



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

Tuesday, March 10, 1:30-3:00pm  
390 LSC

**In Attendance:** Jenny Morse (chair), Sean Bryan (subst. for Natalie Ooi), Christine Pawliuk, Suellen Melzer, Leann Kaiser, Megan Hollis, Denise Apodaca, Steve Benoit, Dan Baker; Guests (NTTF Taskforce): Joseph DiVerdi, Alex Bernasek

**1) MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

- a) CoNTTF Meeting Minutes – Feb 18, 2020 (p. 2-3)
  - i) Motion to approve: Steve; Second: Christine

**2) CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS & UPDATES**

- a) Meeting Minutes: 3/10: Suellen; 3/24: Steve
- b) Adriana Kazar visiting April 6 at 4pm with Maria Maisto
  - i) Location TBA
- c) Update on motions
  - i) Section E motions- pulled from executive committee
  - ii) Section C (representation of how we are represented on Faculty Council):
    - (1) This motion has been discussed in faculty council
    - (2) Tentative meeting with CoFG on March 31 at 2pm

**3) ACTION ITEMS / DISCUSSION**

- a) Leann's idea for the Faculty Council award
  - i) Seeking committee contribution to nominate Jenny Morse for this award
    - (1) nomination letter, form (is this the same as nomination letter?), and suggestions of who could contribute 3 additional letters
      - (a) possible contribution for letter: Sue Doe
    - (2) Annual reports will help inform nomination letter
- b) Visit with the NTTF Task Force
  - i) Materials attached to email
    - (1) Alex distributed a summary of the report on new changes to NTTF
      - (a) This condescend report includes comments by Rick and Dan, but continues to be an iterative process
      - (b) The intent is to distribute across campus
        - (i) There was discussion to wait for new provost, but most agree it best to get this sent asap
      - (2) CoNTTF went through summary report
        - (a) Joseph clarified that external letters are not really letters, but outside approval of packet
        - (b) TILT's teaching effectiveness- area that is going to be pushed for mentorship in the promotion process
        - (c) CLA is promoting workshops to communicate examples of effective Dossiers

- (i) How to complete the provost document and what to include in the extra and more flexible appendices
  - (d) Discussed how we resolve the problem of individuals going up for promotion if their percent workload has shifted within the interval of time assessed.
    - 1. Example: an individual with 100% teaching for 4 years shifted to a higher research responsibility in year 5 and was denied for promotion because the effort distribution was not accounted for meeting criteria.
    - 2. Professor tracks generally have some component of research
      - i. Promotion determination should be based on the sum of an individual's 5 years what-ever that workload might have been
      - ii. All agree that there should be a formal way to quantify this
    - 3. We need to continue working on this messaging and with regards to TTF, the process of NTTF is a parallel process, but not a parallel reward
  - (e) The current summary report does not consider faculty with concurrent assignments and this remains a question that needs to be addressed
    - a. We want people to have a home department and not be split
      - i. Makes it easier to meet promotional requirements
      - ii. Might there be a process to switch home departments?
      - iii. OGC process is a responsibility of the home department if they want to drop a faculty
  - (f) Service credit
    - (i) It is unknown how department chairs value service
    - (ii) Service and workload
      - 1. This is not to put more work, but to have a place to recognize and have a place to count it
        - a. 5% minimum effort contribution to acknowledge that they are doing this and a place to report
        - b. You can opt out, but then that also translated to 5% less pay
        - c. At the senior- and master- instructor level and professor levels it's 10% service
          - i. Next stage is to provide examples of what one could do for this amount
          - ii. Arguing for a coarse numerical evaluation for service
          - iii. Example: 10% is maybe 4 hours a week; if you're going beyond , then you should be getting superior on service
          - iv. Service rubric will protect TTF as well
  - (g) Base salaries
    - 1. Based on terminal degree
    - 2. Office of general council: OGC is on board to revise offer letters
    - 3. Jenny: New law: COMPS: effective March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020 to raise minimum salary to 55k by 2024 and 57.5k for 2026, 12-month annualized salary
      - a. Will we be exempt or if non- exempt how to account?
      - b. Currently, we are exempt from overtime pay
      - c. Non-exempt can track hours for overtime
      - d. The report has the 9-mo salary
      - e. Manual section E12-3
- c) Denise voiced concern on using the recently approved "instructor pathway" and suggests that it still diminishes what NTTF do

- i) Externally not perceived the same and although we say its lateral, it's not really lateral
- ii) Next year (2021-2022), committee may explore the option of deleting senior and master instructor
  - (1) eliminate the 2 tracks into one
  - (2) Start using the word scholarship instead of research to cover that category of requirement
- iii) One track was originally proposed in 2016
  - (1) Christine will put original 2016 report on the website
- d) Taskforce is not currently on April FC agenda. Joseph will meet with Tim Gallagher to get on the next faculty council meeting
- e) Dan has the IR data and still needs to analyze
  - i) Will report data on April 7<sup>th</sup>
    - (1) Committee to think about what stories we want to tell with this data, the optics?
    - (2) Can pull previous years, but this data set is just from this year
    - (3) Christine will preview website on April 7th

#### **4) Adjourn 2:55**