

Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee Meeting
March 1, 2019

Present: Crystal McAlvin, Misty Anderson, Chris Craig, Anne Ho, Will Jennings, Laurie Knox, Anne Langendorfer, Jennifer Tourville

Absent: Doug Aaron, Kristina Gehrman, Karen Jones, Scott Wall

C. McAlvin and L. Knox started the meeting by giving updates about the Faculty Evaluate Manual (FEM, aka Manual for Faculty Evaluation or MFE). This included looking over an email from L. Knox to Michelle Kwon and the Faculty Affairs Committee. Currently, there is no work for the NTTI Committee to do but wait.

The committee moved on to reading the New Business section of the agenda, including work that needs to be monitored and future goals/initiatives. The work that needs to be monitored includes the following (paraphrased from meeting agenda):

- The approval and possible merging of Faculty Handbook (FH) Chapter 4 and the FEM Part VI
- The Provost's Office work to inform department heads on the implementing the new FH and FEM
- The Provost's Office policies on the use of Elements for NTTF

The committee brainstormed several initiatives, primarily focusing on the following from the agenda:

- Family leave for NTTF - Currently, it appears that there is a policy for all faculty, but this sometimes excludes NTTF because of our roles. It was suggested that there could be a comparison with the family leave policy for TT probationary faculty.
- Creating a tenure track for teaching faculty - Many of the concerns about NTTF workload and contracts fell into this discussion. It was mentioned that Georgia State might be a good institution to draw comparisons with because they have such faculty positions and because of the geographic location of the school. There was a discussion about how the word "tenure" may cause anxiety and concern, but that the benefits from tenure could be discussed without using the term itself (e.g. longer contracts, due process, academic freedom). Wright State was mentioned as an example of an institution that was asking for continuous employment protection. Note that this idea was brought up again later (after M. Anderson arrived), and it was not clear that asking for something like "continuous employment protection" was the best direction to proceed in for this, even if everyone generally agreed that NTTF need better working conditions.
- A moon shot goal: it was agreed that having a gathering of all NTTF on campus would be nice. The NTTF listserv might be a good place to start.
- Working with Ombudsperson - L. Knox will represent NTTF on the committee interviewing the new ombudsperson. These interviews are March 25 & 27. She would like committee members' guidance on good questions to ask.

After M. Anderson arrived, the NTTI committee asked that a NTTF be involved in the planning of the Faculty Senate Retreat for next fall, which M. Anderson agreed to. M. Anderson gave some thoughts about various topics mentioned above, which led to a discussion about the writing of two white papers:

1. “NTTI and Academic Freedom” – If our committee would generate a 2-page white paper for Faculty Senate regarding reserving free speech in the classroom, that would be nice. Ideas: have one person interview the old ombudsperson, talk to a law colleague, address how to deal with possible intimidation, look into the Campus Free Speech Protection Act (<https://freespeech.utk.edu/campus-free-speech-protection-act/>), imagine a scalable project, and this document could potentially be placed on the Senate website.
2. “Faculty Workload and Exploitation” – Lay out the consolidated research. Write in questions. Keep this direct but not inflammatory. Get information about NTTF job descriptions, workload, voting rights, etc. Try to align with UCW (e.g. look into Athena project) and Faculty Affairs. Example of information to start: lecturers start at a salary of \$36,000, and there seems to be varying levels of negotiability across departments.

The meeting ended with a discussion of whether the faculty could formally support HB0707 (<https://legiscan.com/TN/bill/HB0707/2019>)/SB0775 (<https://legiscan.com/TN/bill/SB0775/2019>), which would require adjunct professors be compensated at least \$1000 per credit hour taught.