THE ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNICATION ADMINISTRATION

JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNICATION ADMINISTRATION
2023, Volume 40, 71–82

Learning To Think Like a Leader

Mark Hickson III[1]

1. University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA

The dean notified the department that the current chair was stepping down after a couple of decades in office. The chair was the original member of the department. The unit had grown from 1 to 10, plus several adjuncts. The faculty members were in a crisis mode, primarily because they did not know what was coming up next. The senior faculty members were all trying to decide whether to apply for the job. After all, in some senses, applying for a position at this stage was a slap in the face of the former chair. But that was not the intent of the dean. The dean wanted the department to grow even more.

Growing the Department: The Chair as Accountant

As one considers growing the department, some definitional problems arise. What does this mean? Does it mean more faculty? Additional programs? More majors? More credit hours? Are we talking quantitative growth or qualitative growth? Does it mean more research? More grant money? More convention papers? In the past 15 years or so, the impetus to grow has increased exponentially. There are a variety of reasons for this. First, in most public state universities funding has decreased; in the case of private schools, the same is true of giving. Second, federal funding has decreased. This means that grant monies have also been on the decrease. With the "no new taxes" slogan

Editor Note—*This is the second in a three-part series that the author has been working on. The first part was included in an earlier issue of this journal.*

CONTACT Mark Hickson III • E-mail: hicksonm70@gmail.com • Department of Communication Studies • University of Alabama at Birmingham • 1720 University Blvd • Birmingham, AL • 35294

devastating some states in other ways, money has moved from education to prisons and infrastructure, where there also remains too little in the way of improvement.

Central administrators have attempted a shell game, not unlike what legislators have utilized. When enrollment has decreased, research institutions have moved toward grant dollars. Now that gifts and grants have declined, the only answer appears to be increasing tuition (Washburn, 2005). While the public complains about tuition increases for a week or two following an announcement, the students end up paying a few hundred or a couple of thousand dollars more than they did last year. Of course, there is always the idea of cutting costs. For the most part, cost cutting applies to the department. With this move, generally it means fewer tenure-earning positions and usually more adjunct, part-time faculty who are paid by the course—no benefits, and salaries equivalent to what they were 3 decades earlier (Bok, 2003; Gappa et al., 2007, pp. 49–65).

The motto is: "Do more with less." In smaller terms, colleges have attempted to diminish or eliminate using paper. Syllabi, handouts, and other materials are placed on an electronic system such as Canvas or Blackboard. Of course, this increases the costs for electronic infrastructure. It means more IT people. As we move from paper to electronics, costs are not typically being cut so much as they are being shifted. Online courses have significantly decreased "supplies" for academic departments.

More and more programs are being created at each institution in the hopes that by having more possibilities, more students will attend College A instead of College B. Schools of engineering desire to teach their own math courses, so that engineering "gets credit" for them rather than the math department in Arts and Sciences (Zakaria, 2015). At some point, there may be "Writing for Engineers," the "Sociology of Engineering," and "Engineering Philosophy." This is not to blame such schools for attempting this change, but it does two things that are negative for the students. First, it allows people who are expert in one field to teach something they usually know little about teaching. Second, the students are not getting a genuine core curriculum. But when departments are fighting for student credit hours (the number of students per class times the number of credit hours) the fight among units becomes less rational, less academic, more pragmatic, and more vicious.

Thus, we must conclude that growing the department usually means increasing credit hours. Or the alternative, cutting costs. Many administrators have indicated that all departments must learn to pay for themselves in some way. For those departments with little or no research funding, it means having more students take more courses. With all of this information available it is highly likely that a chair needs to have access to the following information:

- Number of majors in the department
- Number of sections taught by the department
- Number of full-time and part-time faculty
- Salaries for each faculty member
- Trends in enrollment
- Tuition per hour
- Total credit hours

Number of Majors

It is important for the chair to know the total number of majors. In some institutions, students take double majors. If this is the case, the chair needs to know where the double majors in his or her department are located according to the registrar's office. It is also good to know the trends in majors. This can be done by asking for the figures for the past 5 or 10 years. If the department teaches more than one major, all of them need to be assessed, cumulatively and individually. It is probably also good to know the number of minors in the department.

Number of Sections

The number of sections provides the chair an idea of how many sections each faculty teaches. It is common in universities not to count internships, labs, independent studies, reading courses, and other courses that are frequently 1-hour courses.

Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty

As is the case with the other numbers listed in this section, these numbers are available through an office of institutional research. It may be that part-time instructors do not teach the same number of sections per semester. Therefore, it is probably best to use all of these figures on an annual, 12-month basis, but also separating out by term.

Salaries of Faculty Members

This information is available in the departmental budget. However, the chair needs to determine how much money is paid in benefits per year and per faculty member as these are also part of costs. Universities usually calculate benefits as a percentage of salary. The chair needs to know that number.

Trends in Enrollment

As we have already mentioned, the chair needs to know about enrollment trends in the department but it is also useful to know about trends in the college or school (i.e., engineering, business, arts and humanities, etc.). As well, the chair should know the trends of other departments in the college or school as well as for the university as a whole. Even comparisons with other comparable universities and their similar departments can be useful when making plans and reporting to the next higher level.

Tuition Per Credit Hour

This figure is sometimes hard to obtain. The reason for this is that higher level administrators tend to under-report the actual figures. However, if the chair asks the question enough times, he or she can get a good approximation. Additionally, departments are "taxed" by the upper-level administration and the college where the department is located. This is, in fact, how larger units generate their own salaries.

Total Credit Hours

These are numbers usually reported as CHG (credit hours generated) or CHP (credit hours produced). It is a multiple of the number of hours in a course times the number of students in that course. This is a significant number to know. In terms of the overall budget for a department, when the tuition per hour is multiplied by the CHP, the department knows how much total productivity there is within a department during a particular time frame.

Using Numbers to Assess Progress

Unfortunately, many chairs do not know how to argue for their departments because they do not know how to calculate productivity and/or they do not know how to find the data. In the next few paragraphs, we will explain what to look for in gathering and using evidence. Such evidence can also be used to assess individual professors and courses.

For the sake of argument and explanation, we will use some fictional figures to illustrate how these numbers can be used in both cases. Below are the numbers:

Number of majors	100
Number of sections	80
Number of faculty	10 + 8 [part-timers]
Trends in enrollment	Varies
Tuition per credit hour	$150
Total credit hours	10,000

With these numbers, the total budget produced by the department is $1,500,000. Of course, a million and a half dollars may sound like a lot. It may be or it may not be. For example, if the total costs for the department is above a million dollars, the "profit" is still significant. However, when one weighs in the costs, the salaries for faculty may total more than one million dollars. At an average of $70,000 per faculty member with half getting more and half getting less, each salary becomes closer to $84,000 because of benefits (social security, pension, health care, etc.). Add another $20,000 for part-timers. Thus, the salaries alone account for $860,000. If the department has substantial equipment costs, the profit is reduced still further. Certainly this is no disgrace. But summer salaries have not been included yet. Neither have supplies or administrative support. The overhead costs for electricity may have been included in the tuition tax, but if not, here lies another cost.

In all probability, though, if a department is making 20% above costs, the dean will be pleased.

The department chair, though, must also assess individual faculty members. While the number of students taught is never the sole factor in evaluating a faculty member, it may become important as enrollment changes take place.

Assessing Faculty

It has been our experience that assessing colleagues is one of the most difficult aspects of the chair's position. As we take a look here, we will consider objective and subjective measures as well as biases. Typically, annual salary increases are based on the faculty member's annual report. Making a connection between the annual report and the salary increase is not always easy. In part, this is because a salary increase is an objective, numerical indicator while the evaluation is somewhat subjective and less quantitative. Stano (1992) has provided an outline for how to conduct a fair appraisal.

Teaching

Annual reports most often include information about teaching, research, and service. The value of each of these three areas varies by institution, by department, and by the individuals who make the decisions, usually the chair or director. An assessment of teaching includes the number of students in one's classes as well as the evaluations that students place on the teacher. Again, student evaluations may be either subjective or more quantitative. We will first discuss the quantitative method. Similar to a grade point average, the numbers are on a scale ranging from 1 to 5 or 1 to 4. A teacher's evaluations should be above the midpoint in any case. For a scale of 1–5, the teacher should have at least a 3. For superior performance, it should be at least a 4.0.

When chairs have their oral review with the faculty member, it is possible that at least some teachers will fall below the midpoint. This is where subjectivity comes into play. One reason may be that the teacher has not had enough time to prepare for a particular course. Thus, the chair needs to take into consideration that this may be a new course or that the teacher was just hired 2 weeks before classes started. Another reason may be that the students do not want to take a required course. While this may be true, the effective teacher must learn how to work around that. Certainly the teacher should not constantly be talking about the required nature of the course. A third reason is that the teacher has had a variety of personal problems during the term. Divorces, deaths in the family, and health problems all lessen the chances of having an outstanding performance in any individual year. The chair must assess the reasons for the performance as well as the outcome.

What the chair must be aware of, though, is that a 1-year negative outcome may turn into more than 1. When teaching outcomes are below 3.00 for several terms or even years, the chair needs to provide mechanisms to assist the faculty member. As for the evaluation, it should be as objective as possible. But given that universities are so engulfed into economics, a department cannot afford to retain bad teachers.

On the one hand, a faculty member who is not very good at teaching will be discovered early in that person's career. In addition to bad student reviews, the teacher may have complaints, especially about grades. The bad teacher also may have a decreasing number of students signing up to take the course and/or large numbers of withdrawals from the course. Some institutions keep track of the numbers of W's, D's, and F's. Whereas in the 1960s and 70s, colleges were less concerned about low grades, but again with the current financial concerns and parents' complaining about their children taking 5 or 6 years to complete a degree, low grades have become a concern of the central administration.

However, bad teachers frequently allocate excessively high grades in the hopes that students are less likely to complain and/or give low evaluations of teaching.

On the other hand, good teachers need to be rewarded. While teaching is just part of the annual review, effective teaching is becoming more important than it has been in the past. When one considers that credit hours are the number one source of income, to some extent the rewards should filter down to the root sources of that income.

Student evaluations are frequently the most significant form of evaluating the quality of teaching. In too many cases, they are the *only* source. Departments may utilize peer reviews or chair reviews. Some use portfolios, include syllabi, test materials, handouts, and the like. Because many classes are taught online today, there is not always a classroom to observe. Therefore, feedback from students may be even more critical than it was in the past.

As for the quantity of students taught, faculty may be judged based on the anticipated enrollment versus the actual enrollment. However, the chair must be realistic about the anticipated enrollment. In part, the number here may be a reflection of scheduling, which we will discuss later. Depending on the culture of the school, students may choose early classes or late classes. Some urban schools hold classes at night; whereas, many colleges do not. Some institutions even offer weekend classes. Experience shows us, though, that the worst time to offer a college class is Friday afternoon.

But what are the other possible reasons that anticipated enrollment may be low? If a class was required but becomes an elective, enrollment is likely to go down. If a course has been taught too many times in the recent past, the enrollment may go down. These are issues that the chair must be vigilant in observing. However, if the same person teaches a class, with high withdrawals and decreasing enrollment, there is a problem.

Faculty members gain reputations easily. In today's world, social media allow for quick evaluations of faculty. Face-to-face rumors and conversations affect what students think of a professor even if the individual student has never been in the class. The website ratemyprofessor.com provides informal evaluations of professors as well.

While teaching should, perhaps, be the most weighted portion of an evaluation, it usually is not. This is particularly the case in research universities. The research component is the most utilized part of a faculty member's portfolio in these institutions.

Research

Research is often the key to gaining tenure and being promoted. As well, it is frequently the most utilized part of the annual review, simply because it is the easiest to quantify.[1] Departments evaluate on the quality of a journal, usually whether it is state, national, or international. In addition, journals have "reputations" that are based on rejection rates. In many departments, if one publishes in a journal with a high rejection rate that is considered more prestigious because it is more difficult to have a paper accepted there. This aspect of quality should be pre-determined in the department's policies and procedures manual.

The number of articles that it takes to receive a superior rating in the annual review will also vary depending on the department. Some departments, such as psychology, sociology, and education consider articles valuable. Others, such as English and history, tend to focus more on book publications. While professors within a department obviously compete with their colleagues across the country, in the annual review they are competing against others within the department. Research that is unfunded is important to individuals, to departments, and to the discipline. However, unfunded research is less important to the administration because it does not contribute to funding.

A faculty member's workload should also be a factor in evaluating research. If a professor teaches eight courses during the year, she should not be expected to produce as much research as another who teaches only four. When it comes to tenure and promotion, the professor is competing against others in the school or college. This is why the chair needs to know and understand what the standards are at every level.

When we say that research is easier to evaluate, we mean that research is more quantifiable. "Professor A had three national, peer-reviewed articles published in the past year." That is a statement with which few can disagree. If one tries to compare teaching in a similar fashion, more disagreement is likely. When the policies and procedures manual for a department is clear, it makes the chair's job as evaluator much more straightforward.

Service

Service is the third component and the one which is given the least value at most institutions. There are generally three types of service: institutional, disciplinary, and community. Institutional service involves serving on tenure and promotion committees, curriculum committees, policies committees, chairing committees, and such periodic acts as serving on reaccreditation ad hoc committees. Disciplinary service involves serving on academic journal review boards, committees in regional and national associations, and holding offices in those associations. Community service includes providing information about one's discipline to local media, working with K–12 schools, and generally presenting a positive image for the department and the community through participation in the local area.

Among those that should be counted highest are probably being president of a national or international professional association, serving as chair of the faculty senate, and developing a program for local public schools on some aspect of one's discipline.

Creating a Model With Rankings

Once the faculty member has completed an annual review form and the chair has discussed the previous year with the faculty member, the chair's job is to make an evaluation. There are numerous ways of doing this. One of the ways is to rank each member of the department in each category. Taking our hypothetical department of 10, the rankings may look like this (see Table 1).

TABLE 1 *Annual Review Rankings*

Professor	Teaching	Research	Service	Overall
Professor A	4	1	10	15
Professor B	5	6	8	19
Professor C	2	10	4	16
Professor D	5	4	9	18
Professor E	8	8	5	21
Professor F	10	9	7	26
Professor G	1	2	3	6
Professor H	6	3	2	11
Professor I	3	5	6	14
Professor J	7	7	1	15

In a hypothetical sense, this process may seem to make sense. Professor G, with the smallest rankings, would get the highest increase and Professor F would get the lowest. But let's take a more careful look. There are two professors with 15. Professor A is "punished" considerably for the lack of high service rankings. Whereas, Professor J illustrates the opposite. That is, J is perhaps given too much credit for service. One way of alleviating the problem is to weigh the three components so that teaching, research, and service are not equal; some universities may have formulae for this.

Once again, these procedures should not be made on an ad hoc basis. The department's policies and procedures manual should tell us how the method will work. If research is the most important component, Professors A, G, and H should do well. If teaching is the most important, C, G, and I should do well. In any case, Professor G will be seen as the most productive faculty member for this year. This is but one method for assigning an evaluation based on the components of teaching, research, and service. Each department can be creative within the bounds of university and college guidelines in setting up a reasonable and fair method.

To carry this out further using a budget, we might divide the salary pool into three separate portions. For the sake of argument and for simplicity's sake, we assume that there is $20,000 in the salary pool for this year. That's a mean of $2,000 per person. Assuming that the middle four receive the average, they would get that amount. The top three, then, would receive more than $2,000 and the bottom three would receive less. Below, in Table 2, are the increases based on taking $1,000 from the bottom three and adding that money to the top three.

TABLE 2 *Salary Increases*

Professors G, H, I	$3,000
Professors A, C, D, J	2,000
Professors E, F, B	1,000

This approach may or may not be the approach that the department wants to make. It may be that some are being rewarded for the "wrong things." In addition, there may be questions about how the chair devised the salary increase system. In any case, it is important for faculty members to know how this was done. While there may still be complaints, there will likely be fewer of them, and the chair can better explain why certain decisions were made.

Some departments make salary increases based on percentages rather than real dollars, per se. So if we knew the salaries of each of these professors, we would be able to make decisions based on percentages. For example, if G makes $80,000 and H makes $60,000, the above system seems less fair because H received a higher percentage increase, even though G's rankings were considerably better. It is most important that the formula be provided to the faculty members beforehand, not after the fact.

So what causes problems with annual reviews? In brief, bias, diffidence, and ambiguity. Especially in those instances in which a faculty member becomes chair of department from within, there is a problem of previous relationships. Depending on the size and composition of a department, it is probable that the new chair has some colleagues who have been closer than others. In these cases, it is only natural that the chair enters the situation with some biases. The chair must learn to evaluate on the bases of data rather than previous relationship. Thus, particularly in the first couple of years, the chair must learn not to be biased either in favor of or against those with whom relationships have changed.

Diffidence may not be the word. Whether it is bashfulness or outright fear, chairs and administrators in general resist communicating negative information. In many cases, the outcome is somewhat of a passive–aggressive approach that exacerbates the problem and postpones necessary decisions. It is not easy to tell faculty members that they are not good teachers. There was a reason that the profession was chosen in the first place. Faculty members have attended college and graduate school for almost a decade with the intent of teaching in college for the remainder of their lives. When they start out with a negative review, many are devastated. Most departments, though, allow a year for the transition from being a student to being the professor. When the problem of bad teaching continues into the second year, the issue needs to be brought forth so that potential solutions can be sought. Most schools have a teaching and learning center. Those who are poor teachers should use this resource. With the permission of the new teacher and a valued member of the department, the chair might also suggest the creation of a mentoring relationship, or with an excellent teacher from another department.

The chair might find it easier to criticize the lack of productivity in research. This area is more obviously quantitative and evidence is much more available. When faculty members receive release time to undertake research, they need to have this brought to their attention.

To tell a professor that she has not been productive is not enough. Most of the time, they already know but do not want to hear it. The chair needs to take two approaches. One is that other faculty members are producing substantially more research. The other approach is to remind the professors that they produced much more in the past. It is at this point that the person being reviewed might scream "burnout." Burnout in research is not uncommon. Together the chair and the person who is being reviewed need to work out a system for correcting the problem.

The third problem with reviews is ambiguity. The department should have a policy statement that makes annual reviews, tenure, and promotion very clear. Some departments even have point systems for individual journals. The more abstract the criteria are, the more problems are likely to occur. Departmental policies are but one of the issues that concern the chair or organizer. The policies and procedures need to be discussed with new members of the department. Finally, the policies and procedures should include options for making changes in that document.

The Chair as Organizer

Most faculty members are unaware of the organization of a university. For chairs, the organization of the institution is an excellent beginning point for the chair as organizer. Most universities' administrative structures consist of a few basic managerial positions. They are (1) chair, or department head; (2) dean; (3) vice president or provost; and (4) president, or chancellor.

Most of the time, the chair is supposed to be the first stopping point for addressing issues of conflict. Most deans believe that there should be few of these problems that come to the dean's office. Thus, the chair should deal with student complaints including grades. At times there are issues between faculty members or between a faculty member and a chair. When this happens, the dean may become involved in the settlement of conflicts. As we have previously mentioned, a strong, complete policies and procedures manual in the department will help dissipate many of these issues.

Policies and Procedures

At most colleges, there are university policies and procedures documents as well as those for the individual deans' units and the department. The university policy takes precedence over the dean's unit, and the dean's policies outweigh those of the department. In reality, such conflicts rarely occur.

Most of the time, each lower-level policy merely restates the specifics of issues established at the university level. The major parts of such policies include how units will make decisions, workload procedures, the tenure and promotion system, curriculum and planning, and the duties of the chair.

The Departmental Decision-Making Process

Most universities are strong on the idea of what is referred to as "shared governance." In short, this means that while there are designated leaders of each unit from department to the university as a whole, it is important to derive input from others. While presidents are ultimately responsible to the Board of Trustees, they also have an obligation to students, faculty, staff, alumni, benefactors, and the community. Successful leaders are aware that shared decision-making is a fundamental part of undertaking the position as leader.

Within a department, all of the decision-making process starts with the document on policies and procedures. For the most part, these documents involve procedures. The first procedure is *how* decisions are made. For the most part, faculty members are willing to relegate to the chair relatively minor decisions about supplies and equipment. However, the faculty should be involved in the hiring process, as well as tenure and promotion processes. The departmental document should state when the faculty are involved, and which members of the faculty should be involved.

At most institutions, search committees are created within the department, and the committee makes recommendations to the chair. This is especially the case with tenure-earning positions since the faculty will also be involved in the tenure decision once a person has been hired. It is probably good practice for other non-tenure-earning (NTE) faculty (instructors) to at least meet those who are interviewed so that the chair can get an idea of compatibility. Usually, though, only tenured faculty vote, if there is a vote at all. The search committee may provide evaluations of a number of candidates, allowing the chair to take it from there.

On tenure and promotion, those who are at or above the rank of the person being considered (the candidate), should be part of the decision. For promotion to associate, associate and full professors should have a vote. For full professor promotion, only full professors should participate. This procedure varies in some places but is often used.

Curriculum matters also call for group decisions. Here the focus should be on the subject matter. In a Department of Communication, for example, it may be that only the broadcasting faculty members take part in curricula decisions about their courses. The chair's responsibility here is to ensure that the entire curriculum fits together for the benefit of the rest of the department.

Curriculum and Scheduling Classes

The chair needs to maintain as much data as possible. For example, what courses are increasing in size? What courses are decreasing in size? To what extent is a core course taking more effort than courses in the major? Just as an example, if there are 20 sections of a core course with 30 students in each class, and one instructor is ending with fewer than 25 after withdrawals and drops, the chair may want to check into the situation. This is especially the case if other instructors are maintaining 30 or at least 27. If the course is supposed to be standardized, there can be few reasons why some sections have substantially fewer than others. But there are reasons. Friday afternoon classes are not popular at any institution where we have worked. Noon classes have similar problems. The same may be true with very early classes or very late classes.

In general, the department should have a plan for all courses to be taught at least once every 2 years. A 2-year calendar is excellent for this purpose. That is not to say that changes are never made, but overall this is a profitable procedure.

Periodically, probably every 3–5 years, the department should evaluate the entire curriculum. Are there courses that need to be eliminated? In some institutions, courses were originally created for a specific faculty member. If that person left some time ago, it may be time to delete it. Most disciplines also require that new courses be added. These are decisions that should be made by the chair in concert with the senior faculty in the department. Regardless of the system, it should be stated in the departmental manual.

Philosophical Discussions

There are times when the department needs to talk about philosophical issues related to the department and the university. While some members of the department might feel that this is a waste of time, it can be beneficial and it gets the faculty meetings away from being constant, tedious talks about bureaucratic content.

Budgetary Issues

As we have mentioned, faculty members do not want to vote on ink cartridges for printers. They may want to vote on large expenditures for equipment. They also may want to make suggestions about summer teaching and teaching load in general. Of course, the chair knows what courses need to be taught, but there may be issues about who will teach in the summer.

Should the department wish to extend the rewards system to summer teaching, the annual review can provide at least an outline of how to select those who will teach in the summer. However, there is also the question of the needs of the students. Which courses do the students need to have taught? The idea that we will do it the way we have always done it may not be feasible. Summer enrollments have been decreasing at many schools over the past decade.

GPS Location of the Chair

The Global Positioning System (GPS) is a device that can pinpoint the location of a person or place within a short period of time. We are using the term here to relate it to where the chair is at any time. Twenty years ago, the chair sat in the office, completing a number of reports by typing them on a computer. When others wanted to see the chair, they came to the departmental office and requested an appointment through the administrative assistant. Before that, the chair wrote reports by hand and they were typed by the administrative assistant. But the roles of the chair and the roles of the administrative assistant have changed.

Chairs now have most of the data they need right in front of them. Universities have most information online. Class schedules are available for students and faculty. They contain the number of students who have signed up for the course at any time on any day before classes begin. University and school policies are online. Many chairs spend most of their time in their offices or at meetings.

The concept of faculty and students scheduling a meeting in the departmental office does create some communication problems. There are problems that need to be handled immediately. Time management is critical to the chair. One approach is what is called management by walking around. In today's electronic world, one might think that this means walking around with an iPhone or iPad.

While it might be necessary to have electronic information available, management by walking around relates to the chair stopping by the offices of the faculty members or having regular Zoom, one-on-one meetings with them. It is important to note that this is not for the purposes of evaluation or monitoring. Rather it is to create rapport with each of the faculty members individually. In this way, the chair can share information with the department without having a formal meeting. When faculty members have individual problems they can talk with the chair about them without sharing with the rest of the department. At least a day or 2 per week should be set aside for these purposes.

Summary

The roles of the chair are numerous and ever-changing. Like the other members of the department, the chair is seeking some level of predictability. While this is a significant goal, any predictability is based on knowing one's role and having a realization that the chair must play different roles at different times and sometimes play more than one role at a time. If the ideas in this paper are used, the chair should avoid many difficulties in the future. While numbers and analyses are important, it is also important to deal with personal issues that may arise from time to time.

Notes

[1]The concept of tenure has undergone substantial criticism from some authors, including Sykes (1988) who has written "[T]enure is the ultimate protection from accountability" (p. 137). He continues, "[T]enure is also—ironically—the source of academia's most brutal thought control. Untenured junior profs—and below them instructors, lecturers, and graduate students—are, of course, absolutely at the mercy of the senior faculty, so academic freedom is very much a relative concept in their cases."

References

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace*: *The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton University Press.

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. John Wiley and Sons.

Stano, M. (1992). The performance appraisal interview. In M. Hickson, III & D. W. Stacks (Eds.), *Effective communication for academic chairs* (pp. 107–120). State University of New York Press.

Sykes, C. J. (1988). *ProfScam: Professors and the demise of higher education*. Regnery Gateway.

Washburn, J. (2005). *University inc.*: *The corporate corruption of higher education*. Basic.

Zakaria, F. (2015). *In defense of a liberal education*. W. W. Norton.