

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

**Meeting Agenda**

Tuesday, December 12, 2-3:30pm

392 Lory Student Center

Attendees: Jenny Morse (College of Business), Chair, Natalie Ooi (College of Natural Resources), Matt Camper (College of Agricultural Sciences), Natalie Barnes (College of Liberal Arts), Dan Baker (College of Engineering), Tobin Magle (Libraries), Steven Benoit (College of Natural Sciences), Joseph DiVerdi (College of Natural Sciences, at-large), C. W. Miller (College of Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences, TTF), Patricia Stutz-Tanenbaum (College of Health and Human Sciences), and Mary Van Buren (College of Liberal Arts, TTF), Leslie Stone-Roy

1. CoNTTF Meeting Minutes approved for November 28, 2017
	1. Joseph - moved to approve
	2. Matt - 2nd motion
2. CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES
	1. Spring 2018 CoNTTF meeting schedule announced Tuesday afternoon 2:30-4pm in LSC 392
		1. Dates: Jan 16, Jan 30, Feb 13, Feb 27, Mar 20, Apr 10, Apr 24, and May 1
		2. Natailie Ooi confirms that she’s not attend Apr 24 and May 1
		3. Meeting notes will pick up where we left off (alphabetical by last name)
	2. Spring 2018 CoRSAF meetings Friday morning 9-10am
	3. Spring 2018 CoFG meetings TBD
3. ACTION ITEMS / DISCUSSION
	1. CoRSAF meeting update
		1. Marie Legare (chair) seems determined to rewrite Section E of Faculty Code (Code)
		2. CoRSAF looks to Richard Eykholt for knowledge of what is possible in revising code
		3. Discussed Senior Teaching Appointments (STA) and how they fit into the currently proposal
			1. FC would not likely accept STA 🡺 Assistant Professor transition
			2. Unclear how many STA’s @ CSU (with or without terminal degree)
	2. Need to finalize the #’s of faculty by rank / education level. Discussion summary:
		1. Jenny reported that the number of education level data points are reduced to 153 and do only record degree earned (PhD or MS) and NOT if the degree is terminal (MFA, MBA, etc)
		2. Possible to split masters by terminal and non-terminal for NTTF portion of code? Jenny pointed out that this is not currently done for TTF
		3. Discussion continued related to hiring of non-terminal degree applicants for TTF positions. Group consensus is that Assoc. Professor title is likely not possible for non-terminal degree candidates
		4. Clarification on CoRSAF spreadsheet whether Senior Teacher relegated to adjunct – agreed it was likely a clerical error
	3. CoFG update (Jenny)
		1. After meeting with Don Estep (Chair CoFG) CoFG has shown renewed energy in NTTF issues
		2. Likely paths forward to increase FC voting by NTTF
			1. (previous idea) Change in election procedures for CoNTTF to become a regular FC committee
			2. (current idea) Redefine specialized committees to allow all specialized committee members to vote in FC
				1. Challenge identified that many CoNTTF members have no service component in contract – noted that FC could provide $500/semester for committee membership
	4. Side discussion related to hurdles for NTTF to work way up to TTF
		1. Research would need to include research of teaching (and learning)
		2. Research allocation % may need to be lowered
	5. Side discussion of contract vs. continuing appointments. Main advantage of continuing is availability of grievance
		1. stated that only one (1) person has won grievance in 20 years
	6. Natalie Barnes wanted to know what NTTF CLA can do to help proposals pass
4. Meeting Adjourned
	1. Matt – motion to adjoun
	2. Joseph Diverdi - 2nd motion

Minutes submitted by Daniel W. Baker

CLA Concerns

**INITIAL Sticking Points--CLA**

Proposal Components—crucial to include, crucial to refine/revise

1. Evaluation processes must be consistent with departmental policies in relation to rank. Evaluation committees comprised only of NTTF would be a non-starter for most units in the CLA.
2. Don’t get rid of the STA. People without terminal degrees who have obtained this designation and will not be eligible for the rank of assistant professor will see the ridding of the STA as an insult, a demotion, and a betrayal.   They might rightfully ask: What was in this deal for me?

Central Administration must be part of the discussion. There must be provisions from upper administration about long-term plans and funding and these must be a matter of record  such as an MOU or other binding document.

1. Central money must be associated with promotions
2. The proposal should include a provision for “holding the line” at 41% NTTF since that’s where we are now and growth of the non tenure-track ranks has been precipitous in the past decade.  In addition to holding the line, the proposal should include clearly laid out plans for REVERSING the trend toward contingency and restoring tenure lines at a steady rate and as capacity/departures permit.

Due Process/Grievance must be assured in the Manual to those possessing appointments in the NTTF ranks, particularly given career ladder and promotion provisions and opportunities. Without due process and full access to grievance procedures, there can be no assurance of the possession of academic freedom, a central tenet of teaching and learning as well as research in higher education, and a diminishment of due process/grievance is often associated with the preference for contingent faculty by higher administrations across the country. Currently the Manual does not provide a due process/grievance mechanism for those terminated from contingent appointments. Bolstering the grievance processes for NTTF would  signal that a threat to academic freedom is not intended by central administration’s endorsement of the CoNTTF proposal.

The first two items go straight to things that CoNTTF and CORSAF might work on.  The second set of things are obligations of central administration, as we have heard over and over from deans, chairs and faculty.  The final item, like the “holding the line” provision,  would make the entire proposal more palatable to TTF because there is widespread distrust of the objectives of a widening reliance on NTTF. Many TTF quite understandably believe fear that admin and BOG support for contingent faculty will diminish the central faculty right to academic freedom and, in so doing, will undermine the entire role of higher education in a democratic society.

General Concerns from Don Estep

There is quite a bit of unhappiness about the wording in the 3 year contracts. Some of our NTTF are protesting by sticking to the older open ended appointment, though this appears to me to offer less protection.

This has raised a discussion about asking for improvements in the language in our College. Barring that, I have suggested that we establish college wide procedures for annual evaluations and documented criteria for dismissal.