

**Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

**Meeting Minutes, prepared by L. Stone-Roy**

Tuesday, September 18, 2018

380 Lory Student Center

Attendees: Jenny Morse, Denise Apodaca, Natalie Ooi, Dan Baker, Steve Benoit, Christine Pawliuk, Patty Stutz-Tanenbaum, Mary Van Buren, Leslie Stone-Roy

1) Sept. 4, 2018 Meeting Minutes approved after Natalie Ooi requested to amend the attendees for the last meeting to include herself since she was present and taking minutes.

2) Chair Announcements and Updates

* Jenny will use a timer to help keep us on track during discussions
* We still need another tenure-track faculty member to replace C.W. Miller. Jenny sent email to Mary Meyer asking for nominations. Patty will check in Health and Human Sciences to see if anybody is interested.

3) Action Items

a) revisions to operating procedures – some editing to #6 wording and then approved at 1:55 p.m. by a vote.

* Discussion about having 2 students on committee – Don Estep has to identify them, & hasn’t happened yet.

b) E12 Service review and recommend language for Instructor ranks. A discussion about instructors and whether they should have a service requirement ensued.

Opinions voice during discussion:

* Senior and Master instructors should do service, but maybe not at instructor level.
* Adjuncts shouldn’t do service, but then a person can be both a master instructor and an adjunct, so that makes it complicated.
* It was suggested that service amount and type should align with rank
* Types of service need to be defined
* Concern that NTTF might be exploited with respect to the amount of service requested. Early TTF avoid service and this duty might be transferred more to NTTF as a result. The mentality that NTTF should support TTF may be an issue.
* It was mentioned that “service” doesn’t define what a percentage is & this is a problem for both TTF and NTTF. It was pointed out that it’s hard to determine percentage effort with respect to service.
* Some NTTF don’t have a service component to their work description and serving on committees therefore doesn’t contribute toward career advancement
* It was pointed out that “unreasonable workload” is grievable, but there is no definition for unreasonable or how service is converted into a percentage of effort.
* There was a suggestion for NTTF to bring up service at annual reviews, and if it seems to be too much, to request an increase in percentage for service
* It was brought up is that 5% service is about 2 hours a week, but being a chair vs. a member of a committee also makes a difference
* Another issue – how do reference letters for students fit in? Some faculty spend a lot of time doing this, and others have little or no time dedicated to this task.

c) Proposed Section C changes

* There was an involved discussion about changing the name of CoNTTF and whether “NTTF” is derogatory. Two views: 1) It is because it’s defining us as something we’re not 2) The name is not offensive, because it gives the signal that we don’t have something we should. The name might benefit us.
* There was further discussion about the name, how Admin Pro, online and joint appointment employees fit in and how NTTF are funded. We need to continue representing people who may be/identify as NTTF but be employed at the university in different appointment types.
* End result: no name change for CoNTTF for now

d) HR document

* Overall impression is that it seems ok

e) Jan Nerger’s document on CNS NTTF ranks:

* Initial reaction – seems clear. Other deans and department chairs have the document so they can work on code. It needs to be finalized and officially released.
* potential problems include:
* There is no service component included in Instructor Track
* There was a discussion about the number of promotional steps that are allowable & it was determined to be 3. This causes a problem with people who would switch from instructor track to professor track if they “use” up their promotions before reaching the highest rank (for example an instructor working on their PhD while teaching). It may be that this would need to be decided by Central and we don’t have to solve that right now.
* There was a discussion about whether the descriptions on page 2 of this document are intended to apply to both NTTF and TTF, or only to NTTF.

f) CoNTTF Website – Patty met with Joseph (who previously took care of the website) about taking over this duty. Unfortunately, we need to create a new website since the current one is not user friendly. Jenny is negotiating with Tim Gallagher to convert website into a more user friendly site (using Word Press or something similar). Once it’s moved to a new platform, we will run it. Patty is happy to do this once the procedure is straightforward.

g) How to proceed with IR

* Need to contact Institutional Research and find out information about NTTF – years at CSU, salary, etc.
* Question arose as to the intent of the report – answer to see if there is compliance with changes & to maintain accountability for salary changes and promotions. Also, it shows that we are monitoring these issues

h) Plans for the semester

* Outlined in meeting agenda packet and were taken from CoNTTF annual report.

4) Adjourn