

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

**Minutes**

Tuesday, February 19, 1:30-3:00pm

392 Lory Student Center

Attendees: Jenny Morse, Leslie Stone-Roy, Suellen Melzer, Leanne Kaiser, Dan Baker, Natalie Ooi, Steve Benoit, Mary Van Buren

1. Meeting begins 1.42pm
2. Minutes approved from Feb 5th
3. **CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS & UPDATES**
	1. Marie is coming to the next CoNTTF meeting on March 5th to talk about CorSAF efforts on code changes. This will be a good opportunity for us to all discuss concerns regarding department efforts to get their codes changes (e.g. external letters, leave/sabbatical, appointment type timeframes, etc.)
	2. CorSAF is inviting CoNTTF members to attend meetings to work on the requirements are in the manual around teaching and advising and how these are evaluated. These meetings are every Friday 9am – 10am Physics Building starting March 1st
	3. Ashley Stokes will be coming March 26th to CoNTTF meeting to talk further about CSU Extension efforts to become NTTF. Jenny to see if Dan Bush can also come to that meeting to answer any questions regarding code changes and what this means for NTTF moving forward (e.g. promotions, pay raises (is this a line item in the budget), CU Boulder pay raises, etc.)
	4. Article relating to CU Boulder and their move to increase minimum instructor wages was acknowledged.
	5. Jenny has agreed to attend next Executive Committee meeting at the behest of Tim Gallagher.
4. **ACTION ITEMS / DISCUSSION**
	1. IR data – what do we want to do with the data that Dan received. Jenny suggests compiling an addendum to our annual report that identifies the information we have received. Dan suggests that before we do the analysis, we work out what we are missing.
		1. Key question to answer:
			1. Which NTTF have been moved across to the new appointment types?
			2. Which NTTF have had promotions, pay increases, etc. over time?
			3. How do we deal with 9 month, 12 month appointments, full time vs. part time?
				1. Jenny suggests breaking it down into groups of those who are above 50% workload, and those who are below so that we can measure and track if there are changes moving forward with those above 50% staying above 50% and not being moved below.
			4. Identify NTTF who have not been promoted in the past 5 years and are eligible to do so
		2. Missing data to add:
			1. Department
			2. College
			3. Credit hours (taught)
			4. Gender
	2. Broad discussion throughout meeting regarding how each department is dealing with code changes (e.g. separation of instructor vs. professor track and the criteria for this; external letters; differences between expectations between instructor track and professor track).
	3. AAUP letter – did Mary’s changes capture the discussion and the changes that people wanted? Those present agreed that the changes were good and they were happy for the letter to be sent on. Jenny will send it forward.

**5) Adjourn: 2:54pm**

**From:** Bush,Daniel
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 26, 2019 4:56 PM
**To:** Morse,Jenny <Jenny.Morse@colostate.edu>
**Subject:** Re: NTTF concerns about conversion and promotion

Jenny

Some answers and some places I’ll have to do some digging.

A couple of concerns/questions have come up that I’d like to check in with you about.

* Rumor has it that Contract appointments are going to be used only for NTTF with significant administrative duties and that Contract appointments are potentially being taken away from people currently on contracts. For example, most STAs in Liberal Arts are currently on contracts and should be moved into Contract appointments, but a fear has come up that they won’t be converted appropriately. I share their concern since my 3 year contract ends this spring and I should have that contract renewed and move into a Contract appointment, but my chair has not yet confirmed that (and the reluctance to do so suggests it may not happen).

              Contracts should be offered to new folks after a few years (4-5) at CSU. They should not be constrained by the presence or absence of service.  Anyone on a current contract (STA or not) should stay on it for the initial move to the new ranks and appointment types.

*
* Additionally, there has been some concern that STAs will lose ranks/titles in the conversion process. CoNTTF wrote conversion guidelines into our original recommendations and we still believe in those conversion guidelines. Current NTTF must be grandfathered in at the appropriate appointment type, rank, and title that corresponds to their current position. Current NTTF should not lose anything in this conversion process.

              Agreed, conversion should be a lateral move based on where they are at now and that is what we’ve been telling all departments.

*
* Workload concerns have come up, especially in my college where a document says that NTTF will have service added to their workload but still have to teach 8 classes. The document indicates that an NTTF with 10-20% service, reducing their teaching % to 80-90, will still need to teach 8 classes. Since 8 classes is currently 100%, the change to FTE should result in a corresponding reduction in teaching loads. How could I have had a job for 6 years that’s 100% FTE, but now that same job is only 80% FTE?

              Agreed - I’ll look into this.

*
* Concerns have come up about the indication that promotions will need to be delayed or rolled out slowly. All NTTF who have been here for more than 5 years and have been denied the opportunity to be considered for promotion or STA should be considered now. CoNTTF is putting together a list of who these people are. If they don’t want to be considered that’s fine, but everyone who is eligible should be asked and should be considered if they want to. How will decisions be made about who can go forward or how many can go forward? And will NTTF themselves have any say in when they and their colleagues are considered?

 This may be true. We have about 350 NTT faculty that have been here for at least 5 yrs, so they might be eligible for consideration next FY. If they all come up at once, it could break the bank”. We have to look at the numbers and do some calculating to see what the bill could be. If it’s beyond our capacity to do it in one FY, we may have to phase promotions in over more than one year. If so, we’ll provide guidance on how to decide who goes first.

*
* Another concern about the promotion process is the idea that NTTF will need external letters. In my understanding, external letters are used to evaluated the research portion of a tenure/promotion package, so they would only be relevant for NTTF who have a research % in their workload. Furthermore, external letters play a role in the granting of tenure, which NTTF are not eligible for; therefore a requirement for external letters seems beyond the scope of evaluating the majority of NTTF. CoRSAF has been working on to strengthen the sections on Service and Teaching in the manual for the purpose of more effective evaluation of these components of faculty efforts. The way in which we evaluate teaching should be standard for all faculty, the way in which we evaluate service should be standard for all faculty, and the way in which we evaluate research should be standard for all faculty, but we should only be evaluated for the components that are in our workloads.

External letters may be requested. We need to discuss this in more detail and yes, internal letters are very likely.

*

I’ve been getting a lot of questions and concerns, and my biggest concern is this: the goal of the changes was to make the situation at CSU better for NTTF; if we are not making things better for NTTF, then the changes are a failure and the NTTF who have been expecting change, progress, and improved situations are going to start making a lot of noise. I hope to be able to ease their concerns with your responses.

 There is no question in my mind the NTT faculty will emerge in much better shape acorss so many levels. BUT, it is a heavy lift with lots of parts in mtion. It will take time to get it done right.

Dan