TO: Luciana Aronne, Chair of Faculty Council

FROM: Sharon Gallagher, Chair of Non-Tenure Track Ad Hoc Committee

DATE: May 15, 2016

SUBJECT: End of the Year Report for 2015-2016

**Members:** Dieteman, David (Business); Dudas, George (Engineering); Evans, Edward (Engineering); Gallagher, Sharon (H&SS); Olszewski, Peter (Science); Rangarajan, Sue (Business); Viebranz, Gary (H&SS); Young, Tia (Science).

**Overview:** This is the second year of the committee and our charges for 2015-2016 were:

1. Investigate extended review practices for FTM faculty and develop a form of developmental review for FTM faculty or standardize across all four schools the process of contract renewal (Faculty Affairs, carry over from last year).
2. Review policies and procedures for promotion to Senior Lecturer and develop best practices for promotion (from Faculty Affairs).
* An addendum to this charge was to determine why there were so few Senior Lecturers on campus, a charge originally given to Faculty Affairs but handed to the NTT Committee at the beginning of the year.
1. Investigate workloads for lecturers.

The committee began working on their charges in October, but our work was interrupted by the unexpected changes to HR23 – Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations that were voted on and passed by the University Senate during their January 26, 2016 meeting, and HR21 – Definition of Academic Ranks that were voted on and passed by the University Senate during their March 15, 2016 meeting.

The change to HR23 was one sentence: “Only tenured and tenure-line faculty are eligible to vote for members of all peer tenure and promotion committees.”

The changes proposed to HR21 were more extensive and included the following (changes indicated in bold):

* “Colleges should have their own guidelines for distinguishing between lecturer and senior lecturer or instructor and senior instructor positions**, for designating a third rank beyond that of senior lecturer or instructor, and** for promoting from one rank to the other, but all units should operate under the following University assumptions:
1. **Fixed-Term faculty should become eligible for promotion to the second rank after five years in rank, and would be permitted to compile their promotion dossiers in their fifth year. There should be no fixed time period for promotion to the third rank. Reviews for promotions should be conducted solely with regard to the merit of the candidate.** Although there can be exceptions, the senior lecturer and senior instructor positions are designed to be promotion opportunities, with a recommended period of at least five years in rank as an instructor or lecturer before consideration for promotion.
2. **Reviews for promotion of the full-time fixed-term faculty shall be conducted by Fixed-Term Promotion Review Committees. Fixed-Term Promotion Review Committees shall be constituted as follows: each of the colleges at University Park shall establish a committee for that college; each of the five stand-alone campuses (Abington, Altoona, Behrend, Berks, Harrisburg) shall establish a committee for that campus; each of the Special Mission Campuses (Great Valley, College of Medicine, and Dickinson Law) shall establish a committee for that campus; and the University College shall establish one committee composed of full-time fixed-term faculty from the campuses within the University College, with no more than one member from any campus. If a unit shall have fewer than seven fixed-term faculty members, at least two members of that unit’s Fixed-Term Review Committee shall be drawn from another unit’s Fixed-Term Review Committee. Only full-time fixed-term faculty members in each unit are eligible to serve on and to vote for the members of the review committee in their unit. Only faculty of higher rank than the candidate should make recommendations about promotions. If there should be insufficient numbers of higher-ranked fixed-term faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the academic unit.**
3. **The promotion procedure itself should include recommendations by (a) a campus/department faculty committee (b) the DAA or department/division head, and (c) a college level fixed-term promotion review committee with the approval of the campus chancellor and/or dean of the college.**
4. All promotions should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college.

Naturally, such significant changes for non-tenure track, full-time faculty announced after Spring Break caused the committee to digress from their original charges.

Below are the committee’s responses to their charges with additional insight provided by changes to HR23 and HR21.

*Charge #1 -* Investigate extended review practices for FTM faculty and develop a form of developmental review for FTM faculty or standardize across all four schools the process of contract renewal.

* Currently, this review process lacks meaning to all non-tenure track faculty who must complete it because its purpose is unclear and the method varies from school to school with H&SS being the most labor-intensive. The arbitrary 5 year term either conflicts with contract renewal periods or, when it does coincide with a faculty member who has a 5 year contract, the timing of the contract renewal review and the 5 year extended review are not streamlined to allow for a little less paperwork for the faculty member being reviewed, the peer review committee, or the staff who must coordinate it all.
* Recommendations: The purpose of the review needs to be meaningful and clearly communicated. With the recent changes to HR 21, there may be the opportunity to tie the 5 year extended review into the recommendation/preparation process for faculty seeking promotion on the non-tenure track.
* Coordinate those who have 5 year contracts to allow their 5 year extended review to occur simultaneously with their contract renewal.
* Ask staff who regularly work to coordinate and assemble these documents for advice on how to improve the process for all who are involved.
* Use a faculty member’s most recent 5 year extended review for his/her contract renewal, adding annual review information where necessary.
* Actively use the 5 year extended review to mentor/assist/facilitate non-tenure track faculty along the promotional track.
* Promote the mentoring aspect of the 5 year extended review among all non-tenure track faculty.

*Charge #2 -* Review policies and procedures for promotion to Senior Lecturer and develop best practices for promotion (from Faculty Affairs). Determine why there were so few Senior Lecturers on campus.

* Behrend has over 100 full-time, non-tenure track lecturers and 13 are Senior Lecturers. This is a very small number, especially when compared with other campuses.
* An unofficial count of the number of non-tenured track, full-time faculty (as indicated on the five stand-alone Penn State campuses’ websites) showed the following: Abington 19 Senior Lecturers out of 76 full-time, non-tenure track faculty; Altoona, 15 out of 70; Berks, 10 out of 49; and Harrisburg, 9 out of 94.
* When looking at the policies and procedures from Behrend’s schools and comparing actual practices that occurred, the answer to why there are so few Senior Lecturers at Behrend varied.
* First, many faculty are not aware of the opportunity for Senior Lecturer promotion due to not being aware of the policies and procedures that pertain to the promotion.
* Those who are aware of the policies and procedures have experienced multiple contradictions in how they were practiced in their schools.
* Some were told that they must be an FTM for 10 years before they could apply (which contradicts the current Behrend policy that says 7 years and will greatly contradict the recently passed HR21 which states 5 years).
* Some were told that only 1 Senior Lecturer candidate could be put forward per academic year per school for promotion.
* Some met the school’s written criteria for Senior Lecturer but were told that they must be published, a criteria that was not clearly indicated as an absolute for promotion but rather part of a list of many scholarly pursuits that would assure candidacy.
* If a faculty member knew the policies and procedures and was supported by his/her school director, he/she had to assemble an application that greatly resembled a tenure candidate’s dossier which took a great deal of time for the candidate and the assisting staff since the candidate did not have the benefit of a mentor helping him/her along the way.
* Once the faculty member received the promotion to Senior Lecturer, there was a wide discrepancy regarding raise and length of contract.
* Some of those “promoted” received no raise at all; some received a raise that, combined with a merit raise, equaled 4%; some received a significant raise.
* Length of contract was not guaranteed to be 5 years; instead the current policy indicates that the *maximum* length of the Senior Lecturer’s contract could be 5 years with the emphasis that if the “promoted” Senior Lecturer did not maintain a certain level of excellence that he/she could have a contract of less than 5 years.
* Essentially, the conclusions among non-tenure track faculty were that the rules were unclear and not consistently applied, and it was a great deal of work for what generally appeared to be a promotion in name only.
* Recommendations:
* Each school should identify all Full-Time Multiyear non-tenure track faculty who have been teaching at Behrend for 5 or more years.
* Each school should review these instructors’ Annual Reviews and Five Year Extended Reviews and determine who should be strongly advised to assemble their applications for Senior Lecturers.
* Each school should work with these candidates to assemble and submit the required materials to the school’s committee.
* Each school should additionally mentor other non-tenure track, full-time faculty to facilitate their successful applications for Senior Lecturer.
* Each school committee should evaluate Senior Lecturer candidates according to the written criteria for each school and determine the candidate’s success in meeting these requirements on individual merit.
* All Senior Lecturer candidates approved by their school’s committee should be forwarded to the college’s committee regardless of the director’s approval.
* Upon receiving the promotion to Senior Lecturer, the instructor should immediately receive a 5 year contract and a promotional raise.
* In light of the proposed revisions to HR21, the committee had further recommendations:
* Each school could move their current criteria for Senior Lecturer to be the criteria for the new promotional level.
* Each school could promote their current Senior Lecturers to the new promotional level since they will have already been reviewed as meeting the criteria.
* Each school will develop new criteria for Senior Lecturer that focuses on teaching.
* The college will create an ad hoc committee with significant full-time, non-tenure track representation to revise Behrend policy and procedures that directly pertain to full-time, non-tenure track faculty (ex. BCF10 – Promotion of Faculty Members to the Rank of Senior Lecturer, BCF19 – Appointment and Renewal Lengths for Fixed-Term Multiyear Faculty, and BCF21 – Penn State Behrend Faculty Workload Guidelines).
* While some policy and procedure revision will have to wait until the official revisions to HR23 and HR21, the college and schools could start working on changes now so that when the revised HR23 and HR21 go into effect, the college and schools will be ready.

*Charge #3 -* Investigate workloads for lecturers

* Each school varies in their teaching workloads for full-time, non-tenure track instructors and within schools, there is further variety among programs. Variations include:
* Number of students in each course
* Number of general education courses taught
* Number of preps per semester
* Number of new preps per semester
* Amount of time required to stay current in an established course
* Amount of grading required in each course
* Number of senior capstone projects directing or participating as a committee member
* Workloads also include duties beyond teaching for all instructors. Some examples are:
* Number of students being advised
* Serving on committees that require a significant time commitment
* Chairing committees
* Serving in a leadership capacity at the program, school, or college level
* Substantial teaching and service obligations often lead to little time left to pursue scholarship interests, often 30% of a full-time, non-tenure track instructor’s annual evaluation.
* In light of the proposed changes to HR23 and HR21, more service would be required of FTM, Senior Lecturers, and 2nd promotional NTT faculty on school and college promotional review committees.
* Recommendations:
* Conduct a culture survey of all full-time, non-tenure track faculty to gather data about current workload.
* Have each school extract data from Digital Measures for full-time, non-tenure track faculty to determine current levels of workload in terms of numbers of students, number of preps, numbers of new preps, number of general education courses, etc.
* Award all Senior Lecturers and 2nd level promotion recipients with one 3-credit course release per academic year to allow time to achieve teaching, scholarship, and service goals.
* Support all full-time, non-tenure track faculty in seeking out grant opportunities that would allow them a semester’s leave time to pursue professional goals.
* Allow for greater flexibility of percentages for full-time, non-tenure track faculty to support them in achieving their professional goals.

**Recommended Charges for 2016-2017:**

1. Develop and distribute a cultures survey to all full-time, non-tenure track faculty.
2. Coordinate with schools to gather data about current full-time, non-tenure track faculty workload.
3. Contact other campuses and request their criteria for promotion to Senior Lecturer.
4. Work with Faculty Council to revise BCF10, BCF19, and BCF21 in anticipation of final approval of HR23 and HR21.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gallagher