

Continuous Appointment: job security

Ongoing employment

Termination:

- “cause” = behavior that warrants firing
- retrenchment
- change in curricular need that results in the elimination of their position
- unsatisfactory review and fails to remediate teaching within a year

Tenure: greater job security

Indefinite appointments

Termination:

- “cause”
- retrenchment

Retrenchment

- requires a declaration of financial exigency
- Order of layoffs within a department:
 1. fixed-term faculty
 - 1b. continuous appointment
 2. faculty on annual tenure
 3. faculty on indefinite tenure.

**Continuous Appointment:
generally Instructor ranks**

Senior Instructor II: **\$55,305**

Senior Instructor I: **\$46,863**

Instructor: **\$41,112**

**Tenure:
professorial ranks**

Professor: **\$82,971**

Associate Professor: **\$67,446**

Assistant Professor: **\$56,430**

TASK FORCE SENATE APPROVED LAST MONTH: REVIEW OF NTTF

The task force is charged to create clear and consistent processes for:

- **Annual developmental review** of NTT instructional faculty during the **probationary period** that serves to document and evaluate faculty contributions, provide developmental feedback and guidance in preparation for the continuous appointment review,
- A **milestone review** for the granting of continuous appointments,
- Regular departmental review, on a 3-year cycle, of faculty **post - continuous appointment**.

WHY ARE CONTINUOUS APPOINTMENTS (AND TENURE) A GOOD THING?

- individual
- students
- department
- shared governance
- academic freedom

**SENATE HAS BEEN ASKED TO
CONSIDER ANOTHER TASK FORCE:
regarding TEACHING-INTENSIVE
TENURE LINES**

- **Whereas** the Faculty Senate concurs with the shared desire expressed by the administration and PSU-AAUP to provide **increased job security and avenues for promotion for faculty**;
- **Whereas** the Faculty Senate considers especially important the **exercise of academic freedom** that comes with tenure and thus would like to see a greater percentage of PSU's faculty hired in tenure lines;
- **Whereas the Faculty Senate also values the role of the scholar-teacher who participates in a variety of spheres of academic life, thereby enriching the student experience, departmental exchanges and the scholarly conversation within the faculty member's discipline**;
- **Be it resolved that the members of the PSU Faculty Senate create a task force to explore the creation of teaching-intensive tenure lines to complement the scholar-teacher lines that must remain primary to departmental composition.**

WHAT EXACTLY WOULD CREATION OF THE TASK FORCE MEAN?

- Task force would **explore** the question, conduct **research**, hold **campus-wide forums**, etc.,
- **deliberate**
- **THEN propose** to the Senate **EITHER** that we vote to create such positions **OR** that we table the discussion

Recommended Timeline:

- **PHASE ONE: RESEARCH/MODELS/ANALYSIS/FEEDBACK**
- **By March 2016:** Task force members appointed and the group convened.
- **Spring 2016:** Task force **researches** models and best practices for rewarding tenure for teaching.
- **Fall 2016:** Two or more **public forums** held to present results of research and solicit feedback from campus. In addition to forums, feedback solicited online and through other means.
- **Winter 2017:** Task force reviews research and feedback and makes an interim report report to Faculty Senate.
- **PHASE TWO: EXPLORE PSU_SPECIFIC MODEL AND IMPLEMENTATION**
- **Spring 2017:** Task force drafts a proposal for the creation and implementation of tenure for teaching at PSU.
- **Fall 2017:** Task force presents its preliminary recommendations to the Faculty Senate and solicits feedback.
- **Winter 2018:** At least 2 **campus-wide forums** held to present the task force's recommendations and solicit feedback widely from across campus. Forums augmented by online and write-in feedback.
- **Spring 2018:** Task force **recommendations** presented at April meeting of the Faculty Senate, questions answered at the May meeting, **vote** held during June meeting.

WHY CONSIDER TEACHING-INTENSIVE TENURE LINES?

PRO

- Greater percentage of tenured members in a department increases stability for the program, students, and the individuals.
- Helps preserve academic freedom.
- It's the right thing to do.

WHAT MIGHT WE HESITATE?

PRO

- Greater percentage of tenured members in a department increases stability for the program, students, and the individuals.
- Helps preserve academic freedom.
- It's the right thing to do.

CON (risks, fears)

- Creates two different tracks for tenure, which carries the risk of certain departments (such as the Humanities) evolving (devolving) into service departments.
- Undercuts the notion of the scholar-teacher.

Discussion:

NEXT MONTH THE SENATE WILL VOTE ON
THE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A TASK FORCE
TO EXPLORE TEACHING-INTENSIVE TENURE
LINES.

TODAY, WHAT QUESTIONS/ THOUGHTS/
CONCERNS/ INTERESTS WOULD YOU LIKE TO
DISCUSS?