There has been much discussion in the literature about maintaining faculty vitality in their later careers. The groundbreaking work of Corcoran and Clark (1985) on faculty vitality has used such words as self-renewal, sense of curiosity, striving to achieve, and continuous improvement to describe faculty vitality. Fundamentally, the vital faculty at an institution are those who demonstrate sustained productivity in their teaching, research, and professional service.

Institutional vitality is equally important. Corcoran and Clark (1985, pp. 62-63) define it as “the creation of an organizational climate or environment that combines individuals and groups in their fulfillment of the institution’s mission and supports individuals in their own, creative, productive, and energized work life.” This should lead to a process of continuous faculty development.

In more recent work, Bland and Bergquist (1997) further link faculty vitality with institutional culture and reward systems. Institutions need to examine their organizational culture, values, and procedures to create a climate that will foster high productivity for senior faculty. In general, several conditions within the academic culture subtly, but effectively discourage senior faculty from being productive: (1) benign neglect, (2) lack of professional development, and (3) non-recognition of the stages of productivity. Once tenured, senior faculty are usually left to seek their own professional quality and performance level. Even where annual reviews are present in the evaluation of senior faculty, these are often perfunctory and related to small variations in annual increases. The result is that there is little incentive for senior faculty to continue to perform at high levels. Moreover, if they do seek to gain professional recognition, the reward structure is such that research is the primary mechanism and teaching is considered secondary.

Higher educational institutions spend only a small fraction of their total resources on faculty development. Usually this is a highly competitive process, and the funds are allocated mostly for research and professional association activities. Moreover, the funding often is designed to help junior faculty enhance their careers as they approach tenure. Often, there is little thought to continue and enhance senior faculty development through such prized mechanisms as released time or funding.

There is also a general non-recognition of the stages of a faculty member’s career. Once faculty gain tenure, they have an ability to take a more long-term look at their career and professional interests.
This often means either more extensive research projects that take longer to develop; text writing gained from a general understanding of their fields; increased emphasis on professional and community service; or, and what we are most interested in here, an increased emphasis on teaching.

**BOYER'S FOUR CRITERIA OF SCHOLARSHIP: THE ROLE OF TEACHING**

When considering the general role of the faculty member in an institution and, more specifically, the role of teaching, Boyer’s four concepts of scholarship (Boyer, 1990) must be considered:

1) Scholarship of discovery: the pursuit of new knowledge in a discipline.

2) Scholarship of integration: making connections within and between disciplines.

3) Scholarship of application: applying knowledge to contemporary problems.

4) Scholarship of teaching: presenting knowledge to students in order to stimulate their understanding and interest in the pursuit of knowledge.

I raise these four categories because teaching is cited as an important and integral part of the academic pursuit and therefore is central to the work of a faculty member.

The American Association for Higher Education’s Project on Teaching Initiatives is dedicated to the idea of creating a culture of teaching and learning. In the introduction of its published work, Hutchings (1996) has amplified Boyer’s ideas of teaching as scholarship with three additional corollaries:

1) The need to see teaching as a “process of ongoing inquiry and reflection.” It is not sufficient to stand and deliver; one must also step back and examine the art of teaching.

2) The need for collegial exchange and publicness. Shulman (1993) has been the foremost advocate of this view of teaching. He contends that assistance and input from colleagues is critical in the development and improvement of teaching.
3) The need for faculty to take professional responsibility for the quality of their work as teachers. In this context, faculty must play a central role in the evaluation of their colleagues’ performance and in ensuring and improving its quality. This takes the form of peer review.

The problem on college campuses is the lack of a campus culture in which the quality and improvement of teaching are subjects of ongoing collective faculty attention and responsibility.

It is clear that the degree of emphasis on teaching in faculty work is a function of the mission of the institution. Three general classifications can be made. First are research universities whose main emphasis is on research activities. The emphasis here is typically on the scholarship of discovery and of integration.

A second classification is teaching institutions, which tend to fall into two categories: liberal arts colleges and community colleges. The emphasis here typically is on the scholarship of teaching. Private liberal arts colleges may also stress the scholarship of discovery in order to enhance their reputations and also to develop a professionally oriented faculty, while community colleges may place more emphasis on the scholarship of application.

The third classification is the comprehensive university. In many ways, I find these institutions to be the most complex and most difficult to categorize. The best way to portray them is that they stress teaching, research, and service in some mixture related to their mission. This means that some element of all four types of scholarship is evident and rewarded and that faculty can have varied activities. Oftentimes the scholarship of teaching is placed on an equal par with other modes of scholarship.

Teaching is viewed as an important endeavor at every academic institution, but its weight varies depending on the mission of the institution. At the same time, most faculty do some teaching. Therefore, teaching must be evaluated in some comprehensive and clearly defined manner.

As faculty age and more gain tenure, they become a critical resource for every academic institution. The granting of tenure involves not just the institution’s recognition of a long-term commitment to the individual faculty member, but that faculty member’s agreement about his or her continued performance as an active member of the faculty.
The need to assess senior faculty centers then on this responsibility to the institution in its granting of a permanent bond between individual and institution. Since that the tenured faculty are a fixed and critical resource to the institution (and often the majority of members of the faculty), continued faculty development in terms of institutional and individual needs is essential. Increasingly, the institutional response to this need is the creation of some form of post-tenure review policy.

MODELS OF POST-TENURE REVIEW

There are three prevalent models of post-tenure review: annual review, comprehensive review (periodic/consequential), and triggered review (episodic/consequential). Each is discussed briefly.

Option 1: Annual Review

Annual reviews are common and generally focus on short-term performance (usually to assess one year’s performance and distribute merit monies accordingly). In some settings, these reviews are perfunctory at best. In other settings, such reviews simply are not effective in providing direct feedback about long-term career development and overall performance. More often than not, annual reviews are administrative exercises and do not involve significant peer input. Additionally, annual reviews cannot assess achievements requiring a longer period of time, as is frequently the case with multiyear projects, research studies, and many scholarly works.

Post-tenure review policy development usually begins with a careful analysis of the benefits and limitations of existing institutional practices for faculty evaluation and development. At the University of Pittsburgh (1995), analysis led to proposals for modifying and strengthening the longstanding annual performance-review process rather than developing a separate periodic post-tenure review process. At the University of Wisconsin, Madison (UWM) (1994), analysis resulted in a separate periodic post-tenure review.

The report of UWM’s Planning Committee on Tenured Faculty Review and Development (1994, p. 7) points out that while no system of review is perfect, “the system of annual merit review links an extensive process of yearly evaluation with recommendations on salary, which are frequently market rather than merit driven. The strains in such a system become particularly apparent when compensation is inadequate to meet competition from other educational institutions and other parts of the economy.”
Option 2: Comprehensive Review (Periodic/Consequential)

- This option involves a periodic comprehensive review of all tenured faculty members, using a prescribed cycle (usually five years). A peer committee, administrators, or both conduct the review. Other characteristics of this approach include the following:
  - Results take the form of a performance assessment accompanied by a recommended professional growth and improvement plan.
  - Satisfactory performance is used as the baseline.
  - The improvement plan establishes goals and timelines and takes into consideration the mission and properties of the department; a professional-development plan is encouraged.
  - Institutional support is provided, where available and when appropriate.
  - Progress is assessed. If progress is unsatisfactory, another review is mandated in one to two years, and longer-term administrative sanctions may occur.
  - An appeals process is usually outlined.

An example of this option is the process at the University of Oregon (1985). A five-year review by an elected peer committee helps identify faculty members who merit special recognition as well as those who need special assistance. Rewards can include a merit increase, reallocation of departmental resources to fund additional research interests or opportunities for curriculum development, additional research or clerical support, or university recognition for achievement. Likewise, actions to improve performance within the university’s career support program include consultation with colleagues on problem areas, reallocation of departmental assignments to facilitate improvement in teaching or research, and access to an instructional improvement center or personal counseling. A second post-tenure review follows these formative steps. The policy suggests that if the faculty member is unwilling or unable to perform at acceptable levels, he or she be counseled about alternate career plans or early-retirement options.

Option 3: Triggered Review (Episodic/Consequential)

This comprehensive review of selected tenured faculty members usually is triggered by unsatisfactory performance as identified through another review. Potential consequences are almost always spelled out.
Several actions characterize this kind of post-tenure review:

- A peer committee or the administration conducts the review.
- Satisfactory performance is used as the baseline.
- An improvement plan is developed with goals, timelines, expected outcomes, and monitoring.
- Institutional support is provided, where available and as appropriate.
- Progress is assessed.
- If progress is unsatisfactory, sanctions occur.
- An appeals process is outlined.

Such triggered post-tenure evaluations are often deemed more acceptable because they are seen as less time-consuming, with attention focused only on substandard performers. Two institutions in Virginia use these evaluations. At Old Dominion University (1995-97), two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews trigger post-tenure review. Longwood College (1995) uses as its trigger either consecutive less-than-satisfactory annual reviews or three less-than-satisfactory annual reviews during a five-year period. The policy at Longwood directs chairs to recommend termination if after two years the faculty member does not make reasonable progress, as judged by the dean, chair, and tenure committee.

How do these models of post-tenure review impact on the evaluation of teaching?

**EVALUATING TEACHING IN POST-TENURE REVIEW**

Evaluating teaching under post-tenure review is different than evaluating teaching on an annual basis. The purpose of annual reviews is summative in nature. They are designed to determine if the faculty member met his or her teaching obligations for that past year and to measure the effectiveness of teaching. Oftentimes, the evidence is student evaluations and classroom visits by colleagues or the chair of the department. A short-term (one year) view of the faculty member’s teaching performance is taken, and rarely is a discussion of teaching philosophy or pedagogy required.

But in post-tenure review, the evaluation is of the performance of a faculty member over a number of years (three to seven). The purpose of the review is primarily developmental, with many
more measurements taken of a faculty member’s performance. The institution relies on a range of indicators to evaluate the complex activity of teaching and how teaching affects learning.

As McAhren of Washington and Lee University in Virginia (in Galgano, 1990, p. 1) states, “fostering continued development of teaching skills in post-tenure review of faculty possesses different problems.” Most senior faculty are relatively comfortable with their pedagogy and style of teaching after they reach tenure. After all, they have “passed muster” using these teaching techniques and therefore have been confirmed as quality teachers. Yet, they must be both held accountable and encouraged to continue to develop their art of teaching. Placing emphasis on teaching in a comprehensive five-year review is one way to maintain a focus on the importance of this activity in their careers.

At the University of Oregon (1993-94, p.1), a teaching workshop was formed to “set forth a policy structure that assists in the systematic and equitable evaluation of teaching and in the encouragement and reward of good teaching at the university. . . .” There was great emphasis placed on the systematic, ongoing support, encouragement, and evaluation of teaching after tenure.

**The guidelines for tenured faculty assert that:**

- Faculty members should continue to update their teaching vitae and teaching portfolios on a yearly basis (see Chapter 9).

- Student evaluations should continue to be conducted routinely (see Chapter 2).

- Within the department, a review and discussion of teaching should be included as a routine component of faculty evaluation and review on a par with the review and discussion of research.

- Every six years (this being the normal period for other academic reviews), the updated record of teaching is submitted to the department for review.

- Any faculty member whose teaching is rated as unacceptable or who wishes to develop teaching abilities further, should establish with the department head new expectations and guidelines for evaluating and improving teaching. This might require further peer review or participation in teaching and improvement activities.
We recognize that post-tenure reviews vary considerably among departments in the seriousness with which they are conducted and taken.

**MATERIALS FOR EVALUATION**

In a comprehensive system of teaching evaluation for a formative purpose, a variety of materials are suggested. Usually, in a self-evaluation, the faculty member discusses his or her philosophy of teaching and reviews a variety of teaching methods and classes taught. Sometimes this evaluation occurs within the context of the department’s course offerings. Typically the evaluation of the professor includes all syllabi for the past five years, classroom visits to at least one class, a statement of self-assessment of teaching, and a teaching portfolio. Moreover, the faculty member is sometimes asked to develop a plan for teaching indicating new pedagogies of teaching and new directions in teaching.

A quantitative judgment is made in some of the departments at the University of Hawaii, Manoa (1992). The adopted criteria for post-tenure review in the evaluation of teaching in the department of economics include these performance characteristics:

1) Maintenance of up-to-date knowledge of fields of instruction.
2) Planning, organizing, and conducting assigned courses and seminars in a satisfactory fashion.
3) Service as chair or member of advanced degree committees.
4) Student advising, as assigned, on departmental matters.
5) Assistance to students in their professional development outside the classroom.

Each of the above areas (subareas) is rated using a five-point scale.

**MULTIPLE TYPES OF TEACHING**

Two recent examples of institutions applying broader views of the evaluation of teaching follow. This more extensive view of instruction considers different types of teaching modes and pedagogies.
The University of Wisconsin, Green Bay (1996) has subdivided the evaluation of teaching into three kinds of teaching: (1) classroom teaching, (2) clinical teaching, and (3) mentor teaching. Classroom teaching is to be evaluated using the following evidence: statement of goals and methods by the faculty member; summary of teaching activities (courses, credits, students, grade distribution); peer review; and student evaluations. Clinical teaching is evaluated like classroom teaching for classroom activities but, in addition, must also include a description of the areas of clinical expertise and activities, evidence of clinical training in professional degree training, postgraduate training, and postgraduate and continuing education courses for the practitioner.

Virginia’s Old Dominion University (1995-97) adds three additional categories those usually applied in the evaluation of teaching:

1) The number of student credit hours produced by the faculty member. The rationale is that the best teachers should be having a major impact on the teaching and educating of a large number of students.

2) Faculty members who teach noncredit courses, workshops, or colloquia in their areas of specialization should also have these evaluated.

3) Faculty members who are assigned to teach credit or noncredit courses, workshops, or colloquia using distance education technologies should have this activity included in their teaching evaluations.

At the same time, teaching performance cannot be viewed in isolation. One of the more subtle problems in promoting teaching effectiveness is creating a departmental climate that encourages and supports faculty development in teaching (see Chapter 10 and Chapter 11). With junior, nontenured faculty, advice from the chair and senior colleagues can often be along the lines of suggested readings of helpful guides on teaching, team teaching a course, or mentoring relationships where senior faculty work with junior faculty to improve their teaching.

At William Paterson College in New Jersey (Gruber, 1990), campus-wide programs focusing on pedagogy are used. Writing Across the Curriculum is perhaps the most visible, but there have been others, such as on race and gender.
A recent emphasis in the evaluation of teaching is student learning. Some institutions place a great deal of importance on it. This requires a different set of evaluation tools. Some departments at SUNY, Geneseo (Bailey, 1990) participate in external standardized examinations, often sponsored by the Educational Testing Service. Others use the passing of professional standards exams in order to test the learning experiences of students in various programs.

SUMMARY

This review of the evaluation of teaching in post-tenure review points up several characteristics of such an evaluation:

- It is different from annual review for merit.
- It is much more comprehensive, long-term, and developmental than a merit review.
- It must be consistent with the overall mission of the institution.
- It must be seen in the context of the faculty development plan.
- It uses many more measurements of performance.
- It focuses not just on the faculty member’s performance but also on pedagogy, style, and innovation.
- It requires self-assessment by the faculty member.
- It allows for different evaluations for different types of teaching.
- It views the teaching by faculty members in the context of the departmental unit and climate.
- It can be made to emphasize student learning.

WHAT WORKS IN THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING IN POST-TENURE REVIEW?

What are the critical components necessary to be successful in developing a system of evaluating teaching in post-tenure review? I believe that there are nine guiding principles.
1) Setting the Standards in Teaching Performance

Setting the standards for performance in teaching is critical to the process of post-tenure review. These usually define the minimum level of performance. An example of such a standard is taken from the minimal standards for satisfactory faculty performance of the Pamplin College of Business at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (1995). For teaching, the expectations for faculty include the following:

Effective classroom instruction.

- To provide effective instruction to students in the regularly scheduled classes they are assigned by the department head.
- To meet all scheduled classes except for absences sanctioned by the department and/or university.
- To provide all students with a course syllabus.
- To deliver lectures and present material in a well-prepared, professional, and competent manner.

Faculty availability.

- To be available to meet with their students outside of regularly scheduled class times.

Knowledge of discipline.

- To remain knowledgeable in their discipline and field of teaching in order that their classroom instruction remains current and reflective of the latest knowledge and academic advancements in the field.

Setting standards must take into account the institutional mission, campus norms and values, and departmental expectations as well as the faculty member’s career expectations, competencies, and prior levels of achievement.
Sometimes the standards set both the acceptable and superior levels of performance. Standards set to those who are “best in class” help determine superior performance. Comparison of standards to comparable institutions or to those institutions that a particular college or university aspires to be like sets a baseline. Benchmarking becomes an important activity of measuring teaching performance. This also must be viewed within the context of the individual faculty member within a department. Determining criteria and measuring the performance of the faculty member at the onset of a review sets a baseline for determining future improvement.

Criteria and evidence must reflect both institutional and individual goals. And, in most cases, they will be established by faculty peers and administrators (chairs and deans) working together.

2) The Development Plan

In post-tenure review, faculty are required to construct a longer-term professional development plan. Within the plan, they must respond to four important questions:

1) How much emphasis will teaching be given in the development plan?
2) What goals will be achieved in teaching over the next three to five years?
3) Will the faculty member require resources to improve his or her teaching?
4) How will teaching relate to the other activities of the development plan?

3) Determining the Purpose of Teaching

Teaching is no longer viewed as the presentation of knowledge. We have moved on to a concept of teaching as learning. Excellent teachers learn what it takes to make students understand a concept, apply it, and integrate it. What occurs in a faculty development plan involving post-tenure review is the determination of the faculty member’s scholarship relative to his or her teaching.

Instructional methods are embedded in the content of the discipline. It is central to quality teaching to have an understanding of the faculty member’s depth of knowledge in a field and his or her ability to impart that knowledge to students. Transmitting knowledge is a necessary but not sufficient condition because the faculty member needs to transform and extend knowledge. The critical purpose of teaching then becomes student learning.
4) Generating Evidence and Providing Feedback

Evidence collected for teaching must be from multiple sources and agreed upon by all of the faculty in a department. The evidence must also be related to work activities involved in teaching. Focusing attention on work activities forces conversation on what “counts” and why. There are two main concerns about this evidence in post-tenure review. One is that the evidence be collected every semester so that a continuous measurement process can be established and progress in improvement can be seen. And two, to make certain that feedback to the faculty member is provided each semester to help improve his or her development. If no progress takes place, additional action and resources must be available to help the faculty member improve.

The trustworthiness of the evidence collected is a critical issue also. Since this evidence will be collected to assess the faculty member’s development over a continuous period of time, it must be trustworthy. In assessment terms, this means that it must be reliable, valid, fair, and must achieve the intended consequences.

5) Interpreting the Evidence

Interpreting evidence on teaching for post-tenure review purposes must be handled carefully and within the appropriate context on the part of peers and chairs. Faculty appear to be better at reviewing and rating written documentation. Braskamp and Ory (1994) report significant differences in the consistency of faculty members’ abilities to evaluate research and written work than teaching style and observation. Faculty views of teaching evaluation data are uneven and may be influenced by “who as well as what is being evaluated” (p. 234).

Evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness and performance is best achieved when the faculty member (1) has the opportunity to offer some self-reflection in the review, and (2) also has the opportunity to discuss with colleagues the various evidence gathered to reflect his or her teaching performance.

6) Evaluation of the Collective Contribution of Faculty

A faculty member and his or her teaching performance should not be seen in isolation but rather in the context of an entire unit, often a department. This accomplishes at least three things:
1) It better integrates faculty interests and performance with institutional needs.

2) It encourages the evaluation of teaching to be more public and collegial rather than private and individualized.

3) It allows greater department and peer influence on each member of the unit.

In fact, post-tenure review of specific faculty members might be placed within the context of departmental or program review. This would allow each department or program to maximize the best talents of each of its members. Doing so requires that the faculty member see his or her contribution over the next five years in the context of the whole department. This is where the important elements of peer and chair review of the plan are essential. Peers have a direct stake in the progress of each of the department’s members, and the chair must relate each member’s ideas to the university mission and goals as well as those of the department and college.

Embedded in the idea of a departmental review is flexible contracts. If a department is judged on the basis of achieving college or university standards in teaching, research, and service, then each faculty member’s contribution can be modified to emphasize the area in which they are strongest. Moreover, once the decision has been set at the beginning of the year for a faculty workload vis-á-vis the department’s needs, then the evaluations of the faculty member can be related to the relative emphasis previously determined. For example, if a faculty member is an outstanding teacher and is assigned greater teaching responsibilities, he or she is then evaluated accordingly at the end of that year. This can be further expanded to multiple years in faculty development plans. The critical factor here is to see each faculty member’s contribution as part of the whole unit and equally valuable.

7) Rewards and Recognition

If quality teaching performance and continued development in teaching is emphasized, such efforts should be placed in high esteem and rewarded accordingly.

Most studies suggest that financial rewards for teaching excellence (e.g., merit raises) be supplemented with nonfinancial ones (e.g., released time) for course development or retraining. Ball State University in Indiana (Edmonds, 1990) established a broad-based committee to investigate the role of teaching at the university and to make recommendations on the improvement of teaching performance. Three recommendations were made to the provost:
1) Individual colleges and departments were urged to reexamine both the level of commitment to and procedures for recognizing excellent teaching.

2) The provost was urged to provide additional support for teaching excellence in both financial and nonmonetary awards.

3) Creation of a recommended institution-wide University Teaching Professorship Program was urged to recognize excellence in undergraduate teaching.

These recommendations led to the reexamination of the role of teaching in various colleges and schools; increased funding by the provost for travel to support faculty participation in conferences and workshops dealing specifically with pedagogical issues; and the implementation of the University Teaching Professorship Program.

8) The Need for Resources

Research and practice strongly suggest that post-tenure reviews of teaching should be tied to faculty development and necessary supporting resources. These resources often include funds for travel, research assistance, extended study, special projects, equipment, and released time. In teaching, improvements can come in style, pedagogy, and greater focus on student learning. In addition, with the increasing use of technology in the classroom and in teaching in general, funding for faculty adoption of and improvement in the use of technology in teaching becomes very important.

The resource issue has raised concerns in the minds of some college administrators about (1) what constitutes reasonable support for professional development when the onus is on the individual to improve, and (2) whether preference should be given to support development plans of poor performers if it means fewer development resources available for strong performers.

Several reports have highlighted the importance of this tie between institutional support for development and improvement plans. The lack of resources for funding faculty development is a commonly expressed problem with post-tenure review at comprehensive institutions. A University of Colorado survey (Wesson & Johnson, 1989) of 526 faculty who had undergone post-tenure review concluded that the overwhelming majority viewed the procedures as having little or no outcome because the resulting development plans lacked needed resources. As a result of this report, a central resource base was later made available for faculty development.
The level of institutional support given to help in the remediation and the development phase is best decided in the context of the overall university budget needs and in relationship to an overall strategic plan. Some institutions do separate development monies targeted for improvement from funds allocated to assist or reward long-term professional development. For most, though, a standard of reasonableness usually prevails in terms of whether the institution can abide both the content of the improvement plan and the financial resources required.

9) Consequences of Continuing Poor Performance

The most formidable question asked by many is what actions are institutions prepared to take when teaching remediation is judged to be unsuccessful or when willful neglect of duty is present? Historically, institutions have avoided dismissal-for-cause actions because of the financial cost to the institution and the emotional burden on those involved in the process. Instead, campuses opt for other less onerous approaches, including buyouts, reassignments, or early retirement transition options. Post-tenure review serves a good purpose insofar as it can create an environment that allows administrative sanctions to occur, even if they never are invoked because other less difficult negotiations are initiated that produce the same desired outcome.

A few private institutions (e.g., Colby-Sawyer College in New Hampshire and Ithaca College in New York) have expanded their dismissal for cause provisions to include teaching effectiveness as a permissible example of adequate cause (Trower, 1996). There is a noticeable trend in public institutions and systems to attempt to build sanctions into newly formulated post-tenure review programs. For example, the New Mexico legislature outlines these substantive consequences for unfavorable evaluations in teaching: “1) a two-year probation and reevaluation period; and 2) loss of tenure if, during the subsequent probation and reevaluation period, the faculty member fails to demonstrate improvement in the area of teaching” (State of New Mexico Senate Bill 1131, 1995).

An alternative approach is career counseling. At the University of California, Davis (1993), post-tenure review practices include encouraging faculty who are poor performers to pursue other career options. The department chair is encouraged to discuss with faculty members a change in title and/or duties more reflective of their individual strengths and interests; other career options that fit their strengths; or discussion of early retirement, if it is warranted.
CONCLUSION

This chapter has focused on methods used to sustain and encourage tenured faculty to maintain, develop, and improve quality teaching, including the following points:

- How the vitality of senior faculty is intertwined with the vitality of their institution and how they have a joint responsibility for the continued development of high quality teaching performance.

- The important role of teaching in faculty work, the scholarship of teaching as part of the four key criteria of scholarship put forth by Boyer, and the importance of expanding and enhancing the role of teaching as scholarship.

- The need to position the importance of teaching in the context of the mission of various types of academic institutions and within specific programs and departments.

Much of the discussion focused on post-tenure review models and the importance in them of the evaluation of teaching.

- Three such models were presented: annual review, comprehensive review, and triggered review.

- How the evaluation of teaching is different for tenured faculty than nontenured faculty, as well as methods of evaluation, measures of teaching performance, variations for different types of teaching, and placing teaching in the proper context of mission and culture.

- Critical components for a successful post-tenure review system of the evaluation of teaching including setting standards, creating professional development plans, integrating teaching and learning, generating evidence, providing feedback, interpreting evidence and review by peers, encouraging collective contribution, creating rewards and recognition, the need for resources, and the importance of consequences.

Maintaining excellence in an academic institution requires continuous development of its most critical resource: its permanent tenured faculty. This necessitates a constructive developmental program of post-tenure review. A central focus of this development is enhancing the relationship between faculty and students in teaching and learning and between the faculty member, his or her department, and the
institution. Only in the continuous fostering of growth and development in the area of the scholarship of teaching will an institution sustain its vitality, maintain the interest of its diverse students, and assure the survival of both in an ever-changing world.
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