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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous Appointment: generally Instructor ranks</th>
<th>Tenure: professorial ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor II: <strong>$55,305</strong></td>
<td>Professor: <strong>$82,971</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor I:  <strong>$46,863</strong></td>
<td>Associate Professor: <strong>$67,446</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor: <strong>$41,112</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor: <strong>$56,430</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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?