

Non-Tenure Track Issues (NTTI) Committee Meeting
October 28, 2019 at 3:00pm in Strong 202

Present: Crystal McAlvin, Laurie Knox, Sarah Eldridge, Kristina Gehrman, Anne Ho, Samantha Murphy, Rossy Toledo, Pedro Tomás-Mitchell

Absent: Jennifer Jordan, Anne Langendorfer

Call to order.

Old Business:

1. Chapter 4 and Appendix

- a. Knox and McAlvin explained that Chapter 4 and Appendix of the Faculty Handbook are still being discussed. Knox and McAlvin had met with John Zomchick and Beauvais Lyons on 10/9/19. The key change that we were trying to write in had to do with workload allocation (e.g. we were writing that 100% teaching means that one can only be evaluated on teaching), however, this doesn't seem like this matches up with various colleges' assignment of work. The new version of the documents (resulting from the 10/9/19 meeting) has been shared with Department Heads, College Deans, and the NTTF listserv. Beauvais Lyons is helping to push this through within a year. The Faculty Affairs committee is mostly in charge of making sure this gets through to the Board now. The most substantive suggestion has to do with defining "excellence" (see [meeting agenda](#) for details on the proposed deadline for this document).
 - i. The committee discussed ideas regarding the proposed amendment for section 4.5.2. The first comment is that the line with "Departmental criteria for tenure" needs to be cut. Is there a way to enforce equity in the definition of excellence across disciplines, departments, and units? This might have to be determined within a department and not written in this document.
 - ii. There was a lot of discussion about what "consistent" but "more specific criteria" entails.
 - iii. Should our committee have an official response? Should we express concern? It seems yes. We want departments and units to come up with fair and transparent standards for evaluation and promotion. Knox will email Lyons to point out that the start of Chapter 4 already covers the same ground here.

- iv. Concern: is there enough time for everyone to actually comment and review changes? Knox will email Lyons about this too.
- 2. Chapter 5.6: “The University may, at any time, with or without notice, terminate the appointment of a non-tenure-track faculty member without cause upon payment of the remaining salary due during the appointment.”
 - a. Brian Krumm is taking comments. **Our homework: what are some talking points and questions regarding this section?**
 - b. We’d like to invite Brian Krumm and Lisa Yamagata-Lynch (ombudsperson) to our November meeting.
 - c. Eldridge says that instead of thinking about changing the language, that we suggest that procedures must be followed.
 - d. McAlvin says there are some wording suggestions that might help here.
 - e. Note: “without cause” has a legal definition.
- 3. Data Request to OIRA
 - a. The committee brainstormed about additional data to request from OIRA.
 - i. Murphy suggests that we look at % of NTT in each department and unit.
 - ii. For part-time faculty, there was a discussion about whether it was 75% or higher to get benefits.
 - iii. There was a question about whether the “trends in student FTE” data will be clear or not because some NTTF oversee grad students, and there is a question over who is listed as instructor of record.
- 4. Comments about survey questions
 - a. Toledo mentioned that it’s impossible to get her PhD while being a full time lecturer right now in her department. There was brainstorming about how to word this in the survey. Gehrman wrote this down.

Adjournment