

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

**Meeting Minutes**

1:00-2:00 p.m., Tuesday, February 14, 2017

392 Lory Student Center

Present: Natalie B, Natalie O, Joseph, Patty, Matt, Steve, David, Sue, Jenny

Minutes taken by Sue Doe

1. **MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**
	1. CoNTTF Meeting Minutes – Feb 7, 2017 (p. 2-3)

Natalie motioned to approve minutes from 2-7-17 and they were unanimously approved.

1. **CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS & UPDATES**
	1. Meeting Minutes: Sue Doe
	2. Anyone available to join me as “back up” for Council of Deans meeting Wed, Feb 15 (day after our meeting) at 1pm in Admin building (106, I think)?

 Natalie, Steve, Matt can be there to join Jenny on 2-15-17. 1-1:30 pm

The group discussed Jenny’s PowerPoint presentation for this event. CoNTTF discussed possible concerns being voiced about the action plan.

David and Jenny commented that Dan and central admin along with Mary have supported the proposal and action plan, and gave the charge to us to create a plan for moving forward with the proposal’s actualization.

Jenny will offer clarification that we are not going to the Council of Deans to circumvent shared governance but to share ideas and check on college-level questions that may have arisen.

1. **ACTION ITEMS / DISCUSSION**
	1. Section C has gone forward to the Committee on Faculty Governance. When ready Section E will go to CORSAF.
	2. Review of drafted manual revisions for section E

This section defines appointment types and evaluation. David explained the efforts undertaken thus far: Steve did an initial sweep, then David made changes, then Sue replied with comments and changes. Finally everyone in this subgroup got a copy, and Steve did a run-through and caught a few more things and then we considered it done to the level we’re at right now. We do not seek major changes at this point. David pointed out one thing to bear in mind: when you’re going through the manual you see other things that you’d like to “fix” but we will resist that in order to keep our role and changes cleanly associated with the proposal. We can note things that may need to be cleaned up (often having nothing to do with the proposal) but the changes must be initiated by Mary and the appropriate committee. Jenny notes that when presenting the changes we are recommending to the appropriate committees, we are accompanying the proposed changes with the action plan as a whole. It’s possible that committee chairs and Mary may decide to talk about the proposal when it’s on the FC floor in ways that go beyond the rationale.

 E.2.1 Basic Types of Faculty Appointments --Discussion

We discussed whether it would be better to send this doc to CORSAF with the recommendation to change the name of “tenure-track/tenured” or to just point out the problem and let them decide on a label. We decide to go with “tenure-track/tenured” because these titles are used elsewhere so in changing it from “regular” to this we are simply making things consistent. We are avoiding any appearance of tampering with language that does not pertain to our action.

Natalie Oie -- E.6 d and e-- someday in the future Natalie points out that it would be good to see the manual remove “non tenured.” One option would be to say: “if the department head does not propose to reappoint a faculty member in their probationary period of a tenure-track appointment.

Patty—E.2.1.a—What about the use of the term “instructor”? Discussion: We left it in due to the possibility that some units may not allow assistant professor rank to be associated with a masters-holding faculty member (terminal masters). We don’t want those people to lose the opportunity for a career path (or a job in general) due to the application of the rank of assistant professor.

Patty—E.2.1.h—emeritus –clean this up? Refer back to the original manual definition of emeritus. Discussion: In this section the issue pertains to those cases where a faculty member is tenured and giving up tenure and moving off the tenure-track. The manual states that you should get emeritus before leaving the tenured appointment. We discussed this and decided to leave it alone.

Patty—E.11—discussed whether to leave in “(not including summer)” and we decided to leave this alone.

Patty--E.11—language says we “shall” include the chair of T&P but “may” include the chair might be better? We had decided on “may” during our meetings because some TTF are not going to want to serve so “may” will open up the possibility of someone off the tenure-track serving in this capacity. THIS WAS THE ONLY CHANGE THAT WAS APPROVED. Steve has record of this change.

**Discussion Item: Stabilizing the action plan on the web site.** Concerns about the posted action plan and making changes. The process is not over but our revisions to the action plan are. Joseph will add a sentence something like this to the action plan information on the CoNTTF web site: “This document is the result of a process and is in the midst of review by many entities. So CoNTTF is receiving feedback at this time and we invite it. The document will not be revised or finalized until we have completed the collection of feedback. 2-14-17”

1. **Adjourn**

Next Meeting: Feb 21 Minutes: David Greene