 

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

Tuesday, February 28, 1-2pm

392 Lory Student Center

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

Minutes taken by Natalie Ooi

1. **MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**
   * CoNTTF Meeting Minutes – Feb 21, 2017
2. **CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS & UPDATES**
   * Meeting Minutes: March 21st – Tobin
   * Visit from Dan Bush

* Introduction by Jenny on focus and strategy for Faculty Council meeting March 7th
* Jenny, Dan and Mary visited during the week to discuss the sentiment on campus regarding the proposal moving forward, in light of some of the emails passed around during the week regarding processes for manual changes and CoNTTF’s proposal
* Dan emphasized strong support around campus regarding our central tenants and overall proposal
* He explained how there has been some confusion regarding the aspirational component of our proposal and the real ‘meat and potatoes’ of our proposal
* He emphasized the need to focus on how we make the nuts and bolts changes to the Faculty Manual to ensure that we get the big concepts moved forward
* He highlighted how there is likely going to be minor feedback regarding manual language, etc. but that it is important that we remain flexible and make changes where we see appropriate and relevant. An example that Dan brought up was our flexibility regarding the re-introduction of the ‘instructor’ term
* He wanted to reemphasize that some loud and vocal voices are not representative of the overall support across campus that we have
* Natalie B. raised frustration regarding how she feels as if she is ‘beating her head against a brick wall’. Dan empathized and made note that it is a lengthy process and that even if the Board of Governor’s don’t approve it until the summer or beyond, then we will just roll out the implementation at a later date
* Natalie O. raised concern regarding Don Estep’s email and his indication that he wanted the Committee of Faculty Governance to do their own investigation into the proposal and need for our proposed CoNTTF changes. What does this mean for delaying our process – it could delay for easily a year? Dan sympathized and indicated that he is not a product of Faculty Council and can’t comment on this, but that this could happen and we need to focus on the task at hand and know that things will eventually get done
* Sue D. raised concerns that CoNTTF has not been treated necessarily with the same respect of other Faculty Council committees in the way we have been challenged regarding the need to shop around our proposal and review/investigate it after all of the work we have done reviewing best practices, and raised the question as to whether or not this is precedent for all committees? Dan mentioned that this was a good point to raise with Mary and maybe could inform her introduction at Faculty Council before our proposal is discussed.
* David raised concerns regarding how our draft proposals and manual language changes were shared beyond Executive Committee that shouldn’t have been shared. This is a concern that we share with Don Estep as this was not meant to have been commented and read on by the broader community. As such, we feel as we have lost a lot of support and credibility as a result, when all we were doing is sharing our proposed ideas as early as possible, as was requested of us. These documents seem to have gotten ahead of the process, having been shared inappropriately, thereby undermining the approval process. It is not that we mind the broader community reading these documents, but the manner in which they were shared has been problematic.
* Joseph asked whether there was a way in which we can get more support from senior administration regarding our efforts to help quell some of the angst being raised. Jenny also brought up the point that this support would be helpful, especially because some of the additional aspects, like compensation, etc. are outside of the scope of our faculty council discussion and manual changes. Dan agreed, but that our focus should be on getting Faculty Council approval first and then after that, we can discuss these additional aspects.
* Dan also mentioned that we already have so much support from senior administration regarding our efforts and wanted to emphasize they have thought carefully about our proposal and support it getting through and moving forward
  + Preparation for Faculty Council meeting next week
* David emphasized the need for us to focus on preparing for next week’s meeting. He empathized with why Don Estep is annoyed because he should never have received a draft proposal in the first place. What we need to do is reach out to Don and explain to him all of the steps CoNTTF has taken already and what was done without our approval (sharing of draft documents) and how there is not a need to do a multi-year review of our proposal, like was required with special academic units.
* David wanted to know if after Faculty Council, some of the CoNTTF members can go and visit some of the different committees and individuals that are expressing concern and try and find a way to clear the air and help them understand what we are doing and work out how to move forward successfully
* The committee discussed the sharing of our draft documents and how they all got out to Executive Committee, Council of Deans, and since then has been shared even more broadly across the university. This has greatly undermined a lot of our efforts.
* David proposed that for next week at Faculty Council, we take out the aspirational goals for our draft proposal so that faculty don’t get fixated on these. Jenny responded that what she is presenting at Faculty Council is a slideshow that does not include the aspirational goals. Rather, it just clearly outlines what we are hoping to change in the faculty manual and that’s it.
* Sue mentioned that we should be prepared for a wide range of questions from Faculty Council beyond our core faculty manual changes that we are proposing, as many of these members will have read the whole document and are aware of the aspirational goals. We need to anticipate some of the questions that might come up and be ready to respond.
* Joseph emphasized that this is just the beginning of a much bigger process.
* Natalie B. asked about who we should be inviting to Faculty Council and whether they can participate in Faculty Council. We are inviting everyone on the committee to reach out to supportive NTT and TT faculty to attend the Faculty Council meeting.
  + No CoNTTF meeting next week – instead we will be attending Faculty Council starting 4pm BSB A101

**3) Adjourned 2:10pm (same day)**