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This qualitative study was designed to gain a deeper understanding of the lived experiences of university faculty who achieve promotion to the rank of associate professor and award of tenure, but are not promoted within 10 years after award of tenure. A review of the literature found that the phenomenon of delayed progression among tenured faculty is understudied, and this study begins to address that gap.

Using a purposive sampling method that sought to maximize homogeneity of sample, I recruited and interviewed five tenured associate professors who have been in-rank for ten years or longer, and evaluated the transcripts of our interviews using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. The study revealed several emergent themes for faculty including Personalities; The Institution; Mentoring and Non-Mentoring; The Student Experience; Decisions; and Changes. Moreover, it raises additional questions about the assumptions that underlie the promotion and tenure review process. A recommendation for further study is enclosed.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Universities compete in the academic marketplace to attract and recruit top faculty prospects, and offer positions to candidates who they judge to possess the aptitude and skills necessary to succeed. Once recruited, institutions invest resources – at research institutions, start-up packages can reach a half-million dollars or more (Ambrose, Huston & Norman, 2005) – in supporting and developing these junior faculty during their probationary period as they progress toward a summative review in their sixth year for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with the award of tenure. While any employment decision is important for an enterprise, in the case of a tenure decision, from an economic standpoint the stakes can be a lifetime contract of 40 years or more, and conservatively, an investment of $3,000,000 in today’s dollars (Bess & Dee, 2012). For a research-intensive university, the decision to award tenure to a faculty member is an affirmation of that individual’s past, and an expression of faith in their future. The present study focuses on the progression from associate professor to professor, but because that progression is nearly always preceded by a standard review for tenure, it must be understood in that context, which is explained in the following paragraphs.

The tenure review process at a research-intensive university is rigorous and designed to assess not just a junior faculty member’s ability to maintain a high level of scholarly activity, but to “see if they can do it for the long run” (Hambrick, 2005, p.301). An individual’s production not only serves to create new knowledge, but to demonstrate that individual’s skill and worthiness as a prospective tenure candidate (Bensimon,
Polkinghorne, Bauman, & Vallejo, 2004). Furthermore, scholarly activity of faculty is a major criterion examined by researchers conducting reputational studies of institutions (Webster & Conrad, 1986; Graham & Diamond, 1997; Brooks, 2005). Because tenured faculty positions represent long-term capital commitments, they are limited in number, and are awarded with an excess of caution. If a candidate’s scholarly profile is sparse, or there is any doubt as to a candidate’s prospects for future academic progress and productivity, the award of tenure is not justified (Weyland, 2011). This high standard of performance, coupled with a fixed date for an up-or-out review, manufactures a working environment where tenure earning faculty must remain focused on their scholarly productivity in order to retain their employment.

The concept of a uniform probationary period for tenure-earning faculty dates back to the very beginnings of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and its desire to allow faculty a degree of certainty in their professional lives, and to prevent institutions from holding junior faculty indefinitely in a state of “career-long purgatory” (Metzger, 1990, p.71). The probationary period for tenure earning faculty is typically seven years, with junior faculty members usually reviewed no later than their sixth year for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and award of tenure. Candidates who are approved for the award of tenure receive the stability and protection of a continuing appointment, which amounts to a lifetime contract. In contrast, faculty who are denied tenure are afforded a one-year terminal appointment after which they must leave the university (American Association of University Professors, 2013); a rule intended to force institutions into a choice between granting the award of tenure to an individual whose services they wish to retain, or losing that person’s services
altogether. While initially conceived as an “in or out” (Metzger, 1990, p. 73) decision where an individual could receive tenure at the end of the probationary period without advancement in rank, institutions increasingly adopted the practice of denying tenure if they were not also willing to approve promotion (Metzger, 1990). This binary, up-or-out choice, coupled with the time pressure of a limited probationary period and the high expectations for performance, makes the probationary period and tenure review process a high-stakes, stressful experience for all involved.

If a university and its mechanisms are operating appropriately, each person selected for a tenure track appointment will possess the requisite ability to perform at a level commensurate with tenure, will be appropriately supported in their academic endeavors by the institution, and will ultimately succeed in receiving promotion and tenure prior to the conclusion of their six-year probationary period. Implicit in a successful promotion and tenure decision is the institutional expectation that faculty members will use the protection of tenure to continue to contribute in significant ways, and their growth and productivity will continue (Hambrick, 2010). Subsequent to their promotion and tenure, if faculty members sustain their pace of scholarly productivity, they will typically accumulate a scholarly reputation and publication record sufficient to merit promotion to the rank of Professor within 5-7 years (Clark, 1987). The promotion from Associate Professor to Professor represents a vindication for the institution – it is recognition that the future scholarly contributions that were predicted at the time of tenure have been realized.

This vindication arrives earlier in some cases, and later in others. For some it never arrives. Experience indicates that some faculty members, once tenured, never
achieve promotion to the rank of Professor. An academic career affords autonomy, intellectual challenge, and freedom to pursue personal interests (Gappa, Austin & Trice, 2007), which suggests that some degree of intrinsic motivation toward scholarship plays a role in one’s selection of the professoriate as an occupation. A slowdown or cessation of scholarly pursuits post-tenure is often characterized or interpreted as a waning of intrinsic motivation, but our understanding of the reasons for lack of post-tenure progression is less clear. The proposed study will explore and illuminate those reasons in order to inform the development of better support systems for faculty to sustain their academic productivity post-tenure.

**Significance of the Problem**

“Deadwood” is a pejorative term referring to faculty members who gradually assume a state of relative inactivity brought about by their failure to stay current with the advances in knowledge and technique in their own field (Clotfelder 2002, p.233). It is a colloquialism occasionally used in academia to describe faculty members who are perceived as nonproductive and whose tenured status renders them unaccountable, or nearly so. The concept of “deadwood” is an unfortunate stereotype and a common rhetorical device used by those who attack the existence of tenure, and the significance of anecdote is not to be underestimated, as anecdote has been considered sufficient evidence to drive public policy in the past. On the history of post-tenure review legislation in Texas, one lawmaker quipped, “I get a complaint, I write a bill, the bill passes, I get reelected” (Chait 2002, p.11). The nature of academic work dictates that continued
engagement with the scholarship in the field is necessary to avoid obsolescence. Rice (2003) describes a “professional consensus” on the nature of scholarly work that defines American higher education. Among these elements:

Research is the central professional endeavor and focus of academic life…Quality in the profession is maintained by peer review and professional autonomy… Professional rewards…accrue to those who…accentuate their specializations… The distinctive task of the academic professional is the pursuit of cognitive truth (p. 4).

While the phrase, “publish or perish” is an academic cliché, the significance for faculty is better restated as, “if you are not growing (as a scholar), you are dying.”

The terms “scholarship”, “scholarly productivity”, and “scholarly production” are used in a fairly loose manner in the academy, but all allude to the pursuit of knowledge and the creation of new works. The *Faculty Manual* (2014) of the University of Miami defines it thus:

Scholarship embraces inquiry, research, and creative professional performance and activity. Scholarship is required for effective teaching and is the obligation of all members of the faculty. Scholarship may be judged by the character of the advanced degree, by contributions to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction, by reputation among other scholars and professionals, and by the performance of students. The scholarly function of a university requires the appointment of faculty members devoted to inquiry and research. Among the criteria for evaluating research are the publication of books by nationally recognized presses and of articles and reviews of a scholarly nature in books, periodicals, technical reports, and other forms of publication nationally recognized in the profession; the direction of scholarly work by students working on advanced degrees; professional awards and fellowships; membership on boards and commissions devoted to inquiry; and the judgment of professional colleagues. Scholarship may be demonstrated by significant achievement in an art related to a faculty member's discipline, such as creative works, original designs, or original procedures. National
recognition of such activities is demonstrated by: commissions, awards and prizes from nationally recognized bodies; performances with nationally recognized companies; invited presentations, exhibitions, lectures and performances before nationally recognized bodies; invitations to teach master classes or lead intensive workshops at nationally recognized institutions; and reviews of performance and creative works in nationally recognized journals, magazines and newspapers (pp.57-58).

Faculty who do not maintain a sufficient level of engagement as described by Rice (2003) can become stuck – professionally immobile both in terms of rank and institution. This phenomenon of stuck or terminal associate professors can be a difficult one, both for institutions and for individual faculty themselves. From the institutional perspective, a tenured faculty member who is not actively engaged and producing scholarly work represents an opportunity cost, occupying a scarce faculty line that might otherwise be held by a more productive scholar who would enhance the profile of the department and institution, and attract better students and colleagues (Weyland, 2011). From the faculty perspective, there may be an economic cost in the form of lower annual merit increases in salary. From a personal perspective there may be the risk of psychological cost in the form of a loss of respect. Evidence suggests that faculty may experience derogation or ostracization from other more successful colleagues (Pfeffer & Fong, 2005; Gilstrap, Harvey, Novicevic & Buckley, 2011). The phenomenon of the stuck associate professor has both personal and institutional implications, and carries both economic and non-economic costs.

A great deal of energy has been directed toward the study of faculty development at the junior faculty stage and the progression from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure, underscoring the need for proper orientation, mentoring, socialization, and support mechanisms for new faculty (Boice, 1992; Sorcinelli & Austin,
However, there has been far less scholarly attention given to the experiences of faculty who have achieved promotion to Associate Professor, and have yet to gain promotion to Professor (Baldwin, DeZure, Shaw & Moretto, 2008; Gardner & Blackstone, 2013).

This lack of attention is both a mistake by institutions, and a waiting opportunity to improve individual work lives and the institutions as well. By focusing on the experiences of faculty who have been delayed in their career progression post-tenure, we might better understand the challenges they face, and develop strategies and mechanisms to assist faculty in avoiding or overcoming potential barriers to sustained productivity and success in advancement to the rank of Professor. Such strategies and mechanisms would benefit not just the individual faculty member, but the institution as well, which derives both tangible and intangible benefits from active and engaged faculty.

**Theoretical Framework**

The following study examined the lived experiences of a select type of faculty in order to focus both on the unique characteristics of the individual participants, and on patterns across participants. In this study, several theoretical frameworks are used to analyze faculty experiences, including both individual level and organizational level conceptualizations of behavior. First, the present study utilizes a framework of motivation theory known as Self Determination Theory (SDT). According to SDT, there are three basic psychological needs which impact intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The three needs are *autonomy* – the extent to which one feels control over their own choices;
competence – the perception that one is capable of the work at hand; and relatedness – a feeling of connection with others in a group. These three needs have the ability to positively or negatively impact motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) focuses on how intrinsic motivation toward an activity (such as academic research) can be affected by changes in one’s perceived locus of causality (autonomy) or one’s perceived competence. Contextual changes that shift locus of causality outward, or diminish perceived competence can also diminish intrinsic motivation. Conversely, changes that move the locus of causality inward, increasing one’s sense of autonomy, or that enhance one’s sense of competence, such as positive feedback, can enhance one’s intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Organismic Integration Theory (OIT) describes how extrinsic motivation is enhanced or diminished according to an individual’s perception of contextual factors. Perception, or a lack of perception of relatedness, competence, and autonomy toward an activity (such as scholarly pursuit) can lead to an individual experiencing a shift in their perception of locus of causality. As the locus of causality becomes more internal, behavior becomes more self-determined, which contributes to increased persistence, better relationships, more effective performance, and greater health and wellbeing (Ryan & Deci, 2002). The framework of Self-Determination Theory should prove useful in developing a deeper appreciation of the significance of personal perception and its impact on motivation at the individual level.

At the organizational level, an additional framework that may be useful in understanding the interaction between university policy, expectations for faculty, and the
achievement of university purposes is that of institutional isomorphism. DiMaggio & Powell (1991) expand on this theme, as an explanation for the way that organizations (such as universities) tend to change their practices over time to emulate other organizations within the population that shares their environmental characteristics. Initially, one institution might make a specific change for reasons that are rational to its purpose, and enjoy the fruits of its innovation. Other institutions, seeking to replicate those successes in the face of uncertainty, will “model” their changes after those of the first institution. The key difference being that those institutions that are attempting to “copy success” may or may not possess precisely the same set of characteristics which made the decision a rational one for the original innovator. In some cases, just the emulation itself can yield a benefit to the institution by way of legitimation. The spread and evolution of the tenure system in the United States over the past century is an illustration of this phenomenon.

**Philosophical Paradigm**

The proposed study flows from a constructivist paradigm. A constructivist ontological approach assumes that universal, absolute truth is unknowable, and that realities are constructed by the individuals interacting with the world as they experience it from their own unique viewpoints (Hatch, 2002). Epistemologically, a constructivist approach utilizes qualitative methodology, where the researcher seeks understanding through a personal gathering of data and interpretation based on the researcher’s own experience and background (Creswell, 2009). Phenomenology challenges the researcher
to set aside or “bracket” usual understandings and focus on the experience of the phenomenon itself (Crotty, 1998, p. 79). The proposed study will utilize Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) as a methodological approach that seeks to describe “what it is like” for research participants, and then to consider “what it means” for research participants to have made the claims they make during data collection (Larkin, Watts & Clifton, 2006, p. 104.). Constructivist assumptions regarding ideology include the explicit acknowledgement of the value-bound nature of research and the interdependence of researcher values and research questions and processes (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). As such, a researcher stance is critical to provide as part of the proposed study.

**Researcher Stance**

“The instrument or means of data collection in qualitative research is the human being or researcher” (Manning 1999, p.19). As an instrument of this study, it is important to recognize the biases and experiences that I bring with me into this endeavor. I am a white male, natural-born citizen of the United States. As a young child, my family moved frequently, as my father was a pilot and officer in the U.S. Air Force. I have lived in ten different states and spent three years living in England. This experience gave me the ability to feel at ease in meeting and interacting with new people, as well as an understanding that there is always something new to be learned from a person. When I was ten years old, my father was killed in a training accident. From that time forward, I became the “man” of the house and my mother, the head of a single parent household.
From that experience I bring a perspective that life can be abrupt, and that it is important to be clear in your intent and true to your priorities. My experiences with higher education, like many others, began with my undergraduate experience, and central to my experience was membership in a social fraternity, Delta Chi. Jokes and stereotypes aside, it is no exaggeration to say that much of my learning and development as an undergraduate I attribute to my membership, and the interactions it facilitated. Chief among these were several alumni volunteers, who served as surrogate father figures in my life, and who taught me the life lessons my father was not able to teach. I have come to believe that there is good and bad in every person, and that with skill and patience, you can help someone to bring that good (or bad) forth. Upon graduation, I accepted a job with my fraternity as a traveling leadership consultant, which led me to visit over 100 different college campuses in the U.S. and Canada, and to interact with students, faculty and staff at each. This has given me a sense of the have and the have-nots in higher education, as well as the differences and similarities between campuses. One universal similarity is the perception that “it’s different here.” For the past 12 years, I have served in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost as the Director of Faculty Affairs. This has given me the unique opportunity to see the inner workings of academic administration, to observe and learn about the challenges that faculty must confront, and to develop a true appreciation for the role that faculty fulfill within the institution and within society at large. Taken to heart, it is a noble pursuit. I have had the opportunity over the past 12 years to be present at all meetings of the board which reviews promotion and tenure cases and makes recommendations on each to the Provost. This experience alone has given me a powerful perspective on how and why promotion and tenure
decisions are made, and insight into the various factors that can influence those decisions. I believe that the people making the decisions on promotion and tenure care a great deal about their work, and understand its implications for candidate and institution alike. A great deal of time and effort goes into reviewing each case, seeking to reach the right decision, sometimes despite confounding data points. I’ve also begun to develop a number of personal convictions about institutional responsibility in the long-term success of faculty. For instance, the institution sends mixed messages about the value of tenure and its hopes for tenured faculty when it permits (or solicits) newly-tenured faculty to take on more involved and complex administrative and service tasks such as department chair or program director. Such positions may be attractive for financial or other reasons, but also hold the potential to significantly delay or derail scholarly productivity. An institution that is serious about scholarship would either reserve such demanding roles for those faculty members who have attained the rank of professor, or provide a clear path for a faculty member to successfully balance those challenges without sacrificing their personal growth. Finally, I would be remiss not to note a strong affinity for my institution, my pride in its recent ascension, my gratitude for the things it has given me, and my desire to work to help it continue to transform peoples’ lives.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the present qualitative study is to examine the lived experiences of tenured associate professors who have experienced a delay in their career progression in order to better understand that phenomenon. The study was conducted at a private university located in the southeastern United States. In this study, the term “delayed
proceeding” is defined as having been in-rank as a tenured Associate Professor for
greater than 10 years without being promoted to full professor.

Research Questions

1. What locus of control do faculty with delayed progression perceive with respect
to their professional environment?

2. What characteristics do faculty with delayed progression share?

3. What factors do faculty with delayed progression identify as salient during the
progression of their career from hire through tenure and post-tenure?
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The dearth of scholarship focusing on the experiences of tenured associate professors is documented in the literature. Mid-career (defined as those between the end of the probationary period and the beginning of preparation for retirement) faculty represent the largest component of the academic workforce, but compared to the body of research on pre-tenure faculty experiences, the research on mid-career faculty experiences is lacking (Baldwin, DeZure, Shaw & Moretto, 2008). The limited extant literature available, including the theories upon which the proposed study draws, is reviewed.

Theoretical Framework

Theory of workplace motivation has evolved significantly from the dominant paradigm of the early 20th Century, which operated from a premise that workers are fundamentally lazy and mercenary and had to be incentivized to work (Taylor, 1911). Contemporary literature characterizes the components of individual motivation as coming from either extrinsic or intrinsic origins. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation have been widely studied, and the distinction between the types has been useful in the development of educational practices (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Extrinsic motivation flows from an expectation of external reward, while intrinsic motivation stems from the task at hand. Amabile (1993) defines it:

Individuals are intrinsically motivated when they seek enjoyment, interest, satisfaction of curiosity, self-expression or personal challenge in the work.
Individuals are extrinsically motivated when they engage in the work in order to obtain some goal that is apart from the work itself. (p.186) The differentiation between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is significant in helping researchers to think about how the nature of work and the work environment can affect motivation.

While behavioral and cognitive researchers have focused on what Deci and Ryan (1985) term the “why” of behavior – of answering the question of why people do the things that they do – no definitive consensus on work motivation exists. Researchers describe various motivational theories as falling on a continuum ranging from the mechanistic, which view humans as passive objects being pushed around by external stimuli and physical needs and drives; to the organismic, which consider the individual (organism) as initiating behaviors and having the ability to act independently to satisfy needs, rather than react to innate drives. The organismic perspective treats stimuli not as causes, but as opportunities that an individual has to act upon (rather than react to) in order to satisfy their needs. Significantly, Deci and Ryan (1985) argue that an organismic perspective gives primacy to the structure of a person’s experience, and their psychological reaction to stimuli, and less emphasis on the objective characteristics of those stimuli. In order to understand the “why”, it is critical to resist the distraction of the characteristics of an event, instead paying close attention to the ways in which an individual perceives, interprets, and ultimately makes sense of the event.

Self-determination theory (SDT) refers to a set of human motivation theories which take into account the social and environmental factors that facilitate and undermine human motivation. Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) describes interactions with
intrinsic motivation, and Organismic Integration Theory (OIT) describes interactions with extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Taken together, these theories provide a useful framework to consider how motivation changes over time, and the factors that can affect, positively or negatively, one’s motivation.

Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) addresses intrinsic motivation. CET argues that interpersonal events and structures that promote feelings of competence in the individual during action can enhance intrinsic motivation, but only when coupled with a sense of autonomy, i.e., that the activity is self-determined. Conversely, overly controlling environments and negative feedback can diminish intrinsic motivation. CET only applies to activities that are intrinsically motivated (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Actions that are “intrinsically motivated” are those where the act itself is the source of reward or satisfaction for the individual involved, in contrast to “extrinsically motivated” actions where the act is performed in pursuit of an external control, result or reward. In the context of the workplace, an intrinsically motivated worker will pursue a given task without regard to what other reward might be offered to them as a result, whereas a worker requiring extrinsic motivation will act to either obtain a desired outcome or to avoid an undesired one. Thus, the inspiration and preservation of intrinsic motivation among workers is a goal worthy of pursuit. Organizations that foster feelings of intrinsic motivation are those which maximize workers’ feelings of self-determination and competence; allow workers to win and maintain the respect of their coworkers; foster a working environment without supervision and rigid rules; and enable workers to deliver results (Strickler, 2006; Wiersma, 1992). One scholar describes the difference between
performing research that is intrinsically motivated versus that which is extrinsically motivated research in this way,

My periodic returns to [a subfield which interests him] have the sort of reenergizing effect for which sabbaticals were created. Leaves [of absence] that let me work more intensely on my more typical pursuits produce their own satisfactions, of course, including more publications. But they don’t provide the same kind of revitalization (Pomeranz, 2013).

The implication of Pomeranz’s statement is that feelings of satisfaction and competence flow from pursuits that are self-determined (in this case, dwelling for a few days or weeks in a subject matter area where it would take months or years to yield “meaningful” scholarship), rather than those which may be more reliably expected to produce results (i.e., publications) for which he might gain other extrinsic rewards.

Organismic Integration Theory (OIT) deals with extrinsic motivation. OIT posits that extrinsic motivation can vary greatly in an individual according to the degree to which it is autonomous. Consider for example, seatbelt use in a car. One individual wears a seatbelt to avoid getting a traffic ticket, while another wears a seatbelt because she knows it can prevent serious injury in the event of a crash. Both individuals are extrinsically motivated, but the second example involves choice and a measure of personal endorsement of the act, while the first example is only compliance with an outside regulation. As internalization of regulation (and personal commitment) increases, so does persistence, self-perception, and quality of engagement (Ryan & Deci, 2000). OIT describes the different forms of extrinsic motivation and the contextual factors that can promote or hinder the internalization and integration of regulation for extrinsically motivated behaviors. As the regulation of an extrinsically motivated behavior becomes more internalized and integrated, it will more closely resemble an intrinsically motivated
activity. In Appendix 1, a diagram by Ryan & Deci (2000) illustrates the OIT taxonomy, with the types of motivation arranged from left to right in increasing order of the extent to which motivation for behavior emanates from within the individual.

By their very nature, extrinsically motivated behaviors must be prompted by some external factor. Ryan & Deci, (2000) suggest that perceived competence and a feeling of relatedness are two key factors that can promote internalized regulation of extrinsically motivated behaviors. Perceived competence in this context signifies the requirement that an individual believes that he or she possesses the relevant skill and ability in order to adopt an external goal as one’s own. SDT defines relatedness as a sense of belongingness or connectedness to a group, whether a family, a society, or a peer group. An individual may be prompted to adopt an otherwise extrinsically motivated behavior, if that behavior is valued by a group to whom the individual feels (or wishes to feel) connected.

The process by which individuals come to learn and understand the rules, norms, expectations and values of an organizational culture is known as socialization. Whitt (1993) states that new faculty members begin to learn these rules and norms even prior to employment, when they are still students in the process of completing a doctoral program. Tierney and Rhoads (1994) note that in academia, socialization occurs through both explicit and implicit interactions. While explicit socialization is structured and tends to be easily observable (as in the form of an organized development program or workshop), implicit socialization is more spontaneous and ad hoc in nature (such as a new faculty learning the ropes by observing peers and their habits.)
It is important to evaluate the messages conveyed through the socialization process to identify and clarify mixed messages that we may be sending to faculty, as well as to understand where faculty might feel unwilling or reluctant to engage in behaviors that might lead to increased performance and job satisfaction over the long term. For example, faculty (even those who value collaboration) are socialized to conduct individual work (Kezar & Lester, 2013) which would present a conflict in situations where developing collaborative research may be advantageous to a faculty member’s professional development and advancement. Social contexts that support feelings of relatedness, competence, and autonomy, e.g., well-functioning collegial departments are best positioned to preserve and catalyze intrinsic motivation.

Review of Current Literature

*Historical context of tenure in the academy.* While the institution of tenure is not the focus of this study, an understanding of tenure’s historical purpose, as well as its contemporary impact, criticisms, and alternatives are where we begin.

The fundamental principle underlying tenure is academic freedom. Academic freedom in American higher education was inspired by the German concept of *Lehrfreiheit*, the freedom of an academic to pursue truth in one’s studies wherever they might lead (Rudolph, 1965, p.412). Huer (1991) argues that beyond this dim notion, most contemporary professors have little understanding as to the origin of tenure as it exists today, in part because in any institution, with each successive generation, the beliefs and values that precipitated its creation are gradually corrupted in the transmission process,
until they bear little resemblance to the original. At the turn of the 20th century, operated as a gentlemen’s agreement between individual faculty members and those responsible for the leadership of their respective institutions. In this environment, professors were vulnerable to the caprice of the leaders, and could be and sometimes were subject to dismissal without notice or due process. Such was the case with Professor Edward A. Ross, an economist at Stanford who was forced to resign in 1900 when he had the misfortune to criticize certain economic policies that were dear to the eponymous Mrs. Leland Stanford, who applied leverage to the President of the University to force Ross’s resignation. It was this turn of events that so affected another Stanford faculty member named Arthur Lovejoy, that he also resigned from Stanford in protest and took a position at Johns Hopkins and began working to organize professors. His efforts over the course of a decade culminated in the formation of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (Huer, 1991, p.8).

Critics of tenure rail that it “corrupts, enervates, and dulls higher education” (Sykes, 1988, p.58). Tenure is a privilege, and privilege, without being subjected to ongoing self-scrutiny, will tend toward corruption. If the freedom to pursue any academic goal is permitted to be conflated with the freedom to pursue no academic goal at all, tenure can become a privilege undeserved – and a privilege undeserved has the tendency to cause discomfort and insecurity in the undeserving (Huer, 1991, pp.4-5).

In contrast, then-Yale President Kingman Brewster advances the argument that tenure is essential because progress depends on having enough freedom to risk being wrong (1972), on being able to attack a problem that might be ten years’ in the making without having to fear for one’s job for “lack of results.” More recently Labaree (2011)
notes that policy tends to be driven by unambiguous research, that is, it is skewed toward specific claims, such as those made by think tanks and research foundations. The researchers at those organizations have policy goals to achieve, and it is only faculty, who presumably are invested with academic freedom and unencumbered by political or other pressures, who can pursue research with clear eyes, and if nothing else, to counter the impact of simplistic, politically-biased research.

*Loss of Focus.* Previous evidence suggests that a lack of explicit goals in the period post-tenure may lead to delayed progression. A qualitative study of mid-career faculty members found unclear goals to be a theme of this career period (Baldwin, et al., 2008). Similarly, a survey study of tenured associate professors at University of North Carolina-Charlotte indicated that the primary perceived barriers to full professor included 1) lack of attention to career planning; 2) lack of institutional and departmental attention to and support for career development; 3) lack of career development opportunities; 4) disproportionate service demands; 5) lack of transparency and clarity regarding promotion criteria; and 6) a need for more flexible and inclusive paths to promotion which recognize a broader range of contributions (Buch, Huet, Rorrer & Roberson, 2011). Further, despite a majority (71%) of respondents indicating that mentorship would be helpful for promotion, a similar proportion of respondents (72%) reported that they chose not to participate in any of the mid-career mentoring programs organized by the institution (Buch, et al., 2011). This finding illustrates that “helpful” is not necessarily synonymous with “desired.” Overall, evidence suggests that some faculty struggle to develop new goals without the externally imposed goals and timelines of promotion and
tenure. These studies, however, were not designed to provide specific insight into the needs or concerns of delayed associate professors.

Uncertainty and Disappointment. The theme of uncertainty as a concern of post-tenure faculty is not limited to unclear standards for promotion, but also uncertainty about the appropriate timing of reviews for promotion. One study cited the average number of years waited prior to seeking promotion was 6.5 (Gardner & Blackstone, 2013). Participants conveyed concern over a lack of clear performance expectations and mixed messages over what was considered an appropriate length of time to wait before being considered for promotion. The same study noted that faculty members who had been denied promotion, or had been promoted in subsequent reviews after being initially denied reported negative impact on job satisfaction, with participants using terms like “pissed off,” “embittered,” and downright “anger.” Participants also described adverse effects on productivity and motivation, with one participant describing herself as “…less-motivated. I considered just skating through for the rest of my years, not really caring and just doing the bare minimum until I retire” (p. 421). A lack of clear standards and expectations can be seen as setting faculty members up for failure, which then leads to diminished satisfaction and scholarly productivity and engagement.

For the Advancement of Science, or Advancement of Rank? The preceding studies share a common factor in considering promotion to full professor as something to be gained with a sufficient passage of time, or the performance of a specific set of actions, rather than focusing on scholarly productivity. A national survey of tenured and tenure earning faculty found that faculty who remain at Associate Professor for six years or less have significantly higher publication outputs than those who remain at rank for seven
years or longer (Tien & Blackburn, 1996). This suggests that faculty who remain productive post-tenure spend six years or less at rank before being promoted to Professor. In addition, the same study found increasing variability of research output for faculty at the rank of Professor, indicating that some faculty remain engaged with scholarly activity after being promoted to Professor, while others do not. The continued productivity of some faculty, even after being promoted to Professor, strongly suggests that faculty members are motivated by more than simply the prospects of achieving promotion or tenure.

*Communication and Context.* The departmental context appears to play an important role in faculty satisfaction and productivity. Communication between faculty peers as well as between faculty members and their academic leaders impact how a faculty member perceives their environment and how they interpret events. Researchers found that departmental support for research is an important factor for motivation to conduct research, but that in instances of a disconnect between actual and perceived support—that perceived support is believed to play a stronger role (Hardre, Beesley, Miller & Pace, 2011). Perception also drives faculty satisfaction. “The strongest predictor of job satisfaction is for the respondent’s research to be recognized by departmental colleagues” (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011, p.177). Collegial social interactions in the department are significant for job satisfaction, which is dependent on how an individual perceives their peers’ opinions of their work, and of their competence.
Summary of the Literature

Midcareer faculty members as a population are comparatively understudied in contrast to junior, tenure earning faculty. The literature indicates that midcareer faculty members report feelings of ambiguity with respect to standards and timelines, as well as increased expectations for service. Further, faculty members who remain academically productive tend to spend less time at the associate professor rank before moving to full professor, and the likelihood of being promoted to full professor decreases, the longer one remains in rank at Associate Professor. Although research is an important component of a successful application for tenure, some faculty members curtail their research productivity after achieving tenure. There are other faculty who maintain productivity until achieving promotion to full professor, and still others who maintain consistent productivity post-promotion to full professor. Overall the literature suggests that there may be an important link between a faculty member’s perceptions and their motivation. There is likely an association between perceptions – of the support faculty members receive in their department, perceptions of how they and their work are viewed by peers, perceptions of whether they are being treated fairly—and motivation to maintain research productivity.

Critique of the Literature

The limited literature on mid-career faculty productivity, perhaps understandably, has focused on practices and factors that lead to successful outcomes in the form of faculty who remain engaged and productive in scholarly research and publication. There
is a lack of attention to the question of why some faculty members remain at the associate professor rank for extended periods of time. The proximate cause in most cases, i.e., a lack of continued research output, is clearly evident, but the underlying factors that contribute to the phenomenon are unexamined. Instead, faculty and administration leaders are left to speculate as to the cause—and the answer within most convenient reach is that the faculty member is somehow to blame.

If we assume that one must possess a certain amount of intrinsic affinity for a discipline in order to pursue a terminal degree in that field; and that they must continue to possess a significant quantity of intrinsic motivation in order to choose a career at a research intensive institution – then under the tenets of SDT, that individual’s intrinsic motivation to pursue the activities for which they were trained and hired will remain strong given the proper environment, or become degraded in an improper environment.

**Methodological Considerations**

This study proceeds from a constructivist paradigm, which holds that individuals construct their own realities based on their own experiences and vantage points. Accordingly, there is no, single, universal truth (Hatch, 2002). Knowledge is symbolically constructed, not an object to be uncovered. Individual constructions of reality are the knowledge of interest for constructivist researchers, and researchers are engaged in co-construction of those subjective realities with the participants they study. Accordingly, it is not only undesirable but unavoidable for researchers to remain at arms-
length from their research participants. Through mutual engagement the researcher and participant construct the subjective reality under investigation (Mishler, 1986).

This qualitative study employed an Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) approach. Methodologically, IPA is well-suited to research questions where the participant is under-researched, the issues are complex, and the researcher wishes to understand something about process and change (Smith & Osborn, 2004). IPA is also referred to in the literature as hermeneutic phenomenological approach (Van Manen, 1990). Hermeneutics refers to the interpretation of language or text by an observer, in this context it is the researcher interpreting and analyzing the language used by the participant in describing his or her lived existence (Sloan & Bowe, 2013).

Using the IPA approach enabled the researcher to interpret the experiences of delayed progression associate professors as they describe their lived experience as faculty members. IPA procedures call for each data item (interview transcript) to be analyzed before moving on to the next. The first step is to perform a process of initial commenting, where the researcher writes initial analytic observations in the margins of the transcript. These comments include both descriptive comments, such as focus on a specific process, event, or relationship; as well as conceptual comments, where the researcher interprets the meaning for the participant to have made such a claim or statement in the context of the situation. Subsequent to commenting, emergent themes are developed from the data item, which are then combined into superordinate themes. Once the coding and theme development is complete for each data item, superordinate themes are developed across the data set. The superordinate themes provide the framework for the analysis, and emergent themes are discussed in detail in the results section (University of Auckland,
IPA literature recommends proceeding with a small, homogenous sample in order to facilitate deeper understanding of the phenomenon from the perspective of the target group (Osborn & Smith, 2004). In the event that the study recruits more participants than are needed, I will prioritize interviews so as to maximize the homogeneity of the sample as suggested by Osborn & Smith (2004). Contingent on the response rate, homogeneity may take the form of having all participants from one department, one school/college, or one general area of scholarship, such as humanities, STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) fields or social sciences.

In thinking about the experiences of delayed associate professors, evaluated against the framework of SDT, it is important to develop questions that will facilitate a comfortable reaction with the participant and allow them to provide a detailed account of their experiences (Smith et al., 2009). The research questions center on perceived locus of control, shared characteristics and factors perceived as salient by faculty during career progression. The three human needs that are integral to SDT: autonomy, competence, and relatedness, are expected to manifest themselves, either positively or negatively, in the context of day to day life as a faculty member. As discussed previously, the significance of daily events hinges on the meaning that the faculty member attaches to them. Positive or negative feelings of autonomy might flow from standing policies, mentoring, or interaction with other faculty. Positive or negative feelings of competence might flow from formal or informal reviews, interactions with review boards or publishers, or teaching evaluations. Positive or negative feelings of relatedness might flow from relationships within the academic unit, with a mentor, or with members of a research team that expands beyond the department or institution. For this reason, the proposed
research protocol will include questions designed to elicit descriptions and characterizations of those relationships and communications, and reveal their nature, and the ways in which they change over time.

Ryan & Deci (2000, p. 61) provide a clear illustration of the relationship between motivation, regulation, and perceived locus of causality (see Appendix 1). The proposed research will attempt to construct questions that are crafted to elicit conversation leading to information regarding regulation and choice; why does a faculty member choose to spend their time as they do? In addition, a previous study investigating motivational profiles among high school and college students (Ratelle, Guay, Vallerand, Larose & Senecal, 2007) will inform the construction of questions designed to assess participants’ perceived locus of control and motivation for performing research, including domains related to intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, external regulation, and amotivation.

**Deductive Disclosure and Anonymity**

Kaiser (2009) raises the issue of deductive disclosure, the phenomenon where others are able to identify interview participants who would otherwise be anonymous, based on details disclosed during the course of the interview. This is of particular concern when the objective is to convey a rich and detailed description of a phenomenon, as in IPA. In a qualitative research setting, confidentiality is considered essential to protecting vulnerable populations. While the participants in the current study will hold tenure, which protects them against institutional retaliation, it does little to protect them against
retaliation from colleagues if they are identified and perceived to have violated the social norms of their department. Baez (2002) notes that confidentiality is considered essential to maintaining privacy as well as building rapport with study participants, but in truth it is anonymity that we are striving to provide. It is simply not realistic to promise confidentiality, as that suggests that no person other than the interviewer will see it. In situations where the act of simply changing a name is inadequate to obscure the identity of the participant, researchers face a difficult choice of either withholding the data altogether, or changing additional details, which risks corruption of the fundamental meaning of the data (Kaiser, 2009). In addition, Wiles, Crow, Heath & Charles (2008) note that in some contexts participants may wish not to remain anonymous, but to be identified. The study will strive to manage these concerns via the informed consent process via a second informed consent form that participants will be asked to sign at the conclusion of the member checking process. The second informed consent form will ask individuals to confirm whether they wish to remain anonymous, or to relinquish anonymity in full or in part as proposed by Kaiser (2009). It is commonplace for informed consent forms to contain language advising that “the participant is free to discontinue participation in the study at any time,” and that is slightly misleading as pointed out by Smith, et al., (2009). Rather, the initial consent form will state that participants may withdraw at any time during the interview, and the second form will reaffirm their informed consent at the member checking session.
Ethical Considerations

In view of my role at the University as Director of Faculty Affairs, I am sensitive to the risk of perception of coercion or undue influence in the recruitment of participants. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2010) provides guidance on this matter:

The issues involving employees as research subjects are essentially identical to those involving students as research subjects: that is, investigators and IRBs must be cautious about the potential for coercion or undue influence and the need to protect confidentiality. Employee participation raises questions about the ability of employees to exercise free choice, for example, because of the possibility that a decision to participate could affect performance evaluations or job advancement, even if it is only the employee’s perception that this is the case. In the case of coercion, refusal to participate might result in a loss of benefits (e.g., salary increases, time off). In the case of undue influence, a decision to participate could result in a job promotion. Employees are likely to view their employers as authority figures to whom they must show deference, which could undermine the freedom of their choice.

Because all prospective participants in the study hold tenure, there is no risk at all to their continued employment, thus any risk of coercion is minimized by definition. In my role as Director of Faculty Affairs, I am not in a position to influence individual decisions by department chairs, school or college deans, the provost, or the president. All recruitment material and informed consent forms will make clear that participants will receive no direct benefit, although there may be indirect benefit if this research results in changes to policy and practice with regard to faculty support.
Data will be collected via semi-structured interviews with participants, who will be asked to give written informed consent to participate in the study prior to the beginning of the interview. In keeping with IPA protocol, interviews will be recorded and transcribed verbatim by a third-party transcription service. In the event that any participants wish not to be recorded, I will take notes by hand. While this would constitute a deviation from IPA norms as defined by Smith et al., (2009), Ambrose, et al., (2005) conducted a qualitative study of faculty satisfaction where ongoing legal considerations precluded recording of the interviews with the research participants and discovered that the faculty, “…perhaps because they knew they were not being audiotaped – told their stories with surprising, sometimes even shocking, frankness” (p.810), suggesting that sacrifices in precision may be compensated for by increased openness on the part of research participants
Chapter 3: Method

Participants

At the outset of this study, University of Miami had 515 tenured faculty members, exclusive of the Richter Library and the Miller School of Medicine. Of these there were 72, or 13.9%, who were awarded tenure at the rank of associate professor effective June 1, 2004 or earlier and had not subsequently been promoted to the rank of professor as of June 1, 2014. These individuals comprised the population to be studied.

In practice, the majority of recruited participants were faculty in the area of “Arts and Humanities.” There were 144 tenured faculty members with a scholarly focus in the arts and humanities including faculty in the School of Architecture, College of Arts & Sciences, School of Communication, and Frost School of Music. Of these faculty, 23 or 15.9% were tenured associate professors meeting the criteria for inclusion in the study. These numbers suggest that the incidence of delayed progression among faculty in the Arts and Humanities are generally in line with the broader faculty population at the University of Miami.

Procedures

IRB approval was secured prior to commencement of the study. Initially, prospective participants were contacted directly by letter, signed by both the investigator
and advisor, to advise them of the study, and let them know they would be contacted to request participation. While the IRB protocol included procedures for additional contacts in the form of a personal phone call from the investigator as a follow-up, and invitation via direct email to volunteer as a participant, the response generated by the initial mailing made further recruiting efforts unnecessary. Data were collected via semi-structured interviews with participants, who provided written informed consent to participate in the study prior to the beginning of the interview. In keeping with IPA protocol, interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim by a third-party transcription service. With one participant, “Charley”, the full interview was conducted, and it was only after its conclusion that I discovered that the recording device had malfunctioned, capturing only a portion of our discussion. After consulting with my advisor, and carefully documenting the anomaly, I reached out to Charley, who graciously agreed to sit down for a second interview. For purposes of analysis, I had both recordings for Charley transcribed, and analyzed them together as one data item. I then reviewed each transcript against the audio recordings of the interview to verify their accuracy. During each interview, I made handwritten contemporaneous notes to maximize accuracy in capturing salient details. The study also utilized member-checking – asking interview participants to read the draft analysis of the interview and provide feedback and notes in order to verify congruence. At the member checking sessions, participants were given a secondary informed consent form that provided them the opportunity to exercise increased control over their disclosures as a means to protect their confidentiality.
Measures

Initially, collected data were reviewed and analyzed utilizing an initial interview protocol as the researcher worked to bracket personal experience in evaluating the phenomena at hand. More generally, as analysis progressed, the researcher endeavored to identify examples and instances of experiences for delayed faculty that are perceived as positively or negatively influencing perceptions of locus of causality (autonomy), competence, and relatedness. Further, in evaluating and interpreting text, the researcher was sensitized to descriptions that align with SDT regulatory styles: intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, external regulation, and amotivation.

*Initial Interview Protocol.* The interview protocol was structured to elicit discussion at various stages of the career, i.e., at the time the participant selects their field of study, at the time of their recruitment and socialization at the University, during the pre- and post-tenure periods, and if applicable, after seeking (unsuccessfully) promotion to professor. For example, the questions—*Tell me about how you came to study (your field); When did you decide on the professoriate as a career path – was there a “moment?” and How did you come to join the university – did you target, were you recruited, what attracted you?*—were designed to elicit recollections of the early career. Examples of questions designed to elicit perceived locus of control, shared characteristics and factors perceived as salient by faculty during career progression that incorporate the three human needs that are integral to SDT: autonomy, competence, and relatedness, included, *Tell me about your time on the tenure-track – how did you choose to spend your time – what kinds of verbal or nonverbal feedback did you receive from leadership, peers inside/outside institution?* Another proposed question, *Tell me about your time*
since being tenured – how do you choose to spend your time – what kinds of verbal or nonverbal feedback do you receive from leadership, peers inside/outside institution? is directed at experiences post-tenure. Finally, questions adapted from the Academic Motivation Scale (Ratelle, Guay, Vallerand, Larose & Senecal; 2007) were used to provides verbal cues for interpreting faculty responses for perceived locus of control and motivation for performing research. Adapted questions included:

Intrinsic motivation: I experience pleasure and satisfaction in learning new things; in discovering things never seen before; in broadening my knowledge in subjects appealing to me; in continuing to learn about things that interest me.

Identified regulation: This will make me more competitive in writing grants; improve my students’ engagement; build my dossier for promotion; enable me to secure an offer of employment elsewhere.

Introjected regulation: This will prove that I am as good as my colleagues; I feel important when I get a publication accepted; to prove to myself/others that I am intelligent; I want to show myself that I can succeed.

External regulation: This will get me a salary increase; this will get me a better teaching schedule; this will get me a sabbatical; this will get the dean/chair off my case.

Amotivation: I feel like this activity is a waste of time; I once had good reasons, now I don’t know if this is worth it; I don’t care about this anymore; I’m not sure what I’m doing here anymore.
Analytic Plan

This qualitative study employed the Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) approach, as outlined by Smith, et al (2009, pp.79-107). The process which follows represents a set of guidelines to assist the researcher, as there are no clear “right” or “wrong” ways of conducting IPA.

Reading and re-reading. The initial step involved immersion in the data. Where many professionals are in the habit of quickly reading and summarizing, the opposite approach is indicated for this strategy—a deliberate slowing down of analysis, such that the researcher becomes the analysis. The researcher conducted a close, line-by-line analysis of the experiential claims, concerns and understandings of each participant as represented in their interview transcripts.

Initial noting. Smith, et al. (2009) describe this step as the most detailed and time consuming of the process. With an open mind, the researcher examined semantic content in the transcript, taking notice of the ways in which each participant explained, described, and spoke about different issues. This may be in the presence of specific descriptive phrases or emotional responses. The analysis then moved on to linguistic choices, such as use of euphemism or politically correct terminology and notes on conceptual noting, where the researcher shifted focus to the participant’s understanding of the matters being discussed.

Developing emergent themes. At this stage in the process the researcher moved away from the participant and broke up the narrative flow of the transcript so as to be able to move beyond narrative and identify within the initial notes the emergent patterns
(i.e., themes) within this experiential material, emphasizing convergence and divergence, commonality and nuance. Smith et al. (2009) describe the development of a “dialogue” between the researcher, the coded data, and their psychological knowledge, about what it might mean for participants to have these concerns, in this context, leading in turn to the development of a more interpretative account; first for single cases, and then subsequently across multiple cases.

**Searching for connections across emergent themes.** The researcher compiled the emergent themes and organized them into groups, which illustrate the relationships between themes. The material was organized so as to allow for analyzed data to be traced right through the process, from initial comments on the transcript, through initial clustering and thematic development, into the final structure of themes for the case.

**Moving on to the next case.** Once the first case was completed, the researcher moved on to the next set of transcripts and repeated the process. An important part of the process involves treating each new case on its own, bracketing the ideas of the prior cases to the greatest extent possible before moving on to subsequent cases, in order to allow new themes to emerge.

**Looking for patterns across cases.** This is where the “I” in IPA becomes crucial. Researchers are encouraged to engage in multiple levels of analysis, ranging from linguistics and metaphor to micro-analysis of very discrete portions of the text which might carry multiple meanings, with the end goal of developing superordinate themes to assist in the write-up of the study, reflection of the researcher’s own perceptions and
discussion of the implications. Using a flipchart and post-it notes marked with the individual themes, the researcher developed a total of six superordinate themes.

In conclusion, the paradox of IPA is that while researchers have articulated a set of recommended steps, the approach is not to be confused with a “recipe” to be followed to the letter, but rather as a process that may take unanticipated paths.

**Analytic Procedure**

Once recruited to the study, all participants visited the investigator’s office to complete the interview process. After review, discussion and signature of the informed consent form (see Appendix 5) each interview was conducted and recorded electronically. For transcription services, a California-based vendor was utilized, Verbal Ink, which included uploading the sound files of the interview recordings via secure website then having them transcribed verbatim. To ensure transcript integrity, each transcript was first printed, then read along with the recording of the interview to ensure agreement with the transcription from start to finish. Following this process the iterative reading process commenced.

For each transcript, the transcript was read by the investigator from start to finish, with minimal notations made. On the second reading, margin notes were added where there were descriptions of salient descriptions of interpersonal events, described feelings of empowerment or powerlessness, and images conveying autonomy. On the third reading, the attempt was made to read between the lines and to be engaged with the specific choices of language looking for patterns and possible use of irony, displacement,
or projection of feelings, and probing for possible hidden or dual meanings. Notes were taken where certain subjects would evoke a sense of tension, or where the literal meaning of a statement seemed in conflict with the perception of an experience or situation, e.g., a participant becoming visibly agitated and saying *I’m O.K.*, but saying so in an abrupt manner.

Having completed the notation exercise, handwritten notes were retyped into Microsoft OneNote, those notes consisting in some places of one or two-word descriptions, and in other cases, of verbatim quotations (extracts) from the transcript, and noting the corresponding transcript page number, in order to facilitate backtracking to the original transcript later if needed. Next, the transcripts were set aside and the process of developing the emergent themes of each case began by having moved extracts around within the document. As themes emerged, new “pages” were created within OneNote corresponding to each emergent theme, and cut-and-pasted the extract to the relevant page, so that at the conclusion of the exercise, all extracts had been aligned with an emergent theme.

The next step in the process involved a dual-purpose follow-up meeting with the research participant. After reviewing with them the original stated purpose of the study, and the analysis process that had taken place up to this point, the participant was given a hard copy of the emergent theme summaries for their case, and asked to read through it looking specifically at accuracy of the data and identifying any areas where they felt they had been misquoted or misinterpreted, or if there were important things they felt were not represented in the text. Participants were reminded about the phenomenon and potential risk of deductive disclosure, and that they would be asked to sign a second informed
consent form at the conclusion of the meeting, and that they would have the opportunity
to identify and request modification/exclusion of any detail that might compromise their
identity. After completing the review process, each participant signed the second
Informed Consent Form (See Appendix 7) wherein they either reconfirmed their
permission to use the data as presented, or to use it subject to certain conditions, such as
omitting or modifying potentially identifying information. This act represented the
conclusion of the initial analysis process for the first research participant.

The process above was repeated for all five participants, taking specific care
between iterations to bracket—that is, take specific note of and consciously set aside—
the insights and experiences of one case from the next, so as to minimize any effect one
case might have upon the others during the initial analysis. Each case was considered as
its own independent data point. At the conclusion of analysis of the five data points, some
29 emerging themes were identified.

The final step involved the development of the superordinate themes, which was
accomplished by placing each of the 29 emerging themes onto post-it notes, and then
placing them on a flip chart and moving the themes around until they coalesced into six
superordinate themes characterizing aspects of the lived experiences of tenured associate
professors.
Trustworthiness

There are four principles articulated by Lucy Yardley (2000) that are used to assess the quality or trustworthiness of qualitative research; they are sensitivity to context, commitment and rigor, transparency and coherence, and impact and importance.

Sensitivity to context. From the outset of this study, beginning with the design proposed to the Institutional Review Board, much thought was devoted to the complexities raised by the research subject, the participants, the researcher, and their respective experiences and relationships to the institution.

Commitment and rigor. The researcher’s commitment to the research questions at hand is addressed in the researcher’s statement. Rigor is demonstrated by the selection of a homogeneous sample of participants, and in the careful analysis of the verbatim transcripts of the participant interviews, as well as the contemporaneous notes.

Transparency. The transparency of this study has been maintained through member-checking with study participants subsequent to transcription and preliminary analysis of their interviews, as well as through the maintenance of a researcher’s journal, to aid in the documentation of choices made by the researcher during the study, as well as to record reflections during the process.

Coherence, impact, and importance. While this researcher has strived to achieve all three, ultimately those judgments are left to the judgment of the reader.
Chapter 4: Results

This chapter reflects the experiences and perceptions of the five faculty members who agreed to participate in the study. The purpose of this study was to examine the lived experiences of tenured associate professors who have experienced a delay in their career progression in order to better understand that phenomenon, and the challenges they face, in order to facilitate the development of strategies and mechanisms to assist faculty in avoiding or overcoming potential barriers to sustained productivity and success in advancement to the rank of Professor. In the interest of confidentiality, the discussion of demographics will be somewhat limited so as to minimize the possibility of deductive disclosure. The results are revealed within six superordinate themes: (1) Personalities; (2) The Institution; (3) Mentoring and Non-Mentoring; (4) The Student Experience; (5) Decisions; and (6) Changes.

Participant Demographics

In the following descriptions, all participants are referred to by pseudonyms corresponding to the official hurricane names from the year 2004: Alex, Bonnie, Charley, Danielle, and Earl (National Hurricane Center, 2015). Pseudonyms were assigned in the order the participants were recruited, and without regard to perceived alignment with the participant’s gender. All participants are associate professors who were awarded tenure on or before June 1, 2004. There were four male and one female faculty participating in the study. Four participants are faculty in the Arts & Humanities, and one participant is in
the Social Sciences. All participants were recruited to the University of Miami during the Presidency of Edward T. “Tad” Foote, II, from 1981 and 2001. One of Danielle’s first experiences upon arrival to campus provides us with a sign of the times on campus:

The department secretary um, typed up my syllabus. I, I kinda sketched it on paper for her. She typed it up, handed it back to me and asked for corrections. So I took out a red pen and wrote all over it and handed it back to her. And she goes [gasp] “Why’d you write all over it?” I said, what do you mean? [Laughter] She goes, “I was gonna put in correction tape!” I’m like, oh. [Laughter]. And it hadn’t occurred to me.

Participant Characteristics and Sense-making

It is instructive to review the emerging themes from the individual participant interviews and take note of their specific experiences prior to the revelation of the superordinate themes identified in the study. The benefit to the reader is to be able to read individual accounts with enhanced understanding and empathy.

Alex. In speaking with Alex his passion becomes clear very early on. He has always loved his craft, and when he found natural ability taking him only up to a certain point, he chose to seek additional formal education to improve himself. Alex has held tenure at more than one institution, and has observed/experienced marginalizing events stemming from multiple facets of otherness, whether racial and ethnic diversity, or the tension between art and commerce, or the politics of higher education institutions. Alex has repeatedly been able to overcome adversity through tenacity, and it is the mindset of a fighter that seems to inform his sense-making process of his experiences.
**Bonnie.** In conversation, Bonnie conveys the quiet confidence of an experienced professional. This stands in conflict, as with many of the participants, with the lack of clarity that corresponding to the path forward for promotion. Bonnie has been obliged at various times to forge ahead with missing, faulty or otherwise incomplete information, and making a conscious choice for action, when inaction offered an alternative path of less resistance. Bonnie’s background and experiences have formed her paradigm to make sense of her experiences in the role of a defender.

**Charley.** Integrity of process and clarity of understanding are values that resonated with Charley’s experiences. He has devoted significant energy to program development, curricular redesign, and textbook authorship. He lights up when engaged in a debate about current trends in his field, and the elevation of certain philosophies over others. Personal connections with students are also significant to him. The worldview that seems to dominate his lens of sense-making is that of a teacher.

**Danielle.** Danielle stands apart from the other participants in the sense that this was the only participant who identified their interest in their field as being acquired during the educational experience as opposed to its having been a life-long interest, but carries forward with a palpable sense of professionalism. The experiences and perceptions that informed Danielle’s development as a faculty member seemed to be dominated by both the strength and complexities of relationships with colleagues, structural characteristics of the academic unit, and organizational change over time, particularly with respect to academic productivity. Danielle had the opportunity to explore and seriously consider opportunities outside of academia, and after informed
consideration, reaffirmed commitment to the university. The lens that seems to help Danielle in the sense-making process is that of a colleague.

*Earl.* As with the other participants, Earl exudes a quiet confidence with respect to the profession. Also in common with several others was Earl’s willingness to accept significant administrative duties early in his career, all the while secure in the belief that others would advise him if he were not doing the right thing. The paradigm that informs Earl’s sense-making might best be described as the role of steward; one who shepherds and marshals the scarce resources of an entity or organization for its advancement.

**Superordinate Theme I - Personalities**

Not surprisingly, people and personalities frequently were mentioned or alluded to in participant interviews, and presented both powerful positive and negative experiences in terms of collegiality and support. Personal friendships, professional relationships and collaborations, as well as interpersonal conflicts were identified as salient events or experiences that could catalyze intrinsic motivation, or send coded messages with the power to discourage or demoralize, and represented some of the best, and possibly the worst that academia has to offer in terms of the work environments and the sense of relatedness they helped to create. Danielle recalls a valued colleague from the pretenure years,

We had a lot of fun, and we were fairly productive for a number of years...we’d work for a while and then go play racquetball…and then come back and work some more…[colleague’s spouse] introduced me to [spouse’s good friend] and we ended up getting married.
The narrative that Danielle shares regarding the mentoring colleague is a textbook example of SDT in practice – an environment where collaboration is catalyzed by feelings of relatedness and competence. The relationship they shared helped to frame a working environment where Danielle felt drawn to the work.

Bonnie derived support from professional colleagues outside the institution, “…we have these national conferences a couple of times a year, and you go and you see the same people…it’s a very nurturing community.”

In an example of an unusually personalized approach to looking after faculty members and conveying a sense of caring, Alex describes the way in which another institution handled a retiree, in paying attention to the sense of transition and continuity,

…it’s like as if his place was being given to someone like him in a way, but with the edge of a new generation, with new knowledge. It’s interesting that the department was so gentle with such heart to heart details…you don’t ever see that.

By the same token, having had that experience at another institution and then seeing a different approach here can put the university’s practices into a rather striking contrast. Several participants related instances of negative sentiment that stood out, whether manifestations of jealousy over productivity, celebrity or compensation; or just outright arrogance. Once again, Danielle:

I heard one of our deans say this once…he didn’t like hiring associate professors ‘cause he didn’t want to hire anybody’s tenure rejects. [Laughter]…Yeah, right. It’s like, “Well, this guy didn’t quite cut it at University of Chicago…Nah.” [Laughter].
Participants also described conflict stemming from the politics of individual rivalries playing out among colleagues, as Alex relates, “… one of those things where you would, ah, you would have to side with this group…or not. And I decided not to side, which was a mistake.” Here, Alex is talking about the department in the context of having been considered and denied promotion to professor, and attributing it, at least in part, to political retribution, i.e., that colleagues who might otherwise have been supportive of the case elected to temper their support. In Alex’s perception, interpersonal relationships amount to a choice between fidelity to one’s ethics and the path to professional success, “…imagine a school of philosophy where everybody is into this kind of philosophy and there’s two people that are not into that…they will be enemies.” Charley describes being confronted with the ethical dilemma of interviewing an applicant for a departmental position who had a close family relationship with a more-senior colleague within the same department. Charley stood by the assessment that the department could do better, and did not recommend the family member for the position. With respect to his relationship with the senior colleague Charley states, “…things haven’t gone so well since then.”

Strikingly, several participants attested to having observed conduct among colleagues who succeeded in being promoted, where they were perceived as behaving in an overtly political way. Alex perceives that past personality clashes with colleagues have had a lingering effect on the way that his work is perceived, received, and valued. “You know, if I would have been a conniving, ruthless, unethical…asshole, I would have [been successful in gaining support for promotion].”
Superordinate Theme II – The Institution

The nature of “The Institution” comprises a superordinate theme that encompasses attitudes and actions that convey a commitment to goals and outcomes that benefit the institution, or the academic unit, or one’s colleagues, but may not necessarily be aligned with one’s own personal career advancement – a willingness to behave in a selfless way. Giving voice to an unpopular idea, taking a stand that is impolitic, or taking on an important but unwanted or undervalued job that does not “count” toward tenure would be examples. “A university is …a repository of reasoned discourse and a moral force. Bottom-line concerns must be counterbalanced by moral and intellectual ones…” (Shalala, 1992, p.35).

The institution has multiple needs and interests that sometimes stand at odds with one another. Clearly, we need administrative leadership and we need gifted educators, and we need successful scholars. Is it reasonable to expect an individual to fulfill all three roles with equal zeal, skill and vigor? Each of the participants in the study has made a decision at some point in their career, sometimes consciously, other times, unconsciously, which placed the interests of the institution before their own self-interest. In turn, each could be said to have paid a price for their unselfishness. Alex was hired in one field, and agreed to take on another field on a short-term basis which became a permanent basis. Bonnie and Earl stepped up into important administrative roles that carried them away from their scholarship, interrupting their career trajectories, to say nothing of placing
them by turns in situations where they might one day have to stand for evaluation by the very senior faculty over whom they were granted administrative authority.

Charley was brought in as a tenure-track faculty member to revitalize a program and did so with such zeal that a group of colleagues conspired to scuttle his tenure bid. Bonnie stepped into a vacuum while a tenure-earning faculty member to help address a resource allocation issue, that might have had political ramifications for her career, but felt the risk was worth the potential benefit. Danielle devotes more time to teaching effectiveness than a rational approach might suggest. Each of these individuals has fulfilled an essential role as a member of the university faculty, and the university community.

While under review for promotion and tenure, Bonnie was focused on a more pressing issue for her colleagues as one of the buildings housing the department was condemned, and alternate space was needed. After securing the blessing of the appropriate leaders to take the initiative and move forward, Bonnie identified an opportunity, and pulled together a proposal to repurpose space to the department that was ultimately approved by the Provost.

The most clear and prevalent example is the decision to accept formal administrative leadership responsibility prior to achieving the rank of full professor. The negative effect that administrative responsibilities can work on one’s scholarly progress can also be compounded in the absence of ongoing evaluation and feedback in that area, as they were in Bonnie’s experience, “You get a form letter that says thank you for your leadership and your raise for next year will be [blank].” Bonnie also described the
reluctance expressed by the appointing authority in the case, over the notion of elevating an associate professor to the role, knowing the likely impact on career progress, and ensuring Bonnie was aware of the “risks” prior to accepting the appointment.

Almost immediately upon receiving promotion and tenure, Earl was asked to step up to an administrative role, and did so without hesitation, helping to maintain continuity in an academic unit that experienced multiple transitions of leadership during that timeframe. Earl began doing a lot more administration post-tenure and that has continued to this day. “To [be promoted to full professor] I would have to step away from doing administration. You just – and between administration and teaching and – there’s not a kind of um, window to do the publication that makes it work.”

A risk faced by tenure-earning faculty is, as referenced above, political retribution. Charley, for example, came into the department as a tenure-earning faculty member, given the charge to “shake things up” among a cadre of senior faculty, some of whom had joined the university right out of graduate school, and had not been encouraged to evolve. Empowered to make changes, Charley did so, and in the process, stepped on the collective toes of senior colleagues who later orchestrated a spirited, if unsuccessful, campaign to ensure he was denied tenure. A number of students were recruited for the purpose of submitting letters complaining about Charley’s performance during his tenure review, but after one student submitted a letter that began, *I have been asked to write this letter...* the conspiracy was undone, the campaign fell apart, and Charley was awarded tenure.
Unfortunately, tenured or not, if a faculty member chooses to abandon the beaten path – whether in the name of service, or in pursuit of one’s own intellectual curiosity, that faculty member assumes a risk of having his or her progression delayed or thwarted altogether. Charley explains,

I’m not about to change the trajectory of my life here in these years, and I’m not unhappy with who I am or what I have done or how I have performed…even if I wanted to, I don’t think I would be able to change…I can’t even imagine wanting to. I mean, [working at UM] has not been a negative experience. Um, it just has not been the full experience that I was actually hoping for. I consider myself lucky…[There are] worse things than being an associate professor for the rest of your life.

Upon Alex’s hire, he demonstrated his flexibility and loyalty early on by agreeing to shift his focus to meet the immediate needs of the department rather than insisting on being allowed to continue to do the kind of work that earned him tenure. In that moment, Alex’s interdisciplinarity played to the department’s benefit, but ironically, as his interest has continued to evolve, work that he produces is dismissed or denigrated for being “outside of the field.”

Bonnie, “Before I became Chair the idea of being a full prof, yeah, it would be nice but it wasn’t like, a life goal for me. If I died an associate professor I wouldn’t feel like a failure… [Now] I understand a lot more why we need full professors and what they do. And we need – definitely need more…” At the same time, she is very clear about owning her choices, “I feel like it’s entirely of my own doing, being where I’m at right now…there really isn’t any animosity, it was always my own choice.”
With respect to Danielle’s increased teaching and administrative load, “over time…that’s been really noticeable. And what’s interesting is that I think, I think it’s actually appreciated. At least, people say nice things.”

**Superordinate Theme III – Mentoring and Non-Mentoring**

Participants reported spotty personal experiences with mentoring as tenure-earning faculty, and that the environment for the tenure-earning faculty today is improving. Sources of mentoring ranged from intra-departmental to intra-disciplinary, to extramural. In addition, mentoring ranged from nonexistent, to essential to success, to counterproductive, suggesting that knowing how to mentor properly is as important as having mentoring available. Mentoring must transcend an anecdotal recounting of “what worked for me” and instead assist faculty members in articulating their academic intentions, and then helping them to realize those intentions with minimal interference.

Many of the answers here relate to mentoring at the tenure-earning level, because protocol questions began with asking participants to think back to their early years, and in many cases, the early years were the only experiences (good or bad) they had with mentoring.

Mentoring was acknowledged as important to varying degrees among the participants, but individual experiences ran the gamut in terms of quality. Danielle was able to make a connection with a newly tenured associate professor while on the tenure track, and felt like the exception rather than the rule, “I did have that one colleague and he was a mentor. Um, but that was it…there was very little other modeling, and many of the other [academic units] were the same.” More importantly, Danielle considers that
relationship as having been integral to achieving tenure, “without, ah, the mentorship from my colleague, I never would have pulled that off.” Earl recalls that direction for tenure track faculty has been historically vague in the academic unit, and standards remain somewhat open to interpretation, but acknowledges that practices are moving in the right direction with “…a more structured approach to…mentoring, just the relationship between the leadership and the…faculty…is something that, you know, has changed, but needs to continue to develop.” In the absence of a formalized process for mentoring toward promotion to professor, Earl conveys a sense of patient confidence, that good work will be noticed and rewarded, and that there is someone watching, who is going to tap you on the shoulder when the time is right to stand for promotion, raising the question, “How many more Earls are there out there right now, with a sense of trust in the process and anticipating that this year might be the year someone finally taps their shoulder?” Bonnie indicates a similar set of assumptions, conveyed to her by a colleague:

The last person in the department who got promoted to full professor told us that the Dean said, “It’s time for you to apply.” So, I think I’ve been kind of waiting for that moment. Because I thought, well, certainly (and I’m completely wrong) someone will tell you when it’s time. But there’s been no one monitoring my career.

This theme continues with Bonnie’s description of the state of mentoring as experienced then and now: “I almost think I got better advice from my colleagues outside the university,” going on to describe being advised by a more senior colleague to formally rebut every single piece of negative feedback received in every review during the probationary period. At the time there were two important things which Bonnie didn’t
understand. The first is that this advice came filtered through the lens of someone who had personally experienced a very trying review process. The second is that it is very easy to misunderstand the behavior of a faculty member who seems to answer every piece of feedback with a written rebuttal of each and every minute detail. Clearly, the mentor meant well, but in fact may have caused a great deal more harm than benefit. This is an example of a situation where no mentoring at all could be preferable to advice that is harmful.

Turning to post-tenure mentoring, Bonnie described approaching senior colleagues to solicit feedback on timing and standards for promotion to full professor, and being asked, “Are you asking me how I’m going to vote on your case?” The fact that Bonnie was compelled to make her intentions clear at the outset simply to obtain meaningful guidance from a colleague highlights one pitfall of a department where conflict reigns—the benign act of soliciting feedback can be interpreted as lobbying or political machination. The act of asking for help can be difficult enough on its own without having sinister motives ascribed to it.

Unbiased formative feedback, even if from other senior faculty within the institution, can be critical to the post-tenure promotion process, as Bonnie related a discussion about the CV and personal statement, and coming to understand why it is important to clarify the hierarchy of descending levels of prestige, “I [said] people in my field will know [which works are more prestigious] and [my colleague] said, *Well, you’ve got to think past that.*”
Alex described some advice received from a faculty member who is a department chair at another institution, telling him to “play the game,” referring to departmental politics, to blend in with colleagues and describing how it is done, “So they [one’s colleagues] come and talk about the opera…I go, Oh! I love the opera! And then we’ll have another dinner and they go, you know, we’re with the Leftists, and I go, I love the Leftists!” The unspoken strategy, conveyed via explicit mentoring, is to play a waiting game with who you are and what you believe, if these things are not already considered in the mainstream of your unity. This advice conveys an implication that personal integrity could be considered a luxury or even a liability. After being denied promotion to Professor, despite having an active program of scholarship, Alex was advised within his academic unit to alter the focus and direction of his scholarship so as to drop activities that are not counted or valued. Put another way, he was being advised to stop pursuing the avenues that were of most interest to him in order to secure promotion. This is external regulation at work. In theory, Alex could choose to do that thing that would get him promoted (possibly), but who would be served by that? If Alex wasn’t inclined to pursue that activity on his own, is it likely that he would continue it once he had obtained the desired external reward of promotion? It would make more sense (to say nothing of being more in keeping with the tenets of academic freedom) to encourage a tenured faculty member to pursue their passion, rather than attempt to exert control over it.

Superordinate Theme IV- The Student Experience

Teaching is an area where the study participants were uniformly vocal in their personal affinity for the work, their strong commitment to students, and their defense of instruction’s value as an integral part of the faculty role. Several also made observations
or expressed sentiment that not all faculty colleagues share the same perspective on the matter. All participants had either a fundamental connection to their field, a fundamental connection to education and teaching, or both. While it may be coincidental, it is striking that the commitment to teaching and students is a common theme among the participants.

Charley and Bonnie both shared graduate school experiences that molded their attitudes about the importance of teaching; Charley suffered personally at the hands of a talented-but-aloof professor, and Bonnie built empathy by observing undergraduates suffer at the hands of such an individual. Charley spoke eloquently about the importance of traditions and foundations, and conveyed his passion for instruction to the extent that the researcher came away with an expanded appreciation for art at the conclusion of the interview:

…I thought that teaching was an important part of what I was here for…I mean, I was being told that it wasn’t that important, but that never quite calculated in my mind…I’ve] taken it very, very seriously…An old mentor of mine used to say, “Can you believe they pay me to do this?”

The theme that teaching as an activity was somehow less valued came up in other interviews as well: For example, Danielle observed,

I think it’s still the case that the only real metric that counts is [scholarly productivity]. There are…still lots of things going on that need to get done and the people who are completely focused on research aren’t doing any of that. I’ve always had the distinct impression around here that the teaching, as long as you’re not in trouble or doing badly, then you’re fine…a lot of [faculty] take more pride in their teaching and put, put effort into it more than they, ah, more so than might be rational in a sense because the, ah, the administration doesn’t seem to recognize it at all.

Several participants expressed the sentiment that while they take teaching very seriously, there is a pervasive perception among faculty that the institution is less serious
about teaching. Specifically, issue was taken with the method by which faculty are evaluated on their teaching, which is heavily reliant on student evaluations. The Faculty Manual requires peer-review of teaching only in cases of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and for the award of tenure. A system, which relies on favorable opinions by students, does not serve to promote high standards or rigor. Once again, Danielle takes issue with the practice of collecting student evaluations of teaching, and the institution’s reliance on that data as an important source of faculty assessment as evidence that we lack seriousness in our approach,

…anyone who’s ever done anything with survey research would look at [the process for student teaching evaluations] and go, “Why are you wasting everybody’s time with this?” [But] administrators stand up and down on these things and go, “No, we need this information.” It’s like guys, seriously?

As the force of institutional isomorphism continues to push the university along a path toward greater emphasis on scholarship and reductions in teaching demands, Charley sounds almost mournful as he declares, “I think my values are more suited to a college, and that’s the issue I’m wrestling with now.” I’m kind of holding on, just wanting to be that voice in the wilderness and just telling these people that the career might not be the goal.” The de-emphasis on teaching translates to a reduction in the number of students one is afforded the opportunity to impact, and there is a genuine sense of urgency around values that Charley clearly wants to impart to the next generation, and he is skeptical that there will be someone there to hand the reins to should he decide to leave, “I don’t think for a
minute that I would be replaced by anyone vaguely resembling my particular portfolio.”

**Superordinate Theme V - Decisions**

The takeaway here was with respect to the myriad decisions that faculty make on a continual basis, without necessarily knowing whether or how they may impact professional advancement. Career-altering decisions are not always labeled as such. It may not even be clear whose career is about to get altered, or in what way.

Time and focus are the barriers to achieving promotion as Earl describes it. “There’s never been an opportunity for a discussion regarding strategy or timeline for promotion to full professor.”

There is a paradox in the structure of shared governance in that some of the key roles in terms of support staff and instruction are handed down to faculty who do not hold tenure, and consequently, are frequently excluded from decision making processes and without power to enact change that may benefit them. The administration of many departments rises to a level of complexity that cannot be executed by the tenured faculty on their own, if they are expected to maintain their teaching and scholarly activity at commensurate levels at the same time. Charley speaks out, “I find that…morally reprehensible, that you hand over the keys to the car but you don’t let them take care of it…the best way to get the most out of [non-tenure-track faculty] is to let them have ownership [of the process].”
Ultimately, decisions that the institutional leadership and one’s own colleagues make are going to impact a faculty member. In Bonnie’s case, the decision to step up and serve as chair effectively postponed any opportunity to advance in rank. In Bonnie’s words, “So do I regret serving as chair for eight years? No. Am I a full professor? No. You know, I think I made the right choice.”

When Charley had the opportunity to write a textbook, he was advised that it “wouldn’t count” toward promotion. How, sight-unseen, could a judgment be made about whether or not something “counts” as a meaningful product? Who decides what “counts”? Alluding back to interpersonal political struggles sown years ago, Charley “…the powers that be are deciding that one individual can determine the legitimacy of a [venue]… I didn’t get into art because I liked other people’s definitions of what I should do.”

Alex and Charley both describe a fault line between the artistic community and the commercial world, which is reminiscent of the divide commonly found between and sometimes even within disciplines. It is extremely difficult to walk in both worlds and command respect in both worlds. Working in a “traditional” art department prior to UM, colleagues, upon hearing that Alex had done commercial work in addition to his art, told him “There is no room here for commercial whores.”

The decision to proceed with a bid for promotion itself can feel fraught with ambiguity and nuance, including timing. In Bonnie’s words, “…one of the things where I’m hovering right now is would waiting a year kill me? No, probably not…On the other
hand, why wait…that’s the interesting thing about coming up…I don’t know what time interval would be proper?”

Bonnie was emphatic in not wanting to move forward with promotion until there was a clear case, rather than risk denial, “I have a feeling if I go up and don’t get it then I’m going to just disappear for three or four years, because at that point they’re saying your…experience isn’t good enough.”

**Superordinate Theme VI - Changes**

This theme might be summed up as, “look how far we have come.” What we see in this theme are allusions to the “bad old days” and how deliberations are more transparent, and direction for tenure-earning faculty is clearer, mentoring is available for the tenure-earning faculty, and their teaching and service loads are much lighter than a generation ago. As an aside, I wonder to myself whether today’s tenure-earning faculty would agree with that assessment.

What is clear is that a shift in the articulated and actual standards of the university with respect to advancement in rank have demonstrably changed over the past several decades as illustrated below, and in that change we can see a shift toward much higher expectations in research and scholarship, and a subtle de-emphasis on teaching.

Participants perceive that while there is still room to improve, we give better feedback to tenure earning faculty today in comparison to their personal experiences. “…this wasn’t true when I went through, but over the…years we’ve really tried to make sure that assistant professors have a really good idea of where they stand,” Danielle explains. The absence of clear feedback during formative reviews served only to heighten
uncertainty and stress during summative reviews as Danielle continues, “…we had a number of people come and go and we denied a number of people tenure [while I was on the tenure track]…when you’re an assistant professor, that’s always scary when somebody gets turned down…you always try, you know, to figure out how your record looks compared to theirs, and um, but, ah, {sighs} um, I don’t know…we had five other associate professors at that time…and none of them ever made full.”

Danielle experienced some jealousy among colleagues at first, “I basically had a lower teaching load and very likely a higher salary than most people when I first came in…I think it took a lot of people a number of years to get over that.”

Earl describes the tenure track process as self-directed, “There wasn’t any mentoring whatsoever, let’s just put it that way,” the implication being, candidates were left to guess based on their perceptions of how they compared to the last person reviewed.

Charley describes a paradigm different from today, “I usually had a four-course load for at least the first six years that I taught. I loved it.” He went on to observe that as teaching loads decrease, so too do the number of students one has the opportunity to impact, suggesting that it has contributed to a corporatization of the institution, making it less common to have significant interactions.

There were examples of institutional structures that sometimes worked hardship on faculty members. For instance, Bonnie joined UM when all but extraordinary cases were required to complete the full six years of “probationary service” at the rank of assistant professor before being considered for tenure, and although Bonnie had several years’ prior experience, they were not given full credit, causing the tenure review to be
delayed by two years. In turn, this then created a situation where Bonnie was obliged to postpone applying for promotion to full professor because it had “only” been two or three years since the award of tenure, and there was a sense it would be “too soon” regardless of the fact that Bonnie’s scholarly productivity may well have been sufficient to merit promotion. When Charley came into the department, a hallmark of the mindset among the faculty was that facilities were locked whenever there wasn’t a class in session.

Earl’s assessment validates those of the other participants, recalling an environment where standards were vague and feedback was minimal, “…the annual review in which, you know, this is what the faculty think, you know, and this is what we think, the leadership thinks you should be concentrating on, and this is, you know a kind of career objective for the next year and for your track, that never happened…[and it’s] not a good way to conduct the process, particularly because at that [junior] level, doing everything they’re doing, um, they don’t have a way of seeing – understanding the structure of what’s important, perspective.”

Bonnie related, “[there was] one tenured colleague who kept telling me, you know, I was being stupid by being so agreeable…at the same time there were all kinds of urban myths if you don’t do everything your chair tells you to do, you’re jeopardizing your chance at tenure.”

Earl, “I don’t have any negative feelings…and I’m happy to have had the opportunities I have had.”

Bonnie’s tenure review was “…not a very fun experience, because faculty would break confidentiality all the time and tell you, Well, so-and-so voted against you and all
this stuff that you really don’t need to know. I mean, part of you wants to know, but you really don’t need to know.”

Alex relates similar experience in promotion review where the decision was negative, but a colleague breached confidentiality and related information about external review letters that led Alex to suspect that the process was being manipulated, “But now that I know, it’s easier to handle than if you don’t know anything, because you’re bad…like you didn’t work enough. You, your work is not good enough, which is not true.” Here Alex believes that it’s not the quality of his work that’s a barrier, it is the worldview of the individuals invited to review the work. In the “old days” perhaps an individual with impure motives might maneuver to have a reviewer solicited, knowing a bad review would result, in effect scuttling an otherwise viable application for promotion?

It is clear that the standards for promotion and tenure have evolved, ever upward, as the institution strives to The Faculty Manual 8th ed. (1965) of the University of Miami indicates that the process of review for promotion should take several factors into account, and while it stops short of prescribing a hierarchy, it does list “successful teaching” first:

Among the factors considered in evaluating the work of a faculty member [for promotion] are successful teaching, research, administration, interest in student progress, and contribution to student life and activities, professional activities, work on University committees, community service, public relations, and general recognition received (p.15). By 1980, the academic standards had become slightly more explicit, and we see the articulation of standards for the rank of associate professor separately and apart from the
standards for the rank of professor. Both the *Faculty Manual* 12th edition (1980), published immediately preceding the inauguration of President Edward T. Foote, and the *Faculty Manual* 13th ed. (1985) of the University of Miami define the standards for promotion in Bylaw 5.7 in the same way. Note that promotion to professor “normally” requires scholarship, suggesting that the faculty retain the latitude to award the rank of professor to candidates who make outstanding contributions in other arenas:

Appointment to the rank of associate professor normally requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient. Appointment to the rank of professor normally requires outstanding, mature scholarship of national recognition (University of Miami, 1980, p.93; University of Miami, 1985, p.45).

Finally, the current edition of the *Faculty Manual* (2014) is considerably more stringent in its prescription for appointment to the rank of professor, stipulating the requirement for a national reputation, and in some cases, an international reputation. The language in Faculty Government Policy C2.5 (c-d) is here:

Appointment to the rank of ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR normally requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and scholarship. In unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities and an adequate record in the other may be considered sufficient…Appointment to the rank of PROFESSOR requires national recognition in the profession, and where specified in a school’s published bylaws, international recognition (p.43).

To summarize the foregoing, the stated criteria under evaluation for promotion at the university evolved from “successful teaching, research, administration, interest in student progress, and contribution to student life and activities…” in 1965 to “normally [requiring] outstanding, mature scholarship of national recognition” in the 1980s, to the
present-day “national recognition in the profession, and where specified…international recognition.”
Chapter 5: Discussion

This section will review and discuss the results in the context of the original research questions. The purpose of this study was to examine the lived experiences of tenured associate professors who have experienced a delay in their career progression in order to better understand that phenomenon, and the challenges they face, in order to facilitate the development of strategies and mechanisms to assist faculty in avoiding or overcoming potential barriers to sustained productivity and success in advancement to the rank of Professor. At the outset, the study aimed to answer three research questions:

1. What locus of control do faculty with delayed progression perceive with respect to their professional environment?
2. What characteristics do faculty with delayed progression share?
3. What factors do faculty with delayed progression identify as salient during the progression of their career from hire through tenure and post-tenure?

It is important first to clarify a portion of the purpose statement in light of this study. Were I to re-write now, I would excise the words, “sustained productivity” altogether, making the purpose “…to assist faculty in avoiding or overcoming potential barriers to success in advancement to the rank of Professor.” For the subjects in this study, productivity has not been a problem, suggesting that motivation may not play as significant a role as I initially theorized. Rather, success in rank may be more a structural challenge, which we will discuss further in the recommendations section that follows.
Discussion of Research Questions

The first research question, *What locus of control do faculty with delayed progression perceive with respect to their professional environment* - was constructed on the premise that faculty with delayed progression were somehow lacking in motivation, in which case their locus of control could be an explanatory factor. In each case, participants expressed intrinsic motivation to contribute to the university; however, these contributions were frequently not in modes that are generally imbued with any kind of currency with respect to evaluation for promotion to professor. Further, participants displayed a strong internal locus of causality in their decisions, and an awareness and acceptance of the potential costs of their decisions. Several participants expressed sentiments along the lines of “there are worse things than being an associate professor for life.” There is a sense of pride that comes through in the contributions that have been made to the university. The ethic that these participants share is reminiscent of the words of former Army Football Coach Red Blaik:

> Once in a while you are lucky enough to have the thrill and satisfaction of working with a group…willing to make every sacrifice to achieve a goal, and then experience the achieving of it with them…in this, believe me, there is a payment that cannot be matched in any other pursuit (Maraniss, 1999, p. 109).

It is precisely the decision to not pursue promotion as an end in itself that allows these contributions to be made; which calls into question the intent and effectiveness of our institutional practices and standards for promotion. If an associate professor is not
already doing the kind of academic/scholarly work that is going to be rewarded by promotion to professor, and the promise of that promotion is enough of an enticement to divert faculty from other activities that they find more important or fulfilling, you face some significant barriers to sustaining that activity after promotion is awarded. In other words, if tenure wasn’t a “finish line” in terms of scholarship for a faculty member, then granting their promotion to professor likely would be.

The second research question, *What characteristics do faculty with delayed progression share* - was developed in anticipation of the ability to locate and identify specific traits or behaviors that are common to faculty who are delayed in their progression to the rank of professor. The participants in this study share several characteristics previously mentioned, including a commitment to students and student learning, a willingness to serve the university, even with the knowledge that their service is unlikely to lead to advancement in rank. This could be interpreted as a conscious rejection of rank, or a feeling of resignation to the fact that promotion is not an option. As Danielle quipped, “…a lot of us know that rank doesn’t mean anything [laughs].” It’s hard to tell how much of this is statement of fact, and how much is a rejection of the perceived negative behaviors that are associated with those highly-productive scholars who succeed in achieving promotion.

Having said that, all candidates were interested in being promoted to professor, but with varying levels of optimism as to their prospects. In addition, each of the participants have, ironically, made choices that were, in the long run, for the betterment of the institution, but counter to the goal of achieving promotion.
The third and final research question, *What factors do faculty with delayed progression identify as salient during the progression of their career from hire through tenure and post-tenure* - was framed initially with the assumption that there might be “trigger” events that cause a faculty member’s perception of their work to be adversely affected by environmental factors, such as feedback from peers or academic leaders, or events that would diminish a faculty member’s perceived autonomy, and that one’s perception of those factors might change over time.

What have become salient are the rise in expectations for promotion to professor, and the divisions that it brings to the forefront. As the university has continued its ascendancy, institutional isomorphism—modeling—has affected our practices with respect to promotion and tenure in two ways. First, as previously noted, the institutional expectation for research record and reputation has steadily grown, reflecting the rising standards of the body of institutions referred to as “aspirational peers”. A second example of values being transferred via institutional isomorphism is in the review process. When a candidate is to be considered for promotion, letters are solicited from “outside experts” in the candidate’s field to opine on the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate’s work. As with any opinion, the ones solicited are going to be imbued with human frailty, meaning that they will reflect the tastes and values of the author (which may in turn have been shaped by the institution to which the author holds an appointment) in that author’s assessment of the candidate. While this is typically a suitable course of action—after all, who better than a fellow expert to assess an expert’s record—an outside letter which is less than laudatory can have an outsized effect on the viability of the case. Thus, if a candidate is on the fringe or wholly outside of the mainstream, the result may be a
debilitating assessment from an outside reviewer. Conversely, work that does not stray too far from the mainstream and does not offend the sensibilities of the reviewer will tend to attract more positive comments. In this way faculty can unconsciously exert a normalizing force on one another, if they do not exercise great care. Faculty members whose work is multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary face a similar risk. A scholar who studies a subject touching three subject matter areas might receive letters from outside reviewers in all three fields, each criticizing the candidate for not being “strong enough” in the field where they work.

The phenomenon of work being marginalized for being outside the mainstream is not at all new. Indeed, perhaps one of the most important scientific books ever written was Sir Isaac Newton’s *Principia*, in which he laid out his three laws of thermodynamics. When it was published it attracted significant resistance and criticism.

Newton did not speak the Aristotelian language of substances and qualities…The priest Nicolas de Malebranche in reviewing the *Principia* said that it was the work of a geometer, not of a physicist…What he did not realize is that Newton’s example had revised the definition of physics (Weinberg, 2015, p. 246).

“The official differences produced by academic classifications tend to produce (or reinforce) real differences by inducing in the classified individuals a collectively recognized and supported belief in the differences, thus producing behaviors that are intended to bring real being into line with official being” (Bourdieu, 1984, p.25).

To put it slightly more colorfully, “There’s always been a battle between art and [sic] commerce. Right now art is getting the shit kicked out of it” (@WillMcAvoyACN, 2014). This battle is one that has played out in some of the cases here, dueling
pedagogies, dueling methodologies, and dueling values. Brewster (1972) reminds us that it is incumbent on faculty to utilize debate to sharpen opposition, not to blunt it. “[T]rimming the argument because some colleague…will have the power of academic life or death in some later process of review would…subvert the whole exercise.”

**Recommendations**

First, we should make every effort to avoid placing faculty below the rank of Professor into situations that put their scholarly productivity and momentum at risk. At the same time, there are also positions, which may be relatively light from a workload perspective, but which carry disproportionately higher political risks. It simply does not make sense to ask a faculty member to make, or even appear to make, unpopular decisions that may be counter to the interests of those faculty who are superior in rank, and may one day hold sway over their promotion review. In the rare scenario where it must be done, a conversation about priorities needs to happen before an appointment is finalized, to ensure that any compromise of one’s academic endeavors is by definition both minimal and temporary. Forethought must also be given to the mechanisms by which the individual may be insulated from political retribution during or subsequent to their service.

Further, it is worth unpacking and reexamining the premises and assumptions embedded in our standards for promotion. The preamble to the Faculty Charter deserves more attention than it receives. Our faculty need to reexamine our system of reappointment, promotion, and tenure to ensure it is working correctly and meeting its
stated purpose. Is there consensus on what it means when someone is either promoted or not promoted to the rank of professor? Undoubtedly there are candidates for promotion who should be gently mentored to keep up the good work and advised the answer “isn’t no… it’s simply, not yet.” At the same time, there are longstanding and active faculty members whose activity is self-directed, off the beaten path, and ongoing. Should their candidacy be dismissed? Is our aspiration to have the tenure-earning faculty populated only by tenured professors, and those who are clearly on a trajectory to get there by today’s standards, or is there a need for those who are effective, energetic, and engaged with the mission of the university? Perhaps it is our task to elevate the role of teaching to a par with doing great research, as President Shalala has called for in the past (1992). At the very minimum, we must do more to carefully examine, and where appropriate, disrupt the distinctions that have been erected between faculty members. We should, in the words of Gergen, Josselson, and Freeman (2015, p.3), “… replace alienation with appreciation, and rejection with respect.”

Limitations/Delimitations

As a qualitative study, the results are subject to multiple interpretations. As a small, single-site study, the findings are not generalizable to other institutions, nor can they tell us the experiences of all tenured associate professors. However, they do provide insight and a more informed understanding of faculty, and provide guidance to future studies (Manning, 1999a).
...a good qualitative study that examines a few students or teachers in depth will allow one to recognize, and hence more accurately predict, some factors that will be important in educational outcomes and important in the design of larger quantitative experiments in similar populations (Wieman, 2014, p. 14).

It is also important to note that my position as a member of the administration may have impacted the authenticity of participant responses, as well as their individual decisions to participate in the study. These limitations were mitigated by the value of my role as “practitioner as researcher” (Bensimon, et al, 2004). In the words of Bensimon, et al, “the knowledge about a particular institution developed by its own members is usually more relevant than knowledge about higher education in general developed by experts” (p.124). The insight that may be derived from a small study conducted at a local institution has the potential to benefit the immediate population under examination, while also serving as a guide for future research at the same institution, and beyond. Such insight is also more likely to make an impact on higher education in the longer term (Prichard & Trowler, 2003). As Huston, Norman, & Ambrose (2007) noted, given the outsized effect even a small number of disaffected faculty can have on an institution, it is essential for practitioners to engage in institution-specific research in order to best understand how to address the issues faced by its own faculty rather than relying on the conclusions of broader studies which may or may not be applicable. A delimitation of this study is that the sample of participants was drawn from the pool of those who contacted me to volunteer to participate. There may be characteristics unique to faculty who were reluctant to volunteer, but who might have been recruited by a more concerted and personalized effort. There is also the possibility of response bias shared in some way among those who chose to step forward and participate early in the study.
Conclusions

“We must send forth a new message, one that elevates the role of teaching young people to a par with doing great research” (Shalala, 1992, p.37).

The Preamble to the Faculty Government Charter, University of Miami reads thus:

A university is a community of scholars contributing, according to their individual talents and interests, to the transmission and advancement of knowledge. Because of its diversity of interests, a university is a complex organization, not quite like any other in its management, which requires the understanding and good faith of people dedicated to a common purpose. A university administration must seek wisely and diligently to advance the common effort, and the strength of a university is greatest when its faculty and administration join for the advancement of common objectives.

Much of the existing faculty-administration relationship has been established through long experience and has the weight and good sense of academic form and tradition. Some of the traditions of the University of Miami are given expression and are extended in this document. Yet these and other common understandings have meaning only to the extent that they reflect the integrity and faith of the faculty and the administration in the day-to-day accomplishment of their joint effort. [emphasis added]
(2014, p.1)

“Nothing is more important to the future of the academy than the recognition that faculty are the university—its lifeblood, its connective tissue, its heart…and its conscience” (Shalala, 1992, p.34). It is time for the conscience of the university to speak up for the values it claims for all of us in the Faculty
Charter – community, understanding, good faith, dedication, good sense, tradition, and integrity.

**Epilogue**

To follow on to the researcher’s statement in Chapter 3, I must admit that I was completely unprepared for the way in which this research project has transformed my approach to my work with faculty. The deeper I got into data analysis, the more frustration I began to feel on behalf of the study participants. It made me angry to think about faculty who have willingly stepped up to do the job nobody else wanted to do, and have done it well. They have taken a leap of faith, risking their own professional advancement in order to allow their other colleagues to facilitate their own. Perhaps it is my military upbringing, but the thought of breaking faith with those who risk themselves for your benefit is nauseating to me. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*

*Adsum.*
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Appendix 1: Conceptual Taxonomy of Human Motivation

Conceptual taxonomy of human motivation illustrating the relationship between motivation, regulation, and perceived locus of causality (Ryan & Deci, 2000)
Appendix 2: Recruitment Letter

December 2, 2014

Professor [FNAME] [LNAME]
[ADDRESS]
[CITY], [ST] [ZIP]

Dear Professor [LNAME]:

I hope this letter finds all well with you. My name is Bill Tallman, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education Leadership program at the University of Miami.

I write today to ask for your consideration in a research study I am conducting. I want to be clear that this study is strictly in my capacity as a doctoral student and is in no way connected to my “day job” as Director of Faculty Affairs at UM.

I am studying the lived experiences of tenured faculty who remain at the rank of Associate Professor for 10 years or longer, paying particular attention to scholarly work, relationships with colleagues, and experiences with the faculty review process. I’ve chosen this focus based on my interest in the promotion and tenure process, and because my educational and professional experiences have led me to discover that this is a phenomenon that is understudied and widely misunderstood.

At this stage, my dissertation proposal has been fully approved by my doctoral committee, and my research plan has been approved by the Institutional Review Board.

I received your name and contact information from the UM Office of Planning, Institutional Research and Assessment after submitting a request for a listing of faculty meeting the study parameters, namely, Associate Professors who were awarded tenure June 1, 2004 or earlier, with primary faculty appointments in Architecture, Arts & Sciences, Business Administration, Communication, Education, Engineering, Music, Marine Science, or Nursing.

In the next few weeks I will be reaching out to you by phone at your office to answer any questions you have and to determine your interest in participating in my dissertation study.

If you have any questions in the meantime, please contact me directly at btall@miami.edu, or at my cell phone, (305) 799-2455; or you may contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Laura Kohn Wood at l.kohnwood@miami.edu or (305) 284-1316.

Sincerely,

Bill Tallman
Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education Leadership
School of Education & Human Development
Appendix 3: Recruitment Email

Dear (Faculty member):

I hope this note finds all well with you! As I mentioned in my previous letter, I am conducting a research project about the lived experiences of faculty who remain at the rank of Associate Professor with tenure for 10 years or more. I am focusing on University of Miami faculty on the Coral Gables and Rosenstiel campuses, and I am writing to ask for your help in completing this research. If you agree to participate we will arrange a convenient location for a confidential interview that will take approximately 90 minutes of your time. The interview can take place in your office, my office, or another location at your convenience.

I am interested in examining your experiences as an Associate Professor at UM. Specifically, I am interested in your scholarly work, your relationships with your colleagues, and your experience with the promotion and tenure process.

The interview will be recorded, and the recordings will be erased after they are transcribed. After transcription, I will set a follow up appointment for us to meet for approximately 30-60 minutes at a time and location of your convenience, where I will provide you a written draft of my analysis from transcript, and we will review it together for accuracy, and you will have the opportunity to delete any comment or reference that you do not wish to have appear in the final draft.

No identifying information will be used in any materials created from these interviews unless explicitly authorized by you. The information obtained in this study will be published in my dissertation, as well as in journal articles.

You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting our relationship or your relationship with the University. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

There may be no direct benefit to you if you participate in this research, however you will be contributing to the improvement of faculty development policies and programs in the future.

Please indicate whether you are interested in participating in this research by contacting me by email or phone at the contact information listed below. You may also contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Laura Kohn Wood at l.kohnwood@miami.edu, or (305) 284-1316 if you have any questions for her.

Thank you, and I look forward to hearing from you and to the opportunity to learn from you.

Sincerely,

Bill Tallman
Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education Leadership
School of Education and Human Development
Appendix 4: IRB Approval

December 1, 2014

Bill Tallman
305-284-3386
btall@miami.edu

Dear Mr. Bill Tallman:

On 11/20/2014, the IRB reviewed the following submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review:</th>
<th>Initial Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of Study:</td>
<td>Understanding the Lived Experiences of Tenured Associate Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator:</td>
<td>Bill Tallman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB ID:</td>
<td>20140830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents Reviewed:
- Recruitment Email - Lived Experience of Associate Professors
- Post Interview ICF - Lived Experience of Associate Professors
- Initial Recruitment Letter - Lived Experience of Associate Professors
- Interview Protocol - Lived Experiences of Associate Professors
- ICF - Lived Experience of Associate Professors

The IRB approved the study from 11/20/2014 to 11/19/2015 inclusive. Before 11/19/2015 or within 45 days of the approval end date, whichever is earlier, you are to submit a completed Continuing Review to request continuing approval or closure.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 11/19/2015 approval of this study expires on that date.

To document consent, use the consent documents that were approved and stamped by the IRB. Go to the Documents tab to download them.
NOTE: Translations of IRB approved study documents, including informed consent documents, into languages other than English must be submitted to HSRO for approval prior to use.

In conducting this study, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual (HIRP-103), which can be found by navigating to the IRB Library within the IRB system.

Should you have any questions, please contact: Vivienne Carrasco, Sr. IRB Regulatory Analyst, (phone: 305-243-6713; email: vcarrasco@med.miami.edu)

Sincerely,

[This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature]

Amanda Coltes-Rojas, MPH, CIP
Director
Regulatory Affairs & Educational Initiatives
Appendix 5: Informed Consent Form

University of Miami
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY
UNDERSTANDING THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

The following information describes the research study in which you are being asked to participate. Please read the information carefully. At the end, you will be asked to sign if you agree to participate.

PURPOSE OF STUDY:
The purpose of this study is to gain an in-depth understanding of the lived experiences of tenured associate professors at a private university located in the southeastern United States who have experienced a delay in their career progression in order to better understand the challenges they face, and develop strategies and mechanisms to assist faculty in avoiding or overcoming potential barriers to sustained productivity and success in advancement to the rank of Professor. For the purposes of this study, the term ‘delayed progression’ is defined as having been in-rank as a tenured Associate Professor for greater than 10 years without being promoted to full professor.

You are being asked to be in the study because: You are a tenured associate professor at the University of Miami with an appointment on either the Coral Gables or Rosenstiel Campus, your primary appointment is neither in the School of Law nor the Richter Library, and your effective date for award of tenure was June 1, 2004 or earlier.

PROCEDURES:
The length of time you are expected to participate in the study is between two hours, and two and a half hours, including an initial interview of approximately 90 minutes, and a follow-up session of 30 to 60 minutes.

1) The study will consist of an interview of approximately 60-90 minutes in duration at a place for your convenience. You will be asked questions relating to your scholarly work, your relationships with your colleagues, and your experience with the promotion and tenure process. The interview will be audio-recorded and the sound recording will be transcribed to text by an outside agency.
2) Once the transcription has been completed, I will schedule a second session of approximately 30-60 minutes in duration at a time and location that is convenient for you.
3) During the second session, I will provide you with a written draft of my analysis from the transcript, and we will review it together for accuracy, and you will have the opportunity to delete any comment or reference that you do not wish to have appear in the final draft.
4) The information obtained in this study may be published in scholarly journals, presented at conferences, and will be used in my dissertation, but the data will be reported so as to preserve your anonymity unless you choose to grant me permission to use information that reveals your identity, or may lead others to discover your identity.

Revised 2/1/07
5) At the conclusion of the second meeting, I will present you with a post-interview confidentiality form to sign which will give you the opportunity to confirm your wish to remain anonymous, or to give authorization to relinquish anonymity on either a limited or an unlimited basis.

RISKS AND/OR DISCOMFORTS:
This study may involve some inconveniences, risks, or discomfort to participants. Risks of participation include:

1. Potential inconvenience of the time required to participate in the study (estimated at 2.5 hours);
2. Psychological discomfort in the event that you are asked questions about your work that you feel are personal and/or sensitive in nature;
3. You may feel uncomfortable having your interview audio recorded;
4. If you voluntarily choose to give up your anonymity, your disclosures may open you to retaliation from colleagues who are uncomfortable with your views and statements.

- Any information you disclose in your interview will be done at your discretion.
- You will not be required to disclose more information than you are comfortable with disclosing.

BENEFITS:
There is no direct benefit to you for your participation in this study. The study may lead to changes in policy and programs to support ongoing faculty development.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
Research data will be maintained in hard copy and electronically. Hard copy data will be maintained in a locked file drawer in the researcher’s office in Ashe Building, 140.
Electronic data will be maintained in a password-protected cloud storage account.
Research data will be retained for three years after the conclusion of the study, and will be accessible only to the researcher and co-investigator. After three years, all data will be destroyed.

Upon your signature of this informed consent form, you will be assigned a pseudonym, and all data collected from you will reference that name, as will the final research report.

One separate document which links pseudonyms to study participant identities will be maintained in a locked file drawer in Ashe Building, Room 140 for three years after the conclusion of the study, at which time it will be destroyed.

The investigators and their assistants will consider your records confidential to the extent permitted by law. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) may request to review and obtain copies of your records. Your records may also be reviewed for audit purposes by authorized University or other agents who will be bound by the same provisions of confidentiality.
Your interview will be electronically recorded, and a copy of the electronic file of your interview will be sent to an offsite transcription service, while the original is stored in a password-protected internet cloud storage facility. Once the researcher has verified that the written transcript matches the content of the recording, the electronic recording file will be deleted immediately. The electronic written transcript will be stored in a password-protected internet cloud storage facility, and any printed copies will be stored in a locked file drawer in Ashe Building, Room 140.

**COMPENSATION:**
There is no compensation associated with your participation in this study.

**RIGHT TO DECLINE OR WITHDRAW:**
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to refuse to participate in the study or withdraw your consent at any time during the study. The investigator reserves the right to remove you without your consent at such time that they feel it is in the best interest for you.

As a tenured faculty member at the University of Miami, your decision not to participate in this study or to withdraw will not adversely affect your relationship with the investigators or your relationship with the University. Your decision will not result in the loss of any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**
Principal Investigator Bill Tallman (305) 799-2455 or email: btall@miami.edu will gladly answer any questions you may have concerning the purpose, procedures, and outcome of this project. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact Human Subjects Research Office at the University of Miami, at (305) 243-3195.

**PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT:**
I have read the information in this consent form and agree to participate in this study. I have had the chance to ask any questions I have about this study, and they have been answered for me. I am entitled to a copy of this form after it has been read and signed.

Signature of Participant ____________________________ Date __________

Signature of person obtaining consent ______________ Date __________
Appendix 6: Approved Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol

UNDERSTANDING THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

Thank you for meeting with me. If you choose to participate in this interview, please sign the informed consent form. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time during our interview without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or the University of Miami. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

(Turn on recording device)
The idea behind the interview questions is to listen for cues in the answers that point to different loci of causality (e.g., internal, somewhat internal, somewhat external, external)

Thanks for agreeing to be interviewed for this research project. I'm hopeful that the information that you and other faculty members share with me will help provide information that provides insight into the lived experiences of faculty who remain at the rank of Associate Professor for 10 years or more. I have a set of questions to guide our conversation. I want to understand your career path, your experiences, your perceptions about your colleagues and your work, and the factors that influence those perceptions. Do you have any questions about what I've said or about the purpose of the interview?

Interview Questions:
- Tell me about how you came to study (your field)
- When did you decide on the professoriate as a career path – was there a “moment?”
- How did you come to join the university – did you target, were you recruited, what attracted you
- Tell me about your time on the tenure-track – how did you choose to spend your time – what kinds of verbal or nonverbal feedback did you receive from leadership, peers inside/outside institution?
- Please describe your relationship with your colleagues (and the department chair, dean, students, others) during your tenure-track years.
- Tell me about your tenure review experience – in particular, the interim between the time you submitted your dossier and the time you received the official word of approval - how did you feel during the review? Probe for elaboration...
- In retrospect, what do you feel contributed to your success at obtaining promotion and tenure?
- Tell me about your time since being tenured – how do you choose to spend your time – what kinds of verbal or nonverbal feedback do you receive from leadership, peers inside/ outside institution?
- Please describe your relationship with your colleagues (and the department chair, dean, students, others) subsequent to your award of tenure.
- Have you requested to be considered for promotion to Professor? (If not, why not?)
- Tell me about your experience being reviewed for promotion? (if reviewed multiple times, try to differentiate for differences) – were you encouraged to apply? How did you feel during the review? How were you notified of the decision? What do you believe contributed to that outcome?
- Tell me about your time since being reviewed for Professor – how do you spend your time – what kinds of verbal or nonverbal feedback do you receive from leadership, peers inside/ outside institution?
- What challenges do you perceive in being promoted to Professor?
- Do you intend to request review again at some point in the future? If so, when?
- If you had a chance to do it all again, what would be different next time? Is there anything else I didn’t ask that you feel is important to share?

Thanks again for talking with me. I’ll be in touch in the next couple of weeks to schedule a time for us to meet and go over some of the things we talked about today. I really appreciate your help.

(Turn off recording device)
Appendix 7: Post-Interview Informed Consent Form

University of Miami
POST-INTERVIEW CONFIDENTIALITY FORM

UNDERSTANDING THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

The purpose of this study is to gain an in-depth understanding of the lived experiences of tenured associate professors at a private university located in the southeastern United States who have experienced a delay in their career progression in order to better understand the challenges they face, and develop strategies and mechanisms to assist faculty in avoiding or overcoming potential barriers to sustained productivity and success in advancement to the rank of Professor.

The trustworthiness and credibility of this study are dependent on the accurate and detailed descriptions it contains. Sometimes there are circumstances where a verbatim recounting of an interview excerpt could compromise the anonymity of the research participant.

In those circumstances, the investigators will always err on the side of caution in protecting anonymity of the participant—either by making minor changes to specific quotes or descriptions, or by omitting them altogether—unless the participant makes an informed choice to allow them to be included.

It is important for you to understand the potential risks associated with choosing to give up your anonymity. While as a tenured faculty member, you are protected against institutional retaliation, your disclosures may expose you to criticism from colleagues who disagree or are uncomfortable with your views and statements.

It is our goal and responsibility to use the information you have shared responsibly. Now that you have completed the interview and reviewed our initial analysis, we would like to give you the opportunity to provide us with additional feedback on how you prefer to have your data handled. Please check one of the following statements:

_____ You may share the information just as I provided it. No details need to be changed and you may use my real name when using my data in publications or presentations.

_____ You may share the information just as I provided it; however, please do not use my real name. I realize that others might identify me based on the data, even though my name will not be used.

_____ You may share the information I provided; however, please do not use my real name and please change details that might make me identifiable to others. In particularly it is my wish that the following specific pieces of data not be shared without first altering the data so as to make me unidentifiable (describe this data in the space below):
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You may contact me if you have any questions about sharing my data with others. The best way to reach me is (provide phone and email): ________________

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Principal Investigator Bill Tallman (305) 799-2455 or email: btall@miami.edu will gladly answer any questions you may have concerning the purpose, procedures, and outcome of this project. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact Human Subjects Research Office at the University of Miami, at (305) 243-3195.

PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT:
I have read the information in this confidentiality form and agree to the confidentiality terms elected above. I have had the chance to ask any questions I have about this study, and they have been answered for me. I am entitled to a copy of this form after it has been read and signed.

______________________________  ________________
Signature of Participant          Date

______________________________  ________________
Signature of Investigator        Date
VITA
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