

central goal. Business practitioners, university administrators and trustees, state legislators and the general public all need to be mobilized to achieve this goal. Only then will the 'brain-drain' of business academicians be stemmed and the business school once again achieve a leadership role.

DONALD L. TUTTLE  
Indiana University

**Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation.** PETER SELDIN. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1984. pp. 200. \$15.95 (cloth).

**Evaluating Teaching.** KENNETH O. DOYLE JR. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1983. pp. 173. No price given.

THE EVALUATION of faculty for appointment, promotion, salary increases and, most important, tenure, has been a topic of growing concern over the past decade and a half. Interest in this issue has been spurred by budget constraints, by a shift from excess demand to excess supply in many sectors of the academic labor market, by an agonizing reappraisal of some of the personnel decisions made during the rapid expansion of the 'sixties and by the growing litigiousness of disappointed faculty members. As this concern about faculty evaluation has grown, so has the literature on the subject, and these two books are contributions to that literature.

In his new book, Peter Seldin, the author of several previous contributions in this area, describes the results of a survey of current evaluation practices and provides some advice on the components of a model faculty evaluation procedure. His procedural advice is largely unexceptional; for example, he suggests that when evaluating research an institution should not "... simply count the instructor's published articles" and should be aware that "publication patterns appear to vary by academic discipline..." Similarly, the institution evaluating teaching should not "... use the ratings from a single class as the springboard for tenure or promotion decisions" and should be careful not to "... misinterpret small differences between mean scores."

A few of his recommendations may be too cumbersome for some tastes (he urges that evaluation of teaching performance be based on student ratings plus "... classroom observation, self-evaluation, review of course materials, and trained evaluators and assessors of student learning, among other sources"). His opinion that "specific and valid reasons must be provided in writing to faculty members who are given negative decisions" is also far from universally accepted. His clearest message, however, and one that an institution ignores at its peril, is that whatever the institution's evaluation procedures are, they must be followed. The college that fails to follow its own procedures is a sitting duck.

In 1983 Seldin asked 770 deans of private and public four-year liberal arts colleges to indicate whether their institution always, usually, seldom or never took each of a set of factors or sources of information into account when evaluating the teaching, research and service of faculty. A description and analysis of the 616 responses from these deans constitutes the core of Seldin's book. He conducted similar surveys twice before, once for private colleges alone in 1973 and then for both private and public in 1978. Some of the most interesting results in the present book are in the tables showing the shifting responses to the same question over time. Among the more notable trends is a growing emphasis on research and publication and a declining emphasis on personal attributes. On the teaching side there was a greater reliance on systematic student ratings and a decline in the use of informal student opinions. In keeping with their report of increased attention being paid to research, the deans reported increased use in the evaluation process of virtually every criterion of research productivity (books, articles, papers at conferences, etc.) and of every indicator of quality (comments from both internal and external peers, grants received, honors, etc.). These and his other results are presented in a large number of tables and charts. Following the presentation of the survey results is a series of extended comments on those results by Seldin and seven other experts (Lawrence Aleomoni, Raoul Arreola, Judith Aubrecht, Arthur Chickering, Kenneth Eble, George Geis and Robert Menges).

While the results and the ensuing discussion are interesting and thought-provoking (one immediately begins to compare his results with the situation at one's own institution), Seldin is not always as careful as he might be in generalizing from his very specialized sample. Although the dust jacket (presumably not Seldin's work) asserts that Seldin surveyed "... over 600 colleges and universities," Seldin himself points out that "university-related liberal arts colleges were excluded from the study..." Six hundred institutions is a large sample, but of a very special population. There are numerous other institutions, employing thousands of faculty members, whose history and whose goals differ markedly from those in his population. His survey results tell us nothing about evaluation practices at these other institutions, yet he never raises a question about the broader applicability of his findings. Once he is past the presentation of his data, references to the narrowly defined sample virtually disappear, and in their place we find generalizations about "institutions of higher education."

Even with respect to the specific group of colleges surveyed, a question arises as to whether his interpretation of the survey results is entirely valid. Suspicion arises when we see that only 51.8% of the deans report that their college, in evaluating research, utilizes "articles in quality journals" and only 58.1% always use the "sole or senior authorship of a book." I try to imagine the justification a dean would give for reaching a conclusion about the quality of a faculty member's research without taking account of publications in quality journals or in books of which the person is sole or senior author. The faculty member being evaluated would appear to have a valid complaint about a procedure that failed to take such

evidence into account, if it exists. But this existence question may help to explain these odd results. The deans were asked to "... indicate the frequency with which each type of evidence is used..." One dean may respond that quality publications are "always" used, meaning that they will always be considered if they exist, while another may respond "usually" or "seldom," meaning that such evidence is not always present but is always used if present.

Since the instructions for the questionnaire (as reproduced in the text) fail to resolve this ambiguity it seems reasonable to presume that at least some respondents took the latter meaning. Once this possibility of ambiguity is admitted, the interpretation of all of the results becomes open to question. Suppose that students in college A rate each faculty member in every class, but those ratings are seldom taken into account in evaluating teaching. In college B faculty members seldom receive student ratings but whenever those ratings exist they are always taken into account. How are the two deans to respond to Seldin's question, and how should we interpret their responses? The dean of A must respond "seldom," but the dean of B can answer "always" or "seldom" with equal legitimacy. Does the increase over time in the "always" response as reported by Seldin imply an increase in the availability of student ratings, an increase in their use, or simply a change in the respondent's interpretation of the question and no change in the underlying behavior?

These criticisms apply to the method used and to the detailed analysis of the results. Most of his overall conclusions, however, at least with respect to the relative emphasis on various factors and to the direction of change over time, are consistent with other informal evidence and are probably reasonably accurate images of the trends in evaluation practice in the surveyed population.

By far the greatest value of the book resides not in the survey and its results but in Seldin's general discussion of evaluation procedures and his detailed description of an evaluation model. While few colleges would wish to devote the necessary resources to as exhaustive a scheme as he recommends, it would serve as a very useful checklist for an administrator responsible for setting up or monitoring a faculty evaluation process at any college or university.

While Seldin discusses the evaluation of teaching as only one part of a broad evaluation process, Doyle devotes his attention solely to the question of the appropriate methods for evaluating teaching. His is not a book for the reader with only a casual interest in the proper structuring of the teaching evaluation process (Seldin's will do very nicely for that). Nor does it present the results of significant new research. Rather, it is a detailed summary and synthesis of the results of prior research on these questions, together with Doyle's conclusions and recommendations. These recommendations take the form of a model procedure for evaluating teaching that depends primarily on data drawn from student ratings.

Doyle's conclusion that student ratings are generally superior to such other devices as colleague class visitations or self evaluations is reached only after a careful description of the research on the strengths and weaknesses of each. He goes into similar detail with respect to issues in sampling, error analysis, reliability, etc. Unfortunately he devotes far less attention to the fundamental issue of the

definition and measurement of the value added in the classroom, and of the instructor's contribution to it.

In his opening paragraph Doyle notes that in 350 AD in Antioch teachers were evaluated on the basis of their student's performance in an examination. If the examination indicated negligence on the teacher's part he could be tried by a panel of other teachers and laymen and could lose his students (and his fees). Doyle's 20th century message to 4th century Antioch is that their focus on the acquisition of skills and knowledge was misdirected; they need only have asked the student to 'rate' the teacher along a well designed scale.

Unfortunately the empirical linkage cited by Doyle between the Antioch question and the student rating answer is quite limited, and he gives it far less attention than it deserves. Since most of the book is devoted to a discussion of student ratings and their comparison with other approaches, all based primarily on inputs rather than outputs, this issue of the linkage between what we want to measure and what we can measure is central. That there is skepticism about this linkage is apparent in the comment of one of the expert contributors to Seldin's book. According to Robert Menges, "student evaluations are not substitutes for direct measurement of learning..." and "... students are reporters of opinions and perceptions rather than judges of performance". Doyle does not face this problem squarely, and the reader with prior doubts will not come away convinced.

ROBERT S. HOLBROOK  
*University of Michigan*

**Terminal Degrees: the Job Crisis in Higher Education.** EMILY K. ABEL. New York: Praeger, 1984. pp. 253. \$24.95 (cloth).

ALTHOUGH author Abel's socialist orientation occasionally emerges, this book provides a fairly balanced examination of the milieu, attitudes, feelings and options of displaced academics. Several themes permeate the book: the idea that the system does not work, that social and economic forces make 'wrong' decisions, and that unemployment and underemployment are destructive to human beings. Abel makes a statement about the role of work as a form of self-expression, about the meaning of professionalism and about how failure affects the displaced academic. Intermixing statements from the interviewees with statistics from other sources, the author presents a fascinating picture of the tribulations of the displaced academic.

Abel's book is loosely organized around three topic areas: part-time faculty employment, the solutions proposed by the professional associations to what Abel calls the 'job crisis', and the ways that displaced academics can fight back. Chapter 1, entitled 'Out of Work', compares the findings in the literature on joblessness with interviews with displaced academics. These interviews recount the experiences of 43 academics who either failed to secure