



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

Tuesday, December 1, 1:30-3:00pm  
Zoom

Jenny Morse, Denise Apodaca, Steve Benoit, Joseph DiVerdi, Megan Hollis, Leann Kaiser, Suellen Melzer, Jamie Neilson, Christine Pawliuk, Natalie Ooi, Pinar Omur-Ozbek, Leslie Stone-Roy.

Guests from TILT: Gwen Gorzelsky, Tonya Buchan joined at 2 pm

**1) MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

- a) CoNNTTF Meeting Minutes – November 16, 2020 (p. 2)
  - i) Moved to approve: Joseph. Seconded: Leslie. Approved unanimously.

**2) CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS & UPDATES**

- a) Meeting Minutes: Pinar Omur-Ozbek                      Dec 15: Cancelled

**3) ACTION ITEMS / DISCUSSION**

- a) Section C proposals on FC agenda for today prep
- b) Gwen Gorzelsky and Teaching Effectiveness 2-2:30pm

**4) MEETING MINUTES**

- a) The committee unanimously decided to cancel the December 15<sup>th</sup> meeting and will continue on January 19<sup>th</sup> (tentatively) and on Tuesdays at 1:30 pm, as usual.
- b) Suellen asked about the CCAF committee progress and we currently haven't heard anything back, Joseph said.
- c) Jenny brought up the committee: FAIR that was established for the continuity of teaching in response to the disruption caused due to the pandemic. They have been soliciting input for the considerations for S/U grades, grading extension, late withdrawal, etc and potential concerns and consequences, the financial aid problems (that committee cleared it saying no problem), registrar's office is on board with late withdrawal and S/U grading. The goal by the advising team is to determine if there would be any negative consequences. Joseph indicated he supports it, and it is essential to take it easy this semester especially. 4500 students used the S/U grading option for at least one course. There wasn't a significant difference between the at risk (marginalized, first gen students) versus others. Joseph asked about the details (was it all courses, one course, etc., and I filled that in after the Faculty council meeting). Incomplete was not favored, as it is too much work, and also not very helpful for the students.
- d) Section C proposal is on the faculty council agenda this evening. First two motions are for faculty governance, we are motions 3 and 4. Steve Reising will present them most likely, but it may go back to Jenny. Jenny asked to keep them as separate motions in regards to two separate discussions, and each not tying each other up. Steve should say we vote yes for this to include NNTF/CCAF. Ideally this one should go easily. One of the COB members may ask for the CoNNTTF to be dissolved before we go for this motion. Leslie asked about the reasoning behind it. Jenny: if NNTF are included, a special committee is not needed.

Joseph: Let's take that suggestion under advisement and bring it up at another meeting. Sue Doe may rule it out as it may not warrant a discussion. Denise: We will reassemble with a presentation and by then they will forget about it. Leslie: Why think about it before rather than after? Jenny: We will be doubling the representation then. We may look like we have more power than TTF. Leslie: It should be discussed after. Jenny: They want to get rid of CoNNTF. Denise and Joseph will respond if dissolving CoNNTF comes up. Jenny: When it was brought up she responded we are willing to talk about that in the future, but let's first see what's going on. A "transition period" will be necessary. CCAF should be included first, before dissolving the committee. Steve: Other colleges may push back, especially Engineering, even though it would be a fairer distribution. This is like our government situation, and we need a census, it is 35 years overdue. Joseph: Very logical and reasonable approach. The second motion: Steve will do 2<sup>nd</sup> one: are NTTF eligible to serve as representatives? Jenny expects to have more discussion behind it. Business didn't like it. Natalie and Pinar: Their departments were on board. Natalie hasn't heard from others. Jenny: committees should go back and forth to decide on the number of faculty on faculty council. It looks like faculty council is hoping for no's for both motions. Leann: Is it worth going over the feedback slides? Jenny: Most of the feedback came from Business.

- e) Gwen and Tonya arrived at 2 pm. We went through the introductions. Tonya shared her presentation to go over the document and solicit feedback. Teaching effectiveness framework document: how do we share the framework and have faculty participate (incentives)? They want to do the background research and with workshops share the information with the faculty and graduate students. The program goal is to have similar pillars such as inclusive pedagogy, cultivating culture of growth through self-reflection and goal setting, etc., and help faculty to grow their teaching practice. There is interest on campus for inclusive pedagogy, so there is extra emphasis on it. They aim for common language and evidence based teaching practices. Provide professional development for faculty and graduate students. The program includes 10 professional development experience units plus reflection. Self-reflection is a critical component. They try to make it fair for the credits to be earned through various activities: one hour workshop versus daylong conference. Domain experience units equivalents could be: TILT summer conference, TILT calendar for events, MTI workshops could be aligned to the domain, instructional strategies, MTI, teaching squares, professional reading, other CSU activates (adults education training), workshops at conferences in our discipline. What drives faculty to develop a teaching practice? The methods should be tried a few times until you get the results you are looking for. Talking to others and sharing the experiences – community practice is desired. Self-reflection can be used a part of the annual review. There will be several achievement certificate tiers: letter of commendation from the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, then the Provost, and a potential stipend for completing all domains. Refer to Appendix B on the proposal document for an the example of completed self-reflection form after attending an outside event. You can work on a domain individually or may concurrently work on a few domains at the same time. It would be great if the reflections align with the FAR documents, faculty and department heads indicated. The forms may be updated to make sure they overlap. There will be another revision to incorporate the feedback, so the proposal is still in draft form. Asked for comments and suggestions.

Natalie: pie chart is a nice start but evaluation component is tough, teaching goals as a part of the evaluations could be derived from it, however one of the challenges is that beyond an individual showing the interest, and after they complete the activities, how do we evaluate

what they really did? What did they change or incorporate into their classes? It is self-reported and subjective and hard to check, her department wants to hire an external evaluator. Would TILT be interested in having an external evaluator to help report what is really being done?

Gwen: Teaching effectiveness framework, there are documents to demonstrate the effectiveness, there are different types of evidence, such as course surveys, letters, informal surveys, scores on exams, classroom observation protocol for undergrads STEM (COPUS), peer review of syllabus, assignments, new materials. TPI (teaching practices inventory) will indicate that the practices are heading in the right direction. There are strengths and limits to the “evidence” document. Link: <https://tilt.colostate.edu/ProDev/TEF/DevEval>

Suellen: In college of agriculture there is a similar problem with the actual metrics, Leann created a rubric for school of education, tailored it for agriculture for guidelines for what to do over 5 years for promotion to senior/master instructor or professor, referenced the teaching effectiveness framework, they prepared rubrics to assess the documents/activities for promotion, now there is this new experience by TILT, how will it be incorporated? Maybe as completing two domains for a promotion?. Having the metrics and documented activities to be completed is good for promotion. Yet, the proof is still needed, because attending a workshop doesn't mean the instructor will be a better teacher. It is a great start, but how do things relate to each other and where do the things fit in? College of ag. Already developed a good rubric for promotion.

Gwen: Agrees. The challenge is there, professional development is not a guarantee, if it is not applied or if it is misapplied, the benefits will not happen. The suite of offerings is there so that every college or department may find something that they are most interested in. The material developed for the pandemic made it clear that it can be overwhelming. There will be how to segments in the offerings so that the faculty and department heads will be able to utilize it for evaluations. Short, medium and long term assessments are being developed. They have built in surveys for it. Pre and post surveys to see if there is a change. Do faculty change the number of practices in their courses, for example? They also check for the student success rate, student grades for faculty who completed the experiences and others who didn't as an aggregate, and after years they will be able to know how participating professional development works. CLA chair met with Gwen and the departments to set priorities. The trends in student grades D F W will be examined, and efforts will be made to make the necessary change for students to succeed. The domain faculty need to focus first will be based on that data. Faculty and TILT need to have a conversation for effective improvement.

Tonya: In her opinion the program should be optional, it should be the tool to help the faculty follow a path, as opposed to being a requirement. It may be better to call it a pilot initially to achieve this vision. The program is at its early stages.

Suellen: Feedback she got was: it is good to incorporate into evaluation rubrics, but because it is varied between faculty they don't want it to be mandatory for the promotional pathway. They will inform the faculty and encourage completing the domains, but will not penalize for not attending/completing. Great tool for faculty.

We can email Tonya for extra comments and questions. She would be happy to come back during another meeting. [tonya.buchan@colostate.edu](mailto:tonya.buchan@colostate.edu)

Jenny: It is great to have extra details on the domains, activities, credits, etc. The award comes way at the end, it would be better if it was earlier.

Suellen: Can we share the document?

Gwen: As long as it is specified that it is a draft. The document is being updated. The goal is to make it flexible for all faculty and not overwhelming.

The final document will be on the TILT website along with the teaching effectiveness framework materials. There will be a roll out and communication when it happens, most likely at the kickoff at spring PDI in May 2021.

Suellen: How are the activities recorded and tracked?

Tonya: Nolan Smith is starting to work on a registration system (and a database). And faculty would log in, answer questions (the changes to make, the evidence, etc.) and then the records will be kept. Ultimately it can be printed out as a pdf to utilize it for any purpose like evaluations.

Gwen: The platform will, once you complete the units, e-mail you of your achievements and send a certificate and remind you of other activities to be completed. For the information on activities outside of CSU, faculty will need to submit it on that platform. There will be good examples on how to fill out forms and report on experiences outside of CSU.

**5) Adjourn at 2:50 pm**