



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

Tuesday, March 1, 1:00-2:30pm
LSC 380

- 1) Attendance: Jenny Morse, Christine Pawliuk, Kendall Stephenson, Steve Benoit, Thomas Conway, Sean Bryan, Jamie Nielson, Ashley Harvey, Laurel Bond, Pinar Omur-Ozbek, Suellen Melzer, Leslie Stone-Roy
- 2) **MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**
 - a) CoNTTF Meeting Minutes – February 15 (p. 2-4)- approved
- 3) **CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS & UPDATES**
 - a) Meeting Minutes: Suellen Melzer Next Meeting: March 22, Zoom; Minutes: Pinar Omur-Ozbek
- 4) **ACTION ITEMS / DISCUSSION**
 - a) Code audit—update
 - i) Most representatives have completed or partially completed their code audits
 - (1) Ag, Vet Med, Werner require a couple more department audits
 - (2) Natural Sciences remains incomplete
 - ii) Jenny raised concern over and clarification of “Schools” having codes, but that these codes do not relate to faculty. SAU’s are not required to have faculty codes.
 - (1) Challenge exists when “schools”, which are SAU’s, have faculty, but those faculty don’t have a code that applies to them and that they can follow. They are either
 - (a) Not mentioned in the code
 - (b) Do not have a home department or are uncertain about how duties are separated and where evaluations are made
 - (2) It would be informative to mention on audit form what colleges have “schools” and if those schools have separate codes.
 - iii) Jenny asks that if code is outdated or absent to make note of that on audit form
 - (1) Codes may be updated but in process and not yet updated on the provost website
 - iv) Thomas asked whether we will audit college codes as well as his interest pertained to discrepancies noticed between departmental and college codes.
 - (1) Example provided involved the “time-served” requirement for promotion and whether something like “semester at sea” counts toward timeline. In this case there was a discrepancy between department and college on whether to accept this time due to “who” this experience served.
 - (2) Jenny: yes, we should audit the college codes at some time.

- v) Jenny reminded the committee that the code audit is for our report, which we will send off in April to Sue James and Sue Doe and Faculty Governance (for alignment concerns) and to encourage to take action by these parties
 - (1) March 22nd meeting is when we should have this audit meeting
 - (2) Jenny is soliciting help to write report

- b) Professional Development (PD) survey
 - i) A survey would inform us on what units were doing for PD after 12 semesters
 - (1) The survey is to find out if anyone has benefited from the current PD leave
 - ii) Professional Development leave: it has been left open-ended and we have not heard of any individuals who have received;
 - (1) Jenny suggested that if we survey, we could also ask if anyone has received professional development leave.
 - iii) PD is written into the faculty manual
 - iv) Previous admin did not want to write down what the PD would be
 - (1) Miranda was opposed to semester off for PD
 - v) The Provosts Office website has a PD application for 1 course release
 - vi) To find out more about PD cases and those that have benefited from PD
 - (1) we ask Provost office as all requests would go through Provost
 - (2) Ask Sue James how many have been awarded?
 - (3) Can also ask department chairs because the Provost application process says to first ask chair, then dean, then provost
 - vii) Mary asks if the funding comes from Deans office or Provost office? Is the call for applications budget related?
 - (1) Jenny: Budget should be irrelevant because it's written in Faculty Manual

- c) Jenny update: Student complaints and how being used- COTL—drafting language in the manual

- d) Extension Faculty
 - i) Will be talked about this afternoon in Faculty Council Meeting
 - ii) Proposal- discussion item-
 - iii) Jenny met with extension faculty in 2016 and they have since been working on proposal
 - (1) They have researched other schools and are undergoing same path as CoNTTF seeking
 - (a) Extension should be faculty
 - (b) They want a promotional pathway
 - (c) The pathway steps parallel the NTTF steps (instructor and professor pathways).
 - (d) Their proposal is for a new appointment types
 - (i) Fall under “other” appointment types
 - (ii) Representation under extension assembly
 - (2) Discussion points and questions
 - (a) If they all become faculty and didn't have their own council, what does that mean?
 - (b) If they all become faculty and do have their own council, what does that mean?
 - (c) What are downsides of extension becoming faculty?
 - (3) Mary asks whether extension roles/duties at CSU are different enough where they potentially should have their own council?

- (4) If they were represented in faculty council, how would NTTF numbers be affected?
 - (5) How many are extension have split or joint appointments with a department and/or as faculty, how many have home department now and would that change?
 - (6) Would it be a SAU or a department because those would have representations?
 - (7) If they become NTTF how would that affect us and the perception of NTTF?
- e) We are electing our new chair and vice chair today
- i) Are those on CoNTTF committee eligible to be nominated
 - (1) No
 - (2) Steve rising is only nominee to go up as Vice chair of faculty council
 - (3) Sue Doe is only nominee and is going up for third term as chair
 - (4) Andrew Norton going up as board of governance rep
- f) Collective bargaining
- i) Invite Andrew Norton to speak with CoNTTF about which groups concerns he will bring to the BOG and otherwise stand for.
- g) Ashley: CST Proposal accepted
- i) We will be on review committee for award

Adjourn: 2:07 pm