

## Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee December 14, 2018

**Present:** Chris Craig, Kristina Gehrman, Anne Ho, Karen Jones, Laurie Knox, Anne Langendorfer, Crystal McAlvin

**Absent:** Doug Aaron, Stephen Marz, Scott Wall, Will Jennings, Jennifer Tourville

C. McAlvin called to order at 1:09.

C. McAlvin motion to approve October minutes. Craig approved.  
Minutes approved

L. Knox discussed plans for meeting – go over documents and fill in teaching, service, and research.

Anne Ho – teaching dossier component – L.K.  
Review of google drive documents that have been edited and comments added

-K. G. brings up issue of simplification of MFE documents (Chapter 6)  
-KG took comments out of margin and into a separate document

-KG proposed – unreasonable to make nt faculty to go through the same amount of hoops for a raise – since they are not trying to get tenured  
-What if we had a single candidate statement that is a cover – around 1000 words max could include the candidate statement of their responsibilities “roughly 100% of my responsibilities were \_\_\_\_\_” and then a breakdown of what they do. Then, the second thing would be the CV and the third thing would be documentation of their accomplishments.

KG

-You have to put “N/A” in categories that NTT are not required to do but they have to put NA so it doesn’t look like they ignored  
-Proposed: what about putting NA and then still list the things they did within that category – even if they are not “required” to do these activities, they should still have the option to explain what they did without it being part of their job requirement.  
-If time is not allocated to whatever category (service, for example)

LK: explained that in the English department they do something similar to this

-Only hesitation is – the cover letters they are writing is much over a page. All of the contextualizing is in the cover letter – so the cover letter will be much longer than a page.

KG

-Explained trying to put a max limit on the words in order to prevent people feeling like they have to write an onerous, complicated cover letter.

KG, LK, and CM agreed that a statement like, “one page is enough, but can go beyond a page”

KJ: Limit is reasonable because the point of the cover letter is to summarize

KG: clean copy chapter 6.B.3a.I – definition of a cover letter

-Make more sense to have a cover letter and then a separate candidate statement

-KG proposed: 6b3ai: items to be supplied by candidate under ai proposing to swap language \_\_\_\_\_ \*\* copy and paste from drive doc

-KG second proposal: we don't need to have asterisked items indicating required \_\_\_\_.

LK: our job today is to figure out what is required and what is recommended for each area

LK: let administrators know what they should absolutely have required and then let candidates know what additional tasks are suggested/options for them

CM: Other \_\_\_\_ may be included at the discretion of the candidate.

Research, scholarship, creative activity section:

-KG: Confused about what the differences are – “Possible indicators at the discretion of the candidate”

LK: for teaching, there are mandated requirements

AH: Are we still requiring a statement under every section?

Craig: yes

Discussion regarding student comments/student evaluations and whether or not it should be included in evaluation process for those up for promotion etc ensued

LK: schedule another meeting before classes start to try to get through the mandated and other for each dossier sections

LK will send out an email with instructions/clear assignments and try to schedule a time to meet soon.