

- on IT/HR/marketing. They have been told that faculty will be housed in a department, just not specifically which one.
- vi) The new positions for faculty hiring (with criteria) have not yet been posted, so there is no clarity on who will be the two full-time and which faculty will not be rehired. This creates an awkward situation where all faculty will apply for all jobs and are each recommending each other for jobs they are competing for, and leaves much insecurity and uncertainty.
 - vii) Joseph observed that this process is much like the behaviors that CoNTTF have been working to prevent. Megan said that some INTO faculty have taught CO-150, and English has expressed concerns that INTO faculty might end up "taking jobs" from English faculty. Jenny observed that English should have stopped forcing faculty to re-apply every year, so this should not be a concern, but that current INTO faculty should just have preference only on new CO-150 hires in English.
 - viii) Denise checked and there are no current pool searches for CO-150. Megan said that at least 4 INTO faculty did apply to the CO-150 pool. Jenny observed that applying to that pool should ideally not be required for current INTO faculty.
 - ix) Natalie asked if CoNTTF has a role in advocating for INTO faculty to have some sort of preference in new hires within English. Jenny will ask Sue Doe about the best approach for CoNTTF's involvement. Mary observed that a resolution as of April might be too late to influence decisions, which may be final by then. Jenny suggested a letter from CoNTTF could express concerns and suggestions more quickly. Mary asked if we can get more information on what would be presented in April in order to know whether a resolution would be helpful.
 - x) Megan asked about what role faculty council should play in the process. Mary pointed out that FC should have say in issues of curriculum, and that this situation should be brought to FC for discussion. Jenny observed that FC has been involved in NTTF issues, and that the process CoNTTF had to go through to make changes to the manual had to go through a full FC "program" review, and that INTO should have been treated the same way. Joseph pointed out that FC does not have administrative authority with respect to INTO - it is limited to authoring a resolution. Jenny agrees that this is a larger shared governance issue.
 - xi) Jenny observed that NTTF can be hired into an SAU, without a home department. Is this a risk for INTO faculty? Megan said that English has told INTO faculty that there will not be a new SAU formed (because getting two departments to sign on to creating the SAU is difficult).
 - xii) Joseph has heard that ESL programs don't generally live in English departments. If so, is that the right thing? Things might be moving too quickly for us to influence the outcome. Denise observed that this is the same culture we've been working to change, and that we should not wait to weigh in quickly. Jenny suggested a letter that speaks to this cultural issue, which undermines stated University priorities related to improving

culture around NTTF.

- xiii) Jenny thinks that dean Withers was not given a choice in acting as the home department for INTO, and was placed in a difficult position of having responsibility for administering the program without authority to make changes to the program. Denise indicated that our letter should go to the people who need to be solving the problem - upper administration - and not CLA. Joseph believes the provost's office is probably the right place.
- xiv) Jenny will create a Google document for our committee to work on a draft letter. Mary suggested bringing these issues up in this evening's faculty council meeting just to make people aware of what's happening. Jenny asked if it would be out-of-order to raise an issue from the floor, Mary suggested framing it as a question after the provost's report. Joseph shared that both the president and provost will be giving reports, and Richard Eykholt will also be giving a report, which might be a good point at which to ask about the INTO grievance rate or whether the dissolution of INTO affected the resolution of those cases. Joseph suggested this might not be the best place, and Mary noted that the president is probably the best, but that the president may refer the question to the provost anyway.
- xv) Mary asked what the ongoing relationship with INTO will be. Megan shared that it's not clear - INTO may continue to do marketing for CSU, but this may not make sense if those students won't be using the INTO program when at CSU.
- xvi) Jenny suggested that we should ask as many questions as we can during the meeting to raise the visibility of the issue within FC. At a minimum, the president and the provost should receive questions. Megan noted that the plan is for all INTO faculty to be terminated and re-hired. This may affect promotion, losing accrued leave, and so forth due to this termination process. They have been told there will be no impact, but that's not clear. The question of why these faculty would need to be terminated and re-hired should be raised in the letter. Jenny observed that if she got a job in a different department she would not have to resign, but Pinar was asked to resign as part of the process of moving from TTF to NTTF within Engineering - she did not check on how this impacted leave time accrual.
- xvii) Megan said the INTO faculty was not told about the program closure before Spring, and are continuing to teach through Spring; the new positions would start in May. Mary asked if we should ask about how long this closure has been in the works and why FC was not told about these changes at the start of the process. Joseph said that Antonio had expressed surprise that Executive Committee was not aware of these changes.

4) Adjourn