

Minutes of NTT Faculty Issues committee meeting March 26, 2018

Present: Laurie Knox, Crystal McAlvin, Stephen (AKA:Scott) Marz, Scott Wall, Jennifer Tourville, Phyllis Thompson via Zoom

1. Voted to approve the January and February minutes, approved
2. Crystal shared with the committee the horrible experience she had earlier today when a coworker stole her lunch from the refrigerator.
3. We briefly discussed the situation of a NTT faculty member that had his contract terminated due to lack of required incoming funding. He was at risk for losing his retirement benefits, TCRS, due to being employed for less than 5 years. He sought assistance from the NTTI committee, and it was recommended that he seek advice from the benefits department. We discussed the possible additional education for NTT faculty during the new hire orientation process to allow complete understanding of the differences between ORP and TCRS retirement plans.
 - a. It may be beneficial to have the Ombudsman come to a NTTI meeting to review benefits of NTT faculty
4. We discussed how to educate the department heads on the revisions made to the FH and what they need to do moving forward. Strategies were suggested.
 - a. We would like to speak with Matthew Theriot and offer him the opportunity to attend a NTT faculty meeting. If not, we would appreciate him distributing a summary of the revisions and the formal document to deans and department heads. Laurie has been in contact with Matthew regarding “getting the word out,” referring to distributing the new revisions. He stated that we were permitted to “get the word out.” We feel that “getting the word out” should follow the chain of command, starting with the provost office. Following new process will be facilitated by coming from a position of control, instead of from a committee of peers. The revisions should be implemented into the training of department heads. The committee co-chairs should be included on the email and communication related to how the changes should be distributed and summarized.
 - b. The changes that have been made to the FH are major and extensive. What should be sent is:
 - i. Clean copy of document
 - ii. Document with changes
 - iii. A summary of the changes
 - c. Voted to forward the above three documents to Matthew Theriot, John Zomchick, Beauvais Lyons that they begin dissemination of the changes, with CC to the NTTI co-chairs as they communicate with administrators, vote was unanimous
 - d. There is concern about faculty having a voice regarding new revisions. These changes will have to be incorporated into college bylaws and should be done so as soon as possible. We discussed sending out the document over the NTTI list serve. The email sent to Laurie by Matthew Theriot states that the committee

should disseminate the revisions. Scott feels that some faculty may not accept some revisions within the new document, and we should follow the hierarchy of the university and allow the provost office and/or Matthew Theriot to send out this information. We believe that it would be appropriate to send an email directing NTT faculty to the document on the Faculty Senate website after sending an email to Matthew Theriot and John Zomchick and receiving an acknowledgment. This will be our next action.

- e. Concerns regarding the timeline of implementation of the new process were expressed. If this is not sent out soon, we risk another year of not have the changes in place.
5. Future to do list:
 - a. MFE revisions – changes to FH need to be incorporated
 - b. We need to ask Matthew Theriot how he plans to incorporate the new FH policies into the evaluation and promotion process prior to MFE revisions being made.
 - c. MFE will also need to be changed to reflect the new TT changes that will be put into place, though this will not be a duty of this committee. However, NTT and TT policies for evaluation and promotion should be similar.
 - d. The peer review and evaluation process for NTT faculty was discussed, this seems to vary between colleges. Departments have requirements that are not in the MFE.
 - e. The process of approving revisions of the MFE was reviewed in the current MFE.
 - f. We will start by making a list of revisions that pertain directly to the new revisions in the FH. Other inconsistencies will be identified along the way and considered after FH revisions are incorporated.
 - g. We discussed reviewing the bylaws audit and see if there are inconsistencies but decided that this should be done by each college's bylaws committee.
 6. We are doing great!!!!
 7. Motion to adjourn approved