

## PROMOTION IN RANK IN HIGHER EDUCATION\*

Dr. Ali BALCI\*\*

### Introduction

Promotion is one of the tough and painful problems of personnel administration. It's tough because so far, there is no fair and effective promotion model which is satisfying both organization and individuals. Recently in academic job marketing, decisions on tenure and promotion are becoming significant within professional education. Declining student enrolment, lack of the Federal and state funds for program support, and decreasing student financial aids caused the new economic situation where most colleges and universities have decreased hiring new faculty and are looking more critically at promotion and tenure of present faculty (Weinbach and Jerry, 1984, p. 81).

"Tenure and promotion are reasonable expectations" for faculty members who did their jobs effectively. In fact, generally higher-lever employees perceive their jobs as the process of progression from one position to a higher one. They see their jobs as the source of satisfaction rather than a specific work, and tend to be permanent employees, because previous achievement in organization is a prerequisite for upgrading. That's the way frequently the promise of promotion is used as an incentive to employees (Maier, 1973, p. 517). On the other hand, the absence of promotion opportunity may cause some problems such as turnover, absenteeism, poor work quality, poor worker discipline and skill shortages (Grinker and others, 1970, p. 17).

---

\*This Paper was prepared by this author as a requirement of the course "EAD 971 A The Department In Higher Education" at College of Education-Michigan State University,

\*\*Eğitim Yönetimi ve Planlaması Bölümü Araştırma Görevlisi

Promotion is also a painful problem because it is directly pertaining to financial and emotional welfare of an individual. Not being able to promote may decrease the level of individual in the view of peers, students and others. As McKeachie (1979, p. 17) stressed these feelings are particularly important in the early yerars for one's career. These kinds of problems make the promotion process so critical and important.

### **Promotion and Related some Terms**

Some of the definitions of promotion were found in the literature are: Pigors and Myers (1969, p. 420) define promotion as "the advancement of an employee to a better job" To them "better job" means a specific job it has greater responsibilities, more prestige or status, increased rate of salary, better hours and better location, better working conditions. These authors see "upgrading" as closely related to promotion. Because upgrading is the movement of an employee to a more responsible job within the same occupational unit and with a corresponding increase in pay. Thus, upgrading amounts to a small scale promotion.

Flippo (1971, p. 227) defines promotion as an advancement within an organization. To him, promotion involves a change from one position to another that is better in terms of status and responsibility. Generally the change to the higher job is accompanied by increased salary and some privileges, but not always. He uses "dry" promotion means an increase in responsibility and status without an increase in pay.

To Grinker and others (1970, p. 2-3) "upgrading" has at least seven definitions, some of them relate only to movement or to more money. They define it as "the movement of a worker into a job requiring greater skill and experience, and usually paying more money".

French (1970, p. 274) perceives promotion as a type of transfer involves reassignment an employee to a higher position, having higher pay, more privileges, and increased benefits. To him, the purpose of promotion is to fill a vacancy which generally is worth more to the organization than the employee's present position.

If these definitions are analyzed, the following conclusions can be reached: (1) Promotion is a movement generally within an

organization from a lower position to a higher one. (2) Promotion is accompanied by increasing salary, more responsibilities, more authority and status, and more skills. (3) Promotion is perceived by employees as an incentive, then it should be tied to employee competence or employee performance. (4) If it is considered in the context of higher education, promotion includes salary increasing, promotion in rank, tenure etc.

In a short paper, there is no possibility to discuss the whole promotion process. In this paper, only promotion in rank in the context of higher education is going to be discussed. In these limitations promotion in rank can be defined operationally-inspired from Stein (1975, p. 9) — as faculty moving up in position from the level of instructor to assistant professor, assistant professor to associate professor or associate professor to full professor.

This must be separated from transfer. Transfer is defined as shifting an employee from one job to another one, at the same occupational level and on about the same level of wages or salary. Transfer expresses no appreciable increase or decrease in duties and responsibilities; it may be a change in working conditions (Pigors and Myers, 1969; Miner, 1970; French, 1970).

Demotion is another closely related term to promotion. Demotion is run entirely opposite direction with promotion. Demotion shifting an employee down to a lower level of position, which involves decrease in salary, status and privilege (French, 1970, p. 274; Miner, 1970, p. 431).

### **Promotion Criteria**

Promotion requires decision-making. It is obvious that making decision for promotion requires faculty evaluation. Especially in those conditions, such as severe financial retrenchment, faculty unionization and collective bargaining and demands for accountability and cost effectiveness faculty evaluation is indispensable (Genova and Others, 1976, p. 89). Promotion decisions should be tied to faculty performance and faculties should be made aware of the link between job performance and promotion. It requires the administration to develop procedures to ensure promotion opportunities for those who have demonstrated on the job that they are capable of achieving higher level tasks (Rebore, 1982, p. 75).

Promotion decisions must be based on objective and standard evaluation. What should be evaluated? What kinds of criteria should be used in faculty evaluation, which is prerequisite for promotion decision-makings ?

To Tuckman, promotion and tenure committees rarely announce their criteria for promotion with specificity, " the weights given to the individual criteria change from one year to the next, and the folders of both considered and rejected are usually not open to public scrutiny." He mentions an intensive research findings (never mentions the methodology used). He emphasizes a multivariate technique is used to estimate the probability of promotion to the associate and full professor ranks with the faculty member's publications, teaching experience, public service, degree level, experience as the independent variables. He mentions the findings suggest a strong incentive for faculty to publish. Article publication contributes significantly to the probability of promotion. The contribution is stronger at the associate professor level than at the full professor level. On the other hand, publication of articles gives rise to a higher probability of promotion than publication of books, especially several articles can be written in the time required to write one book. The findings also indicate that neither teaching nor public service can contribute to promotion as much as publishing. Tuckman, besides teaching, publication and public service mentions the other determinants of promotion as field of specialization, faculty age, other faculty activities (consult for business, government etc.) (Tuckman, 1979, p. 174-179).

Luthans (1967) investigated the promotion policies and practices in 46 large state universities in the USA. The results of this survey as following: (1) Half of the central administrators reported the utilisation of a bibliography of promotion candidates, provided by inspection of actual publications. One-third reported the use of objective teaching reports where decisions were made by deans and chairpersons (non-central administrators) rather central administrators similar practices were employed. (2) Both central and non-central administrators ranked promotion criteria as follows: Research, teaching, service and personal attributes, seniority and competitive bids. (3) The weighted scale of promotion decision-making revealed that the central and non-central administrators perceive the non-administrative level as being the most powerful and influential. Luthans concluded that although research is a basic purpose of the university and most

widely recognized standart for promotion over half of the central administrators reported that they sometimes approved for full professors who have no significant publication record.

To Tucker, teaching, research and service are the performance areas of the university members, and should be used as criteria for promotion decision-makings. Evaluation of teaching should include consideration of (1) correlation of imparted knowledge and skills to course objectives.(2) Stimulation of students' critical thinking and creative ability in light of the course objectives. (3) Adherence to accepted standarts of professional behavior in meeting his responsibilities to students. In research and other creative activities, contribution to and discorvery of new knowledge,new educational techniques and other creative activities should be paid attention for evaluation. Evidence of research and other creative activities should include published books, articles and papers in professional journals. On the other hand, service activities should include participating in department, college and university commitees, councils and senates; service in appropriate professional organizations, involvement in organizing and expediting meetings, conferences, and workshops; participating in local, state and national govermental boards, commissions. Service evaluation should include: (1) Contributing to effective functioning of the academic administrative unit and the the whole institution. (2) Contribution to the university community. (3) Contribution to local, state and national communities. Tucker expresses after these criterions, also other university duties such as academic advising, career counseling, supervision of interns should also be paid attention for promotion decisions (Tucker, 1981, p. 108-110).

Seldin investigated the current policies and practices used in liberal art colleges and found the following results: (1) The big majority of liberal arts colleges place major importance on quality of teaching performance in the evaluation of an individual faculty's overall performance. (2) In addition to teaching, the criteria of "student advising", "length of service in rank", "personal attributes", and "committee work" are used by the majority of liberal arts colleges in the evaluation of overall faculty performance.(3) The primary sources from with information is obtained for use in evaluation teaching performance are "chairman evaluation" and "dean evaluation", other sources of information included "colleagues opinions", "informal student opinions", "committee evaluation", "scholarly research

and publication”, and “systematic student ratings”. (4) Academic deans are using some of the newer sources such as “student evaluation” and “self evaluation” of teaching performance. (5) Increasingly “student advising” and “campus committee work” are being used, on the other hand, the criteria that have decreased – in a ten years period\* – in use include “research”, “publication”, “activities in professional societies” and “personal characteristics” (Seldin, 1975, p. 67–69).

At that point, it is considered that The Association of American University Professors (AAUP) published the “Statement on teaching, research and publications’ evaluation” will add light to the discussion. This statement expresses that institutions should declare their values and communicate them to their colleges, and departments to set forth specific expectations as to teaching, research and service and the other faculty responsibilities. In this statement adequate evaluation data are mentioned as (1) an accurate factual description of what an individual teacher does, (2) various measures of the effectiveness of these efforts, and (3) fair consideration of the relation, between these efforts and the institutions and department’s expectations. After that, those kinds of information should be gathered: (1) An accurate description of a professor’s teaching and the other task areas. (2) Other useful information related to the ability of a teacher to shape new courses, to reach different levels and kinds of students to develop effective teaching strategies etc. (3) These data should promote a careful consideration of both the institutions’s and department’s values. (4) Another kind of data should be systematically gathered and examined by the teacher’s colleagues includes course outlines, test materials and methods used in instruction. (5) Then, evidence of teaching competence demonstrated in publications, attendance at meetings, delivery of lectures and consulting also should be included among the data to be evaluated (AAUP, 1975, p. 200–201).

### **Faculty Performance Data Base**

Under this heading, the question of who should evaluate the faculty performance is going to be answered.

**Student ratings.** — There are opinions in favor of and against the student ratings. According to Raskin and Plante the student rating

\* Seldin compares the findings of his investigation with the results of the survey by Astin and Lee (1966) in the same context.

process should be perceived as demeaning, arbitrary and demoralizing (Raskin and Plante, 1979, p. 381). However, McKeachie says that student rating is useful in those points : (1) Improving teaching. (2) Providing data to judgement about teaching effectiveness. (3) Aiding student choice of course and instructor. (4) Stimulating students to think about their education. He recommends that student ratings not be used as the single measure of teaching performance (Mc Keachie, 1979, p. 396).

Lin and Others (1984) hypothesized that direct quotations from student comments would be more persuasive, because they are more vivid than statistic alone and found that their hypothesis was verified by the investigation which they made. Rayder (1969) investigated if student ratings are related to such student characteristics, and found that generally mean student ratings of instructors were more related to instructors' characteristics than to such student characteristics as age, grade level, grade point average or course grades. To Slobin and Nichols (1969) there are various objections to using students' ratings to assess teaching effectiveness. These are: (1) Student ratings are influenced by variables irrelevant to teaching. (2) It reflects only the instructor's personality. (3) Students can not evaluate the goals of teaching. These authors argued against these objections and concluded by commenting that "student evaluation is already continuous and inescapable, the only question is whether or not we care to know what it is." Miller expresses that there are two reasons that student ratings are accepted by universities: (1) Student rating scales provide quantitative data, and (2) attract of representing the student consumers' judgements. He says that research studies of correlations of student ratings of teachers with student achievement range from  $-.75$  to  $+.87$ , however, increased number of universities use the student ratings are one piece of data among others for promotion decisions (Miller, 1984, p. 87-88).

In conclusion, although there are objections to student ratings it is used inevitably because of the first hand, quantitative data. It is among the other information used for promotion decisions.

**Peer evaluation.**- Methods used generally in peer evaluation are (1) Subjective: Impressions only. (2) Review of syllabi. Test and related class materials. (3) Review personal files. Vita, letters etc. (4) Review of tapes, or films of subject's teaching. (5) Class observation

(Weinbach and Jerry, 1984, p. 86). Weinbach and Jerry conducted a research in the USA and Canada about peer evaluation and found that (1) peer evaluation is currently reality used in the assessment of teaching performance. (2) 60 % respondents stated that peer ratings are very important in decision - making for teaching effectiveness. (3) Faculty are not usually subject to review by all faculty members with most programs employing a selecting committee. (4) There is a tendency to prefer review of more objective criteria such as syllabi, vitae etc. They recommended that informal feedback from university and school committees, review the vitae by authorities who are out of faculty, review of materials by a specifically constructed national panel of other universities, evaluation of a candidate's research and publications, community services and overall value to the educational unit be used as peer evaluation methods (p. 79-85). To Genova and others (1976, p. 19) departmental peers can give enough information about faculty members' contributions to the department. They may also be good judges of a teacher's advisory, consulting, and supervising out side the classroom, if they are a position to observe these activities, and they can be a reliable source of information about these given areas. Seldin (1975, p. 21-23) informs based on research literature relevant to peer evaluation that resistance to classroom visitation comes from, (1) suspicious towards the visitor's intention, (2) uncertainty over the results, and (3) a sense of violation of professional standing. When teacher knows he / she is being watched by someone whose opinion will determine his promotion his / her performance may depend more on her / his nerve than his / her teaching skills. On the other hand, he metions this approach is strongly suggested in the literature. This method can be effectively used when the visit involves friendliness and interest as well as a critical and instructional purpose.

As it is seen that classroom visitation and other peer evaluation methods are suggested by some educators as important source of information on quality of teaching performance. However, equally strong arguments against such techniques are made.

**Self evaluation.**— In this technique it is expected that faculty members as individuals can assist colleagues in evaluation of their performance (AAUP, 1975, p. 202). By self evaluation one develops greater self - awareness, he is able to respond more effectively to the areas and interests of others. It may assist the instructor in improving



the course for the rest of the term. On the other hand, generally it is claimed that its accuracy and reliability is weak, because of the subjective character (Seldin, 1975, p. 18-19). It may be said that although self evaluation is so subjective, it might be objective and useful under the conditions if teachers are trained at that theme and this kind of evaluation is used in improving teaching performance.

**Administrative ratings.**— Administrators have two kinds of roles: (1) Considering the ratings of others (student ratings, peer ratings etc.), and (2) contributing evaluative input to making final decisions, in other words, observing directly teaching performance. But sometimes these two kinds of roles may be conflicted, that is why in some universities administrators (chairperson, dean, president etc.) may act only a source of information. On the other hand, it can be said that, differentiating stage of data collection and carefully defining these two roles may not be confused. In the AAUP Bulletin (1979, p. 168) it is stated the administrators and colleagues are responsible for gathering data about the faculty member and insuring the comprehensive evidence is considered (Genova and others, 1976, p. 20-21).

### **Performance Evaluation Techniques**

Tucker mentions two kinds of performance evaluation techniques: (1) A simple type bases on performance rating of faculty without concern with percentage of full-time workload assigned to each performance area. (2) A more complex type with regard for percentage of full-time workload and offers separate performance ratings for each area.

**Simple-subjective type.**— In this type evaluation, the chairperson bases on his /her evaluation of the faculty performance without listing the activities and without prescribing what percentage of time or effort of full-time workload is to be sent on each activity. The chairperson receives each faculty member's performance over the previous year and decides how valuable this faculty member to department. The chairperson evaluates the all faculty members in the same way and ranks them according to their contribution to the department. For each subjective evaluation, a number is assigned by the chairperson in order to give a quantitative measure (Tucker, 1981, p. 115).

**Complex type.**— It depends on performance rating and can range from simple to complex. A chairperson may use a simple two-point

scale as "OK" or "not OK"; "merit" or "not merit". He / she may also evaluate the faculty members' performance on a three-point scale such as "high merit", "low merit" and "no merit". Tucker improved a four-point scale as "outstanding (4)", "very good (3)", "satisfactory (2)", "weak (1)" and "unsatisfactory (0)". In this system, the faculty member's performance in each major area (teaching, research and service) is rated separately on a four-point scale, and then this rating is averaged. As it can be seen easily, in this kind of evaluation, the percentage of full-time workload is not taken into account. It can be solved by the chart like that (figure 1).

Area of performance	Performance Rating (I)	Assigned % of Full-time Workload (II)	Rating Points (I × II)
Teaching	4.0	60	240
Research	3.0	30	90
Service	3.0	5	15
Other	3.0	5	15
Total	13.0	100	360

FIGURE 1. Rating of Faculty Member A's Performance, by area of Performance and by Percentage of Full-time Workload Assigned to Each Area (Tucker, 1981, p. 119).

$$\text{Rating Point Average} = \frac{\text{Total of Rating Points}}{\text{Total of Assigned Percentage}} = \frac{360}{100} = 3.6$$

If it is desired to make the system more sensitive, it requires extra variables as indicated in chart below (figure 2).

Area of Performance	Performance Rating (I)	Assigned % of Full-time Work Load (II)	Area Priority Factor (III)	Adjusted Assigned % Full-time Workload (IV)	Adjusted Rating Points (V), (I×IV)
Teaching	2.0	40	1.0	40	80
Research	4.0	40	1.5	60	240
Service	3.0	10	1.0	10	30
Other	2.0	10	1.0	10	20
Total	11.0	100	N/A	120	370

FIGURE 2. Rating of Faculty Member A's Performance, by Area of Performance and by Percentage of Full-time workload Assigned to Each Area Taking Into Account The Area Priority Factor (Tucker, 1981, p. 122).

$$\text{Adjusted Rating Point Average (RPA)} = \frac{\text{Total Adjusted Rating Points}}{\text{Total Adjusted Assigned \%}} = 370/120 = 3.08$$

Another system of point allocation used by some departments rates faculty member's performance on a ten-point scale. Ratings are changed between a full-time point and no points at all. The average score is at five point. A department with ten faculty members will have a total of 50 points to be divided among all faculty members for, for instance teaching performance. If a rater gives three faculty members ten points each for teaching performance, three would be only 20 points left to be divided among the other seven members. This system sometimes called "constantsum" (Tucker, 1981, p. 127).

### **Promotion In Rank In the English Language Center (ELC)**

Under this heading the interview which author performed with Dr. Munsell, the previous chairperson of ELC, about the promotion in the ELC-Michigan State University, will be given. The results of the interview can be summarized into following points:

1. ELC notifies all present employees of promotional opportunities through bulletin board, personal contact and house organ. The other medium such as local newspapers, employee council minutes, service personnel policy manual are not used.

2. In the ELC decisions for promotion base on "rules of thumb" and performance appraisal. Dr. Munsell especially emphasized that "the rules are not totally specific".

3. In the ELC, in performance appraisal, those kinds of criteria are principally considered in overall evaluation of an ELC member for promotion in rank and their importance are like: Supervision of graduate study is "very important" criterion in performance evaluation of ELC members. Classroom teaching, research, publication, public service, activities in professional societies, student advising, campus committee work, length of service in rank, personal attributes are "important" criteria. Consultation for instance business, government is "not a criterion". On the other hand, supervision of honors program is "not applicable" in the ELC.

4. In the ELC in evaluation of a teacher's teaching performance those kinds of criteria are used and their frequency are like: There is

no criterion "always used" in teaching evaluation. "Usually used" criteria are systematic student rating, informal student opinions, classroom visitations, colleagues' opinions, chairman evaluation, course syllabi and examinations. The criteria "seldom used" are scholarly research and publication, student examination, dean evaluation, long-term follow-up students, enrollment in elective courses, alumni opinions, committee evaluation, grade distribution and self evaluation.

5. "Do you employ any specific ratings form or other instrument in collecting data on teaching competence or overall performance?" was answered "yes" and presented and given two forms. One of them is a five-point scale used in teaching evaluation of a teacher by students. The other one is a classroom observation form used by observers. This form is not a "point scale", however, offers the observer's explanations on the specific headings such as "plan of lesson", "methods /techniques", "cause and effect analysis" etc. It is a more subjective evaluation instrument.

6. In the ELC, the validity of usefulness of these instruments was investigated.

7. In Dr. Munsell's personal opinion, in the evaluation of a teacher's teaching effectiveness the following criteria should be ranked according to their importance, faculty peer evaluation of teaching performance, chairman evaluation of teaching performance and self evaluation of teaching performance.

8. Dr. Munsell informs that in the ELC the evaluations for promotion are separated the evaluation for such as improving teaching performance. He said that they were a small class group and saw "evaluation" as a means for improvement, not to criticize.

9. The level of importance that the ELC places on teaching behaviors for the purpose of evaluation teaching performance are like that. Be able to motivate students to topic, treating students with respect, being dynamic and energetic, enjoying teaching, be able to communicate and grading student achievement are "most important" behaviors. Well prepared for class, demonstrate comprehensive subject knowledge, encourage independent thought, discuss points of view other than his / her own, create a democratic atmosphere are the "important" teaching behaviors.

## Conclusions

In this paper there is the possibility to reach the following conclusions:

1. Recently in academic job marketing decisions on promotion and tenure are becoming important because of the declining student enrollment, lack of the Federal and state funds for program support, and the decreasing student financial aids.

2. Promotion is an expectation of faculty members. The absence of promotion opportunity may cause some problems as turnover, absenteeism, poor work quality, poor worker discipline and skill shortages.

3. Promotion is an advancement within an organization from one position to another one, which is generally accompanied by increased salary, more authority and responsibilities. Transfer is also a movement within organization from one job to another one, but at the same occupational level and the same level of wages. Demotion is opposite of promotion. Demotion is shifting an employee to a lower level of position, which is accompanied by decreased salary, status and privilege.

4. Promotion requires decision-making. These kinds of decisions should be based on reliable data base and objective criteria. Universities and colleges generally accept teaching, research, public service and others (advising, consulting etc), as the performance areas of the faculty members, and use as criteria for promotion decision-makings. In addition to these criteria, degree level, experience and seniority, faculty age, specialization, personal attributes, competitive bids, supervision of graduate study and honor program are used as criterions among the others. Although institutional goals play important role in determining the priority of the criterions, teaching effectiveness is generally much more importance attached. On the other hand, some studies indicated that neither teaching nor public service can contribute to promotion as much as publishing, especially article publishing.

5. The data base of the faculty members on promotion decisions include student ratings, peer evaluation, self-evaluation, administrators evaluation etc. Although there are objections to student ratings, it's used widely because of the first hand quantitative data. Peer eva-

uation includes these kinds of techniques as impressions only, review the syllabi, review of the personal files, review of the tapes or films of the candidate's teaching, classroom visitations. These techniques are suggested strongly and used as important source of data on especially the quality of teaching, however, equally strong objections to such techniques are made. Self evaluation is a subjective technique, but it might be objective and useful, if the teachers are trained at that point and this evaluation is used for improving teaching performance. Administrators (chairperson, dean, president etc.) have a dual responsibility in evaluating: (1) Considering the ratings of student, peer etc., and (2) observing directly and evaluating the faculty member's performance. These two roles may not be confused by differentiating stage of data collection and carefully defining them.

6. In faculty member's performance evaluation, generally two kinds of evaluation techniques are used: (1) Simple-subjective type and (2) complex one. In simple type, the chairperson bases on his evaluation on the performance without listing activities and without giving any weight on each activity. The chairperson evaluates the faculty member according to his perception of how this faculty is valuable to department. In complex type evaluation, the chairperson can use the two-point, three-point or four point scales and rates the faculty performance separately on these scales. This system can be made more sensitive by using such variables "rating point average" and "adjusted rating point average". In some universities, another type of point allocation, called "constant sum" is used in performance evaluation.

7. According to the interview with Dr. Munsell, in the English Language Center (ELC)-MSU in teaching performance evaluation two kinds of factor play role: (1) "Rules of thumb" and (2) performance evaluation. In overall teacher performance the "very important" criterion is "supervision of graduate study". "Classroom teaching", "research", "publication", "public service", "student advising", "seniority" are "important" criterions. In the ELC, in evaluation of a teacher's teaching performance, usually these criteria are used: "Systematic student ratings", "informal student ratings", "classroom visits", "peer evaluation" and "chairman evaluation". On the other hand, in the ELC the "most important" teaching behaviors on which the ELC places are "being able to motivate students to the topic", "treating students with respect", "being dynamic and energetic",

“enjoying the teaching”, “being able to communicate” and “fair and reasonable grading student achievement”.

(ÖZET)

### YÜKSEKÖĞRETİMDE YÜKSELTİLME

Bu yazıda önce personel yönetiminin en ağırlı sorunlarından biri olan “yükseltılme (promotion)” konusu yükseköğretim çerçevesinde, ilgili inceleme ve arařtırmalara dayanarak tartıřılmıř, sonra da Michigan State Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Merkezi (ELC)’nde yükseltılme konulu görüřme (mülakat) sonuçları özetlenmiřtir.

Yükseköğretimde yükseltılme, öğretim elemanının en doęal beklentisidir. Böylesi bir olanaęın yokluęu, iřten ayrılma, iřte devamsızlık etme, iř kalitesinde düşme, iř disiplininde kötüleřme ve beceri kısrılıęı gibi sonuçlara yolaçabilmektedir.

Yükseltılme, bir örgütte bir görevden, daha fazla ücret, yetki ve sorumluluęu bulunan daha üst düzeydeki bir göreve yükselme, olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Transfer de örgütte bir yer deęiřtirmidir. Ancak aynı mesleksel düzeyde olan ve aynı düzeyde ücreti bulunan bir göreve geçmez. Düşürme (demotion) ise iřgöreni, řimdiki iřinden daha az ücret, statü ve hakları bulunan bir göreve indirmedir.

Doęaldır ki yükseltılme, bazı kararları gerektirecektir. Bu tür kararlar nesnel ölçütlere ve güvenilir verilere dayanmalıdır. Literatür taraması göstermiřtir ki üniversiteler genelde, “öğretim”, “arařtırma” ve “halk hizmeti”ni, bu arada da “öğrenci danıřmanlıęı” gibi alanları, öğretim elemanlarının performans alanları olarak kabul etmekte ve yükseltılme kararları için ölçütler olarak kullanmaktadır. Bunların yanında akademik ünvan düzeyi, deneyim ve kıdem, yař, uzmanlık, kiřisel özellikler, lisans-üstü çalışmaların gözden geçirilmesi de ölçütler arasında yer almaktadır. Çalışmalar, kurum amaçlarının, ölçütlerin öncelik sıralamasını tayin ettięini göstermekteyse de, genelde öğretime dięerleri arasında daha fazla önem verildięi görülmektedir. Bazı arařtırmalar ise yükseltılmeye yayının, özellikle de makale yayınlamanın, hem öğretim, hem de halk hizmetinden daha etkili olduęunu ortaya koymuřtur.

Öte yandan öğretim elemanının yükseltılması kararlarına temel olacak veriler, řu kaynaklardan saęlanmaktadır: “Öğrenci deęerlendir-

meleri”, “aynı düzeydeki meslektaşların değerlendirmeleri”, “öz-değerlendirme”, “yöneticilerin değerlendirmeleri” vs. Öğrenci değerlendirmelerine itirazlar bulunmasına rağmen, birinci elden nicel bilgiler sağladığından yaygın olarak kullanılmaktadırlar. Aynı düzeydekilerin değerlendirmesinde, yalnızca izlenimler, kurs planlarının incelenmesi, özlük dosyasının incelenmesi, adayın teyp ya da filme alınmış dersinin incelenmesi ve sınıf ziyaretleri gibi teknikler kullanılmaktadır. Öz değerlendirme, eğer aday bu konuda eğitilmişse yararlı olabilmektedir. Yöneticilerin (bölüm başkanı, dekan, rektör vs.) ikil bir değerlendirme sorumlulukları bulunmaktadır: (1) Diğer değerlendiricilerin değerlendirmelerini değerlendirmek ve (2) adayı doğrudan gözlemek ve onun performansını değerlendirmek. Bu iki rol, eğer veri toplama aşamaları farklılaştırılır ve özenle tanımlanırlarsa, birbirine karıştırılmayacaktır.

Öğretim elemanının performans değerlendirilmesinde, genelde iki tür değerlendirme tekniği kullanılmaktadır: (1) Basit öznel tip ve (2) karmaşık tip. Basit öznel değerlendirmede, örneğin bölüm başkanı performans değerlendirmesini, eylemleri sıralamadan ve onların herbirine bir ağırlık vermeden yapar. Onun değerlendirmesine, öğretim elemanının bölüme ne denli yararlı olabileceğine ilişkin algısı temel olur. Oysa karmaşık değerlendirmede bölüm başkanı ikili, üçlü ya da dördü ölçekler kullanabilir ve adayın performansını bu ölçekler üzerinde oranlar. Bu sistem bazı değişkenlerin ilavesiyle daha da duyarlı hale getirilebilmektedir.

Dr. Munsell ile yapılan görüşme sonuçlarına göre ELC’de öğretim performansının değerlendirilmesinde iki etken rol oynamaktadır: (1) Deneyime dayalı değerlendirme ve (2) performans değerlendirmesi. Öğretmenin toplam performans değerlendirmesinde “en önemli” ölçüt, lisans-üstü çalışmaların denetlenmesidir. Sınıf öğretimi, araştırma, yayın, halk hizmeti, öğrenci danışmanlığı ve kıdem, “önemli” ölçütlerdir. ELC’de bir öğretmenin öğretim performansının değerlendirilmesinde genelde şu ölçütler kullanılmaktadır: Sistematik öğrenci değerlendirmeleri, informal öğrenci değerlendirmeleri, sınıf ziyaretleri, aynı düzeydekilerin değerlendirmeleri ve bölüm başkanının değerlendirmesi. Öten yandan ELC’de kabul edilen en önemli öğretmen davranışları şunlardır :Öğrencileri konuya güdüleyebilme, öğrencilere saygılı davranma, dinamik ve enerjik olma, öğretmekten zevk alma, iyi iletişim kurabilme ve öğrenci başarısının adil ve akılcı bir değerlendirmesi.



## References

- Astin, Alexander, and Calvin B.T. Lee.** *Current Practices in the Evaluation and Training Of College Teacher. Improving College Teaching.* Ed. C.B. T. Lee. Washington D.C.: American Council On Education, 1967.
- Benardin, John, Richard Beaty and Walter Jensen.** "The New Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures In the Context of University Personnel Decisions." *Personnel Psychology* 33-2 (Sum., 1980) 301-304.
- Bali, Boris Jr.** "Faculty-Ranked Importance In The 1970's of Pay Promotion Criteria." *Resources in Education. ERIC* 18,1 (1983) 82.
- Flippo, Edwin B.** *Principles of Personnel Management.* New York, St. Louis, San Francisco, Düsseldorf: McGraw-Hill Book Com., 1971.
- French, Wendell.** *The Personnel Management Process. Human Resources Administration.* Second edition. Boston: Houghton Miffling Company, 1970.
- Garrity, Marjorie, Marianne Osborn, Velvet Miller and Marjorie W. Linden.** "Developing Criteria for Promotion and Tenure." *Nursing Outlook* (March, 1980) 187-191.
- Genova, William J.M. Madoff, R. Chin and G. Thomos.** *Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education.* Cambridge Mass: Bellinger Publishing Comp., 1976.
- Gold, K.** "Good Teaching." *Times Higher Education Supply* 598 (Apr., 1984) 10.
- Grinker, William, D. Cooke and A.W. Kirsch** *Climbing the Job Ladder. A Study of Employee Advancement in Eleven Industries.* New York and Washington: E. F. Sherley and Comp., Inc., 1970.
- Kasten, K. Lewallan.** "Tenure and Merit Pay As Rewards for Research, Teaching and Service at a Research University." *The Journal of Higher Education* 55, 4 (Jul. / Aug, 1984) 500-514.
- Kellogg, Marion.** *Career Management.* American Management Association Inc., 1972.
- Leavitt, Herald J. Managerial Psychology.** *An Introduction to Individuals, Pairs and Groups in Organizations.* Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Lewis, Darrell R. and Wiliam Becker.** *Academic Rewards In Higher Education.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Pub. Comp, 1979.
- Lin, Yi-guand, W. McKeachie and D. Tucker.** "The Use of Student Ratings In Promotion Decisions." *The Journal Of Higher Education* 55 (Sept. / Oct., 1984) 583-590.
- Luthans, F.** *The Faculty Promotion Process. An Empirical Analysis of the Administration of Large State Universities.* Iowa City, Bureau of Business and Economic Research, College of Business Administration, University of Iowa, 1967.
- Maier, Norman.** *Psychology In Industrial Organizations.* Fourth edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

- Miner, John.** *Personnel And Industrial Relations. A Managerial Approach.* London: The Macmillan Company, Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1970.
- Munsell, Paul.** The Previous Chairperson of the ELC with him the Interview about Promotion In the ELC was Performed on Nowenber 5, 1984.
- Pigors, Paul and C. A. Myers.** *Personnel Administration.* Sixth edition. New York, and et all: McGraw-Hill Book Comp. 1969.
- Rayder, N.F.** "College Student Ratings of Instructors." *Journal of Experimental Education* 37 — 2 (1968) 76 — 81.
- Rebore, Ronald.** *Personnel Administration In Education. A Management Approach.* N.J.: Prentice- Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1972.
- Seldin, Peter.** *How Colleges Evaluate Professors: Current Policies and Practices in Evaluation Classroom Teaching Performance in Liberal Art Colleges.* New York: Blythe-Penningon, Ltd., 1975.
- Tucker, Allan:** *Chairing The Academic Department. Leadership Among Peers.* Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1981.
- The Council of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). "Statement on Teaching Evaluation". *AAUP Bulletin* (Sum. 1975) 200.
- . "Affirmative Action Plans," *ACADEME* (1982) Jun. / Feb.) 15-19,
- . "Academic Freedom and Tenure 1940 Statement of Principles and Interpretive Comments. " *AAUP Bulletin* (Aug. 1966) 280-282.