

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

**Meeting Minutes**

Tuesday, November 13, 1:30-3:00pm392 Lory Student Center

Attendees: Jenny Morse, Natalie Ooi, Steve Benoit, Christine Pawliuk, Denise Apodaca Mary Van Buren, Patty Stutz-Tanenbaum, Dan Baker, Sue Ellen Melzer.

1. Minutes from Oct 30th approved – moved by Patty, seconded by Steve.
   1. Minutes for November 27 meeting will be taken by Denise Apodaca
2. Chair announcements & updates
   1. We can forego the finals week meeting – the Nov 27th meeting will be the last of the semester. Approved unanimously.
   2. CORSAF’s changes to E.13 passed in faculty council. This establishes the promotional pathways and core guidelines for promotion.
   3. CoNTTF may want to assemble a list of NTTF that have not been promoted but who would be eligible for promotion (those who have been here 5 years in rank or those who should be eligible in our view) to begin monitoring whether promotions are being used by departments. We could include NTTF who have received a promotion recently (before the E.13 changes) who would not have received the centrally-funded salary bump. We may want to give people the option to not be included on such a list. This would also let administration know that CoNTTF is monitoring status of the adoption of the new policies.
   4. Employees are now the initiators of the promotion process – we may need a way to inform NTTF that they are now responsible for initiating the promotion process.
   5. We could write a request for the Salary Equity Committee to look into NTTF salaries in the context of the new policies, but this needs to happen after people have been moved into the new appointment types. That committee might view work on NTTF salary as a way to address gender inequities, since a higher percentage of NTTF are women than the population at large.
3. Action Items & Discussion
   1. CoRSAF proposals to section E.11 to strengthen contracts.
      1. This is a new section that specifies a procedure for how a contract can be terminated (by the University) early. The goal was to provide a procedure for people who may not have the same access to the grievance process as TTF.
      2. Sue Doe expressed concern that people on contracts don’t need a separate process, but contract employees should have access to the regular grievance process.
      3. This proposal will likely be on the December faculty council agenda.
      4. Jenny will ask CoRSAF (Marie and Richard) why this section is necessary. There is some concern that this proposal was developed without CoNTTF input or review.
      5. Sue Doe suggested Steve Mumme or someone from AAPU (or a department representative) could frame a response to the proposal, questioning why one class of employee would need different protections than other type of faculty. We can wait to hear the response from Marie/Richard before deciding how to proceed.
   2. Update on the NTTF reception
      1. Jenny was asked to speak at the NTTF reception, but was asked for forward bullet points for approval. Jenny shared a quick summary of bullet points.
   3. Updates on projects:
      1. Christine on INTO – they have 21 faculty, and a rep on the CLA committee. They are building a committee to work on promotion policies. The impression is that the program is in decline.
      2. Natalie on Extension – Most are in Ag, some in HDFS. Some are already classified as faculty, but key positions (county agents and specialists) who are A.P.s, even though some have terminal degrees. The problem is that CSU Extension has no promotional pathways for those not tenure-track faculty. A.P.s have ranks, but they can’t move unless job responsibilities change, and the extension jobs don’t change over time. Their desire to become faculty is to allow the possibility of advancement without changes to job description. There are roughly 230 people who could potentially move to faculty positions. Other institutions have classified extension agents as faculty. There is a perceived risk of conversion to NTTF that the numbers of NTTF would jump significantly. An idea floated by administration is to create a new category for Extension (new appointment types and ranks) that would not merge them into the NTTF category. Extension plans to work with CoRSAF in SP19 to develop a proposal, and CoNTTF can see how we can contribute to the effort. An open question is who would represent these faculty members in faculty governance and on committees (they currently have home departments, represented by their department reps on councils – who would represent those without a home department)
      3. Jenny on COB instructional coordinators – these roughly 30 people are hired for grading in COB. They were faculty at one time, then got moved to A.P., and then were moved to faculty again, but without teaching-based base pay guidelines. They are currently classified as temporary instructors, and have no voting rights, promotion path, representation, evaluations, etc. This is a population who will be reticent to challenge the status quo out of fear of retribution. They get a new contract every 8 weeks. This is a very vulnerable population, but should have representation, and should be treated consistently with other faculty, etc.
      4. Dan asked if anyone else wanted to take part in analyzing the IR data – Mary said she was available and could help.
      5. Salary comparison data – the spreadsheet that Jenny sent to the group that shows revenue vs. salary for NTTF – this is based on in-state tuition for on-campus courses taught and does not include research money and online teaching.
      6. Regarding the NTTF reception, the invitation does not appear to have been sent to all NTTF – CoNTTF might be able to re-send that invitation to all NTTF, or we can send it to college committees. Jenny will contact CSU events so they know the invitation has not reached all NTTF.
4. Adjourn