

FACULTY

ever, the male-female salary differential was reduced to 13 percent, and controlling for differences in productivity and structural characteristics reduced the differential to 8 percent. Comparing male and female faculty by rank and experience cohorts substantially reduced the male-female salary differential. For example, among new assistant professors, associate professors with seven to 12 years of experience, and full professors with 13 to 20 years of experience, the difference in the salaries of men and women disappeared after controlling for differences in human capital investment, productivity, and structural characteristics. (41 ref)—*Department of Education Policy and Leadership, University of Maryland, College Park.*

0821-36/GMT

Shapiro, Douglas T. **Modeling Supply and Demand for Arts and Sciences Faculty: What Ten Years of Data Tell Us About the Labor Market Projections of Bowen and Sosa.** *Journal of Higher Education*, 2001, 72 (September/October) pp. 532-564.

The labor market projections of Bowen and Sosa's *Prospects for Faculty* of 1989 were assessed using data from the last decade. The results revealed that the Bowen and Sosa model overestimated replacement demand for faculty during the first two five-year periods but underestimated growth in undergraduate enrollment and in PhDs awarded. Demand for faculty was partially met by older PhDs and part-time faculty, whereas Bowen and Sosa had taken into account only new PhDs and full-time faculty. Improvements to the model are recommended. (44 ref)—*Graduate student, Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, University of Michigan.*

0822-36/BMM

EVALUATION

Brown, B. E., Barr, S. H., & Lees, N. D. **Preparing Chairs for Expanded Roles in Post-Tenure Review: Providing Feedback to Faculty.** *Department Chair*, 2001, 11 (Spring) pp. 7-9.

The cornerstone of most post-tenure review systems is the annual performance review, which involves both written and oral feedback to individual faculty members and usually serves both summative and formative purposes. In preparing for annual reviews, the department chair must keep in mind the intended audiences and varying contexts. Relevant audiences, besides the targeted faculty member, include the dean, peer reviewers, and departmental and institutional review committees. Contexts include the individual faculty member's history, legal issues, system or union guidelines, and personnel processes. A structure is necessary to ensure that all faculty members are reviewed in a consistent and fair manner. The structure should employ a common vocabulary and include the major criteria for evaluation pertaining to teaching and research, and some way of acknowledging change since the last review.—*Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of North Carolina.*

0823-36/GMT

Collins, Ayse Bas. **Pay-Back; Can Students Evaluate Their Instructors: Dilemmas and Problems.** Paper read at American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 2001, 18 pp.

At Bilkent University, one of the few English language universities in Turkey, 423 students and 66 instructors participated in a qualitative and quantitative study to assess their perceptions of the Student Instruction Evaluation (SIE) System. The results revealed that 95 percent

of the instructors and 98 percent of the students viewed the SIE System as ineffective in content, administration, and application. The great majority of both students and instructors criticized the SIE System for being only in English and for being too long and conflicting. Because the SIE forms are distributed to students just before they take final exams, the students indicated that the process was stressful and that many questions were answered without being read. A large percentage of students reported that they merely checked the midpoint of "three" on the five-point Likert scale rather than making an effort to give a sincere rating of the instructor. Recommendations made by students and instructors for improving the SIE System included redesigning the format and using the students' native language as well as English, explaining the structure and importance of the SIE System to new students during orientation, providing students with the results of the evaluation, and distributing the forms a week or two prior to final exams. (17 ref)—*Bilkent University, Turkey*.

0824-36/GMT

Correa, Hector. **A Game Theoretic Analysis of Faculty Competition and Academic Standards.** Higher Education Policy, 2001, 14 (June) pp. 175-182.

Students tend to give favorable evaluations to faculty members who give high grades, suggesting that faculty members compete for favorable student evaluations and thus contribute to grade inflation. The Theory of Games could be a useful tool to examine interactions among faculty members. A model was constructed using a simplified characterization of the interactions between two faculty members. The results suggested that excessive reliance on student evaluations is indeed likely to reduce academic standards and to promote grade inflation. (16 ref)—*Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh*.

0825-36/BMM

Knox, Alan B. **Assessing University Faculty Outreach Performance.** College Teaching, 2001, 49 (Spring) pp. 71-74.

Because outreach programs are increasingly important in higher education, the assessment of the outreach performance of faculty is essential. In a study of how reviewers evaluate promotion and tenure materials and make recommendations for assistant professors with substantial outreach responsibilities, 18 such faculty members were identified and their promotion packets analyzed by reviewers. A cluster analysis of the reviewers' ratings yielded three clusters: (1) innovation, impact on the field or discipline, and recommendation; (2) the balance of research with teaching and service; and (3) institutional and colleague role expectations, especially concerning teaching. Of the 18 reviews, three were strong recommendations, 13 were recommendations, and two were marginal recommendations. The aspects of outreach most associated with promotion were outreach research and external funding. Whether the review strongly recommended, recommended, or marginally recommended promotion bore little relationship to the proportion of outreach as part of the total appointment, but the quality of performance and documentation related to teaching, research, and service appeared more important than the relative emphasis on outreach. (10 ref)—*Department of Continuing Education, University of Wisconsin*.

0826-36/GMT