payments, which includes 38 percent from households and 14 percent from other private contributors. This level of private payments and household payments is exceeded only by Korea and Japan among OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) industrial or developed countries. The average among OECD countries is 20 percent of total expenditures for higher education from private payments, of which 16 percent is from households. Conversely, among OECD countries the average share of higher education expenditures from public support is 80 percent.

Among the OECD countries, the United States relies much more heavily on payments from households and other private contributors and less on public support. It is also noteworthy, however, that the total expenditures for higher education in the United States as a percentage of gross domestic product is twice the OECD average—2.4 percent in the United States versus an average of 1.2 percent for the OECD countries.

There may be a lesson here. Perhaps a system that balances support for higher education more evenly among the public, households, and other sources in the private sector results in a much higher absolute level of support for higher education. Such an arrangement enables the United States to maintain a more "democratic" higher education sector than other countries, one that encompasses a larger share of the population. For example, 67 percent of those who complete secondary school enroll in higher education in the United States, a rate much higher than in most other nations. ■

Changes in the Academic Workplace in the United States

Kerry Ann O'Meara

Kerry Ann O'Meara is coordinator of the Project on Faculty Appointments, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 14 Story St., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.

If tenure is to survive as the standard practice in the United States, traditional policy, as codified by the American Association of University Professors and outlined in the 1990 *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, may have to adapt to changing circumstances in the academic world. In his 1998 American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) New Pathways Series working paper, *Ideas in Incubation: Three Possible Modifications to Traditional Tenure Policies*, Richard Chait considers three possible modifications to traditional tenure practices: tenure by objectives (a reconfiguration of the probationary period), posttenure reviews that focus more on departments than on individual performance, and guarantees of academic freedom without tenure. These considerations are in keeping with the prevailing public disposition to "mend, not end" tenure.

Tenure by objectives (TBO) seeks to reduce the stress and anxiety of tenure-track faculty experience stemming from ambiguous standards; vague measures of success; and uncertainty about the appropriate mix of teaching, research, and service. The alternative is to base tenure decisions on explicit criteria, performance-based agreements, and demonstrated competence.

How does it work? At the start of a faculty member's first year, the candidate, department chair, and a mentor committee establish a written workplan that describes performance-related goals to be achieved over the course of a probationary period. The plan outlines an appropriate weighting for teaching, research, and service—reflecting the tenure candidate's interests and the department's needs and priorities. The plan also specifies what constitutes appropriate and ample evidence of proficiency in each area of faculty work. Candidates submit a portfolio of work samples to substantiate competency and goal achievement in specific areas of their workplan as part of each annual review. If the department chair and mentor committee or a panel of internal experts are satisfied that competency has been demonstrated in a particular area, the faculty member becomes "certified" in that area and it is no longer at issue for tenure.

TBO might be particularly helpful in the areas of teaching and service, where questions such as "what constitutes good teaching?" and "what kinds of service are most important?" keep candidates guessing in traditional tenure systems. It could also resolve confusion in the research area about the relative importance of quality and quantity, or refereed versus nonrefereed publications, and journal articles versus books or book chapters because the committee's preferences would be carefully laid out in the workplan. Under TBO, candidates would continue in their positions as long as the department observed satisfactory progress toward their objectives. Instances of substantial evidence of inadequate progress would lead to nonreappointment with due notice. An upper limit of 10 years might be advisable, but the process would be driven by results rather than deadlines. Not all members of a cohort would reach the point of tenure at the same time. This option is not unlike doctoral degree programs, which delineate at the outset the requirements for the degree—including the specific mix of courses, comprehensive exams, dissertation proposal, and defensible thesis. Students finish when the requirements have been met.

Different components of the TBO system have been piloted in the United States. The Department of Small Animal Medicine and Surgery in the College of Veterinary Medicine at Texas A&M University assigns a mentor

committee to each tenure-track faculty member. A recent study by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching found that 26 percent of the institutions surveyed had already installed a policy allowing individual faculty to negotiate the length of the probationary period. The study is the subject of the 1997 book, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, by Charles Glassick, Mary Huber, and Gene Maeroff. While this option has flaws, TBO may create a more transparent process and better guidance for junior faculty than traditional tenure systems.

Posttenure review of faculty is the most popular of the proposed modifications to conventional tenure policy. In their 1997 AAHE New Pathways Series working paper, *Post-Tenure Review: Policies, Practices, Precautions*, Christine Licata and Joseph Morreale conclude that well-conceived posttenure reviews enhance faculty development; allow faculty to emphasize teaching, research, or service in their careers; match faculty career goals with institutional priorities; and clarify performance expectations. Yet, individual posttenure reviews are likely to involve extensive time and effort. They rarely result in an increase in funding for professional development that faculty desire or an ousting of nonperformers as some policymakers intend.

Posttenure review of faculty is the most popular of the proposed modifications to conventional tenure policy.

Chait argues that a more effective alternative might be posttenure reviews of departments, embedded in the larger context of comprehensive departmental assessment performed every five to seven years by both internal and external peer experts. The program review would include evaluation of a department's standards, criteria, and procedures used for routine or annual faculty evaluations; documentation of faculty development activities; the degree to which the department awards excellence; and the process invoked to reinvigorate or prune subpar performers. If on the basis of substantial evidence, an intensive internal and external program evaluation concludes that the department performs satisfactorily or higher, no evaluation of its tenured faculty members would be necessary. However, if the review uncovers significant problems or concerns, then the dean or provost and program review committee would institute a performance review of all tenured faculty in the department. Individual posttenure reviews could be activated under this system by a peer determination that a particular colleague's performance was unsatisfactory. The program review option would likely be more time- and cost-effective than individual posttenure reviews because a university could review 50 departments over seven years, as opposed to review 500 faculty in that same time. Northwestern University has a nationally recognized model of program reviews, though it is not tied to posttenure review.

Ensuring academic freedom is often held up as one of the primary rationales for tenure.

Ensuring academic freedom is often held up as one of the primary rationales for tenure. While most colleges and universities would like to describe themselves as guaranteeing academic freedom to their faculty, in 1995 half of all full-time U.S. faculty were hired on non-tenure-track lines, and almost two-thirds of faculty at two-year institutions and one-third at four year institutions were in part-time positions. If academic freedom is primarily linked to tenure, then one-half the faculty workforce is operating without the guarantee of academic freedom. In the 1997 AAHE New Pathways Series working paper, *Academic Freedom without Tenure*, J. Peter Byrne outlines key elements of a procedure that would conceivably provide all faculty with academic freedom. The general principles articulated by Byrne have been codified by Martin Michaelson in "Academic Freedom Policy and Procedures," which appears in Richard Chait's *Ideas in Incubation*—cited at the beginning of this article.

Whether in a small liberal arts college in Ohio, at the University of Amsterdam, or at McGill University, it is challenging to find faculty evaluation systems that respond to economic realities and public demands for accountability while at the same time meeting local needs to preserve traditions of academic culture. The overall interests of the academy are best served by new ideas and robust and civil debate about the purposes of faculty evaluation and best practice. The three modifications to traditional tenure described in this article are offered in that spirit. ■

Author's Note: This article summarizes the essay by Richard Chait, *Ideas in Incubation: Three Possible Modifications to Traditional Tenure Policies*, New Pathways Series, Working Paper no. 9 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1998). The publication can be ordered from the American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360. Washington, DC 20036-1110. Tel: (202) 293-6440, Ext. 11, fax (202) 293-0073, e-mail: <pubs@aahe.org>.