

# TENURE AND PROMOTION DECISIONS: THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE

**Robert G. Green**

Virginia Commonwealth University

Research about the relative importance of faculty performance of teaching, scholarship, and service work roles in tenure and promotion decisions is reviewed and updated. Data collected from 130 deans or directors through Internet administration of the Work Role Salience Index (Green & Baskind, 2007) suggested some variation in the weighting of tenure and promotion decisions among different programs and among different types of programs. However, scholarship was salient at a majority of institutions; teaching and service roles have become less influential over time. Conflict between these findings and findings about workload time allocated to scholarship, teaching, and service are identified and implications discussed.

THE SPECIFIC CRITERIA USED for tenure and promotion decisions are critical to young professionals seeking their first faculty position, continuing faculty members contemplating alternative positions, and students seeking particular emphases in their graduate educations. These criteria define the uniqueness of faculty work at each school or department and contain specific guidelines about expected effort and achievement for each academic rank. Normative data about tenure and promotion criteria are also exceedingly important because they provide feedback about the priorities and accountability of the profession's graduate faculties. Faculty work at the grad-

uate level for all schools and departments comprises three general roles and responsibilities: teaching, scholarship, and service. However, there is considerable variation in the emphases placed on these roles from institution to institution.

Because of differences in the missions and priorities of institutions of higher education, work roles assigned to social work faculties within those institutions also differ. For example, when mission statements of colleges and universities emphasize teaching and service, teaching and service work roles are likely to receive greater emphasis or weight in tenure and promotion decision making than the

scholarship role. Conversely, academic units hosted by research-intensive universities, particularly those with doctoral degree programs, are likely to make scholarship the most salient of the three roles.

A second source of variation, faculty rank, also influences work role priorities in some schools and departments. Some academic units have different, or complementary, expectations for faculty of different ranks. *Complementary* work role expectations are likely to be found within schools or departments where faculty members are expected to shift the focus of their work as they gain rank and seniority. In some units, the importance of the scholarship role may increase as faculty members achieve senior rank. Conversely, at other schools and departments, the importance of scholarship may decrease at the senior ranks, as the importance of the service role increases. Other graduate programs apply the same, or symmetrical, expectations for all ranks. *Symmetrical* work role expectations are found at academic units where all faculty members—assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors—are expected to observe the same priorities with regard to their teaching, scholarship, and service.

Research and evaluative commentary concerning the need for changing the emphases of different faculty roles have appeared in the literature of higher education for at least the last 15 years. Challenges to the traditional dominance of research and scholarship in tenure and promotion reviews have been repeatedly issued, and several alternative models that advocate equalization, integration, or blending of the teaching, research, and service roles have been advanced (Boyer,

1990; Colbeck, 1998; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Huber, 2005).

Although similar concerns about the dominance of scholarship in tenure and promotion criteria in social work education were also raised during the 1990s (Hartman, 1990; Weick, 1991), advocacy for increasing, rather than decreasing, the importance of scholarship in general and of research scholarship in particular has been more prominent within the social work literature (see, e.g., Green, Baskind, & Bellin, 2002; Holden, Rosenberg, & Barker, 2005; National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH], Task Force on Social Work Research, 1991).

Much of the advocacy for research-based scholarship was stimulated by the widely circulated findings of the NIMH's Task Force on Social Work Research (1991). Although each of the academic units investigated by the task force had doctoral programs and most were hosted by large research universities, the majority had not demonstrated expected patterns of research and publication in the 1980s. In response to these findings, and to the level of awareness created within the profession by follow-up discussions and conferences, considerable effort was devoted to developing an organized and vital research subculture at the national level and to reviewing faculty norms, expectations, and work roles within the graduate schools. These efforts included the creation of NIMH-funded research development centers in 1993, the founding of the Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research (IASWR) in the same year, and the establishment of the Society for Social Work and Research (SSWR) in 1994.

In spite of the confusion created by advocacy for increasing and for decreasing the importance of scholarship within professional schools, the rapid growth of graduate programs, and the fundamental way work role priorities influence the nature and scope of faculty work and expectations, it has been 15 years since the last comprehensive study of tenure and promotion requirements of social work graduate faculties (Euster & Weinbach, 1994). Because of this gap in contemporary knowledge, the present study assessed the relative importance of each of the major work roles—teaching, scholarship, and service—for each faculty rank at each of the graduate faculties and examined the prevalence of complementary and symmetrical methods of assessing faculty performance.

### Literature Review

#### Work Roles of the Early Social Work Educators

The agency-based training programs in the early years of the 20th century were targeted exclusively to the education of social work practitioners. Consequently, teaching social work practice was the first faculty priority. As the skills and competencies of agency-based educators became known within the wider network of social services, however, a service expectation and role was developed. This dual expectation soon became normative within social work education and continued for some time, even after social work education began relocating to colleges and universities in the 1920s. As Weick (1991) described work roles in these early years: "For a long

time in academia, faculty in schools of social work concentrated on two things: education and service, with scholarship on the side" (p. 136).

It is not known how long teaching and service roles remained dominant after social work education was relocated within the academy. In fact, reliable information describing the emergence of the scholarship role in social work education was not available until the last quarter of the 20th century.

#### Surveys of Deans and Directors: 1978–1993

Four mail surveys of deans' and directors' reports about tenure and promotion requirements in their respective social work academic units were published between 1978 and 1993 (Euster & Weinbach, 1983, 1994; Gibbs & Locke, 1989; Miller, 1978). These studies documented the emergence of the scholarship role for faculty, the academization of graduate education in social work, and changes in the priorities of the teaching and service roles. The first of these studies was published in 1978 and focused on the middle years of the 1970s (Miller, 1978). Miller found that 50 of the 54 (92.5%) graduate deans or directors who responded to her survey ranked "teaching effectiveness" as the most important of five criteria for appointment, tenure and promotion (with 1 being the most important and 5 being least important). In addition, a majority ranked "scholarship" higher than either "community" or "university service." In 1981 ( $n=54$ ) and again in 1992 ( $n=92$ ) Euster and Weinbach conducted surveys that also asked deans and directors to rank the importance of the same

five tenure and promotion criteria within their respective social work academic units: teaching, publication, research, grants/contracts, and community service (Euster & Weinbach, 1983, 1994). The results of these studies indicated two important findings related to the 1980s. First, "publication" replaced "teaching" as the most important criterion for tenure and promotion. Although teaching was by far the most important criterion in 1981 ( $M$  rank=1.56), it had dropped to second by 1992 ( $M$  rank=2.08). Publication, ranked second in 1982 ( $M$  rank=2.42), was the highest ranking criterion by 1992 ( $M$  rank=2.03). Second, these studies provided evidence that service had become a tertiary, rather than primary, faculty work role. This criterion was ranked last in 1981 ( $M$  rank=4.25) and in 1992 ( $M$  rank=4.19).

A fourth tenure and promotion study, based on a survey of 92 graduate deans or directors, provided support for Euster and Weinbach's (1983, 1994) findings (Gibbs & Locke, 1989). In this study Gibbs and Locke found that "research/scholarly productivity" was the most important criterion for making promotion and tenure decisions at the graduate level, that teaching was the second most important criterion, and that service was tertiary.

### Method

Obtaining the unique tenure and promotion documents from schools and departments of social work is extremely time consuming. In addition, once obtained, the different formats and language make it almost impossible to compare these internal documents across programs (Gibbs & Locke, 1989; Seipel, 2003).

Similarly, because perceptions of different faculty and administrators about specific tenure and promotion requirements often differ within the same academic unit, it is exceedingly difficult to compare policies accurately or reliably within programs. Consequently, an Internet survey was conducted through the use of SurveyMonkey electronic survey software (<http://www.surveymonkey.com>) to address the research questions by asking deans and directors to provide this information for their school or department.

The sampling frame was obtained from the online list of accredited masters-in-social-work (MSW) programs maintained by the Council on Social Work Education ([www.cswe.org](http://www.cswe.org)). Only the 154 deans or directors of fully accredited programs were included. After transmitting the initial Internet package consisting of a cover letter, instructions for reaching the survey Web site, and the three-question research instrument, five follow-up e-mails, over a 9-month period, yielded complete responses from 130 deans and directors, an unusually high return rate of 84.3%.

### Development of the Work Role Salience Index

Previous studies of tenure and promotion required deans to make independent assessments of each of the three work roles or to rank the importance of each in tenure and promotion decisions at their respective schools or departments. Surprisingly, however, none of these earlier studies assessed whether expectations were the same (symmetrical) or different (complementary) for different faculty ranks. In the present study, therefore, I constructed the Work Role Salience Index (WRSI)

so respondents were required to assess and report the importance of each work role separately for each rank. In addition, so that respondents' reports of different work role priorities would be clear when applicable, the instrument was constructed so that responses about the importance of each work role on the WRSI could only be made in relation to the other two work roles.

Teaching, service, and scholarship are complex, multidimensional activities. *Teaching* responsibilities in graduate schools of social work may involve traditional classroom instruction as well as student advising, computerized distance-learning instruction, field instruction, the supervision of independent studies and research projects, and direction of doctoral dissertations. Faculty *scholarship*, as Boyer (1990) proposed, includes activities targeted to *discovery*, the most traditional and easily recognized form of scholarship. However, this broader definition also includes at least three additional activities that are intertwined with other faculty roles: the scholarship of "integration," the scholarship of "teaching," and the scholarship of "application." Similarly, faculty members' service requirements may include service to the school, university, profession, and the community and usually are intertwined with both teaching and scholarship.

A global rather than multidimensional approach to measurement was used in this study. The specification of each of the numerous and diverse dimensions of teaching, scholarship, and service for each of the schools and departments would have made the questionnaire exceedingly lengthy and decreased the likelihood of response. During

the instrument development and pretesting stages of the WRSI, 41 different activities that met the definition for teaching, service, and scholarship from the tenure and promotion documents at only one major school of social work were identified. The number of questions required to assess these dimensions for other schools as well would have precluded attaining the large representative sample of deans and directors required.

Pretests of the WRSI that had no missing data, refusals, or respondent queries indicated that the global concepts of teaching, scholarship, and service—the same global measures used in earlier research of tenure and promotion—were applicable and understood at all of the contemporary schools of social work sampled. In the final instrument, respondents were asked about "the relative importance of faculty members' performance of the teaching, scholarship and service work roles for promotion, and/or tenure evaluations in your school or department" and instructed to check one response for assistant professors, one for associate professors, and one for full professors.

Each of the responses to the WRSI is mutually exclusive and represents one of four models of work role priority for each rank. One of these responses represented an equivalency model in which all three roles contribute equally to tenure and promotion decisions. The response for the equivalency model was written as follows: "Teaching, scholarship and service are of equal importance." A second item represented the teaching/scholarship saliency model: "Teaching and scholarship are of equal importance, both are more important than service." The third item,

written as, "Teaching is more important than scholarship, both are more important than service," was constructed to represent the teaching salience model. The final item represented the scholarship salience model and was written in the following way: "Scholarship is more important than teaching; both are more important than service."

The WRSI was pilot tested through use of a convenience sample of 79 graduate faculty members, deans, and directors. To provide reliability and continuity, the same Survey-Monkey electronic Internet survey service used in the present study was administered in the pilot testing. Because of the expected range of variation among programs, a major function of the pilot testing was to determine whether respondents would readily understand and respond to these questions on the basis of recent tenure and promotion decisions at their respective institutions. Equally important, it was necessary to examine empirically whether the four responses provided by the WRSI were mutually exclusive and exhaustive of all possible priorities of the three work roles at the graduate level. Of particular concern was an evaluation of the use of the service category. Because I assumed that service would not be more important than either research or teaching among graduate faculties, this item was not included among potential responses to the WRSI. The pilot testing verified the accuracy of this assumption. There were no missing data or comments questioning or suggesting problems of interpretation for any of the 79 pretest respondents. Thus, because all pretest respondents were able to classify all faculty ranks with one of the four WRSI responses, I concluded that the new instrument would be

equally reliable in the subsequent national study of deans and directors.

## Results

Descriptive statistics and chi-square tests of independence were calculated to understand (a) national norms and trends in tenure and promotion priorities among graduate faculties and (b) the similarities and differences in the importance assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service in recent tenure and promotion decisions.

### Norms and Trends in Tenure and Promotion Priorities

Table 1 summarizes responses to each of the four WRSI items for three groups of deans or directors: (a) those representing all graduate schools and departments ( $n=130$ ); (b) those from academic units with MSW and doctoral programs ( $n=61$ ); and (c) those from MSW degree programs only ( $n=69$ ).

*Scholarship salience.* The hierarchical weighting in which scholarship is more important than teaching and in which teaching is more important than service was the most frequent pattern of weighting in tenure and promotion decisions for all graduate faculties for all ranks: assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor. At the full professor level, where the scholarship salience pattern is the most pronounced, this model guides tenure and promotion decisions made by 45.4% (59) of all academic units, 55.5% (34) of academic units with doctoral programs, and 36.2% (25) of academic units with only MSW programs. Academic units with doctoral programs were more likely to use this scholarly salience weighting than units with only MSW program

for professors,  $\chi^2(1, n=130)=4.97, p=.020$ ; associate professors,  $\chi^2(1, n=130)=9.53, p=.002$ ; and assistant professors,  $\chi^2(1, n=130)=4.72, p=.030$ .

*Teaching/scholarship salience.* The second most frequent pattern for assistant ( $n=41, 31.5\%$ ) and associate ( $n=40, 30.8\%$ ) professors is the teaching/scholarship salience model, wherein equal weights are assigned to teaching and scholarship and a lesser weight to service. There were no statistically significant differences between responses from administrators of the two types of degree programs  $\chi^2(1, n=130)=0.008, p=.928$ , or associate professors,  $\chi^2(1, n=130)=0.860, p=.770$ . The second most frequent pattern for full professors was

equivalent weightings for all three work roles ( $n=33, 25.4\%$ ). As in the case of the assistant and associate professors, there was not a statistically significant difference between academic units with MSW programs and units with MSW and doctoral programs,  $\chi^2(1, n=130)=0.202, p=.653$ .

*Teaching saliency.* Only 8 (6.2%) academic units reported that teaching was the most salient work role for purposes of tenure and promotion, and only one of these had both MSW and doctoral programs. Similarly, of the 13 (10%) academic units that regarded teaching as the most salient work role for associate professors, 11 were MSW-only programs.

**TABLE 1. Summary of Responses to the Work Role Salience Index by Deans and Directors of All Graduate Schools and Departments, of MSW Programs Only, and of MSW/Doctoral Programs by Academic Rank**

| School Types and Work Roles                 | Assistant Professors |      | Associate Professors |      | Professors |      |
|---|----------------------|------|----------------------|------|------------|------|
|   | <i>n</i>             | %    | <i>n</i>             | %    | <i>n</i>   | %    |
| All schools and departments ( $n=130$ )     |                      |      |                      |      |            |      |
| Equivalence                                 | 21                   | 16.2 | 29                   | 22.3 | 33         | 25.4 |
| Teaching/scholarship salience               | 41                   | 41.5 | 40                   | 30.8 | 30         | 23.1 |
| Teaching salience                           | 23                   | 17.7 | 13                   | 10.0 | 8          | 6.2  |
| Scholarship salience                        | 45                   | 34.6 | 48                   | 36.9 | 59         | 45.4 |
| MSW degree programs only ( $n=69$ )         |                      |      |                      |      |            |      |
| Equivalence                                 | 11                   | 15.9 | 19                   | 27.5 | 20         | 29.0 |
| Teaching/scholarship salience               | 22                   | 31.9 | 22                   | 31.9 | 17         | 24.6 |
| Teaching salience                           | 18                   | 26.1 | 11                   | 15.9 | 7          | 10.1 |
| Scholarship salience                        | 18                   | 26.1 | 17                   | 24.6 | 25         | 36.2 |
| MSW and doctoral degree programs ( $n=61$ ) |                      |      |                      |      |            |      |
| Equivalence                                 | 10                   | 16.4 | 10                   | 16.4 | 13         | 21.3 |
| Teaching/scholarship salience               | 19                   | 31.1 | 18                   | 29.5 | 13         | 21.3 |
| Teaching salience                           | 5                    | 8.2  | 2                    | 3.3  | 1          | 1.6  |
| Scholarship salience                        | 27                   | 44.3 | 31                   | 50.8 | 34         | 55.7 |

Note. MSW = master's in social work.

Last, only 5 of the 23 academic units that weighted teaching as the most important role for assistant professors had both MSW and doctoral programs. Chi-square tests were not conducted for this question because of the limited cell size counts for academic units with doctoral programs.

*Equivalence.* Deans or directors of 21 academic units (16.2%) reported that all three work roles were weighted the same for tenure and promotion for assistant professors, 29 (22.3%) reported equivalent work roles for associate professors, and 33 (25.4%) for full professors. Statistical tests revealed there were no differences between academic units with MSW programs and those with MSW and doctoral programs for assistant professors,  $\chi^2(1, n=130)=0.005, p=.944$ ; associate professors,  $\chi^2(1, n=130)=2.32, p=.128$ ; or full professors,  $\chi^2(1, n=130)=1.007, p=.316$ .

### **Symmetrical and Complementary Models of Decision Making**

Just over half of the responding deans and directors ( $n=76, 58.4\%$ ) reported that the weighting of each of the three work roles was symmetrical, or exactly the same, for assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors. The remaining 54 (41.6%) deans and directors reported complementary patterns in which different weightings were used to assess work for different faculty ranks.

*Symmetrical models.* Of the four symmetrical models (responses were the same for all three ranks), scholarship saliency was by far the most widely followed. Among deans or directors representing the 76 symmetrical units, 34 (44.7%) reported their school or department evaluated faculty with the schol-

arship saliency model. The second most frequent model, teaching/scholarship saliency, was used by 20 (26.3%) schools or departments, and 16 (20.0%) deans or directors reported use of the total equivalency model. Only 6 (8.1%) schools or departments reported use of the teaching saliency model.

*Complementary models.* Among the 54 (41.6%) schools and departments where expectations for faculty were different for different ranks, the deans or directors of about half ( $n=28, 51.8\%$ ) reported that scholarship was more important in evaluations of full professors than it was for assistant professors; among the remaining deans and directors, 26 (48.2%) reported the weighting at their schools was exactly opposite: Scholarship was more important for assistant professors than for professors.

### **Discussion**

The research methods and procedures used in the four earlier studies of tenure and promotion criteria were evaluated, modified, and then implemented to increase the reliability and use of the data collected for this contemporary study of graduate schools and departments. Modifications included development and administration of an instrument to assess the unique importance of each work role and the differences and similarities among requirements for assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors. To achieve a larger and more representative sample than the earlier studies, I conducted the present survey electronically, kept the questionnaire purposefully brief, and used extensive follow-up techniques.

Nevertheless, like the earlier studies, the validity of the results of the present study is

dependent on the extent to which reports of the deans and directors accurately reflect the relative influence of faculty performance of each of three work roles—teaching, scholarship, and service—on the recent tenure and promotion decisions for each graduate faculty. Because post hoc reports of historical events, including tenure and promotion decision making, are vulnerable to errors of both observation and recall, an alternative method of data collection—that is, collecting and interpreting the internal documents that described the specific tenure and promotion policies of each institution—was considered. However, my previous experience and that of others (Seipel, 2003) in collecting tenure and promotion documents suggests that they are frequently unavailable or cannot be retrieved from some academic units. Furthermore, even when obtained, some of these documents do not provide information that can be coded reliably and compared.

Consequently, the survey method was again chosen and the deans and directors were specifically asked to consider “tenure and promotion decisions in the last few years” as the basis for their judgments. Like earlier studies, therefore, there is no way of knowing if the reports of these deans corresponded with the views of their faculty members or with their schools’ or departments’ tenure and promotion documents.

Another limitation of the study is reflected in the choice of global, rather than multidimensional, measures of teaching, service, and scholarship. As one of the reviewers of this study pointed out, “Scholarship may mean different things to different deans” and service can “range from faculty meetings to leading nation-

al organizations” and include “collegiality.” Continuing work in understanding tenure and promotion priorities among graduate faculties should include efforts to identify and weight the numerous activities which constitute each of the three work roles. Last, the study does not account for differences that might exist among the tenure and promotion requirements of individual schools and departments and those of their university or college. Future research should examine university tenure and promotion requirements and the degree to which they are similar or conflict with those of individual schools and departments.

Nevertheless, the study’s major findings are consistent with those reported earlier. The deans and directors indicated clearly that the scholarship work role has become even more salient in tenure and promotion decisions during the 21st century and teaching and service roles have become less influential. Although the emphasis on scholarship is more pervasive within programs offering the doctoral degree, scholarship salience is also the predominant pattern within the nondoctoral graduate programs. The emphasis on scholarship was also evident whether schools and departments applied the same (symmetrical) or different (complimentary) requirements for different academic ranks. Scholarship was either the singularly most important work role or shared this distinction with teaching at 87 of the 130 (66.9%) institutions for assistant professors, at 88 (67.6%) institutions for associate professors, and at 89 (68.4%) institutions for full professors.

Interestingly, the success of efforts to advocate and espouse the importance of the teaching work role during the 1990s is not reflected in these data. Only 23 (17.7%) of the 130 deans

and directors reported that teaching was the most salient work role for assistant professors, 13 (10%) for associate professors, and only 8 (6.2%) for full professors. Among the doctoral degree-granting programs, only 5 (8.2%) considered teaching to be the most important role for assistant professors, 2 (3.3%) for associate professors, and 1 (1.6%) for full professors.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

This study provides evidence that young professionals who are seeking their first graduate level position and continuing faculty who are examining alternatives to their current position will encounter a wide range of work role expectations. Although scholarship is clearly the most important factor in tenure and promotion decisions in the 21st century, a few graduate schools continue to regard teaching as the most salient work role for all ranks, a few others regard teaching as salient for either junior or for senior positions, and some evaluate teaching, scholarship, and service equally.

Surprisingly, in the context of these findings, the most recent study (Seaberg, 1998) of graduate workload indicated that a majority of faculty devote more time to teaching and service than scholarship. Indeed, Seaberg found that almost two thirds (65%) of a randomly selected sample of graduate faculty reported that the time they devoted to research and publication was considerably less than that for teaching or service. For the majority of respondents, scholarship was perceived as a tertiary work role or merely an "add-on" to the prioritized teaching and service work load.

Similarly, in a study of faculty research publications, Seipel (2003) also concluded that teaching and service roles were primary work

roles and that scholarship was tertiary. As Seipel commented, "If scholarship were tangibly rewarded, research and publication activities would become increasingly prominent in the academic environment, and they would no longer take a secondary position behind, teaching, advising, committee meetings and other equally pressing day-to-day challenges" (p. 86).

If the studies of Seaberg (1998) and Seipel (2003) accurately reflect the portion of the faculty members' time allocated to scholarship, there is a striking disconnect between tenure and promotion and workload policies among the graduate faculties. Although scholarship is more important for purposes of evaluation than are teaching and service, it appears that a majority of faculty members are required to fulfill their primary responsibility only after completion of their secondary (teaching) and tertiary responsibilities. The consequences of this conflict between work role priorities and workload policies may be immense for faculty members, students, and the consumer of social work services. Such a strikingly fundamental disconnect in the workplace may be impeding morale, well-being, productivity, and recruitment. In addition, it is possible that this conflict between work priorities and time allocated to those priorities may partially explain continuing findings that most social work faculty members conduct very little research and contribute to the professional literature infrequently (Green, 2005; Green et al., 2002; Holden et al., 2005; Ligon & Thyer, 2001).

Because the data on workload were collected from graduate faculty members and the data on tenure and promotion were collected from deans and directors, future research on the nature of the relationship between work

role priorities and workload priorities should be examined within the same sample of graduate faculty members.

### References

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Colbeck, C. L. (1998). *Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate teaching and research*. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69, 647-671.
- Euster, G., & Weinbach, R. (1983). Rewards for faculty community service activities. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 19, 108-114.
- Euster, G., & Weinbach, R. (1994). Faculty rewards for community service activities: An update. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 30, 317-324.
- Gibbs, O., & Locke, B. (1989). Tenure and promotion in accredited graduate social work programs. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 25, 126-133.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Green, R.G. (2005). The paradox of faculty publications in professional journals. *Social Work in Health Care*, 41, 101-112.
- Green, R. G., & Baskind, F. (2007). The second decade of the faculty publication project: Journal article publication and the importance of faculty scholarship. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 43, 281-296.
- Green, R. G., Baskind, F., & Bellin, M. (2002). Results of the doctoral faculty publication project. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 38, 135-152.
- Hartman, A. (1990). Many ways of knowing. *Social Work*, 35(1), 3-4
- Holden, G., Rosenberg, G., & Barker, K. (2005). Bibliometrics: A potential decision making aid in hiring, reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions. *Social Work in Work Health Care*, 41, 67-92.
- Huber, M. T. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, D. (1978). Criteria for appointment, promotion, and retention of faculty in graduate social work programs. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 14(2), 74-81.
- National Institute of Mental Health, Task Force on Social Work Research. (1991). *Building social work knowledge for effective services and policies: A plan for research development*. Austin: University of Texas.
- Seaberg, J. R. (1998). Faculty reports of workload: Results of a national study. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 31, 7-19.
- Seipel, M. O. (2003). Assessing publication for tenure. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 39, 79-88.
- Weick, A. (1991). Should scholarly productivity be the primary criterion for tenure and promotion decisions? No! *Journal of Social Work Education*, 28, 135-138.

Accepted: 06/07

**Robert G. Green** is professor emeritus, Virginia Commonwealth University, School of Social Work.

Address correspondence to Robert G. Green, 750 Waters Edge, Corolla, NC 27927; e-mail: oceansands@charter.net.

Copyright of *Journal of Social Work Education* is the property of Council on Social Work Education and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.