredibly admirable. I feel certain that this project would not have been achieved without the reassurance and direction of Dr. Burnett. He was my mentor, advisor and my cheerleader. I am also grateful to Dr. Charles A. “Chuck” Wilson and Dr. Krisanna Machtmes for serving on my committee and providing guidance. Dr. Wilson brought the perspective of a seasoned academic administrator and gave valuable feedback. I appreciate the advice from Dr. Machtmes in making the document stronger.

I would also like to thank my supervisors of my professional position, Mrs. Marian-Caillier Castille and Dr. A.G. Monaco, for accommodating my class schedule and research. Having the approval and support of these administrators exemplifies the university’s commitment to investing in the development of its employees and valuing advanced degrees.

My amazing family has been so supportive of me throughout my academic career. It was through their encouragement and faith in my abilities that allowed me to pursue the goal of a terminal degree in my field. My mother and role model, Margaret “Peggy” Keefe, inspired me to continue my education through graduate work. She was an educator who earned a Master’s

degree and Specialist degree all while working full-time and raising three children. Although she passed away in 2012, I know she is proud of my efforts to pursue a doctorate and would be ecstatic to see it come to fruition. My sister, Sarah Singer Gagnon, has been an incredible part of my support system as well. A perfect balance of a driven goal-oriented executive and a caring nurturing mother, she has inspired me to work harder and not shy away from any challenge. Robert and Cheryl Singer, my father and step-mother, were my rocks throughout the difficult times that faced me while pursuing this doctorate. I appreciate their patience and daily encouragement.

And finally, I dedicate this dissertation to my two beautiful children, Anna Katherine Ruebsamen and Mason Dean Ruebsamen. Balancing family and work will only become increasingly more challenging as time goes on and I hope that my research will help continue the dialogue of how the workplace can be better prepared and accommodating of these needs. You two are my world and I love you very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT.....	ix
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Rationale	1
Purpose.....	8
Objectives	8
Significance of the Study	10
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	12
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	25
Purpose.....	25
Objectives	25
Population and Sample	26
Instrumentation	27
Data Collection	28
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	30
Objective One Results	31
Objective Two Results.....	36
Objective Three Results.....	48
Objective Four Results.....	61
Objective Five Results	68
Objective Six Results.....	68
Objective Seven Results	72
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY.....	73
Summary of Purpose and Specific Objectives.....	73
Summary of Methodology	74
Summary of Major Findings.....	76
Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations	94
Conclusion One.....	94
Conclusion Two	95
Conclusion Three	96
Conclusion Four.....	97
Conclusion Five	99
Conclusion Six	100
Conclusion Seven.....	101
Conclusion Eight.....	101

REFERENCES	103
APPENDIX A: ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION	109
APPENDIX B: ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY INSTRUMENT	110
APPENDIX C: TENURED FACULTY REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION	122
APPENDIX D: TENURED FACULTY SURVEY INSTRUMENT	123
APPENDIX E: TENURE-TRACK FACULTY REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION	135
APPENDIX F: TENURE-TRACK FACULTY SURVEY INSTRUMENT	136
APPENDIX G: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL TO ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS	148
APPENDIX H: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL TO TENURED FACULTY	150
APPENDIX I: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL TO TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	152
APPENDIX J: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD	154
VITA	155

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Race of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, & Tenure-track Faculty in a Research University (RU/VH) IN THE Southern Region of the United States	32
Table 2	Gender of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, & Tenure-track Faculty in a Research University (VHR) in the Southern Region of the United States	33
Table 3	Age of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, & Tenure-track Faculty in a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	34
Table 4	Marital Status of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty in a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	34
Table 5	Number of Children of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, & Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	35
Table 6	Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock by Academic Administrators at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States.....	37
Table 7	Accuracy of Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure by Academic Administrators at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States.....	38
Table 8	Overall Knowledge Scores Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock Responses by Academic Administrators at a Research University (RU?VH) in the Southern Region of the United States.....	40
Table 9	Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock of Tenured Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	40
Table 10	Accuracy of Tenured Faculty Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States.....	42
Table 11	Overall Knowledge Scores of Tenured Faculty Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	44
Table 12	Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	45

Table 13	Accuracy of Tenure-track Faculty Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States.....	46
Table 14	Overall Knowledge Scores Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock of Tenured Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	47
Table 15	Factor Analysis of Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock.....	49
Table 16	Perceptions of Academic Administrators Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United	51
Table 17	Recoded Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Academic Administrators at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States.....	53
Table 18	Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenured Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	55
Table 19	Recoded Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenured Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	57
Table 20	Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	59
Table 21	Recoded Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	60
Table 22	Comparison of Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	68
Table 23	Relationship Between Selected Demographic Characteristics and Perception Scores of Stopping the Tenure Clock.....	70
Table 24	Multiple Regression Analysis of Perception Scores toward Stopping the Tenure Clock and Selected Demographic Characteristics of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States	71
Table 25	Relationships Between Knowledge Scores and Perception Scores Among Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty	72

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe university Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty at “RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)” universities as designated by the Carnegie Foundation in the southeastern region of the United States based on demographic characteristics, as well as determine the knowledge and the perceptions of the three aforementioned groups regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock. Researcher-designed surveys were used to collect data. There were 49 participants identified as Academic Administrators, defined as employees who have administrative decision making authority over an academic unit at the level of department chair, director, or dean. Additionally, there were 346 Tenured Faculty who participated in the study while 180 Tenure-track Faculty participated. An important finding was that 78.3% of the Tenure-track Faculty participants were not aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process. It was based on this finding that the researcher recommended future research be conducted to determine the preferred and most effective method(s) of communication to the university community. Lack of awareness of Stopping the Tenure Clock may be a result of inadequate publicity of the policy or procedures. Administrators should consider a variety of communication methods such as website postings (on all related stakeholders’ websites), periodic announcements at faculty meetings or orientation, inclusion in applicable policies, employee handbooks, or print publications. Another important finding is that Tenure-track faculty had more positive perceptions than the Tenured Faculty of Stopping the Tenure Clock. This finding was based on the comparison of perception of Stopping the Tenure Clock by employee groups, whereby a significant difference was revealed between two or more groups. The post-hoc analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between the Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty groups. University

administrators should acknowledge the reasons behind any negative perceptions and address them directly by opening up the dialogue and the appropriate medium of how they can be addressed.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Education has long been viewed as the cornerstone of personal and cultural development. Higher education, in particular, has been an environment of advanced learning where established theory and principles are presented to students most commonly through teaching and research. In many formal learning environments, the basic purpose is to instill students with established knowledge and inspire them to seek new knowledge (Shapiro, 2005). Goals of education may include preparing students for citizenship, cultivating a skilled workforce, teaching cultural literacy, helping students to become critical thinkers, and assisting students to compete in a global marketplace (Jones, 2012). Recognized theory and practice provide a foundation for future research and can enhance experiential learning by complimenting personal experience for a holistic perspective (Kolb, 1984). Higher education not only further expands students' body of knowledge of technical information but also enhances communication skills including advanced oral and writing abilities.

Colleges and universities have served an important role for centuries. Whether from a formal bricks-and-mortar institution or online institution, conferred degrees from accredited universities represent a confirmation that graduates have proven a certain standard of learning and understanding in many areas including specialized knowledge; broad, integrative knowledge; intellectual skills; applied learning; and civic learning (Lederman, 2011). The differing levels of degrees offered at universities indicate a varying comprehension and complexity of skills acquired. For example, a Bachelor's degree may represent a basic understanding whereas graduate degrees such as Master's or Doctorates indicate mastery in a specific discipline (Pappano, 2011). Completion of a college degree can not only better prepare

students for a career but most higher education institutions also strive to instill a sense of concern with impact on society in their students, encourage curiosity, and pursue discovery through research (Gray, Ondaatje, and Zakaras, 1999).

The primary purpose of higher education traditionally has been viewed as a mechanism to prepare individuals for either the general workforce or a specific career path (Sagen, Dallam, and Lavery, 2000). Many employers are seeking candidates with certain skillsets and knowledge that may be transferable to the job. A college degree illustrates a certain base knowledge which may reduce the time and expense for the employer to train the new staff member. In addition, a degree signifies an advanced ability to problem solve on the job. Employers may give candidates with degrees more consideration, especially for entry-level professional positions. However, more and more individuals seeking employment have degrees and there has been a gradual shift in employers' expectations for candidates to have at least a Bachelor's degree. A degree was previously viewed as an exceptional qualification that would distinguish an individual from the rest of the applicant pool. For many entry-level professional jobs, employers currently expect candidates to hold at least a Bachelor's degree in order to receive serious consideration (Leonard, 2012).

As higher education has evolved, workforce preparation is only one of many goals for most universities and colleges. Higher education helps to develop more fully functioning members of society by teaching students to apply the theory and skills learned. A degree signifies not only a mastery of technical information, but also an increased capability of critical thinking. Having the ability to reason and problem solve are skills that can be used in the workplace but can also be used in community involvement and everyday interactions (Alwehaibi, 2012). A more educated society leads to a greater understanding of diverse issues

among the populace and increases collaboration for improvements. The United States must continue to educate its citizens in order to compete in the global economy (Sahlberg, 2006).

Most institutions of higher education are measured by a variety of factors including their ability to graduate students, financial resources and spending, research revenue and outcomes, prestige, and student outcomes (Massy, 2009). Freeman and Kochan (2012) state:

In recent years, there has been growing pressure on higher education institutions to demonstrate their value through various accountability measures, with a strong focus upon the assessment of student progress and success (Mazzeo, 2001). In the U.S., this pressure has come from state and federal government (Ewell, 2002; Kochan, & Locke, 2010), accrediting agencies (Lubinescu, Ratcliff & Gaffney, 2001), parents (Huba & Freed, 2001), and the general public (Baker, 2004). (p. 2)

The record of success may influence future stability such as state funding, accreditation, and retention of students.

Colleges and universities normally have established a guiding mission, and have set forth goals to achieve that mission. Some higher education institutions focus more on strictly delivering instruction while others also conduct varying levels of research. The Carnegie Foundation created a widely recognized taxonomy of designations to distinguish between the missions of universities. “The classification provided a way to represent that diversity by grouping roughly comparable institutions into meaningful, analytically manageable categories” (McCormick and Zhao, 2005, p. 52). Those that are designated as “RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)” have rigorous research agendas and most of the faculty of those universities are expected to seek grants and other outside funding to support their research. Securing grants is a common expectation of faculty who are seeking promotion to a higher faculty rank (Shapiro, 2006).

Funding (ex. governmental, external, and private), facilities, reputation, staff, and faculty can all influence the effectiveness of higher education (Altbach, n.d.). These factors contribute

to a university's ability to attract outstanding students. Perhaps the most impactful of these are the teacher-scholars who directly interact with students (Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J.A., Bridges, B.K., & Hayek, J.C. (2006). Many faculty members have conducted their own research and published findings, worked in private or public sectors as practitioners, and/or been teaching courses for years. Their experience, knowledge, background, and diverse perspectives all assist in cultivating discussion in the classroom and the pursuit of knowledge through research.

Although there has been much debate over whether tenure has a place in higher education in this day and age, most research universities still have a form of tenure in place. Tenure is an indefinite contract between an institution of higher education and a faculty member as a result of a thorough university review of his/her past record of accomplishments. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP, n.d.) defines tenure as:

Essential for the protection of academic freedom, faculty tenure is, at its core, a presumption of competence and continuing service that can be overcome only if specified conditions are met. The AAUP recommends that professors should undergo a probationary period (not to exceed seven years), after which individual faculty members should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause or a bona fide financial exigency or department or program discontinuance. (Tenure section, p.48)

Tenure was first enacted to allow academic freedom and to protect faculty from adverse employment actions due to their teaching, research or service in a particular area. The AAUP further states (1940):

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. (p.3)

In order for new knowledge to be created, many feel that faculty must be secure in their positions to explore other viewpoints, regardless if they conflict with others including faculty, administrators, and politicians.

Leading up to the review for tenure, there is most often a tenure-track period in which faculty must build their portfolio. In many institutions of higher education, this period consists of six years including one to two times of possible reappointment (Renner, 1987). Three areas are typically evaluated: research, teaching, and service. In many research universities, emphasis is often placed on research and teaching for important reasons. Research may contribute to the mission of the university by expanding knowledge and pursuing new information. It is instrumental in bringing in research funds to both the University and the state. Teaching is the most common direct transfer of information to the students and plays a vital role in student success and retention. Although service may not play as big of a part when judging a faculty member's record, it still has a place in higher education. Service could be internal or external to the university and widely varies including serving on a university improvement committee to providing a service to the community that involves the faculty member's research specialty (Shapiro, 2006; Louisiana State University, 2009).

Many universities have procedures that require annual reviews of the faculty members by the appropriate administrator. In these reviews, the administrator evaluates the faculty member for accomplishments and contributions, and provides feedback on whether or not he/she is on track to obtain promotion and tenure. There is often an expectation that each year that a faculty member is on the tenure-track timeframe, they are steadily working to the department's standards for tenure and there is evidence of that steady productivity. Some departments set specific goals for research activity and teaching standards. Research standards are often difficult to specifically

quantify due to varying prestige of journals and grants. Publications in refereed journals are usually preferential over non-refereed publications. Tenure is usually awarded only after many review levels and successive approvals, normally beginning with an assessment by the faculty member's colleagues, both external and internal to his/her home institution. The internal faculty will cast a vote as to whether or not they support the case for tenure. The faculty vote is an important part of the process which becomes a part of the record, and the department head normally takes the votes into serious consideration before making his/her decision (Miller, 1987).

The tenure-track period is a finite timeframe in which a faculty member must build a record of accomplishments and demonstrate future capability. During this time, the faculty member is expected to concentrate on building this academic record. Other life events, however, can sometimes inhibit the ability to fully concentrate on his/her academic career. Even the most dedicated academician can be distracted by significant life events. Examples may be care for an elderly parent, natural disaster, adoption of a child, birth of a child, personal illness, and even professional difficulties such as a delay in lab funding (Louisiana State University, 2009).

Over the last fifty years, there has been a shift in the demographics of the workforce. A male-dominated workforce shifted to now almost equal sharing with women (Lerman and Schmidt, n.d.). This increased female presence has led to a societal shift. Whereas the traditional role of women was to be homemakers and care for their families, there has become a more equal sharing of the labor market and home responsibilities with their male counterparts (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2005). In turn, some men are more involved in family matters. Balancing the role of academician with the other personal roles (e.g., daughter, father, caregiver, etc.) can be quite difficult. The responsibilities inherent in these roles tend to spill over onto one

another. As an employer seeking success, institutions of higher education must respond to the challenges facing their faculty in order to recruit and retain outstanding talent (Curtis, 2004).

Many institutions of higher education have responded to this obvious concern with establishing a policy allowing faculty to either request or automatically “stop the tenure clock” (Louisiana State University, 2009). Over the years, the ability to stop the tenure clock has become more prevalent. According to Pribbenow, et al (2010):

Sullivan et al. 2004, in a study of work-family policies for academics, found that 110 of the 255 institutions (43%) they surveyed had a formal, institution-wide policy to allow ‘a Tenure-track Faculty member to have a temporary pause in the tenure clock to accommodate special circumstances.’ (p. 17)

Most of the university policies allow for a tenure-track schedule to be extended by a certain time frame in order to compensate for the time period where the faculty member was not able to build a case toward tenure either in entirety or substantially not at the level in which they normally produce. The faculty member’s tenure review should be without prejudice and should be considered just as any other faculty member being considered for a mandatory review (Bhattacharjee, 2004).

Although offering a stop the tenure clock option is a step toward accommodating these challenges, many faculty are not utilizing the option, often for two main reasons: lack of knowledge about the policy and negative perceptions by others (Frasch, et al, 2009). A common scenario is when a faculty member will have a life-altering situation and acknowledge that they are significantly not at the productivity level they once were. However, they may not know the policy exists to seek out their options. Awareness of the policy typically comes by word of mouth with colleagues or administrators. However, if the colleagues or administrators are themselves not cognizant of the situation or the policy, the faculty member will not be able to take advantage of it. Many institutions do not have a formal training for Academic

Administrators and often knowledge of policies is self-taught or learned through experience (Frasch, Stacy, Mason, Page-Medrick, and Goulden, 2009).

A negative perception among colleagues and administrators can significantly deter utilization of the policy. This negative stigma may lead to not making the faculty member aware of the policy. Even if they are aware, anecdotal feedback from faculty who have stopped their tenure clock is that the voting faculty or administrators often do not support this extension which may color their opinions when making their tenure assessment. Many of the now tenured faculty were not afforded this opportunity when they were going through the tenure-track period and were forced to juggle personal responsibilities with professional obligations without assistance. The feeling may be that there is inequity in that the new tenure-track faculty are offered this policy when others previously were not. It may also be viewed as a lack of dedication to their career in academia (Ward, and Wolf-Wendel, 2004a).

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the knowledge and the perceptions of the Adjustment to Years of Service toward Tenure procedures (i.e. “Stopping the Tenure Clock”) among University Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty at “RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)” universities as designated by the Carnegie Foundation in the southeastern region of the United States.

Objectives

The following objectives were developed to facilitate this study:

1. Objective one is to describe Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty on the following demographic characteristics:
 - a. Race

- b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital status
 - e. Number of children
- 2. Objective two is to describe Academic Administrators', Tenured Faculty members', and Tenure-track Faculty members' knowledge of stopping the tenure clock procedures.
- 3. Objective three is to describe Academic Administrators', Tenured Faculty members', and Tenure-track Faculty members' perceptions toward stopping the tenure clock.
- 4. Objective four is to determine if a relationship exists between perceptions of stopping the tenure clock and selected demographics for Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty:
 - a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital status
 - e. Number of children
- 5. Objective five is to compare perceptions toward stopping the tenure clock among Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty.
- 6. Objective six is to determine if a model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the perceptions from the following demographics:
 - a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age

- d. Marital Status
 - e. Number of Children
7. Objective seven is to determine if relationships exist between knowledge and perceptions among Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty.

Significance of the Study

The proposed study is important and significant in that it will contribute to a limited existing body of knowledge regarding “Stopping the Tenure Clock.” Although the concept has been present in higher education for decades, much of the research focuses on one aspect such as childbirth, mothers’ responsibilities and fathers’ responsibilities. This study will be broader in that it will assess knowledge and perceptions for any faculty member, regardless of gender, of any situation that would substantiate an extension of the tenure-track timetable. It is also geared toward obtaining multiple viewpoints of stakeholders in the process (i.e. Tenure-track Faculty, Tenured Faculty, and Academic Administrators) rather than just one perspective. In addition, this study will identify opportunities for further research.

Having this information will allow higher education leaders to better understand the needs and concerns of these essential human resources. Identifying the knowledge of Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track will allow us to better understand their level of awareness of any policies or procedures. If there is an identified deficiency of knowledge about stop the tenure clock, campus administrators may wish to educate the campus community, perhaps more so in one or more of the categories. Education could come in the form of a formal policy or communications from the chief academic officer through a variety of sources such as faculty orientation, faculty senate meetings, administrator trainings, websites, and email. This study will also describe Academic Administrators’, Tenured Faculty members’, and Tenure-track

Faculty members' perceptions toward stopping the tenure clock. If a correlation exists between negative perceptions and a certain demographic group, additional research may be recommended to further understand the reasons such as conducting interviews or focus groups with the individuals. Being able to address identified concerns will likely result in a better ability to recruit and retain outstanding teachers and scholars.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Colleges and universities have long served a vital role by preparing students to make intellectual contributions to society in a variety of disciplines on a local, state, national, and international level. Most institutions have a mission that includes researching in one or more disciplines, expanding knowledge of others by teaching, and providing service to the field of study and community. Higher education institutions not only provide students with the opportunity to bolster their knowledge base, they also expose students to different perspectives and help develop their ability to analytically reason and problem-solve (O'Banion, 2011). Institutions of higher education, especially research universities, are being pressured to produce graduates that can allow the nation to compete globally (Kirwan, Cantor, Cordova and Broad, (2005).

Although higher education serves many purposes, an important function is that it prepares individuals for either the general workforce or a specific career path (Sagen, Dallam and Lavery, 2000). Hiring organizations are often looking for a combination of related formal education and experience in order for a candidate to be considered qualified to perform the responsibilities of the position, especially for professional careers. Earned degrees also indicate a demonstrated advanced knowledge in core general areas such as Math, English, and Science, with the "major" signifying a greater understanding of a specific area of study. Graduates have proven the ability to problem-solve and the skills to defend their thought process in writing and/or verbally. By hiring candidates who possess these skillsets, employers reduce the costs and time associated with formal or on-the-job training. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, "As a whole, occupations that employ mostly college graduates are expected to gain new jobs faster than occupations that employ workers who have less education. Between 2004

and 2014, pure-college occupations are projected to grow 19 percent overall, faster than the 13-percent average growth projected for all occupations” (Crosby and Moncarz, 2006).

Colleges and universities not only prepare students for the workforce, but they also encourage general curiosity and emphasize the need to explore new ideas. The level of research varies among disciplines and institutions, but many strive to have a vigorous research program whereby faculty, staff, and students engage in scholarship that may result in expanding knowledge or even new intellectual property. The results are typically published or presented in seminars and can impact the everyday life of a broader population (Lei and Chuang, 2009).

Service learning is a growing component of degree programs. Service learning is a structured learning experience that facilitates the acquisition of awareness, knowledge, and skills while promoting a commitment to personal, social, civic, and professional responsibility (Burnett, Long and Horne, 2005). The impact to student learning outcomes is significant in that it can “connect both disciplinary learning and general education with this historic and increasingly salient commitment to public purposes” (Felten and Clayton, 2011, p. 1).

Institutions of higher education are measured in various ways. Success may be considered as the graduation rate, the retention rate, graduate job obtainment, and service-learning outcomes, and/or many other outcomes. Many public institutions have funding allocations that depend on specific measures of success. For example, the state of Louisiana has the LA GRAD (Louisiana Granting Resources and Autonomy for Diplomas) Act which allows institutions increased autonomy based on specific outcomes. The Governor of the State of Louisiana, Bobby Jindal, stated, “The GRAD Act works to answer the call from higher education for increased flexibility and autonomy needed to reform their systems and improve their outcomes for our Louisiana students. This legislation will give institutions the flexibility they

asked for, while also mandating that their autonomy be directly linked to improved outcomes and more of our students graduating with degrees they need for successful careers. Through this legislation, we want to increase graduation rates for students, so they have the skills they need to compete in the 21st century workforce” (Governor Jindal, 2010). Having these autonomies allows higher education to have more control but there are many factors that may contribute or influence these outcomes. Their ability to graduate students, financial resources and spending, research revenue and outcomes, prestige, and student outcomes may all impact higher education success (Massy, 2009).

Faculty members have direct interaction with students and are often a key part of a student’s achievement. The background and expertise of faculty contributes to furthering student learning. It is critical that they are experts in their disciplines, conduct research to develop new knowledge in the field, use the best instructional course design, and cultivate relationships with students to produce the best learning outcomes. These faculty-student relationships are essential to building a supportive learning environment that leads to student’s success (Hong and Shull, 2010). Institutions of higher education are competitively seeking highly qualified faculty to serve in these roles. The stability and policies offered may attract or deter the best candidates. Many academicians desire a tenured position within a university for many reasons including job stability and academic freedom.

Tenure is a common employment status held by senior faculty in universities. It is an indeterminate appointment that is the result of a rigorous performance review. Tenure is a measure to protect the academic freedom of faculty which allows them to speak openly and challenge their students without fear of recourse (AAUP, 2001). Tenured faculty can only be

terminated from the University due to department or program elimination, bona fide financial exigency, or adequate cause (AAUP, 2007).

In order to achieve tenured status, faculty members must first prove their academic ability including scholarly activity and effective teaching. Most universities that are designated “Research University – very high research activity” by the Carnegie Foundation have tenure-track faculty positions holding the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor. Most tenure-track faculty are appointed for a specific probationary period called the “tenure-track”, typically six or seven years, in which they are expected to build a comprehensive body of scholarly work (Clark and Hill, 2010). A mandatory review occurs at the end of this probationary period where a decision to promote and/or tenure is made. Therefore, it is a thoughtful, deliberate process normally with successive approvals. Obtaining tenure is considered a “rite of passage” and reflects a professional standing (Mandleco, 2010).

In order to determine if faculty have met the standards for tenure, the faculty and administration of each unit or discipline establish academic standards. There are three major areas that are commonly assessed: teaching, research and service. Most universities operate under an “up or out” system whereby a faculty member must leave the institution if he/she is not successful in achieving tenure or change to a non-tenure-track position (Bunk, 1997). This practically means that the decision to tenure can either provide job security or unemployment (Greene et al, 2008).

The tenure-track probationary period is a time for faculty members to intensely create a record of academic contribution. The work accomplished during this period is used as a predictor for potential future performance. There are multiple factors that can contribute to a faculty member’s success in the tenure-track. According to Mandleco (2010), among these

factors may include: transparency/equitability/inclusivity of tenure guidelines; individual faculty member's plan of action related to tenure criteria and their own skills/abilities; formal/informal mentoring opportunities; university family friendly policies to better integrate family/work obligations; and job sharing or part time employment options. It is important for an institution to be aware of these factors because one or more may impact the return on investment and the cost of employee turn-over. Retention is a critical issue for several reasons including consistency in teaching and advising to the students, a return on investment of start-up funds, continuation of research, and retention of a diverse faculty.

The rigid time frame of six or seven years also comes with a great deal of flexibility in how and when the work is accomplished. A career in academics is one that offers many benefits but also results in some unintended consequences. The flexibility and autonomy offered in academic life are some of the reasons that attract individuals to the career. According to Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004a):

Within limits, faculty members are free to work when they choose and to work on what they choose. Those limits, however, are important to heed. Indeed, while praising the flexibility of academic life and its helpfulness in raising a family, respondents also noted that such autonomy comes with a significant price: a workload that never ends, never having enough time in the day, the ambiguities of tenure expectations, and the expectations for working a "second shift" at home (p. 243).

There are times where an employee's personal situation must take precedence over work responsibilities and may hinder his or her ability to build a case toward tenure. Although pregnancy and child birth are common reasons, there are many other situations that may impact progress toward tenure for both men and women. The list could never be exhaustive, however other reasons may include: significant elder care or dependent care responsibilities; own disability or chronic illness; injured spouse care; death of a parent, child, or spouse; catastrophic residential property loss; military service; legal concerns; natural disaster that destroys research

materials; unexpected bankruptcy of a publishing company after a book has been formally accepted for publication; and periods of purely administrative duties (Thornton, 2005). Whether personal or professional, both men and women could be faced with a matter that distracts them from their pursuit of tenure.

Tenure has been a long-standing tradition in most universities. When it was first established, faculty members were mainly men who were presumed to be fully committed to their work (Curtis, 2004; Cramer, E. and Boyd, J. 1995). More and more women have joined the workforce and in 2005-2006, women represented 45% of graduating students with doctorates, a growth of 22% over 33 years (Biernat and Wortman, 1991). Males continue to hold the more senior level faculty positions and females mainly occupy the lower level tenure-track positions or non-tenure-track positions (Kirwan et al., 2005). The change in demographics in the workplace impacts the roles of men and women and their responsibilities with home and career.

Many women enter into tenure-track positions in their late 20s or early 30s after completion of a graduate degree and/or post-doctoral training (Clark and Hill, 2010). The average age of a Doctorate of Philosophy recipient is 33 (Patterson, 2008). This has led to a shift in the personal responsibilities of faculty members for both women and men. Women in tenure-track positions are often times attempting to time life events such as pregnancies to match the schedule of academic demands. Career-building and reproductive years can conflict for tenure-track faculty members (Mason and Goulden, 2002). Women continue to shoulder most of the childcare responsibilities and household maintenance (Armenti, 2004b). As a result, they are often disproportionately affected by conflicts and are less likely to be retained and/or promoted (Clark and Hill, 2010; Hollenshead, Sullivan and Smith, 2005).

The evolution of women being present in the workforce has also impacted males in that men now share much of the child-rearing responsibilities since the female is rarely at home to assume this full-time role. Many faculty feel that there is a choice that must be made: either be loyal to the profession or loyal to family (Mandleco, 2010). This results in some faculty even delaying having children or getting married to avoid any bias (Marcus, 2007).

Faculty members' personal obligations surpass only pregnancy and child-rearing. Another situation that is becoming more common is the responsibility to care for elderly family members. This concern will become even greater as our society continues to live longer. The caregiver can experience a loss of approximately \$650,000 to care for an aging family member (Bonawitz and Andel 2009). This may create further pressure to achieve the job security and steady income that tenure could provide.

Similar to most employees in the workforce, faculty are experiencing difficulty finding a balance between their work and personal obligations. According to Curtis (2004), "The success of faculty members in balancing their academic careers with family responsibilities is a matter of more than individual happiness: it is also a matter of addressing structural inequities and attracting the most qualified candidates to the academic profession." Increasingly, employers are developing policies for a healthy balance of work and home (Hollenshead et al, 2005). Policies that support family life, termed "family-friendly policies", enable employers to help address this struggle while ensuring that standards are upheld (Gerten, 2011). According to Smith and Waltman (2006), "the terms "family-friendly," "work-life," "work-family," and "career flexibility" refer to policies and practices that began to emerge in the late 1980's, enabling employees to balance and integrate the demands of the workplace with the demands of personal or family life."

In academe, family-friendly policies can be presented in a variety of ways such as part-time positions, job sharing, work from home, childcare assistance, flexible schedules (ex. teaching at night), mentoring, clear written expectations, and stop the tenure clock policies (Gerten, 2011). Universities are starting to embrace family-friendly policies but change can come slow in academic environments. Colleges and universities tend to be “tradition-bound” (Kirwan, et al., 2005). Although no one policy can alleviate all balance concerns (Greene, et al., 2008), employers that can exhibit a supportive workplace environment is critical to “effectiveness, satisfaction, commitment, and retention” (Perna, 2001, p. 607). In addition, it is important that administrators not only implement policies that meet faculty needs, but create a family-friendly culture (Comer and Stites-Doe, 2006).

Not offering family-friendly policies may lead to outstanding faculty to leave the institution, change to a non-tenure-track position, or leave academe all together. High-performing faculty with great potential are seeking other opportunities that will allow them the flexibility and time to tend to personal needs in addition to an accomplished career. Having these faculty not succeed in tenure-track positions is costly to the employers when considering the monetary and time investment of recruitment, start-up packages, and subsequent development. Curtis (2004) states, “Colleges and universities invest enormous resources to train, hire, and support early-career faculty. By establishing a climate that helps those faculty members succeed, institutions save themselves the costs- both monetary and programmatic- of recruiting new faculty” (n.p.). In addition, potential research and teaching contributions will be lost that could have brought distinguished recognition to the university. In response to these concerns, many universities and colleges are implementing new procedures such as “Stopping the Tenure Clock”, otherwise known as “STC.”

The basis for a Stopping the Tenure Clock policy is to allow a faculty member to have an extension of the probationary period by one or more semesters to compensate for the time spent on tending to the personal situation (Thornton, 2005). The purpose of making these adjustments is normally to allow the faculty member additional time at the end of the probationary period to further build a case toward tenure. Approved adjustments normally redefine the timetable of the tenure clock, and in particular will redefine the year of the mandatory tenure review. The intent behind Stopping the Tenure Clock policies is to “equalize the opportunity that faculty members who experience these productivity shocks have to demonstrate their scholarly capabilities by the time of their tenure decision, when faculty members are evaluated to determine if they are worthy of lifelong employment” (Manchester, Leslie, and Kramer, 2013, p. 3).

According to Thornton (2005), Stanford University was one of the first universities to offer a form of a Stopping the Tenure Clock policy in 1971 when it offered extensions of up to two semesters for women due to birth of a child. In 1974, the American Association of University Professors added its support for the adoption of STC policies. An increase in the interest of these types of policies occurred in 1993 when the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) was passed by the federal government. “FMLA was established to protect those having families and those with significant family responsibilities that could inhibit an employee’s ability to work” (Ward and Wolf-Wendel, 2005, p. 67). Today, most universities offer some form of Stopping the Tenure Clock.

“A survey of approximately 180 four-year college and university economics departments conducted every year since 2000 shows that between 75 and 80 percent of the institutions responding in any given year have either formal or informal STC policies” (Thornton, 2005, p. 84).

A separate study according to Pribbenow, et al., (2010) indicated:

Sullivan et al. (2004), in a study of work-family policies for academics, found that 110 of the 255 institutions (43%) they surveyed had a formal, institution-wide policy to allow ‘a

Tenure-track Faculty member to have a temporary pause in the tenure clock to accommodate special circumstances.’ (p. 17)

Both of these studies indicate a widespread awareness that there is a need for Stopping the Tenure Clock policies. Many universities are more willing to offer these policies because of the low cost to implement them (Ward and Wolf-Wendel, 2004b).

The literature is clear that two factors commonly impact the usage of Stopping the Tenure Clock: (1) knowledge of policy existence and content; and (2) perceptions of others. Many universities have family-friendly policies such as Stop the Tenure Clock, but are poorly advertised and faculty are not aware of them or forget about them (Draznin, 2004). If the policy is not adequately publicized, faculty will not use it for lack of knowledge about it. Or if they become aware of it, they still may not use it for fear that the reason for it is not accepted or encouraged is due to it not being supported. Many are concerned that requesting an extension may be perceived as having a “lesser commitment to career” and fear of reprisal (Armenti, 2004a). According to the AAUP, “The Mapping Project Survey conducted by Professor Robert Drago and colleagues at Penn State University found that work/family problems among faculty arise partly from “bias avoidance” (a term that defines behavior on the part of faculty members that leads them to avoid family commitments they would otherwise make, fail to fulfill family commitments, or spend time on strategies to hide parenthood and care-giving from others at work)” (n.p.). To successfully implement such a policy, there must be a culture change. Faculty members will likely not use it until they see successful examples of others (Curtis, 2004).

Stop the Tenure Clock policies apply to both men and women. If men utilize the policy, women are more likely to request this since it is not seen as female issue only (Marcus, 2007). Fathers are having more conflicts between work and family but have difficulty expressing the challenges in balancing work and family. A qualitative study was conducted in a large public

university in the southwestern U.S. classified as a Doctoral/Research University- Extensive to examine how junior male tenure-track faculty with children negotiated work and family responsibilities through in-depth interviews. The study revealed three themes including (a) tenure and family balance/conflict; (b) coping responses; and (c) attitudes toward policy and work culture. The majority of men want to parent differently than their fathers, and not place work first (Reddick, Rochlen, Grasso, Reilly and Spikes, 2012). However, men typically request extensions due to professional reasons while women's reasons are often related to personal and family reasons (Quinn, 2010).

Challenges with Stop the Tenure Clock policies come with different interpretations by administrators in different departments (Armenti, 2004a). In one university, Stop the Tenure Clock became automatic for having a child since so few used the policy for fear of how it would be perceived (Marcus, 2007). Regardless if it is automatic or voluntary, administrators must be aware of the policy. Promotion and Tenure committees and external evaluators should be provided with guidance on how to evaluate a portfolio of someone who has stopped the tenure clock.

Including this aspect in a campus-wide policy is critical because it conveys the message of the University's commitment to work-life balance for all employees. It also serves as an excellent recruiting tool for the top scholars. In today's market, it is no longer enough for an employer to only provide the basic employment benefits such as health insurance and retirement plans, institutions of higher education must remain competitive by offering creative benefits that balance the home and work responsibilities. Having an option to stop the clock may be of particular interest to those outstanding female scholars that universities want to recruit.

The policy helps to create an environment of inclusion for women and promotes a diverse work place by being sensitive to personal issues.

Unfortunately, there is no “silver bullet” to fully address the struggles that faculty face to balance family and career. There are unintended negative consequences to some of the methods that are being used to help faculty. Stopping the tenure clock is no exception. For example, it can result in a glaring pay inequity. A recent study revealed that faculty who have stopped their tenure clock earned less than their colleagues who did not stop their tenure clock. There appeared to be a “salary penalty” of 3.1 percent and the gap persists for several years, with men suffering a greater salary gap than women (Jaschik, 2012). The very basis of Stopping the Tenure Clock is to allow more time in the probationary tenure-track timeframe, which leads to a delay in promotion that could impact long-term career outcomes (Manchester, et al., 2013). In order for stopping the tenure clock to have the desired impact, these concerns would need to be studied further and addressed directly.

A recent study was conducted at the University of Wisconsin-Madison to identify concerns with the usage of the Stopping the Tenure Clock policy that had been available for over ten years. Through a campus-wide survey of the faculty and interviews with a sample of the female faculty, the study found that “both men and women who used the tenure clock extension policy were equally less satisfied with the tenure process than their counterparts” (Pribbenow et al, 2010, p 17). The results showed that implementing one policy did not solve all the tenure process in that the faculty who utilized the policy still did not feel supported, did not feel that their job fit with tenure criteria, and to receive feedback on their progress towards tenure compared to other faculty. The data of the study also suggested that there was still ignorance

about how to request an extension and for a small minority of cases, some fear about using the policy (Pribbenow et al, 2010).

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the knowledge and the perceptions of the Adjustment to Years of Service toward Tenure procedures (i.e. “Stopping the Tenure Clock”) among University Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty at “RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)” universities as designated by the Carnegie Foundation in the southeastern region of the United States.

Objectives

The following objectives were developed to facilitate this study:

1. Objective one is to describe Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty on the following demographic characteristics:
 - a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital status
 - e. Number of children
2. Objective two is to describe Academic Administrators’, Tenured Faculty members’, and Tenure-track Faculty members’ knowledge of stopping the tenure clock procedures.
3. Objective three is to describe Academic Administrators’, Tenured Faculty members’, and Tenure-track Faculty members’ perceptions toward stopping the tenure clock.
4. Objective four is to determine if a relationship exists between perceptions of stopping the tenure clock and selected demographics for Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty:

- a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital status
 - e. Number of children.
5. Objective five is to compare perceptions by status (Academic Administrator, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty).
6. Objective six is to determine if a model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the perceptions from the following demographics:
- a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital Status
 - e. Number of Children
7. Objective seven is to determine if there is a relationship between knowledge and perceptions in each of the three groups.

Population and Sample

The target population for this study is Academic Administrators, Tenure-track Faculty, and Tenured Faculty at “Research University – very high research activity” universities as designated by the Carnegie Foundation. The sample is defined as these groups within a Research University in the Southeastern Region of the United States during the Fall 2008. The groups were in-tact and not randomly selected. The following definitions were used in identifying the nonprobability samples:

1. Academic Administrators- Employees with administrative decision making authority over an academic unit at the level of department chair, director, or dean as of October 13, 2008 according to University personnel records (n= 73).
2. Tenured Faculty- Employees holding faculty rank who obtained tenure prior to October 13, 2008 according to University personnel records (n= 675).
3. Tenure-track Faculty- Employees who encumber probationary faculty positions that may lead to tenure and who had not achieved tenure as of October 13, 2008 according to University personnel records (n= 327).

Instrumentation

Three online instruments were developed by the researcher and were utilized to collect data, one for each survey group (see Appendix B, Appendix D and Appendix F). Each were administered through a well-known secure survey website, www.zoomerang.com. The individuals were identified by name and title within the sample lists for the purposes of verifying appropriate classifications. However, the responses collected through the website were anonymous unless the respondent elected to self-identify in order to be contacted for further follow-up questions.

Each survey began by defining “adjustment to service toward tenure.” The introduction stated, “For the purposes of this study, adjustment to service toward tenure (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) is defined as extending the tenure-track period due to a faculty member’s personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure.” The surveys also indicated that there would be an opportunity at the end of the survey to provide any comments.

Each of the instruments was customized for one of the three specific targeted audiences. Both the Academic Administrator and Tenured Faculty instruments included 41 items (39 closed-ended and two open-ended questions) and the Tenure-track Faculty consisted of 43 items (41 closed-ended and two open-ended questions). The content of the questions concentrated on four distinct areas: experience, knowledge, perceptions, and demographic information. Closed-ended questions were structured mostly as either True/False responses or Likert-type scale options. The demographic data collected included Race (mirroring the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's nominal categories), Gender, Age (ordinal categories), marital status, and number of children.

Content validity was established by having a panel of experts review the instruments. Five experienced researchers holding Full Professor status carefully reviewed the assessments prior to implementation. The panel of experts had either previously served or currently serve in administrative positions at various levels within the University.

Data Collection

An introductory email was emailed to each subject to request participation. Each category received a different email (Appendix A, Appendix C, and Appendix E). All versions were addressed from the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost who stressed the importance of the survey and encouraged participation. The request provided the following information: purpose of the study; voluntary and anonymous participation; approximate time to complete survey; online survey link; deadline to respond; hardcopy option; and contact information for any questions.

The survey accepted responses for a two week period and follow-up emails were sent as reminders approximately one week before the closing date (Appendix G, Appendix H, and

Appendix I). The survey closed at midnight on the deadline date and no further data was collected past that time. The researcher has completed the “Human Subjects Training” with the National Institute of Health. The Institutional Review Board approval was sought and received.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the knowledge and the perceptions of the Adjustment to Years of Service toward Tenure procedures (i.e. “Stopping the Tenure Clock”) among University Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty at “RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)” universities as designated by the Carnegie Foundation in the southeastern region of the United States.

The following objectives were developed to facilitate this study:

1. Objective one was to describe Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty on the following demographic characteristics:
 - a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital status
 - e. Number of children
2. Objective two was to describe Academic Administrators’, Tenured Faculty members’, and Tenure-track Faculty members’ knowledge of Stopping the Tenure Clock procedures.
3. Objective three was to describe Academic Administrators’, Tenured Faculty members’, and Tenure-track Faculty members’ perceptions toward Stopping the Tenure Clock.
4. Objective four was to determine if a relationship exists between perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and selected demographics for Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty:
 - a. Race

- b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital status
 - e. Number of children
5. Objective five was to compare perceptions by status (Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty).
6. Objective six was to determine if a model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the perceptions from the following demographics:
- a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital Status
 - e. Number of Children
7. Objective seven was to determine if there is a relationship between knowledge and perceptions in each of the three groups.

Objective One Results

The first objective of this study was to describe Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty on the following demographic characteristics:

- a. Race
- b. Gender
- c. Age
- d. Marital status
- e. Number of children

There were 49 participants identified as Academic Administrators, defined as employees who have administrative decision making authority over an academic unit at the level of department chair, director, or dean. Additionally, there were 346 Tenured Faculty who participated in the study while 180 Tenure-track Faculty participated.

Race

The first variable on which the individuals were described was Race. The Race options mirrored the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission categories: White (not of Hispanic origin); Hispanic; Asian or Pacific Islander; American Indian or Alaskan Native; and Black (not of Hispanic origin). Of the 48 Academic Administrators who responded to this item, the majority were White ($\underline{n}=43$, 89.5%) and none of the participants indicated Black as their race. Similarly, Tenured Faculty participants (85%) and Tenure-track Faculty participants (74.6%) were also mostly White (see Table 1).

Table 1 Race of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, & Tenure-track Faculty in a Research University (RU/VH) IN THE Southern Region of the United States

Race		Academic Administrators	Tenured Faculty	Tenure-track Faculty	Total N
		n %	n %	n %	%
White (not of Hispanic origin)	\underline{n} %	43 89.5	283 85.0	129 74.6	455 82.1
Hispanic	\underline{n} %	2 4.2	7 2.1	7 4.0	16 2.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	\underline{n} %	2 4.2	30 9.0	32 18.5	64 11.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	\underline{n} %	1 2.1	5 1.5	0 0	6 1.1
Black (not of Hispanic origin)	\underline{n} %	0 0	8 2.4	5 2.9	13 2.3
Total	\underline{n} %	48 ^a 100	333 ^b 100	173 ^c 100	554 100

^a1 study participant did not respond to this item.

^b13 study participants did not respond to this item.

^c7 study participants did not respond to this item.

Gender

The second variable on which the groups were described was Gender. Of the 49 Academic Administrator respondents, 11 (22.4%) were identified as Female and 38 (77.6%) were identified as Male. Of the Tenured Faculty participants, 244 indicated that they were male (72.4%) and 93 were female (27.6%). Slightly more than half ($\underline{n} = 99$, 55.6%) of the Tenure-track Faculty participants indicated that they were Male (see Table 2).

Table 2 Gender of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, & Tenure-track Faculty in a Research University (VHR) in the Southern Region of the United States

Gender		Academic Administrators	Tenured Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty	Total
		\underline{n} %	\underline{n} %	\underline{n} %	\underline{n} %
Male	\underline{n} %	38 77.6	244 72.4	99 55.6	381
Female	\underline{n} %	11 22.4	93 27.6	79 44.4	183
Total	\underline{n} %	49 100	337 ^a 100	178 ^b 100	564 100

^a9 study participants did not respond to this item.

^b2 study participants did not respond to this item.

Age

Age was another variable on which Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty were described. There were six response options: 18-25; 26-35; 36-45; 46-55; 56-65; or 66 or older. The largest group of Academic Administrator respondents was the 56-65 age group with 23 individuals (47.9%) while no respondents were under the age 36. Tenured Faculty participants were mostly between the ages of 46-65 (67.7%) whereas the majority of Tenure-track Faculty (85%) were between the ages of 26-45 (see Table 3).

Marital Status

Another variable on which the groups were described was Marital Status. There were two options: "Married" and "Not Married."

Table 3 Age of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, & Tenure-track Faculty in a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Age Category		Academic Administrators	Tenured Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty	Total
		n %	n %	n %	n %
18-25	<u>n</u> %	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
26-35	<u>n</u> %	0 0	3 0.9	82 45.6	85 15.0
36-45	<u>n</u> %	5 10.4	79 23.4	71 39.4	155 27.4
46-55	<u>n</u> %	14 29.2	127 37.7	16 8.9	157 27.8
56-65	<u>n</u> %	23 47.9	101 30.0	11 6.1	135 24.0
66 or older	<u>n</u> %	6 12.5	27 8.0	0 0	33 5.8
Total	<u>n</u> %	48 ^a 100	337 ^b 100	180 100	565 100

^a1 study participant did not respond to this item.

^b9 study participants did not respond to this item.

Of the 49 Academic Administrator respondents, 45 (93.8%) reported that they were married (one study participant did not answer this item). Of the Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty participants, the majority also indicated they were married (tenured- 77.4%, tenure-track- 72.2%) (See Table 4).

Table 4 Marital Status of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty in a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Marital Status		Academic Administrators	Tenured Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty	Total
		n %	n %	n %	n %
Married	<u>n</u> %	45 93.8	261 77.4	130 72.2	436 77.2
Not Married	<u>n</u> %	3 6.3	76 22.6	50 27.8	129 22.8
Total	<u>n</u> %	48 ^a 100	337 ^b 100	180 100	565 100

^a1 study participants did not respond to this item.

^b9 study participants did not respond to this item.

Number of Children

Number of Children was also a variable that was used to describe the three groups. There were six options: 0; 1; 2; 3; 4; or 5 or more. The majority (68.8%) of academic administrator respondents reported having one or two children. Only 6.3% ($\underline{n} = 3$) of academic administrator participants indicated that they had four or more children. Of the Tenured Faculty participants, 130 (38.8%) indicated that they had two children while 96 (28.7%) did not have any children. Of the Tenure-track Faculty participants, 47.5% ($\underline{n} = 85$) indicated that they did not have any children and 45.2% ($\underline{n} = 81$) reported having either one or two children (see Table 5).

Table 5 Number of Children of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, & Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Number of Children		Academic Administrators	Tenured Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty	Total
		\underline{n} %	\underline{n} %	\underline{n} %	\underline{n} %
0	\underline{n} %	7 14.6	96 28.7	85 47.5	188 33.5
1	\underline{n} %	13 27.1	44 13.1	48 26.8	105 18.7
2	\underline{n} %	20 41.7	130 38.8	33 18.4	183 32.6
3	\underline{n} %	5 10.4	50 14.9	12 6.7	67 11.9
4	\underline{n} %	2 4.2	12 3.6	0 0	14 2.5
5 or more	\underline{n} %	1 2.1	3 0.9	1 0.6	5 0.8
Total	\underline{n} %	48 ^a 100	335 ^b 100	179 ^c 100	562 100

^a1 study participant did not respond to this item.

^b11 study participants did not respond to this item.

^c1 study participant did not respond to this item.

Objective Two Results

Objective two was to describe Academic Administrators', Tenured Faculty members', and Tenure-track Faculty members' knowledge of Stopping the Tenure Clock procedures.

Academic Administrator Stopping the Tenure Clock Knowledge

In an attempt to gain a valid measure of the knowledge regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock, Academic Administrators were first asked, "Are you aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process (adjustment of service toward tenure)...?" The response options to this particular item were either "Yes" or "No." Of those Academic Administrators who responded, 35 (71.4%) said "Yes" and 14 (28.6%) indicated "No." The 35 who said "Yes" were asked to respond to a series of items designed to measure their level of knowledge of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process. The response options for these items were either "True" or "False." These 10 items and the responses of the Academic Administrators are listed in Table 6.

All of the participants ($n = 35$, 100%) responded "True" to the item, "Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet." Only three participants (8.6%) responded "True" to two items: "If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically;" and "A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock" (See Table 6).

To further examine the data, each item was coded such that a correct response received a value of "1" and an incorrect response was coded as "0." Correctness was determined by the researcher comparing the item with University policies and procedures and validated by a panel of experts.

Table 6 Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock by Academic Administrators at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	True		False		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet.	35	100	0	0	35	100
Retroactive requests to stop the tenure clock are discouraged.	32	91.4	3	8.6	35	100
The LSU System President or his/her designee is the final approval authority for Stopping the Tenure Clock.	25	71.4	10	28.6	35	100
A faculty member may stop the tenure clock more than once within the tenure-track period.	22	62.9	13	37.1	35	100
One year is the maximum period to stop the tenure clock.	15	42.9	20	57.1	35	100
Once a faculty member has a request to stop the tenure clock approved, he/she cannot be reviewed earlier than the redefined mandatory review year.	10	28.6	25	71.4	35	100
If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped. ^a	8	22.9	27	77.1	35	100
The tenure clock can only stop due to an FMLA qualifying event. ^a	5	14.3	30	85.7	35	100
If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically.	3	8.6	32	91.4	35	100
A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.	3	8.6	32	91.4	35	100

^aFMLA qualifying event was defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

The number of correct and incorrect responses of Academic Administrators to each item is listed in Table 7.

All of the Academic Administrator participants correctly answered that the statement, “Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet” was true. However, 91.4 percent ($\underline{n} = 32$) of the Academic Administrator participants incorrectly responded “False” to the item, “A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.”

Table 7 Accuracy of Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure by Academic Administrators at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	Correct		Incorrect		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet. (Correct = True)	35	100	0	0	35	100
A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock. (Correct = False)	32	91.4	3	8.6	35	100
Retroactive requests to stop the tenure clock are discouraged. (Correct = True)	32	91.4	3	8.6	35	100
The tenure clock can only stop due to an FMLA qualifying event. ^a (Correct = False)	30	85.7	5	14.3	35	100
If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped. ^a (Correct = False)	27	77.1	8	22.9	35	100

(Table 7 Continued)

Item	Correct		Incorrect		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Once a faculty member has a request to stop the tenure clock approved, he/she cannot be reviewed earlier than the redefined mandatory review year. (Correct = False)	25	71.4	10	28.6	35	100
The LSU System President or his/her designee is the final approval authority for Stopping the Tenure Clock. (Correct = True)	25	71.4	10	28.6	35	100
A faculty member may stop the tenure clock more than once within the tenure-track period. (Correct = True)	22	62.9	13	37.1	35	100
One year is the maximum period to stop the tenure clock. (Correct = False)	20	57.1	15	42.9	35	100
If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically. (Correct = True)	3	8.6	32	91.4	35	100

^aFMLA qualifying event was defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

These items were then summed to produce a knowledge score with a possible range of 0 (no items correct) to 10 (all items correct). The Academic Administrator participants' knowledge scores are listed in Table 8. The scores ranged from a minimum of 4 to a maximum of 9 with a mean score of 7.17 (SD = 1.38).

Tenured Faculty Stopping the Tenure Clock Knowledge

The Tenured Faculty were also asked the question, "Are you aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process (adjustment of service toward tenure)...?" The response options to this particular item were either "Yes" or "No."

Table 8 Overall Knowledge Scores Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock Responses by Academic Administrators at a Research University (RU?VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Knowledge Score	Frequency	Percent
9	7	20
8	9	25.7
7	7	20
6	8	22.8
5	3	8.6
4	1	2.9
Total	35	100

Note. Mean knowledge score = 7.17, SD = 1.38

Of the 346 participants, 152 (43.9%) answered “Yes.” These 152 participants were then asked to respond to a series of items designed to measure their level of knowledge of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process. The response options for these items were either “True” or “False.” These 10 items and the responses of the Tenured Faculty are listed in Table 9.

Table 9 Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock of Tenured Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	True		False		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet.	147	96.7	5	3.3	152	100
Retroactive requests to stop the tenure clock are discouraged.	133	87.5	19	12.5	152	100
The LSU System President or his/her designee is the final approval authority for Stopping the Tenure Clock.	121	79.6	31	20.4	152	100
A faculty member may stop the tenure clock more than once within the tenure-track period.	92	60.5	60	39.5	152	100
One year is the maximum period to stop the tenure clock.	76	50	76	50	152	100

(Table 9 Continued)

Item	True		False		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Once a faculty member has a request to stop the tenure clock approved, he/she cannot be reviewed earlier than the redefined mandatory review year.	47	30.9	105	69.1	152	100
The tenure clock can only stop due to an FMLA qualifying event. ^a	44	28.9	108	71.1	152	100
If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped. ^a	42	27.6	110	72.4	152	100
If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically.	20	13.2	132	86.8	152	100
A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.	12	7.9	140	92.1	152	100

^aFMLA qualifying event was defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

All of the Tenured Faculty participants responded "True" to the item, "Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet." Only 12 (7.9%) participants responded "True" to the item, "A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock."

To further examine the data, each item was coded such that a correct response received a value of "1" and an incorrect response was coded as "0." Correctness was determined by the researcher comparing the item with University policies and procedures and was validated by a panel of experts. For the Tenured Faculty, the numbers of correct and incorrect responses to each item are listed in Table 10.

Most of the Tenured Faculty members responded correctly (n = 147, 96.7%) to “Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet” by indicating “True.” The least amount of correct responses (n = 20, 13.2%) was to the item, “If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically.”

These items from Table 10 were then summed to produce a knowledge score with a possible range of 0 (no items correct) to 10 (all items correct).

Table 10 Accuracy of Tenured Faculty Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	Correct		Incorrect		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet. (Correct = True)	147	96.7	5	3.3	152	100
A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock. (Correct = False)	140	92.1	12	8.6	152	100
Retroactive requests to stop the tenure clock are discouraged. (Correct = True)	133	87.5	19	12.5	152	100
The LSU System President or his/her designee is the final approval authority for Stopping the Tenure Clock. (Correct = True)	121	79.6	31	20.4	152	100
If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped. ^a (Correct = False)	110	72.4	42	27.6	152	100
The tenure clock can only stop due to an FMLA qualifying event. ^a (Correct = False)	108	71.1	44	28.9	152	100

(Table 10 Continued)

Item	Correct		Incorrect		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Once a faculty member has a request to stop the tenure clock approved, he/she cannot be reviewed earlier than the redefined mandatory review year. (Correct = False)	105	69.1	47	30.9	152	100
A faculty member may stop the tenure clock more than once within the tenure-track period. (Correct = True)	92	60.5	60	39.5	152	100
One year is the maximum period to stop the tenure clock. (Correct = False)	76	50	76	50	152	100
If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically. (Correct = True)	20	13.2	132	86.8	152	100

^aFMLA qualifying event was defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

The Tenured Faculty's knowledge scores are listed in Table 11. The scores ranged from a minimum of 3 to a maximum of 10 (highest possible score), with a mean score of 6.92 (SD = 1.46).

Tenure-track Faculty Stopping the Tenure Clock Knowledge

Like the Academic Administrators and the Tenured Faculty, the Tenure-track Faculty were asked initially, "Are you aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process (adjustment of service toward tenure) at LSU?" The response options to this particular item were either "Yes" or "No." Of the Tenure-track Faculty participants, 141 responded "No." The 39 participants (21.7%) that were aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process were asked to respond to a series of items designed to measure their level of knowledge of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process.

Table 11 Overall Knowledge Scores of Tenured Faculty Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Knowledge Score	Frequency	Percent
10	1	0.7
9	23	15.1
8	31	20.4
7	41	27.0
6	32	21.1
5	14	9.2
4	8	5.3
3	2	1.3
Total	152	100

Note. Mean score = 6.92, SD = 1.46

The response options were either “True” or “False” and the frequency and percent of responses are listed in Table 12.

Almost all ($n = 38$, 97.4%) of the participants responded “True” to the item, “Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet.” Four participants (10.3%) responded “True” to each of the following two items: “If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped;” and “A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock” (See Table 12).

Again, each item was coded such that a correct response received a value of “1” and an incorrect response was coded as “0.” Correctness was determined by the researcher comparing the item with University policies and procedures and was validated by a panel of experts.

Table 12 Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	True		False		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet.	38	97.4	1	2.6	39	100
Retroactive requests to stop the tenure clock are discouraged.	34	87.2	5	12.8	39	100
The LSU System President or his/her designee is the final approval authority for Stopping the Tenure Clock.	29	74.4	10	25.6	39	100
A faculty member may stop the tenure clock more than once within the tenure-track period.	27	69.2	12	30.8	39	100
One year is the maximum period to stop the tenure clock.	16	41	23	59	39	100
Once a faculty member has a request to stop the tenure clock approved, he/she cannot be reviewed earlier than the redefined mandatory review year.	15	38.5	24	61.5	39	100
The tenure clock can only stop due to an FMLA qualifying event. ^a	13	33.3	26	66.7	39	100
If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically.	6	15.4	33	84.6	39	100
If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped. ^a	4	10.3	35	89.7	39	100
A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.	4	10.3	35	89.7	39	100

^aFMLA qualifying event was defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

Again, each item was coded such that a correct response received a value of “1” and an incorrect response was coded as “0.” Correctness was determined by the researcher comparing the item with University policies and procedures and was validated by a panel of experts. For the Tenure-track Faculty, the numbers of correct and incorrect responses to each item are listed in Table 13.

Like the other groups surveyed, most of the Tenure-track Faculty responded correctly to “Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet” by indicating “True.” The least amount of correct responses was to the item, “If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically” (See Table 13).

Table 13 Accuracy of Tenure-track Faculty Responses to the Knowledge Items Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	Correct		Incorrect		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet. (Correct = True)	38	97.4	1	2.6	39	100
A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock. (Correct = False)	35	89.7	4	10.3	39	100
If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped. ^a (Correct = False)	35	89.7	4	10.3	39	100
Retroactive requests to stop the tenure clock are discouraged. (Correct = True)	34	87.2	5	12.8	39	100
The LSU System President or his/her designee is the final approval authority for Stopping the Tenure Clock. (Correct = True)	29	74.4	10	25.6	39	100

(Table 13 Continued)

Item	Correct		Incorrect		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
A faculty member may stop the tenure clock more than once within the tenure-track period. (Correct = True)	27	69.2	12	30.8	39	100
The tenure clock can only stop due to an FMLA qualifying event. ^a (Correct = False)	26	66.7	13	33.3	39	100
Once a faculty member has a request to stop the tenure clock approved, he/she cannot be reviewed earlier than the redefined mandatory review year. (Correct = False)	24	61.5	15	38.5	39	100
One year is the maximum period to stop the tenure clock. (Correct = False)	23	59	16	41	39	100
If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically. (Correct = True)	6	15.4	33	84.6	39	100

^aFMLA qualifying event was defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

These items from Table 13 were then summed to produce a knowledge score with a possible range of 0 (no items correct) to 10 (all items correct). The Tenured Faculty's knowledge scores are listed in Table 14. The scores ranged from a minimum of 3 to a maximum of 9, with a mean score of 7.10 (SD = 1.35).

Table 14 Overall Knowledge Scores Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock of Tenured Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Knowledge Score	Frequency	Percent
9	4	10.3
8	16	41
7	5	12.8
6	10	25.6
5	3	7.7

(Table 14 Continued)

Knowledge Score	Frequency	Percent
4	1	2.6
Total	39	100

Note. Mean score = 7.10, SD = 1.35

Objective Three Results

Objective three was to describe Academic Administrators', Tenured Faculty members', and Tenure-track Faculty members' perceptions toward Stopping the Tenure Clock.

All participants, regardless of whether or not they were aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process, were asked to respond to 12 items regarding their perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock. The Likert-type scale response options ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The interpretive categories established by the researcher were: 1-1.5, Strongly Disagree; 1.51-2.5, Disagree; 2.51-3.49, Neutral; 3.50-4.49, Agree; and 4.5-5.0, Strongly Agree.

To further examine the perceptions regarding the Stopping the Tenure Clock process, a factor analysis was conducted with the responses provided by the participants in the study. The first step in conducting the factor analysis was to examine the MSA's both for the individual items and the overall scale. When the individual item MSA's were examined, one item, "Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some of the faculty in my department" failed to meet the established criterion of .50 for its inclusion in the factor analysis (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson and Tatham, 2006). Therefore, this item was omitted from the subsequent factor analysis. Additionally, the researcher examined the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. Each of these measures verified that the remainder of the scale data was appropriate and adequate for conducting the factor analysis.

The procedure utilized was a principal components analysis with a varimax rotation. The next step was to determine the number of factor(s) to be extracted. Using a combination of the latent root criterion, the scree plot technique, and the percentage of variance explained, the optimum number of factors was determined to be two factors plus or minus one factor. Each of these factors was then computed and examined for the following three criteria: 1) loadings for each item meeting the minimum acceptable loading criteria of 0.30 for exploratory research (Hair et al, 2006); 2) inefficient factors; and 3) significant cross-loadings of the data. When these criteria were applied to the data, the optimum number of factors to be extracted was determined to be one. However, one of the 11 items included in the scale did not load into this factor solution. With this condition, the researcher re-examined the two factor solution; however this item remained alone as an inefficient factor with the two factor solution (see Table 15). Therefore, the most appropriate approach to the calculation of a perception score was to compute a single scale score with this item eliminated from the computation.

Table 15 Factor Analysis of Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock

Item	Factor Loading
Stopping the tenure clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process. ^a	0.81
Stopping the tenure clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.	0.77
Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive stopping the tenure clock policy.	0.76
Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.	0.76
There is rarely adequate justification for a Tenure-track Faculty member to stop the tenure clock. ^a	0.74
Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	0.73

(Table 15 Continued)

Item	Factor Loading
Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not. ^a	0.65
Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.	0.53
Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	0.47
Stopping the tenure clock option is intended for female faculty only. ^a	0.33
Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of stopping the tenure clock.	0.27

^aA “Strongly Disagree” response to this item was a positive response to Stopping the Tenure Clock. The item was recoded accordingly.

^bDid not meet the criteria for inclusion in the factor

Academic Administrators

The mean and standard deviation of the responses of the Academic Administrators to each of the items are listed in Table 16. The means of the item scores ranged from 1.61 to 4.20. The highest level of agreement was to the item, “Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy” with a mean score of 4.20 (SD = 1.00). The lowest level of agreement was to the item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” with a mean score of 1.61 (SD = 0.91). Overall, there were five items interpreted as “Agree,” three interpreted as “Neutral,” and four as “Disagree” (See Table 16).

In addition to reporting the individual means for the responses to the items designed to measure the perceptions of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process, the researcher computed an overall scale score based on the results of the previously reported factor analysis. However,

some of the items in the scale were reverse worded such that an “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” response to the items listed in Table 16 represented a negative perception toward Stopping the

Table 16 Perceptions of Academic Administrators Regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category ^a
Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy.	4.20	1.00	A
Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.92	0.84	A
Stopping the Tenure Clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.	3.78	0.92	A
Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.	3.59	1.02	A
Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of Stopping the Tenure Clock.	3.55	0.87	A
Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.39	1.00	N
Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some faculty in my department.	3.16	0.97	N
Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	2.63	1.06	N
Stopping the Tenure Clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process.	2.12	0.86	D

(Table 16 Continued)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category ^a
There is rarely adequate justification for a Tenure-track Faculty member to stop the tenure clock.	2.04	1.02	D
Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not.	1.84	0.77	D
Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only.	1.61	0.91	D

Note. The response scale for these items was: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Neutral (3); Agree (4); Strongly Agree (5)

^aInterpretive Categories are coded: 1-1.5, Strongly Disagree; 1.51-2.5, Disagree; 2.51-3.49, Neutral; 3.50-4.49, Agree; and 4.5-5.0, Strongly Agree.

Tenure Clock, and for some of the items a “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” response represented a positive response. Five of the twelve items were worded in this manner.

Therefore, for these five items the coding was reversed by the researcher such that a more positive response consistently received a higher rating (value = 5) and a more negative response consistently received a lower rating (value = 1). In Table 17, all 12 of the items are listed in descending order of the degree to which the responses are positive regarding the Stopping the Tenure Clock process. The mean responses ranged from 2.63 to 4.39 and the item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” had the most positive response among Academic Administrators. The researcher established an Interpretive scale which included the following categories: 1-1.5, Highly Negative (HN); 1.51-2.5, Negative (N); 2.51-3.49, Neither Positive or Negative (HPN); 3.50-4.49, Positive (P); and 4.5-5.0, Highly Positive (HP). Of the responses, nine were categorized as “Positive” and three items were “Neither Positive nor Negative” (see Table 17). The overall mean of the Perception Scores of Academic Administrators was 3.69 (SD= 0.56).

Table 17 Recoded Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Academic Administrators at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category ^a
Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only. ^b	4.39	0.91	P
Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy.	4.20	1.00	P
Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not. ^b	4.16	0.77	P
There is rarely adequate justification for a Tenure-track Faculty member to stop the tenure clock. ^b	3.96	1.02	P
Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.92	0.84	P
Stopping the Tenure Clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process. ^b	3.88	0.86	P
Stopping the Tenure Clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.	3.78	0.92	P
Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.	3.59	1.02	P
Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of Stopping the Tenure Clock.	3.55	0.87	P
Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.39	1.00	NPN

(Table 17 Continued)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category ^a
Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some faculty in my department. ^b	2.84	0.96	NPN
Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	2.63	1.06	NPN

Note. Perception Score Mean = 3.69, SD = 0.56

Note. The response scale for these items was: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Neutral (3); Agree (4); Strongly Disagree (5)

^aInterpretive Categories are coded: 1-1.5, Highly Negative (HN); 1.51-2.5, Negative (N); 2.51-3.49, Neither Positive or Negative (HPN); 3.50-4.49, Positive (P); and 4.5-5.0, Highly Positive (HP).

^bA “Strongly Disagree” response to this item was a positive response to Stopping the Tenure Clock. The item was recoded accordingly.

An overall scale score was computed which included ten of the items in the scale. One item was excluded based on the individual item MSA and one of the items did not meet the minimum loading criterion of .30 for inclusion in the factor. When this overall perception score was computed, the values ranged from 1.10 to 5.00 with an overall mean of 3.72 (SD = .70).

Tenured Faculty

The mean and standard deviation of the responses of the Tenured Faculty to these items are listed in Table 18. The range of mean scores was 1.66 to 3.98. The highest level of agreement was to the item, “Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy” with a mean score of 3.98. The lowest level of agreement was to the item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” with a mean score of 1.66. Overall, there were four items interpreted as “Agree,” four interpreted as “Neutral,” and four as “Disagree” (See Table 18).

Table 18 Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenured Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category ^a
Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy.	3.98	1.14	A
Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.88	1.02	A
Stopping the Tenure Clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.	3.69	1.11	A
Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.	3.65	1.01	A
Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some faculty in my department.	3.37	0.97	N
Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.14	1.06	N
Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of Stopping the Tenure Clock.	3.12	0.83	N
Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	2.98	1.26	N
Stopping the Tenure Clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process.	2.43	1.11	D
There is rarely adequate justification for a Tenure-track Faculty member to stop the tenure clock.	2.38	1.23	D

(Table 18 Continued)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category ^a
Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not.	2.21	1.00	D
Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only.	1.66	0.87	D

^aNote. The response scale for these items was: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Neutral (3); Agree (4); Strongly Agree (5)

^aInterpretive Categories are coded: 1-1.5, Strongly Disagree; 1.51-2.5, Disagree; 2.51-3.49, Neutral; 3.50-4.49, Agree; and 4.5-5.0, Strongly Agree.

Some of the items in the scale were reverse worded such that an “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” response to the items listed in Table 18 could represent a negative perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock, depending on the item. Five of the twelve items were worded in this manner. Therefore, for the five items the coding was reversed by the researcher to reflect a “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” response as a positive perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock. The items are listed in the order of descending positive perception. The responses ranged from 2.63 to 4.34. The item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” had the most positive response among Tenured Faculty. The researcher identified the Interpretive Categories as: 1-1.5, Highly Negative (HN); 1.51-2.5, Negative (N); 2.51-3.49, Neither Positive or Negative (HPN); 3.50-4.49, Positive (P); and 4.5-5.0, Highly Positive (HP). Of the responses, eight were categorized as “Positive” and four items were “Neither Positive or Negative” (see Table 19). The overall mean of the Perception Score of Tenured Faculty was 3.53 (SD = 0.65).

Table 19 Recoded Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenured Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category
Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only. ^b	4.34	0.87	P
Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy.	3.98	1.14	P
Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.88	1.02	P
Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not. ^b	3.79	1.00	P
Stopping the Tenure Clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.	3.69	1.11	P
Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.	3.65	1.01	P
There is rarely adequate justification for a Tenure-track Faculty member to stop the tenure clock. ^b	3.62	1.23	P
Stopping the Tenure Clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process. ^b	3.57	1.11	P
Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.14	1.06	NPN
Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of Stopping the Tenure Clock.	3.12	0.83	NPN
Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	2.98	1.26	NPN
Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some faculty in my department. ^b	2.63	0.97	NPN

Note. Perception Score Mean = 3.53 (SD = 0.65)

Note. The response scale for these items was: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Neutral (3); Agree (4); Strongly Disagree (5)

(Table 19 Continued)

^aInterpretive Categories are coded: 1-1.5, Highly Negative (HN); 1.51-2.5, Negative (N); 2.51-3.49, Neither Positive or Negative (HPN); 3.50-4.49, Positive (P); and 4.5-5.0, Highly Positive (HP).

^bA “Strongly Disagree” response to this item was a positive response to Stopping the Tenure Clock. The item was recoded accordingly.

Tenure-track Faculty

The mean and standard deviation of the responses of the Tenure-track Faculty to these items are listed in Table 20. The mean scores ranged from 1.71 to 4.18. The highest level of agreement was to the item, “Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy” with a mean score of 4.18. The lowest level of agreement was to the item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” with a mean score of 1.71. Overall, there were four items interpreted as “Agree,” four interpreted as “Neutral,” and four as “Disagree” (See Table 20).

Some of the items in the scale were reverse worded such that an “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” response to the items listed in Table 20 could represent a negative perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock, depending on the item. Five of the twelve items were worded in this manner. Therefore, for the five items the coding was reversed by the researcher to reflect a “Strongly Disagree” response as a positive perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock. The items are listed in the order of descending positive perception. The mean responses ranged from 2.55 to 4.29. The item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” had the most positive response among Tenure-track Faculty.

The researcher identified the Interpretive Categories as: 1-1.5, Highly Negative (HN); 1.51-2.5, Negative (N); 2.51-3.49, Neither Positive or Negative (HPN); 3.50-4.49, Positive (P); and 4.5-5.0, Highly Positive (HP).

Table 20 Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category
Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy.	4.18	0.92	A
Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.98	0.97	A
Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.	3.93	0.89	A
Stopping the Tenure Clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.	3.89	1.07	A
Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some faculty in my department.	3.45	0.93	N
Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.31	0.99	N
Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.21	0.94	N
Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of Stopping the Tenure Clock.	3.06	0.73	N
Stopping the Tenure Clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process.	2.27	1.06	D
Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not.	2.24	1.03	D
There is rarely adequate justification for a Tenure-track Faculty member to stop the tenure clock.	2.08	1.09	D
Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only.	1.71	0.96	D

Note. The response scale for these items was: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Neutral (3); Agree (4); Strongly Disagree (5)

(Table 20 Continued)

^aInterpretive Categories are coded: 1-1.5, Strongly Disagree; 1.51-2.5, Disagree; 2.51-3.49, Neutral; 3.50-4.49, Agree; and 4.5-5.0, Strongly Agree.

Of the responses, eight were categorized as “Positive” and four items were “Neither Positive nor Negative” (see Table 21). The overall mean of the Perception Scores of Tenure-track Faculty was 3.65 (SD = 0.52).

Table 21 Recoded Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category ^a
Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only. ^b	4.29	0.96	P
Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy.	4.18	0.92	P
Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.98	0.97	P
Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.	3.93	0.89	P
There is rarely adequate justification for a Tenure-track Faculty member to stop the tenure clock. ^b	3.92	1.09	P
Stopping the Tenure Clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.	3.89	1.07	P
Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not. ^b	3.76	1.03	P
Stopping the Tenure Clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process. ^b	3.73	1.06	P
Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.31	0.99	NPN

(Table 21 Continued)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category ^a
Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.	3.21	0.94	NPN
Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of Stopping the Tenure Clock.	3.06	0.73	NPN
Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some faculty in my department. ^b	2.55	0.93	NPN

Note. The response scale for these items was: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Neutral (3); Agree (4); Strongly Disagree (5)

^aInterpretive Categories are coded: 1-1.5, Highly Negative (HN); 1.51-2.5, Negative (N); 2.51-3.49, Neither Positive or Negative (HPN); 3.50-4.49, Positive (P); and 4.5-5.0, Highly Positive (HP).

^bA “Strongly Disagree” response to this item was a positive response to Stopping the Tenure Clock. The item was recoded accordingly.

Objective Four Results

Objective four was to determine if a relationship exists between perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and selected demographics for Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty: Race, Gender, Age, Marital Status, and Number of Children.

Academic Administrators

Race

In order to determine if relationships exist between perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and demographics that were measured as categorical variables with more than two categories, the researcher chose to utilize the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings. The demographic variable “Race” had five category options: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic, White (not of Hispanic origin, and Asian or Pacific Islander. Certain categories of the variable Race (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic

origin), Hispanic, and Asian or Pacific Islander), however, had an insufficient number of subjects in the category to enable the researcher to make comparisons. Therefore, the researcher determined that the only comparison that could reasonably be made with this data was to compare the White (not of Hispanic origin) category with all other categories (designated as non-White) combined. Even with this approach, the number of subjects in the Non-White category was lower than desired. Nevertheless the researcher reported the comparison so that the relationship of the dependent variable and Race was examined at least at some level.

When this analysis was studied, the mean value for the perceptions of White (not of Hispanic origin) administrators was 3.71 (SD = 0.54). When compared with the mean perception score for administrators that are Non-White (mean = 3.53, SD = 0.70); no significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{47} = 0.759$, $p = .45$).

Gender and Marital Status

In order to determine if relationships existed between Academic Administrators' perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and the demographics that were measured as dichotomous variables (Gender and Marital Status), the researcher chose to utilize the independent t-test procedure for the analysis. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings.

The demographic variable "Gender" had two category options: Male or Female. When the analysis was examined, the mean value for the perception of Male Academic Administrators was 3.64 (SD = 0.59). When compared with the mean perception score for Female Academic Administrators (mean = 3.86, SD = 0.42), no significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{47} = 1.17$, $p = 0.25$).

“Marital Status” also had two category options: Married and Not Married. Marital Status did not have sufficient data to make comparisons and therefore the researcher did not make a statistical comparison.

Age and Number of Children

In order to determine if relationships existed between the Academic Administrators’ perceptions and the ordinal variables of Age and Number of Children, the researcher chose to utilize the Kendall’s Tau Correlation Coefficient procedure for analysis. The perception scale scores of Academic Administrators were not found to be significantly correlated with Age ($r = -0.11$, $p = 0.35$). Number of Children was also not found to be significantly correlated with the perception scale scores of Academic Administrators ($r = -0.11$, $p = 0.33$).

Tenured Faculty

Race

In order to determine if relationships existed between perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and demographics that were measured as categorical variables with more than two categories, the researcher chose to utilize the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings. The demographic variable “Race” had five category options: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic, White (not of Hispanic origin), and Asian or Pacific Islander. Certain categories of the variable Race (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), and Hispanic, however, had an insufficient number of subjects in the category to enable the researcher to make comparisons. Therefore, the researcher determined that only two comparisons could reasonably be made with this data. The first was to compare the White (not

of Hispanic origin) category with all other categories (designated as minorities) combined. The second was to compare Asian or Pacific Islander with all other categories combined.

When the analysis of the White category compared to all other race categories was examined, the mean value for the perception of White (not of Hispanic origin) Tenured Faculty was 3.61 (SD = 0.56). When compared with the mean perception score for Tenured Faculty that are Non-White (mean = 3.18, SD = 0.86); there was a significant difference found between the two groups ($t_{74.151} = -3.79$, $p = <0.01$). Therefore, White (not of Hispanic origin) Tenured Faculty had more positive perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock compared to Non-White Tenured Faculty.

The analysis of the Asian or Pacific Islander category compared to all other race categories was examined, the mean value for the perception of the Asian or Pacific Islander Tenured Faculty was 3.23 (SD = 0.80). When compared with the mean perception score of Tenured Faculty that are not Asian or Pacific Islander (mean = 3.56, SD = 0.62), there was a significant difference found between the two groups ($t_{32.123} = 2.19$, $p = 0.04$). Therefore, Tenured Faculty who are not Asian or Pacific Islander had a more positive perception of Stopping the Tenure Clock than those who were Asian or Pacific Islander.

Gender and Marital Status

In order to determine if relationships existed between Tenured Faculty's perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and the demographics that were measured as dichotomous variables (Gender and Marital Status), the researcher chose to utilize the independent t-test procedure for the analysis. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings.

The demographic variable "Gender" had two category options: Male or Female. When the analysis was examined, the mean value for the perception of Male Tenured Faculty was 3.50

(SD = 0.62). When compared with the mean perception score for Female Tenured Faculty (mean = 3.70, SD = 0.59), a significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{335} = -2.59$, $p = 0.10$). Therefore, Female Tenured Faculty had significantly more positive perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock compared to Male Tenured Faculty.

“Marital Status” also had two category options: Married and Not Married. The mean value for the perception of Married Tenured Faculty was 3.56 (SD = 0.60). When compared with the mean perception score for Not Married Tenured Faculty (mean 3.55, SD = 0.65), no significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{335} = -0.24$, $p = 0.81$). Therefore, Married Tenured Faculty’s perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock were not significantly different from Not Married Tenured Faculty.

Age and Number of Children

In order to determine if relationships existed between the Tenured Faculty’s perceptions and the ordinal variable of Age, the researcher chose to utilize the Kendall’s Tau Correlation Coefficient procedure for analysis. A total of two variables were included in this analysis- Age and Number of Children. The perception scale scores of Tenured Faculty were not found to be significantly correlated with Age ($r = <-0.01$, $p = 0.95$). Number of Children was found to be significantly correlated with the perception scale scores of Tenured Faculty ($r = -0.09$, $p = 0.03$). This correlation was a negative correlation indicating the more children that a Tenured Faculty member had, the less favorable perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock.

Tenure-track Faculty

Race

In order to determine if relationships exist between perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and demographics that were measured as categorical variables with more than two

categories, the researcher chose to utilize the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings. The demographic variable “Race” had five category options: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic, White (not of Hispanic origin, and Asian or Pacific Islander. Certain categories of the variable Race (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), and Hispanic, however, had an insufficient number of subjects in the category to enable the researcher to make comparisons. Therefore, the researcher determined that only two comparisons could reasonably be made with this data. The first was to compare the White (not of Hispanic origin) Tenure-track Faculty category with all other categories (designated as minorities) combined. The second was to compare the Asian or Pacific Islander Tenure-track Faculty with all other categories combined.

When the analysis of the White category compared to all other race categories was examined, the mean value for the perception of White (not of Hispanic origin) Tenure-track Faculty was 3.67 (SD = 0.51). When compared with the mean perception score for Tenure-track Faculty that are Non-White (mean = 3.61, SD = 0.55); there was not a significant difference found between the two groups ($t_{178} = -0.61$, $p = 0.54$).

The analysis of the Asian or Pacific Islander category compared to all other race categories was examined, the mean value for the perception of the Asian or Pacific Islander Tenure-track Faculty was 3.59 (SD = 0.57). When compared with the mean perception score of Tenure-track Faculty that are not Asian or Pacific Islander (mean = 3.66, SD = 0.51), there was not a significant difference found between the two groups ($t_{178} = 0.77$, $p = 0.48$).

Gender and Marital Status

In order to determine if relationships existed between Tenure-track Faculty's perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and the demographics that were measured as dichotomous variables (Gender and Marital Status), the researcher chose to utilize the independent t-test procedure for the analysis. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings.

The demographic variable "Gender" had two category options: Male or Female. When the analysis was examined, the mean value for the perception of Male Tenure-track Faculty was 3.54 (SD = 0.50). When compared with the mean perception score for Female Tenure-track Faculty (mean = 3.80, SD = 0.50), a significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{176} = 3.47$, $p = <0.01$). Therefore, Female Tenure-track Faculty have a more favorable perception of Stopping the Tenure Clock Male Tenure-track Faculty.

"Marital Status" also had two category options: Married and Not Married. The mean value for the perception of Married Tenure-track Faculty was 3.66 (SD = 0.51). When compared with the mean perception score for Not Married Tenure-track Faculty (mean 3.61, SD = 0.56), no significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{178} = -0.62$, $p = 0.54$).

Age and Number of Children

In order to determine if relationships existed between the Tenure-track Faculty's perceptions and the ordinal variable of Age and Number of Children, the researcher chose to utilize the Kendall's Tau Correlation Coefficient procedure for analysis. The perception scale scores of Tenure-track Faculty were not found to be significantly correlated with Age ($\tau = -0.09$, $p = 0.14$). Number of Children was also found not to be significantly correlated with the perception scale scores of Tenure-track Faculty ($\tau = -0.85$, $p = 0.15$).

Objective Five Results

Objective five was to compare perceptions by status (Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty).

In order to compare perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by status, the researcher utilized the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure (see Table 22). This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings and indicated a significant difference ($F_{2, 572} = 3.173$, $p = 0.034$) between two or more groups. Therefore, a post-hoc analysis was conducted using Tukey's HSD to determine where the significant difference lies. Tukey's test revealed that there was a significant difference between the Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty groups (See Table 22).

Table 22 Comparison of Perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

Source	df	MS	F	P
Between Groups	2	1.522	3.173	0.043
Within Groups	572	0.48		
Total	574			
Group	n	M	Tukey ^a	
Tenured Faculty	346	3.67	A	
Academic Administrators	49	3.79	A, B	
Tenure-track Faculty	180	3.82	B	

^aGroups that do not have a common letter are significantly different

Objective Six Results

Objective six was to determine if a model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the perceptions from the following demographics:

- Race
- Gender
- Age

- d. Marital Status
- e. Number of Children

The researcher opted to perform a regression analysis to accomplish this objective. The perception scores of the three groups of study participants (Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty) were used as the dependent variable. The other variables were treated as independent variables and stepwise entry of the variables was used due to the exploratory nature of the study. In these regression equations variables were added that increased the explained variance by one percent or more as long as the overall regression model remained significant.

In conducting the multiple regression analysis, two of the independent variables that were originally treated as categorical were converted to dichotomous variables in preparation for entry into the analysis. These variables were Race and Age. The first variable “Race” originally had five categories: American Indian or Alaskan Native; Black (not of Hispanic origin); Hispanic; White (not of Hispanic origin); and Asian or Pacific Islander. Each of the categories was changed to a dichotomous variable as being a member of the category or not. It was in this format that the variable “Race” was entered into the analysis.

The variable “Age” was designed for participants to originally self-identify as “18-25,” “26-35,” “36-45,” “46-55,” “56-65,” or “66 or older.” No participants, however, were identified in the category “18-25” and it was therefore excluded from the analysis. Each of the remaining categories were used to create dichotomous variables as being a member of the category or not. It was in this format that “Age” was entered into the analyses. The researcher examined the bivariate correlations in the regression analysis. Two-way correlations between factors used as independent variables and the Perception Scores are presented in Table 23.

Table 23 Relationship Between Selected Demographic Characteristics and Perception Scores of Stopping the Tenure Clock

Variable	r	p
Age 66 and older or not	-0.20	<0.01
Tenured Faculty or not	-0.18	<0.01
Gender ^a	0.13	0.03
Tenure-track Faculty or not	0.13	0.03
Race- Asian or Pacific Islander or not	-0.13	0.03
Knowledge Score	0.12	0.04
Age- 26-35 or not	0.10	0.06
Number of Children	-0.10	0.07
Academic Administrator or not	0.09	0.09
Race- White (not of Hispanic origin) or not	0.08	0.11
Race- Hispanic or not	0.07	0.17
Age- 46-55 or not	0.07	0.17
Age- 56-65 or not	-0.05	0.23
Age- 36-45 or not	0.02	0.38
Marital Status ^b	-0.02	0.39
Race- Black (not of Hispanic origin)	-0.01	0.43

Note. $n = 221$

^aGender was coded such that Male = 0, Female = 1

^bMarital Status was coded such that Not Married = 0, Married = 1

Three of the 16 correlations were found to be statistically significant. The highest correlations with the Perception Scores were found to be with the category “Asian or Pacific Islander” of the variable Race ($r = -0.13$, $p = 0.03$), the variable Tenured Faculty ($r = -0.18$, $p = <0.01$), and the category “66 or older” ($r = -0.20$, $p = <0.01$) of the variable Age.

The researcher examined the variables entered into the regression analysis for any excessive collinearity or if any combination of the independent variables formed a singularity. Therefore the variance inflation factor (VIF) was examined, the values ranged from 1.003 to 1.769. According to Hair et al. (2006), “A common cutoff threshold is a tolerance value of 0.10

which corresponds to a VIF value of 10” (p. 230). No excess multicollinearity, therefore, was present in the data.

The multiple regression analysis utilizing Perception Scores as the dependent variable are listed in Table 24.

Table 24 Multiple Regression Analysis of Perception Scores toward Stopping the Tenure Clock and Selected Demographic Characteristics of Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty at a Research University (RU/VH) in the Southern Region of the United States

ANOVA					
Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p	
Regression	3.00	2.04	6.14	0.001	
Residual	217.00	0.33			
Total	220.00				
Model Summary					
Model	R Square	R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change	Standardized Coefficients Beta
Age- 66 or older	0.04	0.04	9.08	0	<u>-0.18</u>
Tenured Faculty	0.07	0.03	6.22	0.01	<u>-0.16</u>
Race- Asian or Pacific Islander	0.08	0.01	2.77	0.1	<u>-0.11</u>
Variables not in the Equation					
Variables	t	P			
Knowledge Score	1.36	0.18			
Age- 56-65 or not	-1.26	0.21			
Gender	1.06	0.29			
Age- 46-55 or not	0.80	0.42			
Race- Hispanic or not	0.68	0.50			
Number of Children	-0.52	0.60			
Age- 26-35 or not	0.48	0.63			
Race- White (not of Hispanic origin) or not	0.47	0.64			
Race- Black or not	-0.26	0.79			
Marital Status	-0.22	0.82			
Tenure-track Faculty or not	0.13	0.90			
Academic Administrator or not	-0.13	0.90			
Age- 36-45 or not	0.03	0.98			

The variable which entered the regression model first was the Age category of “66 or older” which explained four percent of the variance. The second variable which entered into the regression model was the category of Tenured Faculty. The third variable was the Race category of “Asian or Pacific Islander”. All three of these combined explained 7.8 percent of the variance. Therefore, not being in the age group of “66 or older” would be associated with higher perception scores. Not being in the Tenured Faculty group would be associated with higher perception scores. Likewise, not being in the “Asian or “Pacific Islander” group would be associate with higher perception scores.

Objective Seven Results

Objective seven was to determine if a relationship exists between knowledge and perceptions in each of the three groups.

In order to determine if relationships exist, the researcher examined each group independently by conducting a Pearson’s Correlation analysis in each group (Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty) between Knowledge Scores and Perception Scores (see Table 25). None were found to be statistically significant.

Table 25 Relationships Between Knowledge Scores and Perception Scores Among Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty

Group	r	p
Academic Administrators	0.19	0.29
Tenured Faculty	0.07	0.41
Tenure-track Faculty	0.18	0.27

CHAPTER V: SUMMARY

Summary of Purpose and Specific Objectives

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the knowledge and the perceptions of the Adjustment to Years of Service toward Tenure procedures (i.e. “Stopping the Tenure Clock”) among University Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty at “RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)” universities as designated by the Carnegie Foundation in the southeastern region of the United States.

The following objectives were developed to facilitate this study:

1. Objective one was to describe Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty on the following demographic characteristics:
 - a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital status
 - e. Number of children
2. Objective two was to describe Academic Administrators’, Tenured Faculty members’, and Tenure-track Faculty members’ knowledge of stopping the tenure clock procedures.
3. Objective three was to describe Academic Administrators’, Tenured Faculty members’, and Tenure-track Faculty members’ perceptions toward stopping the tenure clock.
4. Objective four was to determine if a relationship exists between perceptions of stopping the tenure clock and selected demographics for Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty:
 - a. Race

- b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital status
 - e. Number of children
5. Objective five was to compare perceptions toward stopping the tenure clock among Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty.
6. Objective six was to determine if a model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the perceptions from the following demographics:
- a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital Status
 - e. Number of Children
7. Objective seven was to determine if relationships exist between knowledge and perceptions among Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty.

Summary of Methodology

The target population for this study was Academic Administrators, Tenure-track Faculty, and Tenured Faculty at “Research University – very high research activity” universities as designated by the Carnegie Foundation. The sample was defined as these groups within a Research University in the Southeastern Region of the United States during the Fall 2008. The groups were in-tact and not randomly selected. The researcher defined “Academic Administrators” as the employees with administrative decision making authority over an academic unit at the level of department chair, director, or dean as of October 13, 2008 according to University personnel

records. The researcher defined “Tenured Faculty” as the employees holding faculty rank who obtained tenure prior to October 13, 2008 according to University personnel records. “Tenure-track Faculty” were defined by the researcher as employees who encumber probationary faculty positions that may lead to tenure and who had not achieved tenure as of October 13, 2008 according to University personnel records.

The instruments that were used were developed by the researcher to collect data, one for each survey group. Each included both closed-ended (Likert-type and True/False formats) and open-ended questions related to experience, knowledge, perceptions and demographic information. Content validity was established by having a panel of experts review the instruments. The Louisiana State University Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost permitted and endorsed this study. Approval was also received from the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The first three objectives were descriptive and were analyzed using descriptive statistics. All of the demographic variables were described by reporting frequencies and percentages in categories. The data collected for objective two was summarized by computing the mean, standard deviation, and range of scores for each of the three groups.

The data for objective three was summarized by computing the mean, standard deviation, and range of scores for each of the three groups. A factor analysis was conducted.

Objective four used a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the characteristics measured on a categorical (nominal or ordinal) scale with more than two categories and a t-test was applied to the characteristic with just a nominal scaled. The characteristics measured on an ordinal scale that had relatively large numbers of tied ranks had Kendall’s Tau applied.

Summary of Major Findings

The major findings of this study are discussed by objective.

Objective One

The following objectives were developed to facilitate this study:

1. Objective one is to describe Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty on the following demographic characteristics:
 - a. Race
 - b. Gender
 - c. Age
 - d. Marital status
 - e. Number of children

Of the 48 academic administrators who responded, the majority were White ($\underline{n} = 43$, 89.5%) and none of the participants indicated Black as their race. Similarly, tenured faculty participants (85%) and tenure-track faculty participants (74.6%) were also mostly White.

Of the 49 Academic Administrator respondents to the Gender item, 11 (22.4%) were identified as female and 38 (77.6%) were identified as male. Of the Tenured faculty participants, 244 indicated that they were male (72.4%) and 93 were female (27.6%). Slightly more than half ($\underline{n} = 99$, 55.6%) of the Tenure-track faculty participants indicated that they were male.

The largest group of Academic Administrator respondents was the 56-65 age group with 23 individuals (47.9%) while no respondents were under the age 36. Tenured faculty participants were mostly between the ages of 46-65 (67.7%) whereas the majority of Tenure-track faculty (85%) were between the ages of 26-45.

Of the 49 Academic Administrator respondents, 45 (93.8%) reported that they were married (one study participant did not answer this item). Of the Tenured and Tenure-track faculty participants, the majority also indicated they were married (Tenured- 77.4%, Tenure-track- 72.2%).

The majority (68.8%) of Academic Administrator respondents reported having one or two children. Only 6.3% ($n = 3$) of Academic Administrator participants indicated that they had four or more children. Of the Tenured faculty participants, 130 (38.8%) indicated that they had two children while 96 (28.7%) did not have any children. Of the Tenure-track faculty participants, 47.5% ($n = 85$) indicated that they did not have any children and 45.2% ($n = 81$) reported having either one or two children.

2. Objective two was to describe Academic Administrators', Tenured Faculty members', and Tenure-track Faculty members' knowledge of Stopping the Tenure Clock procedures.

Academic Administrator Stopping the Tenure Clock Knowledge

In an attempt to gain a valid measure of the knowledge regarding Stopping the Tenure Clock, Academic Administrators were first asked, "Are you aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process (adjustment of service toward tenure)...?" The response options to this particular item were either "Yes" or "No." Of those Academic Administrators who responded, 35 (71.4%) said "Yes" and 14 (28.6%) indicated "No." The 35 who said "Yes" were asked to respond to a series of items designed to measure their level of knowledge of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process. The response options for these items were either "True" or "False."

All of the participants ($n = 35$, 100%) responded "True" to the item, "Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the

tenure review packet.” Only three participants (8.6%) responded “True” to two items: “If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically;” and “A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.”

To further examine the data, each item was coded such that a correct response received a value of “1” and an incorrect response was coded as “0.” Correctness was determined by the researcher comparing the item with University policies and procedures and validated by a panel of experts.

All of the Academic Administrator participants correctly answered that the statement, “Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet” was true. However, 91.4 percent ($n = 32$) of the Academic Administrator participants incorrectly responded “False” to the item, “A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.”

These items were then summed to produce a knowledge score with a possible range of 0 (no items correct) to 10 (all items correct). The scores ranged from a minimum of 4 to a maximum of 9 with a mean score of 7.17 ($SD = 1.38$).

Tenured Faculty Stopping the Tenure Clock Knowledge

The Tenured Faculty were also asked the question, “Are you aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process (adjustment of service toward tenure)...?” The response options to this particular item were either “Yes” or “No.” Of the 346 participants, 152 (43.9%) answered “Yes.” These 152 participants were then asked to respond to a series of items designed to measure their level of knowledge of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process. The response options for these items were either “True” or “False.”

All of the Tenured Faculty participants responded “True” to the item, “Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet.” Only 12 (7.9%) participants responded “True” to the item, “A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.”

To further examine the data, each item was coded such that a correct response received a value of “1” and an incorrect response was coded as “0.” Correctness was determined by the researcher comparing the item with University policies and procedures and was validated by a panel of experts.

Most of the Tenured Faculty members responded correctly ($n = 147$, 96.7%) to “Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet” by indicating “True.” The least amount of correct responses ($n = 20$, 13.2%) was to the item, “If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically.”

These items were then summed to produce a knowledge score with a possible range of 0 (no items correct) to 10 (all items correct). The Tenured Faculty’s scores ranged from a minimum of 3 to a maximum of 10 (highest possible score), with a mean score of 6.92 ($SD = 1.46$).

Tenure-track Faculty Stopping the Tenure Clock Knowledge

Like the Academic Administrators and the Tenured Faculty, the Tenure-track Faculty were asked initially, “Are you aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process (adjustment of service toward tenure) at LSU?” The response options to this particular item were either “Yes” or “No.” Of the Tenure-track Faculty participants, 141 responded “No.” The 39 participants (21.7%) that were aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process were asked to respond to a

series of items designed to measure their level of knowledge of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process.

Almost all ($n = 38$, 97.4%) of the participants responded “True” to the item, “Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet.” Four participants (10.3%) responded “True” to each of the following two items: “If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped;” and “A faculty member who has been given notice of non-reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.”

Again, each item was coded such that a correct response received a value of “1” and an incorrect response was coded as “0.” Correctness was determined by the researcher comparing the item with University policies and procedures and was validated by a panel of experts.

Like the other groups surveyed, most of the Tenure-track Faculty responded correctly to “Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet” by indicating “True.” The least amount of correct responses was to the item, “If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically.”

These items were then summed to produce a knowledge score with a possible range of 0 (no items correct) to 10 (all items correct). The Tenured Faculty’s knowledge scores ranged from a minimum of 3 to a maximum of 9, with a mean score of 7.10 ($SD = 1.35$).

3. Objective three was to describe Academic Administrators’, Tenured Faculty members’, and Tenure-track Faculty members’ perceptions toward Stopping the Tenure Clock.

All participants, regardless of whether or not they were aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process, were asked to respond to 12 items regarding their perceptions of Stopping the

Tenure Clock. The Likert-type scale response options ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The interpretive categories established by the researcher were: 1-1.5, Strongly Disagree; 1.51-2.5, Disagree; 2.51-3.49, Neutral; 3.50-4.49, Agree; and 4.5-5.0, Strongly Agree.

To further examine the perceptions regarding the Stopping the Tenure Clock process, a factor analysis was conducted with the responses provided by the participants in the study. The first step in conducting the factor analysis was to examine the MSA's both for the individual items and the overall scale. When the individual item MSA's were examined, one item, "Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some of the faculty in my department" failed to meet the established criterion of .50 for its inclusion in the factor analysis (Hair et al, 2006). Therefore, this item was omitted from the subsequent factor analysis. Additionally, the researcher examined the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. Each of these measures verified that the remainder of the scale data was appropriate and adequate for conducting the factor analysis.

The procedure utilized was a principal components analysis with a varimax rotation. The next step was to determine the number of factor(s) to be extracted. Using a combination of the latent root criterion, the scree plot technique, and the percentage of variance explained, the optimum number of factors was determined to be two factors plus or minus one factor. Each of these factors was then computed and examined for the following three criteria: 1) loadings for each item meeting the minimum acceptable loading criteria of 0.30 for exploratory research (Hair et al, 2006); 2) inefficient factors; and 3) significant cross-loadings of the data. When these criteria were applied to the data, the optimum number of factors to be extracted was determined to be one. However, one of the 11 items included in the scale did not load into this

factor solution. With this condition, the researcher re-examined the two factor solution; however this item remained alone as an inefficient factor with the two factor solution. Therefore, the most appropriate approach to the calculation of a perception score was to compute a single scale score with this item eliminated from the computation.

Academic Administrators

The mean and standard deviation of the responses of the Academic Administrators to each of the items were calculated. The means of the item scores ranged from 1.61 to 4.20. The highest level of agreement was to the item, “Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy” with a mean score of 4.20 (SD = 1.00). The lowest level of agreement was to the item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” with a mean score of 1.61 (SD = 0.91). Overall, there were five items interpreted as “Agree,” three interpreted as “Neutral,” and four as “Disagree.”

In addition to reporting the individual means for the responses to the items designed to measure the perceptions of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process, the researcher computed an overall scale score based on the results of the previously reported factor analysis. However, some of the items in the scale were reverse worded such that an “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” response to the items represented a negative perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock, and for some of the items a “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” response represented a positive response. Five of the twelve items were worded in this manner. Therefore, for these five items the coding was reversed by the researcher such that a more positive response consistently received a higher rating (value = 5) and a more negative response consistently received a lower rating (value = 1). The mean responses ranged from 2.63 to 4.39 and the item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” had the most positive response among

Academic Administrators. The researcher established an Interpretive scale which included the following categories: 1-1.5, Highly Negative (HN); 1.51-2.5, Negative (N); 2.51-3.49, Neither Positive or Negative (HPN); 3.50-4.49, Positive (P); and 4.5-5.0, Highly Positive (HP). Of the responses, nine were categorized as “Positive” and three items were “Neither Positive nor Negative.” The overall mean of the Perception Scores of Academic Administrators was 3.69 (SD= 0.56).

An overall scale score was computed which included ten of the items in the scale. One item was excluded based on the individual item MSA and one of the items did not meet the minimum loading criterion of .30 for inclusion in the factor. When this overall perception score was computed, the values ranged from 1.10 to 5.00 with an overall mean of 3.72 (SD = .70).

Tenured Faculty

The mean and standard deviation of the responses of the Tenured Faculty were calculated. The range of mean scores was 1.66 to 3.98. The highest level of agreement was to the item, “Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy” with a mean score of 3.98. The lowest level of agreement was to the item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” with a mean score of 1.66. Overall, there were four items interpreted as “Agree,” four interpreted as “Neutral,” and four as “Disagree.”

Some of the items in the scale were reverse worded such that an “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” response to the items could represent a negative perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock, depending on the item. Five of the twelve items were worded in this manner. Therefore, for the five items the coding was reversed by the researcher to reflect a “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” response as a positive perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock. The items are

listed in the order of descending positive perception. The responses ranged from 2.63 to 4.34. The item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” had the most positive response among Tenured Faculty. The researcher identified the Interpretive Categories as: 1-1.5, Highly Negative (HN); 1.51-2.5, Negative (N); 2.51-3.49, Neither Positive or Negative (HPN); 3.50-4.49, Positive (P); and 4.5-5.0, Highly Positive (HP). Of the responses, eight were categorized as “Positive” and four items were “Neither Positive or Negative.” The overall mean of the Perception Score of Tenured Faculty was 3.53 (SD = 0.65).

Tenure-track Faculty

The mean and standard deviation of the responses of the Tenure-track Faculty to these items. The mean scores ranged from 1.71 to 4.18. The highest level of agreement was to the item, “Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive Stopping the Tenure Clock policy” with a mean score of 4.18. The lowest level of agreement was to the item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” with a mean score of 1.71. Overall, there were four items interpreted as “Agree,” four interpreted as “Neutral,” and four as “Disagree.”

Some of the items in the scale were reverse worded such that an “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” response to the items could represent a negative perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock, depending on the item. Five of the twelve items were worded in this manner. Therefore, for the five items the coding was reversed by the researcher to reflect a “Strongly Disagree” response as a positive perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock. The items are listed in the order of descending positive perception. The mean responses ranged from 2.55 to 4.29. The item, “Stopping the Tenure Clock option is intended for female faculty only” had the most positive response among Tenure-track Faculty. The researcher identified the Interpretive

Categories as: 1-1.5, Highly Negative (HN); 1.51-2.5, Negative (N); 2.51-3.49, Neither Positive or Negative (HPN); 3.50-4.49, Positive (P); and 4.5-5.0, Highly Positive (HP). Of the responses, eight were categorized as “Positive” and four items were “Neither Positive nor Negative.” The overall mean of the Perception Scores of Tenure-track Faculty was 3.65 (SD = 0.52).

4. Objective four was to determine if a relationship exists between perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and selected demographics for Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty: Race, Gender, Age, Marital Status, and Number of Children.

Academic Administrators

Race

To determine if relationships exist between perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and demographics that were measured as categorical variables with more than two categories, the researcher chose to utilize the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings. The demographic variable “Race” had five category options: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic, White (not of Hispanic origin), and Asian or Pacific Islander. Certain categories of the variable Race (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic, and Asian or Pacific Islander), however, had an insufficient number of subjects in the category to enable the researcher to make comparisons. Therefore, the researcher determined that the only comparison that could reasonably be made with this data was to compare the White (not of Hispanic origin) category with all other categories (designated as non-White) combined. Even with this approach, the number of subjects in the Non-White category was lower than desired.

Nevertheless the researcher reported the comparison so that the relationship of the dependent variable and Race was examined at least at some level.

When this analysis was studied, the mean value for the perceptions of White (not of Hispanic origin) administrators was 3.71 (SD = 0.54). When compared with the mean perception score for administrators that are Non-White (mean = 3.53, SD = 0.70); no significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{47} = 0.759$, $p = .45$).

Gender and Marital Status

To determine if relationships existed between Academic Administrators' perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and the demographics that were measured as dichotomous variables (Gender and Marital Status), the researcher chose to utilize the independent t-test procedure for the analysis. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings.

The demographic variable "Gender" had two category options: Male or Female. When the analysis was examined, the mean value for the perception of Male Academic Administrators was 3.64 (SD = 0.59). When compared with the mean perception score for Female Academic Administrators (mean = 3.86, SD = 0.42), no significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{47} = 1.17$, $p = 0.25$).

"Marital Status" also had two category options: Married and Not Married. Marital Status did not have sufficient data to make comparisons and therefore the researcher did not make a statistical comparison.

Age and Number of Children

To determine if relationships existed between the Academic Administrators' perceptions and the ordinal variables of Age and Number of Children, the researcher chose to utilize the Kendall's Tau Correlation Coefficient procedure for analysis. The perception scale scores of

Academic Administrators were not found to be significantly correlated with Age ($r = -0.11$, $p = 0.35$). Number of Children was also not found to be significantly correlated with the perception scale scores of Academic Administrators ($r = -0.11$, $p = 0.33$). However, it should be noted that even though this correlation was statistically significant, with a value of less than .10, it would be described as a negligible relationship (Davis,

Tenured Faculty

Race

To determine if relationships existed between perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and demographics that were measured as categorical variables with more than two categories, the researcher chose to utilize the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings. The demographic variable “Race” had five category options: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic, White (not of Hispanic origin), and Asian or Pacific Islander. Certain categories of the variable Race (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), and Hispanic, however, had an insufficient number of subjects in the category to enable the researcher to make comparisons. Therefore, the researcher determined that only two comparisons could reasonably be made with this data. The first was to compare the White (not of Hispanic origin) category with all other categories (designated as minorities) combined. The second was to compare Asian or Pacific Islander with all other categories combined.

When the analysis of the White category compared to all other race categories was examined, the mean value for the perception of White (not of Hispanic origin) Tenured Faculty was 3.61 (SD = 0.56). When compared with the mean perception score for Tenured Faculty that are Non-White (mean = 3.18, SD = 0.86); there was a significant difference found between the

two groups ($t_{74.151} = -3.79$, $p = <0.01$). Therefore, White (not of Hispanic origin) Tenured Faculty had more positive perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock compared to Non-White Tenured Faculty.

The analysis of the Asian or Pacific Islander category compared to all other race categories was examined, the mean value for the perception of the Asian or Pacific Islander Tenured Faculty was 3.23 (SD = 0.80). When compared with the mean perception score of Tenured Faculty that are not Asian or Pacific Islander (mean = 3.56, SD = 0.62), there was a significant difference found between the two groups ($t_{32.123} = 2.19$, $p = 0.04$). Therefore, Tenured Faculty who are not Asian or Pacific Islander had a more positive perception of Stopping the Tenure Clock than those who were Asian or Pacific Islander.

Gender and Marital Status

In order to determine if relationships existed between Tenured Faculty's perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and the demographics that were measured as dichotomous variables (Gender and Marital Status), the researcher chose to utilize the independent t-test procedure for the analysis. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings.

The demographic variable "Gender" had two category options: Male or Female. When the analysis was examined, the mean value for the perception of Male Tenured Faculty was 3.50 (SD = 0.62). When compared with the mean perception score for Female Tenured Faculty (mean = 3.70, SD = 0.59), a significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{335} = -2.59$, $p = 0.10$). Therefore, Female Tenured Faculty had significantly more positive perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock compared to Male Tenured Faculty.

"Marital Status" also had two category options: Married and Not Married. The mean value for the perception of Married Tenured Faculty was 3.56 (SD = 0.60). When compared

with the mean perception score for Not Married Tenured Faculty (mean 3.55, SD = 0.65), no significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{335} = -0.24$, $p = 0.81$). Therefore, Married Tenured Faculty's perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock were not significantly different from Not Married Tenured Faculty.

Age and Number of Children

In order to determine if relationships existed between the Tenured Faculty's perceptions and the ordinal variable of Age, the researcher chose to utilize the Kendall's Tau Correlation Coefficient procedure for analysis. A total of two variables were included in this analysis- Age and Number of Children. The perception scale scores of Tenured Faculty were not found to be significantly correlated with Age ($r = <-0.01$, $p = 0.95$). Number of Children was found to be significantly correlated with the perception scale scores of Tenured Faculty ($r = -0.09$, $p = 0.03$). This correlation was a negative correlation indicating the more children that a Tenured Faculty member had, the less favorable perception toward Stopping the Tenure Clock.

Tenure-track Faculty

Race

In order to determine if relationships exist between perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and demographics that were measured as categorical variables with more than two categories, the researcher chose to utilize the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings. The demographic variable "Race" had five category options: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic, White (not of Hispanic origin, and Asian or Pacific Islander. Certain categories of the variable Race (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), and Hispanic, however, had an insufficient number of subjects in the category to enable

the researcher to make comparisons. Therefore, the researcher determined that only two comparisons could reasonably be made with this data. The first was to compare the White (not of Hispanic origin) Tenure-track Faculty category with all other categories (designated as minorities) combined. The second was to compare the Asian or Pacific Islander Tenure-track Faculty with all other categories combined.

When the analysis of the White category compared to all other race categories was examined, the mean value for the perception of White (not of Hispanic origin) Tenure-track Faculty was 3.67 (SD = 0.51). When compared with the mean perception score for Tenure-track Faculty that are Non-White (mean = 3.61, SD = 0.55); there was not a significant difference found between the two groups ($t_{178} = -0.61$, $p = 0.54$).

The analysis of the Asian or Pacific Islander category compared to all other race categories was examined, the mean value for the perception of the Asian or Pacific Islander Tenure-track Faculty was 3.59 (SD = 0.57). When compared with the mean perception score of Tenure-track Faculty that are not Asian or Pacific Islander (mean = 3.66, SD = 0.51), there was not a significant difference found between the two groups ($t_{178} = 0.77$, $p = 0.48$).

Gender and Marital Status

In order to determine if relationships existed between Tenure-track Faculty's perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock and the demographics that were measured as dichotomous variables (Gender and Marital Status), the researcher chose to utilize the independent t-test procedure for the analysis. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings.

The demographic variable "Gender" had two category options: Male or Female. When the analysis was examined, the mean value for the perception of Male Tenure-track Faculty was

3.54 (SD = 0.50). When compared with the mean perception score for Female Tenure-track Faculty (mean = 3.80, SD = 0.50), a significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{176} = 3.47$, $p = <0.01$). Therefore, Female Tenure-track Faculty have a more favorable perception of Stopping the Tenure Clock Male Tenure-track Faculty.

“Marital Status” also had two category options: Married and Not Married. The mean value for the perception of Married Tenure-track Faculty was 3.66 (SD = 0.51). When compared with the mean perception score for Not Married Tenure-track Faculty (mean 3.61, SD = 0.56), no significant difference was found between the two groups ($t_{178} = -0.62$, $p = 0.54$).

Age and Number of Children

In order to determine if relationships existed between the Tenure-track Faculty’s perceptions and the ordinal variable of Age and Number of Children, the researcher chose to utilize the Kendall’s Tau Correlation Coefficient procedure for analysis. The perception scale scores of Tenure-track Faculty were not found to be significantly correlated with Age ($r = -0.09$, $p = 0.14$). Number of Children was also found not to be significantly correlated with the perception scale scores of Tenure-track Faculty ($r = -0.85$, $p = 0.15$).

5. Objective five was to compare perceptions by status (Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty).

In order to compare perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock by status, the researcher utilized the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. This procedure was chosen for ease of interpretation of the relevant findings and indicated a significant difference ($F_{2, 572} = 3.173$, $p = 0.034$) between two or more groups. Therefore, a post-hoc analysis was conducted using Tukey’s HSD to determine where the significant difference lies. Tukey’s test revealed that there was a significant difference between the Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty groups.

6. Objective six was to determine if a model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the perceptions from the following demographics:

- f. Race
- g. Gender
- h. Age
- i. Marital Status
- j. Number of Children

The researcher opted to perform a regression analysis to accomplish this objective. The perception scores of the three groups of study participants (Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty) were used as the dependent variable. The other variables were treated as independent variables and stepwise entry of the variables was used due to the exploratory nature of the study. In these regression equations variables were added that increased the explained variance by one percent or more as long as the overall regression model remained significant.

In conducting the multiple regression analysis, two of the independent variables that were originally treated as categorical were converted to dichotomous variables in preparation for entry into the analysis. These variables were Race and Age. The first variable “Race” originally had five categories: American Indian or Alaskan Native; Black (not of Hispanic origin); Hispanic; White (not of Hispanic origin); and Asian or Pacific Islander. Each of the categories was changed to a dichotomous variable as being a member of the category or not. It was in this format that the variable “Race” was entered into the analysis.

The variable “Age” was designed for participants to originally self-identify as “18-25,” “26-35,” “36-45,” “46-55,” “56-65,” or “66 or older.” No participants, however, were identified

in the category “18-25” and it was therefore excluded from the analysis. Each of the remaining categories were used to create dichotomous variables as being a member of the category or not. It was in this format that “Age” was entered into the analyses.

The researcher examined the bivariate correlations in the regression analysis. Two-way correlations between factors used as independent variables and the Perception Scores were determined.

Three of the 16 correlations were found to be statistically significant. The highest correlations with the Perception Scores were found to be with the category “Asian or Pacific Islander” of the variable Race ($r = -0.13$, $p = 0.03$), the variable Tenured Faculty ($r = -0.18$, $p = <0.01$), and the category “66 or older” ($r = -0.20$, $p = <0.01$) of the variable Age.

The researcher examined the variables entered into the regression analysis for any excessive collinearity or if any combination of the independent variables formed a singularity. Therefore the variance inflation factor (VIF) was examined, the values ranged from 1.003 to 1.769. According to Hair et al. (2006), “A common cutoff threshold is a tolerance value of 0.10 which corresponds to a VIF value of 10” (p. 230). No excess multicollinearity, therefore, was present in the data.

The variable which entered the regression model first was the Age category of “66 or older” which explained four percent of the variance. The second variable which entered into the regression model was the category of Tenured Faculty. The third variable was the Race category of “Asian or Pacific Islander”. All three of these combined explained 7.8 percent of the variance. Therefore, not being in the age group of “66 or older” would be associated with higher perception scores. Not being in the Tenured Faculty group would be associated with higher

perception scores. Likewise, not being in the “Asian or “Pacific Islander” group would be associate with higher perception scores.

7. Objective seven was to determine if a relationship exists between knowledge and perceptions in each of the three groups.

In order to determine if relationships exist, the researcher examined each group independently by conducting a Pearson’s Correlation analysis in each group (Academic Administrators, Tenured Faculty, and Tenure-track Faculty) between Knowledge Scores and Perception Scores. None were found to be statistically significant.

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Based on the findings from this study, the researcher has derived the following conclusions, implications, and recommendations:

Conclusion One

1. The majority of the respondents were White.

This conclusion is based on the findings that 89.5% of the Academic Administrators who responded were White, 85% of the Tenured faculty participants were White, and Tenure-track faculty participants were also mostly White (74.6%).

Since the research was exploratory in nature, no previous literature was identified that specifically addressed race or any correlations with knowledge or perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock. The majority of respondents being White may or may not be representative of the employee population. Future research should be conducted to evaluate official university records of employees’ race. In addition, future research should focus on the demographic “race” and the differences between knowledge and perceptions toward Stopping the Tenure Clock. This

finding is a reminder to University leadership the need to improve diversity efforts to recruit and retain a diverse workforce.

Conclusion Two

2. The majority of the study participants were Male.

This conclusion is based on the findings that 77.6% of the Academic Administrators indicated that they were Male, meaning only 22.4% were Female Academic Administrators. Of the Tenured Faculty, 72.4% were Male and of the Tenure-track Faculty, 55.6% were Male.

The reasons behind these results could be several factors. First, Academic Administrators tend to be the employees with substantial experience who are farther into their careers. As indicated in the literature review, academia has traditionally been male dominated and therefore those with more experience were typically hired under this old model.

Comparatively, Tenure-track Faculty are typically employed in the more junior ranks. The increase in Females represented may reflect an increase of diversity efforts of the university. These results are consistent with the literature where Kirwan indicated that males continue to hold the more senior level faculty positions and females mainly occupy the lower level tenure-track positions or non-tenure-track positions (Kirwan et al, 2005).

While Stopping the Tenure Clock may be offered to both men and women, the availability of the policy tends to be of particular interest to females. Utilization of the policy is often by women due to pregnancy and birth of a child. Some universities include in their Stop the Tenure Clock policy, an automatic implementation for situations such as having a child. Having an automatic stop would alleviate concerns of how it would be perceived if it were applied to all (Marcus, 2007).

The results could be beneficial for Academic Administrators and hiring managers to attract and retain a diverse faculty. To verify that the gender of the respondents to this survey is representative of the population, the researcher recommends further research in which data sources would be more comprehensive such as official personnel files available from the university. University leaders may also wish to review policies that address life events and recognize that they can be used effectively as a recruiting benefit. Having the policy widely publicized will help attract minority faculty, especially faculty. The researcher recommends that university administrators establish and ensure effective implementation.

Conclusion Three

3. Almost half of the Tenure-track faculty did not have children.

This conclusion is based on the findings that 47.5% of the Tenure-track faculty respondents indicated that they did not have any children. Tenure-track faculty may be delaying or deciding to not have children to be fully dedicated to such a demanding academic career. This is consistent with the literature in that many faculty feel that there is a choice that must be made: either be loyal to the profession or loyal to family (Mandleco, 2010). This results in some faculty even delaying having children or getting married to avoid any bias (Marcus, 2007). This conclusion may be indicative of the conflict that Female Tenure-track faculty face between career-building and reproductive years (Mason and Goulden, 2002).

Future research should be conducted to determine what impact, if any, children have on the tenure-track process and the likelihood of successfully being awarded tenure. University records of faculty who have stopped the tenure clock could be tracked to determine if they became tenured. Additionally, research should be conducted to determine the perceptions of Academic Administrators and Tenured faculty toward those Tenure-track faculty who have

children. This research could have even practical implications in that university administrators will have a better understanding of the perceptions and can address any negative perceptions. The result will demonstrate a more family-friendly campus, thereby positively influencing recruitment efforts and retention.

Conclusion Four

4. A low percentage of Tenure-track faculty were aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock option.

This conclusion is based on the findings that 78.3% of the Tenure-track Faculty participants were not aware of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process. This is consistent with the literature in that some universities offer the option but many faculty are not aware of it and therefore cannot take advantage of the option (Draznin, 2004).

Awareness of Stopping the Tenure Clock may be a result of inadequate publicity of the policy or procedures. As universities are becoming more and more diverse, administrators may wish to consider a variety of communication methods such as website postings (on all related stakeholders' websites), periodic announcements at faculty meetings or orientation, inclusion in applicable policies, employee handbooks, or print publications. University groups such as the Faculty Senate and public relations students could be enlisted to assist in exploring the best way to disseminate the Stopping the Tenure Clock policy. Repeated review of policies and communication methods over time is important as well. Often times a Tenure-track faculty member may be informed of the process once but is not in a position to need it at that time. As years pass, the awareness of the option may wane. Reinforcement is needed in the event that a situation arises at a later date that may warrant a Stop the Tenure Clock request.

Another common communication method may be the network of colleagues and administrators that support the Tenure-track Faculty. In a crisis situation, an individual is often

unable to fully consider the implications to his/her record, thereby neglecting any pursuit of Stopping the Tenure Clock. Colleagues may recognize the need for assistance and bring the option to his/her attention. Having all faculty, not just the tenure-track, aware of the procedures or policy may heighten the likelihood of the utilization of the policy by someone in need. Again, repeated communication to the university community would be beneficial as faculty come and go, and administrators rotate in and out of leadership roles. Administrators should review the stated policies to refresh their understanding of the option. It is also critical that the policies and procedures are communicated clearly, leaving little room for interpretation by different departments or individuals (Armenti, 2004a). Increasing awareness could also benefit faculty and administrators in appropriately treating the Stop the Tenure Clock case when reviewing a promotion and tenure portfolio.

As more and more universities offer family-friendly options, candidates for Tenure-track Faculty positions are researching these policies and procedures even before accepting job offers, thereby affecting faculty recruitment and retention (Clark and Hill, 2010). This reinforces the need for the option to be easily accessible through mechanisms intended for not only internal constituents, but also external constituents. Another external group that may express interest in the policy is the external reviewers for promotion and tenure. While the administrator who requests the external review should explain the university's view on Stopping the Tenure Clock, a reviewer may wish to understand it further by reading the policy. Again, availability to external constituents would be critical in this situation.

The researcher further recommends that future research be conducted to determine the preferred and most effective method(s) of communication to the university community. As

technology becomes more and more sophisticated, the methods used for everyday correspondence evolves. What works today may not work tomorrow.

Conclusion Five

5. Female Tenure-track Faculty have a more favorable perception of Stopping the Tenure Clock than Male Tenure-track Faculty.

This conclusion is based on a comparison of the mean perception score of Male Tenure-track Faculty 3.54 (SD = 0.50) and Female Tenure-track Faculty (mean = 3.80, SD = 0.50).

There was a significant difference between the two groups ($t_{176} = 3.47$, $p = <0.01$).

Literature indicates that although Stopping the Tenure Clock is often times available to both males and females, utilization is more likely among females. Research shows that women are particularly affected by the expectation of unlimited commitment to their work and women tend to shoulder more family responsibilities than men (Armenti, 2004b). In addition, women are burdened by pregnancies and child birth, a life event that may drastically impact a scholar's work productivity.

The researcher recommends that future research be conducted to further understand the reasons behind these perceptions of both males and females. As the roles of men and women in the household and in the workplace evolves, additional research should identify describe the roles and determine any correlations with perceptions.

Universities continually strive to recruit the most qualified and diverse faculty. This finding lends itself to assisting in the recruitment of female faculty. Administration may wish to probe further in determining why this option is so desirable and other mechanisms that could supplement this policy.

Conclusion Six

6. Tenure-track faculty had more positive perceptions than the Tenured Faculty of Stopping the Tenure Clock.

This finding is based on the comparison of perception of Stopping the Tenure Clock by employee groups, whereby a significant difference was revealed ($F_{2, 572} = 3.173$, $p = 0.034$) between two or more groups. The post-hoc analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between the Tenured Faculty and Tenure-track Faculty groups.

Tenure has been long-standing in many universities and is engrained in tradition. It is often seen as a “rite of passage” and reflects a professional standing (Mandleco, 2010). Some Tenured faculty may not have a positive perception of Stopping the Tenure Clock because this was not an option offered to them at the time they were going through the tenure-track period. Some feel that the standards of tenure will be compromised by giving more time. Others feel that if they were able to handle personal responsibilities along with working toward tenure, then future tenure-track faculty should do the same. The researcher recommends future research to identify the specific sources of these perceptions and methods to address them.

The implications of this finding for practical purposes are many. Being that most RU/VH universities typically have shared faculty governance, Tenured faculty have a great deal of input on many issues including the tenure review process. Their perceptions of Stopping the Tenure Clock may influence their vote as to whether or not a Tenure-track faculty member is awarded tenure. University administrators should acknowledge the reasons behind any negative perceptions and address them head-on by opening up the dialogue and how they can be addressed such as a department head meeting or Provost’s institute. In addition, the university’s leadership should be vocal about their position on Stopping the Tenure Clock and why this offering is beneficial to higher education.

Conclusion Seven

7. Not being in the age group of “66 or older” is associated with higher perception scores.

This conclusion is based on the finding that one of the highest correlations with the Perception Scores was found to be with the category “66 or older” ($r = -0.20$, $p = <0.01$) of the variable Age. Not being in the age group of “66 or older” was associated with higher perception scores.

This particular age group likely mostly consisted of tenured faculty that went through the tenure-track process without the option of Stopping the Tenure Clock. As discussed in Conclusion 6, their own experience going through the tenure-track period without this option may influence their perception of STC. Some feel that if they were able to balance their personal responsibilities with the demands of the position, the current group of Tenure-track faculty should be held to the same expectations. Future research should be conducted to identify specific reasons behind the lower perception scores. On a practical implication, the researcher recommends that campus administrators open the dialogue with experienced faculty to discuss the changing academic environment and how a STC option could benefit the university and improve the academic core.

Conclusion Eight

8. Tenured Faculty who are not Asian or Pacific Islander had a more positive perception of Stopping the Tenure Clock than those who were Asian or Pacific Islander.

This conclusion is based on a comparison of the mean perception score of Tenured Faculty that are not Asian or Pacific Islander (mean = 3.56, SD = 0.62) to the Asian or Pacific Islander Tenured Faculty category (3.23 (SD = 0.80)). There was a significant difference found between the two groups ($t_{32.123} = 2.19$, $p = 0.04$).

Again, this research was exploratory in nature. No previous research was identified that specifically addressed a comparison of this perception by categories of the variable race. It is interesting to note that no other category of race was found to hold significantly different perceptions of the Stopping the Tenure Clock process. Future research is needed to discover the reasons behind this difference between the groups.

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P. (n.d.). Higher education in context - economic factors, an era of competition, demographic realities, governmental political and legal challenges, religious factors. In StateUniversity.com. Retrieved January 6, 2013, from <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2041/Higher-Education-in-Context.html#ixzz2HEdBPvSO>.
- Alwehaibi, H.U. (2012). Novel program to promote critical thinking among higher education students: empirical study from Saudi Arabia. *Asian Social Science*; Vol. 8, No. 11. 193-204.
- American Association of University Professors (1940). 1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure. Retrieved on January 21, 2013 from <http://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure>
- American Association of University Professors (2001). *Statement of principles on family responsibilities and academic work*. Retrieved June 20, 2008 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/workfam-stmt.htm>
- American Association of University Professors (2001). *Stopping the tenure clock*. Retrieved May 8, 2008 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/WF/tenureclock.htm>
- American Association of University Professors (2007). Informal glossary of AAUP terms and abbreviations. Retrieved on July 12, 2012 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/about/mission/glossary.htm>
- American Association of University Professors (n.d.). Informal glossary of AAUP terms and abbreviations. Retrieved on January 21, 2013 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/about/mission/glossary.htm>
- American Association of University Professors (n.d.). *Balancing family and academic work*. Retrieved January 21, 2013 from <http://www.aaup.org/issues/balancing-family-academic-work>
- Armenti, C. (2004a). May babies and posttenure babies: Maternal decisions of women professors. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(2): 211-231.
- Armenti, C. (2004b). Women faculty seeking tenure and parenthood: Lessons from previous generations. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 34, 65-83.
- Bardoel, E.A., Drago, R., Cooper, B. & Colbeck, C. (2009). Bias Avoidance: Cross-cultural Differences in the US and Australian Academies.
- Bhattacharjee, Y. (2004). Family matters: stopping tenure clock may not be enough. *Science*, Vol. 306 Issue 5704, 2031-2033, Retrieved January 21, 2013 from <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/306/5704/2031.full>

- Biernat, M., & Wortman, C.B. (1991). Sharing of home responsibilities between professionally employed women and their husbands. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 844-860.
- Bonawitz, M. & Andel, N. (2009). The Glass Ceiling Is Made of Concrete: The Barriers to Promotion and Tenure of Women in American Academia. *Forum on Public Policy Online*, v2009 n2 2009.
- Bunk, S. (1997). Policies to stop tenure clock support family life. *The Scientist*, 11 (23),
- Burnett, J.A., Long, L.L., & Horne, H.L. (2005). Service Learning for Counselors: Integrating Education, Training, and the Community. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development*. 44 (2), 158-167.
- Clark, C.D. & Hill, J. (2010). Reconciling the tension between the tenure and biological clocks to increase the recruitment and retention of women in academia. *Forum on Public Policy*, 2010, www.forumonpublicpolicy.com
- Comer, D. & Stites-Doe, S. (2006). Antecedents and Consequences of Faculty Women's Academic-Parental Role Balancing. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 27, 495-512.
- Cramer, Elizabeth; Boyd, John (1995). The tenure track and the parent track: a road guide. *Wilson Library Bulletin*, March 1995, 69, 41-42, 2
- Crosby, O. & Moncarz, R (2006). The 2004-14 job outlook for college graduates. *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, Fall 2006, 42-57.
- Curtis, J.W. (2004). Balancing work and family for faculty: why it's important. *Academe Online*. Retrieved December 2, 2010 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2004/ND/Feat/04ndcurt.htm>
- Davis, J. A. (1971). *Elementary survey analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice Hall.
- Draznin, J. (2004). The “mommy” tenure track. *Academic Medicine* 79:289-291.
- Felten, P. and Clayton, P. H. (2011), Service-learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2011: 75–84. doi: 10.1002/tl.470
- Frasch, K., Stacy, A., Mason, M.A., Page-Medrich, S., & Goulden, M. (2009). The devil is in the details: creating family-friendly departments for faculty at the University of California. In J. Lester and M. Saltee (Eds.), *Establishing the Family Friendly Campus: Models for Effective Practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus
- Freeman, S., Kochan, F.K.I (2012). The role of assessment and accountability in higher education doctoral programs: A presidential perspective. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, v7, n2, Summer 2012. 1-13

- Gerten, A.M. (2011). Moving beyond family-friendly policies for faculty mothers. *Journal of Women & Social Work*, Vol 26(1), Feb, 2011. 47-58.
- Governor Jindal Announces LA GRAD Act (2010). *Office of the Governor Bobby Jindal*. Retrieved July 12, 2012 from <http://gov.louisiana.gov/index.cfm?md=newsroom&tmp=detail&articleID=1915>
- Gray, M.J., Ondaatje, E.H., Zakaras, L. (1999). Combining service and learning in higher education: Learn and serve America, higher education. Summary report. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp. Retrieved January 21, 2013 from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED443380>
- Greene, H.C., O'Connor, K.A., Good, A.J., Ledford, C.C., Peel, B.B. & Zhang, G. (2008). Building a support system toward tenure: challenges and needs of tenure-track faculty in colleges of education. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, Nov 2008, Vol. 16 Issue 4, 429-447, 19.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Upper saddle River, New Jersey , Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hollenshead, Carol S.; Sullivan, B.; Smith, Gilia C. (2005). Work/Family Policies in Higher Education: Survey Data and Case Studies of Policy Implementation. *New Directions for Higher Education*, n130,41-65 Sum 2005.
- Hong, B. & Shull, P. (2010). A retrospective study of the impact faculty dispositions have on undergraduate engineering students. *College Student Journal*, June 2010, Part A, Vol 44, Issue 2, 266-278.
- Jaschik, S. (2009, January 6). Ignorance about “stop the clock” policies. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/01/06/stc>
- Jaschik, S. (2012, June 14). A ‘Stop the Clock’ Penalty. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/06/14/study-finds-those-who-stop-tenure-clock-earn-less-those-who-dont>
- Jones, K (2012). What is the Purpose of Education? *Forbes*. Retrieved December 18, 2012 from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/sap/2012/08/15/what-is-the-purpose-of-education/print/>
- Kirwan, W.E., Cantor, N., Cordova, F., & Broad, M. (2005). Creating flexibility in tenure-track faculty careers. *American Council on Education, Spring*, 34-38.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J.A., Bridges, B.K, & Hayek, J.C. (2006). What matters to student success: a review of the literature. *National Postsecondary Education Cooperative, July 2006*.

- Lederman, D. (2011). What degrees should mean. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved January 21, 2013 from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/01/25/defining_what_a_college_degree_recipient_should_know_and_be_able_to_do#ixzz2HDug8iZa
- Lei, S. & Chuang, N. (2009). Research collaboration and publication during graduate studies: evaluating benefits and costs from students' perspectives. *College Student Journal*, v43 n4 1163-1168. Dec 2009.
- Leonard, B. (2012). Higher education needed for most future jobs: SHRM study. *Society for Human Resource Management*. Retrieved on 1/6/2013 from <http://www.shrm.org/publications/hrnews/pages/higher-education-needed.aspx>
- Lerman, R.I., Schmidt, S.R. (n.d.). An overview of economic, social and demographic trends affecting the U.S. labor market. United States Department of Labor. Retrieved online January 21, 2013 from <http://www.dol.gov/oasam/programs/history/herman/reports/futurework/conference/trends/trendsV.htm>
- Louisiana State University (2009). *Stop the Tenure Clock Report from the University Council on Women*. Retrieved January 6, 2013 from [http://appl015.lsu.edu/acadaff/cswomen.nsf/\\$Content/Sub+Committee+Reports/\\$file/STC.pdf](http://appl015.lsu.edu/acadaff/cswomen.nsf/$Content/Sub+Committee+Reports/$file/STC.pdf)
- Louisiana State University (2009). *Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty: Appointments, Reappointments, Promotions, Tenure, Annual Reviews, and Enhancement of Job Performance*. PS-36-T. [http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/4d8b193f0753c7e48625714000672ba4/9810721F6C7A3F19862575C90076C063/\\$File/PS36-T+FINAL+2009.pdf](http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/4d8b193f0753c7e48625714000672ba4/9810721F6C7A3F19862575C90076C063/$File/PS36-T+FINAL+2009.pdf)
- Manchester, C.F., Leslie, L.M., & Kramer, A. (2013). Is the clock still ticking? An evaluation of the consequences of stopping the tenure clock. *ILRReview*, 66(1) 3-31.
- Mandleco, B. Women in Academia: What Can Be Done to Help Women Achieve Tenure? Forum on Public Policy Online, v2010 n5 2010.
- Marcus, Jon. Helping Academics Have Families and Tenure Too: Universities Discover Their Self-Interest Change. *The Magazine of Higher Learning*, v39 n2 27-32 Mar-Apr 2007. (EJ767654)
- Mason, M. & Goulden, M. (2002). Do babies matter? The effect of family formation on the lifelong careers of academic men and women. *Academe*, 88(6), 21-27.
- Massy, W. (2009). Objectives and success measures for higher education. *Forum for the Future of Higher Education*.
- McCormick, A.C. & Zhao, C. (2005). Rethinking and reframing the Carnegie classification. *Change*, September/October 2005. 51-57

- Miller, R.I. (1987). Evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure. The Jossey Bass Higher Education Series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Banion, T. (2011) Focus on learning: The core mission of higher education. In *Focus on Learning: A Learning College Reader*. Terry O'Banion & Cynthia Wilson (eds.) League for Innovation in the Community College: Phoenix, AZ, 3-8.
- Pappano, L. (2011). The Master's as the New Bachelor's. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 21, 2013 from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/24/education/edlife/edl-24masters-t.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Patterson, G.A. (2008). Managing motherhood and tenure. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 25 (20), 16-18.
- Perna, L.W. (2001). The relationship between family responsibilities and employment status among college and university faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(5). 584-611.
- Pribbenow, C.M., Sheridan, J., Winchell, J., Benting, D., Handelsman, J. and Carnes, M. (2010). The tenure process and extending the tenure clock: the experience of faculty at one university. *Higher Education Policy*, 23. 17-38.
- Quinn, K. (2010). Tenure clock extension policies: who uses them and to what effect? *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education* 3:182-206
- Reddick, R.J.; Rochlen, A.B.; Grasso, J.R.; Reilly, E.D.; Spikes, D.D. (2012). Academic fathers pursuing tenure: A qualitative study of work-family conflict, coping strategies, and departmental culture. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, Vol 13(1), Jan, 2012. 1-15.
- Renner, K.E. (1987). Academic decision making: faculty appointments and reappointments. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 26 (4), 363-372.
- Sagen, H.B., Dallam, J.W., Laverty, J.R. (2000). Effects of career preparation experiences on the initial employment success of college graduates. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 41, No 6.
- Sahlberg, P. (2006). Education Reform for Raising Economic Competitiveness. *Journal of Educational Change*, December 2006, Volume 7, Issue 4, 259-287.
- Shapiro, H.N. (2006). Promotion & tenure & the scholarship of teaching & learning. *Change*; March/April 2006, Volume 38, Issue 2, 38-43.
- Shapiro, H.T. (2005). *A larger sense of purpose: Higher education and society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, G.C. & Waltman, J. (2006). Designing and implementing family-friendly policies in higher education. Retrieved January 13, 2013, from University of Michigan, Center for the Education of Women website: <http://www.cew.umich.edu/sites/default/files/designing06.pdf>

Sullivan, B., Hollenshead, C. and Smith, G. (2004). Developing and implementing work-family policies for faculty *Academe* 90(6): 24-27.

Thornton, S. (2005). Implementing flexible tenure clock policies. *New direction for higher education*, 130, 81-90.

Ward, K. & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2004a). Academic motherhood: Managing complex roles in research universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(2), 233-287.

Ward, K. & Wolf-Wendel, L.E. (2004b). Fear factor: how safe is it to make time for family? *Academe*, Vol. 90, Issue 6.

Ward, K. & Wolf-Wendel, L.E. (2005). Work and family perspectives from Research University faculty. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 130, 67-80.

APPENDIX A: ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

October 14, 2008

To: Deans, Chairs, and Department Heads

From: Astrid E. Merget
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey

I am requesting your response to a study regarding the adjustment to service toward tenure process (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) at LSU. The study is part of an effort to better understand the needs of faculty and administrators as it relates to the tenure-track probationary period and as a result, determine improvements or actions to be taken. We are contacting you because of your position as an administrator and your role in the approval process.

This survey is voluntary and participants will remain anonymous. However, your input is very valuable and the survey should not take more than ten minutes to complete.

The study is web-based and may be accessed at <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB228BBQYMXJN>. Please contact me if you would prefer to have a hard-copy delivered to you.

The deadline to complete the survey is **October 28, 2008**. If you have any questions or comments about the study, you may send them to academicaffairs@lsu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

APPENDIX B: ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator
Page 1 of



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

For the purpose of this study, adjustment to service toward tenure (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) is defined as extending the tenure-track period due to a faculty member’s personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure.

Please note that there will be an opportunity at the end of this survey to provide any **comments**.



Survey Page 1



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

Indicate the response that reflects your individual experience as an administrator with stopping the tenure clock.

- 1 * Are you aware of the stopping the tenure clock process (adjustment of service toward tenure) at LSU?



Survey Page 2

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23JALZDT2...>

10/26/20

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator
Page 2 of



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

2 * Indicate if you have discussed the stopping the tenure clock process: (check all that apply)

With a tenure track faculty member who had a situation that may have hindered his/her ability to build a case toward tenure

In a faculty meeting

With the promotion and tenure committee in my department/school (separate from a faculty meeting) With the promotion and tenure eligible voting faculty (separate from a faculty meeting)

None of the above



Survey Page 3



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

Indicate whether the following statements are true or false regarding the current stopping the tenure clock process at LSU.

3 * If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped.

FMLA qualifying event is defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23JALZDT2...>

10/26/20

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

Page 3 of

health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

True
False

- 4 * If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically.

True
False

- 5 * A faculty member may stop the tenure clock more than once within the tenure-track period.

True
False

- 6 * The tenure clock can only stop due to an FMLA qualifying event.

FMLA qualifying event is defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

True
False

- 7 * One year is the maximum period to stop the tenure clock.

True
False

- 8 * Retroactive requests to stop the tenure clock are discouraged.

True
False

- 9 * Once a faculty member has a request to stop the tenure clock approved, he/she cannot be reviewed earlier than the redefined mandatory review year.

True
False

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23JALZDT2...>

10/26/20

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

Page 4 of

10 * The LSU System President or his/her designee is the final approval authority for stopping the tenure clock.

True
False

11 * Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet.

True
False

12 * A faculty member who has been given notice of non- reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.

True
False



Survey Page 4



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

Indicate your agreement with the following statements by selecting the corresponding number.

13 * Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive stopping the tenure clock policy.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
----------------------------	----------	---------	-------

1	2	3	4
5			

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23JALZDT2...>

10/26/20

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

Page 5 of

14 * Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
----------------------------	----------	---------	-------

1	2	3	4
5			

15 * Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some faculty in my department.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
----------------------------	----------	---------	-------

1	2	3	4
5			

16 * Stopping the tenure clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
----------------------------	----------	---------	-------

1	2	3	4
5			

17 * There is rarely adequate justification for a tenure-track faculty member to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
----------------------------	----------	---------	-------

1	2	3	4
5			

18 * Stopping the tenure clock option is intended for female faculty only.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1 5	2	3	4

19 * Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1 5	2	3	4

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23JALZDT2...>

10/26/20

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

Page 6 of

20 * Stopping the tenure clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1 5	2	3	4

21 * Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
----------------------------	----------	---------	-------

1	2	3	4
5			

22 * Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1	2	3	4
5			

23 * Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of stopping the tenure clock.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1	2	3	4
5			

24 * Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1	2	3	4
5			



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

Indicate your opinion if each of the following situations merit stopping the tenure clock by selecting the corresponding number.

25 * Pregnancy/Birth of a Child

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

26 * Adoption

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

27 * Care of Spouse (Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent (Not Parent-in-Laws)

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

28 * Care for Another Family Member Other than Spouse (Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

	1	2	3
29	* Divorce		

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

	1	2	3
--	---	---	---

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23JALZDT2...>

10/26/20

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

Page 8 of

30 * Own Serious Health Condition

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

	1	2	3
--	---	---	---

31 * Property Loss or Damage

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

	1	2	3
--	---	---	---

32 * Administrative Duties

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

	1	2	3
33 * Fellowship (i.e. Fulbright)			

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

	1	2	3
34 * Temporary Part-Time Assignment			

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

	1	2	3



Survey Page 6



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23JALZDT2...>

10/26/20

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator
Page 9 of

For data analysis purposes, please provide the following demographics:

35

Race:

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Black (not of Hispanic origin)
- Hispanic
- White (not of Hispanic origin)
- Asian or Pacific Islander

36

Sex:

Male

Female

37

Age:

18-25

26-35

36-45

46-55

56-65

66 or older

38

Marital

Status:

Married

Not Married

39

Number of Children:

0

1

2

3

4

5 or more



<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23JALZDT2...>

10/26/20



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

40

Comments

Please provide any information that you would like to share about the stopping the tenure clock process.

Your comments do not necessarily need to be related to previous questions.



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Academic Administrator

41

If you would be willing to participate in an in-depth interview, please provide your contact information below.



APPENDIX C: TENURED FACULTY REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

October 14, 2008

To: Tenured Faculty

From: Astrid E. Merget
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey

I am requesting your response to a study regarding the adjustment to service toward tenure process (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) at LSU. The study is part of an effort to better understand the needs of faculty and administrators as it relates to the tenure-track probationary period and as a result, determine improvements or actions to be taken. We are contacting you because of your status as a Tenured Faculty member.

This survey is voluntary and participants will remain anonymous. However, your input is very valuable and the survey should not take more than ten minutes to complete.

The study is web-based and may be accessed at www.zoomerang.com. Please contact me if you would prefer to have a hard-copy delivered to you.

The deadline to complete the survey is **October 28, 2008**. If you have any questions or comments about the study, you may send them to academicaffairs@lsu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

APPENDIX D: TENURED FACULTY SURVEY INSTRUMENT



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

For the purpose of this study, adjustment to service toward tenure (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) is defined as extending the tenure-track period due to a faculty member’s personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure.

Please note that there will be an opportunity at the end of this survey to provide any **comments**.



Survey Page 1



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

Indicate the response that reflects your individual experience with stopping the tenure clock.

- 1 * Looking back on your tenure-track period, did you have a situation that hindered your ability to build a case toward tenure?



<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty Pa

Survey Page 2



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

2 * Please identify the situation(s) that hindered your ability to build a case toward tenure (check all that apply):

Pregnancy/Birth of a Child

Adoption

Care of Spouse (Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent (Not Parent-in-Laws)

Care for Another Family Member Other than Spouse (Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent

Divorce

Own Serious Health Condition

Property Loss or Damage

Administrative Duties

Fellowship (i.e. Fulbright)

Temporary part-time assignment

Other, please specify



Survey Page 3



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

3 * Did you hold a tenure-track position at LSU?

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty Pa



Survey Page 4



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

4 * Did you formally submit a request to stop the tenure clock at LSU?





Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

- 5 * Are you familiar with the stopping the tenure clock process (adjustment of service toward tenure) at LSU?



<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty Pa

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

Indicate whether the following statements are true or false regarding the current stopping the tenure clock process at LSU.

- 6 * If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped.

FMLA qualifying event is defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

True
False

- 7 * If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically.

True
False

- 8 * A faculty member may stop the tenure clock more than once within the tenure-track period.

True
False

- 9 * The tenure clock can only stop due to an FMLA qualifying event.

FMLA qualifying event is defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

True
False

- 10 * One year is the maximum period to stop the tenure clock.

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty Pa

True
False

- 11 * Retroactive requests to stop the tenure clock are discouraged.

True
False

- 12 * Once a faculty member has a request to stop the tenure clock approved, he/she cannot be reviewed earlier than the redefined mandatory review year.

True
False

- 13 * The LSU System President or his/her designee is the final approval authority for stopping the tenure clock.

True
False

- 14 * Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet.

True
False

- 15 * A faculty member who has been given notice of non- reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.

True
False





<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty Pa

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

Indicate your agreement with the following statements by selecting the corresponding number.

16 * Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive stopping the tenure clock policy.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

17 * Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

18 * Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some faculty in my department.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

19 * Stopping the tenure clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

20 * There is rarely adequate justification for a tenure-track faculty member to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty Pa

21 * Stopping the tenure clock option is intended for female faculty only.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

22 * Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

23 * Stopping the tenure clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

24 * Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

1 2 3 4 5

25 * Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5

26 * Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of stopping the tenure clock.

Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty Pa

27 * Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.

Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5



Survey Page 8



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

Indicate your opinion if each of the following situations merit stopping the tenure clock by selecting the corresponding number.

28 * Pregnancy/Birth of a Child

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock
Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

29 * Adoption

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

30 * Care of Spouse (Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent (Not Parent-in-Laws)

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty Pa

31 * Care for Another Family Member Other than Spouse (Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

32 * Divorce

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

33 * Own Serious Health Condition

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

34 * Property Loss or Damage

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

35 * Administrative Duties

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

36 * Fellowship (i.e. Fulbright)

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

37 * Temporary Part-Time Assignment

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty
Pag

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

SUBMIT

Survey Page 9



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

For data analysis purposes, please provide the following demographics:

38 Race:

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Black (not of Hispanic origin)
- Hispanic
- White (not of Hispanic origin)
- Asian or Pacific Islander

39

Sex:

- Male
- Female

40 Age:

- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66 or older

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1
Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty
Pag

41 Marital Status:

- Married

Not Married

42 Number of Children:

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more



Survey Page 10



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

43 **Comments**
Please provide any information that you would like to share about the stopping the tenure clock process.

Your comments do not necessarily need to be related to previous questions.



Survey Page 11



<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL7G9J4...> 1

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenured Faculty

44 If you would be willing to participate in an in-depth interview, please provide your contact information below.



APPENDIX E: TENURE-TRACK FACULTY REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

October 14, 2008

To: Tenure-track Faculty

From: Astrid E. Merget
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey

I am requesting your response to a study regarding the adjustment to service toward tenure process (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) at LSU. The study is part of an effort to better understand the needs of faculty and administrators as it relates to the tenure-track probationary period and as a result, determine improvements or actions to be taken. We are contacting you because of your status as a Tenure-track Faculty member.

This survey is voluntary and participants will remain anonymous. However, your input is very valuable and the survey should not take more than ten minutes to complete.

The study is web-based and may be accessed at www.zoomerang.com. Please contact me if you would prefer to have a hard-copy delivered to you.

The deadline to complete the survey is **October 28, 2008**. If you have any questions or comments about the study, you may send them to academicaffairs@lsu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

APPENDIX F: TENURE-TRACK FACULTY SURVEY INSTRUMENT



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

For the purpose of this study, adjustment to service toward tenure (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) is defined as extending the tenure-track period due to a faculty member’s personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure.

Please note that there will be an opportunity at the end of this survey to provide any **comments**.



Survey Page 1



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

Indicate the response that reflects your individual experience with stopping the tenure clock.

- 1 * Have you had a situation during your tenure-track period that hindered your ability to build a case toward tenure?



Survey Page 2

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL55N3W...>

10/26/2011

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty
Page 2 of 11



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

2 * Please identify the situation(s) that hindered your ability to build a case toward tenure (check all that apply):

- Pregnancy/Birth of a Child
- Adoption
- Care of Spouse (Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent (Not Parent-in-Laws)
- Care for Another Family Member Other than Spouse (Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent
- Divorce
- Own Serious Health Condition
- Property Loss or Damage
- Administrative Duties
- Fellowship (i.e. Fulbright)
- Temporary part-time assignment

Other, please specify



Survey Page 3



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

3 * Did you formally submit a request to stop the tenure clock?

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL55N3W...>

10/26/2011

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

Page 3 of 11



Survey Page 4



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

- 4 * Are you familiar with the stopping the tenure clock process (adjustment of service toward tenure) at LSU?



Survey Page 5



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

Indicate whether the following statements are true or false regarding the current stopping the tenure clock process at LSU.

- 5 * If a faculty member is on leave due to an FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act) qualifying event, the tenure clock is automatically stopped.

FMLA qualifying event is defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

True
False

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL55N3W...>

10/26/2011

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

Page 4 of 11

- 6 * If a faculty member is on leave without pay for any reason, the tenure clock stops automatically.

True
False

- 7 * A faculty member may stop the tenure clock more than once within the tenure-track period.

True
False

- 8 * The tenure clock can only stop due to an FMLA qualifying event.

FMLA qualifying event is defined as: birth of a child and/or to care for the child; placement of a child through adoption or foster care; care of the employee's spouse (wife or husband), son, daughter, or parent (no parent-in-laws) who has a serious health condition; inability to perform the essential duties of the position because of employee's own serious health condition.

True
False

9 * One year is the maximum period to stop the tenure clock.

True
False

10 * Retroactive requests to stop the tenure clock are discouraged.

True
False

11 * Once a faculty member has a request to stop the tenure clock approved, he/she cannot be reviewed earlier than the redefined mandatory review year.

True
False

12 * The LSU System President or his/her designee is the final approval authority for stopping the tenure clock.

True

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL55N3W...>

10/26/2011

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

Page 5 of 11

False

13 * Scholarly work that is accomplished during the period where the tenure clock is stopped may be included in the tenure review packet.

True
False

14 * A faculty member who has been given notice of non- reappointment may request to stop the tenure clock.

True
False



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

Indicate your agreement with the following statements by selecting the corresponding number.

15 * Louisiana State University should adopt a comprehensive stopping the tenure clock policy.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

16 * Faculty who have personal obligations or situations that can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress towards tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL55N3W...>

10/26/2011

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

Page 6 of 11

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

17 * Requesting to stop the tenure clock is viewed negatively by some faculty in my department.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

18 * Stopping the tenure clock allows faculty to build a record that more accurately reflects ability.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

19 * There is rarely adequate justification for a tenure-track faculty member to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

20 * Stopping the tenure clock option is intended for female faculty only.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

21 * Faculty who accept a temporary assignment that results in a temporary reduction to part-time status should request to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

22 * Stopping the tenure clock gives the candidate an unfair advantage in the promotion and tenure review process.

Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL55N3W...>

10/26/2011

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty
Page 7 of 11

23 * Comparatively, promotion and tenure records of candidates that have stopped the tenure clock should exceed those who have not.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1 5	2	3	4

24 * Faculty who are assigned administrative duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure should request to stop the tenure clock.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1 5	2	3	4

25 * Generally speaking, faculty in my department/college are supportive of stopping the tenure clock.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1 5	2	3	4

26 * Offering the option to stop the tenure clock improves faculty recruitment.

Disagree Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1 5	2	3	4





Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL55N3W...>

10/26/2011

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty
Page 8 of 11

Indicate your opinion if each of the following situations merit stopping the tenure clock by selecting the corresponding number.

27 * Pregnancy/Birth of a Child

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

28 * Adoption

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

29 * Care of Spouse (Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent (Not Parent-in-Laws)

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

30 * Care for Another Family Member Other than Spouse
(Wife or Husband), Son, Daughter, or Parent

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

31 * Divorce

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

32 * Own Serious Health Condition

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL55N3W...>

10/26/2011

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

Page 9 of 11

1

2

3

33 * Property Loss or Damage

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

34 * Administrative Duties

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

35 * Fellowship (i.e. Fulbright)

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3

36 * Temporary Part-Time Assignment

Definitely does not merit stopping the tenure clock

May merit stopping the tenure clock

Definitely merits stopping the tenure clock

1

2

3



Survey Page 8



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

For data analysis purposes, please provide the following demographics:

<http://app.zoomerang.com/Report/PrintSurvey/PrintSurveyBody.aspx?ID=L23KL55N3W...>

10/26/2011

Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

Page 10 of 11

37 Race:

American Indian or Alaskan Native
Black (not of Hispanic origin)
Hispanic
White (not of Hispanic origin)
Asian or Pacific Islander

38

Sex:

Male
Female

39 Age:

18-25
26-35
36-45
46-55
56-65
66 or older

40

Marital

Status:

Married
Not Married

41 Number of Children:

0
1
2
3
4
5 or more





Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

42

Comments

Please provide any information that you would like to share about the stopping the tenure clock process. Your comments do not necessarily need to be related

to previous questions.

SUBMIT

Survey Page 10



Stopping the Tenure Clock Survey- Tenure-track Faculty

43 If you would be willing to participate in an in-depth interview, please provide your contact information below.

SUBMIT

Survey Page 11

APPENDIX G: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL TO ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

From: Office of Academic Affairs

Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2008 8:39 AM

To: Office of Academic Affairs

Subject: RE: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey- Academic Administrators REMINDER

Last week, you received the email below asking you to participate in a survey regarding stopping the tenure clock. [If you have already completed the survey, thank you!](#) If you have not responded yet, please take approximately ten minutes to complete the survey at the link listed below. Your participation is voluntary but your feedback is important.

The deadline to complete the survey is **October 28, 2008**.

From: The Office of Academic Affairs ID

Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2008 9:46 AM

To: The Office of Academic Affairs ID

Subject: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey- Academic Administrators

October 14, 2008

To: Deans, Chairs, and Department Heads

From: Astrid E. Merget

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey

I am requesting your response to a study regarding the adjustment to service toward tenure process (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) at LSU. The study is part of an effort to better understand the needs of faculty and administrators as it relates to the tenure-track probationary period and as a result, determine improvements or actions to be taken. I am contacting you because of your position as an administrator and your role in the approval process.

This survey is voluntary and participants will remain anonymous. Your input is very valuable and the survey should not take more than ten minutes to complete.

The study is web-based and may be accessed at <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB22889VWS7TP>. Please contact me if you would prefer to have a hard-copy delivered to you.

The deadline to complete the survey is **October 28, 2008**. If you have any questions or comments about the study, you may send them to academicaffairs@lsu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

APPENDIX H: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL TO TENURED FACULTY

From: Office of Academic Affairs

Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2008 8:45 AM

To: Office of Academic Affairs

Subject: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey- Tenured Faculty REMINDER

Last week, you received the email below asking you to participate in a survey regarding stopping the tenure clock. [If you have already completed the survey, thank you!](#) If you have not responded yet, please take approximately ten minutes to complete the survey at the link listed below. Your participation is voluntary but your feedback is important.

The deadline to complete the survey is **October 28, 2008**.

From: The Office of Academic Affairs ID

Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2008 9:57 AM

To: The Office of Academic Affairs ID

Subject: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey- Tenured Faculty

October 14, 2008

To: Tenured Faculty

From: Astrid E. Merget

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey

I am requesting your response to a study regarding the adjustment to service toward tenure process (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) at LSU. The study is part of an effort to better understand the needs of faculty and administrators as it relates to the tenure-track probationary period and as a result, determine improvements or actions to be taken. We are contacting you because of your status as a Tenured Faculty member.

This survey is voluntary and participants will remain anonymous. Your input is very valuable and the survey should not take more than ten minutes to complete.

The study is web-based and may be accessed at <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB228CJHDDLJU>. Please contact me if you would prefer to have a hard-copy delivered to you.

The deadline to complete the survey is **October 28, 2008**. If you have any questions or comments about the study, you may send them to academicaffairs@lsu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

APPENDIX I: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL TO TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

From: Office of Academic Affairs

Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2008 8:47 AM

To: Office of Academic Affairs

Subject: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey- Tenure-track Faculty REMINDER

Last week, you received the email below asking you to participate in a survey regarding stopping the tenure clock. [If you have already completed the survey, thank you!](#) If you have not responded yet, please take approximately ten minutes to complete the survey at the link listed below. Your participation is voluntary but your feedback is important.

The deadline to complete the survey is **October 28, 2008**.

From: The Office of Academic Affairs ID

Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2008 10:01 AM

To: The Office of Academic Affairs ID

Subject: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey- Tenure-track Faculty

October 14, 2008

To: Tenure-track Faculty

From: Astrid E. Merget

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE: Stopping the Tenure Clock survey

I am requesting your response to a study regarding the adjustment to service toward tenure process (commonly called “stopping the tenure clock”) at LSU. The study is part of an effort to better understand the needs of faculty and administrators as it relates to the tenure-track probationary period and as a result, determine improvements or actions to be taken. I am contacting you because of your status as a Tenure-track Faculty member.

This survey is voluntary and participants will remain anonymous. Your input is very valuable and the survey should not take more than ten minutes to complete.

The study is web-based and may be accessed at <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB228CJ9VDGBB>. Please contact me if you would prefer to have a hard-copy delivered to you.

The deadline to complete the survey is **October 28, 2008**. If you have any questions or comments about the study, you may send them to academicaffairs@lsu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

APPENDIX J: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight

Unless qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/projects using living humans as subjects, or samples or data obtained from humans, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved or exempted in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.



Institutional Review Board
Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
P: 225.578.8692
F: 225.578.6792
irb@lsu.edu | lsu.edu/irb

- Applicant, Please fill out the application in its entirety and include the completed application as well as parts A-E, listed below, when submitting to the IRB. Once the application is completed, please submit two copies of the completed application to the IRB Office or to a member of the Human Subjects Screening Committee. Members of this committee can be found at <http://www.lsu.edu/irb/screeningmembers.shtml>
- A Complete Application Includes All of the Following:
 - (A) Two copies of this completed form and two copies of parts B thru E.
 - (B) A brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects and to explain your responses to Parts 1 & 2)
 - (C) Copies of all instruments to be used.
 - If this proposal is part of a grant proposal, include a copy of the proposal and all recruitment material.
 - (D) The consent form that you will use in the study (see part 3 for more information.)
 - (E) Certificate of Completion of Human Subjects Protection Training for all personnel involved in the project, including students who are involved with testing or handling data, unless already on file with the IRB.
Training link: (<http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php>.)

1) Principal Investigator: <u>Michael F. Burnett</u> Rank: <u>Professor</u> Student**? Y/N <u>N</u>		Study Exempted By: Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman Institutional Review Board Louisiana State University 203 B-1 David Boyd Hall 225-578-8692 www.lsu.edu/irb Exemption Expires: <u>7/9/2016</u>
Dept.: <u>SHREWD</u> Ph: <u>578-5748</u> E-mail: <u>vocbur@lsu.edu</u>		
2) Co Investigator(s): <u>please include department, rank, phone and e-mail for each</u> * If student, please identify and name supervising professor in this space Mimi S. Ruebsamen, Executive Director, Office of Human Resource Management, Doctoral Student (Michael Burnett supervising professor), 578-8392, mimir@lsu.edu . <i>Mimi S. Ruebsamen</i> Rita Culross, Professor, Educational Theory, Policy, and Practice. 578-1264, acrita@lsu.edu . <i>Rita L. Culross</i>		
3) Project Title: <u>KNOWLEDGE & PERCEPTIONS OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, TENURED FACULTY, & ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING STOPPING THE TENURE CLOCK AT LSU</u>		
4) LSU Proposal?(yes or no) <u>No</u> If Yes, LSU Proposal Number _____ Also, if YES, either <input type="radio"/> This application completely matches the scope of work in the grant OR <input type="radio"/> More IRB Applications will be filed later		
5) Subject pool (e.g. Psychology Students) <u>Tenured & TT faculty, acad admin</u> • Circle any "vulnerable populations" to be used: (children <18; the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the aged, other). Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.		
6) PI Signature <u><i>Michael F. Burnett</i></u> ** Date <u>12/18/08</u> (no per signatures) **I certify my responses are accurate and complete. If the project scope or design is later changed I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the Authorized Representative of all non-LSU institutions in which the study is conducted. I also understand that it is my responsibility to maintain copies of all consent forms at LSU for three years after completion of the study. If I leave LSU before that time the consent forms should be preserved in the Departmental Office.		
IRB# <u>E4354</u> LSU Proposal# _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Complete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Human Subjects Training		
Screening Committee Action: Exempted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Exempted _____ Category/Paragraph <u>4</u> Reviewer <u>Mathews</u> Signature <u><i>Robert Mathews</i></u> Date <u>7/10/13</u>		

VITA

Margaret Singer Ruebsamen, a native of Baton Rouge, LA, earned her Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from Louisiana State University (LSU) in 1999. After completion of her undergraduate work, she began her professional career in the field of Human Resource Management and became interested in furthering her HR knowledge. While working full-time, she earned her Master of Science degree in Human Resource Education from LSU in 2003 and is expected to receive her Doctorate of Philosophy in August 2013. She is currently the Executive Director of the Staffing and Employment Center at Louisiana State University.