



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

Tuesday, October 8, 1:30-3:00pm
380 LSC

Attendees: Dan Baker, Jenny Morse, Natalie Ooi, Christine Pawliuk, Leslie Stone-Roy, Mary Van Buren, Steve Benoit, Suellen Melzer, Ashley Harvey, Ashley (INTO), Mary Stromberger (Dean of the Graduate School), Alex Bernasek (Associate Dean of College of Liberal Arts; Chair of NTTF Task Force), Sarah Blesenger (HR representative from CLA; NTTF Task Force member), Lisa Kutcher (Chair of Accounting, NTTF Task Force member), Jonothan Carlyon (Chair of Languages, Literature and Culture, NTTF Task Force member)

Minutes: Natalie Ooi

1) MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

- a) CoNTTF Meeting Minutes – September 24, 2019 (p. 2-3):
 - i) Points of clarification raised by Dan Baker regarding archiving case studies and goal-setting on the minutes. Dan will send changes to Jenny to edit the minutes. Jenny will also edit the numbering of items in the minutes
 - (1) With those changes, motion to approve minutes moved by Christine Pawliuk, All in favor.

2) CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS & UPDATES

- a) Meeting Minutes: Natalie Ooi Minutes 10/22: Christine Pawliuk
- b) Campus Equity Week update (gathering in lieu of 10/22 CoNTTF meeting)
 - i) Decided on Avogadro's Number as the venue. There is room and no other competing events so it should be quiet enough for discussion
 - ii) Mary is designing a poster to advertise. Jenny will send her the NTTF listserv for Mary to send out electronically; hard copies will also be distributed.
 - iii) Denise will send out a tentative agenda for Campus Equity Week and all activities organized by CLA. Looks like there will be a discussion and comparison with what CU Boulder is doing with their NTTF (they have been working on this for about 10 years). The chair of their NTTF committee has offered to come and speak to all interested parties during Campus Equity Week. As more information becomes available, Denise will send out location and time.

3) ACTION ITEMS / DISCUSSION

- a) Mary Stromberger and Graduate School Bulletin revision
 - i) Visit to discuss revision to the Graduate School Bulletin that is based on a concern raised by Matt Camper from Agricultural Sciences regarding whether non tenure-track

faculty members on the instructor track are still eligible to serve on graduate committees and chair them as well.

- ii) Mary wanted CoNTTF to review first to see if we had any concerns or questions.
 - iii) Jenny discussed how this consideration of different NTTF tracks is being discussed more broadly across the university, e.g. can NTTF be considered as University Distinguished Professor if they are on the instructor route?
 - iv) Denise mentioned her concerns about the two tracks and how the college of liberal arts is facing challenges regarding the transfer of positions for NTTF who were 'clinical professors' and are now 'instructors' and see this as a downgrade, even though they are technically lateral moves. This issue of advising further plays into this.
 - v) Natalie asked if Graduate School Bulletin trumps department code as there are department codes out there that explicitly state that no NTTF can be on graduate committees, or only those on the Professor Track. Mary explained that if this revision went through, graduate students, if told by their department that NTTF of the relevant ranks were not allowed to be on their committee, they could bring the discussion to the graduate school and challenge this as it would be allowed according to the Graduate School Bulletin. So, technically speaking, the Graduate School Bulletin does trump department code, but if departments are making it known explicitly that students can only choose certain faculty, then in practice, departments are able to influence the role that NTTF play on graduate committees.
 - vi) The hope is that by explicitly making this revision on the Graduate School Bulletin it sets the expectation for departments that NTTF should be allowed to (whether Instructor of Professor Tracks)
 - vii) Mary mentioned that if this revision goes through, she will make sure to communicate it to the college deans and department heads so that they are aware of this.
 - viii) Steve mentioned that his department discussed allowing NTTF to be on graduate committees and concerns were raised that if NTTF are allowed to, are they now expected to for promotion.
 - ix) Overall CoNTTF members think it's a great change and sets a great precedent for the university. It also recognizes that NTTF can be great contributors as advisors and this should be recognized.
 - x) Mary will take this to CoSRGE next and state that it has the support of CoNTTF.
- b) NTT Task Force
- i) Alex provided background on the origins of the NTT Task Force – President's idea to get a group of people together to look at what has been happening with NTTF changes, and assess what is working okay and what needs improvement. Got Provost to agree that this was best done at the level below senior administration (department chairs, HR officers, OGC representative for the legal perspective, External Affairs Communication representative, Budget officer, and Joseph Di Verdi as Chair of Strategic and Financial Planning and CoNTTF member)
 - ii) Task force is looking at a shortened list of NTTF issues to focus on and wants CoNTTF input on priority and other suggestions
 - iii) Provost's top 3 that he wants the NTTF Task Force to look at:
 - (1) Service credit (STAs) and early promotion consideration for promotion
 - (2) Expectations for service and what this will do for NTTF workloads and compensation
 - (a) Provost is pushing for a minimum service expectation for those on 50% load or more (justification for this is because of base pay increases – in his mind he has tied this to service expectations)
 - (3) Appointment types and ranks – confusion among departments regarding what appointments people should be on and why

- (a) E.g. how do you deal with concurrent appointments where a NTTF might be on a contract in one department, but continuing in another – what do we do from a HR perspective
 - (b) Concerns regarding how contracts are administered
 - (c) Much of this discussion is nuts and bolts administratively focused.
- iv) Second-wave issues
- (1) How do we deal with online appointments
 - (2) Professional development leave (should start in the spring)
 - (a) What does this look like? Is it appropriate?
 - (3) Accountability and best practices – holding departments and colleges accountable
- v) Alex outlined the NTTF Task Force recommendations so far:
- (1) NTTF Promotions
 - (a) In general, service credit is not being considered unless for exceptional hires. Same with cases early promotion.
 - (b) Would be useful to have something in the manual that clarifies this (much like there is with TT faculty)
 - (2) STAs – Task Force is in disagreement with Provost regarding when the clock starts for promotion. Task Force sees STAs to be at an equivalent rank of senior instructor. This is not seen to be a promotion but a lateral move (clock should not be reset)
 - (a) Task Force recommends that any STA that qualifies to go from Senior to Master Instructor should go for promotion next year – don't restrict them or stagger them. Just make the process less onerous. It's just not fair.
 - (b) To make this process doable, the Task Force is recommending two letters (one internal, one external) instead of five, until the process gets underway and the backlog is cleared. The recommendation is that this should extend for all NTTF on Instructor Track for the meantime – this could be reviewed later on in the future
 - (c) Task Force recommend that all departments need to provide guidance to NTTF going for promotion regarding what documents need to be provided for external review. This needs to be codified at the department level for clarity and transparency.
 - (3) Jenny mentioned that the recommendations on two letters for NTTF promotion on the Instructor Track is something she approves of as it is an area of concern for many NTTF and departments. Alex asked if we should make the letter requirement more open – not specify if it has to be internal or external, etc. Suggestion from Ashley Harvey to state a minimum of external letters, but then leave it open.
 - (4) Discussion on whether we need a maximum number of letters to stop departments from requiring a lot more. Alex mentioned that they will make an explicit recommendation of two letter maximum.
 - (5) \$45K is the new base for a terminal degree and \$43K to distinguish those without terminal degree. For adjuncts less than 40% get \$40,500 base. The argument from the Provost is that for the adjuncts, they are doing a 'different job'. Task Force disagrees and is recommending that they get rid of the \$40,500 base. Jenny raised concerns as in the listening session (where this is announced) that there should only be one base \$45K and FTE addresses how much adjuncts get paid depending on courses taught.
 - (6) Provost is also arguing that the \$45K needs to include service, however, the understanding was that the \$45K base was for the job NTTF are already doing, and that service should be on top and compensated in addition.

- (7) Jenny argues that base is base – it means it is the base amount the university will pay. Discussion about clarification regarding whether that was formally associated with those on terminal degrees, or base in general for all NTTF.
- (8) Natalie raised concern about the lack of consistency across the university as to what is a 100% FTE. If we do not understand this better, then how are we going to accommodate for service expectations, etc.
- (9) Alex agreed on the importance of better defining what is 100% and coming up with a way that helps differentiate between different pay rates and expectations across the departments, etc.
- (10) Jenny talks about the importance of protecting hours and not going to an hourly system that ‘counts hours’ because that would be to our detriment
- (11) Discussion among group about department variations of what 100% is and how it is allocated every year and how a lot of work is not accounted for.
- (12) Jenny highlighted the issue that NTTF does not have the same ability to advocate for themselves within their departments which is why it is important that this be addressed in this broader discussion
- (13) Alex mentioned the possibility of the Task Force recommending a maximum of 12 credits a semester as full time. Departments can allow for less, but that needs to be the maximum so that is a campus-wide understanding of what is 100%. Alex highlighted that this needs to go into the faculty manual to be effective.
- (14) Jonothan recognized the importance of CoNTTF really playing a key role in defining what service looks like and how that be integrated into current workloads
- (15) Ashley Harvey raised the question of whether there be an hours guideline to help define what 5% or 10% service on average looks like. Jenny recommended that just like FTE, maybe there could be a suggestion regarding what the maximum amount of service for a certain % looks like.
- (16) Natalie raised the question about what the department head perspectives are regarding ‘buying out’ NTTF for service – how is this received and how do they afford it? Jonothan and Lisa mentioned that much of that salary discussion and the need for supplemental pay is decided at the dean’s level – not at the department head level. So, they would have to go to the dean to ask for supplemental pay. Highlighted the issue and challenges for some departments to allow to ‘release’ some NTTF for service.
- (17) Alex highlighted how maybe to fund things like service, there is a need for a central guarantee because the reality is that some departments can afford to pay, and some cannot. Much like parental leave is a cost borne by central, this should be the case for service too perhaps.
- (18) Lisa raised the question as to how to better introduce service for NTTF within the College of Business. She drew on her past example of what happened for TT faculty in her departments which was not well received.
- (19) Alex is open for some CoNTTF members to attend the Task Force meetings (we already have a representative in Joseph there) or send some bullet points or questions for the Task Force to consider ahead of time.
- (20) Natalie and Mary raised the importance of enforcement and accountability to ensure that manual changes etc. are actually being enforced and implemented in good faith. Otherwise, any recommendations or changes end up being ignored with little consequence.

4) **ADJOURN: 3.03pm**

C.2.1.3.1 Elected Members *(last revised May 2, 2007)*

Each academic department and the Libraries shall elect one (1) representative. An additional number of representatives, equal approximately to one-third (1/3) of the number of representatives elected from the departments and the Libraries, shall be elected at large by and from the colleges and the Libraries as required to achieve, as nearly as practical, membership proportional to the number of regular, regular part-time, and transitional faculty members in the colleges and Libraries.

All faculty representatives to the Faculty Council shall hold regular full-time, regular part-time, or transitional appointments and shall not hold an administrative appointment of more than half-time (0.5) at the level of assistant/associate dean or above. A faculty representative to the Faculty Council who becomes ineligible shall cease to hold this position.

From a series of emails with Joseph:

He shares CNS NTTF doc (attached to agenda email) with me.

My response: This is lovely. Question, is the required professional development for Senior and Master Instructors paid? And how does it factor into workload?

Joseph (original in black) asks an associate CNS dean and gets this response (in blue):

I've shared the CNS document regarding NTTF ranks (attached) with CoNTTF as a best practices tool and the committee has expressed appreciation and some question. I'm not immediately familiar with the answer nor the composition of the executive committee although I'm betting you are in there.

The questions surround the professional development for the Instructor and Senior Instructor ranks. The document reads as though the professional development is viewed as a requirement rather than a perk.

A requirement.

Is this the spirit? What about compensation for such development?

The cost of professional development activities for NTTF members is expected to be borne by the department. Obviously an agreement needs to be reached between the NTTF member and the department. A three-week workshop in Hawaii in November, while assuredly advancing the expertise of the NTTF member, might be difficult to schedule and fund.

Will this be paid and considered to be time off or on?

My first answer was "yes", but now I am thinking more carefully.

That is trickier for the following reasons. It is difficult to take a week long training workshop during the semester for reasons of course coverage. If it were possible, e.g., a Friday workshop for a NTTF member with a TR teaching schedule, it would certainly be paid time. It is difficult to know how to compensate for a weekend training course. What if a NTTF member on a 9-month contract attends a week long workshop in June? Certainly they should not be out of pocket, and any fees, travel, accommodation and meals should be paid for by the department, but should they be paid a week's salary? My initial response is "no". Certainly there would be no expectation from a TTF faculty member on a 9-month appointment who attended a conference or workshop during the summer. OK, there is more to this than I had at first thought. I hope to get Jan's ear tomorrow.

Question from Natalie Ooi:

I met with HR for WCNR today to talk about some of our appointments and one of the issues raised is that we have a handful of administrative professionals across the department who are primarily academic advisors (probably 80% of their role on average) but also teach one or two courses.

Given that they are APs we have established they are not covered regarding academic freedom, as that applies only to faculty in the faculty manual. Talking to HR, the university is not keen on joint appointments as it makes it tricky in terms of pay rates, differences in leave eligibility, etc. between the potential two appointments.

One way we were considering that these APs could be protected is by granting them affiliate faculty status (just needs a department vote). My question is – would that make them be considered faculty to cover their academic freedom in the courses they teach? If you look at the manual, affiliate faculty is not one of the basic types of faculty appointment, however, E.2.2 considered affiliate faculty under ‘other faculty appointments’ which makes it seem they are....

Any thoughts on this?

I don't think these folks in my department are inaccurately classified as APs – the large majority of what they do best fits in this category. But what we are looking for is some degree of protection for them in the classroom as well.

Proposal to make the Chair of CoNTTF an administratively funded position

Serving as the Chair of the Committee on Non Tenure Track Faculty is a herculean task. I have taken this responsibility seriously and done it to the best of my ability. However, representing more than 780 faculty whose voices have been regularly left out of faculty governance and whose power in their departments and colleges is often so minimal as to have federal laws violated without consequence is overwhelming and unmanageable on top of the central duty for which I was hired: teaching.

While I have been chair of CoNTTF, the chair of CoNTTF has been asked to serve on additional committees (the Committee on Teaching and Learning, the Committee for Strategic and Financial Planning, the President's Council on Culture); to present at the Fall Forum, Faculty Council, Council of Deans, the annual NTTF Reception, and in other arenas; to advise departments, colleges, and deans on a regular basis; to meet with people in substantially stronger positions of relative power including the President, Provost, Vice Provosts, Deans, and others without appropriate pay (I have earned a total of about \$4000 over the last 3.5 years in supplemental pay for this service), service in my workload, or the realistic ability to say no. For evidence of the substantial burden of labor, which has to this point been provided primarily without adequate adjustments to the workload or pay, CoNTTF's annual reports for the last 3 years and a detailed account of my service since submitting this year's annual report are attached to this proposal.

Last year, the chair was written into the Faculty Manual as someone who would be called on to serve, alongside the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, Chair of Faculty Council, and University Grievance Officer, in review of the termination of non-tenure track faculty contracts. The entry into the manual of the person in this position on equal terms as these three other funded governance and administrative positions, all three of whom have tenure which allows that even if they were removed from their governance or administrative role, they would still retain their faculty position, requires that chairing CoNTTF become a funded and secured position as well.

Therefore, CoNTTF respectfully requests that the chair of CoNTTF be funded in the following ways:

- The chair will have at least 25% of their workload dedicated to service, which will mean a corresponding reduction in other duties for the duration of their service;
- The chair will be paid an additional 1/9 of their salary or the salary of the lowest paid Faculty Council Officer, whichever is greater, for 3 additional months each year for the duration of their service;
- And the chair will be employed on annually renewing 3-year contracts which cannot be terminated or non-renewed for any reason including inadequate department-level funding, so that their faculty position is guaranteed for at least 2 years beyond their service as chair.