



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

Tuesday, April 7, 1:30-3:00pm
Zoom

In Attendance: Jenny Morse (chair), Dan Baker, Steve Benoit, Joseph DiVerdi, Leann Kaiser, Suellen Melzer, Christine Pawliuk, Leslie Stone-Roy, Denise Apodaca, Steve Benoit, Ashley Harvey, Sean Bryan.

1) MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

- a) CoNTTF Meeting Minutes – Mar 10, 2020
 - i) Motion to approve: Dan Baker; Second: Christine

2) CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS & UPDATES

- a) Meeting Minutes: Steve April 21: Christine
- b) Retirement Plan Review Committee
 - i) A message was forwarded from John Elder. The issue was raised in the March Faculty Council meeting - there is a concern about the handling of the retirement benefits funds since 2003.
 - ii) A new committee is being formed to examine these issues; they would like NTTF representation on the committee.
 - (1) John Elder suggested Chris Stein (College of Business NTTF committee)
 - (2) Robin from HR expressed interest in having someone not from College of Business providing representation, since there are many from CoB already involved.
 - (3) The commitment would be for 54 weeks during engagement with an external consultant.
 - (4) Jenny mentioned Joseph as someone with experience chairing committees.
 - (5) Joseph: John Elder served on my committee for a year, this is an important topic, and it seems to have been poorly managed. Sue Doe will be taking over as chair of F.C., so Sue trading into the role reduces the Business college participating. Jenny: It's not clear Sue would swap in since the 54-week timer has started -Tim may remain. Joseph offered to serve.
 - (6) Jenny will propose Joseph as a committee member as an alternative to Chris Stein, and will indicate support of their effort to review the handling of the plan.
 - (7) This issue will be discussed at the F.C. meeting this afternoon, Robin and Terry from HR will be there to present.

3) ACTION ITEMS / DISCUSSION

- a) Debrief on CoFG meeting and response
 - i) We were invited to the CoFG meeting – we summarized our proposals but were met with significant pushback by Don Estep. He argued that NTTF would be better served by having a separate council and presented his perspective on the role of faculty governance, which differed from the view that it represents shared governance and that NTTF faculty should be represented.
 - ii) Dan: Don seems to want to prevent diluting TTF influence. Jenny: True – he pointed out the difficulty in forming consensus, to be more difficult by addition of NTTF.

- iii) Jenny: We should respond to Steve Reising with our reactions.
 - iv) Joseph: perhaps our response should not focus on the negative tone presented by CoFG, but to return to articulating the core principles.
 - v) Jenny: We should thank them for the meeting, express regret that we could not spend time on the actual proposals rather than the discussion that occurred.
 - vi) Joseph: This is not new language from Don – it has been his position for a long time. He feels administration has too much power over faculty.
 - vii) Jenny will draft a response – thanking them and asking for questions or suggestions regarding the proposals. Denise: focus on the positive comments from some of the other CoFG members and try to move the proposal forward. Jenny: we can ask for the best next steps. Ashley: the risk then is that those who were not at the meeting would not hear our response to the criticisms raised by Don. Jenny: we can include some material to address this in the response. There's not a rush – the proposals need to go to EC before FC, and we only have the May FC meeting left this year. We need to know if they will put the proposals forward in May.
 - viii) Leslie: The CoFG member from our college is in support of moving the proposal forward. Jenny: The Liberal Arts rep is also in favor, and the College of Ag. rep as well.
 - ix) Jenny will draft a response, circulate it before sending it.
- b) Statement on Equity and Covid-19
- i) There is a committee in Ag (Women in Agricultural Sciences) drafting a letter in support of equity during the COVID situation. They asked if CoNTTF was doing something similar. Jenny: Should we have a statement on equity? Do we have concerns about NTTF an inequitable treatment during this situation?
 - ii) Leslie: we should ask for input to see how NTTF are doing.
 - iii) Jenny: agreed – we've been working individually, not reaching out to see how it's going.
 - iv) Leslie: it could be that NTTF get more work allocated to them during this crisis.
 - v) Denise: We could "second" the letter being written.
 - vi) Jenny: No one is getting extra compensation for the extra work – this is a faculty issue rather than an NTTF issue. Also, will some faculty get stuck teaching online since the ROI is greater? Some NTTF won't know if they will get hired in Fall, will have more uncertainty than TTF.
 - vii) Denise: Concern for renewal of contracts in the face of an expected 10% or more enrollment decline. We may not know until May 1 how many students accept and what enrollment may look like. NTTF will be affected more by budget factors. There is also fear that promotions to Sr. Instructor that are in-process may not get finalized and become official.
 - viii) Jenny: Students get messages "here are resources to help you", but there is not as similar messaging available for faculty for help with things beyond teaching.
 - ix) Joseph: contingent faculty are suffering the same problems but have exaggerated concerns because of their contingency.
 - x) Jenny: Flexibility, which administration has argued for, is now putting NTTF at risk. The question would be – should we draft a statement at all.
 - xi) Denise: it's good to continue to make the president aware that we are still here.
 - xii) The consensus is that we should write something, even something simple.
- c) UCC item on F.C. agenda:
- i) There is a concern that UCC supports addition of all instructional formats for all existing courses and all future course proposals as well. The rationale is to accommodate unique

- circumstances now, but the concern that this could change how instruction is delivered in the future, since there is no end date on the approval.
- ii) Many courses are designed for online delivery, and are not best delivered online, and it would not be a benefit if they had to be taught online.
 - iii) Dan: There is a benefit to getting fast approval for online sections – it usually takes time to get that approved.
 - iv) Leslie: Students may like online less – it might be good to survey the students to decide whether online formats are a good idea.
 - v) Denise: Many teachers have never signed into Canvas and are struggling with conversion to online or are overcompensating with assignments.
 - vi) Jenny: Dan Bush says students are being surveyed, but we don't know when/if we would get access to that data. There is an advantage to fast approval during the emergency situation, but NTTF often don't have input on curricular decisions, so there's a risk decisions will be made regarding how to offer a course without input from the instructors who will teach.
 - vii) Suellen: I believe any course could be taught online, but students may not get as much out of it as for a face-to-face. Joseph: some courses with hands-on situations would not work – for example vet school, working with animals, like a cow.
 - viii) Jenny: Long-term, we would be saying that the course that's designed today will work as an online course in a non-emergency situation.
 - ix) Joseph: Some accreditation bodies won't accept online delivery of some lab courses.
 - x) Leann: having approval for online does not force online delivery. Jenny: what if NTTF get told that they are teaching online (at a possibly reduced pay scale), without choice. Leann: instructors who have not done online courses before are not really online instructors now, simply because of emergency conversion to online delivery of a face-to-face course.
- d) Dan on IR data
 - i) Not much to report. The data is here – we have ranges/medians of salaries, but data has not been analyzed yet.
 - e) Christine on website
 - i) Progress has been made – the accessibility team suggested changes, and they have been done. Web Communications just needs to put the site up.

4) Adjourned at 2:49