

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

**Minutes**

Tuesday, March 26, 2019

1:30-3:00 p.m.

392 Lory Student Center

Attendees: Jenny Morse, Steve Benoit, Natalie Ooi, Christine Pawliuk, Leann Kaiser, Mary Van Buren, Dan Baker, Denise Apodaca, Suellen Melzer, Leslie Stone-Roy. Guests: Dan Bush and Ashley Stokes

**1) MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

a) CoNTTF Meeting Minutes – March 5, 2019 (Note: I don’t think we approved meeting minutes from last time)

**2) CHAIR ANNOUNCEMNTS & UPDATES**

a) Meeting Minutes: Leslie Stone-Roy

**3) ACTION ITEMS / DISCUSSION**

a) There was a discussion about the CLA petition and the request from CLA for CoNTTF support. It was decided that the committee would review the petition language and an addendum would be added indicating that CoNTTF supports the petition, but was not the author. This was approved unanimously.

b) There was a request to share departmental promotion language that is being developed. It was agreed that this was a good idea, but the shared information should remain within the CoNTTF for now since the language is still undergoing changes.

c) Dan Bush conversation about progress on NTTF and manual changes

i) Questions from CoNTTF were discussed as described below:

(1) Jenny asked – where are we in the process of NTTF changes? Response: moving NTTF into appointment types and ranks is taking longer than anticipated, but this I because criteria need to be developed and departments are being thoughtful about the process. Placement criteria for current NTTF needs to be the same as promotion criteria, so it takes time. All but one college has sent documents to Dan. He also wants to be sure the criteria are in the same ballpark across the university although there will be differences.

(2) Jenny asked about contracts & the rumor that some STA on contract appointments may not be renewed. Dan said he’s seen people moving into contracts and there haven’t been any problems. Mary asked about the number of people being moved to contracts & Dan replied that if they are on contracts, they should stay on contracts. CLA has a challenge because the previous 2-year time frame for adjuncts allowed more flexibility than the new 1 year adjunct appointment. Mary asked if somebody was in a contract and the number of students enrolling in courses went down if that contract would be honored. Dan said yes, that’s why it’s a challenge. Jenny asked about people being described as part-time with 4 courses in the fall and zero in the spring so that departments can get around continuing or contract for full-time. Dan said to send him the information about this, it shouldn’t be happening that way. He said most units are trying to do a good job with the NTTF changes, but it’s a heavy lift for them.

(2) Next a discussion began about workloads and if 15-20% research was required for the professor track. DB said no, that’s nonsense. He said that administration is not setting guidelines for instructor vs. professor track, except that there should be a service component. If there’s research, it should be 10-15% maximum so the NTTF don’t start looking like TTF in terms of distribution of effort.

(3) Natalie asked about letters and the information that several NTTF have gotten that NTTF have to do the same things as TTF because they will have the same titles. An international reputation was used as an example. Dan said he’d discourage that attitude. He also pointed out that units can have local titles if they want to distinguish between TTF and NTTF like “Professor of Practice”. He also mentioned that qualification for promotion should be more than just teaching 4 classes for a long time. More discussion ensued about letters and whether TTF would have the expertise to evaluate teaching. Dan said this question will also be taken to the Council of the Deans & whether letters need to be from department, college, campus, or outside of the university will be discussed. Mary pointed out that maybe letters aren’t needed for NTTF. Dan responded that evaluative letters are appropriate even if they are just from CSU faculty. The committee on teaching and learning could sit in on classes, etc. Dan has been working with TILT for 1 ½ - 2 years to incorporate evaluation of teaching for both NTTF and TTF. There was a question about whether NTTF need to have scholarship in teaching if they already have scholarship in research. Dan said no.

(4) Denise asked about NTTF converting to TTF. Dan said he wouldn’t encourage or discourage this, however NTTF is not an entry point for becoming TTF.

(5) Leann asked if the same committee will be used for NTTF and TTF promotions. Dan said this would be discussed with Council of Deans, but that both TTF and NTTF should review NTTF promotions. Also, if there was subgroup that evaluated only NTTF promotions, this would double the workload for some people.

(6) Natalie asked if there would be a different promotional package on the Provost website for NTTF. Dan said no, NTTF will use the same packet, there will just be one empty section.

(7) Mary asked about the timeline & Dan replied that it would parallel regular faculty and the promotion process would be in the fall. He said a caveat is that there are a large number of NTTF that have been here 5 years or more and they can’t all be promoted at once because it would break the bank. Mary asked about estimated costs & indicated it would be about 3 – 3 1/2 million if all NTTF over 6 years were promoted. Dan said the university probably couldn’t handle that. Mary pointed out that in CLA, people can’t afford to live here and can’t wait another 5 years for a raise. Denise indicated that raising the bottom level of salaries has been discussed. Dan said he’s sympathetic and has put in money to get salaries raised and the way to deal with salaries that are too low is to lift the bottom of CLA salaries similar to what was done before. The salaries were lifted from around 33K to 40K. Denise asked how we can do that. Dan said he’d bring it up with Rick, it’s a problem, but at least now there’s going to be funded promotions for NTTF.

(8) The next discussion was about funding promotions for NTTF. Specifically, whether Central will fund promotions for NTTF paid on 12 accounts. Dan said Central will fund raises for people on 13 accounts and departments will fund raises for people on 12 accounts. They won’t have a choice. A discussion about delaying promotions for NTTF faculty due to this funding issue then took place. Dan mentioned that departments fund raises for administrative professionals and state classified employees and the NTTF raises would be similar.

(9) There was a question about NTTF sabbaticals and funding. Dan said it will depend on the department and Central intends to provide funds, but this would have to be reasonable, for example funds for a class release for a month-long class or something.

(10) Jenny mentioned that there was 5 minutes left and Dan finished by saying that if we see things happening that don’t seem right to let him know. Gaming the system is not what is intended with these changes. Dan also said he thinks there is good faith effort being put into these changes. If too many NTTF go up for promotion at the same time, they will have to go back to units to prioritize. There was more discussion about TTF promotions going forward while some NTTF promotions might not go forward & whether this is fair. It was pointed out that the Board of Governors has money for discretionary spending. This was seen as a good point.

(11) Jenny asked if Dan would be willing to share notes/updates from the upcoming Council of Deans meeting. Dan said yes.

d) Ashley Stokes on proposal to convert Extension personnel to faculty

i) Ashley introduced herself and explained that even though extension is one of 3 mission areas at CSU, people in Extension are not considered faculty. Extension has pursued getting people converted to faculty for about 10 years, and the recent changes related to NTTF have given them new hope. A survey indicated that there is lots of interest and some reservations about converting Extension people to NTTF. The lack of a promotional pathway in Extension is also an issue. They have gone through multiple drafts of a proposal based on the work CoNTTF has done. One issue is that by state statute, there can be no contracts in Extension. They’ve received lots of support and have talked to Rick, Dan and Tony. Logistics are the biggest issue. One of biggest is that if they are faculty then they should be in a college. Dan pointed out that Libraries are not in a college and they have TTF and NTTF. There was some more discussion & then Jenny asked what CoNTTF can do to help. Suggestions were made to think about timeline to bring proposal to faculty council and how to present the proposal to faculty council.

**4) MEETING WAS ADJOURNED**

**Draft of possible petition to increase salaries**

**Fair Pay for Faculty at Colorado State University.**

The base salary at CSU is 30% below the median household income in Fort Collins.

In February 2019 the University of Colorado, Boulder raised the minimum instructor salary to $52,000 for Instructors and $60,000 for Senior Instructors.

The Modern Language Association has recommended at least a minimum base salary of $10,900 per 3 credit course.

We, the undersigned, demand that Colorado State University implement a guaranteed minimum salary of at least $52,000 per year for all full-time faculty working at CSU, a minimum salary of $60,000 per year for full-time faculty promoted to Assistant Professor/Senior Instructor, and a minimum salary of $66,000 per year for full-time faculty promoted to Associate Professor/Master Instructor. We demand that this be implemented within all colleges at CSU, beginning in fall semester, 2019.

Salaries across the CSU system should be increased to match their regional cost of living.

**AAUP**

**CSAL**

**Salary Equity Committee**

**NTTF**

**Collegian**

**Coloradoan**

**Poudre School District**