



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

Tuesday, September 8, 2020, 1:30-3:00pm (Zoom)

Attendees

Jenny Morse, Steve Benoit, James Neilson, Christne Pawliuk, Leann Kaiser, Leslie Stone-Roy, Suellen Melzer, Pinar Omur-Ozbek, Joseph DiVerdi, Natalie Ooi, Sue Doe (Faculty Council Chair)

Chair Announcements and Updates

- Meeting minutes: Steve Benoit
- Approved meeting minutes (Joseph moved, Steve seconded)
- Sue Doe (chair of Faculty Council) visiting - Introductions
- Debrief from Faculty Council meeting
 - Discussion of Joseph's self-nomination for vice chair, and possibility of future discussion of NTTF eligibility for faculty council committees or leadership.
 - No contact from CoFG since the FC meeting.
 - CoTL was looking at whether an NTTF could serve as a member, and was told by CoFG that they could of CoTL was a specialized standing committee, which would imply every CoTL member would become a voting member of Faculty council. CoTL would still like to allow NTTF members, without having to have each member do double-duty as faculty council members.
 - Jenny suggested that if an NTTF could serve on faculty council in general, they would automatically be eligible to serve on standing subcommittees. Joseph agreed that this is a good argument and that this should be the main goal - that all appointment types should be eligible to serve.
 - Jenny mentioned that the motions currently being reviewed by CoFG should accomplish most of this. Jenny asked CoTL if they would support those changes, and received statements of strong support.
 - Sue indicated Steve Reising has an idea how to move these proposals forward, involving taking the proposals to the community, rather than taking them directly to the faculty council. Sue indicated executive committee might have some ideas on ways to approach getting feedback, and said perhaps there is a concern about the implications of faculty council eligibility has for eligibility for unit-level shared governance.
 - Jenny observed that much of the unit-level governance was already taken care of by earlier changes to required departments to include NTTF participation in unit codes, and that much of the feedback gathering should already have been done for the most part.
 - Sue can suggest addition of a discussion item for this topic, but there are many discussion items. Sue will work to prioritize this topic in those discussions. Sue indicated executive committee usually has discussion about an item before placing it on the agenda to gather context, and would invite a CoNTTF rep to attend executive committee to help establish this context. There are four EC meeting in September before the October FC meeting, so we have time for such a meeting.

- Jenny pointed out that the arguments from administration that it is "hard" to let a continuing/contract faculty member go (hence the growing use of adjunct), that is an argument that those faculty members should be considered permanent and should have standing equal to TTF in representation.

Action Items / Discussion

- It's important for us to continue to maintain Dan Baker's data collection and analysis to track rollout of NTTF proposals and to see how appointment types are being used and how many promotions are being processed. Pinar volunteered to talk to Dan about taking this over. James also agreed to help.
- Jenny has sent new information to post on the web site - asked if there was other information that should be included to more proactively answer common questions. Any ideas can be sent to Jenny, Christine, or Natalie.
- Administrator award:
 - Leann & Ashley Harvey originated the idea of an award for an administrator for effective promoting of NTTF, but the pandemic slowed down its consideration. Question to Sue about how to best move that forward. Sue will look into the process - it feels similar to the Harry Rosenberg award.
- NTTF Reception:
 - Jenny asked Sue if there would be an NTTF Reception - Sue did not know.
 - The event was set up by the president's office. Sue felt this may just not be on president McConnell's radar - we may just need to bring the event to the attention of the executive leadership team. Sue is part of that team, and could bring it up to them. Jenny could also mention it to Sue James.
 - Sue thought the provost's office would be an appropriate owner of the event, and that the president's office might have too many pressing issues now to prioritize this event.
 - Joseph offered to write to president McConnell to remind her that such an event has been held. Sue suggested copying the provost on that communication. Joseph will send such a note.
- Goals:
 - Enforcement:
 - Joseph brought up enforcement, now that we have a new vice provost of faculty affairs (Sue James). We need to return to the discussion of enforcement of the policies that have been passed in the manual.
 - Sue noted that Sue James is well respected and an ally of NTTF.
 - Joseph noted that Dan Bush's strategy was to get affected NTTF to self-report and seek help from him, but NTTF were often reluctant to do so. There should be a systematic process for NTTF to report issues.
 - Sue indicated that she felt Sue James would have a strong focus on accountability.
 - Jenny will reach out to Sue James to start the conversation
 - Alex Bernacek's NTTF task force
 - Sue believe this task force is starting up again. Nobody in CoNTTF were aware of this, but Joseph will ask.
- Opportunities:

- Sue is a long-time member of CoNTTF, a member of AAUP, and an ally of NTTF. Sue James is also an ally of NTTF, and we have a new provost and president. There may be a lot of opportunities to further NTTF.
- Steve suggested teaching tenure could be back on the table, or a revisit of Don Estep's flexible work distribution in the tenure process.
- Jamie mentioned, at UC Irvine, first-day faculty could vote on long-term faculty promotions - there is a precedent to refer to.
- Natalie sees enforcement as the top priority - there is significant discrepancy between colleges, and that's a problem that needs to be resolved.
- Leann suggested NTTF should at least be able to vote on NTTF promotions across the university. Also, we should revisit contracts and how they are written. There should be a way to write the "rolling" type of contracts so they would renew a year before the old contract ends, rather than when it ends.
- Jenny suggested trying to include a broader vision in conversations around smaller proposals to help raise awareness of the larger goals, even if we're not ready to shoot for a big goal.
- Natalie brought up the weakness of the contract language, and the need to revisit.
- Question about unionizing - Jenny feels that Sue Doe and Sue James have been supportive of unions in the past. Perhaps a labor organizer could speak at a campus equity week to gauge interest.
- Representatives on other standing committees - this could be moot if we can get NTTF to be able to serve on faculty council.
- Jenny may ask Sue James to review department codes in light of NTTF updates.
- Workload outside 9-month appointment duration:
 - Jenny is concerned about the significant increased workload and the expectations placed on NTTF teaching faculty during the summer (while not officially working for the university) to prepare to teach in the COVID situation.
 - Natalie observed this is a culture, an expectation of work over the summer, even when on 9-month appointment, for faculty in general.
 - Jenny suggested maybe there should be a small stipend/supplemental during the other 3 months to do the work needed to remain connected and engaged (answer emails, prepare for Fall, etc.).
 - Natalie observed that if a person is being paid for one specific type of work, it's inevitable that they will be asked to other type of work.
 - Suellen observed that many feel obligated to do whatever is asked out of fear of losing the job.
 - Jenny thought CoNTTF may have ability to help with this situation.
 - Suellen described some templates or guidelines that could provide members of a unit more guidance on what options might meet a certain obligation like a service workload, and when an employee has done those, they have met the quota and should not be required/asked to do more. Having those templates could reduce the asking for extra work or help employees to say no to requests based on a rubric.

Meeting adjourned at 2:59pm